

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

**Eightieth Session
April 10, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 4:38 p.m. on Wednesday, April 10, 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

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michael Stewart, Committee Policy Analyst
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel
Diane Rea, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Bradley Schrager
Patricia Farley
Maureen Schafer, Executive Director, Council for a Better Nevada
Randy Soltero
Carter Bundy, AFSCME International
Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices
Gariety Pruitt, Nevada Conservation League
Annette Magnus-Marquart, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress
Laura Hale, Indivisible Northern Nevada
James Sullivan, Culinary Union
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom

Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Lorena Portillo, Assistant Registrar of Voters, Clark County

Chair Ohrenschall opened the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 450. He said it is a Committee bill and deals with recall elections.

SENATE BILL 450: Revises provisions relating to recall elections. (BDR 24-71)

Senator James Ohrenschall, Senatorial District No. 21, introduced the bill with a statement ([Exhibit C](#)), adding he has reviewed the proposed conceptual amendments ([Exhibit D](#)). He stated S.B. 450 is a lengthy bill. It is a technical bill, but what is at stake is the proposal to undo the will of the voters. Whenever a recall—a right our Constitution provides to our voters—is filed, it seeks to turn back the intent of voters.

Bradley Schrage states he is an attorney from Las Vegas for the Senate Democrats and also a political law attorney who has some experience with recall cases over the last couple of years. He is in support of what has been presented by Senator Ohrenschall.

Patricia Farley stated she wished to speak in support of S.B. 450 which is to update Nevada's recall laws and make sure they are not abused by politicians. She is the former Senator for Senatorial District No. 8, a seat she won in 2014. For family reasons, she decided not to seek reelection. She informed both sides of Leadership of this decision in March 2017.

The Nevada Legislature only meets in odd years, and her term would be up before the next Session. Someone else would return as the Senator from her district. Political opponents, funded by an out-of-state special interest group, filed a petition to recall her in August 2017. It was a complete abuse of Nevada laws and the rights of Nevadans to recall a public official. This is not what our recall system was designed for. Nevadans must be protected in the future from recalls which serve as a way for political opponents to challenge the outcome of elections they do not like. She said if we allow abuse of the recall process and force new elections, we will have a never-ending election and waste millions of dollars. This is not about Democrats or Republicans. This is about protecting the public from politicians attempting to grab power. It is to protect the voters and the will of the voters in Nevada.

Ms. Farley said during the recall, voters in her district were being systematically harassed and lied to by proponents attempting to collect enough signatures to force a special election.

She said she had walked in Senator Joyce Woodhouse's district while the recall effort was going on and was flabbergasted by the lies being told to voters. She said to give credence to what Senator Ohrenschall had shared; she recalled going to the door of a gentleman who was blind and tended to by a caregiver. When she told him she was there to make sure he wanted to sign the recall petition, the caretaker told her he could not legally sign those forms.

In another incident, she approached a house where three people had signed the recall petition, and the house was vacant. It looked like it had been vacant for months which was odd since two weeks before people had put their names on a petition to recall.

Another disturbing time was when she came to a gentleman, a registered Democrat, who had been told there was a recall because Senator Woodhouse was under investigation for embezzlement from the school district. She had to explain to him if that was the case, it would be a criminal matter, not an election matter. It was terrible what was being told to people.

Those were not even the lies being told in Ms. Farley's district, but she said she was shocked by the whole process—the lies, forging and everything else that went along with it.

Ms. Farley stated it may be our right as Nevadans to recall our elected officials, but it is also our right to feel safe in our homes and communities, and not have taxpayer dollars wasted. That is why she supports this bill. The bill makes recall laws more open and transparent, cracking down on the many abusers seen in the recalls of 2017.

Senator Ohrenschall said he had the opportunity to walk door-to-door when Senator Nicole Cannizzaro was facing a recall and talked to voters not aware their names were on any petition, not aware they had signed a petition to recall a Senator they loved like a daughter.

Senator Seevers Gansert said she was looking at section 17 that talks about:

the person who submits the petition must deposit in advance the estimated costs of the signature verification with the filing officer including, without limitation, the estimated costs for the Secretary of State and the county clerk

She asked is there an idea of what the cost would be if there is a reason to recall someone. She said we want to make sure the process is accessible to the people.

Senator Ohrenschall replied certainly. Nevada has been a progressive state that believes in direct democracy and has allowed initiative referendums and recalls. These processes are in the Nevada Constitution. Section 17 provides for a waiver of the fee for a recall group unable to afford the fee or to hire paid circulators. He said it protects the public and taxpayers. He would agree that many of the recall efforts seen in the recent years have been frivolous and not aboveboard. Senator Ohrenschall added he did not have costs, but others testifying could give a more accurate estimate on the fees.

Senator Seevers Gansert stated the proposed conceptual amendment talks about three registered voters voting in Nevada having to sign the petition, and there are civil penalties for anybody who signs a petition. She said she is concerned about individuals feeling threatened by trying to begin a petition for recall because of the threat of civil and felony penalties mentioned in section 18.

Senator Ohrenschall said he agreed 100 percent. There is no intent to direct participation in democracy. There are instances of some petitions gathered where signatures, multiple signatures, signatures of people who were deceased, signatures like Abraham Lincoln and Daffy Duck attempted to perpetrate fraud on the recall process. That is the reason for section 18.

He added the proposed amendment for the initial three supporters would require voters to have voted in the election district being targeted for recall, whether it is a legislative or a county commission district.

Senator Seevers Gansert said it might be helpful to have a comparison of penalties imposed, whether an initiative petition or a question on the ballot.

Senator Ohrenschall said he would try to get that compiled and get it to the Committee.

Senator Pickard said he did not learn about the recalls until after they were underway. He heard much of the same in terms of the alleged shenanigans. He said the penalties should be consistent.

Senator Pickard asked about the timing of the withdrawal requests, saying it seems to cut off the canvassers for the petition. He added we have a different set of rules for those who want to seek his or her removal. He asked to go through the rationale of why a separate set of rules for them.

Senator Ohrenschall stated the amendment proposed that at 45 days, halfway through the 90-day period, the proponents of the recall would need to submit the signatures collected to that point. The reason is to see if there are deceased persons on this list, if Abraham Lincoln has signed, or something like that, and to realize if there are shenanigans going on. The timelines are to ensure adequate time for both parties to protect his or her office.

Senator Pickard said in terms of the timing, if we are cutting off those seeking the recall who are pushing the measure and giving them nearly a month more in time, why is there a different set of rules for them? We allow them to continue after the halfway date.

Senator Ohrenschall said he believed Senator Pickard was referring to section 23 of the bill on page 34. He said the proposed change in days at line 16 from 10 to 20 and 20 to 30 days is a choice of statute. The proponents of a recall have 90 days once the notice of intent is filed and may have been fund-raising before that time. The date is still far less than the time the proponents have and is a choice of the Legislature.

Mr. Schrager said one way to think of what is being conceived is the end of signature-gathering versus an extended period by which someone can ask to have his or her name removed. Some of that addresses the imbalance of information leading up to the point at which, prior to issuing a notice of intent to start a recall petition, proponents of a petition know the universe of individuals they need to talk to in order to get signatures. They can check the voting rolls and see who voted in the election or where the targeted individual came into office. They have names, addresses and the information of the target,

and his or her supporters do not know who has signed the petition throughout the entire 90 days. There is no way for a target of a recall petition to engage in his or her First Amendment rights and try to discuss with individuals who have signed the petition about either removing their names, changing their mind or seeing the circumstances under which they signed. The postpetition submission period is there to essentially draw an even playing field so once the petitions are handed in, the target has the information about who actually signed those petitions and has the opportunity to discuss with those individuals the reasons for the recall and what they were told about the recall. That is the only time in which a recall target could find out who has been lied to, misrepresented or did not have the full information needed. That is the opportunity for candidates to make arguments to voters.

Senator Pickard stated that made sense. He said his other question had to do with the penalties associated with certain representation made by a candidate during an election. If voters found out that was not what the candidate promised and they want a recall, felony penalties and the cost of the signature verification could potentially be laid at their feet—a criminal penalty as well as a civil penalty. The amendment allows them to get out from under that, but he asked Senator Ohrenschall to describe the current penalties for fraud, stating he understands in the initiative petition realm it is illegal to put someone's name on a petition. Senator Pickard asked how these penalties differ.

Senator Ohrenschall replied, looking at section 6 and section 18, the proposed criminal penalties are either for procuring a false signature on the petition or violation of campaign finance law. Things that are serious deserve serious penalties. As to penalties in other parts of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), in recent years they have gotten tougher, but Senator Ohrenschall would have to get back to Senator Pickard on what penalties are for other like violations and other parts of the NRS.

Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel, said in sections 18 and 19 of the bill, the criminal penalty and the civil penalty; those are modeled on existing penalties in chapter 293 of NRS, which is the general elections law of the State. So, for example, if a voter committed voter fraud in violation of chapter 293 by registering to vote when they were not eligible to vote, they would be subject to a Category E felony, and they would also be subject to civil penalties of up to \$20,000. So these match existing law in chapter 293 of NRS.

In addition, 293 of NRS has NRS 293.800 that provides that any person who violates any of the provisions of the election laws of this State is subject to a Category E penalty, so anyone in any other initiative process that is controlled by that title of NRS—the elections title, Title 24—would be subject to these same types of criminal and civil penalties.

Senator Pickard asked if Mr. Powers could answer under current rules whether the proponent of an initiative petition also has to put up a bond or otherwise pay for the signature verification.

Mr. Powers said to circulate an initiative petition or a petition for referendum, there is no requirement for the proponent to advance the cost or pay the cost for the signature verification. This would be the first type of petition circulated that has that payment required attached to it in Nevada law. Other states, however, do provide for this type of payment.

Senator Pickard asked if the amendment, where it is the ability to sign a written declaration that imposes an undue burden, would require a simple affidavit to waive a review or an audit.

Senator Ohrenschall replied it would be a declaration under penalty of perjury, and there would be criminal penalties if someone is not truthful. The deposit is appropriate because the recall seeks to reverse a decision made by voters. It is unlike an initiative or referendum. In his research, Senator Ohrenschall has found that Florida does require a deposit prior to any kind of action.

Senator Pickard replied we are replacing the deposit or adding to the idea that a simple affidavit will waive that requirement and he or she can move forward. Is that correct?

Senator Ohrenschall said yes, a declaration under penalty of perjury.

Maureen Schafer, Executive Director, Council for a Better Nevada, stated she is in support of S.B. 450. In addition to recall election law, the Council has been connected to supporting initiative petition progress in Nevada since 2007. Recall election law reform has become a growing interest to the Council, especially after the last few election cycles where this provision was used more as a political tool between parties. Public press and the political process is paramount. The suggested provisions in S.B. 450, such as increasing signature

verification requirements, contribution limitations, disposal of unspent funds, and the opportunity for removal of names from the petition, increased transparency controls and integrity to this process and are a marked improvement to the current recall election statute.

She added 11 seats carry no recall provisions. Historically, Nevada has rarely seen a successful recall election, with more than 20 efforts Statewide since 2009; recalls here become more costly and partisan, with money asked to be raised from people in the community. This brings great pause and concern to groups like the Council. There appear to be gaps and loopholes in the NRS, much like what we have experienced in the initiative petition process over the years. In this growing environment, the Council commends this Committee for the thoughtfulness which has been put into strengthening recall laws.

Recall election law will always exist in Nevada and will exist with more clarity and integrity toward use and purpose with this proposed legislation. The Council applauds the progressive effort of the Legislature in this important area of election law that directly touches the public trust through all public officials and the voters. The Council supports you in the passage of S.B. 450.

Randy Soltero said he was taking off his lobbyist badge for this testimony and would bare his voter registration card which shows him as a registered voter in Senate District No. 5, one of the locations of a recall petition. He supports this bill because, as a resident, he believes what went on in the last election cycle was grotesque. He said one of the people trying to gather signatures came to his home, told him Senator Joyce Woodhouse was supporting this recall and encouraged him to sign. He asked them to leave, and they came back two other times. They talked to his son, Randy Soltero, Jr., who is also registered in Senate District No. 5, and told him his dad had signed, and they were just circling back. Mr. Soltero said when he heard this was going on, he had to go through a process to find out whether his and his son's names had been falsely put on some petition.

Carter Bundy, AFSCME International, stated he volunteered in two of the districts for Senator Cannizzaro and Senator Woodhouse. Once he had a list of people who had allegedly signed and maybe did not want to be on the petition, he found there were a lot of people who were confused and who signed because people had come to their doors. There were at least three instances where people swore up and down that they absolutely had not signed anything.

He said one couple he will never forget were registered Republicans, but he asked if this was something they wanted regardless of party. The woman was furious because she said not only had she not signed anything, she signs everything for her husband because he was in the back, bedridden, and he had not left that room in four months. Fraud was absolutely going on. There was no confusion with this woman. She was taking care of her dying husband, and both of their names were on the petition.

Anything the Committee can do to distance people from committing fraud in this process is something Mr. Bundy said he strongly supports.

Chris Daly, Nevada State Education Association, stated Nevada State Education Association (NSEA) is also in support of S.B. 450 and thanks Senator Ohrenschall for presenting the bill.

In 2017, NSEA was a part of two distinct committees formed to work against recall petitions. He said the Committee has heard compelling testimony that this bill is necessary to prevent future abuse of the recall process and to provide clarity in the provisions regarding things like campaign finance and recall efforts.

Nevada State Education Association has legal counsel beyond Mr. Schrager. He said NSEA is concerned with what it is able to do in terms of finance. This was not spelled out in the Nevada Constitution or NRS, so S.B. 450 is good progress in that direction.

He said regarding the process of folks who have signed petitions withdrawing their signatures, a discussion for debate is at the Nevada Supreme Court. Clarity in the NRS is important. Nevada State Education Association would encourage the Committee to support the bill.

Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices, read her statement ([Exhibit E](#)).

Gariety Pruitt, Nevada Conservation League, stated she was speaking in support of S.B. 450. Nevada Conservation League's (NCL) vision is of a Nevada where all can thrive because residents have access to a healthy climate, clean air, clean water, public lands and parks, and a safe, healthy and sustainable community.

Ms. Pruitt said passing strong laws to protect Nevada's environment depends on open and fair elections because Nevadans believe the health of our planet is inextricably linked to the health of our democracy. Every Nevadan deserves an equal voice in our elections, in our commitment to democracy and our democratic processes.

The NCL also supports the right, as provided by the Nevada Constitution, to recall public officials if and when necessary. The recall efforts in recent years has caused great concern. Nevada Conservation League supports the passage of S.B. 450.

Ms. Pruitt continued to say this bill provides much-needed clarity to the statutes pertaining to the recall process and strengthens key components of the law while leaving intact the core tenets of this important democratic process. Removing immunity from civil liability for the signers of the notice of intent, increasing the criminal penalties for misrepresenting the intent or conduct of petitioners, and holding petitioners physically responsible for the costs incurred by the county and State during the verification process are all important changes which will serve to dissuade parties from abusing the recall process in the future and filing petitions in an attempt to circumvent the traditional electoral process in favor of a potentially more favorable outcome in a special election. Nevada Conservation League strongly urges Committee support.

Annette Magnus-Marquart, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress, said Battle Born Progress is in support of S.B. 450. This is an abuse of our electoral system, our recall system and voters. It is also an incredible waste of taxpayer dollars. Allowing special interests to recall an elected official for no reason beyond they did not like how he or she acted, what the official stood for or because of gender, race or to gain control of a Chamber is wrong.

She said adding clarity and increased penalties is exactly what is needed. Battle Born Progress has been clear and consistent about this issue. It is not opposed to the ability to recall an elected official. Nevadans should have that ability if someone does something that warrants it and people follow the laws.

Elections are in place for a reason. Elections have consequences whether you agree with them or not. If a person does not like the outcome of an election, he or she should work to change that during the next election. What has happened

in the past cannot happen again because it was beyond inappropriate and not the intention of the recall process. Please support S.B. 450.

Laura Hale, Indivisible Northern Nevada, read her presentation ([Exhibit F](#)). She added that it concurs with the last two speakers.

James Sullivan, Culinary Union, stated recall elections have been abused by individuals and organizations when they do not like the result of the election down south. It is a waste of taxpayer money and abuse of the system. The Culinary Union fully supports this bill because it makes the changes necessary to stop what is going on with the recall elections down south.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom, said this bill will shut down any opportunity for recall. In the last 39 years, there have been 23 attempts at recall in Nevada. Two of those were successful. One was in 1980 in Nye County. One was in Fernley in 2009. She asked if there were any prosecutions of any people who misrepresented what they were saying. She said it is against the law, and she would support that.

Ms. Hansen said one of the things that concerns her was when Senator Ohrenschall talked about getting duplicate signatures for people who were not living in the district or getting a false signature. You do not know if voters are aware they are not supposed to sign more than one petition, so it is not their fault.

Ms. Hansen continued asking what happens if somebody is not living in the district? People do not know the boundaries for Senate or Assembly seats. They know what a county is. It is almost impossible for voters or the person who is gathering those signatures to know the boundaries.

Ms. Hansen said another important issue in the amendments was proponents must submit signatures collected during the first half of the petition-collecting phase—45 days into the 90-day collection period. The real purpose of this is so the other side can look at signatures, go out and talk with people and take their names off. This is not required in any other kind of petition-gathering in Nevada. This is new and does not have anything to do with our traditional signature-gathering requirement.

Ms. Hansen said section 18 talks about a person who is guilty of a Category E felony if he or she knowingly or negligently obtains a false signature. She asked what negligently means. She said when you are talking to people, if you do not get their interest in about 10 seconds, you are done. You do not have time to research each person who signed the petition. She said she would be opposed to anyone going out and getting signatures of Donald Duck or any of those kind of things.

Ms. Hansen added the U.S. Supreme Court has spoken about recalls numerous times and has said the right to petition, which includes the right to free speech, is at the zenith of protection for people as they go out to gather signatures. The Supreme Court has struck down a lot of rules and regulations in different states trying to suppress the gathering of signatures. It is important that we not jeopardize our right to free speech by making rules, even in recall.

Wayne Thorley, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State, said the Secretary of State's Office is neutral on the policy proposals in S.B. 450. He said he wanted a clear record of legislative intent to fall back on. Section 2 of the bill, as introduced, would require county clerks to verify all signatures on all recall petitions. With the conceptual amendment for Statewide recall petitions, that would be reduced to 25 percent, which is still a significant amount for county clerks to verify. Statewide recall is unlikely, but he wanted to put that on the record. Mr. Thorley said the current sampling number is 5 percent, so this would be an increase from 5 percent to 25 percent for Statewide recalls only.

Section 6 sets a contribution limit to \$5,000 per candidate per recall election. It is Mr. Thorley's understanding, based on the definition of candidate found in chapter 294A of NRS, this contribution limit would apply to all candidates at a recall election, including the public officer who is subject to being recalled. If this is not the intent of the bill, he would like a clarification.

Mr. Thorley said in section 6, the start and end of the contribution period for recall elections are defined. If the court finds a recall petition is legally insufficient, the bill indicates that the contribution period ends on the date that the district court's order is given. As we have seen with two recent recall petitions, the district court's determination is not necessarily the end. The matter may be appealed to the Nevada Supreme Court. Mr. Thorley said if the Committee wishes to move forward with this bill, the Committee may want to

consider defining when the contribution period ends if there is an appeal made to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Thorley said section 10 requires all candidates at a recall election to dispose any unspent campaign contributions by the fifteenth day of the second month following the last day for the candidate to receive contributions. He stated his understanding is only unspent contributions received for the recall election purpose would be required to be disposed, not unspent contributions the candidate may legally be holding from a prior election. If that is not the case, Mr. Thorley would request a clarification.

Section 17 requires the person or groups who submit a recall petition to pay for the cost of examining and verifying signatures on the petition. Mr. Thorley was pleased to see the conceptual amendment includes at least a portion of what costs would be chargeable to the recall proponents.

Mr. Thorley said for recounts, regulations specifically spell out what costs associated can be charged to the person who requests a recount. It is in *Nevada Administrative Code* 293.375. This is a regulation for staff salaries for county election officials. Extra materials, overtime costs, temporary staff hired to conduct the recount—all of those are chargeable to the person who requests a recount. If the Committee wishes to move this bill forward, it may be beneficial to clarify which costs are chargeable to the person submitting the recall.

Lorena Portillo, Assistant Registrar of Voters, Clark County, read a statement on behalf of Joe Gloria, Registrar of Voters, Clark County ([Exhibit G](#)).

Senator Pickard said a couple of points were raised during the opposition and neutral testimony. He wants to make sure the Committee is clear as to the intent. The restrictions in section 6 on contributions apply to everyone equally. Is that correct?

Senator Ohrenschall replied in section 6, it is the intent to apply to both. He would be open if the language needs tightening up.

Senator Pickard asked about the limitations on paid canvassers. Do those apply to those who both seek and oppose the recall? Neither one is allowed to use paid canvassers, correct?

Senator Ohrenschall said the last part of the amendment proposes to waive the paying in advance for the cost of the recall. That applies to someone seeking waiver of cost and would only apply to the person or group circulating the recall petition.

Senator Pickard asked if a person or group does not want to be responsible for the full cost, they cannot hire canvassers. Is that right?

Senator Ohrenschall replied correct. The intent with the amendment is to make sure that the requirement for costs be paid up front and would not apply to an organization that does not have those resources. Large-scale organizations being funded from out of state will pay in advance. The will of the voters is being countered being undone, and taxpayers need to be protected.

Senator Pickard asked what happens if someone has a large association that would pay his or her canvassers. Are they excluded, or do they have to pay up front?

Mr. Schrager said a recall is not a form of direct democracy. Direct democracy involves the people acting in their legislative capacity, impinging upon duties to enact or repeal legislation in an affirmative way. A recall is different. Nevada Constitution Article 2 and NRS 306 are for recalls. Article 19 is for the direct democracy. They inhabit different statutory sections; NRS 295 is for initiatives and referendums.

He added it would be a mistake to draw too close an analogy between those processes because the only thing they share is a significant signature-gathering procedure.

Mr. Powers said thank you for the opportunity to just ensure that the record is clear. With regard to section 6 and the term "candidate," as far as the contribution limitations, that section is going to be added to chapter 294A of NRS which defines candidate, which under that definition would mean any candidate in that special election. It would include the public officer who is subject to recall and anyone who is nominated under chapter 306 to run against the public officer in the recall election. So both the public officer subject to recall and any of those candidates would be subject to the contribution limitations and the reporting requirements in the bill that will be added to chapter 294A of NRS.

Senator Ohrenschall said recalls are different. While it is our right under the Nevada Constitution to recall an elected official, it is also our duty as Legislators to ensure that the will of Nevada's voters is not undermined by those looking to abuse our recall system. Recalls do seek to undo the decision of our constituents and voters. We must protect our taxpayers' right to recall any elected official, but we must also ensure that our recall system is not being abused. Senate Bill 450 seeks to do just that.

Vice Chair Cancela closed the hearing on S.B. 450.

Having no further business on the agenda, Chair Ohrenschall adjourned the meeting at 5:56 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Diane Rea,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	5		Attendance Roster
S.B. 450	C	9	Senator James Ohrenschall	Introductory Statement
S.B. 450	D	1	Senator James Ohrenschall	Proposed Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 450	E	1	Emily Persaud-Zamora / Silver State Voices	Written Testimony
S.B. 450	F	1	Laura Hale / Indivisible Northern Nevada	Written Testimony
S.B. 450	G	1	Lorena Portillo / Registrar of Voters, Clark County	Written Testimony