

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

**Eightieth Session
March 12, 2019**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Sandra Jauregui at 4:11 p.m. on Tuesday, March 12, 2019, in Room 3142 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/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Chair
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Skip Daly
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman William McCurdy II
Assemblywoman Brittney Miller
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblyman Tom Roberts
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman John Hambrick (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Carol Stonefield, Committee Policy Analyst
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel
Christopher Roske, Committee Manager
Catherine Bodenstein, Committee Secretary
Melissa Loomis, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Patricia Farley, President, Board of Directors, Serving Our Kids Foundation
Denise Tanata, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance
DaShaun Jackson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services,
Department of Health and Human Services
Stephan Page, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Rosemary Gully, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Steven Parry, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada
Briana Escamilla, Nevada State Director, Human Rights Campaign
James Healey, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ricardo Barcena, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Autumn Zemke, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Gabrielle d'Ayr, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Rex Reed, Outreach Coordinator, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Ronald Quinn, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Mary Liveratti, Treasurer, League of Women Voters of Northern Nevada
Sherrie Scaffidi, Director and Advocate, Transgender Allies Group, Reno, Nevada
Jeremy Manke, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Mackenzie Baysinger, Intern, Human Services Network
Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance
Richard Zemke, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association
Gloria Campman, Director, Nevada House of Prayer - Henderson
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada
Richard Ziser, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Sally Zamora, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Sheila Arceo, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada
David Hoff, Priest, Saint Paul's Charismatic Episcopal Church, Henderson, Nevada
Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chair Jauregui:

[Roll was called and Committee protocols explained.] Welcome to the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 111.

Assembly Bill 111: Requires the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice to conduct a study concerning the funding of the child welfare system in this State. (BDR S-451)

Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno, Assembly District No. 1:

Good afternoon, Madam Chair and Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. I want to apologize for my voice before we get started. There is a bug going through the

building and apparently I have caught it. For the record, I represent Assembly District No. 1 in Clark County. During the last interim, I had the opportunity to Chair the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice, which is where Assembly Bill 111 originated. This bill is straightforward. It requests an interim study to be conducted by an outside consultant who would conduct analysis of two essential components of our state child welfare system: the funding structure and the database we use to manage the system. The study would be overseen by the Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. The committee would submit the findings and any legislative recommendations to the Legislative Commission prior to the 2021 regular session.

Joining me today to explain the rationale behind this request is Denise Tanata, executive director of the Children's Advocacy Alliance, but before I turn the microphone over to Ms. Tanata, I would like to make a couple of points. First, in requesting the study, neither I nor the committee wish to suggest in any way that there is anything nefarious taking place within our child welfare system regarding funding. Rather, the request is an acknowledgement that the system is incredibly complex and there is a lot at stake here. As such, we believe it would be of great benefit for a disinterested party to do an in-depth analysis to ensure that we are getting every penny possible from every source possible and that, in turn, we are using that money in the most effective, efficient ways we can to support the children and the families that depend on us.

Second, in regard to the Unified Nevada Information Technology for Youth, which is otherwise called the UNITY data management system, it has been openly acknowledged for several years that UNITY is nowhere near adequate for the task of managing our ever more complex child welfare system. The cost of maintaining, upgrading, and repairing it, not to mention training staff to run such an antiquated system, is beyond explanation, and I do not believe the system can be updated to work seamlessly with newer systems that might be available. However, to date, there has been no serious effort undertaken to replace UNITY. It is time for us to find a viable, cost-effective replacement, and this study will help us accomplish that. With that, I will turn the microphone over to Ms. Tanata, who offers some more specifics on the rationale behind Assembly Bill 111.

Also joining me is former Senator Patricia Farley. She was the Vice Chair for our Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice. Unfortunately, she was not able to join us here in Carson City, so she will be testifying from the Grant Sawyer State Office Building in Las Vegas. She may have some opening statements to add as well.

Patricia Farley, President, Board of Directors, Serving Our Kids Foundation:

I am the former state Senator for Senate District No. 8. Again, I want to take a moment and thank Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno for championing these issues and concerns in this legislative session. This is an important bill. Back in 2015 when I was working with Ms. Tanata on some child welfare issues, this idea was brought to me. We went and talked about getting a study done. We tried to get it in 2017, and I am thinking with the legislative makeup in this session, we should be able to get this through. This is super important.

As most of you know, I am a foster parent. I have two children who live in my home. One of the things that I learned between the 2015 Session and the 2017 Session was that there are many service providers who rely on their information from the UNITY system, which is not always correct. If the state cannot rely on its information technology system to know where a child is, that is very scary. It is also requiring a lot of complexity and effort. We do not necessarily track all of the foster parents and opportunities to place children because we do not have a system that can manage that.

On the issue of the audit, I believe it is critical. It would be the first time in the state of Nevada where there has been a global—not audit, I should say, but study, I apologize for that—there will be a global study that will track where the money is going and how it is being used in our system. I think that is critical so we know what programs are working, what efficiencies we can maximize, and that we can also understand where maybe the funding is not quite meeting the needs. With that, I just wanted to go on record. Thank you for inviting me and allowing me to talk because these two issues have been very important to me in the 2015 and 2017 Sessions. With that, thank you.

Denise Tanata, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance:

Thank you for having me here today and I also want to, in particular, thank Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno as well as former Senator Patricia Farley for supporting this effort now and previously. I am going to walk you through the presentation very quickly ([Exhibit C](#)). The Assemblywoman went over the provisions of the bill, so I will not belabor those. I want to point out a couple of things, to emphasize them.

In section 1 of the bill language, it does go over the study [page 2]. I wanted to point out that this would include the analysis of our current block grant model for funding child welfare. This also looks at the analysis of potential sources of funding, not only for our child welfare system, but also for those community programs that our child welfare system relies on to provide services and support to family and to children. Then, as was mentioned, the study also includes doing the cost-benefit analysis for the UNITY system.

Page 3 goes over the remainder of the sections. Those were covered so we will not go over those again. I did want to provide a brief overview of child welfare funding in the state of Nevada [page 4]. In Nevada, our child welfare system is a state-supervised, county-administered structure, so we have the three child welfare agencies: the Division of Child and Family Services in the Department of Health and Human Services, which provides oversight as well as services in our rural communities. The other two are the two large urban areas: Clark County and Washoe County. In 2011 the state put forward a block grant funding structure which allows the state to fund the two county agencies.

Providing an overview of looking at where our funds come from for child welfare [page 5], about 66 percent of those funds come from state and local sources, and only about 34 percent comes from federal funding. It comes from multiple sources. The majority of it comes from the Social Security Act's Title IV-E, but there is also a lot that is funded through Medicaid, Social Services Block Grant, and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families.

Child Trends conducted a study looking at child welfare funding in the state [page 6, [\(Exhibit C\)](#)]. These are some figures from state fiscal year 2016 to give you an idea of how much we are spending, the per capita expenditures, as well as funding in other states. For state fiscal year 2016 in Nevada, our total expenditures were about \$215 million, whereas the U.S. average was about \$574 million in the states. Per capita, looking at our numbers, we were at about \$317 per person in the state in 2016, whereas the U.S. average was about \$402. That puts Nevada at a rank of 36 in per capita funding for child welfare.

I thought it was also important to mention that the federal government has recently passed the Family First Prevention Services Act, which essentially changes not only how we provide services to children and families, putting a lot more emphasis on prevention and front-end services to keep children in their homes, but it also changes how the federal government is funding those child welfare programs throughout the states [page 7]. The states are in the process right now of planning for implementation of the federal act. I bring this up because it is actually a really good time to look at this study, not only at what we are doing now, but making sure we are planning appropriately for implementation of the federal law.

I also wanted to highlight the reason why this is not just looking at our child welfare agencies but also those community supports. The child welfare system, in order to provide supports not only to children in its care but to families it serves, relies on a lot of outside programs and services. Some of those are listed here [page 8]: housing, child care, particularly substance abuse treatment, mental health treatment services, educational supports, transportation, employment services, and many, many others. If those supports are not adequately funded, it puts a strong strain on the child welfare agencies.

This is some additional information regarding UNITY, Nevada's child welfare data system [page 9]. As was said, this is a system that was implemented in 2003. It was a DOS-based desktop application that has been converted to a web application. I want to emphasize, too, that this is not just used for generating reports, but this is used for daily case management for services for kids and families. As has been mentioned, we have invested millions of dollars over the years into updating and upgrading the system, but what we are hearing from caseworkers and from families is that it is not a very user-friendly system. It is difficult to learn and navigate. What we know, particularly looking in the private sector, is that there is technology out there that we could potentially integrate into the system to make it much more user-friendly and to create efficiencies in the system. Also, I wanted to note that there are, as we look at this, federal requirements that our data system has to meet. Those are things that we would include in the study. Essentially what we are looking for is not a replacement of the system right now, but looking at the cost-benefit analysis of that and including that in this study. That concludes our presentation.

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you so much for the information. Does the Committee have any questions?

Assemblyman Leavitt:

I appreciate this type of legislation. As many of you know, my mother was in this field, having run Child Haven for a long time. How to figure out how to determine funding is an ongoing problem. That being said, what prompted the need for this study? Could you talk a little bit about that? What are some of the things that are happening that would prompt a need for this study other than the obvious lack of funding?

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

The Legislative Committee on Child Welfare and Juvenile Justice met four times over the course of the interim. During those hearings, we heard testimony from the various agencies within the state, organizations that work with children within the state, and representatives from our juvenile justice system. It became apparent in testimony after testimony that the same issue came up numerous times on all four occasions that we met. We not only heard from the organizations, but we heard from the children themselves who were in our foster care system and had siblings who were also in the system. We heard how the system was not effective in tracking moms or dads in jail. They were in one court proceeding, the kids were in the family court, and the younger children were in a different foster home. Oftentimes the communication between all of those entities was lacking because of the antiquated system. The question came up: Is there a better way that we can utilize the resources that we currently have in our state? And, if anyone knows me, I am an advocate for grants. Is there a way to bring in other resources into the state to help with these social needs within our state? That is one of the reasons.

Denise Tanata:

I wanted to add that we have had the opportunity—as a child advocacy organization that is part of a national network of child advocacy organizations—to talk to some of our counterparts in other states. I, and others from the state, have also had the opportunity to visit other states and learn about their systems. We do know in other states that there are different ways they are using Title IV-E funding. There are different ways they are utilizing Medicaid funding to support our child welfare system. It is one of the reasons we included in this language to bring in an outside consultant. We really want somebody who has had the experience of working in those other states who understands not only the child welfare system but how those other states are funding those programs so that they can bring those ideas here as well. We know other states are getting additional funding. Obviously, we are thirty-sixth in that. We know there are ways we could maximize those federal funds coming in.

Assemblyman Leavitt:

Thank you for that. I wonder if there is a quicker way to get from A to Z. Is the study really necessary to get to where you need to go? It seems as if you already know where you need to go and this study is not necessarily required to get there. You could implement these things that you found through your investigations through other states, through other things. I wonder if it could be faster.

Denise Tanata:

I know anecdotally. I know about a few states, but I do not have the knowledge that some of these large national consultants have in doing that. I think there are multiple pieces, not only looking at how we can draw down additional or maximize federal funding to support these systems, but also looking at our block grant structure. It is relatively new. Are other states funding it that way? Is that working in our state? I think there are multiple components to look at, not only drawing in maximizing the resources for these kids and their families, but also making sure that we have efficiencies there. I would like for it to happen tomorrow too.

Chair Jauregui:

Are there any further questions from the Committee? [There were none.] I want to thank you for bringing the bill forward. I feel like it is a great approach. We are being proactive instead of waiting for things to go bad and then being reactive. Seeing no further questions from the Committee, I will open the hearing to testimony in support.

DaShaun Jackson, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am a former foster youth. One of the questions that was posed by Assemblyman Leavitt concerned if it can happen tomorrow. The state has a huge problem, as well as the counties, where we have put money on things that we do not do research on. One of the things I found within the system—where I spent five years—is that we have put Band-Aids over various situations. There have been incidents where youth do not necessarily have the right funding. That is because there is no funding, because of how the state works. It diverts money to various programs without essentially doing the research on it first.

I sat on the Nevada Youth Advisory Board for the state of Nevada where I worked with Washoe County as well as Clark County. I currently sit on a national policy council which looks at various states and how their youth organizations are run, as well as how their departments are run. One of the things that I have seen is that youth lack services, especially here in Nevada. We do not have the services that the youth need. What happens is that we then develop this problem where youth go into homelessness. They need extra services. I was fortunate that I had a good foster parent, but I am not like every other youth that enters into the foster care system. That is what we have to look at: the bigger picture.

The bigger picture is the lack of resources, the lack of monies. Youth enter the system—we have a system where we take youth out of the homes and then we do not equip them with the skills that they need. Then when they turn 18, we say, Well, you are on your own with no support systems. The youth did absolutely nothing wrong to enter the system, yet we put them into a position in which they are forced to grow up at the age of 13 or the age of 8. Then we say when they are 18 that they are no longer our problem. What this funding does is allow there to be an avenue where we know where to source out the money. The Family First Prevention Services Act took money from programs of youth who are exiting the system. What that means is that there is less money that is going for youth who are being emancipated. Where we were talking about extending foster care to the age of 21, essentially what we are doing is extending homelessness for youth to the age of 21 when there is no funding or there are no resources for them.

You cannot continue to operate in the system that we have when we continue to put money on different programs, and if they do not work then move on to something else, and if that does not work then we will move back to this because you are not fixing anything. We do not—as people in our private lives, outside of policymaking—make decisions based off of how much money we have. We do research on it. Before you buy a house, before you plan a trip, you do your research. You plan it out. You work it out. You see how much you can afford. What can I put my money toward? How much will I have for food? It is essentially the same thing. We downplay and limit the voice of foster youth or the child welfare system.

One of the problems we have within UNITY is that there is no crossover. There is nothing that tracks youth who entered Clark County Juvenile Justice Services as well as foster care. So what happens is, the youth are lost within the system. There is no account. If you were to ask right now how many youth are in Juvenile Justice Services and how many youth are in foster care and the crossover, no one can tell you because there is no system that tracks that. There is a humongous problem when it comes to us putting money into different programs without doing any research on them.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral?

Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services:

I am neutral on this bill. I did want to offer to any members on this Committee if they want to come take a look at the UNITY system to see what it does now, we are happy to do that at the division. We have a timeline that shows where UNITY was and where it is today ([Exhibit D](#)). I did want to note that it is not currently and it has never been a DOS-based system. If you think we are running child welfare with floppy disks and the green screen, we are not doing that. I can promise you that. Also, I want to say that we would welcome a review. I wish we could get there today. I do not have the internal capacity. Our staff is just really catching up with ever-changing federal requirements. This would be an assistance. And the division would stand ready if this bill passes to work with the Legislative Counsel Bureau on that request for proposal development so that we get the study that best fits Nevada.

Assemblyman McCurdy:

Thank you for your testimony and coming up in neutral. My question is around data sharing as it relates to the UNITY system. If there is one caseworker in one part of the state and another person enters data in the opposite region of the state, is that live? Is it automatically uploaded? I did hear that there has been a lot of investment in this system, but how much work needs to be done as it relates to it?

Ross Armstrong:

I cannot get into the computer technical stuff. That is not my expertise, but since it is a web-based application now, if a worker enters something into UNITY on one end of the state, it will appear in that case file if another worker accesses it. I do not know if it is instant. There are some reports that we have done, technical upgrades in the background that make it as instant as possible on those urgent reports, but anybody around the state can enter case notes into the UNITY system, and anyone else who has access to that system can see those.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there anyone else who wishes to testify in the neutral position? [There was no one.] I welcome the bill sponsors back up if you would like to give any final remarks.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

I want to say thank you for allowing us to present Assembly Bill 111. We hope to earn your support.

[Assemblyman Fumo assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair Fumo:

This will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 111. Next, Assemblywoman Jauregui will present Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session.

Assembly Joint Resolution 2: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to require the recognition of all marriages regardless of gender. (BDR C-690)

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41:

I am here today to present Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session. On June 26, 2015, our nation's Supreme Court ruled in favor of marriage equality across our nation, allowing all individuals, regardless of their gender, to marry the person they love. Here in Nevada, we continue to celebrate that decision. In fact, between Clark and Washoe Counties, we have conducted over 20,300 same-sex marriages since 2015, generating \$1.5 million in local government revenue. Keep in mind that the local resort and wedding industry that hosts the weddings has a much larger revenue gain that is not accounted for in these numbers. But, unfortunately, our state's *Constitution* still has outdated language that discriminates against love. I want to stress to the Committee, our nation's highest court has ruled this section of our *Constitution* unenforceable. So it is time for us to remove this exclusionary language from our *Constitution* and protect the rights of every Nevadan. I am a proud ally. I am here today even more proud to be able to present Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session, which proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to recognize all marriages regardless of gender.

I would now like to walk the Committee through the bill. Currently, Section 21 of Article 1 of the *Nevada Constitution* defines marriage as a union between a man and a woman. This resolution would remove the following phrase: "Only a marriage between a male and female

person shall be recognized and given effect in this state." This resolution would add the following phrase under Section 21, Subsection 1: "The State of Nevada and its political subdivisions shall recognize marriages and issue marriage licenses to couples regardless of gender." And under Section 21, Subsection 3: "All legally valid marriages must be treated equally under the law."

Committee, as you can see, it is a simple bill and the exact same bill that was passed in 2017. Because this is a change to our *Constitution*, this is a three-step, five-year process. The first step was passing it in 2017. Two years later, the second step is passing it for a second time in its exact same form during this 2019 Legislative Session. The third and final step would be a year later when it is added to the ballot in 2020 putting it to a vote of the people here in Nevada.

I would now like to turn it over to my colleague and cosponsor of this bill, Senator Parks.

Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7:

Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to recognize the marriages of all couples regardless of gender. Currently, Article 1, Section 21 of the *Nevada Constitution* defines marriage as a union between a man and woman. This Section 21 was rendered unenforceable by the 2015 United States Supreme Court decision *Obergefell v. Hodges* 135 S. Ct. 2584 (2015).

Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session proposes to make the law of Nevada reflect the law of the United States and protect the rights of same-gender couples and those who might want to enjoy the rights and benefits of marriage.

This resolution passed both houses of the Nevada Legislature in 2017. In order for the proposed constitutional amendment to become constitutional law, this resolution would need to pass both houses this session and then it would go to the vote of the people for the final decision in 2020.

I strongly encourage your favorable vote on Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session. If you have any questions, I will happily try to answer them. Thank you.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Do we have any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] We will move to testimony in support. Because we have had so many people sign in to speak, I am going to limit testimony to two minutes. We will stop you at the two-minute mark for support, opposition, and neutral, just so you know. We will start in Carson City and then move to Las Vegas.

Stephan Page, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am the northern Nevada organizing lead with the Human Rights Campaign, and I am also an openly gay resident of Reno, Nevada. I am here today in support of A.J.R. 2 of the 79th Session.

Support of this resolution is obvious for anyone who supports equality for all. Moreover, anyone who believes in the importance of the *Constitution* should also support this resolution. I think most people would agree that the *Constitution* should be accurate and be representative of our laws. Because of the current language stating that only marriages between a male and a female shall be recognized, our state *Constitution* is simply incorrect as it reads now.

The issue of same-sex marriage has already been settled, both at the state and federal levels. In 2014 the courts ruled that the state's same-sex marriage ban was unconstitutional, and gay couples have been getting officially married in the state since October 9, 2014. Furthermore, with the United States Supreme Court's decision in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, same-sex marriage has been legal across our entire country since 2015.

The legality of same-sex marriage is no longer in question; same-sex marriage is legal both in our state and throughout the entire United States. Consequently, it only makes sense that our *Constitution* reflects that and currently, the language in the *Nevada Constitution* not only misrepresents our community, but it specifically writes us out of the conversation.

Despite the opinions of those who oppose this resolution, lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ) people exist. We are here and we have rights. Luckily, both our state and our country have recognized those rights and it is time that our state *Constitution* recognizes our rights as well.

To the members of this Committee, I urge you all to stand up for the LGBTQ constituents that you all have in your districts. Please support A.J.R. 2 of the 79th Session. Thank you.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Outstanding, two minutes even. Good work.

Rosemary Gully, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am here to testify in support of Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session. I am an openly queer individual here in the state of Nevada. I have been openly queer for several years now. The fact of the matter is that until 2015, I had no idea if I could get married. I had no idea if I could go ahead and find someone whom I love and marry them. Now I have that right. I have that ability because of national law, but my state does not reflect this. My state's laws do not reflect this within the *Constitution*. Representation matters. Regardless of what anyone thinks, just because something nationally happened does not mean that it should not happen within the state. We are still at risk. My community is still at risk. I am still at risk to lose my rights. This is not a symbolic gesture. This is a protection for the community, and it is something that will solidify the protection and the rights of the LGBTQ community and go ahead and assure that this is a safe place and that Nevada will stay a safe state for my community and for myself. I urge that the Committee pass this resolution, and I urge that everyone go ahead and support what is genuinely right for this state. Thank you very much.

Steven Parry, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:

I am speaking before you tonight in support of A.J.R. 2 of the 79th Session. This resolution is another great milestone in Nevada's fantastic leadership on the front lines of the progressive movement. After all, it was a Nevada Senator who gave us the Thirteenth Amendment in the form that we know today. Just a few weeks ago, this same Assembly did pass a resolution celebrating the fact that 150 years ago, Nevada was the very first state to ratify the Fifteenth Amendment, which codified in constitutional law that everybody has the right to vote no matter what. As a gay, nonbinary member of the LGBTQ community, it is important for me to know that my government has my back and recognizes that I have equal rights to enjoy the privileges, benefits, and, yes, the miseries of being married. I may be one speaker, but I speak on behalf of those in the LGBTQ community and our allies who could not be here today or cannot speak for themselves when I say, please pass this resolution. Please recognize us, your constituency, as citizens with equal rights. As the great Abraham Lincoln once said, "Those who deny freedoms to others deserve it not for themselves." Thank you.

Briana Escamilla, Nevada State Director, Human Rights Campaign:

The *Nevada Constitution* currently includes archaic and harmful language that has been rendered unconstitutional and unenforceable by the 2015 ruling in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, which affirmed that the right to marry is a fundamental right inherent in the liberty of a person and that couples of the same sex may not be deprived of that right and that liberty. One of the best things about Nevada is its inclusivity and commitment to nondiscrimination. According to the Human Rights Campaign's most recent state equality index, Nevada is one of the 13 states in the highest-rated category of working toward innovative equality. That is a classification we should be proud of and work to uphold. The language in our *Constitution* is outdated and does not accurately represent many of Nevada's hardworking families. It is important for all of these families to feel welcome and seen by their state government. Thank you.

James Healey, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am former Assemblyman James Healey. I had the privilege of serving with some of you in 2013 and also was one of the original sponsors in the Assembly to bring this joint resolution to the floor back in 2013. As it has been clearly stated, this is a five-year process. Unfortunately in the 2015 Session, this did not pass. Thanks to Assemblyman Nelson Araujo, it came back in in 2017.

The reason I wanted to be here today is to stress, as I had the honor to do on the Assembly floor, the importance of passing this bill. It comes down to one thing and one thing only: equality. That is the way of life for us here in the United States and particularly in the state of Nevada. We are very proud to be one of the most progressive states and worked very hard to pass laws that have done that. I apologize for my voice as well. Unlike Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno, I did not get the bug. I did nine hours of speaking on the microphone for St. Baldrick's Foundation last Saturday and was proud to shave my head for that cause.

Being an openly gay individual here in Nevada, I have called Nevada my home for 25 years. The thought of not being able to be recognized for when I would like to marry my partner, who is with me today, Ricardo Barcena, scares me. Why does that scare me? A lot of people have said to me, That is now the law of the land. The United States Supreme Court has stated that. That is true today. However, it must be known, as we all have seen very clearly, that our current administration has made it very clear they will look to overturn that. As the face of the Supreme Court has changed since that law went into effect, we are all at risk right now of equality being threatened. That is a reality I hope everybody understands. Even though the Supreme Court has passed that as the law of the land, that can be changed.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Thank you for your testimony. Your two minutes are up. I am sorry to cut you off.

Ricardo Barcena, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here to testify in support for Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session basically because I want my rights to be respected and at some point I would love to have the right to marry the person whom I love. Thank you for your time.

Autumn Zemke, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am Graham's mom. I am going to submit written testimony from Graham:

"Hello my name is Graham Zemke and I am 12. When I was in fourth grade I knew that I was gay. I support marriage equality because it will be a long time before I will want to get married, but when I am ready I want to be able to marry the person I love. Please support A.J.R. 2 to protect my future."

When Graham was little, he would regularly have night terrors, which really started in about third or fourth grade. He would be half asleep crying and so scared. We knew that these kinds of night terrors stem from fear and anxiety, but we could not get to the root cause. When Graham was 9, he asked me every night, "Mom, how do same-sex couples have children?" Every night I would tell him that there are options for same-sex couples: adoption, surrogacy, et cetera. This went on for a month, but one night at the end of our discussion, he said, "When I grow up, I am going to marry a man." The reality is, he knew and knows who he is, just as when I was in kindergarten, I knew I liked boys and never had concern that I would be able to grow up and get married to whom I loved.

Marriage equality is now legal, but things change, and I am asking you to ensure that no matter what may come to pass on the national level, our state, the state my family has lived in since the 1870s, protect my son's future to love and to be loved by whom he chooses. He will face many obstacles and hate in his life just simply for being who he is, but if you pass Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session, he will face just one less. I ask you for your support now because love is love.

Gabrielle d'Ayr, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here to testify in support of this resolution. I would like to echo the sentiments of many of the people who have spoken before me. I am not going to reiterate, but to say I agree. This is about equality and we have to protect the equality of everyone or none of us are equal. Thank you.

Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:

Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada has worked tirelessly on advancing social justice in Nevada for the past 25 years, including the passage of domestic partnerships and civil rights inclusion in employment, housing, and public accommodations. Today we believe it is time that we amend the *Nevada Constitution* to require the recognition of all marriages regardless of gender. I urge you to vote yes on the resolution and affirm the state's commitment to equality. Thank you.

Rex Reed, Outreach Coordinator, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:

I am here on behalf of the American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada to state our support for Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session. In 2000 and 2002, Question No. 2, a discriminatory effort to deny the rights of LGBTQ Nevadans, altered the *Nevada Constitution* to expressly exclude and discriminate against loving LGBTQ couples by denying them recognition of their rights and responsibilities in marriage. In 2019 we are living in a different Nevada. Hearts and minds have changed and both the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Ninth Circuit and the Supreme Court affirmed that love is the law of the land. But there is still a stain on our state's *Constitution*, which is arguably our most important legal document. I urge you to pass this resolution and let us take it back to the voters. Thank you.

Ronald Quinn, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am here with my husband, Ken. October 9, 2014, was a very memorable day for us as we were standing out in front of the Clark County Clerk's office waiting for licenses to be issued, something that I thought I would never see in my lifetime. We have been married for a number of years now. We are coming up on celebrating 30 years together. We believe that this is definitely a discriminatory aspect of our *Constitution* and something that needs to be removed. I, too, will echo the sentiments of everybody else that it is about equality. It is about Nevada continuing to be a progressive state within this country. I know so many people who live here who want to stay here for that reason. They have actually turned down opportunities in other states where they know they are not protected and they know that this issue could be a problem for them. We urge you to pass Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session.

Mary Liveratti, Treasurer, League of Women Voters of Northern Nevada:

The League of Women Voters of the United States supports equal rights for all regardless of sex. The league supports equal rights for all under state and federal law. We support legislation to equalize the legal rights, obligations, and benefits available to same-gender couples with those available to heterosexual couples. We support legislation to allow same-gender couples to marry under civil law. The league believes that the civil status of marriage

is already clearly distinguished from the religious institution of marriage and that religious rights will be preserved. We urge you to pass Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session.

Sherrie Scaffidi, Director and Advocate, Transgender Allies Group, Reno, Nevada:

We support Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session, and we hope that you vote and pass this bill. Thank you.

Jeremy Manke, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am here today to represent my family. First of all, I apologize for the baby noises. I wanted to make sure that I had her picked up to be here today to see this through. I was born here in Carson City, graduated from the University of Nevada, Reno, and put down roots here in northern Nevada. My husband—who is from Las Vegas—and I own a thriving small business in Reno, Nevada, and both of us are very active in our community. We were married in 2014 in California because marriage between same-sex couples was not legal in Nevada, which is our home state. As you know, the Supreme Court decision in 2015 narrowly passed, which is why we are here today to hopefully change the laws here in the state of Nevada to ensure that we have protections.

Although we have come a long way, we still hope that this can be corrected and removing the great injustice of removing the enshrined discrimination currently in our *Constitution* can happen. It would demonstrate that our state stands up for the rights of all Nevadans regardless of who they love. This protection is needed in the event that a new wave of discrimination or hatred arises and will ensure that our marriage and the marriages of same-gender couples are guaranteed equal rights and status under the state laws of Nevada. Just last year my husband and I welcomed our little daughter to our family and we could not be happier, but we hope that through the passing of this bill and eventual change in the state *Constitution*, our marriage and our family will be protected. Thank you.

Mackenzie Baysinger, Intern, Human Services Network:

We would like to echo the previous speakers and state that this is the commonsense thing to support. Thank you.

Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

I represent the Nevada Faculty Alliance, the independent statewide association of Nevada System of Higher Education faculty. We are very interested in particular in the benefits for our faculty members and everyone in the state, so I will focus on the third clause of the proposed article which states that all legally valid marriages must be treated equally under the law. Passage of this amendment will protect against future efforts like a lawsuit in Texas that attempts to roll back equal spousal benefits for City of Houston employees with same-sex spouses. The challenge of Houston's benefits for same-sex couples seeks to narrow the scope of the *Obergefell v. Hodges* ruling maintaining that spousal benefits are not a fundamental right and can be restricted by the State of Texas on the basis of the sex of the spouses. Mr. Douglas Alexander, the lawyer who defended Houston's benefits policy, told the Texas court that if you extend spousal benefits to opposite-sex couples, then you also

have to extend them to same-sex couples. That seems to make sense, not because there is a fundamental right to employment benefits or spousal benefits, but because there is a fundamental right that both of those marriages be treated equally. However, the Texas Supreme Court ruled that the constitutional recognition of same-sex marriage does not necessarily extend to spousal benefits, and the U.S. Supreme Court declined to review that decision. The case is now back in the lower Texas courts. Clarifying the *Nevada Constitution* that all legally valid marriages must be treated equally is very important for that reason.

And then on a personal note, my husband and I got married last year. I assure you that it was a big impact on our economy. [A letter submitted by Kent Ervin ([Exhibit E](#)) is included as an exhibit for the meeting.]

Richard Zemke, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am a resident here in Carson City, a father, a strong union leader, and what I hope to be a pillar of my community. I stand in support of this resolution because I stand for all fathers who should stand behind their sons or their daughters in these situations and support my previous colleague here that there are other benefits that would come in such a committed relationship that are due. Thank you very much. I rise in support.

Ruben R. Murillo, Jr., President, Nevada State Education Association:

We are here in support of Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session. The National Education Association, the Nevada State Education Association, and our affiliates have been very active and proactive in racial and social justice for our members, our students, and for our school communities. Words matter. While you are probably going to hear people say, Oh, do not change it; you do not need to change it; this is already law; just leave it in the *Constitution*. Words matter. They need to get away from living in the past and live in the future.

When I say words matter—my husband and I had our taxes done on Saturday. We have been filing separately all these years, and we decided to look at filing jointly. The tax preparer said that the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) requires us to ask you a question. I said, "What is the question?" He said, "Who is the husband?" I said, "We both are." He said, "Well, the IRS requires that." I said, "We both are. I am not going to answer that question." He said, "So, okay, well, how do we solve this?" I said, "I do not know. You tell me." So we figured out that it would be the order of the name on the marriage certificate. So when I say, words matter, words do matter in terms of far-reaching areas that people may not even think about until they go to have their taxes done and they get asked: who is the husband? We strongly ask that you support this. We ask you to do this because we should all be in sync when it comes to language because when we are not in sync, that is when we have problems. Thank you.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Is there any more testimony in support? Seeing no one, we will move on to opposition.

Gloria Campman, Director, Nevada House of Prayer - Henderson:

I am a Henderson, Nevada, resident for 45 years. I worked for the City of Henderson and am retired. I just want to state before I read this, I am not against anybody. I love everybody and I think equality is good. I am in opposition because of my own beliefs and I saw a statement that is carved in the concrete in front of our Nevada Supreme Court. It says, "We the people of the State of Nevada grateful to Almighty God for our freedom in order to secure its blessings, insure domestic tranquility, and form a more perfect Government, do establish this CONSTITUTION." Surely our Founding Fathers acknowledged that all of us, especially those in governing authority representing the people, are dependent upon God Almighty for our blessings and peaceful existence. God's word says in the Holy Bible that marriage is between a man and a woman. One has their own free will, but if we seek the blessings from God as a state then it will continue to be reflected in our laws and governing documents. I am asking that you see the bigger picture and seek God yourself and do not strike this important stance from our state *Constitution*. Thank you.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:

I testified on this two years ago and I want to go on the record today again. My concern then is the same as now. What takes precedence in the *Nevada Constitution* if Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session passes? In the ordinance of the *Nevada Constitution*, it states that "perfect toleration of religious sentiment shall be secured, and no inhabitant of said state shall ever be molested, in person or property, on account of his or her mode of religious worship." In Article 1, Section 4 of the *Nevada Constitution*, it states, "Liberty of conscience. The free exercise and enjoyment of religious profession and worship without discrimination or preference shall forever be allowed in this State . . . but the liberty of conscience hereby secured." My concern is that if this passes, as stated last session by Brenda Erdoes from the Legislative Counsel Bureau, this will take precedence over other things currently in our *Nevada Constitution*.

I am concerned about potential discrimination and persecution for those who have a different point of view on the marriage issue. Right now there is nothing that limits someone in the state of Nevada, whoever wants to get married, from doing it. I think it is very important to protect that religious liberty. I myself have endured a lot of persecution when I was the chairman for getting the signatures on this in 16 of 17 counties. I could not go anywhere without a bodyguard—my brother or my husband—because I was threatened numerous times, as were my children, by those who disagreed with me. I am not suffering under the delusion that there is a lot of tolerance on the other side for those who may disagree. In addition to that, at least twice in this building, I have had to call upon the Legislative Police for protection because of threats.

So I want to go on record saying that we recognize that we have this religious liberty in the *Nevada Constitution* and that it be protected and that this not take precedence over it. Thank you very much.

Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:

In the state of Colorado, the state attorney general announced on March 5, 2019, that they were dismissing most of the charges against Mr. Jack Phillips in the wake of newly discovered evidence of the state's ongoing hostility toward religious freedom. Alliance Defending Freedom (ADF) had been defending him for more than a six-year battle with the state over the First Amendment-guaranteed religious freedoms. A judge ruled on behalf of the Colorado Civil Rights Commission that Phillips had violated the civil rights of a homosexual couple after he refused to provide them with a wedding cake. I think we all remember that. The judge ordered Phillips to serve same-sex couples or stop baking wedding cakes, which accounted for 40 percent of his business. Alliance Defending Freedom appealed to the Supreme Court and in June 2018 ruled 7 to 2 in favor of Phillips, reversing the state's penalties against him. The state of Colorado brought more charges against him, and on March 5, 2019, they decided to drop them. The Colorado Attorney General Phil Weiser said that under the terms of the agreement, the Colorado Civil Rights Commission will voluntarily dismiss. Kristen Waggoner, ADF's senior vice president of the U.S. legal division, said, "Tolerance and respect for good-faith differences of opinion are essential in a diverse society like ours. They enable us to peacefully coexist with one another. But the state's demonstrated and ongoing hostility toward Jack because of his beliefs is undeniable."

There is also another Supreme Court case and it has to do with a peace cross that has been around.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Thank you for your testimony. Your two minutes are up.

Richard Ziser, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I am the former chairman of the Coalition for the Protection of Marriage. The Coalition for the Protection of Marriage is the organization that promoted the inclusion of Section 21 of Article 1 into the state of Nevada's *Constitution*. This section is in our *Constitution* because a majority of Nevada voters passed an initiative in two consecutive elections.

The only reason we have this proposal before us is because five lawyers overturned the will of the people in Nevada and in numerous other states. In his dissent in *Obergefell v. Hodges*, Chief Justice Roberts stated that five lawyers have "enacted their own vision of marriage as a matter of constitutional law. Stealing this issue from the people will for many cast a cloud over same-sex marriage." He further states, "The right it [the majority] announces has no basis in the Constitution or this Court's precedent" . . . ordering the . . . "transformation of a social institution that has formed the basis of human society for millennia" based on "its desire to remake society according to its own 'new insight' into the 'nature of injustice.'"

Not only has a cloud been cast over same-sex marriage, but those who support traditional marriage have been persecuted and prosecuted for their sincerely held religious beliefs. Orthodox Jews, Roman Catholics, Evangelical Christians, Latter-Day Saints, and Muslims all

fall into this category and are part of the coalition. This issue continues to this day, as just last week the United Methodists reaffirmed their church's position on traditional marriage.

This is important for everyday Nevada citizens who have deeply held religious beliefs on this issue. I think the comments of Janine Hansen show where the problem could be. Section 21 of Article 1 of Nevada's *Constitution* has been rendered unenforceable, and we should leave it that way. This amendment will cause an unavoidable collision with religious liberty, throwing Nevada into a legal abyss.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Thank you for your testimony, sir. Your two minutes are up.

Sally Zamora, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

I am sorry, I do not have a formal speech like some of our other people do. However, I have, for 80 years, been a citizen of the United States so I have a right to my opinion. I have seen an awful lot of changes. For about 40 years, I have felt that I was secure and safe in this country. I felt the unity of this country. I felt that we were, by and large, honest people and so were our politicians. Things have changed a lot and I do not feel that way anymore. I believe that some of the laws that have been passed in regard to this subject on the federal and state levels have added to the insecurity, the fear, and the dishonesty that we are experiencing in our country and in our state today. I would urge you to vote against this bill. Thank you very much.

Sheila Arceo, Private Citizen, North Las Vegas, Nevada:

I oppose Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session. Changing Nevada's marriage amendment will subject Christians to discrimination and persecution. Individuals exercising their religious beliefs in their businesses will be subjected to religious targeting, discrimination, and persecution. I want to say that I think it will be open season to any business owner who is a Christian and wants to uphold their religious beliefs. I think it will become a dangerous thing for them. I would like you to respect and protect religious liberty. Thank you.

David Hoff, Priest, Saint Paul's Charismatic Episcopal Church, Henderson, Nevada:

One spokesperson said, "Words matter." I would like to open with this statement. Those of you who identify as a Christian, what gives you the right to go against God's word? In the book of Matthew, Jesus is talking to the Pharisees: "Have you not read that He who created them from the beginning made them male and female, and said, 'For this reason a man shall leave his father and mother and be joined to his wife, and the two shall become one flesh'? So they are no longer two, but one flesh. What therefore God has joined together, let not man separate" [Matthew 19:4-6]. That is the end of my comment.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Is there anyone to testify in opposition? Seeing no one, we will move to neutral.

Cyrus Hojjaty, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

This amendment really does not affect me, but I do have some possible concerns about it. I cannot say that it will cause problems, because I am not sure. That is why I stay neutral. I am a proud straight guy. I am damn proud of it. I find the opposite sex very attractive. As long as this bill does not impose on my straight behaviors and everyday life, I am fine. I believe that—same sex or whatever—they have the right to be engaged with whomever they want to be. Here is the issue with this, though: If you are in support of LGBTQ, then you should not be in support of massive numbers of people who radically believe in Islam to come into this state because I can tell you what, my parents

Vice Chair Fumo:

Mr. Hojjaty, we need to keep your focus on the testimony on hand. If you are going to be neutral, it has to be regarding this bill and no other subject.

Cyrus Hojjaty:

Okay, I am just pointing out that I hope this does not discriminate because I have seen reports that many people who bake cakes refuse to do this for same-sex couples and have been slammed with lawsuits and fines, so this is really my concern. I am not happy with this trend of the last 50 years where males have been emasculated and females have been masculine more often. It is all I have to point out. Thank you.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Thank you for your testimony. Is there anyone else to testify in neutral? We will bring the resolution sponsors back to the table if they have any closing remarks.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

I do want to give a closing remark. One of the testifiers quoted the dissenting Chief Justice, so I want to leave you with one closing remark. I am taking this from one of our former colleagues, former Assemblyman James Healey, from his testimony last session: "I would like to share with this Committee a quote from Justice Anthony Kennedy, who wrote the brief on marriage equality when the U.S. Supreme Court overruled it. 'No union is more profound than marriage, for it embodies the highest ideals of love, fidelity, devotion, sacrifice, and family.' Kennedy goes on to say that gay and lesbian couples 'ask for equal dignity in the eyes of the law. The *U.S. Constitution* grants them that right.'" Thank you all for hearing this bill and I urge you to vote for it, and please err on the side of equality and love.

[A fact sheet prepared by Diane C. Thornton, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, was submitted for the record by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui ([Exhibit F](#)) and is included as an exhibit for the meeting.]

Vice Chair Fumo:

Thank you so much for your testimony today. Are you willing to accept one question? We do have one question from one of the Committee members.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Yes.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno:

Thank you for bringing the bill. Could you tell us, if this passes this Legislative Session as it did last legislative session, what is the next step?

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

The next step would be placing it on the 2020 ballot where it would actually be up to Nevadans to vote for and decide on. We put it to a vote of the people. Ultimately, it is every single Nevadan's decision.

Vice Chair Fumo:

Seeing no other questions, this will close the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session.

[Assemblywoman Jauregui reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Jauregui:

Thank you, Committee. We do have a couple more items on the agenda. We are going to start with our next item, which is a bill introduction. Bill Draft Request 24-951 originated in the Assembly Legislative Operations and Elections Committee.

BDR 24-951—SUMMARY—Revises provisions relating to elections. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 259](#).)

Chair Jauregui:

It is here in our Committee for a Committee introduction. This measure addresses elections, revising the circumstances under which candidates of major political parties appear on or are omitted from the ballot at primary elections, revising provisions governing primary elections for certain judicial candidates, and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

I would like to remind the Committee that a vote in favor of introducing a bill draft does not imply a commitment to support the measure later pursuant to Assembly Standing Rule 57. All this action does is allow the bill draft request to become a bill and then be referred to a Committee for possible hearings. A vote to introduce a bill draft requires a majority of votes of the entire Committee. For our Committee, that would be six votes. I will entertain a motion to introduce Bill Draft Request 24-951.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN TORRES MOVED TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT
REQUEST 24-951.

ASSEMBLYMAN McCURDY SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Jauregui:

Is there any discussion? [There was none.]

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

We will now move on to the next item on the agenda: public comment. If you are here to give public comment, please fill the seats in Carson City and Las Vegas. Seeing no one, our meeting is adjourned [at 5:25 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Catherine Bodenstein
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a PowerPoint presentation titled "[Assembly Bill 111](#): Child Welfare Funding Study," submitted and presented by Denise Tanata, Executive Director, Children's Advocacy Alliance.

[Exhibit D](#) is a document titled "Milestones of the UNITY Project: Nevada's Comprehensive Child Welfare Information System," submitted by Ross E. Armstrong, Administrator, Division of Child and Family Services, Department of Health and Human Services.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter in support of [Assembly Joint Resolution 2 of the 79th Session](#), to Senator Nicole Cannizzaro, Chair, Senate Committee on Judiciary, dated March 11, 2019, submitted by Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance.

[Exhibit F](#) is a document titled "Fact Sheet: Same-Sex Marriage in Nevada," dated May 2018, prepared by Diane C. Thornton, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau, and submitted by Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui.