MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Seventy-Sixth Session
April 5, 2011

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Tick Segerblom at 1:11 p.m. on Tuesday, April 5, 2011, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda (Exhibit A), the Attendance Roster (Exhibit B), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Marcus Conklin
Assemblyman Richard (Skip) Daly
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Cresent Hardy
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblyman William C. Horne
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman John Oceguera
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick (excused)
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst
Nancy Davis, Recording Secretary
Michael Smith, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ben Graham, representing the Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court
Michael L. Douglas, Chief Justice, Nevada Supreme Court
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families
John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party
Garrett Sutton, Attorney and Author, Reno, Nevada
Alan Glover, Clerk/Recorder, Carson City
Scott Gilles, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum
Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

Chair Segerblom:
[Roll was taken.] There has been a request that Assembly Joint Resolution 1, dealing with changing the assessment and collection of property taxes, be placed on hold, so we will not be hearing that bill today.

Assembly Joint Resolution 1: Proposes to amend certain provisions of the Nevada Constitution related to the assessment and collection of property taxes to allow the recalculation of the taxable value of depreciated improvements to real property upon the transfer, sale or conveyance of the property. (BDR C-402)

[This bill was not heard.]

I see the Chief Justice here, so we will turn to Assembly Joint Resolution 7.

Assembly Joint Resolution 7: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to create an intermediate appellate court. (BDR C-1129)

Ben Graham, representing the Administrative Office of the Courts, Office of Court Administrator, Nevada Supreme Court:
On behalf of the people of the State of Nevada and the judicial system, I want to thank the Legislature for its support toward the establishment of an appellate court in this state. You passed legislation in 2003, 2007, and 2009, without a

single no vote, that would establish this court. The measure was submitted to the electorate, but there were a number of factors that contributed to the demise of that ballot measure. It did carry in Clark County, but the remainder of the state rejected it along with the judicial selection measure. I urge this Legislature, since many of you have supported it in the past, to continue to support the effort to establish the appellate court so that there can be a more timely resolution of appellate matters—many of which involve your constituents' very vital issues.

Michael L. Douglas, Chief Justice, Nevada Supreme Court:
We are here again to work toward establishment of a court of appeals within the State of Nevada. The vote on this issue during the last general election was close but not good enough. The vote was 53.18 percent no and 46.82 percent yes. We were disappointed, to say the least, but we are here to ask that this process begin again. Even if the process began yesterday, it would not go into effect until 2016, so there is time for us to properly educate the electorate.

It is my opinion that we did not properly plead our case in rural Nevada, but, more importantly, the ballot measure was coupled with another bill concerning judicial selection. Many voters felt selection of judges would be taken out of their hands, so they voted no on anything dealing with the courts or spending additional money. They did not want this.

We come back before you because justice delayed is justice denied. We do not want to set up another hurdle; we want to get important matters decided for the voters, and the court of appeals would do that. It would be a "push down" in jurisdiction. All matters would come into the Court, so we would be using our existing clerk's office and would not need additional personnel for that aspect. The personnel we would need to add include three court of appeals judges and their secretaries and law clerks. We have the other infrastructure and a court for them in Las Vegas.

The push-down situation means that all cases would be filed with the Supreme Court. The Court would be looking at constitutional matters, matters of first impression, where there is no set law. Clearly, we would be looking at criminal matters, such as death penalty-type cases, because of the major importance they have, so there would be speedy resolution.

We submitted a short set of slides to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) (Exhibit C). The slides note that A.J.R. 7 would leave the Supreme Court more time for first impression matters and death penalty cases, but more importantly, the publishing of opinions. In 2006, we issued 122 published opinions where we, in writing, opined as to issues of law.

In 2010, we had only 63 published opinions. In 2006, we had 2,000-plus cases filed and disposed of 2,100 of them. In 2010, we had 2,200 cases filed and we disposed of 2,400. We have shifted our priority to disposition of more cases, so people have settled results.

One of the important things about published opinions relates to the business community, which wants to know what is on the mind of your branch of government as well as our branch of government. They want to see settled rulings so they understand how their businesses should work and what would happen if they have a case in court. Likewise, on the criminal side, proponents of death penalty or capital murder cases also want to know how this court is looking at the new evidentiary trends and what is going on. Both those areas are asking for more opinions to be written to clarify any inconsistencies in the law or any areas that may be vague.

We have also provided you with information as to states with similar populations, such as New Mexico, Kansas, and Utah. Those states all have courts of appeal to aid with getting cases resolved.

This court of appeals would be able to sit in either Las Vegas or in Carson City. The cost would not come into play until this court actually comes into being. The estimated cost on slide 5 is based on a 2007 number; we are not sure what the expense will be when we finally get an appeals court in place, but we will update those figures as we go forward.

There is also a link to a white paper that will give you a full statement as to the court of appeals, and I have also provided you with a fact sheet (Exhibit D). The bottom line is this legislation is being considered today in 2011. If it is passed, it would return in 2013. If it passes in 2013, it would go on the general election ballot in 2014. If it passed at that time, it would come back to you in 2015 for the financial appropriation. Also, the judges would have to be selected. Speaking about selection of judges, because we understand we have a little inconsistency, we made certain those new judges would come on board and be on line so that there would not be any discrepancy in their salaries.

If everything goes as we hope, the court would begin sitting in 2016. Hopefully we can do a proper job of educating the voters. We hope there will not be any mixed messages that we are not able to correct in front of the voters this next time. Again, this is something we think goes with the growth and development of the State of Nevada and is something the various chambers of commerce have talked to us about having. Our feeling is that it would benefit the people in the State of Nevada in terms of reviewing decisions of the lower courts.

Chair Segerblom:
Obviously, it is a great idea and a great bill. I think it is important to keep trying, because there is a five-year delay between the start of the process and when it would actually have an impact. We know we need it now, so I am sure we are really going to need it by 2016. Does anyone have any questions?

Assemblyman Horne:
I agree wholeheartedly with your assessment, Mr. Chairman.

Assemblyman Stewart:
I am very much in agreement with you and Mr. Horne on this matter, Mr. Chairman.

Justice Douglas:
We thank the Chair and Members of this Committee for giving us the opportunity to come forward today and present this to you.

Chair Segerblom:
Is there anyone who wishes to speak on behalf of A.J.R. 7? [There was no response.] Does anyone want to speak against A.J.R. 7?

Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families:
I am not necessarily for or against this measure, but I am concerned with the fact that the people just voted on this and said that this was not the right time and not what they wanted to do. Because this issue is being brought up again so quickly right after it was voted on, I believe the people are becoming "non-voices." You are not listening, and that is insulting to the people. We did not want this.

Chair Segerblom:
Is it your opinion that members of your party should not run more than once?

Lynn Chapman:
This is not about a party; this is about setting up a court system. This is not really about running for an office.

Chair Segerblom:
If it does not succeed the first time, try again.

Lynn Chapman:
But it is an affront to the people, and that is what I wanted to bring forward.

Chair Segerblom:
Thank you. Mr. Horne?

Assemblyman Horne:
Ms. Chapman, you heard the Chief Justice's testimony that they believe this measure may not have passed last year because it was coupled with an unpopular provision—the selection of judges. They posit that, except for the other provision, this measure would have passed. Is that a fair assumption?

Lynn Chapman:
I was not necessarily against this when it came up for a vote. I was against the appointment of judges, but I was not necessarily against the appellate court, because I was in the hearings. I do not know that its defeat really had anything to do with the appointment of judges. I do not think it did.

Assemblyman Horne:
In your statement, you just said that you were not necessarily against that provision, but you were against the selection of judges. That could mean others like yourself, who were not necessarily against the appellate court, were certainly against the selection of judges. That is why the Court is now proposing to put this on the ballot by itself to see if it can stand on its own. Is that a fair question to ask the people if it was coupled with something that was so unpopular?

Lynn Chapman:
There were two separate questions on the ballot, and I do not think most people put them together. It is okay that you want to bring it up again, but the people have already spoken. "Just keep trying until it goes through" seems to be the mentality, and sometimes that is insulting because the people just voted on it. I think there should be some time in between.

John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party:
My position is that this has been voted on two different times, and both times the measure lost. I believe the people have spoken, and to infer we need to be educated almost implies that we are stupid, which I really do not like to hear. That is my position: the people have spoken on this twice already.

Chair Segerblom:
Is anyone else opposed to A.J.R. 7? [There was no response.] Is anyone else neutral on A.J.R. 7? [There was no response.] Hearing none, we will close the hearing on A.J.R. 7. We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 383.

Assembly Bill 383: Directs the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study concerning trademark and copyright law. (BDR S-983)

Assemblyman Pat Hickey, Washoe County Assembly District No. 25:
I am here to introduce A.B. 383, which calls for the Legislative Commission to conduct an interim study concerning trademark and copyright law. As a part-time journalism instructor, I am well aware, as are many of you on the Committee, of the incredible level of digital piracy that has gone on in recent decades. It results in billions of dollars in lost earnings to various creative people—filmmakers, authors, musicians, and others. This is a loss of intellectual property rights to these individuals.

This request for an interim study builds on advice given to the proponent of this bill and to me from the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB). It was felt a study was warranted that would dig more deeply into the issue. Following the study, legislation that would be crafted would allow individuals who are the victims of this piracy of their creative rights to have access to stop the Internet service providers, and other websites, that typically download things at far less cost than what the artist or author had asked for his property.

Mr. Sutton has found what he believes is a way to remedy this problem. There is a unique element to the solution that not only will help remedy this problem, but may also provide an economic benefit to the State of Nevada. Companies seeking redress would have to domicile or have at least one employee in the state. Should this idea work, we are talking about major entities, and it could result in a large incidental income to the State of Nevada. At this point, I would like to introduce Mr. Garrett Sutton, a Reno attorney, who has developed the idea for this bill and study.

Garrett Sutton, Attorney and Author, Reno, Nevada:
I am part of the Rich Dad's advisor group. I have sold a number of books, and it is quite infuriating to see my name on the Internet associated with free downloads of my book. This happens all the time lately, and it is having a negative effect on the creative industries. Authors, artists, musicians, and filmmakers are finding that their work, as soon as it comes out, is available for free download on the Internet.

I have talked to intellectual property attorneys, and I have crafted a bill that would deal with the creation of a title trademark, whereby the State of Nevada would allow a title of a book, song, or other creative expression to be trademarked. That would offer protections for that artist.

As Mr. Hickey mentioned, it would also have an economic component for the State of Nevada in that people who were going to assert these rights would have to have at least one employee domiciled in the state to pursue this. An issue we have in this regard relates to being certain we do not wander into copyright law where federal law has preemption, so the bill requests a study so that we can carefully draft a bill that just deals with trademarks. We do not want to veer off into the area of copyright law.

I do believe that this can be done. I have talked to a number of intellectual property attorneys who say that if we spend some time and craft it properly, we can have a trademark for a title. In that way, the State of Nevada will be able to protect creative expression.

I think the way the bill is drafted will force the interim committee to spend some time and come up with the right language, and I am happy to assist with that. I think this type of legislation has merit, not only to provide economic opportunities for the State of Nevada, but also to protect the creative expression of artists, musicians, and authors.

Chair Segerblom:
You said you currently see your book available for free downloads. Is there a reason why you cannot sue someone for putting it on the Internet?

Garrett Sutton:
Typically, what you do is start with a "take down" notice. You have a service provider send a notice to the offending website to take down your free download. Some do; most do not. Your next step is to go to federal court and pursue a trademark claim. That is very time-consuming and cumbersome. This bill we are proposing would provide for a much more accelerated and inexpensive process for protecting people's trademark rights.

Chair Segerblom:
So you would still have to go to court, but it would be a simpler process. Would it be a Nevada court?

Garrett Sutton:
Yes, it would be in Nevada courts. I have spoken with District Judge Brent Adams in Reno, and he is in support of this. If we draft it properly, I believe it can be a very summary procedure for publishers to proceed in Nevada courts.

Assemblyman Stewart:
Has this been tried successfully in other states?

Garrett Sutton:
Not to my knowledge. It has not been pursued in other states, so we would be the creative fountain in this.

Chair Segerblom:
It appears there may not be any actual studies proposed for the interim, but there are interim committees that are assigned topics like this. This sounds like a good topic for this Committee if it exists during the interim. Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Seeing no further questions, thank you very much for bringing this to our attention. You definitely will be heard.

We will close the hearing on A.B. 383 and ask the clerks to come forward so we can open the hearing on Assembly Bill 473.

Assembly Bill 473: Revises provisions governing elections. (BDR 24-1021)

Alan Glover, Clerk/Recorder, Carson City:
I have been asked by Larry Lomax, the Registrar of Voters in Clark County, to give his apologies for being unable to attend today as he is busy with their primary elections. He wants you to know that he is in support of this bill.

This bill contains the collective thoughts and ideas of all the county clerks in the state. After each election, they have ideas for things that need to be changed as well as practical ideas to improve elections. A number of the ideas in this bill were in the Secretary of State's bill that failed to pass two years ago.

Section 1, on page 3 of the bill, is our attempt to clean up the problem that occurred with Scott Ashjian in his campaign for the U.S. Senate and the very messy situation in the Mineral County Clerk's race concerning people filing for office. At the time they signed their declarations of candidacy, they did not belong to that party. It cost quite a bit of time and money on many people's part to litigate this issue, and in my opinion, it still was not clear. As clerks, we want to know that when someone comes into our offices, signs a declaration, and files for office, they actually, at that moment, belong to that party—not later on in the day, not tomorrow, and not next year. In the Mineral County case, the lady had not belonged to the party for several years that she filed in, yet she was allowed to be on the ballot. This is our attempt to clean that up. I believe this change would occur in the declaration of candidacy for partisan office, and this is bill drafting language on how to address that problem.

Language in section 2 on page 6 of the bill would increase the maximum size of a precinct from 1,500 to 3,000 voters. This gives the counties a little more flexibility in creating precincts, and the timing could not be better, because with

redistricting the precincts are all going to change. This is a cost-saving mechanism. The Secretary of State pays to have the rural counties' elections programmed by the Sequoia Voting System Company, which charges by the precinct. The cost is $250 for each precinct, so the fewer precincts we have, the less it costs.

Precincts do not mean to us what they once did. It is not one precinct in one polling place; we have large polling places now. You sign the roster poll book alphabetically and not by precinct any longer. This change was a best practice recommendation and has been very successful. Most people do know what letter of the alphabet their last name starts with, but they very seldom know what precinct they belong to.

Chair Segerblom:
From your point of view, it is the cost of programming the Sequoia machines?

Alan Glover:
That is not the number-one reason for it. It would give us more flexibility when we are creating precincts, and we are going to be redoing them after you redistrict. Creating precincts is like cutting cookies out of a sheet of dough. There is always a piece left over, so you could end up with one very small precinct, but if you have larger ones, it makes it easier to create precincts. I am not convinced that Clark County is going to grow at the rate it did during the last ten years, but once a precinct reaches 1,500 voters, you have to split it and create another. Now, this is all on paper, but to a voter, the precinct number does not mean much. We are simply assigning them a precinct number.

Assemblyman Grady:
What would you do in a small county containing only one precinct for the entire county?

Alan Glover:
That is a distinct possibility. You have to have separate precincts for the different areas. There cannot be only one precinct with people voting in many locations. That does not work. There needs to be a polling location nearby. In a town like Fernley, there may be only one polling location and one precinct. If they come in to vote and sign in alphabetically, what difference does it make?

Assemblyman Grady:
On redistricting, with only one precinct, you would make it very difficult to draw those lines in some counties.

Alan Glover:
Yes. If you are splitting a county, each precinct has to contain a distinct voter group. You cannot have one precinct and put all the county commissioners together and all the general improvement districts together or two Assemblymen or two Senators. You have to create precincts that have that ballot style. That is why most precincts end up being small. If an area was entirely in your Assembly district, your county commission district, and your school board district, and they built a big subdivision, you could place up to 3,000 voters into that precinct. Remember, precincts are based on the number of registered voters, but districts are based on population, and it fluctuates over the years in most cases.

I believe you have copies of some sample ballots we have used over the years (Exhibit E). The language proposed in section 3 on page 7 we consider to be cleanup, because we have used both abbreviations and the full names of parties over the years. In 2010, we were directed by the Secretary of State to use the full party name, such as Independent Party of Nevada, Democratic Party, et cetera. That caused us a major problem with the printers. Most of the rural counties use the State Printing Office. To get a really long name plus the party affiliation in the space was very difficult, and then the sample ballot needs more and more pages. With this proposed change, we can go back and simply use the abbreviations for the parties. Our sample ballots contain a key that tells voters what the abbreviations mean. I do not think most people have too much trouble identifying the various parties, but that is an important issue to us for printing purposes and saving money.

Section 4 on page 8 of the bill applies only to a very few voters. These are the people who have submitted their voter applications to us by mail. When they were entered into the system, these applications did not clear with the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). These voters are flagged. They are registered voters, but they are required to show identification (ID) at the polls. Because the law says a voter must be able to show who he is and where he lives, this is our attempt to tighten that up and get their physical addresses to verify they are who they say they are.

Also in section 4 on page 8, line 26, it says, "If there is a question as to the physical address of the person, the election board officer or clerk may request additional information." You cannot register at your business. If that has occurred, we ask them to prove where they live. If their driver's license also has their business address on it, we would like to be able to ask for a utility bill that shows where they actually live.

Language being added in section 5 would bring the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) into compliance with the Uniformed and Overseas Citizens Absentee Voting Act and the Military and Overseas Voting Empowerment (MOVE) Act, which require the clerks to prepare ballots and distribute them 45 days before each election.

Language in section 6 on page 9, line 39, deletes the requirement that we consider absent ballot requests for two elections. Our statutes say that we are to consider military absentee ballot requests for two elections. Since the MOVE Act passed, federal law allows only one year, so this conforms our law to the federal statute.

Section 8 on page 10 gets into an area that may be controversial. We consider this cleanup concerning the hours we stay open before an election. This is really old language left over from the days when the only place where you could register to vote was the clerk's office. Since then, you can register at the DMV and, hopefully, we are going to register online. We do not get very many people registering at night, and we need some flexibility. Clark County may want to stay open a variety of hours, but in a county like Esmeralda, no one comes in at 9 o'clock at night to register to vote. This is our attempt to get relief concerning the hours we are open. Again, if we get online voter registration, that would really help us.

Language in section 9 on page 11, and in sections 10, 11, and 12 on page 12, all conform city law to what the counties do.

Language in section 13 on page 14 addresses a minor issue. A number of years ago when the statute was changed, there was an error made. In writing the statute, the phrase "criminal proceedings" was left out. Since a lot of challenges to petitions are filed here in Carson City in the First Judicial District, we thought it would be best to conform the language to that of all the other statutes that give precedence to election matters over criminal proceedings. However, I must say our district judges have been excellent at hearing election matters, and we have not had a major problem.

Section 14 of the bill goes back to allowing the county clerks to determine the hours they will be open during the last five days of voter registration, because people do not come in at odd hours as they used to. Section 15 on page 15 does the same thing.

Section 16 of the bill was added by Mr. Lomax and deals with the Virgin Valley Water District. Apparently they were left out of the bill that passed last session which changed when they are to have their elections. I do not know if anyone

is here to represent them, but they did contact Mr. Lomax, and they all agree that they want to conform to every other district.

Finally, we are repealing NRS 293.219 concerning recommendations by political parties for people to serve on election boards. We are always looking for workers, and this does not really happen. In fact, I do not recall the parties here having ever given me any suggestions for membership on the board. They may not even be aware of this antiquated provision. As I said, we are always looking for people to work.

Chair Segerblom:
I do not like the 3,000-voter precinct limit. I was considering proposing an amendment that would eliminate the requirement that you send sample ballots to every registered voter and allow you to send sample ballots to each household. Talking with you and Mr. Lomax, I understand that would be a substantial savings.

Alan Glover:
We have discussed this considerably in my office. It certainly would save a lot of money. Sample ballots are now bar coded, so when people come in, we scan the sample ballots and bring their names right up, so there is some benefit. But the cost of sending sample ballots is probably one of the biggest costs in an election.

I do not know if people would like it. They are used to getting their own individual ballots and there are a lot of split households—Democrats and Republicans—but it is worthy of discussion.

Chair Segerblom:
Maybe we could make it optional for each county.

Assemblyman Horne:
I believe it would be a problem. We have been telling people to complete their sample ballots and bring them to the polls to make voting easier and more efficient. If only one was sent to a household, they would have to share it. I fill mine out and take it with me.

Assemblyman Stewart:
You would have to send out individual sample ballots for primary elections because of different party affiliations. For the general election, you would not.

Alan Glover:
A lot of states do not send sample ballots. This may be peculiar to the West and the Progressive movement of the past century. We have talked about putting them online. As time evolves, technology will evolve, too.

Assemblyman McArthur:
Going back to the number of voters in a precinct, is this just for the mechanical voting systems? Is there a figure for nonmechanical systems?

Alan Glover:
No, it does not make any difference. A registered voter is assigned a precinct no matter what method he uses to vote. It is where he physically lives. Traditionally, precincts were kept small because the voters in each one voted at one polling place, and you could not fit 3,000 people in a firehouse, for example. Now, we are better off when we can use multiple large polling places. Again, precincts do not mean a lot to the clerks anymore.

Assemblyman Hickey:
Going back to section 8 and the question of flexibility regarding opening and closing times on page 10, line 39, it says that "The county clerk shall determine the hours during which the office . . . ." Can that be tightened up? Theoretically, you could close it at 9 o'clock in the morning or have it open at a very late hour.

Alan Glover:
Yes, we could work on tightening it up. I mentioned to Mr. Hickey that you might want to allow the county commissioners to set the hours. That way, if Storey County wanted to close at 7 at night or the Clark County Commissioners wanted Mr. Lomax to stay open for 24 hours, I suppose they could. We do want to stay open and get people registered, but over the years I have noticed that people come in between 5 and 7 p.m. After 7 p.m. they just do not come in, especially during the fall when it is cold and dark and they can register other ways. But we would like some flexibility. I will be more than happy to work on language for that if you would like me to.

Assemblywoman Flores:
The language about precinct sizes says you can have a maximum of 3,000 voters. Could they contain fewer than 3,000 voters in order to have more precincts? Do they all have to contain the same number? How does that work?

Alan Glover:
That is the maximum number a precinct could contain. I believe there are precincts in Clark County that may have as few as 20 voters because of the

way it was districted. After the last redistricting, I built all the precincts to contain about 1,000 voters, and we have one left over that would not fit into either Senate or Assembly district. It has only 200-plus people in it. The precincts go by ballot style. You will find that most counties will not change the number of precincts or their locations very much.

Chair Segerblom:
Does anyone else wish to speak in favor of A.B. 473?

John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party:
I like this bill and particularly the language on page 3, line 27, where it says "currently registered to vote in the State of Nevada." As you well know, we went to court against Mr. Scott Ashjian on this, and the courts ruled that he was in substantial compliance, so that problem would be taken care of by this language.

I have submitted an amendment (Exhibit F), and it should be on NELIS. It has to do with section 3, subsection 3(a) on page 7, and the word "independent" on the ballot. When you register to vote, "independent" is not on the registration form. It is our position that the phrase should say "no political party." So-called "independents" do not belong to any political party. If you abbreviate "independent" as "IND," it might be misinterpreted as being the Independent American Party. I think "IND" should be changed to "NPP"—no political party. I made the same change in section 3, subsection 4, on line 34.

Chair Segerblom:
What would the Independent American Party be?

John Wagner:
The abbreviation would be IAP.

Chair Segerblom:
Mr. Glover, under your proposal, what would the abbreviation for the Independent American Party be?

Alan Glover:
The Secretary of State would tell us how to abbreviate the parties' names, but I would think it would be IAP—the Independent American Party.

Chair Segerblom:
In your amendment, does "IND" stand for nonpartisan?

Alan Glover:
The abbreviation "IND" was the bill drafter's choice. Whatever you want to use is fine with us.

John Wagner:
I have run this by Secretary of State Ross Miller several different times, and his office does not seem to have any opposition to this, so it is probably up to you to decide what to do.

Assemblyman Daly:
Is there actually an Independent Party? I know the IAP is a party, the Democrats have a party, but is it even a party? Did it meet all the qualifications?

Assemblyman Horne:
You can be an independent without being a member of the Independent American Party, so why would they have to be characterized as having no political party?

Chair Segerblom:
I think we are calling those people nonpartisan as opposed to independent.

Scott Gilles, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:
It is my understanding that there is not an Independent Party, per se. You can be independent, and, according to Mr. Glover's amendment, a person falling under that category could be abbreviated as IND. I can follow up on this issue and get back to the Committee with a more specific answer.

As to Mr. Wagner's representation that Secretary of State Miller is okay with the NPP, I will take his word, but I have not spoken to the Secretary about it, so I will follow up on that as well.

Chair Segerblom:
Thank you. Ms. Hansen.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum:
We support this bill. On page 3, lines 27 and 28, we thought the language stating "I am currently registered . . . as a member of the . . . Party" was pretty clear. With the Ashjian case, it was obvious that it was not clear to the Secretary of State's Office, and it was not clear to the court. So we are very happy that you will be clarifying the situation with this proposed change.

Referencing section 2 on page 6, you have concerns about 3,000 voters to a precinct. I agree with many of the issues the clerks brought up, but their use of precincts is different from ours. Many candidates use precincts. When I have run as a candidate, or when I have run petition campaigns, we use precincts to identify where we want people to go door to door, et cetera. The larger a precinct is, the more difficult it is to deal with. For the practical purpose of candidates or ballot issues, it is easier to have a smaller number; however, we are not opposed to it. We understand the clerk's concern over money, but for those of us who use precincts beyond what the clerks use them for, the smaller precincts can often be easier to manipulate.

John Wagner spoke about his amendment to language on page 7. I support his proposed amendment. When you register to vote, you either have to register as a member of a political party or you have to register as nonpartisan. You do not register in Nevada as an independent, so you identify yourself as being nonpartisan. When a candidate running for election has no party or is nonpartisan, he is identified in our statutes as independent. It is confusing. If it were consistent in the voter registration terminology and on the ballot, it would be helpful. What frequently happens is that "independents" become confused with our Independent American Party. We do not mind that, but it would be helpful if it was consistent for the voter. If he registers as nonpartisan or he files as nonpartisan, he should be recognized as nonpartisan. He might call himself an independent, but it would be more consistent in the law if it were all either "no party" or "nonpartisan," because under our law, that is what they are.

We certainly support the clerks' request that people show their physical addresses. We also are in support of the clerk or the county deciding the hours of operation for voter registration. We think flexibility is always good, so we support the clerks in that as well.

We generally support this bill and believe it goes a long way toward cleaning the statutes up; however, we do request adoption of Mr. Wagner's proposed amendment.

Chair Segerblom:
Are there any questions for Ms. Hansen? [There was no response.] Is anyone else in support of the bill or neutral on the bill?

Scott Gilles:
I am representing the Secretary of State's Office, and we are neutral on this bill. It has quite a few practical changes, and it is clear that the clerks have been involved in drafting it, so there are a lot of good changes. It also includes some

of the provisions in two of our election bills, so we obviously support those specific provisions.

I would like to discuss the requirement in section 1 that changes the declaration of candidacy to add the language "currently registered to vote in the State of Nevada as a member of the . . . Party." It appears the purpose of this change is to clearly identify the party affiliation and establish that early on. An unintended consequence of the language, the way it is now written, is that it might be interpreted to require someone to have registered to vote prior to running for office. That is actually not a requirement. In Nevada right now, one only needs to be a qualified elector, which is defined by the *Constitution* as someone who is permitted to vote, so to the extent that the language in the bill is going to be interpreted to create that restriction, I think it should be clarified. This is not a huge deal, but it could come up in the future. There is case law from 1940 which says that you cannot restrict someone from filing for office simply because he is not registered to vote. I think some easy clarification on that language—maybe take out the "registered to vote" portion—would be useful just to avoid any conflicts later on.

There is a small issue in section 4 because the copy of the current photo identification that must be sent when you register by mail refers to a physical address. There may be a potential small problem there. Some DMV-issued IDs or licenses have post office box addresses on them, which clearly do not fall under the definition of physical address. The follow-up language in that change, where the clerk may follow up with an individual request for information regarding their physical address, probably resolves that, but it may be something to think about during a work session.

Chair Segerblom:
Are there any questions from Mr. Gilles? [There was no response.] Seeing none, does anyone else want to speak on A.B. 473?

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:
I am signed in as opposing this bill. We agree with some of the comments made by various people testifying this afternoon, in particular the representative from the Secretary of State's Office. I would like to reiterate the fact that there could be some confusion about the types of political parties, whether it is independent versus Independent American. From our perspective, we would encourage the Committee to have the entire party spelled out to eviscerate any problems in the future. We do understand Mr. Glover's perspective that it is a fiscal issue, but from our perspective, the duty we have to provide transparency

to the voters should be without regard to whatever extra pennies it will cost, especially if it is confusing to voters.

Current law says that major party candidates must be a member of that party. That does not actually apply to minor candidates. What would make sense would be to use a declaration for major party candidates. For minor party candidates, actually getting rid of the declaration would probably be more applicable.

I may have misread the portion regarding adjusting hearings on ballot measures in front of criminal proceedings, but I would like to clarify that criminal proceedings on any particular day can be multiple, and I want to make certain that it is up to the jurisdiction of the courts, where it should be, to consider the timeliness of the issue and opt to hear that first. This is language at the top of page 14 at lines 1 and 2 stating "to such a complaint over all other matters pending with the court, except for criminal proceedings." Essentially, as written, this would give criminal procedures precedence over whatever election issue was at hand, and that could be problematic.

Chair Segerblom:
Do you have an opinion on whether it should be "independent" or "nonpartisan"?

Rebecca Gasca:
When individuals first register, they are registering as nonpartisan and it would probably behoove the state to continue in that pattern. As long as the state does one thing and sticks with it—that is what should matter the most regardless of the title. The name should also be spelled out, especially if it will conflict with something like "independent" versus "Independent American" so as not to confuse voters.

Chair Segerblom:
Are there any questions? [There were none.] Seeing that there are no questions, does anyone else want to speak for, against, or neutral? [There was no response.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 473. I will turn the meeting over to the Vice Chair.

Vice Chair Flores:
I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 502.

Assembly Bill 502: Revises provisions relating to ballots. (BDR 24-1112)

Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Clark County Assembly District No. 9:
This is a very simple bill that was brought about by a change to our *Constitution* in the 1990s which required that all tax increases be approved by two-thirds of the Legislature. As part of that constitutional amendment, which was adopted by the voters, it said that, at the end of a legislative session, the Legislature could vote by majority vote to put a tax increase on the next general election ballot. In anticipation of that situation occurring, I am proposing this bill, which would place a ballot measure that the Legislature would put on the ballot at the top of the ballot right after the federal offices. Right now, ballot questions are placed after most other candidates. As the slides in my PowerPoint indicate (Exhibit G), there is a substantial drop-off in voter participation between the top of the ticket and the ballot questions. The purpose of this bill would be to make sure as many voters as possible vote on what would be a critical issue to the State of Nevada.

Looking back through history, there is about a 5 percent drop-off in voter participation as one goes down the ballot. Of course, everyone who votes for president or governor would vote for the tax question, but if it was right there at the top of the ballot, you would have higher voter participation. Because taxes are such critical issues to the State of Nevada, the more people who participate the better.

We have a sample ballot showing how this would look in my PowerPoint. The first position on the ballot would be the presidential contest, the next position the U.S. Senate race, and the third position would be the ballot question. This is just a hypothetical ballot.

Vice Chair Flores:
We have a few questions.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:
But that would be the case no matter what the question was, as long as it was referred by the Legislature.

Assemblyman Segerblom:
This only applies to those tax questions brought about by the 1996 constitutional change. It deals with questions brought under Section 18 of Article IV of the *Nevada Constitution*.

Assemblyman Grady:
Would there be questions in two different places on the ballots?

Assemblyman Segerblom:
Yes. This critical question that a Legislature thought was important—a public vote on tax increases—would be placed at the top of the ballot, assuming it ever was needed. The remainder of the questions would be at the bottom of the ballot.

Assemblyman Grady:
Are we trying to confuse the issue or make it simpler?

Assemblyman Segerblom:
We are trying to involve as many people as possible in a decision that is critical to the citizens of the State of Nevada. As I pointed out, there is a marked drop-off in the number of people who vote the top of the ballot as compared to those who vote the entire ballot. This would get as many people as possible to vote on that issue.

Assemblyman Hickey:
Do you think there is a possibility a question like that could anger a certain segment of the population who would then not vote for anyone else as a result?

Assemblyman Segerblom:
That is why it is proposed legislation, and why we are here for this hearing. Anything is possible.

As I said earlier, we want to facilitate having as many voters as possible participate in such an important ballot question.

Vice Chair Flores:
Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 502? [There was no response.] Is there anyone neutral on the bill? [There was no response.] Do we have any opposition to A.B. 502? [There was no answer.] The hearing is now closed on A.B. 502, and welcome back, Mr. Chair.

Chair Segerblom:
Now we will have a presentation by staff on Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 75th Session. We are not going to vote on this today, but we wanted to have a brief discussion on this resolution.

Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 75th Session: **Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to revise the provisions governing a petition for a state initiative or referendum. (BDR C-710)**

Patrick Guinan, Committee Policy Analyst:
Several of the members of this Committee will remember this resolution from the last session. The provisions it offers are pretty straightforward. It is a constitutional amendment that passed last session and is back for a second time this session. It cannot be amended. If you want it to go forward, it has to remain in the form it is in now. If passed this session, it will go to the voters at the next general election.

It contains two provisions. In order to put a petition on the ballot, the signature gatherers, or the backers of the petition, would have to gather signatures from 10 percent of the voters in the state who voted in the last general election. That 10 percent number would have to come from each petition district as created by the Legislature. As the members of this Committee are aware, the Legislature, during this session as part of its redistricting job, is tasked with creating petition districts. Those petition districts are not defined at this point; they have not been created. This measure simply places into the *Nevada Constitution* that 10 percent of the voters who voted in the last election would have to sign the petition from each of the petition districts.

The second provision in the resolution simply states that the number of registered voters—whatever that 10 percent number is that needs to be achieved—would have to be determined by the Secretary of State at the time the copy of the petition was filed with the Secretary of State. This is an attempt to generate the required number of signatures early on so the petition backers and signature gatherers know what number they are working with, and the 10 percent figure would be in the *Constitution*.

It is my understanding that the way it would work is that the petition districts, once set by the Legislature, would be in statute and not in the *Constitution*, and they would be subject to amendment by the Legislature when changes were necessary, but the 10 percent requirement would remain in the *Constitution*.

Chair Segerblom:
The reason this came up is that the *Constitution*, as it is now written, had a requirement that signatures from 10 percent of the voters in each county was required. The courts ruled that was unconstitutional, because 10 percent from Elko County would be a lot different than 10 percent from Clark County. When that provision was thrown out, it became a statewide issue. Petition districts

are currently adopted by statute, but the ability to have petition districts would now be in the *Constitution*.

Patrick Guinan:
That is correct, and I would add that the Legislature has had two separate petition requirements overturned in court. So right now we are in the process of coming up with a new requirement, and that is where this fits in. This sets the population standard, but it does not design the districts.

Chair Segerblom:
Does anyone have any questions or comments?

Assemblyman Conklin:
For the last couple of sessions I have worked fairly diligently on the initiative petition process, with some success. It is not an easy body of law. Having worked on this particular resolution, in retrospect, I wish I had had all the information last session I now have. I have some concerns with this resolution the way it is drafted. One of those concerns has to do with the way the 10 percent figure is calculated. I believe the *Constitution* is very clear regarding 10 percent of those who voted in the last general election by aggregate.

If you are going to have a geographic component to each petition district—and we would all agree that is a good thing and most states have them—they have to be built around one person, one vote, as we know from all the court cases involving this issue. The issue here is that we are asking for 10 percent of the voters from each district, and voters from each district do not represent the population. The population in each district has to be equal; therefore, you must have a proportional number of votes. This resolution is not drafted that way, and I believe it is a potential problem, so I would like the opportunity to look at it further.

Also, there are two parts to this resolution—a referendum portion, or a portion that deals with the changing or addition of a law—and a portion dealing with changing the *Constitution*. I believe the threshold for changing the *Constitution* in terms of signatures should be higher than the threshold for putting a statute in place. Changes to the *Constitution* should be few and well thought out. They should garner more support than should an amendment to statute. I do not know what the Committee's thoughts are on that, but I just wanted to mention it.

Assemblyman Grady:
If we change this resolution, we start over again, correct?

Assemblyman Conklin:
If we change this one, it would have to come back before this body a second time. The rules on constitutional amendments are that they must pass two separate legislatures. It cannot come before this body in a special session; it must come after the next election when the members of this body may have changed, and it must be voted on a second time before it goes to a vote of the people.

Chair Segerblom:
Are there any other questions or comments? [There was no response.] We have until April 15 to do something, so if anyone has any ideas or suggestions, please talk to Mr. Conklin.

Assemblyman Conklin:
Do resolutions have any exemptions to our deadlines?

Patrick Guinan:
In general, a resolution does not have any exception or exemption from the time lines. The exception to that rule is if it is a resolution dealing with the operation of the Legislature or a money issue. This resolution does not have an exemption.

Chair Segerblom:
So my bill to have annual sessions does not have a limit?

Patrick Guinan:
That is correct.

I need to state for the record that, as staff, I am not allowed to advocate for or against any measure or any position on a measure, so my discussion of this resolution today is purely informational.

Chair Segerblom:
Does anyone have any comments or questions about A.J.R. 1 of the 75th Session?

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum:
The issue of petitions is one I have been most concerned about during all my years here at the Legislature, and I have followed this very carefully. I have a couple of comments about this resolution I would like to make. It is a difficult issue to try to resolve. We have all looked for good answers; there are not any that please everyone.

On page 3, it says the "Petition districts must be established by the Legislature." During this session, there have been proposals that we would have to gather signatures in all 42 Assembly districts, which, in my opinion, is a total impossibility. The purpose of that is to destroy the right to petition. The Legislature, with its antagonism toward the people's right to petition, has already rendered that right to be almost nonexistent. There were no people's petitions on the ballot in 2008 or 2010—not because of this issue, but because of the single-subject rule that has made it virtually impossible for people, unless they have millions of dollars up front, to get on the ballot because the issue can be challenged in court. Challenging issues in court costs millions of dollars to resolve.

I was part of successful and unsuccessful ballot issues before the single-subject rule. I think it is healthy, and our *Constitution*, passed in the early 1900s, provided people with the opportunity for access through the petition process. They could express their opinions if there were an intransigent legislature, or for other reasons. That right for the people is now almost entirely eliminated by the single-subject rule. You would further eliminate petitions if you use Assembly districts as petition districts.

I do not know if any of you have attempted to get signatures, but I have done that in every county in the State of Nevada. I have also been the national ballot access coordinator for all 50 states, I have petitioned in many other states, and I have coordinated petition drives. I know how difficult it is. You have 30 seconds to talk to a potential signer. You are defeated practically before you begin if you have to have a stack of 42 individual petitions—which you need if you have 42 districts—plus you must have 42 maps. If someone wants to block you, they need to block you in only a couple of the 42 districts, and it is done—your opportunity is finished.

Another bill this session suggested using the Board of Regents' districts. That would be better, but, according to testimony in the Senate, they do not have to be linked to population—which would be a problem.

One other proposal is that you have clusters of Assembly districts. For instance, divide the 42 by 6 and have 7 petition districts. That would be more reasonable and something people could accomplish. Then you would have to have only 7 different petitions and 7 different maps.

My concern is that the Legislature, whenever it pleases, can decide to change those regulations. So if we get legislators, such as some in the Senate who are totally antagonistic toward the right of the people to petition, we might end up with 42 Assembly petition districts again. This battle will never be over, and I

am concerned about the Legislature being able to change that issue in statute. If we know what the *Constitution* says, then we can depend on it. We do not have to worry about the mercurial nature of the Legislature. We do not have to worry about the Legislature changing its mind to further impinge on the right of the people to petition, which as I said is almost entirely gone now anyway because of the single-subject rule.

Assemblyman Conklin talked about passing constitutional amendments. We are one of only a few states that require passage by two consecutive legislatures and then a vote of the people, or for the people to vote twice. Most states do not require that. Nevada already has a larger hurdle to passage of a constitutional amendment than most states. I do not think we need a larger percentage to do that, so I am opposed to Assemblyman Conklin's idea that we would differentiate between passing a statute and passing a constitutional amendment. I think the process is already difficult enough, especially as compared to other states.

I appreciate your consideration on this issue. If you want to start over, I would be happy about that. Maybe we could get legislation that would be more acceptable. I would like to ask Assemblyman Conklin to explain the issue he brought up at the beginning of this hearing about why he is concerned about the 10 percent and how it relates to population.

These are issues that are of great concern to me because this is a critical issue. I appreciate your indulgence, Mr. Chairman, and your consideration on this subject. As I said, we are very concerned about what the petition districts will be. We could not support anything unless we know.

Assemblyman Conklin:
I am happy to meet with Ms. Hansen off-line if she wants to talk about this.

Chair Segerblom:
All right, Mr. Conklin has offered you a special invitation, so take him up on it.

Janine Hansen:
Thank you, Mr. Chairman; thank you, Mr. Conklin.

Chair Segerblom:
Does anyone else want to speak?

Rebecca Gasca, Legislative and Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

The issue of initiative petitions is one with an interesting history, particularly in the State of Nevada and particularly from the American Civil Liberties Union's (ACLU) perspective. We have litigated this issue in the past on multiple occasions.

There are two important questions to consider when talking about initiative petitions being constitutional or not. The first is whether the populations are distributed equally—an issue twice litigated by the ACLU. The second is whether the number of districts becomes so burdensome that it de facto takes the process away from the public, which Ms. Hansen commented on.

Last session, we testified on this petition issue. From our perspective, the courts have said that the flat 10 percent is constitutional. We also agreed with legal counsel last session that use of the federal Congressional districts would pass constitutional muster. Identifying petition districts by Assembly districts may create the same problems that led to other lawsuits, so I hope you take that into consideration.

Leaving an open-ended process, or otherwise undefined petition districts, is going to drag on not only through this session but through successive sessions. Those of you who have had quite extensive careers with the Nevada Legislature can certainly attest to that. From our perspective, it is probably in the best interest of the State of Nevada and its citizens to resolve the situation once and for all this session, particularly because we are redistricting and looking at all pieces of this puzzle at once.

I offered lengthy testimony in the Senate already this session, but suffice to say that the ACLU really encourages this body to move forward with something that is reasonable, that allows reasonable access to the ballot, and that adds constitutional requirements based on population so as to support one man, one vote. So, for example, the Board of Regents' districts would likely not qualify because they are not based on population.

If any of you, particularly the newer members of this Committee, have questions about the cases we have brought, I would like to talk with you about them. This is a fairly important issue given that we have litigated it in the past. We, as an organization, would prefer not to find ourselves in that situation again, so if there is any way I can be a resource for you, I would love to be.

Assemblyman Conklin:
How does the ACLU feel about geographic restrictions on ballot initiatives and the question of whether a state should have a geographic boundary?

Rebecca Gasca:
Are you asking our position based on geographical weight of petition districts themselves?

Assemblyman Conklin:
No, I am asking whether a state should have boundaries. When initiative petitions was first added to our *Constitution*, the idea was that in order to reach the ballot an issue should have broad appeal. There were two components. One was that an aggregate number of signatures needed to be gathered, and the second was that they had to be gathered across a broad spectrum of the geography of the state because the geographies are different. Gathering signatures in that manner would guarantee that there was broad enough appeal or concern to bring an issue forward. So there were two components: aggregate number of signatures and where they came from. I am asking about where the signatures come from. Where does the ACLU stand on the responsibility of the state to protect the right that all parties should be represented when an initiative is brought to the ballot?

Rebecca Gasca:
As we saw in the recent case in which the 13-county rule—a majority of the 17 counties—was struck down, the courts said it violated the one man, one vote rule. If there is a way to somehow create a small enough number of districts that reflected geographical diversity but did not undermine the one man, one vote rule, particularly in regards to population changes over the ten years between redistricting, there would likely not be a problem. But there are multiple components that need to be satisfied. Basing it on geography rather than looking at the holistic picture is something that could be problematic.

Assemblyman Conklin:
I asked a really simple yes or no question, but this is what I got from your testimony—in your mind, the answer is no because we cannot draw a boundary that moves with population over a ten-year period. Unless we have zero population growth, or each district experiences the same population growth, no matter how we draw lines for everything we are drawing them for, there is going to be some change. That change is not unconstitutional under the *United States Constitution*, but what you are suggesting is, if there is a change, that change would be unconstitutional for petition districts.

Rebecca Gasca:
I respectfully disagree, and am sorry if my comments led you to believe otherwise. If the size of the districts were large enough, that would likely account for whatever population shift there could be. That is why we agreed that congressional districts would satisfy the one man, one vote rule. Over the ten years, there is likely not going to be so much population shift within those three, soon to be four, Congressional districts to see an override of that one man, one vote rule.

Assemblyman Conklin:
What number would be large enough?

Rebecca Gasca:
It is impossible for me to give you a specific number. I am not an expert on redistricting, nor was I a party to any of these cases. I know this body has considered our State Senate districts. That would certainly be less burdensome than using the Assembly districts, but depending on whether this body decides to expand or contract the number of Senate seats in the state, that would also have to be taken into consideration.

That is what the courts deal with in looking at the application of this rule and how burdensome the process it creates is. Certainly 100 districts would be far too many; 42 districts are also too many. Say there were 17 State Senate districts—maybe the courts would consider that reasonable. I think a lot of it goes into the legislative intent you put behind it and that you are taking into consideration that holistic picture of not only population shift but also the size and breadth of those districts.

There is an additional component, especially if this body chooses to create petition districts that are outside existing districts—for example, if you create brand-new petition districts that have nothing to do with the current lines of Assembly, State Senate, or Congressional districts. If you decide to create seven petition districts, the burden would be on the state to share that information with the voters. So there would likely be a financial component to that so voters understand what petition district they are now in. As you heard from testimony earlier today, someone might know his last name and address, but does he know his precinct? No. Does he know that you actually represent him in his Assembly district? Probably not. His representative in the Senate, maybe less so. Federal—Congressional or Senatorial—yes, he is a little more likely to know that person. The smaller you make the district, the less likely a voter is to be able to follow and the more burdensome it becomes. The more different types of districts you create, the less likely the voter is to follow and

the more of a burden will be placed in the state in order to reasonably inform the voter what district he or she would be in.

Assemblyman Conklin:
Anything you say can and will be used against you in this Committee at a later date for any proposals we consider, and I want that on the record.

Chair Segerblom:
I think she just endorsed 21 as the number.

All right, are there any other questions for Ms. Gasca? [There were none.] Does anyone else want to speak for, against, or as neutral on A.J.R. 1 of the 75th Session. [There was no response.]

Does anyone want to make any public comment? [There was no response.] The meeting is adjourned [at 2:54 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Nancy Davis
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Terry Horgan
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

_____
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

Date: April 5, 2011 **Time of Meeting: 1:11 p.m.**

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.J.R. 7	C	Michael L. Douglas	PowerPoint
A.J.R. 7	D	Michael L. Douglas	Fact Sheet
A.B. 473	E	Alan Glover	Copy of Sample Ballot
A.B. 473	F	John Wagner	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 502	G	Assemblyman Segerblom	PowerPoint