

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Eightieth Session
May 1, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 3:57 p.m. on Wednesday, May 1, 2019, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair
Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Vice Chair
Senator Marcia Washington
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert
Senator Keith F. Pickard

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Assembly District No. 41
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson, Assembly District No. 17

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel
Janae Johnson, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Doug Goodman, Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform
Vinson Guthreau, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Bill Chernock, Executive Director, Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce
Warren Hardy, Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities
Kathy Clewett, City of Sparks
Emily Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices
Holly Welborn, Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 1, 2019
Page 2

Maria-Teresa Liebermann, Battle Born Progress
Eric Jeng, Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada
Jared Busker, Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Melody Judilla, Silver State Voices
Courtnhi Vo, Senior Manager, Asian Community Development Council
Cecia Alvarado, State Director, Mi Familia Vota

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will open the meeting with Assembly Bill (A.B.) 259.

ASSEMBLY BILL 259 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections.
(BDR 24-951)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):

I am here to introduce A.B. 259. In 2015, Senator James A. Settelmeyer introduced S.B. No. 499 of the 78th Session that passed and was signed into law, as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

DOUG GOODMAN (Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform):

Assembly Bill 259 was introduced from the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The law changed in 2015 by Senator Settelmeyer's legislation also affected the nonpartisan races. The races for judge or university regent were winner-take-all primaries. If one candidate got 50 percent plus 1 vote, the race would be over with no primary. There would be a runoff between the two vote-getters. Have many races been decided that way for nonpartisan races when the race is over and the voters go to the election but are not able to participate in the race?

MR. GOODMAN:

I do not believe S.B. No. 499 of the 78th Session addressed nonpartisan races.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I could be thinking of a different bill during the Seventy-eighth Session affecting the nonpartisan races.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 1, 2019
Page 3

MR. GOODMAN:

Another bill from Senator Settlemeyer in 2015 did address a candidate in nonpartisan race who received 50 percent plus 1 in the primary would be elected. The bill also targeted the sheriff races.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Michael Stewart found the correct bill: S.B. No. 5 of the 78th Session. Would A.B. 259 affect partisan and nonpartisan races?

ASSEMBLYWOMEN SANDRA JAUREGUI:

Correct. In its current format, it extends to partisan and nonpartisan races.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties):

This bill is a significant priority for the Nevada Association of Counties and our membership. We strongly support A.B. 259.

BILL CHERNOCK (Executive Director, Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce):

Speaking on behalf of the Chamber, we are in support of A.B. 259 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

WARREN HARDY (Nevada League of Cities and Municipalities):

We are opposed to A.B. 259 as it is written. The local government elections are nonpartisan elections. The 50 percent plus 1 rule that was put in place in 2015 works well and should continue. The bill opens all of the charters to make these changes; most of the charter commissions are carefully reviewed and analyzed to make decisions at the local level. We ask that the amendment adopted be removed for the local government nonpartisan races.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The municipal rule that 50 percent plus 1 would win the primary and be over predates the 2015 legislation, correct?

MR. HARDY:

I believe that is correct.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The change in 2015 to have the 50 percent plus 1 winner-takes-all primary rule is suddenly applicable to district judge, university regent, school board or others that are not municipal races.

MR. HARDY:

That is correct. The thought process behind this was everyone has the opportunity to vote in the primary nonpartisan elections. You are not prohibited from voting as when indicated in the deciding election. It is an expense savings to the local governments to conduct the elections this way.

KATHY CLEWETT (City of Sparks):

The Charter Committee in the City of Sparks discussed the 50 percent plus 1 rule. We made a couple of changes in the Seventy-ninth Session. One change was to make the 50 percent plus 1 for voting in the primary and general elections, so we are not violating the Voting Rights Act.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Are you opposed to A.B. 259?

MS. CLEWETT:

I am opposed to A.B. 259 for the charters being opened. It would change what the charter does say.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

This is not a new bill; it was introduced in 2017 by Senator Ira Hansen. I think it is the right thing to do to make sure we are giving access to voting to as many people as possible. Our job is to enfranchise voters, not disenfranchise voters.

MR. GOODMAN:

The change to go to the winner in the primary for the 50 percent plus 1 was in 1997.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

That is for municipal reasons?

MR. GOODMAN:

Yes.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will open the hearing on A.B. 448.

ASSEMBLY BILL 448 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the procedure for filling certain vacancies in office. (BDR 17-950)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):

Assembly Bill 448 purposed to revise the residency requirements for people who are appointed to fill vacancies for Senate or Assembly seats. Currently when there is a vacancy, county commissioners must appoint a person from the same party to that seat. That person has to be a qualified elector. This bill seeks to require that the person being appointed to the Legislature have the same residency requirements for filing. The appointed person must actually live in the district for at least 30 days prior to the close of filing.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

This certainly seems like a logical requirement that someone who wants to be appointed have the requirements mirror those for someone who would want to file as a candidate for office.

SENATOR PICKARD:

What is your understanding in the difference between constructive residency and actual residency?

KEVIN POWERS (Counsel):

The difference between constructive residence and actual residence comes into when a person has more than one residence. A person could have different homes in different locations. Actual residence is essentially their legal domicile. It is where they actually reside and are considered to be legally domiciled. Of their multiple residences, it is the one where they spend most of their time; it is the one where their family is. It is the one where their pets are and the actual residence. The constructive residence is another residence than your actual residence or your legal domicile.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will now open the hearing on A.B. 450.

ASSEMBLY BILL 450: Revises provisions relating to the apportionment of districts for certain offices. (BDR 17-1105)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SANDRA JAUREGUI (Assembly District No. 41):

Assembly Bill 450 is a proposal to assist Nevada to prepare for the 2020 census, as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit F](#)).

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 1, 2019
Page 6

EMILY ZAMORA (Executive Director, Silver State Voices):
I am here to present A.B. 450, as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:
I would like to walk through the sections of the bill as referenced from my testimony, [Exhibit F](#), starting on page 3.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I believe we have 16,000 persons incarcerated, and it is a large population in Nevada. This is how districts are drawn. A significant amount of people are not a part of these areas where the correctional facilities are located.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:
The prisoners are getting mail at the prison. They do not have any voting rights. I do not understand why you would make the change for them to be counted in the census?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:
They are already counted in the census. This is just going to change for the purpose of redistricting where they are counted.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:
But it is for redistricting; they are not there and they cannot vote. What difference will it make by them being counted in the census from the district where you might be redistricting?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:
According to the Department of Corrections, in 2018 13,000 inmates were housed in the facilities in the State, and those numbers can skew a apportionment when redistricting because those inmates will return to the areas of their last known residence and not stay in the area where they are currently present.

Ms. ZAMORA:
When we are talking about inmates, we are referring to all inmates. If somebody is in jail and has not been sentenced, he or she still has the legal right to vote. If somebody is sentenced under a misdemeanor and is in prison, that person still has a legal right to vote. The census only occurs every ten years, and the average sentence is less than ten years. If someone is filling out the census and

currently serving time, most likely the inmate will be out of prison by that time and go back to the district he or she is originally from.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

As districts are drawn through the census data, it is based on the number of human beings whether they can vote or not, including those under the age of 18 or under a felony conviction and not able to vote during that time. They are based on how many people live in those districts whether they vote or not. This could be how the numbers are affected on the census since some of these individuals are in different areas for incarceration. This could include people who came from an urban area and now are in a rural area.

MR. POWERS:

For the record, if a person is incarcerated in the State prison that means they have already been convicted and that means they have been convicted of a felony. No one in State prison would have the right to vote because they would be a convicted felon. Those who are waiting to be sentenced are in county facilities. Those who have not been tried yet are detained in county facilities. The goal of redistricting is to ensure that each district is calculated using a general estimation of the people who will be residing in that district over the ten-year sentence period.

They do that by taking a picture or slice on the one day of census day. But in order to estimate how many people will be in that Legislative District over the ten-year period, they want to count people who they believe, reasonably, will be in that district during the ten-year period. By using the last known address of the inmate, you are assigning that inmate to the Legislative District where he or she will most likely spend their time during the ten-year period, except for the period they are incarcerated. Most people [who] are incarcerated in State prisons do not spend that entire ten-year period in a State prison. Most of their time, most likely in most situations, will be spent in the Legislative District of their last known address.

SENATOR PICKARD:

My concern is—to say nothing of those who are serving longer sentences that will not be out—moving that padding from one county to another to say nothing of the State dollars allocated based on population. In several presentations in the Senate Judiciary Committee, we heard James Dzurenda, Director, Department of Corrections, indicate that a large number of the inmates in his

Department have no known address. How do we resolve that? Do we just let them decide where they want to go? Do we decide for them? Do we then pad the districts to make sure we have better representation on one side or the other in the redistricting? I see this as a potential for gerrymandering from either side. Whoever is in control at the time can use this to say that these people are going to put them in these districts where we need some help. How do we avoid that if we do not know a good number of their last known addresses? I do not see anything in the bill on when there is no known last address.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I may need to direct this question to Director Dzurenda to find out what the Department of Corrections does in terms of compiling last-minute addresses for inmates.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

It was my understanding that they had to give a last known place of residency when entering, which could be cross streets. This would be sufficient for an address.

SENATOR PICKARD:

The bill that deals with the Department of Corrections' identification is a significant issue for them. In some instances, their last known address was where they were arrested, not necessary where they reside. Director Dzurenda was saying we do not know where they live or have a proper name. All we can use is the name, place, and time when they were arrested. As result, a number of the inmates have 10 to 20 names that they are known by which are tied to DNA. Assembly Bill 450 has nothing that reconciles this or addresses the problem. According to Director Dzurenda, there is no way for them to know.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

With some inmates, there is a problem getting an address or a real name. We may need to reach out to the Department of Corrections or the Division of Parole and Probation. When the presentence investigation report is compiled, it usually gives a last known address even if it is the cross streets. We have voters on the list who often are homeless and use the cross streets for addresses.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

What happens if someone has counted them as part of the household when filling out the census report, but that person is also being counted through the prison system and identified in a certain district from a last address? The inmate could be double-counted. I do not know if there is any reconciliation between the two of those.

MS. ZAMORA:

From the State Demographer, the inmates are only counted by the prison; they cannot be counted by their original household for the census.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

People individually fill out their census card. We do not know when someone is filling out a card and who exactly is getting counted. I am concerned about a double count. The other concern is dollars allocated based on population and reallocation from the rural areas that have people reside in their county for long periods of time. The State allocations are based on county that would receive less money because some people are reallocated to a county to which they are not living.

MICHAEL STEWART (Policy Analyst):

The Legislative Counsel Bureau has been working with the U.S. Census Bureau in a few projects in advance for redistricting. I had a conversation with a representative on how the Census Bureau handles states that have gone this direction. Specifically, New York, Maryland, California and Delaware have legislation proposing this. The Census Bureau would be working on an application for a computer database that would share information with the State Demographer. The last known residential address could be input into a system that could automatically assign that last known residential address to the proper census block. It would be a matter of inputting that data appropriately and then generating the census block of that last known address.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

When they are uploading the data, is the data assigned by name? How do you identify unique people so they are not getting double-counted?

MR. STEWART:

The discussion was on a high level, and we did not get into that level of detail concerning names. It was more of the process and how it could potentially work.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We need to reach out to the Census Bureau for answers on these questions.

HOLLY WELBORN (Policy Director, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada):

I am in support of A.B. 450. While looking at some other states doing this, for example, Illinois has 60 percent of prisoners from Cook County, yet 99 percent of them are counted outside of the county. This does affect the numbers and the way the districts are drawn. This leads to an inaccurate picture of community populations when redrawing districts. In Texas, one rural district is almost 12 percent prisoners, of the residents represented in the state house. In terms of how districts are drawn, it is important to acquaint representation.

SENATOR PICKARD:

In Texas, the districts are written by qualified electors only, not residents. The 99 percent outside is not counted in either way for purposes of determining what persons can vote. If we are looking at residents versus qualified electors, how do you square that?

MS. WELBORN:

We are looking at two different systems. I am not sure how it works in Texas. We are talking about residency, depending on an inmate's level of offense and eventually returning back to the community. We have people living in our communities who have felony status but still live in the community and take the census to be counted.

SENATOR WASHINGTON:

I need some clarification. When a census is taken, the individual actually has to live at that address, correct?

MR. POWERS:

For the purpose of the federal census, the U.S. Census Bureau counts prisoners at the location where the prison is. For federal purposes, that is how the population is determined. However, states are allowed—for the purposes of their own state redistricting for their state elected offices—to allocate prisoners

to their last known address. Because the goal, again based on representation, is to have the districts based on population that would exist during that ten-year period most likely during that span. By assigning the prisoner to their last known address is assigning to the Legislative District based on the presumption they will spend most of their time during that ten-year period with that intended district.

Again, this is not going to apply to every single individual, but states are allowed to make reasonable presumptions in distributing population. Under Article 4, section 5 of the Nevada Constitution, Legislative Districts have to be apportioned based on the number of inhabitants. It is not the number of qualified electors that Legislature Districts are based on, it is the number of inhabitants. Keep in mind other states may not have this provision in their constitution. Other states on purposes of redistricting may use different populations, others states can use voting population for their legislative districts or other states choose to use total population. In Nevada, because of Article 4, section 5 of the Nevada Constitution, [the State] has to use total population because of [*sic*] it is based on number of inhabitants.

SENATOR PICKARD:

Does this include prisoners in the county in which they are incarcerated?

MR. POWERS:

There is room in the Constitution for the State to interpret inhabitance to mean the place where the person will most likely reside during the largest period of time over that ten-year sentence period. By assigning the prisoner to the last known address, the State is making a reasonable presumption that during the ten-year period, the prisoner would spend most of his time in that Legislative District from the last known address instead of the Legislative District where the prison is located.

SENATOR PICKARD:

What is the current state of the law?

MR. POWERS:

Because the federal census assigns prison population to the location of the prison for the purpose of the census, Nevada, during the last census, used that data to create the Legislative Districts. "The purpose of this legislation is to

change that law to ensure that instead of using the location of the prison as the prisoners address or last known address before they were incarcerated"

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Inhabitation is a place where they are likely to be the longest during that period, correct?

MR. POWERS:

There is a difference between actual residence and constructive residence. In this case, an inhabitation is generally based on where that person will reside most of the time during allotted period. In this case, the State is allowed to make a reasonable presumption, creating an average prisoner, and assume the average prisoner would be spend most of the prisoner's time during a ten-year period at their last known address versus at the address where the prison is located. The states have that leeway in drawing their legislative districts to make reasonable presumptions. It is no different than making the reasonable presumption that someone who is a resident of a city on the date of census will spend the next ten years in that city. That is the reasonable presumption you are making, obviously, not everyone on the day of census is going to spend the next ten years in the city. But the reasonable presumption is that they will be [an] inhabitant of the Legislative District if they are [an] inhabitant of that time during the census.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The census is a snapshot of that day, since people are mobile and move around a lot. During past redistricting, there were a number of populations seen at correctional facilities, including Lovelock and Ely, when the census was counted.

MARIA-TERESA LIEBERMANN (Battle Born Progress):

Battle Born Progress is in support of A.B. 450 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

ERIC JENG (Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada):

We support A.B. 450.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI:

Nine states have ended prison gerrymandering, and eight states are currently considering it.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 1, 2019
Page 13

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will open the meeting with Assembly Joint Resolution (A.J.R.) 6.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 6 (1st Reprint): Urges Congress to prevent the United States Census Bureau from adding a citizenship question to the 2020 decennial census. (BDR R-279)

ASSEMBLYMAN TYRONE THOMPSON (Assembly District No. 17):

I am pleased to introduce A.J.R. 6 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).

JARED BUSKER (Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada):

I am here to help present A.J.R. 6 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit J](#)).

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am concerned about anything that would restrict citizens' participation in the census, making sure Nevada along with every state gets proper count of all citizens.

SENATOR PICKARD:

We need to know who is a citizen and who is not because it affects many things. The question is: Are you a citizen of the United States? Is the issue of reluctance an issue of education that we need to make sure that everyone is counted and who is eligible to vote? There is lot of discussion surrounding the election and the first step to the next election. The U.S. Supreme Court was focused on that. We are not talking about not counting noncitizens instead we are talking about who is and is not eligible to vote.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

Good logic, but if we are talking specifically about the census, the first step of the census is looking at electronic means. People are to respond electronically to be counted. Literally, a person has to fill out the form electronically. A further issue is after certain people have not completed the form electronically, there will be a door-to-door collection. You can visualize what that process will be like if you are a person who is not documented. There is fear that comes in because it does not create an accurate count.

SENATOR PICKARD:

But if we are knocking on the door, they are going to refuse to open the door. They are not going to hear whether they are even asked the question. The next

step is how does this affect the federal elections? This does not disenfranchise anyone but for the fear at the door. How does this change the mind of the person who has to answer the door who may not know about the citizen question?

MR. BUSKER:

We do believe there needs to be an educational component going along with the 2020 census. Just having the citizenship question removed will not complete the count. Another piece of legislation is seeking to find additional funding for outreach. The citizenship question is being addressed by the American Community Survey that looks at immigration status. If this question is added, we would lose out on millions of dollars to help the children.

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

It is going to create even more of a barrier that will add more layers by having the question. If you do not have the question, you still have to ask the citizen question. That is the complete count that the Governor put in place, and this is a big component. Also, you need people who will build trust in the community. There is not a repercussion with filling out the paper and feeling safe about filling out the form. The education piece and relationship-building are important, and that is why the money is being invested. The U.S. Supreme Court came back to say it is lawful and, ultimately, up to Congress.

SENATOR PICKARD:

I want to count everyone. You had said 20 percent of the population is not documented? Is that what you meant to say?

ASSEMBLYMAN THOMPSON:

I meant to say 20 percent are immigrants to clarify the confusion.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

An undercount hurts everyone, especially if people are afraid to participate in the census.

MS. WELBORN:

We support A.J.R. 6. This is an important issue to the American Civil Liberties Union. The goal of the census is to count how many people live in the United States without exception. The census is a fundamental pillar of our democracy, the constitutional structure governing the allocation of Congressional seats and

Electoral College votes since this data also informs the Nation's important decisions, including how the federal government spends \$900 billion on critical services like building roads, providing health insurance and supporting public education. An accurate census is critical to having a functioning Country. This citizenship question is an attempt to sabotage the 2020 census.

For the first time in 70 years, we are seeing a citizenship question on the census. The Trump Administration announced this untested change in March 2018 despite unanimous opposition from experts, including the Census Bureau itself, which said it would drive down participation. According to the Trump Administration, the citizenship question would stop approximately 6.5 million people from participating. As a result, states like Texas, California, Arizona, New York, Florida and Illinois are likely to lose a seat in the House of Representatives. Numerous other states will lose funding for federal programs. The reason it has approximately 6.5 million people estimated not to participate has to do with anti-immigrant status that has resonated throughout this Country for several years. The danger is if people are not counted, our communities will receive less representation in government and fewer resources.

A federal district court found that the citizenship question constitutes a violation of federal law and was right to block it. The evidence at a trial, including the government's expert witness, exposed how adding a citizenship question would wreak havoc on this once-in-a-decade count on the Nation's population. We strongly encourage Nevada to send a clear message that we will not use the census as a weapon. Democracy requires a count of all people.

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

We support A.J.R. 6. It is critical we encourage Nevadans to complete the census. In this political environment, a citizenship question will only continue to invoke fears in the immigrant communities and prevent an accurate count impacting Nevada for years to come.

MELODY JUDILLA (Silver State Voices):

I support A.J.R. 6 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit K](#)).

COURTNHI VO (Senior Manager, Asian Community Development Council):

We support A.J.R. 6 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 1, 2019
Page 16

MS. LIEBERMANN:

Battle Born Progress supports A.J.R. 6 as referenced from my testimony ([Exhibit M](#)).

CECIA ALVARADO (State Director, Mi Familia Vota):

I support A.J.R. 6. The U.S. Department of Commerce has announced its plan to allow the last minute, unnecessary, untested question about citizenship status through the 2020 census. An expert said this will discourage many legitimate responses. Therefore, the results of the census will be dramatically skewed and affect the resources and political power our communities can access. We should call this what it is, a political motivation to demolish the census, and Nevada should not stand for it.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 1, 2019
Page 17

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I will adjourn this meeting at 5:19 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Janae Johnson,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	3		Attendance Roster
A.B. 259	C	1	Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui	Testimony
A.B. 259	D	3	Doug Goodman / Nevadans for Election Reform	Testimony
A.B. 259	E	2	Bill Chernock / Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce	Testimony
A.B. 450	F	4	Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui	Testimony
A.B. 450	G	2	Emily Zamora / Silver State Voices	Testimony
A.B. 450	H	1	Maria-Teresa Liebermann / Battle Born Progress	Testimony
A.J.R. 6	I	4	Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson	Testimony
A.J.R. 6	J	3	Jared Busker / Children's Advocacy Alliance of Nevada	Testimony
A.J.R. 6	K	2	Melody Judilla / Silver State Voices	Testimony
A.J.R. 6	L	1	Courtnhi Vo / Asian Community Development Council	Testimony
A.J.R. 6	M	1	Maria-Teresa Liebermann / Battle Born Progress	Testimony