

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
May 11, 2017**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chairwoman Olivia Diaz at 1:38 p.m. on Thursday, May 11, 2017, 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/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Chairwoman  
Assemblyman Nelson Araujo, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson  
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod  
Assemblyman Skip Daly  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall  
Assemblyman James Oscarson

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

Assemblyman John Hambrick (excused)

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1  
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst  
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel  
Julianne King, Committee Secretary  
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1101



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Priscilla Maloney, Government Affairs Retiree Chapter, American Federation of  
State, County, and Municipal Employees  
Megann Johnson, Intern, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Alanna Bondy, Intern, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada  
Reverend Leonard Jackson, Director, Faith Organizing Alliance  
Arturo Gonzales, Volunteer, CHISPA Nevada  
Arlene Alvarez, Las Vegas Coordinator, Mi Familia Vota  
Iridane Sanchez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Emily Zamora, Director, Silver State Voices, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum  
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum  
John Wagner, Carson City Vice Chairman, Independent American Party  
Sharron Angle, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Susan Merriwether, Clerk-Recorder, Carson City  
Joseph P. Gloria, Registrar of Voters, Clark County  
Stacey Shinn, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

[Roll was taken. Rules were explained.] We will begin with the work session. I will have Ms. Stonefield start us off with Senate Bill 117.

**Senate Bill 117: Revises provisions relating to election accessibility. (BDR 24-547)**

**Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The first bill before the members today is Senate Bill 117. It was heard in this Committee on May 9, 2017, and was presented by Senator Settlemeyer ([Exhibit C](#)). Senate Bill 117 requires each polling place to have a separate line for voters with disabilities or who are not physically able to wait in line to vote. Existing law requires a polling place to accommodate disabled or elderly voters. This bill would require that a polling place either must have a separate line for disabled or elderly voters or must allow an elderly or disabled voter to move to the front of the line of waiting voters. There was no opposition, and no amendments have been offered.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 117.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 117.

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Oscarson.

**Senate Bill 447 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to absentee voting.  
(BDR 24-1125)**

**Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The next bill before the members today is Senate Bill 447 (1st Reprint). It was heard in this Committee on May 9, 2017 (Exhibit D). It was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. It was presented by Senator Cannizzaro. The bill authorizes a registered voter to request an absent ballot as follows:

- A registered voter with a physical disability or who is 65 years of age or older may submit a written request to the clerk for receipt of an absent ballot for all elections at which the registered voter is eligible to vote.
- Any registered voter may request and vote an absent ballot for all elections held during the year he or she requests the absent ballot. A written request for an absent ballot may be made by mail or via an approved electronic transmission.

The bill further clarifies existing provisions relating to the written statement of a person who assists a registered voter in completing their absent ballot. Existing law requires a person to indicate next to his or her signature that the ballot was marked on behalf of the voter. The proposed revision requires a written statement, including name, address, and signature. Finally, the bill provides that if a requestor of a permanent absentee ballot becomes "inactive" or is removed from the voter rolls at some point, the clerk shall no longer mail the voter an absent ballot. No amendments were offered, and there was no opposition during the hearing.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 447 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MONROE-MORENO MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 447 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno.

**Senate Bill 491 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to mechanical voting  
systems and mechanical recording devices. (BDR 24-491)**

**Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The next bill before the members is Senate Bill 491 (1st Reprint). It was heard in this Committee on May 9, 2017. It was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and presented by Senator Cannizzaro ([Exhibit E](#)).

Senate Bill 491 (1st Reprint) authorizes counties whose population is less than 100,000 to lease voting machines from the Office of the Secretary of State without the option to purchase such systems. Under the bill, a county would agree to maintain and insure the machines for the duration of the lease agreement.

This option requires a two-year agreement between the county and the Office of the Secretary of State, with an exclusive option for the county to extend the terms of the agreement for periods of two years. The measure provides that the aggregate of rental payments under the two-year agreement must not exceed 10 percent of the purchase price. Only those mechanical voting systems and devices approved by the Secretary of State's Office may be purchased, leased, or used in Nevada. This bill specifies that all rental payments received under the available lease options must be deposited into a separate account in the State General Fund. These funds must be used to pay the costs of replacing aging and outdated voting systems in the future. No amendments have been offered. There was no opposition in Committee.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Is there any discussion on the bill?

**Assemblyman Oscarson:**

This is not requiring the counties to do that if they already have their equipment. This is giving them the option to do that. Is that correct?

**Carol Stonefield:**

This is entirely an optional program. The fiscal note is zero, because it is not requesting or making an appropriation. It is simply establishing a program in the event that there is an appropriation to the Secretary of State's Office in order to purchase these voting devices.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

This is permissive. If the counties with populations of less than 100,000 needed this type of support to update their voting equipment, they would have this option available to them. Are there any other comments on the bill? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 491 (1st Reprint).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 491 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN OSCARSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Hansen. I will move on to  
Senate Joint Resolution 5.

**Senate Joint Resolution 5: Urges Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act.  
(BDR R-890)**

**Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Senate Joint Resolution 5 was heard in this Committee on May 2, 2017. It was sponsored by Senator Woodhouse ([Exhibit F](#)). It urges the United States Congress to enact the Marketplace Fairness Act, which would provide the states with the authority to require out-of-state retailers to collect and remit sales tax on purchases shipped into Nevada. No amendments were offered, and there was no opposition to the proposal.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Joint Resolution 5.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 5.

ASSEMBLYMAN DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK WAS ABSENT  
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Daly.

**Senate Joint Resolution 8: Urges Congress not to repeal the Patient Protection and  
Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions. (BDR R-1090)**

**Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst:**

The last measure before the Committee today is Senate Joint Resolution 8. This was heard in this Committee on May 4, 2017. It was sponsored by the Senate Committee on Health and Human Services and presented by Senator Spearman ([Exhibit G](#)).

Senate Joint Resolution 8 urges the United States Congress not to repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or its most important provisions. No amendments have been offered, and there was no opposition expressed in Committee.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Is there any discussion on Senate Joint Resolution 8?

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I will be voting no on this. I think the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act has been a disaster. Premiums have gone up. Deductibles have gone up. The number of insurance companies available to buy insurance from has gone way down. It is also very unfair to younger people to force them to buy insurance that they do not necessarily need to help subsidize the rest of us. What we should do is encourage the United States Congress to dramatically improve the whole thing and go back to the better system of allowing the market to determine these things.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I would wish that Congress would want to give us the level of coverage that they enjoy as well.

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

I started thinking about this. It is somewhat ironic, because the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act came from "RomneyCare," which was also the Heritage Foundation idea, which is a conservative think tank. The idea was to ask everyone to take personal responsibility for their health care and to buy health care, rather than rely on the government. The original idea was a way to increase the amount of people in the risk pool in order to lower premiums and ensure access. The government helped folks who did not have the means to get that.

I will be the first to admit that the law is not perfect. It probably did more for access than it did cost. I think cost needs to be addressed. Unfortunately, what is happening in Congress is leading to even worse problems than premiums getting too high. They are too high—there is no question about that. However, the way that Congress chose to approach this is completely detrimental to the health care marketplace and to hardworking Nevadans who need health care to take care of their families. While I would encourage Congress to fix some of the parts that are not working well, the way that they have chosen to go about it—nearly a straight repeal wherein some of the law's major provisions hurt people with pre-existing conditions—is not the right way to go. It is about fixing a problem, not fighting an ideological battle. With that, I will be voting yes.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Joint Resolution 8.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN BILBRAY-AXELROD SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HANSEN, McARTHUR, AND OSCARSON VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN HAMBRICK WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Araujo. That concludes the work session.

The next order of business is to hear two bills. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint), which is a proposal relating to voting and voter registration.

**Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-300)**

**Senator Pat Spearman, Senate District No. 1:**

It is an honor to be here today to introduce Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint), which addresses a number of important election issues and proposes changes that will help streamline the election process and voter registration. Much of this bill attempts to take advantage of voting technologies to make our election procedures more efficient and accessible to all voters. I know that S.B. 144 (R1) is rather lengthy, but please know that the many changes in the bill are repeated in later sections to make conforming changes throughout Chapters 293 and 293C of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). I would like to list the major components of the bill.

First, S.B. 144 (R1) provides for a vote center style of voting at one or more polling places in a county on Election Day. This means a person can vote at any such polling place on Election Day—much like early voting. According to a study that was conducted by the National Conference of State Legislators, this particular method has saved counties and states money with respect to people who are only able to cast a provisional ballot or not being able to vote at all.

The bill requires the county commission to set by ordinance the criteria for selecting the polling place to be used as vote centers. The bill requires that the locations of such vote center polling places be published in a newspaper during the week before the election and posted on any bulletin board used for public notices. The measure specifies that if every polling place in the county is a vote center, such posting is not required.

At least 15 states now either permit jurisdictions to replace precincts with vote centers or have authorized vote center pilot projects in selected jurisdictions. Three states allow jurisdictions to use vote centers on Election Day: Wyoming, South Dakota, and Iowa. Twelve states and the District of Columbia allow jurisdictions to use vote centers during early voting only: Nevada, Kansas, Louisiana, Tennessee, Illinois, Ohio, West Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Maryland, Massachusetts, and the District of Columbia. Eight states may use vote centers during early voting and on Election Day: Utah, Arizona, Colorado, New Mexico, Texas, Arkansas, North Dakota, and Indiana. California has authorized the use of vote centers starting in 2018.

The measure also requires the county clerk to prepare a roster for each of these polling places that contains information about every voter in the county. Section 6 of S.B. 144 (R1) sets forth the procedure by which a voter shall cast a ballot at a vote center location, including signing the election roster, verifying his or her signature, confirming that the voter has not already voted in that election, and then allowing the voter to cast a ballot. Section 6 also pulls existing language from NRS Chapter 293 for vote center-style voting as it relates to verifying a person's identity when his or her signature does not match the roster.

Also included in Section 6.5 of S.B. 144 (R1) are provisions that would allow people both to register and vote on the day of a primary or general election at a polling place that is specifically designated for that purpose. All existing requirements in Nevada law, as they relate to identifying the voter for registration purposes and verifying his or her identity, are also included in these new provisions.

I want to stress that this does not mean that every polling place must provide for same-day registration. Only the sites so designated by the county election official and approved by the county commission must offer this registration. Voters will know which polling places offer same-day registration, because the bill requires the county to publish a list of sites designated for same-day registration and post the list on any bulletin board used for public notices. If all polling places offer same-day registration, the public notice is not required.

The one stipulation, however, is that a person who registers at a specific, designated polling place may only cast his or her ballot at that particular polling place. It is my hope that as we adopt vote center-style voting, registering to vote and then voting on the same day will become a standard practice. The bill also requires the Office of the Secretary of State to create and maintain software for a mobile device—a telephone app—that includes all the information that is available on the Secretary of State's Internet website. Most of us have an app from banks on our phones. I know that the technology exists. The secure sockets layer (SSL) technology exists, so that this can be secure. About 99 percent of banks now use this. I am talking about an app very similar to this, except it would be for registering and casting a vote for absent ballot requests and military overseas ballots.

Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint) also allows for the preregistration of a person 17 years of age or older if he or she meets the residency requirements for a qualified elector and will be 18 years old by the next election. I would note that the category E felony described in section 68 of the bill in NRS 293.800 for falsely registering to vote does not apply to a person who preregisters under the bill. The preregistration may be updated in the same manner as a standard voter registration; however, a county clerk or voter registrar is not required to provide a sample ballot or other election materials to the preregistered voter until he or she is eligible to vote. The measure also provides that any affidavit filed against a person who is preregistered, which states that the person is not eligible to vote, must not be acted upon until the preregistered person is officially registered to vote. I would also note that any preregistration information relating to a person is confidential and not a public record.



This takes the Committee to section 15 of the bill. The next several sections of the bill make conforming changes relating to the provisions found earlier in the bill, primarily relating to the preregistration procedures and voter registration on Election Day. I would like to point out a few other provisions in S.B. 144 (R1) relating to voter registration, voting at the polls, early voting, and military overseas ballots. Specifically, the bill makes conforming changes relating to preregistration to provisions addressing military overseas voting. The bill provides that a voter, if eligible, may use the federal postcard application to register to vote or request a military overseas ballot if the application or request is received no later than seven days prior to the election.

Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint) authorizes an eligible voter who does not receive his or her military overseas ballot and voting materials for any reason, including as a result of a change in the voter's duty station, to request the local election official resend the ballot and related materials. The eligible voter may cast the military overseas ballot by fax, email, or other approved electronic transmission. I know that there was at least one presidential election that I was not able to vote in because I was stationed overseas. We did not have this type of technology then. I also know that there are times when military members receive orders to go one place, are in the middle of transporting to that place, and receive additional orders that will take them somewhere else. That is why this bill has the provision that if they do not receive it, they can request an additional ballot. That happens in the United States Army, and it probably happens in the United States Marine Corps too.

Another initiative in S.B. 144 (R1) is the extension of the period during which a person may register to vote for a primary or general election until the last day of early voting for the election, which is the Friday before the election. Currently, the deadline is the third Tuesday before the election. The bill also changes the registration period for recall and special elections that are held separately from a primary or general election to the fourth day before those elections. Currently, the registration deadline is the third Saturday prior to such elections.

Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint) proposes an expansion of early voting. Currently, county clerks may offer polling hours on Sundays during the early voting period. Since Clark and Washoe Counties already offer early voting on Sundays, S.B. 144 (R1) would require those counties to include every Sunday during the early voting period. The bill also authorizes Clark and Washoe Counties to include any federal holiday that falls within the early voting period and require a permanent early voting site that is open on Saturday to remain open until 8 p.m.

The bill specifies that permanent early voting sites only open on Sundays in Clark and Washoe Counties must be open for at least four hours between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. This is to accommodate the people who work. Most people do not work for a hobby; they work for a living. Especially in Clark County, there are several types of hours that people work. People literally can go to work at 2 a.m. and get off at 10 a.m. This is designed to make sure that those people can vote as well. Many provisions are repeated in the bill to make the new

provisions conform throughout Title 24 of the NRS. Specifically, sections 71 through 90 duplicate many of the provisions I have highlighted so far for city elections.

I know these remarks are a bit lengthy, but S.B. 144 (R1) has many critical components, and I wanted to make sure that the Committee understands the many provisions of this important bill. I know that there are still ongoing discussions as to whether voting should be easier for eligible voters or whether we should restrict it. I believe that a democracy is stronger when the participants vote and are engaged in the public arena with respect to electing the officials who should represent them. With that, I will conclude my remarks and stand for any questions.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Are there any questions from the Committee? Seeing none, I will open it up for testimony in support of S.B. 144 (R1).

**Priscilla Maloney, Government Affairs Retiree Chapter, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees:**

We were in support of the original bill. There has been an amendment, and some of the other questions or concerns, if any, have been worked out. Access to voting rights is extremely important to Nevada's seniors, especially my members, the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) retirees. We are in full support of this bill. Anything that increases voter participation in a reasonable and lawful manner is absolutely something that we value very highly at AFSCME International. Given the recent high turnout in our sister ally, France, in the last week, we have seen a great deal of discussion about what we can do to get more people in America to get out and exercise their right to vote. We think this bill suits that purpose beautifully, so we are in full support.

**Megann Johnson, Intern, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada believes that every voice deserves to be heard, and making voting more accessible is a vital part of our democracy. Same-day registration helps decrease the number of disenfranchised voters on Election Day. Research shows that voter turnout increases 3 to 6 percent and is the only election administrative change proven to increase voter turnout. It is also important to involve 16- and 17-year-olds who will become future voters. Currently, it is difficult to do voter registration within the school system, as it is dependent on each teacher's permission. Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint) would capture more young people to participate in elections. A case study from Hawaii and Florida shows evidence that preregistration encourages youth turnout. It is time to modernize Nevada's voter registration system and include as many people as possible in the democratic process. The Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada supports S.B. 144 (R1).

**Alanna Bondy, Intern, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:**

This bill provides increased access to voting and registration. For the reasons already stated, we urge your support of S.B. 144 (R1).

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

We will switch to Las Vegas and take further testimony in support of S.B. 144 (R1).

**Reverend Leonard Jackson, Director, Faith Organizing Alliance:**

I am a retired Army veteran. Being retired, I understand the difficulties faced by military personnel. We wholeheartedly support S.B. 144 (R1). The extension of the Sunday programs supports the program we have operated successfully called "Souls to the Polls." We urge churches to go directly to the polls immediately following their congregations during early voting on Sunday. This would also help individuals get to the polls. We thank you and wholeheartedly support S.B. 144 (R1).

**Arturo Gonzales, Volunteer, CHISPA Nevada:**

I am here in support of S.B. 144 (R1). I used to be a field registrar with the Elections Department in Las Vegas. Working in the field, I encountered many 17-year-olds who wanted to register to vote and had many questions about it. They would often tell me about how they would try to register to vote online, but the systems did not allow them to because it did not recognize them as eligible to vote. If we could expand our systems to accommodate for this, we could involve and engage far more youth into the voting process. It would be very helpful in our elections and engage far more people.

**Arlene Alvarez, Las Vegas Coordinator, Mi Familia Vota:**

On behalf of Mi Familia Vota, I strongly support S.B. 144 (R1). Throughout United States history, our right to vote has fully extended to women, people of color, and other previously excluded groups. These strides have allowed our electorate a means to fully and actively participate in shaping the course of government with our values and input.

Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint) builds on this strong foundation by guaranteeing citizens an opportunity to exercise one of their most important rights. Vote centers have been a huge success in Clark County where citizens vote at places near them, such as schools, grocery stores, and other sites that are open during voting hours. The preregistration of youth allows them to engage in the democratic process after learning about its importance in their academic and personal experiences. In all, S.B. 144 (R1) is a forward-thinking and intuitive piece of legislation that understands the realities of our twenty-first century electorate. I strongly support this bill

**Iridane Sanchez, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

I am here in support of S.B. 144 (R1). I have previously volunteered and worked on various campaigns around "get out the vote." We try to motivate voters to get out and vote. Unfortunately, this past election cycle, we noticed that many people were not able to vote on Election Day. They had moved, and their assigned polling locations were tied to their previous address. If their address was on the other side of town, the commute would delay that process. Oftentimes, they would not be able to vote or were unmotivated to make that drive. We realized that was a problem for many voters. It is heartbreaking to see people who want to vote but are unmotivated by the fact that they did not know the rules. Allowing

same-day voter registration would be vital for individuals who are eligible to vote to be able to exercise their right to vote.

**Emily Zamora, Director, Silver State Voices, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Silver State Voices and all of its partners stand in support of S.B. 144 (R1). I would particularly like to highlight our support for section 6, which would implement a voting center model of voting on Election Day. Section 14 authorizes preregistration for 17-year-olds. Sections 26.6 and 82.6 would require counties that have populations of over 100,000 to remain open for at least four hours on Sundays. These would currently be Clark County and Washoe County. We support this because, as an organization, we work with organizations that are having interactions with voters. Our mission at Silver State Voices is to empower Nevadans to have the access and to be able to exercise their right to vote. We often see people who have moved and, unfortunately, wait until the last minute on Election Day. They are not able to cast their vote because of transportation issues.

Implementing a vote center model would allow people to go to whichever polling location in their city and ensure that they are able to vote. Authorizing preregistration for 17-year-olds is very critical. Currently, Clark County and some of the other counties allow registration of 17-year-olds. However, what we have seen with this demographic is that there is a matter of miscommunication. They do not receive their voter registration card until they turn 18, unless their birthday is very close to early voting. Oftentimes, the organizations on the ground are speaking to 17-year-olds. They say, "I registered to vote, but I have not received my card. I do not know what is going on. Am I not registered to vote?"

Implementing this process would create a more organized system, wherein 17-year-olds would know that they were registering to vote, and they would get their voter registration card within two to three weeks. Lastly, section 2.6 and section 82.6 are very critical as well. Las Vegas is a transient city. It is a very busy city. Most residents do not work nine to five, Monday through Friday. Allowing every opportunity to go and vote, including Sundays, would make voting accessible to a lot more people.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Is there anyone else wishing to offer testimony in support of S.B. 144 (R1)? We will now take testimony in opposition to S.B. 144 (R1).

**Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum:**

The most important thing for me is election integrity. We support the military portion of this bill. We think it is very important that all efforts be made for our military to be able to vote. One issue I have with this bill is it contains an unfunded mandate. We oppose unfunded mandates. We think if legislation is passed, it ought to have a way to be funded. Concerning election integrity, I went on the Secretary of State's website today and looked up what it said about the voter registration verification process. I do not see how same-day voter registration can work under this bill with the process of the Secretary of State's office now having to verify the people who register to vote.

When they register to vote, the county sends out information overnight to the Secretary of State's office. They verify them through the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), the Social Security Administration records, the Office of Vital Statistics, and the statewide voter registration list. If that is validated, the information is then put on the active voter list. They do not even have to show their identification (ID) when they go to vote, because they are already on the active list, and their ID has been matched to existing records. However, if there is a duplicate, they send it back to the counties to resolve. If they are unable to validate that voter registration by looking at those databases, they also have the county reach out to the person to try to verify it. That process cannot take place if voter registration is on the same day as the election. They have to have some amount of time to be able to verify that voter's information on there.

The other thing the Secretary of State's office does with regard to verifying is being a member of the electronic registration information center. About every 60 days, they upload their voter rolls and check them against 20 other states that are participating. They check them against the Social Security Death Index. They check them against the United States National Change of Address database in an effort to identify deceased individuals. It is a very admirable process that we have between the counties and the Secretary of State's Office to ensure that we have voters' information and their registration is verified, so we can rely on the fact that we have voting integrity. We do not feel that same-day registration would provide us with the security of having those voters registering and voting on the same day. We oppose that part of the bill.

**Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Eagle Forum:**

I am a 42-year member of the American Legion Auxiliary. I am glad to see that the military overseas ballot information is in this bill. I think it is important, and I like that portion of the bill. I was going to address the same-day voter registration and voting. I have a problem with that. I read a very interesting blog. I usually do not read them, because it is just someone else's opinion, and I think my opinion counts for something. I came across this one, and he had some of the same questions that I did. It was by Mario Burgos. He said, "If you're not going to take the time to register to vote before Election Day, how interested are you?" I do not think people really are that interested if they cannot be registered before the day of elections.

Burgos cites a state representative, Joe Cervantes, who introduced a bill. It was about same-day registration and voting. He said in his press release that the incidents of voter fraud are low. He did not say it was nonexistent; he said it was low. That made me start thinking about something before I read this blog. There have been many elections that were very close. I remember someone in northern Nevada who won by 11 votes. That made me stop and think about things. We give driver's licenses to people who are not eligible to vote, because they are not United States citizens. How is same-day registration going to take care of that situation? We need a photo ID for same-day voting, but not for everyone else. I had a thought of, "Oh, I never thought about that."

Ballots for same-day registrants are counted in an election, but the actual registration is not verified until after Election Day. There were 62,000 people who registered on Election Day in Milwaukee in a 2008 election. How many of those registrations were actually legitimate? They did not know until after their votes were counted. Please think long and hard about this. I am opposed to it.

**John Wagner, Carson City Vice Chairman, Independent American Party:**

We oppose this legislation. There are some good parts. I have no problem with the military section. I have no problem with 17-year-olds being able to register to vote. I have a problem with the same-day registration. I used to travel extensively. When I was living in California, I was hardly ever home. One time when I came through customs and immigration control, the guy asked me if I ever stayed home. I said, "I think so. Once in a while."

I always managed to vote, except once. That was because I applied for an absentee ballot, and it arrived on Election Day when I was in London. I did not bother to send it back. Otherwise, I always made arrangements to vote. When I lived in southern California, I drove up to Santa Ana to do that. I made the effort all the time. If a person really wants to vote—and they travel a lot—they know where the absentee ballots are. With early voting, it is a piece of cake. I have a problem with the same-day registrations simply because it probably cannot be verified the same day. The election is over, and if a person fraudulently votes, how are you ever going to catch them?

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

There is a former assemblywoman here today to offer her testimony.

**Sharron Angle, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I would like to speak to the same-day registration portion of the bill. Voter and election integrity are always coming into question with every election. However, more often in Nevada, we have found this to be an issue. We are once again under a Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) investigation because of irregularities and mischief that have happened within our elections. I would caution that we need more integrity within our balloting structure, rather than less. We cannot verify those that are voting and ensure the integrity of the elections as long as people are allowed to register and vote on the same day.

In collecting petition signatures, asking registered voters to sign, and registering voters, I came across a lot of cynicism. I probably came across more cynicism in the millennial generation amongst those who are registered to vote but do not vote, or have declined to vote over the years, because they say, "My vote doesn't count." The reason they say that is they believe that the integrity of our elections is not secure. I would say that we would have better voter turnout. The more secure we make our elections—the more that people feel that their votes count—the more voter participation you will have. I would urge you to strike this portion of the bill.

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

Two years ago, you came to this Committee. I asked you if you had any evidence of voter fraud. You said, "No." I wanted to ask about that. Have you now uncovered actual evidence of voter fraud? Secondly, you said that there was an FBI investigation. Can you help me understand what they are investigating? I do not know that that is accurate.

**Sharron Angle:**

I would be glad to tell you that there are cases of it. I believe that the proper statement would be that I do not know of any that have been prosecuted successfully. There are many reasons for that. This is a victimless crime. Generally, those who could be prosecuted have to admit to the crime themselves rather than being found out. You do not find the person who is impersonating someone else. They usually tell you. I think you can go on [www.youtube.com](http://www.youtube.com) if you want to know about that kind of thing. There is a lady in Ohio who said, "Of course, I voted three times. I wanted to make sure my vote counted." That is election fraud. She was not prosecuted for that. She was just told, "Do not do that anymore." We have some in Nevada. I did not anticipate the question, so I do not have the name of the lady who is going to jail for election fraud. This was in the last year or two in Nevada. I know of that case.

The second part of your question was about the FBI investigations. I was told by a newsperson that I cannot obtain a list of addresses of folks who had been sent First Class campaign pieces that were returned "Not at this address" or "deceased." We wanted to check them against the voting rolls. She said, "No. That is all they turned over to the FBI." They are now investigating. There is an investigation in Nevada that I know of.

**Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson:**

I am glad that we cleared up the fact that you do not have any names. These are really serious accusations. The only case that I am familiar with is a Republican woman who was arrested trying to vote twice. I think the insinuation is that Democrats are out committing voter fraud. I wanted to make the point that the only case I am aware of is a Republican woman getting caught trying to prove that someone could vote twice.

**Sharron Angle:**

I believe that when we talk about election integrity, voters, people being allowed to vote, and people wanting to vote, this is very nonpartisan. I think it goes across party lines. This is an American question. Integrity of our election system is the foundation of our freedom. It is not a party issue at all. It should be every citizen's issue. As citizens, we should want the very best and most secure election process that we can have in this country. Our founders wanted us to be a representative republic. They did not want us to be a dictatorship or a banana republic where elections were not secure. None of us have implied that this was a partisan issue. It is an American issue.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I think it is very important for the record to reflect accurate information. If someone is committing voter fraud in Ohio, we have different election procedures state by state. We do not know of anything yet. I have not heard of any FBI investigations in this area. As soon as someone can let us know, it would be important to be told that investigations are happening. Is there any further testimony in opposition? Seeing none, we will go to neutral. Is there anyone wishing to testify in the neutral position on S.B. 144 (R1)?

**Susan Merriwether, Clerk-Recorder, Carson City:**

I am here representing the clerks of Nevada. You have seen the implementation of same-day registration handout ([Exhibit H](#)). Several sections in the bill are very similar to other bills this session that have been amended. We are hoping that those will merge with this bill and get cleaned up. We need a real time voter registration system. It would be impossible for the counties to verify if someone had voted throughout the state if we do not have a live system.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Are there any questions from the Committee? I see none. Senator Spearman, are there any final remarks?

**Senator Spearman:**

I appreciate the dialogue when it comes to the issue of voting. People in the military have given their lives for the opportunity to vote and pursue freedom. However, if we go into some of the darker days of our history in the 1950s, 1960s, and even the 1970s, people were trying to subvert other people's right to vote. That is what this is about. One thing that is a testament to the security of our election system is that the people were caught.

A study was done that went back 20 years or so, and the percentage of the people who actually attempted voter fraud was infinitesimally small. It was not even 0.1 percent. I know that other states have figured out how to do same-day registration. Idaho, Iowa, and Wyoming have been doing it for a while.

I am a proud Nevadan. I was not born here, but it was my choice to come here when I retired. I am proud of the fact that we, as Nevadans, have a history of figuring things out. I do not think that the people who do this now, and have been doing it, are smarter than we are. Maybe there are some glitches, but we can learn from whatever mistakes they made in the early implementation.

Speaking of implementation, this is not something that needs to happen the day after tomorrow. A couple years ago, I talked to folks who were dealing with voting machines. One of the things that they said was that bills like this, when approved, help them make the case for voter machine modernization, because we are woefully lacking in that area. I think we can figure it out. I can go on my phone and get into my bank. I can transfer money and pay bills. There is even a bank where, if someone gives you their email address, they can send you an email; you accept the email; and they can send you money that goes directly into your bank. The technology for security is already there.



When we start talking about change, I am aware of the fact that change is often difficult. That is okay. Rome was not built in a day. We may have to do this two or three times. I hope we do not. It is to make sure that people understand that the process is still protected. The gentleman mentioned that if you want to vote, you should register to vote before Election Day. When I was a pastor, a couple members of my church had to go take care of a sick relative. One was in the hospital for a lengthy stay. They did not get out until the Saturday before Election Day. Intervening circumstances prevented them from making sure that their registration was up to date, so they were not eligible to vote. There are many reasons why people do not register three months, four months, or a year in advance. I would not presume to judge whether their circumstances or the reasons for those circumstances are warranted or not. I know that people have things that happen. It is kind of like life.

I appreciate the dialogue, even those who came in opposition. I think that robust dialogues of this type help us make our democracy stronger. We just have to always be mindful, especially when we are testifying at this table, that NRS 218.085 makes it a misdemeanor to give false information knowingly. I appreciate the dialogue, and I encourage your support.

[Chairwoman Diaz designated ([Exhibit I](#)) as presented but not discussed. It will be made part of the record.]

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 144 (R1). I will invite Senator Cannizzaro to come to the table. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 492 (1st Reprint), which is a proposal to create vote centers.

**Senate Bill 492 (1st Reprint):   Revises provisions relating to polling places.  
(BDR 24-450)**

**Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro, Senate District No. 6:**

Today I am presenting Senate Bill 492 (1st Reprint), which allows for the establishment and use of vote centers during Election Day. This method of voting is becoming more popular and, as of this year, at least 20 states now either permit jurisdictions to replace precincts with vote centers or have authorized vote center pilot projects in selected jurisdictions. Moreover, the next generation of voting machines is designed to support this type of voting.

Senate Bill 492 (1st Reprint) authorizes the voter registrar in each county to establish one or more polling places in the county where any person entitled to vote in person may do so on Election Day. This vote center style of voting means a person can vote at any polling place on Election Day—much like early voting. When we think of early voting, we know we can go to our local library, the supermarket, a mall, a community center, and sometimes there are trailers set up. These are the types of voting center-style places that we are talking about.

In my days of canvassing in Senate District 6 during and around Election Day, one of the common misconceptions that I found with voters was that they thought they could go to any location in order to vote. They did not realize, because of the prevalence and accessibility of

early voting, that they could not just go to the polling place at the local library on Election Day. Voters have to go to a specific place that they are designated to go to. We found a number of people who were very lost on Election Day and looking for that particular place. This would alleviate some of those concerns by allowing us to continue to do what we do during early voting on Election Day.

This bill requires that the locations of the vote center polling places be published in a newspaper during the week before the election and posted on any bulletin board for public notices, so the public can know where to vote. This posting must begin no later than the fifth business day before the election and continue through 7 p.m. on the day of the election. To avoid any surprises, no additional polling place may be established after the newspaper publication date, except in the rare case of an emergency when the polling place needs to be changed or relocated. This way, we can ensure that people are getting the proper information about all of the places they can go to vote. The measure also specifies that if every polling place in the county is a vote center, such posting is not required.

Under the bill, the county clerk must prepare a roster for each of the polling places that contains information about every voter in the county. This will allow a voter's information to be readily available at each vote center location, so he or she can receive the proper ballot style based on the precinct in which the voter lives. This is common practice for early voting. When someone goes to early vote, they go to a place that allows for early voting. The poll workers pull up the voter's particular precinct. The ballot the voter receives is the ballot for the precinct in which the voter lives. The voter might be across town at a place that is closer to their work. For anyone who lives in or represents Clark County, this is important because so many people have to work on Election Day. Trying to get from downtown Las Vegas to Summerlin can be quite the task for individuals who like to vote on Election Day.

Section 5 of S.B. 492 (R1) sets forth the procedure by which a voter shall cast a ballot at a vote center location, including signing the election roster or a signature card, verifying his or her signature, confirming that the voter has not already voted in that election, and then allowing the voter to cast a ballot. Section 5 also pulls existing language from Chapter 293 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) for vote center-style voting as it relates to verifying a person's identity when his or her signature does not match. Moreover, if the signature of the voter has changed in comparison to the signature on the application to register to vote, the bill requires the voter to update his or her signature on a form prescribed by the Office of the Secretary of State. This is the same process already set forth in law for election rosters used at standard polling places.

Casting a ballot using the vote center model has proven to be a popular, reliable, convenient, and safe voting method. The bill includes language in sections 5, 9, and 10 that requires the county clerk to prescribe procedures, as approved by the Secretary of State's office, to verify that the voter has not already voted in the county at the current election. These safeguards are critical to protecting the integrity of the elections process in Nevada. You will notice the

remaining sections of the bill add conforming language as it relates to the new language set forth in sections 2 through 5.

Finally, S.B. 492 (R1) adds provisions to our early voting statutes to give the counties the option to establish an early voting location in certain residential developments for elderly persons in lieu of an Election Day polling place. Sometimes it is difficult to set up an entire voting center in those particular places. This would permit for that to be something to be addressed during the early voting period. With that, I will open myself up to any questions.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Are there any questions from the Committee members?

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I have a comment. I want to thank you for bringing this bill. I think I get a call from a constituent around 6:30 p.m. every regular Election Day. Either they have gone to the wrong polling place, or they thought they could vote at the mall, where early voting was open for the last two weeks. Many times, there is not time for them to drive to their correct polling place. It hurts me, because people are trying their best to get off work and go vote. In southern Nevada, it is a three-shift town. Many times, a person works in Henderson or downtown and is trying to get to Summerlin or up at Sunrise Mountain. Traffic is a challenge when getting from one end of town to another. There are times I think it is easier to get from Carson City to Reno than it is to get from Las Vegas to Henderson or from Summerlin to downtown.

I thank you for bringing this bill. Nevada has early voting, which is a modern, twenty-first century system wherein a person can go to many different sites and they do not have to go to the school in their neighborhood. On Election Day, we revert to this 1950s model of how we used to vote, which is how it was when I was a kid. I think it hurts our constituents. Thank you for bringing this bill.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Are there any further questions or comments? [There were none.] I think the transiency of our communities has changed. We used to stay put in one home that we bought, but I think in the unique nature of our times, we are more mobile. We might be in one housing division for a set of years, but then we decide to go to another. There are many complexities in terms of keeping up with that. I am not saying that we should not update our voter registration with our accurate address, but I believe that because we are a more mobile society than we were before, being more flexible in terms of where people can cast their vote should be a priority of ours. I do not see any further questions or comments, so with that, I will open it up for testimony in support of S.B. 492 (R1).

**Joseph P. Gloria, Registrar of Voters, Clark County:**

I am here to testify in support of the bill and to thank Senator Cannizzaro for working so closely with us to make some amendment to the bill that helps us to administrate. I want to point out two sections that I have a concern with. In sections 11.6 and 15.8, it states that only

the residents of the development are entitled to vote at the temporary branch-polling place. I do not have a means to determine whether the individuals actually live at the residence. Therefore, I would appreciate it if we could amend that and eliminate that section.

The purpose there was to ensure that we had an opportunity to provide voting opportunities to those elderly subdivisions by giving them a site during early voting, as it is a challenge to set up the proper number of machines at some of these facilities. Because of the size of the room, we cannot put in the number of machines needed to serve them properly. I hope the sponsor will consider that. Many of the positives related to vote centers have already been mentioned.

I only want to state that more access in Clark County will allow us to eliminate the largest number of provisional ballots. Many folks vote provisionally on Election Day, because they are in the incorrect polling place. The vote center concept is already in place in Clark County and has been successful in the City of Henderson. In fact, in the primary election, all four cities supporting the municipal election have used vote centers. We look forward to putting this in place in the future in Clark County, and we certainly support the bill.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

How has the voting center worked out during municipal elections in Clark County?

**Joe Gloria:**

It has been a great success. The process and the computer system in place simply duplicates what we do during early voting. The voter turnout has not been as high as we would like to see it, but I think that is more of a municipal election symptom than the process itself. I think it would definitely be very successful in the even-year elections in Clark County as well.

**Arlene Alvarez, Las Vegas Coordinator, Mi Familia Vota, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

We are in support of this bill. I am just echoing what has been mentioned before. We live in a 24-hour town, and peoples' schedules do not accommodate traditional voting hours or places. Therefore, voting centers are a great addition to our twenty-first century lifestyle. We fully support it.

**Stacey Shinn, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

The current policy is very confusing to voters. They can go anywhere during early voting, but on Election Day, they can only go to their polling place. This will reduce provisional ballots and confusion. I was able to find a study of two counties in Colorado. They looked at voting rates before and after implementation of vote centers. Their study demonstrated a positive effect on individuals' electoral participation. It also produced further evidence that vote centers matter for younger and less experienced voters. The study showed there was a positive effect on all age ranges but had a more positive effect on the younger voters. It also demonstrated that there could be a long-term effect of increasing turnout when election centers are provided for the voters.

**Susan Merriwether, Clerk-Recorder, Carson City:**

I would like to thank Senator Cannizzaro for presenting this bill and working with the clerks to include the rural counties in the option of having vote centers. There are several counties that will be looking into this, and I think it is going to be a huge benefit for Nevada.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Does Carson City already have implemented vote centers?

**Susan Merriwether:**

Yes. In 2014, Carson City purchased electronic poll books. In the 2016 election, we opened it up to allowing for voting. We currently vote at the community center in Carson City. We do early voting at the courthouse. We opened up voting on Election Day at the courthouse and the community center. There are two locations we use. It has worked out terrifically.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Is there any further testimony in support of S.B. 492 (R1)? Seeing none, we will go to opposition.

**John Wagner, Carson City Vice Chairman, Independent American Party:**

If there are polling places, are they going to be at the same place in the next election, the next election, and the next election? In Carson City, it is very easy. I know where to go, and I vote early. I am sure it is a large community in Las Vegas. I have been down there a few times. I hate travelling across it. People get used to going to a certain place. When you go to a certain polling place, usually the same people are working the polling place from election to election. They know who you are when you walk in. I think this effect is a good way for possible fraud. In other words, if someone came in and said that they were me, and that would probably not go unnoticed at the polling places here in Carson City. Otherwise, it has some good merits, but I know we have consolidated polling places. I am mildly against it, not violently against it.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Mr. Gloria, this sparked a question for Assemblyman Ohrenschall.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Mr. Wagner's comments lit a little spark. The municipal elections held in the City of Henderson have been held at vote centers for at least the last several years. Have there been issues with voter fraud while using the vote center model?

**Joe Gloria:**

We make it a habit to try to keep the same polling places, and the cities have duplicated that effort. There have not been any problems in the City of Henderson. In fact, at least 80 percent of their polling places remain the same. In the case where we change a polling place, it is usually not under our control. It is a facility that no longer exists or a facility that

no longer wants to allow us to be there for voting. We will use the same processes for setting up our vote centers as well.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Is there any further testimony in opposition to S.B. 492 (R1)? Seeing none, we will go to neutral. Seeing none, does Senator Cannizzaro have any closing remarks?

**Senator Cannizzaro:**

I was able to look at the amendment from Clark County. I think it makes sense, and I view it as a friendly amendment. It is acceptable from my point of view. The only thing I wanted to stress about this bill is that it is permissive. If there was a county that did not want to move to a vote center-style of voting, they do not have to under this bill. This simply allows them to do so once they have everything in place that they needed in order to implement this.

I wanted to share something, because when we talk about this, it is so important. On election night, I was out knocking on doors around 6:30 p.m. This older lady was wandering in the streets. She said, "Are you from here?" I said, "Yes, I am from here. Is there something I can help you with?" She said, "Yeah. I tried to go to a polling place that is near my house. It turns out that you cannot go there on Election Day. I have to go to this specific school, and I have no idea where it is. I have been walking around for over an hour trying to find it." She was several blocks away from where the school was. That is just one story I have from Election Day. I encountered a woman who had been wandering the streets for over an hour to try to find her polling place, because she thought she could go to where the early vote center had been set up for the weeks prior to the election. I think this is an important step to alleviate that and to allow more access to get in and vote, particularly in places like Clark County.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

I encourage Mr. Gloria and you to work out the language and keep my legislative counsel staff apprised of those changes, so we can ensure the amendment reads exactly how we want it to.

I will now close the hearing on S.B. 492 (R1). I will now open it up for public comment.

**Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Eagle Forum:**

The other day, we were talking about the issue of free speech and the importance of that. I know that all of you support free speech and are concerned about those issues. I wanted to tell you one of the reasons that I have been very passionate about that issue and very concerned.

In 2004, I was arrested at the bus depot in Reno. I was arrested because I was gathering signatures on a petition that had been approved through the Office of the Secretary of State. In 2003, the law in Nevada had been changed by the Legislature to ensure that we had a place to go and gather signatures. You have a right to petition, but you cannot do it on public or private property, so essentially, you have nowhere you can do it. They changed the

law, so it ensured people could go to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) or a public place. The bus depot refused to acknowledge that and wanted me to follow their procedures. I knew what the law was, because I had been hearing that discussion. Lynn Chapman and my son were with me when we were gathering signatures for a petition. We were arrested, handcuffed, put in a paddy wagon, and taken to Parr Boulevard. We were there for seven hours.

In 2000, we had been threatened to be arrested several times. Mrs. Chapman and I were threatened probably five times. That time, my son and I were arrested. Mrs. Chapman was not gathering petition signatures, she was documenting what happened. After that time, the American Civil Liberties Union took my case. We went to the municipal court, and I was exonerated, because the people who had me arrested were violating my right to free speech and my right to petition. We went all the way to the Nevada Supreme Court and received judgments against those. In Las Vegas, others were arrested at the DMV, as well as those who were with me.

I remember one of the things my brother always said, "He has rights who dares to assert them." I want you to know that free speech, the right to petition, and exercising these rights is a very important issue. I know Senator Spearman has been an advocate for many of these, but if we do not advocate for the right to freedom of speech and right to petition, and if we are not willing to put ourselves on the line, we can lose those rights. That is why those issues are very passionate and personal for me. I went to jail over it, although I was exonerated. My son went to jail. When we were sitting in jail, it was cruel and unusual punishment, because the only thing we could do was watch the finale of Friends. Other than that, it was not a terrible experience for the seven hours we were there.

I just wanted to share that with the Committee, because I think all of the Committee members put themselves on the line for the things they believe in. I want the Committee to know, if we do not, we will lose those rights. If we do not stand up for them, they can be in jeopardy. Sometimes we begin to take them for granted. The man at the bus depot was taking for granted that he had the right to throw me off there, but he did not, because it was a public place.

**Chairwoman Diaz:**

Seeing no further public comment, we are adjourned [at 3:06 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Julianne King  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Olivia Diaz, Chairwoman

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_



## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 117, presented by Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 447 (1st Reprint), presented by Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Bill 491 (1st Reprint), presented by Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Joint Resolution 5, presented by Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for Senate Joint Resolution 8 presented by Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is an informational document titled "How Will Nevada Comply with the Implementation of Same Day Registration?" by the Nevada Association of County Clerks and Election Officials, presented by Susan Merriwether, Clerk-Recorder, Carson City.

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony submitted by Arlene Alvarez, Las Vegas Coordinator, Mi Familia Vota, Las Vegas, Nevada, in support of Senate Bill 144 (1st Reprint).