

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Ninth Session
May 16, 2017**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chairman Edgar Flores at 9:26 a.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2017, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 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/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman
Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Vice Chairwoman
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblyman Chris Brooks
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Amber Joiner
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblyman Jim Marchant
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Melissa Woodbury

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13
Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Assembly District No. 20



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst
Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel
Isabel Youngs, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor
Shelley Berkley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Steve Edmundson, Investment Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada
Marla Letizia, Chair, Executive Board of Directors, Jewish Nevada
Dillon Hosier, National Director, State Government Affairs, Israeli-American Coalition for Action, Los Angeles, California
Vicki Shearin, Founder, Christians United for Israel Nevada
Jason D. Guinasso, representing Christians United For Israel
Joseph Shalev, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Todd S. Polikoff, President and Chief Executive Officer, Jewish Nevada
Tom Letizia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Alana Gross, Assistant Director of Development, Anti-Defamation League of Nevada
Rozita Lee, representing National Federation of Filipino American Associations
Michael Arage, Board Member, Jewish Voice for Peace, Las Vegas Chapter
Andy Amid, Jewish Voice for Peace, Las Vegas Chapter
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

Chairman Flores:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol were explained.] Is there any public comment? [There was none.] We will start with the work session today and then move on to the bill hearing for Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 78 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to local government financial administration. (BDR 31-403)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 78 (1st Reprint) authorizes a local government to transfer money from an enterprise fund to the general fund of the local government on or after July 1, 2021, for the purpose of subsidizing the general fund if: (1) on or before July 1, 2018, the Committee on Local Government Finance of the Department of Taxation has approved a plan adopted by the governing body of the local government to eliminate such transfers, which includes, without limitation, a plan to reduce the amount of such transfers by at least 3.3 percent each fiscal year during the term of the plan; and (2) the local government reduces the amount of the transfers in accordance with the plan. Each approved plan is subject to annual review by the Committee ([Exhibit C](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 78 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN NEAL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the election of members of certain local governing bodies. (BDR 20-786)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 127 (1st Reprint) provides that a board of county commissioners within a county whose population is less than 100,000 may appoint the members of a local governing body rather than hold elections for the positions if: (1) each member of the local governing body is entitled to receive annual compensation of less than \$6,000 for his or her service on the body; and (2) the board of county commissioners obtains the approval of the local governing body to make it appointed rather than elected if the local governing body has enough current members to obtain a quorum for the transaction of business. The board of county commissioners is not required to obtain the approval of the local governing body if that body does not have enough current members to obtain a quorum.

This bill defines "local governing body" to mean any district, board, council, or commission that is charged with executing limited duties or functions within the county and includes a town board, citizen's advisory council, local improvement district, general improvement district, county hospital district, fire protection district, and irrigation district ([Exhibit D](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 127 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WOODBURY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

I just want the Committee to know that I will be voting no.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BROOKS, CARRILLO,
DALY, MCCURDY, MONROE-MORENO, AND NEAL VOTED NO.)

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Woodbury will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 191 (1st Reprint): Establishes a standard for evidence of eligibility for any benefit, program or assistance provided to a veteran with a military service-connected disability. (BDR 37-803)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 191 (1st Reprint) establishes a standard for evidence of eligibility for any benefit, program, or assistance provided to a veteran with a military service-connected disability. The bill makes conforming changes to relevant chapters of *Nevada Revised Statutes* concerning bid preferences for purchasing and public works contracts, certain special license plates, hunting and fishing licenses ([Exhibit E](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 191 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman Marchant will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint): Requires a license or permit issued by a local government to operate certain businesses in which the use of marijuana is allowed or to allow the use of marijuana at certain events. (BDR 20-43)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint) authorizes a board of county commissioners or governing body of an incorporated city to adopt an ordinance requiring a person who wants to operate a business or special event at which the use of marijuana will be allowed to receive a license or permit. The bill also sets forth certain conditions pertaining to the licensing or permitting of these businesses or special events, including that no license or permit may be issued to a business or event that allows the entry of persons under 21 years of age ([Exhibit F](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 236 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I understand the focus and purpose of the bill, but I cannot support this particular measure. I will vote no.

Assemblywoman Joiner:

I would be happy to support almost this entire bill. The only concern that I have, which will force me to vote "no" today, is that I think during the hearing it was clear this allows smoking in places where the Nevada Clean Indoor Air Act that we currently have for tobacco does not allow smoking—specifically, for events. For example, they could cordon off a portion of a restaurant, limit it to age 21, and have that happen there. For me, I cannot support something that weakens the Nevada Clean Indoor Air Act, which was voted for by the people of Nevada. Everything but that I would be happy to support.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I will be voting no on Senate Bill 236 (1st Reprint). I still do not think the regulations meet the intent of the law.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I will be voting "yes" because we will give people a place to do this. On the Strip in Las Vegas and in downtown Reno, people are going to smoke it regardless of whether it is legal or not to smoke in public. People still need a place to go.

Assemblyman Kramer:

I will be voting "no." The way the initiative was put on the ballot, it said this would not be done in public. I think the way this is written is too open.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I will be voting yes on this today. I do share some of the concerns Assemblywoman Joiner has. However, I do not think we should let the perfect stand in the way of the good, and if we want to come back and tighten things up, I think we can do that in the next legislative session.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, JOINER, KRAMER, MCARTHUR, NEAL, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman Carrillo will take the floor statement.

Senate Bill 245 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing county treasurers. (BDR 20-599)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 245 (1st Reprint) expands the method by which the facsimile signature of a county treasurer is authorized to be produced to allow use of the most efficient device or other method of facsimile reproduction reasonably available and imposes requirements for the safekeeping of any facsimile image or impression or any registered key, password, or other securing device or procedure if severable from the device or other method of facsimile reproduction ([Exhibit G](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 245 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN KRAMER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman McArthur will take the floor statement.

**Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions relating to urban agriculture.
(BDR 22-1078)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 429 (1st Reprint) authorizes a governing body of a city or county to establish by ordinance an urban agriculture zone for the purpose of promoting the development and operation of urban agriculture. This bill provides that a master plan may also include an urban agricultural element, which must include a plan to inventory any vacant lands owned by the city or county and blighted lands in the city or county to determine whether such lands may be suitable for urban farming or gardening.

A governing body of a city or county is authorized to establish by ordinance the terms and conditions for the use of vacant or blighted land owned by the city or county for the purpose of community gardening ([Exhibit H](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN KRAMER MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 429 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MCCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chairman Flores:

Assemblyman Daly will take the floor statement.

**Senate Bill 434: Requires certain city attorneys to be appointed rather than elected.
(BDR S-1046)**

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 434 requires the city councils of Reno and Sparks to appoint the City Attorney. The City Attorney serves under the direction and supervision of the City Council and may be removed by a majority vote of the entire membership of the City Council at any time ([Exhibit I](#)).

Assemblyman Ellison:

It was brought up several times during the bill hearing that if this bill did not pass it would go to the vote of the people. Is that still under consideration?

Chairman Flores:

That is not correct.

Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel:

There was a proposed amendment to gut the bill and submit the question to an advisory vote of the people, but that amendment is apparently not to be adopted. If the bill is not adopted by the Legislature, it would leave the status quo in Reno and Sparks. There would be no election.

Chairman Flores:

Senator Ratti is on her way, so I will put S.B. 434 on hold.

Senate Bill 469 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing collective bargaining by local government employers. (BDR 31-685)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 469 (1st Reprint) reduces from 25 percent to 16.67 percent of the budgeted ending fund balance of a local government, other than a school district, the amount that must be excluded from collective bargaining negotiations and cannot be considered by a fact finder or arbitrator in determining the local government employer's ability to pay compensation or monetary benefits to employees ([Exhibit J](#)).

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 469 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, KRAMER,
MARCHANT, MCARTHUR, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

Chairman Flores:

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod will take the floor statement. We will return now to Senate Bill 434 ([Exhibit I](#)). There is a question for Senator Ratti.

Senate Bill 434: Requires certain city attorneys to be appointed rather than elected. (BDR S-1046)

Assemblywoman Neal:

This was the bill that did not go through the Charter Committee, is that correct?

Senator Julia Ratti, Senate District No. 13:

Correct. Professor Kagan from William S. Boyd School of Law at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, explained the inherent conflict in a system with an elected city attorney. There is a question about whether the city attorney is representing the body, the city, or the individual voters. The Senate Committee on Government Affairs brought this bill forward. We believe there is an inherent flaw and significant challenge in the client-attorney relationship. We believe this is the appropriate policy.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JOINER MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 434.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I will be voting no. I understand what is happening, but I would have preferred for this to go through the Charter Committee. I remember the testimony and the people who came up from the Charter Committee. I did not see any evidence that there was any conflict within the Charter Committee with that relationship to allow them to bring forth this issue. I believe that is the appropriate process, and that is how it should go.

Assemblyman Ellison:

This was taken to a ballot question twice and the Charter Committee did not make the recommendation to go forward with this bill. I was hoping the amendment would allow it to go back to the vote of the people, so I will be voting no on the bill.

THE MOTION FAILED. (ASSEMBLYMEN DALY, ELLISON, KRAMER, MARCHANT, MCARTHUR, NEAL, AND WOODBURY VOTED NO.)

Chairman Flores:

We will roll that item for another day for further discussion.

Senate Bill 375 (1st Reprint): Authorizes agreements between the Governor and Indian tribes in this State relating to the regulation of the use of marijuana. (BDR 18-321)

Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 375 (1st Reprint) authorizes the Governor or his or her designee to enter into agreements with tribal governments within this state to facilitate cooperation in the implementation of state laws and tribal laws governing the use of marijuana. An agreement may address matters including, but not limited to: criminal law and law enforcement; regulatory matters concerning the possession, delivery, production, processing, or use of marijuana products; medical and pharmaceutical research; taxation; immunity, preemption, or conflicts of law; and dispute resolution.

Any agreement entered into under these provisions must preserve public health and safety, ensure the security of marijuana establishments, and establish provisions regulating businesses involving marijuana that passes between tribal and nontribal lands in Nevada ([Exhibit K](#)).

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I would like to propose an amendment ([Exhibit L](#)). I would like to add a paragraph (d) at the end of section 1, subsection 2 that says, "(d) ensure that the tribal government adopt and enforce provisions at least as restrictive as the provisions of NRS Chapters 453A and 453D and the regulations adopted thereunder."

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 375 (1ST REPRINT).

Assemblywoman Neal:

Does the amendment change tribal sovereignty and their right to make their own decisions?

Jim Penrose, Committee Counsel:

I just got this amendment ten minutes ago. I have not had an opportunity to research the question of whether this would run afoul with tribal sovereignty.

Chairman Flores:

I would like Assemblyman Carrillo to rescind the motion to amend and do pass S.B. 375 (R1). I want legal counsel to be 100 percent sure that we are not going to cause conflict later down the road. We will roll this item for tomorrow.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO WITHDREW HIS MOTION TO AMEND
AND DO PASS SENATE BILL 375 (1ST REPRINT).

Chairman Flores:

I will open the bill hearing for Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint): Makes certain changes concerning governmental entities that contract with or invest in companies that boycott Israel. (BDR 27-418)

Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor:

With me are former Congresswoman Shelley Berkley and Assemblywoman Spiegel. I want to present Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) to the Committee, which passed unanimously out of the Senate Committee on Government Affairs and passed with a 19-2 vote on the Senate floor. Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) proclaims that the State of Nevada will not contract with or invest in companies that boycott, divest, or sanction Israel.

Often this is called BDS activities. The BDS movement is a global campaign that places political pressure and economic burdens on Israel in order to culturally delegitimize one of the United States' strongest allies. The presentation of S.B. 26 (R1) presents Nevada with an opportunity to support Israel and, in turn, further support our own state. It is in the best economic interest of our state to establish a clear state policy as set forth in the bill.

Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) presents the opportunity for Nevadans to prohibit purchasing and investing with companies that make economic and business decisions motivated by discrimination based on national origin, religion, or politics. In turn, this affects our own state and our own taxpayers. This is an opportunity to say that, as a state, we value the United States' foreign policy, financial performance over our state contracts and investments, and diversification over discrimination.

This bill further strengthens a policy already in place in our state—a policy that we will not subvert U.S. foreign policy by engaging in business with entities that target a critical and unique U.S. ally. This policy is set forth in our Iran petroleum legislation from 2009 [Assembly Bill 493 of the 75th Session] as well as the Office of the State Treasurer's policy prohibiting investments with states that sponsor terrorism [Terror-Free Investment Policy approved by the State Board of Finance on April 23, 2008].

As a participant in the market, Nevada must view contracts and purchases competitively. Nevada's contracts should emphasize business and financial performance, and should be a top priority in our consideration as we prioritize and select with whom to contract and invest. Nevada should undoubtedly be concerned by any company motivated by discrimination or politics over legitimate business performance.

Finally, in the last few years, Nevada has been fortunate to diversify our economy in a major way—ways we could only dream of in years past. Israeli companies have a competitive edge in sectors that have been very important for this diversification. Industries like water technology, unmanned aerial vehicle technology, and cybersecurity have become significant partners for the state. If Nevada wishes to maintain its own competitive edge, we must ensure that our state policy is welcoming of Israel and Israeli businesses and not one that is tolerant of discrimination or delegitimization of Israel. This bill sends a clear message. Companies that decide to boycott Israel are certainly free to do so, but Nevada is free to choose the companies in which it will invest and with whom it will do business. Those decisions are critical in pursuing Nevada's own economic interests and public policy.

Other states have followed this state policy—19 other states across the nation have passed similar anti-BDS legislation. Those states include California, Colorado, Minnesota, and New Jersey. I hope we can join the growing list to help protect our financial interests and economic diversification as well as respect and support U.S. foreign policy.

Let me begin my overview of the bill by reviewing the definition of "boycott of Israel." That phrase means "refusing to deal or conduct business with, abstaining from dealing or conducting business with, terminating business or business activities with or performing any

other action that is intended to limit commercial relations with: (a) Israel; or (b) A person or entity doing business in Israel or in territories controlled by Israel, if such an action is taken in a manner that discriminates on the basis of nationality, national origin or religion."

It is important to note that the term does not limit a company from making business decisions based on bona fide business or economic reasons. Further, the bill defines a "scrutinized company" as "any company that engages in a boycott of Israel." Let me talk about how this impacts local and state government purchasing. Following the definition section, the bill amends local government and state purchasing statutes. Sections 5 and 11 of the bill prohibit a public entity from entering into a contract with a company "unless the contract includes a written certification that the company is not currently engaged in, and agrees for the duration of the contract not to engage in, a boycott of Israel."

Section 5 was amended in the Senate to include only local government purchasing contracts over \$50,000. Section 11 was also amended in the Senate, and provides that the state contracts cover only those that are formally solicited and entered into by state purchasing, and not contracts entered into by any individual departments or agencies. These changes were made after consulting with the co-chairs of the Nevada Public Purchasing Study Commission and the Administrator of the Purchasing Division in the Department of Administration.

Sections 6 and 13 of the bill provide notice to bidders that they will be required to provide written certification as a part of their contract with the State of Nevada. Subsection 11 requires the Administrator of the Purchasing Division to adopt regulations to carry out the policy and define what "written certification" means. We anticipate such language would include a claim saying the company is not currently engaged in, and agrees for the duration of the contract, not to engage in a boycott of Israel.

This bill amends statutes relevant to the Public Employees' Retirement Board. Section 21 requires the Retirement Board to create a list identifying each scrutinized company in which the Public Employees' Retirement System (PERS) holds a direct holding. "Scrutinized company" is defined in section 20 as a company that is engaged in a boycott of Israel. In identifying the scrutinized company, the Retirement Board should rely on publicly available information, such as information provided by nonprofit organizations, research firms, or government entities. That is important because the Retirement Board is to rely on information available publicly and not have additional expenses related to that evaluation. Section 22 requires the Retirement Board to prepare an annual report of investments of money from PERS into scrutinized companies and submit that report to the Governor and the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB).

The Public Employees' Retirement System already has a reporting system. This is nothing new. Assembly Bill 493 of the 75th Session requires PERS to identify and report investments of money from the system in certain scrutinized companies with business activities in connection with Iran's petroleum sector.

Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) next amends Nevada's existing state financial administration laws and statutes relating to the Office of the State Treasurer. Section 31 requires the State Treasurer to create a list identifying each scrutinized company in which the public fund has a direct or indirect holding. Again, in identifying a scrutinized company, the State Treasurer should rely on publicly available information.

Section 32 requires the State Treasurer to prepare an annual report of investments of PERS money in scrutinized companies and submit that to the Governor and Director of the LCB. Section 33 requires the State Treasurer to sell, redeem, divest, or withdraw all direct holdings of scrutinized companies from the assets under its management within three months after preparing the list of scrutinized companies from the public funds. The bill also prohibits the State Treasurer from acquiring securities of a scrutinized company as part of a direct holding.

Additionally, the State Treasurer should post on its website a list of those investments that were sold, redeemed, divested, or withdrawn before June 30 of each year. The bill also specifies that the State Treasurer request the manager of those with indirect holdings of public funds, such as mutual funds, to consider selling, redeeming, divesting, or withdrawing holdings of a scrutinized company from the assets under its management. It is very important to note a caveat here. The State Treasurer is to undertake these activities so long as it is consistent with the State Treasurer's fiduciary duties to the state.

Finally, section 34 requires the State Treasurer to adopt regulations to carry out the provisions of the bill, including the establishment of a process for notifying companies that they are on the list of scrutinized companies and that they are subject to divestment by the State Treasurer. This bill also provides that a process be established for removing a company from the scrutinized company list if the company has provided documentation that the company has ceased its boycott of Israel and will not boycott Israel for the period of time that the State Treasurer invests in the company.

I am proud to bring forward S.B. 26 (R1), which is legislation confirming America, and Nevada in particular, stand with and support policies that prioritize financially effective business practices and innovation and diversification over baseless discrimination against national origin, religion, or political discrimination.

Assemblywoman Ellen B. Spiegel, Assembly District No. 20:

I am here today to speak with you about S.B. 26 (R1), which addresses the discriminatory aspects of the anti-Israel BDS movement, while not denying the free speech aspects. For those of you who do not know, BDS is the movement that intends to destroy Israel through boycott, divestment and sanctions against Israel. In plain English, they are trying to use economic warfare to accomplish what rockets and suicide bombers have failed to do, which is to destroy Israel.

Quite simply, if passed, this bill would mandate the State of Nevada only do business with and invest in companies that do not boycott Israel. So, why is this bill important to Nevada?

First, as you have already heard, Nevada has a special relationship with Israel. As a state, we rely on Israel and Israeli companies for technology, water acumen, agricultural expertise, and a great deal of our economic development. In the past eleven years, Israeli companies have invested over \$1.7 billion and employed over 6,100 Nevadans. Not passing this bill could put those jobs at risk, as well as future investments and future jobs. Putting this into perspective, the Tesla deal—which by all accounts was a very big deal to this state—involved 6,500 direct factory employees and capital expenditures of \$1.5 billion over 20 years. As you can see, our state's economic relationship with Israel is quite significant.

As legislators, we have a fiduciary responsibility to the state, and we know that we should not take actions that could harm our state's economy. We also have a responsibility to ensure that we do not knowingly allow actions that could harm our state's economy. In this hearing, you will hear from Nevada's Jewish community. This bill is important to us. For most of us, increases in anti-Semitism make us united in our efforts to ensure that Israel continues to exist. As a community, we have seen increases in anti-Semitism worldwide, and we look at the effects it has been having on our extended families. In France alone, in the year following attacks on a kosher supermarket in Paris, 9,000 French Jews left the country to move to Israel—compared with 1,900 five years earlier. Most of those people had no long-term plans to leave their homes, their friends, their families, and their businesses. They left because they felt they needed to do so to survive, and Israel is their safety net.

Sadly, anti-Semitism has been increasing here in Nevada too. Just earlier this month, a man set two fires at the Chabad of Southern Nevada. As a community, we know what anti-Semitism feels like, and yes, it is personal. A number of years ago, I had anti-Semitic materials left at my front door. I reported it to the FBI, but I was so unnerved that, for days afterward, I shook whenever I thought of it.

Home means Nevada to us, and the vast majority of us have no intentions of moving to Israel. I can tell you that I have never even been there, but I can also tell you that Israel's very existence provides me and my community with the knowledge that we have a safety net. This knowledge is what allowed me to sleep at night when I went through that experience.

As a legislator, I know that what is important to hard-working Nevadans is important to me, and this bill is important to our constituents. I looked at the online opinion poll, and this is the thirty-first most important bill this session out of 1,000 bills. As of last evening, there were 396 responses, and 95 percent of them were in support of this bill.

Even on short notice, we were able to get a number of people to come out for this hearing. At some point, I would appreciate it if you could show the crowd down at the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas. I would like the Committee to see the community support for this bill.

Finally, as you think about this bill and you think about its positive impact on our economy and its importance to our constituents, I would also like you to keep in mind that in none of the 19 states that have passed similar legislation, has this been opposed by organized labor.

In the words of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America, as its members they overturned a pro-BDS resolution, "... despite semantical claims to the contrary by the local union, can easily be construed as academic and cultural discrimination against union members on the basis of their national origin and religion"

If passed, S.B. 26 (R1) would make sure that anti-Semitism cannot enter our state's business dealings. It is good for our businesses, it is good for our economy, it is good for our constituents, and I urge your support.

Shelley Berkley, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a former member of the Nevada State Assembly. I began my service to the people of Nevada in 1983. Since then, I have never testified in front of a legislative committee during regular session, but this issue is so very important to me personally, and to the organized Jewish community, that I feel compelled to join you today. The BDS movement is as serious to the Jewish community as deporting DREAMers [individuals meeting requirements of the Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act] is to the Latino community, or forbidding our friends in the lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender (LGBT) community from marrying someone they love.

The BDS movement is a transparent attempt to delegitimize the state of Israel. It is blatantly anti-Semitic. It is an anti-Semitic movement that discriminates against one country—Israel—on the basis of religion and nationality. The leader of the BDS movement, Omar Barghouti, candidly admits that all parts of the boycott are to destroy the Jewish state. He opposes Israel's existence, not only on the West Bank, but also within its own border. The BDS movement urges boycott of all Israeli products, divestment from all companies that do business with Israel, and sanctions to destroy Israel economically and politically. The anti-BDS legislation before you protects Nevadan taxpayer money from being used to support discrimination of Israel.

The Lieutenant Governor discussed in detail why this is important to us economically. Israel is America's most reliable ally and the only democracy in the Middle East. This legislation simply ensures no taxpayer money goes to the anti-Semitic attempt to delegitimize Israel's very right to exist. With passage of this bill, Nevada would be joining 19 other states in rejecting efforts to isolate and demonize the Jewish state as well as the U.S. Congress, which in 2015 passed legislation combating the BDS movement. In signing the law, President Barack Obama stated, "I have directed my Administration to strongly oppose boycotts, divestment campaigns, and sanctions targeting the State of Israel. As long as I am President, we will continue to do so." Hillary Clinton also spoke out against BDS. I have a letter she wrote supporting anti-BDS. Even President Trump has reaffirmed America's opposition to BDS. Our own newly elected Congresswoman, Jacky Rosen, recently cosponsored House Resolution 1697 to Congress, the anti-BDS bill. It already has 146 other cosponsors.

Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) is consistent with similar policies passed in Nevada. As the Lieutenant Governor stated, in 2009 the Nevada Legislature passed a bill requiring PERS to report on any investment in companies doing business in Iran's energy sector. In 2011, State Treasurer Kate Marshall implemented a policy prohibiting state investment in companies doing business in countries that sponsor terrorism. In 2013, Palestinian President Abu Mazen said, "We don't ask anyone to boycott Israel itself. We have relations with Israel, we have a mutual recognition with Israel." Why? Jewish businesses provide jobs for Palestinians. The BDS movement hurts Palestinian workers.

Support for anti-BDS legislation has enjoyed bipartisan support. This is not a Democratic or Republican issue. Indeed, the platform of both political parties contained anti-BDS planks. I want to talk a minute about our nation's economic relations with Israel. Imports and exports total \$38 billion. Every state, including Nevada, does business with Israeli companies. More than 100,000 U.S. companies are doing business in Israel. Eighty-six Israeli companies are listed on U.S. stock exchanges.

Boycott Israeli products? I want to talk about that a moment. We will have to stop using our smartphones because that is Israeli technology. Driverless cars? I am a little squishy about that, but it is Israeli technology. Cybersecurity is Israeli technology. Water quality and conservation is Israeli technology. Talk to the Southern Nevada Water Authority. Our water authority recaptures 93 percent of all the water that hits our sewer system. The average U.S. city only captures 10 to 15 percent. The state of Nevada is using Israeli technology. The brain cap that saved the life of my friend and former colleague, Congresswoman Gabby Giffords, is Israeli technology. That there is a 98 percent survival rate for our troops serving in Iraq and Afghanistan is, in large part, due to Israeli battlefield medical technology.

What this bill is not is a violation of anyone's right to free speech. I am a member of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU), and I was honored by the ACLU in 2015. I respectfully disagree with their opposition to this bill, as did the 19 states that voted for anti-BDS legislation over the opposition of the ACLU. I have a list of quotes that have been made by President Barack Obama in discussing the First Amendment issue when it comes to anti-BDS legislation.

This bill is not anti-union. I come from a union family. Those of you who know me know that my father was a member of the Culinary Union Local 226 for his entire working life. I was a member of Culinary Union Local 226. In 30 years of public service, I have a 100 percent voting record with labor. There is absolutely nothing in this bill that would prevent any union in this state from organizing, picketing, or boycotting any anti-union business. I have been on a few picket lines myself. This bill would not prevent me from doing that ever again.

The labor movements in Israel and in the U.S. have been partners in fighting for workers' rights since Israel first became a state in 1948. I am very proud of that. The BDS movement would hurt the labor movement in Israel in a most profound way by killing employment for tens of thousands of Israeli workers and Palestinian workers in Israel. It is the BDS movement that is anti-labor, not the other way around.

I respectfully urge the members of this Committee to do the right thing, vote for this legislation, and let us move onto a brighter day and a closer relationship between the State of Israel and the people of the state of Nevada. It is markedly advantageous to the people of Nevada that this relationship continues.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I want to thank you for bringing this bill forward. I think this is so important. I stand strong for Israel and what it represents. I still think to this day that Israel stands for peace. We have families starving to death over there. Boycotts add fuel to the fire. I am happy that this bill has come forward, and your statements were wonderful. I do not see any backlash. I do not think you would see any backlash, but if there is, we will stand and fight that battle when it comes.

You mentioned PERS. Can you talk about that? The Public Employees' Retirement System is a national system; it is not located only in Nevada.

Mark Hutchison:

This bill would establish a reporting mechanism for PERS. They would report to the extent that there are any direct investments of PERS public funds in scrutinized companies. It would be a report presented to the Governor and the Director of the LCB annually.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I, too, think this is a very important bill in not only what it does but in what it symbolizes as well. I know the concerns I have been hearing from people have to do with the First Amendment. Ms. Berkley, you mentioned that you have a few quotes from President Barack Obama. Can you give us a few of his comments?

Shelley Berkley:

I was going to read the following into the record [From July 13, 2015, *Tablet Magazine* article by Eugene Kontorovich, "Can States Fund BDS?"]:

The current legislation by states does not bar any BDS activity and does not otherwise violate the First Amendment

The new laws only relate to state contracting and public pension funds' investments. They simply limit a state's business relationships with companies that discriminatorily limit their own business relations. These laws

do not prohibit or penalize any kind of speech. Proponents of boycotting Israel are free to call for such boycotts, encourage others to join them, and participate in them. As the BDS movement itself admits, these laws will not prohibit their activities.

Moreover, the First Amendment allows states to place conditions on doing business with them. Antidiscrimination restrictions on government contractors are commonplace and a normal requirement for government funding

But as President Barack Obama said when signing the executive order prohibiting such discrimination in government contracts, the federal government is not required to 'subsidize discrimination.'

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I received a lot of emails regarding S.B. 26 (R1). I had my attaché count how many emails were against the bill, and how many emails were for the bill. I received 43 emails against the bill and 62 emails for the bill. The one thing they all have in common is that they all state that they are of the Jewish faith. I am a bit confused as to why there would be such divisiveness around this. Can you talk about that?

Shelley Berkley:

I cannot even begin to speculate. I do not know who sent those emails. I cannot confirm or deny that they were Jewish. I think it is easy to say you are Jewish when you are sending an email. It is easy to say a lot of things when you send an email. I could not tell you that. I think it is telling that a majority of the emails you received were in favor of this piece of legislation.

Assemblywoman Spiegel:

One of the things I have seen is that many of the emails that I have received in opposition have come from out of state. I have not been through your email box, so I cannot tell, but that is something I would look at. I know there are some nationwide efforts to bring these things down. I will also say that when you look at the opinion poll on the legislative website, that is Nevadans. The opinion polls show that 95 percent of Nevadans are for S.B. 26 (R1) and 5 percent against. I would look at Nevadans.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

We have the ability to see which people are from our districts. There were a few of them for and against this bill from my district. They do vote. Whether they are Jewish or not is difficult to say, but I did not look to see if they were from out of state. The ones I did find were in my district, and they vote. The numbers were not lopsided. It was 43 to 62; it was not like there were just four against.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

I have a great deal of respect for our strongest ally in the Middle East and the Jewish community here in Nevada. Section 3, subsection 1 of the bill defines "boycott of Israel." Then in section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (b), it talks about boycotts against a public entity of Israel. Can you clarify where we are going with this? How do we identify the distinction between the two?

Mark Hutchison:

This emphasizes and underscores the definition of what it means to boycott Israel. Legitimate boycotts and efforts to speak out politically or disagree with individuals or entities are not prohibited. The action would have to be directed towards the entire State of Israel based on nationality, national origin, or religion. Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (b) says, "taken pursuant to a boycott against a public entity of Israel if the boycott is applied in a nondiscriminatory manner." I would leave that to broad interpretation. If you are engaged in boycotts or efforts to speak out publicly against an Israeli entity and it is not based on national origin or religion, it is very clear under this statute that this law would not apply.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

To be clear, this bill would not apply to companies that boycott Israel as a government. Is that correct?

Mark Hutchison:

It would be a boycott of Israel. This would apply to any company that does not want to do business with Israel and wants to sanction them. If you look under section 3, subsection 1, paragraph (b), it clarifies what you are talking about. It says, ". . . if such an action is taken in a manner that discriminates on the basis of nationality, national origin or religion." It would have to be that type of discriminatory activity. Section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (b) says that you can boycott a public entity of Israel if the boycott is applied in a "nondiscriminatory manner." In order to violate this public policy, your motives and reasons for boycotting Israel have to do with national origin or religion. If you want to boycott a public entity or other individuals or businesses in a nondiscriminatory basis, you are not prohibited from doing so under this statute.

Assemblywoman Neal:

In section 21, when you come up with scrutinized companies, how are you are getting the provisions to place them on the list? Are they coming from section 3?

Mark Hutchison:

That is correct.

Assemblywoman Neal:

I was looking at the Office of Antiboycott Compliance in the Bureau of Industry and Security of the U.S. Department of Commerce. They were saying that there are laws that prohibit certain conduct under the Export Administration Regulations. That included agreements to refuse or actual refusal to do business in Israel or with blacklisted companies.

Then there was a prohibition against the agreements to discriminate or actual discrimination. When I was reading it, they were talking about who was in compliance and out of compliance. What do these antiboycott laws prohibit? I am confused about what the federal law may have already carved out as areas that we cannot touch. Does this apply?

Mark Hutchison:

I think you are asking about federal preemption. Does what the federal government has done preclude the State of Nevada from acting? We have had LCB look at this. There have been no conclusions at all that there would be any federal preemption issues as it relates to this statute. There are experts in this area who can follow up later. In broad terms, the LCB has looked at the federal laws, and there is nothing inconsistent with what we are doing at the state level in this statute that would be preempted by federal legislation.

Assemblywoman Neal:

When I was looking at contract terms and how we are delineating it, I was trying to compare the U.S. contract clause and commerce. I have never seen a contract where we tie the terms like this. You say that boycott is not an act of speech, but you are tying the contract term to an action of speech. Therefore, it is an unenforceable contract. I want the lineage of the case law that applies to that area. That is very unique. I have never seen a contract term where a boycott, which has some speech elements, is a term that is denied within a contract term.

Mark Hutchison:

It makes sense to raise the issue. I will go back to the comments of those who have already testified about this not infringing upon free speech. You are certainly welcome to engage in all the free speech you want. You can have others join with you. The question here is whether the State of Nevada will engage in contractual investment activities with businesses that engage in discriminatory conduct themselves.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral to the bill?

Steve Edmundson, Investment Officer, Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada:

Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) requires the Retirement Board to identify and report on any companies in our investment portfolio that are being scrutinized for engaging in boycotts against the State of Israel. As the Lieutenant Governor pointed out earlier on, we have this reporting infrastructure in place under the 2009 legislation, which requires a similar type of reporting for companies that do business with the petroleum sector in the country of Iran. We currently have the infrastructure in place, and we do not believe the reporting requirement would be onerous in any way. As such, the Retirement Board has adopted a neutral position on S.B. 26 (R1).

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone wishing to testify in favor of the bill?

Marla Letizia, Chair, Executive Board of Directors, Jewish Nevada:

I would like to express great reverence and gratitude for you and your Committee's willingness to hear this bill this morning. Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony today in support of S.B. 26 (R1) on behalf of Jewish Nevada and the 70,000 members of the Nevada Jewish community. I also come today on behalf of a coalition as diverse as our state, which includes many Jewish groups, renowned human rights organizations, other faith groups, business and civic leadership, and people from the university community.

I have four pages of things I was going to say that have been said eloquently and beautifully by the Lieutenant Governor, Assemblywoman Spiegel, and former Congresswoman Berkley. I would like to defer my time to Vicki and David Shearin—the Christians United for Israel pastors,. They can speak from a point of view to which I cannot speak on behalf of S.B. 26 (R1).

Dillon Hosier, National Director, State Government Affairs, Israeli-American Coalition for Action, Los Angeles, California:

The Israeli-American Coalition for Action is a voice for around 8,000 Israeli-Americans, largely first- and second-generation immigrant families, who call Nevada home. I want to express special thanks to the Committee Chair and members for taking the time to meet with a few Israeli-Americans as they shared their experiences as a minority community targeted for economic discrimination. We are grateful to Lieutenant Governor Hutchison and Assemblywoman Spiegel for recognizing the damage caused to Nevada and Nevadans by those who seek to wage economic warfare against Israel.

Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint) ensures that Nevada's dollars do not subsidize a well-organized and systematic effort driven by foreign powers to undermine longstanding U.S. foreign policy, eliminate the one and only democratic nation in the Middle East, and destroy self-determination for the Jewish people. This bill would bring Nevada in line with decades of federal legislation. It would also bring us in line with the 19 other states that have passed similar legislation, representing well over 60 percent of Americans nationwide.

While S.B. 26 (R1) has gone through the legislative process, there have been some comparisons between actions taken by anti-Israel BDS proponents and the labor movement. As someone who has worked shoulder to shoulder with organized labor in the past to oppose actions taken by anti-Israel BDS proponents, I find the comparison to be simply misunderstood.

The proponents of the BDS movement often mislead, confuse, and coerce workers into supporting their discriminatory agenda. Labor unions take actions intended to secure better wages and working conditions. To equate those actions with an anti-BDS agenda designed to annihilate a nation is simply incorrect.

A few years ago, the United Auto Workers got it exactly right when they declared that support of and participation in BDS boycotts "would harm UAW-represented workers and other union members" by boycotting companies that employ these individuals,

leading to "direct economic deprivation for members of the UAW, as well as other organized members by, categorically interfering with the flow of commerce to and from earmarked companies." Some of those earmarked companies include Boeing, Caterpillar, General Electric, Lockheed Martin, Northrop Grumman, and Raytheon.

Further, the UAW International Executive Board stated its "unanimous belief" that BDS "espouses discrimination and vilification against Israelis and UAW members who are of Jewish lineage." The UAW decision clarifies the issue and rightly distinguishes between actions taken by their membership to secure better working conditions and the completely dissimilar discriminatory actions taken by BDS, which are in fact hostile to labor and commerce.

This bill ensures that the state will not subsidize destructive and discriminatory BDS activities which directly harm the economic conditions of working women and men here in Nevada—including members of our Israeli-American community who are also members of organized labor. This bill will ensure that Nevada is welcoming to international trade and commerce, fostering the kind of economic diversification we so desperately need.

Finally, S.B. 26 (R1) will positively affirm that Israeli immigrants who have made their home in Nevada—who are now Israeli-Americans—are welcome and part of the diversity which makes this state so strong.

Vicki Shearin, Founder, Christians United for Israel Nevada:

My husband and I are here representing Christians United for Israel Nevada. We work together with the Jewish communities in Nevada as Christians. Christians United for Israel is now the largest pro-Israel grassroots organization in the U.S. We just passed 3.5 million in our membership. Questions and concerns for the Jewish community and their outspokenness are important, but we would appreciate the Assembly considering that there are many Christians supporting the State of Israel and recognizing the destructive force of BDS. Our organization sees the BDS movement as resembling what happened in Germany and Europe moving up to the Holocaust—boycotting Jewish businesses and government becoming complicit with that.

Christians United for Israel has made the determination over the last ten years that we are not going to allow that to happen again on our watch. We believe there is an ugly underbelly with the BDS movement. This is anti-Semitism rearing its ugly head again in America. As Christians, we want you to know that we stand with the Jewish community in opposing BDS. We are asking you to be urgent in voting for this bill. We do not want to see it fail because we know how aggressive this BDS movement is. It is immoral. As Americans, as Nevadans, and as Christians, we believe in this legislation. We thank Lieutenant Governor Hutchison for his involvement with the introduction of this bill. We would also like to thank former Congresswoman Shelley Berkley for her eloquent advocacy regarding this bill.

Jason D. Guinasso, representing Christians United For Israel:

I happen to be a member of Christians United for Israel, and I spent a large part of my law practice working with nonprofits and religious organizations fighting against bigotry in all its invidious forms. I want to speak with you for a moment as a lawyer about some of the First Amendment issues that have been raised. The opposition seems to be focused on the fear that this bill would impede free speech. We know from case law that boycotting is considered speech under constitutional jurisprudence. I respectfully submit that the BDS movement is not speech. That is to say, there is a huge difference between boycotting an employer over unfair trade practices and boycotting against a company due to hatred for a race or religion. There is a fundamental difference, not only practically speaking, but also in case law.

As an example, I would like to point to an old case from the 1980s—*Bob Jones University v. United States* [461 US 574 (1983)]. There was a university called Bob Jones University that prohibited interracial dating. The Internal Revenue Service, as a result of that discriminatory practice, revoked that school's nonprofit status. The case went to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled that the university had the right to engage in those practices, but the government did not have to endorse those discriminatory practices. By analogy, what we are saying in S.B. 26 (R1) is that Nevada will not engage in the endorsement of a boycott or a set of speech that discriminates against a company based on its national origin or religion.

I would also note that since the first piece of anti-BDS legislation was passed three years ago, there have been zero legal challenges to this form of legislation. It tells us that the concerns that have been raised are really red herrings. They are not substantive for purposes of constitutional law that would somehow prohibit people from exercising their free speech rights. There is nothing in this bill that inhibits a company from boycotting, but it does inhibit a company from engaging in invidious discrimination against a company from Israel based on its national origin or religion.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

What incidents have taken place? A lot of times, the reason we are here is because something happened. I know the Lieutenant Governor specifically stated in different parts of the country things have happened, but what has happened in Nevada in the last five or ten years? I had people come to my office and say something happened with a bake sale. In fact, I met that young woman on the floor the following week. Do you have examples of instances of discrimination that have hit the media?

Jason Guinasso:

I do not have specific examples. Others may have examples, but I think legislation that is preemptive in nature, especially when it addresses invidious discrimination, is important. History is our best teacher in that regard. In the events that led up to World War II, one of the precipitating actions to the Holocaust was companies that were targeting other Jewish companies and boycotting them. That activity, based on national origin or religion,

was ultimately what led to a whole parade of evil. An ounce of prevention is well worth the effort if you understand what the risk is to a group of people being mistreated based on their religion or national origin.

Joseph Shalev, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I have been practicing ophthalmology and eye surgery in Boulder City, Henderson, and Las Vegas for over 40 years. I have served the state of Nevada. Besides that, I am also a Holocaust survivor. There are not many of us left now. As such, I feel that I have to look at S.B. 26 (R1) from a different direction. My memory going back shows me that this is the way that the Holocaust started. It did not start by suddenly shooting Jewish people. It started by boycotting Jewish businesses and putting the Star of David on the windows of Jewish businesses. It started by encouraging people not to go to Jewish professionals. That is how the Holocaust started. We see the beginning of that in Europe, but we also see it a bit over here. The intention is not to try to help Palestinians and convince Israel to be nicer to them. The people who started the organization tell you themselves. The reason for that entity is to destroy the State of Israel. Going beyond that, it is not just about destroying the State of Israel. It is about destroying Judaism. As such, there is one motto to remind people of the Holocaust we had—never again. That is what I want to tell you. Never again. It is not just about S.B. 26 (R1). You are making a statement here. Your statement is against what the BDS is addressing. You are making a statement that it will not happen here, not in Nevada. We will not work with you. We will work against you.

Todd S. Polikoff, President and Chief Executive Officer, Jewish Nevada:

As the primary representative for the organization of over 70,000 Jews in Nevada, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify in favor of S.B. 26 (R1). The connections between Israel and Nevada run very deep. Several Nevadans have played seminal roles in the establishment of the State of Israel. Today, thousands of Nevadans continue to visit, work, and live in Israel. Jews and non-Jews have created a literal living bridge between the Silver State and the Jewish State. We have a robust Israeli community in our state that has brought new businesses, technology, and revenue streams. Israeli pilots train alongside our finest at Nellis Air Force Base. Many of the green trees and flowers that we see blooming in our desert are due to Israel's drip irrigation technology. Our state has seen the value in the relationship with Israel by signing a memorandum of understanding on water technology—the only state in the U.S. to do so. Israel is a top-20 trade partner with Nevada.

For many of the members of this Committee, and in fact, for many in the halls of our Legislature, the concept of BDS as it relates to Israel is relatively new. Often in my work, I need to help members of the community separate opinion from fact, so allow me to do so. I think much of this confusion also exists within the Jewish community around BDS. I believe some of the voters opposing this bill have an issue more with the wording of the bill than being in support of BDS.

What you are hearing from me and my fellow supporters of S.B. 26 (R1) today is not opinion regarding the dangers of not standing firmly against BDS. These are facts. What you need to know about BDS is that it is a movement bent on the delegitimization of the State of Israel, the severing of the connection between the Jewish people and the land of Israel, and the exploitation of the Palestinian people. Those are the facts.

To properly view S.B. 26 (R1) through the lens of our community, it should be seen as an antidiscrimination measure and welcomed on those grounds. It is this discrimination, endorsed by the BDS movement, that has the Jewish community so alarmed. It is one of the main reasons that we have been so passionate in our advocacy in favor of S.B. 26 (R1). The people who are discriminating against Israel are not simply protesting a country that they feel is doing something wrong in the world. This group targets anyone who associates with Israel—the Jewish people. I am not stretching the truth or giving an opinion. I am telling the Committee a fact. When BDS is given sway in a state, country, and government, there is active discrimination against Jews, and violence is soon to follow.

Just recently in southern Nevada, we have seen swastikas painted outside of a Jewish fraternity house. A few weeks ago, we saw an arson attack at a Jewish center in Las Vegas. The person arrested had a copy of *Mein Kampf* in his backpack.

One does not need to be Jewish to see this progression, as Jews have not been the only target of discrimination, both public and private. But history has shown us that discrimination on a grassroots level eventually turns into violence against that targeted group. It is this fact and this progression that follows discrimination that has brought 19 states to sign anti-BDS measures, with several others soon to follow suit.

The fact is, S.B. 26 (R1) prevents businesses from entering into contracts with the State of Nevada if those businesses or entities are found to be engaging in a discriminatory boycott of Israel. But more than that, this legislation makes a clear statement that the State of Nevada will not be a party to discrimination on any level.

This does not mean that engaging in a boycott of Israel is illegal, but for people who care about their bottom line when doing business with our state, S.B. 26 (R1) provides a powerful incentive against discrimination against Israel. Nevada should not contract with entities that enforce discriminatory policies. Boycotting Israel in the expectation that doing so will contribute to the Jewish state's demise is, by definition, an act of discrimination.

Why should taxpayer funds subsidize such bigotry? Why should jobs and revenues be sacrificed in the promotion of hatred towards an entire nation and people? We are here today to ask that our state stand with the only democracy in the Middle East, with the pro-Israel community of Nevada, and with the growing number of states in our country that have taken a stand against discrimination of any kind.

Tom Letizia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am the President of the Letizia Agency in Las Vegas. I have been in business in Nevada for the past 42 years. I have worked in the media since I moved here in 1971. I, and other business leaders, support S.B. 26 (R1). We think Nevada's economy and Nevada's values are reason enough for the Assembly to likewise support this. Just a few years ago, I was fortunate to join our Governor, who led a trade mission to Israel with several of our local and state elected officials. We learned a lot on this fact-finding mission. Business development leaders learned much about Israel and the partnership between Nevada and Israel. This mission helped lead to several business connections that will positively impact our state.

The BDS movement will simply cause Israelis to take their businesses elsewhere. Conversely, by denying state contracts to any business or entity that engages in BDS against Israel or Israelis, S.B. 26 (R1) will send a strong message to Israeli companies, researchers, academics, and business leaders that Nevada is open for business. As legislators, you have the opportunity to curb the BDS movement's attempt to delegitimize Israel, and in turn, support the best interests of the state of Nevada.

Alana Gross, Assistant Director of Development, Anti-Defamation League of Nevada:

Since 1913, the Anti-Defamation League has worked to combat anti-Semitism and secure justice and fair treatment for all. We write in support of S.B. 26 (R1), which will prevent discrimination in state contracts and investments by ensuring that taxpayer funds are not used to subsidize discriminatory conduct against Israel or a person doing business in Israel. We commend the Lieutenant Governor for taking a public stand against the BDS movement, and we urge the Committee to follow suit.

The Anti-Defamation League believes that the state of Nevada has a significant and substantial interest in opposing discrimination based on national origin. This bill specifically addresses the BDS movement, a campaign which aims to pressure, ostracize, and marginalize Israel. In reality, these campaigns often create climates that are hostile to Jews, where anti-Semitism can take root.

Not all advocates of BDS are anti-Semitic. Many may be driven by their perception that they are merely engaging in legitimate criticism of certain Israeli policies towards Palestinians. But it is clear that the intent of the founders of the BDS movement and a significant number involved in the campaigns are driven by opposition to Israel's very existence as a Jewish state—a fundamentally anti-Semitic view.

The Anti-Defamation League works every day to combat discrimination in all its forms. The Anti-Defamation League is also a strong supporter of the First Amendment, and recognizes that advocating boycotts for political reasons is protected by the *United States Constitution*.

While boycotts are protected when they constitute pure political expression, they are not protected when they manifest themselves as a form of discrimination based on national origin, religion, or some other protected category. The Anti-Defamation League supports

anti-BDS legislation that addresses BDS conduct that constitutes discrimination. With this in mind, the Anti-Defamation League welcomes S.B. 26 (R1), which is designed to prohibit the State of Nevada from doing business with companies that engage in boycotts when such boycotts are discriminatory. We hope this initiative serves as an important vehicle to eliminate discrimination when it comes to doing business with the State of Nevada ([Exhibit M](#)).

Chairman Flores:

Can those speaking in support of S.B. 26 (R1) in Las Vegas please stand? Will someone take a head count and let me know? We will continue with the testimony.

Rozita Lee, representing National Federation of Filipino American Associations:

I have been an advocate for the Jewish community for many years, especially because I am a Filipina. This makes a big difference as far as testifying goes, because the Jewish people have been great friends of ours. Way back when we had refugees from the Jewish community, it was the Philippines that opened the doors for them to come and stay with us. Because of that and the many years we have associated with the Jewish people, we have formed many wonderful relationships and friendships. When the Philippines had the Haiyan typhoon crisis, it was the Jewish people who came forward to help us financially.

As a Christian and pastor of Seek Jesus First Ministries, we rebuke anything that has to do with discrimination or people who have anything to do with discrimination. We rebuke the fact that they want to have this boycott against Israel. This is a world that has many, many differences and diversities. I am asking the Assembly to vote yes on this bill. It is important that we work together in Nevada as people who want to know more about each other's cultures and as people who have more understanding of one another in business and other aspects of life. I have been very busy trying to bring this about in our communities and ensuring that we tie our interests together.

Asian-Americans represent the nation's fastest-growing multicultural segment, with a population that will reach 25.7 million by 2019, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. The current buying power of Asian Americans in the U.S. is worth \$825 billion. Here in Nevada it is worth \$9 billion. We are effective, we are contributors to the community, and we work closely with our Jewish friends who are also very business-minded and entrepreneurial.

Chairman Flores:

There are 35 people present in Las Vegas in support of S.B. 26 (R1). I appreciate you all being a part of the process. In the interest of fairness, we will move to opposition. There are individuals who did not testify in Carson City. Please rise so that we can recognize you in Carson City. We have around 30 individuals in Carson City who are here in support for S.B. 26 (R1). Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to the bill?

Michael Arage, Board Member, Jewish Voice for Peace, Las Vegas Chapter:

I want to start off by stressing that I am not a lawyer or a lobbyist. I am a regular citizen of Nevada. This is the first time I have ever testified at a hearing. I am self-employed here in Las Vegas and a Palestinian Christian member of the Las Vegas chapter of Jewish Voice for Peace.

I want to make four points about Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint), an antiboycott bill that will silence dissent and create state-sponsored blacklists. First, S.B. 26 (R1) is a dangerous bill that threatens the capacity of boycotts to bring about nonviolent social change. We now live in the Trump era, and now is definitely not the time to pass a bill that weakens the power of boycotts. It is understandable that Nevadans do not want to do business with racist or hateful companies, and it seems possible that S.B. 26 (R1) could be amended to declare that any business that can be shown to be racist or directly advocates violence against Jews cannot contract with Nevada. In the Trump era, S.B. 26 (R1) could be a bill about uprooting the causes of anti-Semitism and racism. But as the bill is written now, it jeopardizes legal forms of association by mistaking a boycotter's goal of curtailing the actions of a state for violence directed toward an ethnic group, and this confusion exposes all Nevadan groups who utilize boycotts to new forms of repression.

While it has been sad to watch news outlets like *Breitbart* and the *Las Vegas Sun* cheer this bill forward, at least we can establish a public record documenting how the power of boycotts came to be eroded in Nevada if this bill passes. Thanks to requests under the Freedom of Information Act, we know how groups partly financed by Sheldon Adelson work with the Office of the Lieutenant Governor to promote the bill. Additionally, thanks to lobbying regulations, we can and have filed a complaint identifying an individual we allege engaged in unregistered lobbying in support of S.B. 26 (R1). Even if S.B. 26 (R1) passes, at least we are now keeping track of the resources and conduct that likely moved it through the Legislature.

My second to last point is about evidence, facts, and research, and this is the same point I made in a letter to the sponsor of the bill back in January. The Lieutenant Governor and many of the bill's supporters are awkwardly confident when it comes to intervening in a history they do not understand. Nothing in the bill and nothing in the multiple and recently published opinion pieces show anything approaching the depth of knowledge and quality of research required to understand Jewish history, Palestinian history, and the history of boycotts. Jews and Holocaust survivors gave experience-based testimony before the Senate, but look at the recent articles by Mr. Hutchison, Alan Stock, and Representative Rosen in the *Las Vegas Sun* and *CBS Las Vegas*.

Mr. Hutchison offered only vague descriptions of the Nevada economy. Alan Stock gave no evidence to support his claim that people of color will suffer unless S.B. 26 (R1) is passed. These are not arguments based on research. Just like this bill, they are based on a dangerously narrow understanding of the history of Jews, Palestinians, and boycotts.

Lastly, let me say that, as a Palestinian and a new father, I care deeply about all of our futures. However, I must ask whether or not this Committee or bill supporters have reached out to the Nevada Palestinian community to ask them their thoughts about S.B. 26 (R1). Maybe this testimony is a start to that process. But unless you can amend S.B. 26 (R1) so that it is a bill that fights anti-Semitism rather than fighting boycotts, I strongly urge you to not pass this bill ([Exhibit N](#)).

Andy Amid, Jewish Voice for Peace, Las Vegas Chapter:

I was born in the U.S. I am a member of the Arab-American Muslim community. I am opposed to the anti-BDS bill, S.B. 26 (R1). I think there is a lot of misunderstanding about the bill. The BDS movement is not out to destroy Israel. The intent is to provide human rights for Palestinians. I think that is the basic issue here. The Palestinians live under a horrendous occupation. Unfortunately, in America, we do not have the opportunity to see the atrocities going on there perpetrated against the Palestinians. Citizens of the world and a growing force in the United States are speaking up. This is one of the efforts to do something. It is not a religious issue. There are a growing number of individuals within the Jewish community, nationally and internationally, advocating on behalf of the Palestinians because their basic principles are for justice and fairness. Many of the Palestinians are Christian and Muslim. They are not just Muslim. Many of them are trying to leave and get out because of that.

When we talk about the benefits here in Nevada, it seems like we are weighing the economic benefits against the basic human rights and dignity of individuals in Palestine. There is a tremendous amount of animosity against the Palestinians, and it would help if the American people were able to witness what is going on in Palestine and hear from the Palestinians. You do not have that opportunity. You do not see their orchards being destroyed or their olives being picked. You do not see their homes being blown up because someone was suspicious and alleged a child was doing something. We would not tolerate that in this country, but the Israeli forces are blowing up their homes without questions. You do not see that in this country. These are the kinds of things going on. Please seriously consider not supporting this bill.

Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

The American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada regrets to inform the Committee that we oppose S.B. 26 (R1) because it would punish the constitutionally protected freedom of speech and association. Our organization defends the rights and liberties guaranteed by the *U.S. Constitution*, no matter how popular or unpopular those rights may be. However sympathetic one might be to the cause the government seeks to support, the constitutional rights to free speech cannot depend on whether the context of the speech is admired or abhorred. Nor can any governmental right to speak in aid of its interests outweigh the individual right of the people to disagree. If governmental speech rights trumped individual speech rights, the First Amendment would have no meaning.

In the context of the constitutional implications of S.B. 26 (R1), we must remain neutral in the debate this bill seeks to address, and thus we take no position on either side of that debate. We do, however, assert that states should not make their contracting or investment decisions based solely on political viewpoints or opinions.

As introduced, S.B. 26 (R1) facially discriminates on the basis of the business entity's viewpoint. Section 5 states, "A governing body or its authorized representative shall not enter into a contract . . . with a company unless the contract includes a written certification that the company is not currently engaged in, and agrees for the duration of the contract not to engage in, a boycott of Israel." Section 5 requires a specific statement, that is speech, by the contractor to align with the state's political position or penalties will be suffered by the contractor. Contractors may refuse to sign the contract with this provision, feel threatened to state their true belief, or falsify their true belief. To compel a contractor to declare alignment with the state's preferred political position is a violation of the First Amendment of the *U.S. Constitution* and the *Nevada Constitution*.

Boycotts to bring about political, social, and economic change through speech, association, assembly, and petition are unquestionably protected under the First Amendment. In many different contexts, the Supreme Court has made clear that, although the government is under no obligation to provide various kinds of benefits, it may not deny them if the reason for the denial would require a choice between exercising First Amendment rights and obtaining that benefit.

In 2016, the *Harvard Law Review* reported that state BDS bills violate the First Amendment because they amount to ". . . announcing their disdain for a marginal political movement whose goals they strenuously oppose. This motive could not be more antithetical to the core values of the First Amendment."

We would additionally like to point out that section 21, subsections 1 and 2 would create a blacklist that would be based on an arbitrary system subject to the whims, frailties, and biases of the staff and public who collaborate to create it. Companies would again be subject to a preferred political view test and labeled without due process. There should be no doubt that companies which are blacklisted would seek relief from the designation and pursue remedies and damages accordingly.

Nevada has every right to declare its beliefs and principles through resolution and legislation, so long as those declarations do not punish or infringe on the rights of the people to express their disagreement or associate in opposition to those declarations. The U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the First Amendment rights of expression and association repeatedly, and we believe S.B. 26 (R1) violates these rights.

I also want to respond to a few things that came up in testimony. I want to clarify the argument for labor unions and the reason I do not speak on behalf of the labor unions. I speak on behalf of an organization that has represented labor unions in the free speech context. The argument is not that the bill, as specifically written now, affects the

free speech rights of a labor union; it is the precedent it sets. Before voting on this bill, I encourage you to replace the words "Israel BDS" with words like "labor unions' collective bargaining."

There have been efforts in the private sector and efforts in the last legislative session to silence the boycott and free speech rights of those labor unions and prohibit them from picketing and boycotting in certain circumstances. That is a very real issue and a very real concern. While there have not been lawsuits yet since this bill was last heard in the Senate, there are new efforts, and some states are considering bringing forth lawsuits. As was stated, this is new law that has been in effect for about three years. There are 19 states that have enacted these pieces of BDS legislation, but we are confident this will be decided in the courts.

Finally, we acknowledge and respect that the intent of this bill is to be an antidiscrimination piece of legislation. We do not deny that. We encourage the bill sponsors to write something that is not so viewpoint specific and that is an antidiscrimination law, as some other states have done to resolve the constitutional issues we find in this bill. Thank you for your time, and I can answer any questions.

Chairman Flores:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in opposition to the bill, either in Carson City or Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks?

Mark Hutchison:

I just ask that the members keep in mind all of the points. I have great respect for opposing viewpoints. They come from legitimate interests and feelings. Please keep in mind those who support anti-BDS legislation: President Barack Obama, Secretary Clinton, Congresswoman Berkley, Assemblywoman Spiegel, et cetera. These are people who would not embrace the ideas and arguments presented in the opposition. Please support this bill and provide a great partnership and opportunities for us to progress with Israel as we move forward.

Shelley Berkley:

I really respect everyone who has spoken, and I appreciate everyone coming out. Unlike the gentleman who spoke in Las Vegas, I have been to the West Bank and Ramallah on 18 separate occasions. The atrocities he suggested simply do not exist. I wanted to ensure I clarified that before anyone voted on this legislation.

The President of the Palestinian Authority, Abu Mazen, is opposed to the BDS movement for a number of reasons. I stated them in my testimony. He has relations with Israel. He knows that Israeli companies are providing jobs both in Israel and on the West Bank for the Palestinian people. If the President of the Palestinian people is opposed to the boycott movement because it provides jobs for ordinary Palestinian citizens, I do not think someone sitting in Las Vegas who has never been to the West Bank can speak with more authority than the President of the Palestinian Authority, whose job is to protect the Palestinian people.

[([Exhibit O](#)), ([Exhibit P](#)), ([Exhibit Q](#)), ([Exhibit R](#)), ([Exhibit S](#)), ([Exhibit T](#)), ([Exhibit U](#)), ([Exhibit V](#)), ([Exhibit W](#)), ([Exhibit X](#)), ([Exhibit Y](#)), ([Exhibit Z](#)), ([Exhibit AA](#)), ([Exhibit BB](#)), ([Exhibit CC](#)), and ([Exhibit DD](#))] were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chairman Flores:

I have expressed hesitation with the bill. Lieutenant Governor Hutchison, I appreciate your working so hard on this bill. I have a tremendous amount of admiration and respect for the Jewish community in our state. I recognize the enormous contributions to our state. I realize our state is better because of our Jewish community. We have a responsibility to protect our Jewish community, just like every other community. However, my hesitation has always and only been rooted in the fact that as Chairman of this Committee, I have an obligation to dissociate myself from the emotional connection that comes with legislation. I have to look at it through a strict policy lens. I have to look at the argument and see if it tells me, logically, that it flows correctly, and that I am not creating precedent that in the future will come back and harm the very core of my essence. I will not get in the way of the process. This process needs to be played out. You have the obligation and responsibility to speak with every member and ensure this moves forward.

Growing up, I have seen discrimination in my household with my parents. They had a hard time getting apartments and purchasing things because our skin tone looked a specific way. Very, very early on, I realized the First Amendment was my way of protesting against that. Any time we challenge the First Amendment, or we put it in a box where we pick and choose when it is okay, it goes against the essence of my memories. That is the only reason I have expressed hesitation. Last session, we voted in support of the resolution saying Israel was a friend of Nevada [[Assembly Joint Resolution 1 of the 78th Session](#)]. I put my name on that. However, I am worried about the precedent we set moving forward in saying that we will pick and choose when we accept speech. This state is so powerful because of boycotts. It is better because of boycotts. Even when I hate the fact that someone is boycotting something I admire and respect, I have to respect the process and allow the boycott to be against me and in support of me. That is the essence of the First Amendment.

I urge you to work with me. My office has always been open. If you have the votes, we will make sure this gets moved out as soon as possible. I promise that to you. I will close out the hearing on S.B. 26 (R1). This meeting is adjourned [at 11:30 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Isabel Youngs
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Chairman

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 78 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 127 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 191 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 236 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 245 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 429 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 434](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 469 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 375 \(1st Reprint\)](#) presented by Jered McDonald, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit L](#) is a proposed amendment to [Senate Bill 375 \(1st Reprint\)](#) submitted by Riana Durrett, Executive Director, Nevada Dispensary Association, presented by Assemblyman Richard Carrillo.

[Exhibit M](#) is a letter dated March 13, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#), authored by Jolie Brislin, Nevada Regional Director, Anti-Defamation League, submitted by Alana Gross, Assistant Director of Development, Anti-Defamation League of Nevada.

[Exhibit N](#) is written testimony authored and submitted by Michael Arage, Board Member, Jewish Voice for Peace, Las Vegas Chapter, in opposition to [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#).

[Exhibit O](#) is a letter dated February 8, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to the Nevada Legislature, authored by Congresswoman Jacky Rosen, Nevada Congressional District No. 3, submitted by Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor.

[Exhibit P](#) is a letter dated March 7, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#), authored by Congresswoman Dina Titus, Nevada Congressional District No. 1, submitted by Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor.

[Exhibit Q](#) is a letter dated February 16, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to Assemblyman Edgar Flores, authored by Congressman Mark E. Amodei, Nevada Congressional District No. 2, submitted by Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor.

[Exhibit R](#) is a letter dated February 24, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to The Honorable Edgar Flores, authored by United States Senator Dean Heller, submitted by Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor.

[Exhibit S](#) is a letter dated March 22, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to The Honorable David R. Parks, Chair, Senate Government Affairs Committee, authored by Scott A. Edelman, Regional President, American Jewish Committee Los Angeles; Ira Handelman, Public Policy Chair, American Jewish Committee Los Angeles; and Janna Weinstein Smith, Regional Director, American Jewish Committee Los Angeles, submitted by Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor.

[Exhibit T](#) is a letter dated May 15, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs, coauthored by Neville Pokroy, Co-Chair, Israeli-American Coalition for Action Government Relations Committee, and Joseph Shalev, Co-Chair, Israeli-American Coalition for Action Government Relations Committee, submitted by Mark A. Hutchison, Lieutenant Governor.

[Exhibit U](#) is a letter dated March 6, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to The Honorable David R. Parks, Chair, Senate Government Affairs Committee, from Jewish Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit V](#) is a letter dated March 13, 2017, in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to The Honorable David R. Parks, Chair, Senate Government Affairs Committee, authored and submitted by David Oberg, Senior Pastor, Faith Alive Christian Center, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit W](#) is a letter in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#) to The Honorable David R. Parks, Chair, Senate Government Affairs Committee, authored and submitted by Cesar Minera, Senior Pastor, Word of Life Ministries, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit X](#) is a letter in support of [Senate Bill 26 \(1st Reprint\)](#), authored and submitted by Roger Canary, Pastor, Spirit Filled Church, Sparks, Nevada.

[Exhibit Y](#) is a letter dated May 16, 2017, in support of Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint), authored and submitted by Kenneth L. Kraft, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada.

[Exhibit Z](#) is written testimony in support of Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint), authored and submitted by Hannah Alterwitz, President, Sigma Alpha Epsilon Pi Jewish sorority at the University of Nevada, Reno.

[Exhibit AA](#) is written testimony authored and submitted by Hayim Mizrachi, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada, in support of Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit BB](#) is written testimony authored and submitted by Matthew Levin, President, Alpha Epsilon Pi, University of Nevada in support of Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit CC](#) is written testimony authored and submitted by Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner, Assembly District No. 26, in support of Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint).

[Exhibit DD](#) is written testimony authored and submitted by Virginia Wisdom, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada, in opposition to Senate Bill 26 (1st Reprint).