

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session  
March 3, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:05 a.m. on Friday, March 3, 2023, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Max Carter  
Assemblyman Rich DeLong  
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblyman Bert Gurr  
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts  
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen  
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor  
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District No. 31



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst  
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager  
Lindsey Howell, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Francisco V. Aguilar, Secretary of State  
Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices  
Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County  
Brian Harris, Voter Education Organizer, Battle Born Progress  
Amy Koo, Acting Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada  
Jamie Rodriguez, Registrar of Voters, Washoe County  
Jennifer Willett, Grassroots Manager, All Voting is Local Nevada  
Christopher P. DeRicco, Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners  
Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Department of Motor Vehicles  
Kalie M. Work, Vice President, Recorder's Association of Nevada  
Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager,  
Washoe County  
Jason Leshar, President, Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association  
Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts

**Chair Torres:**

[Roll was called. Committee protocol was reviewed.] We do have a presentation from the Office of the Secretary of State. Then we will be hearing two bills.

**Francisco V. Aguilar, Secretary of State:**

I am joined by Mark Wlaschin from the Elections Division to present Assembly Bill 59. This is one of my two bill proposals which, if passed, will significantly enhance the physical security of Nevadan's election officials, their staff members, and families. The passage of Assembly Bill 321 of the 81st Session enabled "Any county or city clerk or registrar of voters charged with the powers and duties relating to elections and any deputy appointed by such county or city clerk or registrar of voters in the elections divisions of the county or city" to request that the Department of Motor Vehicles display an alternate address on the person's driver's license.

**Chair Torres:**

Are you presenting the bill or the presentation for the Office of the Secretary of State?

**Secretary Aguilar:**

We are presenting the bill.

**Chair Torres:**

Is there no presentation?

**Secretary Aguilar:**

No. This is our presentation. We were trying to save you time.

**Chair Torres:**

Not a problem. At this time, I will open the hearing on A.B. 59. If Committee members have questions for the Secretary of State's Office, they will be sure to ask after the bill is presented.

**Assembly Bill 59: Revises provisions concerning the confidentiality of certain personal information of certain persons. (BDR 20-408)**

**Francisco V. Aguilar, Secretary of State:**

As I mentioned, in 2021, the Legislature enacted opportunities for city and county clerks and their staff to be able to have protections. Today's provision also allows any spouse, domestic partner, or minor child of those election officials in the Secretary of State's Office to do the same. Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (f) of Assembly Bill 59 builds upon the protection by adding to that list "Any employee of the Office of the Secretary of State charged with the powers and duties relating to elections." To be clear, that change would only add about 25 or 30 individuals across the agency to the list of eligible individuals who would have this protection.

Additionally, I have proposed an amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] to this bill that would expand upon the existing text of the statutes so it encompasses more than just the county and city clerks and their deputies. It would include other county staff who are charged with powers and duties relating to elections. That provision could increase the list of eligible individuals by approximately 75 to 100 people.

It is imperative we ensure the umbrella of protection afforded to our county and city clerks also protects their staff members, who work tirelessly to ensure our voters have free and fair elections. Every election is important, and we have three of them in 2024 that will demand the full time and attention of every election official and staff member across our great state. We know they will do their duty in a superb manner, but the passage of this bill will help ensure they can remain focused on the task at hand and are not worrying about their physical safety or the safety of their families and children.

Thank you for your time and consideration. We are available for any questions.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you for your very efficient presentation to the most phenomenal committee, the Assembly Committee on Government Affairs. At this time, I will take any questions from members.

**Assemblyman Carter:**

How big a problem is the Department of Motor Vehicles' (DMV) sharing personal, private information out there? I see this specifically addresses the DMV. Is that a big problem?

**Secretary Aguilar:**

It is. Public information is widely available, given the Internet and the ability to spread that information through social media channels, creating a doxing situation. It is an unfortunate situation, but it is something that can be done easily and quickly. That is why we are asking for the protection of these employees.

**Assemblywoman González:**

My question is, is there a process for renewal, or is this for the person's lifetime and/or if they are no longer employed?

**Secretary Aguilar:**

That is a great question. I am happy to have a conversation about figuring it out because, obviously, people do move on from different positions. This protection should be limited to the time they are actually employed in these positions.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

How do you determine which employees would be subject to this list? Is it a clerk who might look at a piece of paper, or is it something more substantial than that?

**Secretary Aguilar:**

Especially in the Secretary of State's Office, we look at everybody who would work in the Elections Division. That would be determined by my deputy, Mark Wlaschin.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

The Department of Motor Vehicles is just one agency that holds those records. Are there other state agencies or county municipalities carrying the same information that could also be affected in terms of making sure that we can cover everyone? Maybe they are not listed with the county recorder, but they are listed in other ways. For example, I am thinking of a voter file. They would be on there, but that is not kept by the county recorder.

**Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:**

The Department of Motor Vehicles holds the repository for the information, but this provision under the statute allows for acceptance into the confidential address program as well. That program would enable us to make the individual's voter files confidential and not released to the public.

**Chair Torres:**

Members, any additional questions? [There were none.] I am hoping you can walk us through what it would look like for somebody to receive this. My understanding is, it is not as simple as an individual being automatically part of this program and automatically having

a fictitious address just because they work at this office. What does that process look like for those employees?

**Mark Wlaschin:**

The process starts with a little bit of paperwork being filled out, you submit it, and you go to court. The judge signs off on it and basically approves and authorizes it, validating that you are, in fact, a member identified in the statutes. In this case, it would be a member of the Office of the Secretary of State with duties related to elections. That is, as the Secretary said, the Elections Division. But we also have our securities investigators, the criminal investigators who knock on doors and talk to individuals, who I suspect would fall into that umbrella as well. It is fairly quick, another process we have seen through other individuals who have gone through it before. It is designed to not be administratively burdensome so folks can get their protections fairly quickly.

**Chair Torres:**

Is there any burden of proof put on the applicants to demonstrate there is a threat? Obviously, I am very familiar with some of the things that went on during the previous election cycles that really did put our election workers at risk. Is there any requirement that they have to provide some type of proof? I understand it is under judicial review, but is there a standard for those judges to accept it or not?

**Mark Wlaschin:**

No, there is no requirement that they have been threatened. It is the position, really, that would lead to that involvement and might result in an agitated individual ultimately causing the threat. It is designed to prevent those sorts of things from happening.

**Secretary Aguilar:**

There are actual instances of threats occurring among our staff. If there were a standard that would be necessary, we would be able to meet that threshold.

**Chair Torres:**

Members, any additional questions? [There were none.] I think that was one of the most efficient presentations we have heard so far. We will now invite anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 59.

**Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices:**

Silver State Voices leads the Let Nevadans Vote coalition. Today, we are here to support A.B. 59. Election staffers are the unsung heroes of our democracy. They work tirelessly to run Nevada's elections and ensure all voters can cast their ballots. It is unfortunate to know our public servants have faced harassment for simply doing their job. As of right now, existing law already allows city clerks, county registrars, and any deputy in their election divisions to request their personal information be kept private. We support this bill, as it would expand the option to include individuals that are part of the Elections Division at the Office of the Secretary of State. Passing this bill provides a sense of assurance to both workers and their loved ones as they continue to uphold our democracy.

**Joanna Jacob, Manager, Government Affairs, Clark County:**

That was very eloquently stated by the previous speaker, so I will not belabor the point. On behalf of the hardworking staff of our Elections Division, we appreciate this bill and the amendment [\[Exhibit C\]](#) offered by Secretary Aguilar and his staff to protect the people who are working so hard on our elections. We are in full support. To put it on the record, the confidential address program is also administered through Clark County. It is a form that is filled out at our assessor's office and recorder's office by our county clerks along with the court order that was described in the testimony.

**Brian Harris, Voter Education Organizer, Battle Born Progress:**

[Read from [Exhibit D.](#)] We are in support of A.B. 59. Our election officials need this in order to be protected from the recent attacks on them in the last few cycles. From the Secretary of State to the registrars of voters or clerks, these folks play a very vital role here in this great state of Nevada and should not have to fear for their lives or the lives and safety of their loved ones. This is why I am here in support of A.B. 59.

**Amy Koo, Acting Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada:**

We are a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization that advocates for the growing Asian, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander community in Nevada. In our electoral work, we help recruit and train volunteers to become election workers and become civically engaged. Everyone deserves to work without the fear of harassment or intimidation. Our election workers are at the front lines in ensuring our elections stay safe and free for our communities. Our elections are only as safe as our election workers feel. We urge your support for A.B. 59.

[A letter in support of A.B. 59 was submitted by Amy Koo, Acting Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada, Las Vegas, Nevada, [Exhibit E.](#)]

**Jamie Rodriguez, Registrar of Voters, Washoe County:**

I am calling in support of the bill this morning. When the Secretary of State's Office first advised us they were bringing the bill forward to include the Secretary of State's Office, that made all the sense in the world. That is something we definitely supported. Adding our staff is something we are also very much in support of. We did have to take precautions after the primary election going into the general because we did have staff who, leaving work at the end of the night, were being followed to their cars. Pictures of their license plates were taken. Expanding it beyond myself or my assistant registrar of voters to the rest of my election staff is something we are absolutely in support of, based on giving them more comfort, especially after the activities we saw in this last election. I want to again thank the Secretary of State's Office for bringing it forward. We are very much in support with the amendment expanding it to my staff as well.

**Jennifer Willett, Grassroots Manager, All Voting is Local Nevada:**

All Voting is Local Nevada is an organization that exists to expose and dismantle threats to voter freedom in order to make voting safe, fair, and accessible to build a democracy for us all. All Voting is Local is also a member of the Let Nevadans Vote coalition. We are here in strong support of A.B. 59. Election officials carry the responsibility of ensuring the promise

of democracy and work tirelessly to ensure Nevadans can cast their ballots safely and securely. However, since 2020, there has been continued harassment of election officials by election deniers and conspiracy theorists. Election employees deserve to be recognized for their contributions to our great state and to do their jobs without conflict. Instead, they and their loved ones are being harassed and intimidated at their job and, more egregiously, at their home. This bill is an unfortunate necessity to keep election workers and their families safe. All Voting is Local strongly supports A.B. 59.

**Chair Torres:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of A.B. 59? [There was no one.] I will now invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 59. [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 59?

**Christopher P. DeRicco, Chair, State Board of Parole Commissioners:**

I would like to say we deal with the same issues the Secretary of State's Office is dealing with and have for many years. The sections of this bill incorporate a lot of law enforcement agencies and justice agencies. I have reached out to the Secretary of State's Office to propose a friendly amendment to include members of the parole board staff as well. Even most recently, we have been reporting crimes threats to capitol police with regard to our staff as well. We think this is a very good bill, and we hope to work with them for a future friendly amendment. Thank you.

**Chair Torres:**

Just for clarification, because I do not have an amendment—there is an amendment, but you plan to work with the Secretary of State. Is that correct?

**Christopher P. DeRicco:**

That is correct. The dialogue already started on that some time ago. We hope to work on it.

**Chair Torres:**

I am going to ask that be put in opposition, but with the understanding that you will continue working together. Anytime there is a proposed amendment, under our rules, we do put that in opposition.

**Sean Sever, Deputy Administrator, Department of Motor Vehicles:**

We are neutral on this bill. I am proud to say the DMV has submitted a no-impact fiscal note on this. The Department of Motor Vehicles already has procedures in place for requesting display of alternative addresses, and this bill's provisions would just be incorporated into the existing process we do with other agencies.

**Chair Torres:**

It is always a surprise when the DMV comes without a fiscal note. Congratulations, Secretary of State.

**Kalie M. Work, Vice President, Recorder's Association of Nevada:**

As you know, the county recorders are dedicated to recording, permanently preserving, and providing convenient access to property, mining, and marriage records. Today we are in neutral. To clarify, our comments are not about the individuals being added to this group. It is about the policy and the public intent of this statute. We believe there should be a level of protection for those who need it, and our association is supportive of those who need this level of confidentiality on their property records. But in practical application, we may not be able to accomplish what you think we are able to accomplish with the current way the statute is written.

We are testifying neutral as they work through enacting a time limit and renewal process for redacted personal information as well as enabling the applicant or eligible person to include subsequent recordings following an active court order. To accomplish the intent of the confidentiality order, we would like to ensure uniformity across all departments where this information lives. We have been able to talk with some of the bill sponsors and proponents of these bills and are working on reaching all affected groups.

We want to thank Madam Chair for her time earlier this week. We require a little bit more time to get through this information with relevant stakeholders and would like to propose a friendly amendment soon.

**Chair Torres:**

As a reminder to everyone, the amendments are not friendly until this presenter agrees to them. I imagine the Secretary of State is eager to work with you all to make sure we create a system that makes sense for Nevadans. At this time, is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 59? [There was no one.]

Feel free to provide any closing remarks.

**Secretary Aguilar:**

Thank you all for taking the time to hear us today. We really are here because the people who work in elections work hard every day to ensure they run smoothly. They are secure, and they are the best-run elections in the country. We are here because right now, we are trying to protect them and also encourage people to join elections teams throughout our state. We do have shortages because people are fearful of working in the elections department. We need to understand why the fear exists and protect them to allow them to do the work they need to do for us.

**Chair Torres:**

I will close the hearing on A.B. 59. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 96.



**Assembly Bill 96: Revises provisions relating to the confidentiality of certain personal information of peace officers and retired peace officers. (BDR 20-489)**

**Assemblywoman Jill Dickman, Assembly District No. 31:**

I am here to present Assembly Bill 96, which provides for the confidentiality of certain personal information of peace officers and retired peace officers.

Assembly Bill 96 adds any peace officer or retired peace officer to the list of individuals under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 247.540 who can request through a court order that their personal information held in the county recorder's office be kept confidential. Currently, the law allows for peace officers or retired peace officers to request this confidentiality in the assessor's office, and this bill brings parity to the statutes governing the recorder.

This bill will provide an additional level of security to individuals who have chosen to dedicate their lives to public safety and who, by the very nature of their work, encounter folks who, by the very nature of their decisions, may seek retaliations against active or retired peace officers or their families. We need to make sure we are protecting the Nevadans who protect us.

Taking a look at the bill, you can see it is pretty short and simple. In section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (e), "Any peace officer or retired peace officer" is added to the list of existing persons who may request that the personal information contained in the records of a county recorder be kept confidential.

The only other change is the addition of a definition of peace officer, which is borrowed from the assessor's chapter [NRS Chapter 250]. It is the same. The definition includes any person upon whom some or all the powers of a peace officer are conferred and anyone who resides in this state whose primary duties are to enforce the law, including National Park Service rangers, agents employed by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Secret Service, United States Department of Homeland Security, or United States Department of the Treasury.

This bill is a safety, privacy, and antiharassment bill to provide peace officers and their families with the same protections as any justice or judge in this state, any senior justice or senior judge, court-appointed master, any clerk of the court, court administrator or court executive officer in this state, any district attorney, persons employed by the Office of the Attorney General to prosecute or defend actions on behalf of the state of Nevada, any social worker, any county manager, any inspector, code enforcement officer, and their families. It is kind of sad this list is growing, but it is indeed growing—people who get harassed for doing their jobs.

Each of these persons serves the public. In delivering services to the public, certain members of the public become angry, hostile, and abusive, as we know. These public servants and their families are often put at increased risk of harm for no other reason than they are doing their job. This bill is simply cleaning up an inadvertent omission, to protect the real property and related personal information of peace officers.

Washoe County has requested an amendment [\[Exhibit F\]](#). Would this be the place to address that, or do you want questions at this point?

**Chair Torres:**

If you are accepting the amendment, please do address it.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Yes.

**Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager,  
Washoe County:**

My thanks to Assemblywoman Dickman for considering this a friendly amendment. I want to start by saying I understand there may be a broader discussion that takes place amongst this body about the policy behind these exemptions. Our amendment is not intended to necessarily be an endorsement of that policy.

To the extent that it remains the policy of this body that certain individuals who are exposed to risk as a result of their profession be given certain protections, we would like to ask for your support of an amendment that would include coroners, medical examiners, or death investigators of a county coroner's office in the list of eligible persons who may petition the court for an order to have the information held in the records of county recorders and county assessors be confidential. These public employees do face some similar risks to some of these other individuals. They are involved in the investigation of homicides and other high-profile, potentially contentious or controversial deaths. Not infrequently, families of the deceased or other members of the public take issue with their determinations. They are also frequent expert witnesses in murder trials, which are often high-profile, and that expose them to public scrutiny.

A recent example of a medical examiner receiving harassment and threats would be Dr. Andrew Baker of the Hennepin County Medical Examiner's Office in Minnesota, who handled the death of George Floyd. Dr. Baker testified at trial that he and his staff received hundreds of harassing and threatening phone calls. His personal residence address was published on Twitter. There was a call for people to go to his home and harass him. Ultimately, he and his family went into hiding. They sold their family home and now reside under protection. There is risk for coroners and medical examiners. Again, if it remains the policy of this body to provide protections for these persons, we would ask that you consider them.

**Chair Torres:**

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

Our previous presenter, Mr. Aguilar, went across all of the sections and asked that the Secretary of State election staff as well as the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV), be covered under the same types of coverage for those employees. I know existing statute already covers peace officers in the assessor's office. Now you are adding the recorder's office. What about the other two agencies that could also have that information?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Are you asking why we are not putting in the DMV as well?

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

Yes.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

That is probably a good thing to do. At this point, I am unfamiliar with whether this is even available for peace officers. In fact, can I ask Mr. Jason Leshar to come up?

**Chair Torres:**

Yes, I imagine he is going to clarify where they are already included in NRS Chapter 250. I am hoping that is his clarification.

**Jason Leshar, President, Washoe County Sheriff Deputies Association:**

I am also a member of the Public Safety Alliance of Nevada. Assemblyman Nguyen, currently peace officers are not on that list at the DMV. We have not really been requesting that. We have been part of that assessor's exemption for a number of years. I am not sure why we did not end up at the recorder's office. It was probably an oversight some time ago when somebody was sitting right here asking for that to be passed.

That information is so readily available, and that is our main concern. Just typing in a name at the recorder or the assessor's website will bring up a picture of my house. At the recorder's office, it is the same thing—address, deeds, marriage licenses, and appointments to the sheriff's office or police department. I believe the DMV information is a little harder to get. Obviously, this information is out there. There is no way to be 100 percent anonymous in this day and age. However, that is just not something we have been seeking.

**Assemblyman Carter:**

This ties into that. I am curious if this is also trying, or is envisioned to stop state agencies such as the DMV from selling personal data. We talk about public access, but what about these agencies that sell personal, private data to third-party brokers such as LexisNexis? Is that also envisioned as part of this?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I am unaware of the assessor's office or recorder's office selling information.

**Assemblywoman González:**

I have a couple of questions. The first is the same thing I asked in the previous presentation. Is there a termination time where if the person is no longer in this state, this would end? Is it forever?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I do not believe there is anything in the statute that addresses that. As I understand it, the recorder would like to have that clarified. We may even have to do a further amendment, but at this point there is nothing in statute.

**Jason Leshner:**

This would apply to peace officers and retired peace officers. I think we would have to do a little work as far as if somebody resigned and was not honorably retired from a Nevada police department or sheriff's office and review that. Just as the Secretary of State's Office said, we would have to do a little work on that.

**Assemblywoman González:**

Would they have to list all their properties in this? If they owned multiple real properties, would that be protected, or would that still be made public?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I am not sure of that. I would have to look into that, but I would assume it would for sure be the primary residence. Beyond that, I am not sure.

**Jason Leshner:**

From my understanding—I have done this before, so I know it exactly—you fill out an affidavit, submit it to a justice of the peace, and they issue it. I believe you can ask to have any and all of your properties remain confidential. It would be up to the judge to approve or deny that request.

**Chair Torres:**

I had a meeting with the county recorders earlier this week and they clarified that yes, it is to add all properties.

**Assemblywoman González:**

This is not automatic, correct? The peace officer or the retiree would have to go and petition this to the court, right?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Yes, that is correct. It would have to be approved by a judge.

**Assemblywoman González:**

In terms of adding coroners, medical examiners, or death investigators, I know you talked about the national case, but I am curious what that looks like here in Nevada. I am wondering where this list ends. Every session we are adding and adding, so I am curious about the need for their information to be protected and what that looks like here.

**Cadence Matijevich:**

I do not have a specific high-profile case I can call to. I will say, Dr. Laura Knight, our medical examiner, did indicate to me that on a routine basis, she and her staff are called to be witnesses at trials. They experience intimidation in dealing with the people who are not satisfied with the determination they have made that may implicate someone in a death. I do not want to speculate. I hope we will never have a situation like what has happened in other communities.

I appreciate your statement that this group of individuals seems to be getting larger and larger. The intent of my statement at the beginning of presenting the amendment was, I understand this body may need to consider again the broader policy of this. Our request for the amendment is not intended to necessarily be an endorsement of continuing that policy. If it is continued, we do think that the employees, the medical examiners, and the coroners face similar risks to these other employees.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

As I said in my remarks, it is a sad commentary on our society that the list of people who are being harassed for doing their job serving the public continues to grow. A lot of this comes from that.

**Chair Torres:**

I do want to state on the record, I look forward to working with the bill sponsor as well as the sponsors of every single bill in this session. There are other bills this session that will add teachers. I had a conversation earlier about adding social workers—all of these professions. We need to have a conversation about how we are working with confidentiality here in the state of Nevada, and what the burden of proof on the individual is, because I do not know that every peace officer needs to have their address confidential. I do not know that every national parks rep needs to have their address confidential, but there are definitely those who are threatened, and they should be able to access that.

We need to work on figuring out what that looks like and what makes sense because I do think this could overwhelm our county recorder's offices. In southern Nevada specifically, there are hundreds of these applications every single year. They require one full-time employee to do this job. This is another unfunded mandate we put out as a legislative body. We need to have a conversation about what that looks like to make sure they are not overwhelmed with these applications.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I would not disagree, but the initial bill is just the simple addition of the recorder's office, which this entire list is already in. It is the same list as in the assessor's office. It is just missing the peace officers.

**Chair Torres:**

Can you clarify what documents the county recorders would need to do if they did this for a worker? From my conversation with the county recorders, it is a pretty extensive list. It is not just a computer blocking this out. If every peace officer went in, or if 100 peace officers went in, what is the responsibility of the recorder's office, so they could eliminate the personal information?

**Jason Leshner:**

I do not think we would know exactly what that entails. I do know the assessor's office's information is much easier to redact. I am aware of that. I think if Ms. Work is here, she would be able to answer that better.

**Chair Torres:**

I know Ms. Work is probably on the phone. Ms. Work, obviously, we can prolong the amount of time you need to testify if you could help us answer that question of what it is the recorders have to do and about how long it takes for the workers. We have to be reasonable if we are adding additional expectations onto these workers. I do not think there are any other questions, though.

**Cadence Matijevich:**

In the context of that conversation, it is probably also appropriate for me to add—I know we are not talking about the fiscal policy of this bill—local governments were asked for fiscal notes on these. I think there is a workload that probably bears mentioning here, and that is at the courts. When these petitions come to the courts, our district court has indicated it takes about 30 to 45 minutes to process each one of them. To the degree that more individuals are added, peace officers already have that ability. They would just be adding the list of recorder's documents to that petition. In the case of our amendment, it would be a new group of employees who could be petitioning the courts, and there is a workload there.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you for your presentation. At this time, we will invite anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 96. [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 96?

**Annemarie Grant, Private Citizen, Quincy, Massachusetts:**

My brother, Thomas Purdy, was murdered by Reno police in the Washoe County Sheriff's Office. I am opposed to A.B. 96. As I recall, there was an attempt at this last session to allow police officers to make their property information private. Where is the data or cases of harassment or endangerment of police officers in Nevada? There is no data to show a need for the confidentiality of their property. It is just another way to put police on an

imaginary pedestal and further the unsupported idea that police officers are under attack by the community. The data shows it is actually the communities who are in danger from law enforcement. The peace officers' bill of rights in Nevada already provides unnecessary measures that stifle transparency and accountability from law enforcement in Nevada. There are 339 sworn officers with the Reno Police Department, 104 with the Sparks Police Department, and I do not know how many with the Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department. That would create an unnecessary burden because I am pretty sure every single one of them would try to hide their address. Please oppose this bill. I oppose this bill, and I think it is a terrible bill for you to pass.

**Chair Torres:**

Is anyone else wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 96? [There was no one.] Is anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 96? [There was no one.] Assemblywoman Dickman, any closing remarks?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

I am most grateful to you for taking the time to hear this bill. As for the amendment, if it overly complicates this bill, I leave that up to the discretion of the Committee. I am okay if we just go with the original bill—whatever you decide to do. Anyway, I thank you for your consideration. On behalf of those who serve, I ask for your positive consideration.

[[Exhibit G](#) and [Exhibit H](#) were submitted but not discussed and are included as exhibits for the hearing.]

**Chair Torres:**

At this time, we will close the hearing on A.B. 96. Wow, look how efficiently run this Committee is. It is 10 a.m., and we are already on to public comment.

[Public comment was heard.]

Any additional comments or remarks? [There were none.] Assemblyman McArthur, you look like you were eager to speak today. He did want everyone to know the pin he has is actually a gift I gave him from Washington, D.C., and he is very fond of it. That is why he wears it almost every day.

Fortunately, we were able to continue scheduling our Committee meetings mostly for 9 a.m. next week. I will give Committee members a heads-up that next Wednesday, March 8, we will be meeting at 8 a.m. For the rest of the week, though, I believe we will be able to steam ahead with 9 a.m. Committee hearings because this Committee just runs so much more efficiently than every other committee in this body. We will be back in this room on Monday at 9 a.m.

We will have a presentation from the Attorney General, and we will be hearing Assembly Bill 13 as well as Assembly Bill 52. Have a safe weekend. I saw there is an update of another winter snowstorm coming. This meeting is adjourned [at 10:03 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Lindsey Howell  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

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



## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed conceptual amendment to Assembly Bill 59, dated February 26, 2023, submitted by Mark Wlaschin, Deputy Secretary for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State.

[Exhibit D](#) is written testimony dated March 3, 2023, presented by Brian Harris, Voter Education Organizer, Battle Born Progress, in support of Assembly Bill 59.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter dated March 3, 2023, submitted by Amy Koo, Acting Deputy Director, One APIA Nevada, in support of Assembly Bill 59.

[Exhibit F](#) is a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill 96, presented by Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated March 3, 2023, submitted by Daniel Gordon, President, Nevada Police Union, in support of Assembly Bill 96.

[Exhibit H](#) is a letter submitted by John Abel, Director of Governmental Affairs, Las Vegas Police Protective Association, in support of Assembly Bill 96.