

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

**Eighty-First Session
March 30, 2021**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Brittney Miller at 4:16 p.m. on Tuesday, March 30, 2021, Online. 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/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Jill Dickman
Assemblyman Jason Frierson
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblyman Glen Leavitt
Assemblyman Andy Matthews
Assemblyman Richard McArthur
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas
Assemblywoman Selena Torres

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Principal Policy Analyst
Kathleen M. Norris, Committee Counsel
Bonnie Borda Hoffecker, Committee Manager
Jordan Green, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Robin Reedy, Executive Director, Nevada State Organization, National Alliance on Mental Illness
Edward Ableser, representing Opportunity Village
Jack Mayes, Executive Director, Nevada Disability Advocacy & Law Center
Jeffrey Beardsley, Member, Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services

Chair Miller:

[Roll was called. Committee rules and protocol were explained.] We have the pleasure of having an American Sign Language (ASL) interpreter today as part of our presentation. Welcome to everyone who is participating and listening through our ASL interpreter.

I would like to open our first bill hearing. Assembly Bill 392 is sponsored by the Committee on Judiciary and will be presented by Assemblyman Yeager. This measure requires the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to enter into an agreement with a qualified consultant to analyze certain data submitted to the LCB containing traffic stops and other stops.

Assembly Bill 392: Requires the Legislative Counsel Bureau to enter into an agreement with a qualified consultant to analyze certain data submitted to the Legislative Counsel Bureau concerning traffic stops and other stops. (BDR S-1036)

Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9:

I am pleased to present Assembly Bill 392 for your consideration. As Chair Miller stated, A.B. 392 requires the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to enter into an agreement for analyzing information on traffic stops.

Let me give you just a little bit of background on why you have this measure in front of you today. Last year, during the 32nd Special Session, which happened in August 2020, the Legislature passed Assembly Bill 3 of the 32nd Special Session, relating to public safety. Assembly Bill 3 of the 32nd Special Session addressed the use of police force by police officers, drug and alcohol testing of officers involved in a shooting or instances of other substantial bodily harm, and other subjects. Section 9 of A.B. 3 of the 32nd Special Session required each law enforcement agency in our state to submit a report to LCB by November 1, 2020. That report was to include information on traffic stops and other stops, including the software the agencies use to process the identities of those involved in the stop. We requested information on how traffic stops are recorded, how those records are maintained, what information is collected at the time of the stop, what software law enforcement agencies use in their vehicles and dispatch offices, and what the features and limitations are on that software.

According to the testimony before the Committee of the Whole during the 32nd Special Session, these reports were intended to lay the groundwork for a more in-depth data collection and analysis. I had the pleasure of presenting A.B. 3 of the 32nd Special Session, and at that time, I testified that the Legislature intended to work with others to make sure we are collecting the right information on traffic stops and other stops and we were able to analyze it in a meaningful way.

The Legislative Counsel Bureau did receive those reports from law enforcement agencies. They are available and on file with the Research Library of LCB. The Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department (Metro) submitted a four-page report answering the questions posed in A.B. 3 of the 32nd Special Session. All other agencies answered on a form, and their answers are compiled in an Excel workbook. In discussions with interested parties, it was suggested that the Legislature engage an outside expert to go over the reports, provide us with the summary, and give us some recommendations for moving forward.

You and I probably are not familiar enough with the procedures and software that law enforcement agencies use in the field and, frankly, we might overlook issues an expert would notice and understand. I certainly agree with that concept of engaging an outside expert to go over the reports, and that is the reason A.B. 392 is in front of you today.

To get to the bill itself, A.B. 392 consists of only two sections. In section 1, the bill requires LCB to enter into an agreement with a qualified consultant to analyze the data that was submitted and to prepare and submit a report. In section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a), the bill specifies that the report must include a summary of the answers law enforcement agencies submitted on traffic stops and other stops. The bill [section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b)] also says that the report must include recommendations on how to improve data collection related to traffic stops, the data elements that should be included, the features of software law enforcement agencies should be using, how to make sure the data that we collect can be integrated and analyzed, and how to make sure we have appropriate quality control.

Finally, you may be wondering whether we have somebody in mind to do this work. While we have had some initial conversations with staff of the Legal Division and the Research Division of LCB, we would like to stay flexible at this point and, if and when A.B. 392 passes, engage the entity that works best for our needs. This bill, of course, is going to cost money. To that end, there is likely to be a fiscal note on the end at some point if there is not already, so this bill will certainly have a stop in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. Indeed, that is a problem for another day.

Although it is somewhat rare for LCB to do this kind of arrangement, it is not without precedent. Just last interim, LCB hired a consultant to work on child welfare funding issues. In that case, there was an appropriation in the bill, and that appropriation was for \$200,000 to cover the costs [Assembly Bill 111 of the 80th Session]. I have included a copy of that request for proposal [Exhibit C] as an exhibit on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), so you can see what that looks like if you are interested.

The last thing I will say is in terms of how this process would work if A.B. 392 were to pass. A request for information would likely be issued by LCB, followed by a formal request for proposal. Then there would be a vetting process through one of our interim committees, followed by the selection of the consultant. My best guess is that this entire process would take us to the end of this calendar year or the beginning of the next calendar year. At that time, the consultant would likely be selected, and the work could begin with an eye towards making recommendations, as enumerated in section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (b) of the bill.

That concludes my presentation on Assembly Bill 392. Thank you for your consideration, and I would be happy to take any questions at this time.

Chair Miller:

We do have a few questions.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

You kind of touched on it a tiny bit, but what do you think the definition might be of "qualified consultant"? Do you have any ideas of what you might require?

Assemblyman Yeager:

That is a great question, and I think that is kind of why we envision the two-part process. I think the first thing we would do is a request for information just to ask folks out there in the consulting world, "What would this look like in your mind? Have you analyzed data like this before?" Our hope would be that we would get some information back from interested parties who say, "Look, this is the kind of work we do. We think we could help you because we crunch data, we look at this kind of stuff in other areas." After that, a formal request for proposal would go out, much like the one that you see on NELIS [[Exhibit C](#)] that was done last year.

I think it is a two-step process, but really in my mind, it is a consultant who is familiar with this kind of software—where law enforcement agencies use it in real time to make stops and to run people to check backgrounds—and then has some kind of knowledge about data integrity, about maintaining data and, I think probably most importantly, about our systems being able to communicate with one another because that is an issue we have had in this state. We have different agencies using different platforms, so if we are trying to look on a state level of what is actually happening out there on the ground, we need to be able to compile that data in some meaningful way. That is probably more information than you wanted but certainly it would be someone in this realm who can tell us what the latest and greatest technology is and make recommendations for what we should be doing as a state.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

That makes sense. We collected this data, and now we need someone who can interpret it. It may be hard to find the right person, right? It sounds like it.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I guess we will see. If we put out a request for information to see what kind of capacity is out there and a request for proposal, there is the possibility that maybe we do not get a lot of interest. We will deal with it at that point, but I think that sort of in-house work that we can do from a staff basis is not going to cost us any additional money. Again, if it is approved in the Committee on Ways and Means, it would only be the actual selection of a consultant that would result in the contract and in the payment of the funds.

Assemblywoman Dickman:

Great, thank you so much.

Assemblywoman González:

Did you say that you are going to collect surveys from police officers? Did I hear that right?

Assemblyman Yeager:

We did collect information from law enforcement agencies; Assembly Bill 3 of the 32nd Special Session required law enforcement agencies to provide information to LCB by November 1, 2020, so they have done that. It is out there and available. The next step would be to find someone to help us understand that information.

I know you do not have it in front of you, but if you go back and look particularly at section 9 of A.B. 3 of the 32nd Special Session, it includes the information that law enforcement agencies needed to provide. Just by way of a quick background, we were hoping maybe to do something bigger with this data, but during the context of the 32nd Special Session, we realized that we probably needed to figure out what data is actually collected, what systems are used, and what is out there right now; that was sort of the first step. This would be the second step, which is analyzing that data; hopefully, it will help us to guide our future decision-making as a legislative body.

Assemblywoman González:

I definitely agree that we need the data. As a researcher, I am a little concerned about how we are getting the data, how we make sure that it is accurate data, and then making recommendations based off of this data if we do not know where these recommendations are coming from. I would want someone who is a criminal justice policy analyst or someone who understands this type of work making these important recommendations. I do not know if that is maybe something to think about when we are looking for a consultant, but that stuck out to me. I am not saying we need to have researchers, but I think that sometimes things get lost in translation when we collect data and we do not know how to accurately display it.

Assemblyman Yeager:

Those are excellent suggestions. I think that would probably be the next step in the process. This first step is trying to get a sense of what the data is and what it means. I anticipate the consultant would be able to ask follow-up questions to law enforcement agencies as well

because he or she is probably going to have follow-up questions about what data they use and how it is collected. I think that next step is for us as a legislative body to bring in some of those other experts to tell us what else we need here and how we can act on it.

Great suggestion, and I think that is contemplated down the road after we get a handle on what we collect currently and what it means and how we can aggregate it in some meaningful fashion.

Assemblywoman González:

Thank you so much.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

The Legislative Counsel Bureau has this data right now. What is the scope of the data? We know that we always get traffic stops data at the end of the month, sometimes at the beginning of the month. It looks like maybe a year of data has been collected so far.

Assemblyman Yeager:

We do not have the actual data itself right now. What we have are responses from law enforcement agencies about what sort of data they collect, how they collect it, and how they store it. We have not asked for the actual data yet. I think that second part is to figure out what data they have now and how far back it goes. You ask a great question. Does data on traffic stops go back two years, three years, or only six months? What is the auto-overwrite feature on some of this?

That is the information we have right now, and I think that next step is to ask the consultant to help us understand what is readily available and already out in the world. Then we can start to collect that and analyze it, or we can work from that. Because, for instance, if the data is only available for 90 days and then it gets written over, that is problematic for us in making decisions. We will not be able to look at long-term trends.

We do have the responses from law enforcement agencies answering the questions we sought in Assembly Bill 3 of the 32nd Special Session. What we do not yet have is the underlying data about those traffic stops.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

With the information that you just gave us, how long will this consultant be in that position? Once you get the consultant, I assume that he or she will need software in order to gain knowledge of the surveys that were taken so we can look at the results. Is the consultant plus the software and any assistance that he or she gains within the monies that the fiscal note would request?

Assemblyman Yeager:

Those are great questions. I would anticipate that in getting through this process, we probably would not be in a position to have a consultant start working with us until the end of this year or the beginning of next year. I think that is going to be the timeline.

To answer your other question about what software or staffing the consultant might need, that would be determined in the request for proposal. Essentially, we would put out a request for proposal and they would come back to us and tell us exactly what they think they need and how much it is going to cost. Now, we do not have an unlimited budget. I do not believe there is a fiscal note on here yet, but at some point LCB is going to look at this and will come up with what it believes to be a reasonable estimation for what a fiscal note will be.

The Legislative Counsel Bureau will probably look at the bill I referenced from last interim where the cost was \$200,000 [A. B. 111 of the 80th Session]. The consultant would have to work within those parameters. There would not really be an ability for us to pay them more. There would be an agreement where we would say, "Look, this is the amount of money that we have to spend, and what can you do for us with that amount of money?" Hopefully, that would include anything the consultant might need.

My hope is if we engage a consultant who does this kind of work, he or she might have some automated system or some software in-house already that can help us do this. We just will not know until we do that request for proposal and see what responses we get.

Assemblywoman Thomas:

Thank you, I appreciate that.

Chair Miller:

I appreciate that Assemblyman Yeager is obviously a very experienced chair and legislator, but I would just like to remind everyone that here in this Committee, we are a policy committee, so we can keep our focus just on the policy. The concerns and questions—while they are so real—about funding and financing things are for a completely separate committee. We just want to focus on if we see something as good policy, and then we will allow the budget committees to take it from there. Thank you for that and thank you for your response.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Just out of curiosity, do you know if every single law enforcement agency submitted the required data to the Director of LCB? Did 100 percent of them report back?

Assemblyman Yeager:

No. We never have 100 percent, right? I will say this from looking at the data, I think our largest law enforcement agencies in the state did respond: Metro and the Reno Police Department. Assembly Bill 3 of the 32nd Special Session was pretty broad in its applicability, so there were definitely some smaller agencies that did not respond. To their credit, there were some that responded and said, "We do not do person or traffic stops." We got a decent number of responses, but not 100 percent.

I also think the consultant can help us with that if we need additional information from other agencies out there; the consultant can reach out. I do not think there is anybody out there who did not respond intentionally. Sometimes, they are just not aware that we enact these things, but we will strive to get more information through the consultant process if we need it.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Is there a target date to have the consultant hired and the recommendations in?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I hope we would have the consultant on board by the end of this year or the beginning of 2022. Then the consultant can start his or her work. How long that is going to take, I do not know. I do not anticipate the analysis of the data we have now would take a long time, but there might be some follow-up. Certainly, my hope is we would be in a position by the next legislative session to have actionable recommendations that we could potentially act on. Well, any of us who come back to the building could potentially act on them in the 2023 Session. That is the hope—next session we are talking about the results and what we can do better in the state.

Assemblywoman Jauregui:

Thank you.

Chair Miller:

Committee members, are there any additional questions?

Assemblywoman Torres:

I really appreciate the intent of this legislation. My question is kind of along some of the lines as Vice Chair Jauregui's. I noticed that in this legislation we are not requiring the information be disseminated to anyone, like members of a committee, and that is pretty standard. Is there a reason why or is it something we would like to consider? Perhaps the information in the report would be disseminated to all members of the Legislature or to the members of the Committee on Judiciary or the information would be presented to an interim committee. I do not see it; maybe I am missing that.

Assemblyman Yeager:

I do not think that is in the bill, so I do not think you are missing that. One of the discussions I had with LCB that is still ongoing is where exactly would the oversight for this be in the interim? Which committee would it likely be in front of? I do not think we have reached that conclusion yet. If and when we do, I think it would certainly be appropriate to make sure that the assigned committee gets a report and that whatever other report is generated be distributed. At a minimum, LCB is going to get it because it is the contracting party and make sure that it is made available to the Legislature. I will continue to work with the Legal Division on that to see if we need to put that in the bill. There will be oversight throughout the interim process, but we are just not sure where it is going to be at this point.

Chair Miller:

Are there any additional questions from Committee members? [There were none.] We will move into testimony in support of A.B. 392. [There was none.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition of A.B. 392? [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] It was a pleasure to see you in our Committee today, Assemblyman Yeager. Thank you so much for presenting this legislation. I will go ahead and close the hearing on A.B. 392.

With that, I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 421, which is sponsored by the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and will be presented by Assemblywoman Brown-May. It establishes the preferred method to referring to certain persons with certain conditions in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* and *Nevada Administrative Code*. Assemblywoman Brown-May, whenever you are ready. If you would like to introduce anyone who is copresenting with you, that would be wonderful.

Assembly Bill 421: Establishes the preferred method of referring to persons with certain conditions in the Nevada Revised Statutes and the Nevada Administrative Code. (BDR 17-1037)

Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May, Assembly District No. 42:

With me today to present Assembly Bill 421 is Ms. Robin Reedy, who is the Executive Director of the Nevada State Organization of the National Alliance on Mental Illness, affectionately known as NAMI Nevada. Following my presentation, Ms. Reedy will discuss the importance of respectful language from both a professional and personal perspective.

Joining us in neutral today is Mr. Jeffrey Beardsley, a member of the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing. There are a number of self-advocates who are planning to call in support of this legislation, as well as a particular letter of support from the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities [[Exhibit D](#)] that has been uploaded onto the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System for you to review.

I am pleased to present Assembly Bill 421 for your consideration. Quite simply, the goal of this bill before you today is to update antiquated and discriminatory language in Nevada law that can be insulting to people who have mental illness or people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Simply put, words matter.

Here is a little background information relative to A.B. 421. As we all know, the words we use have the power to shape the lives of the individuals in our state and in our community. The meanings of words change over time as society evolves, so we must also make changes in our *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). The words and labels we use in statute can have a profound effect on people; as lawmakers, we can show our respect by refusing to use the terms that are outdated or offensive.

Some of the more outdated terms that we still find in our statutes concern people diagnosed with or experiencing mental illness. Antiquated and derogatory terms such as "idiot," "lunatic," and "mentally defective" have appeared in statutes and case law in many states to describe people with intellectual or psychiatric disabilities or mental illnesses. Many of these terms are maintained in our laws. It was only in 2004 that we removed the reference to "idiot" in the *Nevada Constitution* [Article 2, Section 1; Assembly Joint Resolution 3 of the 71st Session].

For people who are experiencing mental illness, replacing these offensive terms in our statutes is the first step to reducing the stigma associated with mental health conditions. Remove discriminatory terminology, and we hopefully begin to shift the focus to treatment and recovery.

The same is true for Nevadans who are deaf or hard of hearing. Many of the terms referring to people who are deaf or hard of hearing are offensive. They are inaccurate, and they are outdated. Negative terminology for the members of this community persist in law and popular culture, including the label "deaf and dumb." That is almost hard to even say. The National Association of the Deaf calls this a relic from medieval England. The organization also notes that the Greek philosopher Aristotle used the label "deaf and dumb" because he thought that "deaf people were incapable of being taught, of learning, and of reasoned thinking" [Community and Culture – Frequently Asked Questions, National Association of the Deaf's website at www.nad.org]. We know that is wholly untrue.

More recently, the terms "hearing impaired" and "hearing disabled" are offensive, outdated, and inaccurate as well. These terms focus on what people cannot do by establishing the standard of hearing and implying that anything different must be impaired or substandard. That is what we need to fix.

Nevada Revised Statutes already direct the Legislative Counsel to refer to people with disabilities and others in a respectful manner [NRS 220.125]. Assembly Bill 421 continues this process. At this point, we will run through the key sections of the bill.

Section 1 of A.B. 421 contains two key provisions. First, subsection 3 of section 1 makes specific references to what is considered the preferred or respectful language in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* for people with mental illness. It also lists the words and the terms that are not preferred when referring to these individuals [section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (b)]. [Unintelligible.] Second, subsection 4 of section 1, requires that respectful language and sentence structure be used for the *Nevada Revised Statutes* references relating to people who are deaf or hard of hearing. Additionally, subsection 4 specifies the terms that are not preferred and should be avoided.

In a similar manner, section 2 of A.B. 421 specifies that our state regulations codified in the *Nevada Administrative Code* must also use respectful language and sentence structure when referring to people with mental illness or people who are deaf or hard of hearing.

Finally, section 3 of A.B. 421 specifies that the Legislative Counsel will update these words and changes in reprints and supplements to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* and in supplements to the *Nevada Administrative Code* to conform with the provisions of A.B. 421.

I would like to ask Ms. Reedy to provide additional information at this time relative to her story.

Robin Reedy, Executive Director, Nevada State Organization, National Alliance on Mental Illness:

I am pleased to present in support of A.B. 421 on behalf of the Nevada chapter of the National Alliance on Mental Illness (NAMI). We are a grassroots mental health organization dedicated to building better lives for the more than 400,000 Nevadans affected by mental illness.

Stigma is real and it kills. As a grandparent of two granddaughters living with hearing loss, I am all too aware of language that hurts people, creates more stigma, and adds barriers to the mountain of barriers they already face.

Almost two decades ago, I took my oldest granddaughter to Rochester, New York, to visit a university with specialized access for those living with a hearing loss. Last night, as I was researching statistics on mental health and those with a loss of hearing, I ran across the Deaf Health Survey 2008 from the National Center for Deaf Health Research at the University of Rochester Medical Center that we had visited. While a small sample, it has far reaching implications, specifically suicide risk: Deaf respondents were more than five times more likely to report attempting suicide in the previous year, which is 2.2 percent compared with 0.4 percent in the general population.

The deaf community struggles daily with stigma, prejudice, and communication, but that is not all. Medical studies have found that deaf people suffer from mental health issues at about twice the rate of the general population and also have real problems accessing needed mental health services. The mental health issues common in the deaf community include depression and anxiety, as well as severe illnesses such as bipolar disorder and schizophrenia.

Calling a group "the hearing impaired" suggests that the hearing disability defines the person. The dictionary defines "impaired" as "being in a less than perfect or whole condition, disabled, or functionally defective." The point is to put people first. We urge using positive language that avoids referring to people with disabilities as "the disabled," "the blind," "the epileptics," "a quadriplegic," et cetera. It is fine to say "person with" a disability, but terms like "challenged" and "the disabled" have fallen out of favor.

In other words, people with disabilities, including hearing loss and mental health, want to be recognized because they want equal access. That does not mean they want to be defined by their disability.

My oldest granddaughter did not ultimately go to college. She married and lives in Elko with my great granddaughter. Her sister did graduate from the University of Nevada, Reno. We are very proud of both of their achievements in a hearing world. It was not easy for them, and they will continue to bump into barriers. Those barriers, though, should not be supported by the language in our laws.

[Ms. Reedy also submitted written testimony, [Exhibit E.](#)]

Chair Miller:

Do you have another presenter?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

We do have Mr. Jeffrey Beardsley. He is here in neutral. I do not know if you would prefer to hear from him now or if you would like to go to testimony.

Chair Miller:

Is he part of your presentation, or is he just here to testify?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

He will be here to testify.

Chair Miller:

We will wait until we are taking neutral testimony. Does that work?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

That works great, thank you.

Chair Miller:

Does that conclude your bill presentation at this time?

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

It does.

Chair Miller:

With that, we will go ahead and open the lines for anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 421. I am really sorry, but we need to open it up for questions first. Committee members, I know we have one question, and I apologize to members and everyone on the lines as well.

Assemblywoman Torres:

I was able to answer it during the hearing. I just noted that this was very similar to a bill from last session, and I was checking to see that we kept similar form and language from Assembly Bill 367 of the 80th Session. We did. That was my question, but I answered it.

Chair Miller:

Committee members, are there any other questions? [There were none.] Assemblywoman Brown-May, thank you so much for bringing forth this legislation on such an important and sensitive issue to bring respect and dignity for what people deserve.

With that, we will now go ahead and open the line. Is there anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 421?

Edward Ableser, representing Opportunity Village:

I am representing Opportunity Village and members of the broader community of individuals who have long been advocating for the appropriate usage of language in representing those who have a disability or mental illness. I just want to extend my appreciation to Chair Miller and the Committee for hearing this bill.

I believe that Assembly Bill 421 provides tremendous value to the ongoing conversation about acceptance and appropriate language in our community. We know that words have tremendous power, as we have seen nationally across the political milieu. We want to ensure that those individuals who do have a disability or a mental illness are appropriately represented in our own symbolic statutes. With that, I truly and sincerely want to thank Assemblywoman Brown-May for her leadership and guidance in this space as well as thank Committee members. I ask for your support on this bill. Thank you.

Jack Mayes, Executive Director, Nevada Disability Advocacy & Law Center:

Thank you for the opportunity to express support for A.B. 421. We have been working to clean up some of the language, and we support the efforts to add people first, respectful language, and the preferred method of referral. Thank you for the opportunity for input.

[There were no more callers in support.]

Chair Miller:

Is there anyone testifying in opposition? [There was no one.] I know that we do have one person for neutral testimony in the Zoom meeting. We will begin with that testimony and then move to any telephone callers testifying as neutral.

Jeffrey Beardsley, Member, Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services:

As people have mentioned before, the bill says it all. I want to point out that from the deaf and hard of hearing community, our view is that our deafness or our being hard of hearing is not a disability. We function just as well as hearing people, except we do not hear. That is all.

The notion of disability is based on a societal and even a governmental view. From our own views, we do not consider ourselves "disabled." Of course, "disability" is defined for agencies such as Medicare, et cetera, so it impacts them.

The terms "deaf and dumb" and "hearing impaired" are ancient terms and offensive. They are just absolutely outdated and out of practice. We are trying to educate people to use those other terms when they label us so that we can make sure everyone is being respectful and to achieve equality for deaf people.

Also, this bill will help to promote awareness of individuals rights to access, especially for people who are deaf and hard of hearing, in terms of getting access such as interpreters and effective communication. That is all that I can say. Thank you.

[Mr. Beardsley also submitted written testimony, [Exhibit F.](#)]

Chair Miller:

Thank you so much for being here with us today and thank you for educating us. Our goal, of course, is to treat everyone with respect, and often that comes in the words and the terms that we use. Thank you for sharing and teaching us today.

Do we have anyone else to testify as neutral? [There was no one.] With that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 421. Again, thank you so much for bringing forward this legislation, Assemblywoman Brown-May.

We will move to our next agenda item, which is public comment. Again, everyone will have 2 minutes, we will take up to 30 minutes of public comment, and public comment should be on an issue that is under the purview of this Committee. [There were no callers.] We will wait just another moment or so. Is there anyone? [There was no one.]

With that, I would like to remind everyone that our next scheduled meeting is this Thursday, April 1, 2021, but we will begin at 3 p.m. We are moving it up one hour and beginning promptly at 3 p.m. on Thursday. With no other business before us, thank you so much, everyone, and have a great evening. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:03 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jordan Green
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a request for proposal titled "Request for Proposals for a Consultant to Assist in the Study of Child Welfare Funding in the State of Nevada (A.B. 111, 2019)," submitted by Assemblyman Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter to the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, dated March 29, 2021, submitted by Kari Horn, Executive Director, Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities, in support of Assembly Bill 421.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony dated March 30, 2021, submitted by Robin Reedy, Executive Director, Nevada State Organization, National Alliance on Mental Illness, in support of Assembly Bill 421.

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony submitted by Jeffrey Beardsley, Member, Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing, Aging and Disability Services Division, Department of Health and Human Services, neutral to Assembly Bill 421.