

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

**Eighty-second Session  
March 2, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 3:32 p.m. on Thursday, March 2, 2023, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E 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 Skip Daly, Vice Chair  
Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro  
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert  
Senator Lisa Krasner

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Nicolas Anthony, Policy Analyst  
Diane Rea, Committee Secretary

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Francisco Aguilar, Secretary of State  
Mark Wlaschin, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State  
Jamie Rodriguez, Registrar of Voters, Washoe County  
Amy Burgans, Clerk-Treasurer, Douglas County  
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices  
Annette Magnus, Executive Director, Battle Born Progress  
Jennifer Willett, All Voting Is Local, Nevada  
Janine Hansen, Independent American Party of Nevada  
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party  
Renee Rezentes  
Joy Trushenski  
Betsy Strasburg  
Richard Nagel

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections  
March 2, 2023  
Page 2

Karen Stephens  
Susan Proffitt, Nevada Republican Club  
Lisa Partee  
Richard Winger  
Doug Goodman, Founder and Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform  
Laura Hale  
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Al Rojas  
Paul Bodine  
Pauline Lee  
Cyrus Hojjaty  
Valerie White  
Tracey Thomas  
Bruce Parks, Chair, Washoe County Republican Party  
Bob Russo  
Adrienne O'Reilly

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We have three bills and will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 53.

**SENATE BILL 53**: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-411)

FRANCISCO AGUILAR (Secretary of State):

I am here to introduce S.B. 53. This bill proposes to change the dates for the filing for nonjudicial candidates to make it fall earlier in the calendar year. I am proposing an amendment (Exhibit C) to this bill which will change the filing period to align with the candidate filing period already in place for judicial candidates.

MARK WLASCHIN (Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State):

The reason for this proposed change is to reduce voter frustration and confusion that existing time lines create in relation to candidate withdrawals and challenges. Existing law provides the period for filing a declaration of candidacy for nonjudicial candidates begins on the first Monday in March and goes for two weeks until it ends at 5 p.m. on the second Friday.

Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 293.202, candidates have seven days after the last day of filing, excluding Saturdays, Sundays and holidays, to submit a written withdrawal of candidacy for office. Only after the

period of withdrawals has ended can an elector file a written challenge of the candidate on the grounds the person fails to meet a qualification required for the office pursuant to the Constitution or laws of the State. Those written challenges must be filed with the appropriate office where the candidacy was filed. In the case of multicounty or Statewide offices, the filing office is the Office of the Secretary of State.

When the Office receives a challenge, we immediately transmit it to the Office of the Attorney General. The Office of the Attorney General or county district attorney has five working days to determine if probable cause exists to support the challenge and then, if valid, petition the appropriate court to order the person to appear.

The NRS 293.182, subsection 4 states, "The court shall give priority to such proceedings over all other matters pending with the court, except for criminal proceedings."

We have noticed when these statutory time lines are strictly followed, there is not enough time for the county clerks and registrars to work with their ballot printing vendors to remove ineligible candidates from ballot, before the sample and mail ballots have been drafted, printed or sent.

It is important to note NRS 293.250, subsection 2, paragraph (a), requires "the Secretary of State shall prescribe with respect to the matter to be printed on every kind of ballot: The placement and listing of all offices, candidates and measures upon which voting is statewide, which must be uniform throughout the State."

That means if just one county cannot remove the candidate from the ballot, the candidate must remain on all county ballots. At that point, the only option is to inform the electorate of an ineligible candidate by posting signs in polling locations or an expensive postcard notification mailed to all active voters. This will confuse the voters, and State and county election officials would be inundated with questions asking why someone is disqualified but is still on the ballot.

During the 2022 election cycle, thousands of votes were cast but not counted for ineligible candidates who should not have been on the ballot.

When initially drafted, we intended to move the nonjudicial filing period only as far as necessary. Given the timing associated with the Presidential Preference Primary, which will occur in the first week of February 2024, the Secretary has recommended an amendment, [Exhibit C](#), to align the nonjudicial filing period with the judicial candidate filing period in January.

SENATOR DALY:

How many days before the primary in June do we have to print and mail out the ballots? You have the first 2 weeks in March, you have April and May, and you have 60 days or 30 days to mail out? How much time is there in between if everything is followed that the courts would have to do their duty on a priority basis?

MR. WLASCHIN:

One of the limiting factors is the requirement under federal law to send out a mail ballot to our military and overseas citizens which must be done no later than 45 days prior to the election. The counties will typically send out the ballot between the forty-fifth and fiftieth day.

The 2024 election primary cycle will be around mid-April 2024. When looking back to the 2022 election cycle, we had two candidates who were disqualified in mid- to late-April. By that point, it was already too late. It is a logistics problem.

The process to develop a ballot, get the proofs and work through those overseas mail ballots goes back to the beginning of April, which is part of the real issue for this conflict.

SENATOR DALY:

The courts are saying 15 days into April before they can get it done. They are supposed to give a priority. Fifteen days seems like plenty of time. Can we give a little higher priority or give us a little bit more time rather than moving back and adding two months to the election cycle?

There are a variety of things that go into a candidate's recruitment. Moving two weeks or two months back is overkill.

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

We need to have a conversation about those suggestions and work with you further on defining what the suggestions are.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

If S.B. 53 passes with the proposed amendment for independent candidates who need to circulate a petition, they would need to start gathering those signatures to have them ready for filing the petition in January, so they need to start earlier in terms of trying to get the petition signatures needed.

MR. WLASCHIN:

When first filed for candidacy, the independent candidates hand in the applications and notify us of their intent to file. That is when they turn in the blank paperwork and is the starting point for them to gather signatures. That period would extend a little bit for the independent candidates. Their deadline is still later in the election cycle.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Candidates do not have to have all the signatures by the date of the judicial filing?

MR. WLASCHIN:

That is correct.

JAMIE RODRIGUEZ (Registrar of Voters, Washoe County):

I support S.B. 53 with the proposed amendment. The Secretary of State's Office went through the time line. We really must have everything approved, finalized and ready for the printers by end of March to the first week of April.

For us to meet those deadlines and for the military and overseas ballots to be able to go out at the end of April, the ballots must be approved, completed and ready to be printed. That is why we are asking to do one candidate filing instead of having to split it up. It was a discussion among the counties and the Secretary of State's Office.

AMY BURGANS (Clerk-Treasurer, Douglas County):

I want to echo what Ms. Rodriguez said. As Clerk-Treasurer, I really appreciate the support the Secretary of State's Office gives us. All the proposed bills the Office is bringing forward have been discussed with the counties in our

biweekly meetings. We gave the group our input. That is where this amendment came from. We are in full support of the amendment for the additional time mail ballots would be given in the State. We must have everything to the printer so early to get ballots to the out-of-state people within 45 days and 30 days before the election.

The additional time is incredibly helpful to get the information needed on the ballot and to make sure it is accurate, time to proof the ballots, and give our printing vendor the ballots in enough time to get everything done. Every single person in every county is going to get a mail ballot. That is a lot of ballots and a lot of jurisdictions for the vendors to have to support.

EMILY PERSAUD-ZAMORA (Executive Director, Silver State Voices):

I support S.B. 53. Moving up the filing deadline for nonjudicial candidates ensures the city and county clerks have adequate time to process candidates' applications. This minor change may seem insignificant, but when looking at it in a combination with the dates of a primary election, it is an important change.

With respect to the petitions filed to the Secretary of State's Office, the changes are equally important, especially given the Secretary of State's Office supervises all State and local elections, including ensuring the effective absentee system for election is available 45 days before an election. This bill helps streamline the election process and ensures all candidates have a fair and timely opportunity to participate in our democracy.

ANNETTE MAGNUS (Executive Director, Battle Born Progress):

We are in support of S.B. 53 as noted in my written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)), paragraph one.

JENNIFER WILLETT (All Voting Is Local, Nevada):

I support S.B. 53 as noted in paragraph one of my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).

JANINE HANSEN (Independent American Party of Nevada):

This bill makes it completely impossible for us to have any candidates. The State law requires minor parties to have a state convention before any of those candidates can file for office and turn the names into the Secretary of State. This makes us have a state convention at Christmas, New Year's Day or Thanksgiving. It makes it impossible for us to have a doable convention. It would be hard enough if it were moved up to February to try to have a state

convention, which is our largest event and where we choose our candidates, our party and our party officers. There is no way we can have a state convention in the middle of December to choose our candidates. It also increases the time we have for campaigns, which increases the costs for everybody and the time our families are coping with campaigns.

It is a negative not just for the Independent American Party or any other minor party but for all parties and all candidates. Things have worked well so far. We have done it for many years with these deadlines. If there are one or two candidates who do not or are unable to be processed through the judicial process, that needs to be looked at. This makes it impossible for minor parties to participate in the process because there is no way to have a convention in the middle of December.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Treasurer, Independent American Party):

When the bill came out, I thought, how many times do we have to keep going through this? We keep producing the same problem; let us move this back, do this and that. It hurts the minor parties.

We have our convention in February. We get our names in by the first week of March, and it works. I would ask you to help us as a minor party to leave things the way they are and not make it difficult for all of us who want to participate.

RENEE REZENTES:

I am a Washoe County resident. I oppose S.B. 53 for the same reasons these ladies mentioned, but I am also concerned about the candidates who are filing to run their races. Is this going to extend the amount of time they need to advertise and fundraise? Is it going to be a burden on them? Especially if they do not have the money to advertise for an extra month, is it fair for those candidates?

JOY TRUSHENSKI:

I oppose S.B. 53. This bill makes the campaign season another month longer. It is already too long. I would like to see the time reduced or kept the same. I support these ladies 100 percent.

BEPSY STRASBURG:

I support the previous speakers in opposition to the S.B. 53. Part of the grassroots efforts is to source candidates, and this would cut back the time

available for us by two months. I am sure we can come up with a compromise that will help the clerks, recorders and the processes they need to go through. I support we negotiate and figure out a compromise, so our efforts are not compromised by acceleration of the deadlines.

RICHARD NAGEL:

I oppose the bill on the grounds of fairness because we really tried to source candidates for the last election. Getting people to stand up for school board and for other slots available and uncontested was difficult. We were down to the last minute when we got someone to file for the Board of Supervisors in Carson City. It does not do us any favors in this aspect to get candidates, and we are trying to get good candidates.

KAREN STEPHENS:

I oppose this bill, having helped candidates running for office and knocking on doors, this really is a burden for them. I agree with the past speakers who are in opposition.

SUSAN PROFFITT (Director, Nevada Republican Club):

I oppose S.B. 53 because it appears it is going to put a burden on the candidates and increase costs. The only parties this will help are the two major parties, and I am not for that. I am a Republican, but I think we should be fair and transparent and give everybody in our communities an opportunity to run for office and have his or her voice heard. I would ask the Secretary of State to think in terms of how to save tax dollars so we can put them where they need to be: schools, mental health and a few other places like security.

LISA PARTEE:

I just want to say ditto. I agree with all the opposition reasons behind everything. It all sounds smart to me. I do not think we need to make any changes. It sounds like this is being extended because of the mail-in ballots that have been instituted over the last couple of years.

RICHARD WINGER:

I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)) in opposition to S.B. 53.

MR. WLASCHIN:

We appreciate all the feedback both for and against. The Office is open to continue dialogue about this challenge. We received feedback from our clerks



and registrars across the State. When we look closely at it, we identify that it would be a cost saving for taxpayers. It comes down to the voters. We are not trying to inconvenience anyone or add to the amount of work the candidates must do. The reality is there were 1,231 candidates who filed during the 2022 election cycle and 1.8 million voters received the ballot. Many were confused by the presence of names of candidates who were disqualified. That is what led to this bill.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 53 and open the hearing on S.B. 54.

**SENATE BILL 54**: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-409)

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

I am here to introduce S.B. 54. This bill proposes the creation of an elections procedures manual (EPM) and a required county and city clerk training program.

MR. WLASCHIN:

The bill proposes a significant amount of new work for the Elections Division of the Office of the Secretary of State. We are good with that because it hopes to address a significant challenge which has existed for the last two years and will continue for at least the next decade.

The challenge is how to educate and train new county or city election officials in the tasks they must conduct in perfect compliance with federal and State laws as well as regulations.

The education and training must be done as rapidly as possible yet leave the clerks with the knowledge and tools needed to conduct an election almost immediately.

The EPM will be revised on a biennial basis and reviewed by the Office of the Attorney General prior to approval to ensure compliance with existing law.

Revisions of the manual may be more frequent, if required, with updates issued as the technical and procedural aspects of our elections administration continue to be refined, particularly in its first years of existence.

An improvement such as the transition to a top-down voter registration system, as intended before the June 2024 primary, would necessitate enough updates to warrant the publication of a new version.

Once created, the EPM will function as the textbook for the second part of S.B. 54, a mandatory county and city clerk training program. The training program will be conducted annually with attendance being required for county and city election officials, but it will be open and optional for other county and city staff members to attend.

There will also be a makeup training period so appointees who fill vacancies of county or city election official positions or fresh staff members will not have to wait for two years to attend a training session.

We originally intended to define the windows of time when the training sessions would occur. The Secretary has recommended an amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) to remove the specific dates to build flexibility.

SENATOR DALY:

You said you have revisions. It is going to be better if you go through the regulatory process because the Attorney General is going to review it for compliance with the legal authority. Section 2, subsection 4, would still cover you because nothing in this section authorizes the Secretary of State to include any provision in an elections procedures manual that amends or conflicts with any provision of State or federal law.

The regulation process is preferred being in the Legislative Branch. Then we would see it more often. It is good to get consistency. You have many new clerks. To make sure they are interpreting laws in the same way and everybody is on the same page, you identify laws that are ambiguous. You can change those by trying to add as much as you can into statute. There is less vagueness or opportunity for people to say that is not covered.

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

Yes, regulation obviously provides us the strongest format but given where we are from a talent perspective within the election professionals, we must be ready and prepared to deal with the change in talent. Given the fact that we are now putting elections at the forefront of a lot of our discussions, we need to make sure we have consistency throughout 17 counties. Deputy Wlaschin has

done a phenomenal job working with our 17 clerks and representatives of elections throughout the State to ensure we are all driving from the same playbook. We see this as a playbook to give somebody like me, who is new to this and been in this business for two months, the opportunity to understand what the rules are, what the role is and to be more equipped to be able to deal with the situations that come up in elections every single day.

SENATOR DALY:

I agree, and I have complete confidence if you are the Secretary of State.

SENATOR KRASNER:

My question is in section 2, subsection 1, where the bill talks about the Secretary of State preparing and maintaining the elections manual. It goes on to say each county and city clerk is required to comply with the procedures set forth in the most current version of the EPM. I know in our last election, we had some counties that had voted to count their ballots manually. Would this prohibit them from doing so in the future?

MR. WLASCHIN:

The point about the elections procedures not being able to conflict with or create a new statutory requirement speaks to your question. It would carry the weight of regulation but not create new statutes, new requirements or limitations that do not exist in the statutes this Body makes. It would be a means to provide clarity to the process without adding or attempting to fill in gaps which should be filled if they exist through statutes.

SENATOR KRASNER:

Would it prevent the counties who want to hand count the ballots from doing so?

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

The manual must comply with State law, and the State law says we would have to make sure that is the rule. If the Legislature does not have a ruling on that issue, we would go into regulation of the Secretary of State's Office. If the Legislature determined it did not allow hand counting, we could not supersede that law and we must follow the Legislature's guide. The Legislature would set the law and the manual would follow that law. If we produced the procedure that is not in State law, we could not conflict with the Legislature.

MR. WLASCHIN:

The answer is no. There is no law prohibiting the use of hand counts.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

I was going to ask you about the training. I know you said it is not necessarily a certain date, but it does say annually. We have clerks who have been doing this for a long time. Are you going to require every clerk to go annually? Is there a way some of the forms we fill out must be trained for only once? Is this still required for everyone every year?

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

I would say yes because those clerks who are experienced and have the background are beneficial to the new clerks who are coming into the process. To be able to have a place where you can have a dialogue about issues or present challenges is phenomenal. After being elected, the previous Secretary of State, Barbara Cegavske, had a conference with all the clerks in December. It is easier to get all the clerks together and have a conversation if you make it mandatory, given the politics in their local communities. Giving them the opportunity to have a conversation about what the future looks like is phenomenal.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Putting things in statute is a little tricky.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Section 2, subsection 1 says the Secretary of State shall biennially prepare, maintain and publish an elections procedures manual. If there was some big technological change or something happened and you needed to update this manual quicker than biennially, do you think this language would give the Secretary's Office that flexibility if you had to? I think the language should be "at least biennially prepared."

MR. WLASCHIN:

Yes, I do think that. We are certainly open for discussion or review of the language. I agree there will be changes. The transition of the top-down that Secretary Aguilar does not intend to have in place before June 2024 is a great example. If we publish one on January 1, 2024, by the time the transition to a top-down system is completed, we would need to update the manual and not

just wait for two years. We are open to making sure the language allows for those updates in a more periodic manner.

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

Going back to the question about whether hand counting is not in statute, where it is in law or if it does not exist: When one county determined it wanted to move forward with hand counting, the Secretary of State, because statute was silent, then propagated regulations to be able to deal with hand counting. It would go through the regulation process of the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC). Then counties would have to follow the NAC which provides a pathway from statute into the NAC to the Secretary of State's Office. This is the process which says, these are the regulations we are putting in place. There is a hearing process, and then it is submitted to the Legislative Commission within Legislative Counsel Bureau for approval, and then it goes into the NAC, which the county would have to follow.

MS. BURGANS:

I was appointed in December 2020, right after the 2020 election, which we know was slightly contentious. Within a short time, I lost all my staff who had worked in the elections department. I came in as the Clerk-Treasurer, which means I had the Clerk's department, Treasurer's department and elections to oversee. The way to get information on elections was limited. I had the State law. I understand law, but State law can be interpreted many different ways. To have an elections manual, something that is accessible for all the new clerks when they come in, for registrars to follow and know what the State requires, would have been beneficial when I was appointed. I support S.B. 54. The Secretary of State's Office has spoken with the clerks and registrars about this prior to bringing it forward, and we are in support.

DOUG GOODMAN (Founder and Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform): For any function to run smoothly and consistently requires standard procedures. We all know there is an almost universal desire to ensure elections are run efficiently and effectively. To do this, it is critical to have uniform processes and training of those responsible for implementing and conducting the process. The passage and funding of top-down is an example of why standard procedures are so important. Passage of this bill will also ensure Nevada maintains its high rankings every four years in the surveys of election administrations. In 2016, Nevada ranked fifth and in 2020 ranked fifteenth. Having set procedures will ensure we keep our high rating in the survey.

MS. MAGNUS:

Battle Born Progress supports S.B. 54 which I noted in paragraph two of my written statement, [Exhibit D](#).

MS. RODRIGUEZ:

We have had multiple conversations with the Secretary of State's Office on S.B. 54. I was lucky when I took over the Registrar of Voters Office in Washoe County. I had a working relationship with the Secretary of State's Office and with other clerks across the State. It was easy for me to reach out and ask questions because we do not have this type of material. It would be beneficial for new people to have this information readily available.

Senator Seevers Gansert, I understand the concern about people continuing to come to these trainings. At the frequency by which election laws are changing, those refreshers of changes are beneficial to the State so we are all clear on what those changes are. I know there was confusion in our department about some laws that have been passed and what the final versions were. It is helpful to have the sitting election managers and operation individuals do these trainings regularly.

MS. WILLET:

I have submitted the All Voting Is Local Nevada statement, [Exhibit E](#), paragraph 2, in support of S.B. 54.

MS. PERSAUD-ZAMORA:

Silver State Voices support the requirement of having the Secretary of State's Office prepare and maintain an EPM every two years instead of every ten years. In a Joint Legislative Operations and Elections Committee meeting last month, the Secretary of State's Office presented concerning statistics. Only 7 of Nevada's 17 clerks were in office during the 2020 election. This loss of institutional knowledge is unfortunate and underscores the importance of having clerks and registrars attend a training every year instead of every ten years. The manual will not only benefit city and county clerks but also Nevada voters since it will be accessible to the public. This manual will provide an additional opportunity for Nevadans to understand and follow our election process. The manual can help prevent misinformation and confusion about Nevada's elections. By implementing this provision, we can help guarantee all city and county clerks receive adequate training and are equipped with the necessary knowledge and resources to perform their duties effectively.

LAURA HALE:

I support S.B. 54. I have presented my written statement ([Exhibit H](#)).

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

We support S.B. 54. We have made great strides in expanding access to voting over the past few years, but much of this information is still new and being learned. Having an elections manual that is updated frequently will better educate our election officials and make clear the process and procedures everyone needs to follow.

MS. HANSEN:

The Independent American Party of Nevada only opposes one section of this bill. We think a manual from the Secretary of State's Office is a good idea and of course training goes along with that. Our concern is in section 4, the same concern as that of Senator Daly. This exempts the EPM from the requirements of the Administrative Procedure Act relating to the adoption. I have participated in some hearings on changes with the Secretary of State's regulations. There was one during the 2020 COVID-19 time. It was helpful to be able to go over those elections. It made people feel more secure about what was happening with the Secretary of State's regulations. It is a good process to invite the public to look at these things. We have a great Secretary of State, but he is not perfect, and someone might notice needed improvements through the public hearings. I am in favor of a continued process of any regulations by the Secretary of State by going through the procedures manual in public hearings.

MS. CHAPMAN:

I want to reiterate keeping the process available to the people. People want to get involved and to vote. Having meetings open to the public where people can be part of the process is important. I thank and agree with Senator Daly on his comments about regulations.

MR. NAGEL:

This manual is mandatory following the surrender of the autonomy of each county to control the elections. I really do not think it is wise to make everybody responsible. I think training should be available, and to understand the law is a good thing. To make it mandatory for uniformity with everybody else and lose our ability to control our own elections in our own county brings a lot of questions to mind. It really does not seem like it is going to be an equal method, and if we surrender our control to the State, the State becomes a total

power. It is in the wrong direction. I have worked as an election worker in Carson City for two elections. The people who worked there are fair, and everything was done by the book. They really worked hard. Everybody tried to do a good job, and we respected that. I do not understand why we need to steer away from the autonomy we have and surrender to the State.

MS. REZENTES:

This needs to have a public hearing. We need to be able to find out what is in the manual. We do need a manual and something to follow, but we need transparency. I worked as a poll watcher at three polls in the primary and helped in the registrar of voters (ROV) office as a poll observer. Things happened we tried to address, but we did not have answers.

I have a vested interest. I did speak to the Deputy of Elections face to face after a meeting, and he said we do not get to pick and choose the statutes we are going to follow. I went to four polling places that were all handling the surrender ballots differently. When I spoke to him about that, he said there is no *Nevada Revised Statutes* that applies, although I was carrying it with me the whole time.

MS. TRUSHENSKI:

I say no to S.B. 54, which would allow the Secretary of State to control all elections in Nevada with no oversight. The rural counties are not like Clark County. I oppose one person of any party controlling the Nevada elections. This is dangerous to our citizens and our freedoms. It puts too much power in one person and takes away the checks and balances in our elections. Our elections are compromised with mail-in ballots and the use of voting machines which could be hacked. I was happy to see Nye and Esmeralda Counties go to paper ballots in the 2022 midterms. I do not believe they could do this again if S.B. 54 passes. I do not trust some of our public officials since they do not hold my values. I do not trust the new Secretary of State as I believe this bill from him is a grab for power. There is no detailed script as to what exactly will be in the manuscript. It will be all unified, and all counties are different.

MS. STRASBURG:

I was a management executive for over 30 years, so I know training and manuals are good. The manual should be used as a reference, not be mandatory. We have an elected clerk-recorder in Carson City. We want our



clerk to hear us while keeping to the statutes. If the clerk has a question or the clerk-recorder has a question, he or she can reach out to the Secretary of State. The hearing on the manual counting procedures brought a lot of good ideas for implementation. I was at that hearing. A top-down manual would not promote the good ideas. One point of view and one way of doing things is not always a good thing. It may bring a false sense of security.

MS. STEPHENS:

I oppose S.B. 54. Having retired from the Nevada Department of Education, I totally concur we do need standard procedures, but I am wondering why there was not one before? Why are we coming up with one now and trying to make it a law? We need to stay in the regulation process and allow for public hearings for input before anything is put in stone.

MS. PROFFITT:

I have some expertise on this bill. I want to let our new Secretary of State know I would be happy to be available to him for any questions and help him figure out why he might need to tweak this bill a bit and resubmit it. We cannot have this go through the way it is. One reason is there is no transparency. The Secretary of State's Office goes out of its way to keep us from being able to see anything at the registrar of voters and is abusive as the other ladies have said.

There is a manual, but it does not cover everything. It gives a nice picture of what is going on, but it does not really tell you what is going on. I can tell you from firsthand experience the manual they have is insufficient. I have already made another one. If the Secretary of State would like to review what I have already done for Clark County, he is welcome to have a copy of it. We use it for training for our observers, and I would really appreciate it if he would be a bit more proactive with the community because we really do not feel our voices are being heard.

AL ROJAS:

I live in Assembly District 12 and Senate District 21, and I am all for more transparency. I went down one time when there was a request to do the recount. Nobody really explained to us what was going on. They just sat down and watched.

MS. PARTEE:

We are all new at a job at some time and most jobs do have desk manuals for training and consistency. The Secretary of State's Office does have just that. I feel public hearings and not being transparent when so many of us have zero confidence in our elections is wrong. If you avoid public hearings and regulations, that puts you in a bad light. The counties each have their own rules and regulations of how they want to do things. If some counties want a hand count, they can hand count. If some do not want machines, they do not need the machines. A lot of us do not trust anything that has been taking place since 2020 and before in the elections. I am going to say I do not trust this at all.

PAUL BODINE:

The manuals are good. Anybody who has tried to roll out consistent procedures over several particularly complicated processes like our elections understands consistency is good. To a certain extent I agree with those who are concerned with taking autonomy away from the counties. There is a reason why we have county governments. They do not have the same issues across the board. I think there must be some areas for input from the local elected officials.

The bill removes the requirement for a public hearing on the election regulations. It does not provide for input from local election officials. If that is true, why are those requirements and ability for local input being removed?

PAULINE LEE:

Senate Bill 54 provides a standardization of election procedures which I appreciate, and I do support. The one thing I am concerned about, and I would like the Committee to consider, is to have provisions that would not only increase transparency but more importantly educate. It is important to educate our population as to what these procedures are so we all know what they are. There would be no conflict in the future if there is transparency also and an opportunity for citizens to respond directly to certain standards. I support this bill only to the extent that we can get more from the population as to what those procedures will look like.

CYRUS HOJJATY:

I would like to ditto the comments and viewpoints that everybody else just made. I will admit there are bright spots to this bill. Hopefully, there can be at least a few changes made to it.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections  
March 2, 2023  
Page 19

VALERIE WHITE:

My written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)) was submitted in opposition to S.B. 54.

TRACEY THOMAS:

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit J](#)) which includes several NRS provisions.

MS. PROFFITT:

The Nevada Republican Club wants one thing fixed. We want transparency and the community involved.

BRUCE PARKS (Chair, Washoe County Republican Party):

I submitted written testimony ([Exhibit K](#)) in opposition to S.B. 54.

MR. WLASCHIN:

I appreciate the feedback, and the office will continue to be open for discussion. I do want to reiterate this will be a public document. In the rough draft version, page 1 identifies how we receive public feedback. We will discuss this with the city and county election officials. We want to make sure the procedures accurately reflect the regulatory processes we mentioned and will continue in a public manner because there is a lot of merit.

The mandated training and manual will contribute to standardization and consistency across the State and counties. Having a public document like this will benefit all of us, the entirety of the electorate and election officials as well.

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

We are willing and open for discussions to figure out the best interest of the public. Transparency is our No. 1 priority.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am closing the hearing on S.B. 54. We have two bill draft requests (BDR).

**BILL DRAFT REQUEST 24-363:** Revises provisions relating to mechanical voting machines and mechanical recording devices. (Later introduced as Senate Bill 215.)

**BILL DRAFT REQUEST 24-364:** Establishes provisions relating to elections. (Later introduced as [Senate Bill 216](#).)

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR 24-363 AND BDR 24-364.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\* \* \* \* \*

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:

I have a point of order and want to address it to this Committee. I appreciate everyone's public dialogue; however, public dialogue that crosses the line into disparaging individuals who have appeared before this Committee or elected officials or any person is not appropriate for the Committee or for any Senate Committee. Ad hominem attacks are not appropriate. Moving forward, public comment must be restrained to the bill itself. It goes against the Committee rules, Senate rules and just proper decorum. It is also inappropriate to make outlandish and false representations on the record before this Committee as well. This is a Committee where you cannot just appear and make false representations. We have rules in this Committee and in this Body for a reason.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 60.

**SENATE BILL 60**: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-412)

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

This bill proposes several changes to Title 24, which is the collective name for the nine chapters of State law that cover the conduct of our elections. These proposed changes are not significant shifts in policy but are changes to various statutes to make them align more cleanly with recently implemented laws.

I proposed a series of amendments ([Exhibit L](#)), one of which proposes to remove one of the original provisions. Sections 6 and 10 of this bill provide that the mail ballot central counting board must complete the count on or before the ninth day following the election, instead of on or before the seventh day. The intent of this proposed change is to allow the counting of mail ballots returned

to county election officials after the seventh day but before the canvass by the county commissioners.

In the last two election cycles, 15 to 20 ballots fell into this category during each election. This effort to ensure all legally cast ballots could be counted will not work given the other statutory deadlines. I have proposed an amendment to remove these sections from the bill.

MR. WLASCHIN:

The cleanup bill before you proposes several changes. Law provides the test of the declaration of candidacy for partisan offices, but it does not apply to an independent candidate as it has a specific line setting the candidate's party affiliation.

Section 1 of the bill creates a declaration of candidacy for an independent candidate for partisan office which omits any reference to a political party. Existing law allows the payment of a candidate filing fee to be done by cash, cashier's check or certified check only. Section 2 allows the fees to be paid by credit card, if that option exists at the filing office. It would not require filing officers to accept credit card payments but whether they are able to accept that form of payment.

Sections 4, 8 and 12 through 17 provide purposes of determining most of the votes cast in a primary election for an office where voters may select more than one candidate. Each ballot marked with a valid choice for one or more candidates for that office shall be determined to be one vote cast in the primary election.

This situation came up during the 2022 election cycle. Existing law allows that if one candidate received 50 percent plus one vote during the primary election, that candidate is declared elected and will not appear on the general election ballot. With voters being able to pick up to three candidates on a race, it was not clear as to how to determine if anyone had received 50 percent plus one of the votes. This proposed change will address that confusion.

Existing law provides every ballot with the names of candidates for any Statewide office or for President or Vice President of the United States must contain an additional line in which the voter may select "None of these candidates."

The statute specifically says the line must have a square next to it, where we have used ovals or circles on our ballots for years. Section 5 of the bill proposes to change the word “square” to the word “space” for uniformity.

Section 7 requires the Secretary of State to adopt by regulation a cyber-incident response plan specifically for elections. It also requires a county or city clerk or other election official to notify the Secretary of State of any cyber incident or attempted cyber incident in accordance with the cyber-incident response plan. In NRS 293.875 is the requirement for immediate notification of any cyberattack or attempted cyberattack. The development of this cyber-incident response plan will provide additional clarity for election officials as to what needs to be reported and when.

Section 9 requires a withdrawal of candidacy by a candidate for a city office to be presented within seven days, as opposed to the current time line of within two days. This change will make the withdrawal period for candidates for city office consistent with the requirement for all other candidates.

Section 11 revises the definition of “uniformed-service voter” to include a member of the active or reserve components of our newest branch of the U.S. military, the Space Force of the United States.

Section 19 proposes to repeal certain outdated provisions. First, NRS 293.365 and NRS 293C.365 which require no counting board in any precinct, district or polling place where paper ballots are used may commence to count the votes until all ballots used or unused are accounted for. The legislative intent of the statute from 1960 was to ensure if 200 paper ballots were issued, they would first get verification of all 200 ballots before starting the tabulation. With mechanical voting devices and mail ballots, this statute is no longer applicable.

Second, NRS 293.423 states, “At the hearing of any contest, the ballots may be opened and a recount made, in the presence of the parties or their representatives, of the votes cast for the various candidates for the contested office.” Other statutes in place describe the process for the recount and an election contest, that allows for the complexity of how elections are administered nowadays. It would not be possible to “open ballots” and conduct a recount during a court hearing of an election contest, especially since NRS 293.404, subsection 3 requires during a recount, “All ballots must be

recounted in the same manner in which the ballots were originally tabulated” which means the use of mechanical tabulators.

Third, NRS 293.567 requires the county clerk to transmit the number of registered voters in the county and their political affiliations to the Office of the Secretary of State before certain elections. The intent was to have a final number of registered voters in each county before Election Day.

With same day voter registration, the actual voter turnout and number of registered voters continues to change up to the close of polls on Election Day. This information is important to both county and State election administrators, and we continue to get it to determine the percentage of voter turnout.

This statute requires information to be compiled and sent no later than four days before Election Day, so it is not an accurate depiction of our registered voters and is inaccurate upon submission as other voters continue to register up to the close of polls.

There are seven additional proposed amendments to the bill that were identified during and after the 2022 election cycle.

The first is a minor adjustment to improve our list maintenance process which would allow a clerk or registrar to update a voter’s registration using information received through the National Change of Address program. This program is allowed by NRS 293.5307 and requires a notice to be sent to and confirmed by the voter before the change can be implemented. This would give the clerks and registrars the option to implement the change and send a notice to the voter.

Next is the inclusion of “special elections” into the statute in NRS 294A which covers the campaign contribution limit. The primary, general and special elections recall are addressed in NRS 294A.100 but not special elections to fill a vacancy. This proposes to address that omission.

Two proposed changes are related to risk-limiting audits (RLA); the first is a change in the time line to ensure there is time to do a RLA properly. The proposed change will still enable the results of the RLA to inform an election challenge under the statutory time lines. The second proposed amendment is an allowance in NRS 293.391 to clarify in conducting an RLA that clerks and

registrars are authorized to use voted ballots and other records which otherwise would be secured in the vault of the clerk.

The fifth proposed amendment is a clarification of the filing fees to make them more understandable. The only new fee proposed on the list clarifies that all Presidential candidates must pay the filing fee of \$250. In NRS 298.109, it is only requiring independent candidates for the office of President of the U.S. to pay the \$250 fee. This change will standardize the fee for all candidates.

The sixth amendment will enhance our security against threats to our election infrastructure, proposing to make NRS 293.755 more inclusive. The only crime is to tamper, interfere with or attempt to tamper with or interfere with a program or machine used to count ballots. This change would expand it to cover all programs and systems used in the conduct of an election, such as voter roll databases, election management systems and check-in kiosks, which are all critical to the process.

The final proposal relates to the recent passage of the Electoral Count Reform and Presidential Transition Improvement Act of 2022, referred to as the ECRA, which was part of an omnibus appropriation bill passed in the last days of the 117th Congress. There are numerous changes in the ECRA, but an analysis conducted by the Elections Division, in conjunction with our Deputy Attorney General, identified two significant changes which make up this recommendation. The first is to clarify who will submit the certificate of ascertainment. Existing State law suggests but does not specify that the Secretary of State will do that. This has been our historic precedent and should be clear in statute.

The second proposal relates to the new time lines under the ECRA for the selection of presidential electors. The current time lines for canvass, recount and contest do not line up with what is now required by the ECRA for the selection of the presidential electors.

In 2024, we must certify our presidential electors under the new requirements of the ECRA by December 11, 2024, but we could still be conducting a recount or challenge, which under existing law could extend through the end of December. The difference in the time lines must be reconciled or we risk a significant issue after each presidential election.



SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

You can see how nuanced and detail-oriented these proposed changes are. This reflects our desire as election administrators to ensure the law is kept accurate and clean to the benefit of our candidates, those of us who administer elections and the public who are increasingly reading and reviewing our statutes in order to understand our processes.

SENATOR KRASNER:

I have questions from citizens who ask for clarification. Section 19 repeals NRS 293.365, 293.423, 293.567 and 293C.365. The concern is there will not be the ability to recount ballots if somebody wants to contest an election.

MR. WLASCHIN:

Recount and contest processes will continue. This simply clarifies that the ability during a contest to conduct a recount in front of a body is simply not possible given the way elections are administered now. But the recount and challenge processes are important to the electoral process and will continue.

SENATOR DALY:

Section 2 regarding the credit cards is quite a process. There is an extra fee charged. Are candidates going to be responsible for that fee rather than the local government?

If people pay with a credit card, someone might say until we receive the money, we are not putting you on the ballot. Pay cash if you want to be sure. Right?

In section 4, section 8 and sections 12 through 17 regarding the vote count, you have in the city charters where there are multiple candidates. When I read the way it is written, it says it counts as one vote if a person voted for one or more valid votes. It is a vote if you voted for one when you could have voted for three. If you vote for two and could have voted for three, it is a vote. If you vote for three out of three, is that going to count as a vote?

The person could say I voted for one or more, but I overvoted, which then would be a no vote if I voted for four and I was only allowed three. That needs to be clarified.

In all those sections it reads the same and is not clear to me on an overvote. Is it a vote or is it not a vote? A person could come back and argue the technicality saying he or she voted for one or more and you said it would count. The next question goes to the amendment. You are going to amend NRS 293.394, subsection 2, where you remove this prior to certification. Can you explain to me why I read there is a risk audit required? You would do it prior to certification. Why would we want to remove "prior to certification" when the reason for the audit is to reduce the risk where you would certify an incorrect account?

MR. WLASCHIN:

We started doing the risk-limiting audit pilots in 2020. We have done them every election since Statewide and locally to get the practice. One of the biggest themes we saw was these are extremely time-intensive and are what led to this amendment.

The audits are valuable in validating the results of the election. But to squeeze the audits into the time lines we have given plus the other requirements—four days to accept ballots, two more days for signature curing for provisional comparisons—and the clerks and registrars are working on the paperwork for the board of county commissioners, they will not have enough time to do it, recognizing the entirety of the process includes the challenge period. If there is an issue that comes up during a risk-limiting audit at any point, either it was during the period after Election Day, up to the canvass or in the days following it, the process would still enable a challenge. It does not negate the purpose behind it. In fact, it is still valid. It shifts when it becomes more applicable.

SENATOR DALY:

You are saying the certification is different than the canvass and the canvass is the last step; or is the certification and canvass the same thing? After the certification but before the canvass is there still a challenge within that? Do you think you can do this in that period?

How many of these risk audits had shown a wrong account was certified?

MR. WLASCHIN:

No issues have come out of our risk-limiting audits outside of procedural issues where we messed up something as part of the pilots, which is the intent, the learning process. The audits have come back clean. The county commissioners

canvass is the final step in the process. There are several other postelection audits and reviews we do. This would be one of those where we closely scrutinize attempts to vote twice and other things going past the election, in many cases, for months after. One would be done the week after the canvass.

SENATOR DALY:

The intent would be to try to meet the time line in any event. You would try to, but if you did not, you would have this risk audit before the canvass was done. Is that going to happen before the final step?

MR. WLASCHIN:

The goal would be yes. It may not be before the county canvass for a general election. It would be before the Supreme Court canvass. That would be the intent.

SENATOR DALY:

In the amendment on NRS 293.755, subsection 1, after the word election, it appears that you left out the word "with." It should say "with the intent." There is a word missing.

On the Electoral Count Act of 1887, I would ask you to follow up with me just so I am clear.

SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT:

Looking at sections 6 and 10, when you are moving the date required to count all the ballots from seven days to nine days, many voters were frustrated over the last election cycle because we were the last to report due to the lag. Have you considered changing the postmark date, the last day of early voting instead of the last day of the election, so we can get the mail-in ballots earlier and do not have to keep moving things out?

Before we had the last election, the clerks had put on record they were going to have a hard time meeting these deadlines because you do not know exactly when mail is going to be delivered. People are so frustrated, and that is part of the reason people start questioning the results of the election. It is dragged out so long because of the lag and count.

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

I know there is some discussion in this Body about a determination which needs to take place. The Secretary of State's Office will implement and follow any law that comes out of that discussion. The conversation in this situation is heard from the clerks about capacity and the ability to count ballots by election night. We are going through the data on hand to determine if this is an issue of the date when the postmark is on the ballot. Or was it the ability of the counties to count ballots by election night?

Six percent of ballots were received after the day of election. We had 94 percent of the ballots in hand on election night. It was the inability to process all those ballots. We need to look at what the counties' processes and systems are, as well as what their capacity is to count ballots by election night.

The number of ballots received in Washoe County after Election Day was 3 percent, so we had 97 percent of the ballots in hand on Election Day. It was the ability to count those ballots. We need to work with our clerks to understand how to increase capacity so we can call elections on election night.

MS. RODRIGUEZ:

I appreciate the intention by deletion of the extra days in sections 9 and 10. I understand your point, Senator Daly, about the risk-limiting audit. I want to go through quickly what happens in terms of our time line.

The processes in Washoe County after the election is we have until the sixth day to cure ballots. This means on the seventh day after the election, we are finalizing pulling those cured ballots to ensure we can count them or whether they must be duplicated; which can be counted to finish getting our reports to the Secretary of State's Office; and what ballots have been counted so we can determine which provisional votes can be counted once we get those clear. That is Day eight, which means I have Day nine to have my certification board come in, certify my voter verification (VV) patrols and certify the machines again to ensure that nothing happened with the counting machines for the ballots—all for me to bring it to the County Commission on the tenth day for a canvass.

That is why we have been doing the risk-limiting audit after the election. The certification board for Washoe County, because of the volume we have, does take an entire day. It is a good nine-hour day for the certification board to go

through to confirm the VV paper audit trail rolls are all accounted for and correctly counted against what is on the roll versus what was counted in the system. The risk-limiting audit is also an entire day. There is no time in that ten-day period for it to get to the canvass and be able to do the certification and the risk-limiting audit. That is why it has been requested from us to move the due date backward.

Ms. PERSAUD-ZAMORA:

Silver State Voices supports S.B. 60. We commend the Secretary of State and his team for making cybersecurity a priority and taking the appropriate steps to safeguard the voting process.

Ms. MAGNUS:

Battle Born Progress supports S.B. 60. I will read paragraph three of my written testimony, [Exhibit D](#).

Ms. BURGANS:

These are things that have come up over the last couple of years through the biweekly meetings that the Secretary of State's Office has with the clerks offices. Deputy Wlaschin has done a great job of keeping track of all the concerns we have as they come up, and he has made sure they got into a cleanup bill for the election clerks. The credit card was a concern we also had in Douglas County. If a candidate decides to call and knows not to pay with a credit card, how to handle it was a discussion we had. However, there are ways for us to go about opposing that charge with the credit card company, verifying the paperwork had been submitted and stating he or she has paid with a credit card. There is a process for the credit card side.

Ms. SAUNDERS:

Senate Bill 60 makes common sense with its election updates, candidate filing and paying of candidate's fees to use time lines and cybersecurity. The Progressive Leadership Alliance urges your support.

Ms. HANSEN:

The Independent American Party does not oppose this bill, but we have one concern we want to bring forward, the same concern Senator Seevers Gansert mentioned about extending the time of counting the ballots from the seventh day to the ninth day. There are other ways to resolve the issue of the time crunch after the election. People are frustrated and concerned.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The amendment from the Secretary of State proposes to remove sections 6 and 10.

MS. HANSEN:

Then we are good. I tried to find the removal of sections 6 and 10 when I read the amendment, but I did not see it. I wish I understood the bill better. But it seems like I would not be opposed anyway.

MR. ROJAS:

I am opposed to extending the time from 9 to 11 days or the extra 2 days.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

There is an amendment proposed by Secretary of State to remove sections 6 and 10, so that part of the bill would be deleted. There should be hard copies of the amendment at the Grant Sawyer building or online.

MS. PROFFITT:

I would like to apologize to the lady who seems to be offended by some of the things I said. I was not trying to be disparaging. What I gave you were facts and are substantiated with Occupational Safety and Health Administration filing reports.

We need to do everything we can in that bill to bring the cost down, not push it back up, because we have so many other needs in the State, especially education. I would like to see less regulation. This is getting tedious. You are going to bring the bill back, and I would like to address these things at that time. I would like to encourage the Secretary of State we have now to call me or meet with me because I would love to give him some information.

SECRETARY OF STATE AGUILAR:

This bill came about over the last couple of years since our last election in consultation with the clerks and the previous administration. I want to thank former Secretary Cegavske for her input in this bill as well as the work of Deputy Wlaschin to make sure we continue to update our regulations and statutes online.

MR. WLASCHIN:

State, county and city election officials are privileged to be able to spend the time with Title 24. This bill reflects the level of scrutiny we have and shows how serious we take our jobs, especially as it relates to security and transparency. This is something developed with county, State and city election officials. I appreciate that you are considering the bill and amendment.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 60. I will open the hearing to public comment.

MS. PROFFITT:

I want to speak to the fact that we could save a lot of time and money if the operations inside the ROV were changed to count the ballots when they come in. The ROV withheld over 20,000 ballots that were processed the first three days. The ballots had been ready to be tabulated, but the ROV did not tabulate them until after Election Day.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

If you are going to make allegations ...

MS. PROFFITT:

It is not an allegation. I have the proof and I have witnesses. There are two lawyers who will be happy to help the Secretary of State. The operations need to be streamlined. I would love to be able to give you the evidence that former Secretary of State Cegavske did not read.

MR. ROJAS:

I want to thank our Secretary of State for taking the extension off the bill. I would like to invite him to the hearing on S.B. 142, which is going to affect security and his office. It is going to affect the business environment in all of Nevada because the sponsors want to extend the homeless bill of rights. It is going to increase crime. It is going to be harder for the Secretary of State to do his job in many ways. It is also going to give everybody the right to vote. It is going to have more work for everybody.

**SENATE BILL 142**: Enacts the Homeless Persons' Bill of Rights. (BDR 38-195)

MS. REZENTES:

In speaking with the Deputy of Elections for the Secretary of State, I asked him to consider meeting with the observers because I know he is talking to the employees at the ROV. He has not heard anything from us at all. He did write down my email information and never got back to me. That is why we are speaking out today. What do we do if they are not going to work with us?

BOB RUSSO:

It was not too long ago votes were cast in person on the same day, and we usually received the election results on Election Day. Absentee ballots were only available upon request. If we really want to restore trust in our elections, we need to ditch voting machines and mail-in ballots, return to paper ballots and offer same day voting with absentee ballots only available upon request.

The COVID-19 emergency is over, and all election legislation passed to accommodate it should be repealed. This would minimize the chance for voter fraud and increase our faith in the election process. Voter fraud documentation can be found on the Heritage Foundation's Election Fraud Database at [<heritage.org/voterfraud>](http://heritage.org/voterfraud).

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I want to remind you both the prior Secretary of State, a member of the Republican Party, and the current Secretary of State have firmly stated there has been no evidence of widespread voter fraud in Nevada.

ADRIENNE O'REILLY:

Due to a phone issue I had earlier, this is my opportunity to speak on S.B. 60. I want to take this opportunity to thank everyone on the Committee for their time here today. I especially thank Senator Seevers Gansert for some of the questions she posed.

MR. HOJJATY:

I would like to thank everyone for bringing up some important topics and discussing issues which matter. Trust is important regarding the trustworthiness of elections; we would like to have open discussion.



Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections  
March 2, 2023  
Page 33

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I reiterate both our current Secretary of State, a registered Democrat, and our past Secretary of State, a registered Republican, have firmly stated there has been no evidence of any widespread election fraud. Those accusations are completely out of line.

We are adjourned at 5:37 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Diane Rea,  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair

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

<b>EXHIBIT SUMMARY</b>				
<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit Letter</b>	<b>Introduced on Minute Report Page No.</b>	<b>Witness / Entity</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 53	C	2	Secretary of State Francisco Aguilar	Amendment
S.B. 53 S.B. 54 S.B. 60	D	6	Annette Magnus / Battle Born Progress	Support Testimony
S.B. 53 S.B. 54	E	6	Jennifer Willett / All Voting Is Local, Nevada	Support Testimony
S.B. 53	F	8	Richard Winger	Opposition Testimony
S.B. 54	G	10	Mark Wlaschin / Office of the Secretary of State	Amendment
S.B. 54	H	15	Laura Hale	Support Testimony
S.B. 54	I	19	Valerie White	Opposition Testimony
S.B. 54	J	19	Tracey Thomas	Opposition Testimony
S.B. 54	K	19	Bruce Parks	Opposition Testimony
S.B. 60	L	20	Secretary of State Francisco Aguilar	Amendment