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

Eighty-Third Session
March 20, 2025

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair Erica Mosca at 3:33 p.m. on Thursday, March 20, 2025, in Room 3142 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 3 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, 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/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Chair
Assemblymember Cecelia González, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Lisa K. Cole
Assemblymember Jill Dickman
Assemblymember Rebecca Edgeworth
Assemblymember Brian Hibbetts
Assemblymember Sandra Jauregui
Assemblymember Brittney M. Miller
Assemblymember Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblymember Cinthia Zermeño Moore
Assemblymember Hanadi Nadeem

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst
Aaron MacDonald, Committee Counsel
Mackenzie Scruggs, Committee Manager
Kristi Howard, Committee Secretary
George Whalen, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Chanel Cassanello, Campaign Manager, All Voting is Local Action Nevada
Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Chloe Lim, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Amanda Mallous, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Ty Tan, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada
Kaylah Maese, Civil Rights Analyst, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada
Brenda Zamora, Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada
Julian Salvador Avila, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Abigail Negate, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices
Yaneli Jimenez Rodrigues, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Izack Tenorio, representing Campaign Legal Center
Pio Rejas, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Rachel Leddy, Rural Outreach Organizer, Make the Road Nevada
Shelley Freed, representing Las Vegas Deaf Seniors
Sean Mulholland, President, Las Vegas Deaf Seniors
Paula Luna, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress
Trystin St. Denis, Policy and Advocacy Associate, Nevada Conservation League
Bethany Kahn, Spokeswoman and Director of Communications and Digital Strategy, Culinary Workers Union Local 226
Hieu Le, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
William Moore, Nevada Civic Engagement Director, Mi Familia en Acción
Eric Wilcox, Chair, Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada
Iris Stone, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Oscar Williams, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Miles Dickson, CEO and Founder, Nevada GrantLab
Tom Clark, representing United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra; and The Children's Cabinet
Cindi Rivera, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Marco Rauda, representing Green Our Planet; and Jobs for American Graduates Nevada
Henry Rosas, representing United Way of Southern Nevada
Lea Cartwright, representing Foster Kinship; and Boys Town Nevada
Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Eric Jeng, Executive Director, One APIA Nevada
Sally Balecha, Region President, Desert Mountain, National Federation of Filipino American Associations
Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada
Lisa Habighorst, Cofounder and CEO, Spread the Word Nevada
Anthony Curry, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Kipp Ortenburger, Director of Strategy, Vegas PBS
Tameka Henry, Executive Director, Obodo Collective
Jordan Hankins, Founder and Executive Director, Southern Nevada Black Educators Initiative
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom
Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
A'Keia Sanders, Director, Office of Federal Assistance, Office of the Governor
Ellen Gifford, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada

Chair Mosca:
[Roll was called, and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Welcome to the audience here in Carson City and in Las Vegas. We do have an overflow room as well. Thank you all for coming a little early as we have a busy agenda today. As you can see, we are grateful we have accessibility-related measures here today for our hearing. Let us get started.

Committee members, we are going to first start with a Committee introduction of Bill Draft Request 24-570, which revises provisions relating to elections. As a reminder, a vote in favor of introducing a bill draft request (BDR) does not imply a commitment to support the measure later. All this action does is allow the BDR to become a bill and enter the legislative hearing process.

BDR 24-570—Revises provisions relating to elections. (Later introduced as Assembly Bill 491.)

I will entertain a motion to introduce BDR 24-570.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO MADE A MOTION TO INTRODUCE BILL DRAFT REQUEST 24-570.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER HIBBETTS VOTED NO.)

So, our next item of business today is our very first work session here in the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. It is not customary for the Committee to take testimony or otherwise rehear the bills during a work session. However, I may invite a witness to come forward for clarification or questions during our consideration of a measure. Our Committee's policy analyst, Ms. Proehl, will be walking us through the work session documents, and Ms. Proehl has a lot of reading to do today, so we thank you in advance. You may begin when you are ready.

Assembly Joint Resolution 6: Urges Congress to extend the Social Security Fairness Act. (BDR R-32)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
As nonpartisan staff of the Legislative Counsel Bureau I neither support nor oppose any measures before you today. I am here to just walk you through the work session document.

The first measure for the Committee's consideration today is Assembly Joint Resolution 6, sponsored by Assemblymember Miller and heard in Committee on February 25, 2025, [read from Exhibit C]. Assembly Joint Resolution 6 urges Congress to enact legislation to extend the Social Security Fairness Act to apply from the month of December 2013 forward and for the President to sign that legislation into law. There are no amendments. And, as a reminder to the Committee of what the Social Security Fairness Act is, it was federal legislation signed into law on January 5 of this year and applies to monthly social security benefits from December 2023 forward. The Act repeals the Government Pension Offset and Windfall Elimination Provision formulas used to calculate social security benefits, which reduced or eliminated social security benefits for people also receiving a pension based on work not covered by social security.

Chair Mosca:
Members, are there any questions on A.J.R. 6? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to do pass A.J.R. 6.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 6.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS COLE, DICKMAN, EDGEWORTH, AND HIBBETTS VOTED NO.)

I will now assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Miller. Next bill, please.

Assembly Joint Resolution 7: Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to revise provisions relating to the compensation of certain elected officers. (BDR C-654)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next measure on work session today is Assembly Joint Resolution 7 sponsored by Assemblymembers Watts, Mosca, and Hibbetts and Senators Nguyen and Stone. It was heard in Committee on February 27, 2025, [read from Exhibit D]. Assembly Joint Resolution 7 proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to reserve to a Citizens' Commission on Compensation for Certain Elected Officers the power to establish salaries and benefits for

members of the Legislature, the Governor, Lieutenant Governor, Secretary of State, Treasurer, Controller, and Attorney General.

The resolution provides for the terms and appointments of commission members and requires the commission to hold at least four public meetings before filing a schedule of salaries and benefits. After the commission files its initial schedule of salaries and benefits not later than January 1, 2029, the commission shall file subsequent schedules not later than January 1 of each odd-numbered year that may not increase or decrease the salary of any elected officer whose salary and benefits are under the commission's purview by more than 15 percent.

The resolution also proposes to amend the *Nevada Constitution* to repeal the limits on the number of days a legislator may receive compensation during a regular or special session and the authority of the Legislature to provide by law, under certain circumstances, for increasing or diminishing the salaries or compensation of constitutional officers.

Assemblymember Watts proposed the attached amendment, which seeks to make the following changes:

1. Revise the submission date of the initial schedule of salaries and benefits to not later than January 1, 2031;
2. Require meetings of the commission to be held in locations across the state; and
3. Add additional sponsors to the bill who are all listed on the attached amendment.

And a special note for this resolution; if it is passed by the 2025 Legislature, it must also be passed in identical form by the next Legislature and then approved by voters in an election before the proposed amendments to the *Nevada Constitution* become effective.

Chair Mosca:
Members, are there any questions? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.J.R. 7.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any discussions on the motion? [There were none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Watts, who is in the back. Next bill, please.

Assembly Bill 148: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-770)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
Assembly Bill 148 is sponsored by Assemblymember Hafen, heard in Committee on March 11, 2025, [read from Exhibit E]. Assembly Bill 148 requires city and county clerks to distribute sample ballots to registered voters before the applicable deadline to distribute mail ballots.

Assemblymember Yeager proposed the attached amendment to add himself as a primary sponsor of the bill and to amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* 293.269911 to require mail ballots to be distributed not earlier than the fifth Monday before an election and not later than the fourth Monday before an election.

Chair Mosca:
Members, any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 148.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 148.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MONROE-MORENO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Hafen, also in the back of the room. Next bill, please.

Assembly Bill 256: Directs the Legislative Commission to appoint a Regional Rail Transit Advisory Working Group to conduct an interim study relating to regional rail transit. (BDR S-614)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next measure for the Committee's consideration is Assembly Bill 256 sponsored by Assemblymembers La Rue Hatch, González, Roth, Moore, and Anderson, et al., heard in Committee on March 4, 2025, [read from Exhibit F]. Assembly Bill 256 directs the Legislative Commission to appoint a Regional Rail Transit Advisory Working Group to conduct a study during the 2025-2026 Legislative Interim concerning the development of regional rail transit in Clark and Washoe Counties. The Advisory Working Group shall meet monthly and submit to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure on or before July 1, 2026, an actionable plan to develop regional rail transit in Clark and Washoe Counties and a report of its findings and any recommendations for legislation.

The Advisory Working Group consists of 11 members in total, all listed below. I will not read through them all, but they are there because the amendment proposes to revise the membership.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch proposed the attached amendment, which seeks to:

1. Add Assemblymembers Flanagan and Cole as cosponsors of the bill;
2. Amend the study directive and objectives by replacing instances of "Clark and Washoe Counties" in subsections 1, 4, and 8(a) of section 1 with "regional communities across the State"; and
3. Revise the membership of the Advisory Working Group by:
    a. Adding one member who represents a rural county, another local government in a rural county, or a representative from an organization representing multiple rural counties;
    b. Adding one member who is a resident of a county other than Clark and Washoe who has an interest or expertise in rail transit; and
    c. Replacing the member who represents a private business engaged in the business of rail or transit with one member who represents a chamber of commerce or trade association.

Chair Mosca:
Members, are there any questions? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 256.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 256.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER MOORE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember La Rue Hatch. Next bill, please, Ms. Proehl.

Assembly Bill 261: Revises provisions relating to voter registration. (BDR 24-360)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next measure is Assembly Bill 261 sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, heard in Committee on March 4, 2025, [read from Exhibit G]. Assembly Bill 261 requires county and city clerks, if contacting a voter to resolve a reasonable question of fact as to whether the voter's signature on a mail ballot matches his or her signature in the records of the clerk, to affirmatively ask whether the voter would like to update his or her signature in the records of the clerk. If the

voter agrees to such update, the signature provided to the clerk becomes the voter's signature for voter registration purposes.

Additionally, A.B. 261 requires the Secretary of State, rather than county clerks, to mail the notice that allows a registered voter to indicate political party affiliation and decline to register to vote or have his or her voter registration updated, among other things, to persons who complete an automatic voter registration transaction. There are no amendments.

Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 261.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 261.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS COLE, DICKMAN, EDGEWORTH, AND HIBBETTS VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Nadeem, and we can go to the next bill, please.

Assembly Bill 262: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-362)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next measure is Assembly Bill 262, sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections, heard in Committee on February 27, 2025, [read from Exhibit H]. Assembly Bill 262 authorizes an election board officer or trainee, voting board officer, or counting board officer to choose to work as a volunteer who receives no compensation. The bill amends the Las Vegas City Charter, Airport Authority Act for Battle Mountain, and Airport Authority Act for Carson City to similarly authorize an officer appointed for certain special elections to choose to work as a volunteer who receives no compensation.

Additionally, A.B. 262 authorizes a person who has been convicted of a felony involving theft or fraud to be employed by a voter registration agency, even if his or her duties will include registering voters, or appointed as a field registrar. There are no amendments.

Chair Mosca:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 262.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 262.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER NADEEM SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBERS COLE, DICKMAN, EDGEWORTH, AND HIBBETTS VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Moore. Next bill, please.

Assembly Bill 287: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-202)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
The next bill is Assembly Bill 287 sponsored by Assemblymembers González and Monroe-Moreno, heard in Committee on March 6, 2025, [read from Exhibit I]. Assembly Bill 287 requires a vote recount for an office if the difference between the highest number of votes cast for a candidate and the next highest number of votes cast for a candidate is 0.25 percent or less. Defeated candidates may demand a vote recount if the difference between the number of votes cast for the candidate with the highest number of votes and the votes cast for the defeated candidate is 5 percent or less.

The bill also eliminates the authority of a voter to request a vote recount for a ballot question and instead requires a vote recount for a ballot question to be conducted if the difference between the results of the ballot question being approved or disapproved is 0.25 percent or less.

There are two proposed amendments, both attached. The first amendment, from the Office of the Secretary of State, contains the following changes:

1. In section 1, subsection 1(b), replacing the word "person" with "filing officer," as it is the filing officer who would determine the cost of the recount;
2. In section 1, subsection 1(b), replacing the term "estimated costs of the recount" with "estimated recount costs" for clarity purposes; and
3. Clarifying that an automatic recount required by the bill is paid by the county but reimbursed by the Reserve for Statutory Contingency Account as currently required by NRS 293.405 for election recounts in which the recount requester prevails.

The second amendment, from Assemblymember González, proposes to align the language applying to ballot question recounts with the language applying to recounts for elected offices to ensure voters can still request a recount for ballot questions if the difference between the results of the question being approved or disapproved is 5 percent or less.

Chair Mosca:
Members, any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 287.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI MADE A MOTION TO AMEND AND DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 287.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

> THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Vice Chair González. Next bill, please.

Assembly Bill 348: Revises provisions relating to the Legislature. (BDR 17-931)

Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst:
The final bill on work session today is Assembly Bill 348, sponsored by the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and heard in this Committee on March 11, 2025, [read from Exhibit J]. Assembly Bill 348 requires the Interim Retirement and Benefits Committee to review the operation of and make recommendations regarding the Legislators' Retirement System and provides for the terms of members, appointment of alternates, and filling of vacancies for the committee.

The bill also eliminates the requirements for the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau to perform—in even-numbered years and to the extent of available resources—budget stress tests comparing estimated future revenues and expenditures to major funds in the State Treasury under various potential economic conditions, and to report the results of such tests to the Governor and Legislature.

Finally, A.B. 348 abolishes the Legislative Bureau of Educational Accountability and Program Evaluation within the Fiscal Analysis Division. There are no amendments.

Chair Mosca:
Members, are there any questions? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 348.

> ASSEMBLYMEMBER GONZÁLEZ MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS ASSEMBLY BILL 348.
>
> ASSEMBLYMEMBER JAUREGUI SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno. I think that is it, so we will give a big thanks to Ms. Proehl. Good job, Committee, on your first work session. I will now close the work session.

With that, I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 367. This measure makes various changes related to language access in elections. We have Vice Chair González presenting A.B. 367 today. As a reminder, please limit your presentation to 15 minutes, and please begin when you are ready.

Assembly Bill 367: Makes various changes related to language access in elections. (BDR 24-364)

Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16:
Today I am excited to present to you Assembly Bill 367. I also have Chanel Cassanello with me from All Voting Is Local, who will also be copresenting the bill with me with the Chair's permission.

Every Nevadan has a fundamental right to participate in the electoral process. However, this right is often restricted for limited English proficient Nevadans due to language barriers that discourage them from participating in the process. To ensure fair and equitable access to voting, we must move towards providing voting materials and election information in the languages that many eligible voters read and speak. Nevada is a diverse state—the third most diverse state in the nation according to the 2020 Census—and I would argue that this diversity is our state's greatest strength. We have the fourth largest population of residents who identify as Asian American, Native Hawaiian, and Pacific Islander (AANHPI) and the fifth largest population who identify as Latino.

Compared to the 2010 Census, both communities grew significantly in just one decade. The AANHPI population grew 45.6 percent, and the Latino community grew 24.3 percent. As our state continues to diversify, the number of people speaking a language other than English at home continues to grow. Although there are existing federal requirements for providing voting materials in languages other than English, these requirements often do not go far enough. Assembly Bill 367 seeks to establish the additional state standards for providing voting materials in various languages to ensure equitable access to the ballot box. At this time, I will now turn the presentation over to Chanel Cassanello from All Voting Is Local.

Chanel Cassanello, Campaign Manager, All Voting Is Local Action Nevada:
I am the campaign manager at All Voting is Local Action Nevada. We are an organization that advocates for policies and legislative priorities that expand voter access to build a democracy for us all. It is a pleasure to present A.B. 367 before you today alongside Assemblymember González, whom I would like to thank for her support on this important legislation.

The purpose of this bill is to ensure that all eligible voters, no matter their primary language, have equal access to voting resources. By protecting and expanding essential language access—resources currently implemented by the Office of the Secretary of State on a voluntary basis—we can set a foundation to build upon to further reduce language barriers to the ballot box. Without doing so, we risk abandoning historically marginalized communities, specifically voters whose primary language is not English. These language accessibility tools and resources are currently in place at the discretion of Secretary Aguilar's office. This measure would codify these voting resources so they remain available and reliable for all voters to access for every election.

I will be speaking to the conceptual amendment [Exhibit K] we submitted to clarify the bill's intent using this presentation [Exhibit L]. It would strike all the bill language except for these five components: One, it would codify the Secretary of State's telephonic interpretation and translation services, or hotline, for voting-related questions in more than 200 languages year-round, including American Sign Language (ASL). Secretary Aguilar's office launched this hotline in 2024, which was utilized by voters seeking information on voting methods, candidates, ballot measures, and more, in their primary language. This critical resource reduces the language-access barrier for voters who want to participate in our democracy and who need clarification in the language that they speak. Voters can utilize this year-round and receive real-time interpretation and translation about any questions on voting.

Second, it would codify the Secretary of State's website translation to ensure voting information is available in a minimum of the seven most common languages, including Spanish, Tagalog, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Thai, and American Sign Language.

Third, it would authorize the use of certain devices, such as cell phones or tablets, inside a polling place to ensure that voters who are deaf or hard of hearing can access critical interpretation services at any voting site.

Fourth, it would mandate all statewide communications sent by the Secretary of State to occur in both English and Spanish.

And lastly, it would fund the language access coordinator position in the Secretary of State's Office in order to continue targeted efforts towards addressing gaps in language accessibility across our state.

Moving on to the makeup of our state, I would like to highlight findings from the U.S. 2020 Census [Exhibit L]. We are the third most diverse state in the country, which is worth celebrating. About 30 percent of the population speaks a language other than English at home. Spanish is spoken by 21 percent of the state population and 12 percent of our rural population. Nearly half a million Nevadans over 18 years of age speak a language other than English, and over 125,000 Nevadans over 18 years of age speak a primary language other than English. Over 119,000 Nevadans have a hearing difficulty, and over 85,000 have a vision difficulty. We also have the fourth largest population of people who identify as Asian and Pacific Islander, and the fifth largest population of those who identify as Hispanic and

Latino. Lastly, the top languages spoken, aside from English, are Spanish; Tagalog and Filipino; Chinese, Mandarin, or Cantonese; Amharic, Somali, or other Afro-Asiatic languages; and German.

As mentioned, we are very diverse, and we will continue to grow in that direction. So, it is critical that future secretaries of state continue to provide voting resources and election information for voters who do not primarily speak English. There is no state mandate to require voting materials, unless voters meet thresholds established by the Voting Rights Act of 1965 (VRA). Our population of limited English proficiency voters who do not fall within these thresholds are left out of the electoral process. Through this bill, the Nevada Legislature has an opportunity to catch these voters and ensure, regardless of the language they speak and read, they have access to accurate election information; they understand their ballot, and they can make well-informed decisions in every election moving forward.

For additional background, the VRA was enacted to make sure that all citizens, especially Black Americans in the South, could vote without facing unfair impediments, such as literacy tests or poll taxes. It bans discriminatory practices and gave the federal government the power to step in if states tried to block people from voting. The 1975 reauthorization of the Voting Rights Act expanded protections to include more groups such as non-English speakers, Native Americans, and people with disabilities. It ensures these groups have equal access to voting by requiring voting materials in different languages. Section 203 of the VRA requires that if a certain number of people in an area speak a language that is not English, the government must provide voting materials, such as sample ballots and ballots in that language. This ensures people who do not speak English fluently can still understand how to vote and have an equal opportunity to participate in our elections. Section 208, really quickly, ensures individuals who need help when voting can receive assistance from a person of their choice at that voting site.

Diving a bit more into Section 203 of the VRA, in order to qualify, these four protected groups are included: Native American, Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders, Alaska Natives, and Hispanic and Latino. Again, in order to qualify for this federal mandate, these groups must meet a threshold of 5 percent of the voting-age population or 10,000 citizens, be limited English proficient of the same language, and have an illiteracy rate higher than the national average. It is worth noting that the next language determination will take place in 2026 by the U.S. Department of Justice using U.S. Census Data.

Section 208 of the VRA allows people who have a disability or are illiterate and need help to vote to have someone of their choice assist them at a voting site. It should be noted that if there is any reason that a person needs help voting, they can choose that person, and this is not bound to any particular region or group. This is nationwide.

Now, how does Section 203 take place in Nevada? Only 2 out of our 17 counties are required to abide by Section 203. Clark County must provide voting materials in Spanish and Tagalog and Filipino, and Nye County must provide translation and interpretation services in Shoshone, which does not have a standard writing system, so the interpretation piece is

really, really critical. And although not required, Washoe County does have 17.6 percent of the population who speak Spanish, and they have voluntarily provided bilingual sample ballots and ballots in English and Spanish.

Again, through these five components, this measure cultivates a more inclusive system for Nevadan voters who face language barriers and are not protected by Section 203 of the Voting Rights Act. It fills a gap for voters who cannot confidently utilize an English language ballot. In addition, it provides the Secretary of State's Office with direction in order to plan out language accessibility programming and to include it in their budget.

To wrap up, we are really grateful to the Secretary of State's Office for being committed to implementing these language resources and willing to expand their efforts. We strongly believe these resources should be protected to limit voter confusion and to cultivate a more inclusive electoral process. The ability to vote does not equate to access to vote. No voter should feel intimidated by an English-only ballot or hesitate due to the lack of a translation or interpretation option in any county in Nevada. This legislation makes a meaningful impact on all Nevadan voters. It provides directions to the Secretary of State's Office. It strengthens our democracy by ensuring all eligible voters have access to the information and the resources they need to make well-informed decisions in every election. And with that, Chair Mosca, this concludes my presentation, and we welcome any questions.

Chair Mosca:
We will move to questions, and you may go direct to the member.

Assemblymember Moore:
I am always supportive of anything that makes language access easier for folks. I am someone who is bilingual. I did not speak any English until I started going to elementary school, and Spanish is the language that—even though my parents have been here since they were teenagers—they still feel more comfortable speaking it. I have noticed in my district, as soon as people realize that I speak Spanish, they quickly speak to me in Spanish like they prefer to speak. A lot of folks prefer to receive their information in a language that they feel most comfortable.

I love that Nevada is the most diverse state in the country, but I do have a question about what the other two—if you are able to tell us a little bit about what the other two most diverse states in the country are already doing to expand language access when it comes to ballots.

Chanel Cassanello:
I will have to fact check this, but there is room for improvement in Nevada. As you know, we do not have statewide Spanish language ballots even though Spanish is the second most common language spoken in the state. In comparison to states such as New York, California, Florida—Nevada is expected to be at their level, and in particular regarding Spanish language ballots, it is very surprising to others that with our population we do not have statewide Spanish ballots. So, this in particular meets—it closes the gap so folks who cannot

confidently utilize an English language ballot—the hotline in particular and the resources on the Secretary of State's website, which are translated in the seven most common languages—it is a safety net so that voters can utilize these resources. We are just really happy to be in partnership with the Secretary of State's Office to expand those resources, I think the hotline in particular, offering 200 minimum languages; it is a big leap of progress.

Assemblymember Moore:
My follow-up has to do with the American Sign Language as well. Are you able to tell us what other states are doing regarding that as well, expanding access to those who use American Sign Language?

Chanel Cassanello:
I cannot speak on that, but I can look into it and follow up. I cannot speak to that in particular, but we do have a letter of support [included in Exhibit M] from the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing. We are working with them to help them achieve their goals in terms of language accessibility and voting, in particular, but there is a shortage in all industries here in Nevada, unfortunately, when it comes to American Sign Language interpretation. I know that there is other legislation moving around this session trying to address some of those issues. I think it will really depend on progress made in other areas where we can take American Sign Language accessibility in Nevada in regard to voting. I will follow up with more information on that.

Assemblymember Cole:
My question is a technical one. I feel like I always bring technical questions, and you may not have the answer to this, but who does the translation work in the various languages and is there a mechanism for proofreading to ensure accuracy? I am mostly concerned with all of the ballot initiatives and everything and all of the explanations of how this is affected and the pros and the cons—I mean, it is a lot of words, and there are a lot of nuances in various languages.

Chair Mosca:
We have the Secretary of State's Office coming to the table.

Mark A. Wlaschin, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:
Excellent question, and it is one that I know we grappled with because it is critical that you get it right. In talking with some of my colleagues across the country about translated services, one of the initial things they highlighted was a concern about dialects. If you interpret something and translate it using a dialect from, for example, northern Mexico, but if your community and your state are really from southern Mexico, it simply does not work.

So, what we have decided on currently is that we use the state contract vehicles. There are some translated interpretive services that are through State Purchasing [Purchasing Division, Department of Administration]. As a starting point, that is one for continuity of the language across the state. Two, we also use the U.S. Election Assistance Commission, which has a dictionary of kind of recommended terms. But those are starting points. The third and most

important part is, really it is a dialogue. We talk to community leaders, our clerks, and registrars across the state. If the feedback they get is one of, this is close but not quite meeting the mark, then we eagerly adjust to make sure that it meets the needs of the electorate.

Assemblymember Cole:
For these seven languages, do you have any concern that you would not be able to do everything you just described with any of them, or you are good with all of them?

Mark Wlaschin:
Know that absolutely there are mechanisms in place to ensure that the languages identified by the bill—or even others that have come up as being close to the top seven, but perhaps not there just yet—would be translatable, for sure.

Chair Mosca:
Any other questions? Seeing none, we will go to testimony. For today, because of time constraints, we will be limiting testimony to 30 minutes for all. So, 30 minutes in support, 30 minutes in opposition, and 30 minutes in neutral. If those in Carson City can start filling in the tables, you will have two minutes. You may start when you are ready, and because of the time constraints, do not be shy to just ditto as well. You may begin.

Chloe Lim, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:
I am here today to testify in support of the bill A.B. 367. I am a senior at Coronado High School, and I am a first-generation American with Korean immigrant parents. I am also a dual citizen, and while my parents are green card holders, they are not yet U.S. citizens and cannot vote. However, despite the challenges they faced adapting to a new country, my parents care deeply about the future, not just their own, but mine and my peers' futures as well.

My mother, who is not fully proficient in English, often relies on me to translate important documents and information for her, including materials related to elections. I cannot help but imagine how much easier it would be for families like mine if translated voting materials were more readily accessible. This bill, A.B. 367, would make that a reality, ensuring that voters like my mom could more easily understand and participate in the process, which is something I hope to one day provide for her—having access to translated voting materials.

The ability to select a preferred language when registering and access to interpretation services would help make sure that people are not excluded from this critical process simply because of language barriers. I know firsthand how important it is for my mother to feel confident about what is on the ballot and the impact her choices have. Though she cannot vote today, I want to help create a world where people like my parents, who are invested in the community and care about our future, can participate. I urge you to support A.B. 367, not only because it would make a difference in my life, but because it would ensure that families like mine are not left out of a process that affects us all.

Amanda Mallous, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a high school senior at Ed W. Clark High School in Las Vegas, and I have never met prouder American citizens than my newly immigrated Iraqi family, which is why today I am here in strong support of A.B. 367. As the daughter of Middle Eastern refugees, I grew up watching my parents navigate the world in a language that was not their own. I remember the challenges they faced, whether it was reading legal documents, filling out forms, or understanding critical information. Voting, the foundation of our democracy, should not be one of those challenges.

Currently, Nevada provides limited ballots in Spanish and Tagalog, but for communities like mine who speak Arabic, Farsi, and many other languages, there is no guaranteed access. This leaves thousands of voters struggling to understand the very process that determines their representation. Nevada is home to diverse communities, and yet many voters, especially first-generation immigrants like my family and first-generation Americans like myself, struggle to fully engage in the democratic process due to language barriers. By expanding language accessibility on our ballots, A.B. 367 ensures that all citizens, regardless of their linguistic backgrounds, can make informed decisions that shape their futures and represent the citizenship that they newly and proudly wear across their heart. Language should never be a barrier in participation to democracy. This is why I urge you to support this bill and take a step toward a more inclusive Nevada.

Ty Tan, Private Citizen, Henderson, Nevada:
I am a sophomore at Coral Academy of Science Las Vegas, representing One APIA Nevada. I am here to testify in support of A.B. 367 to ensure that language access is a guarantee in our elections. Now, during the Cambodian genocide, my great-grandparents and their children moved here, escaping from a refugee camp with the help of church officials to come to Nevada. For years they worked tirelessly in the casinos cleaning, serving, and slowly moving up the work ladder, all to bring all of our family here to Nevada. Yet, even at their deathbed, even when they had become American citizens, my great-grandparents never got the ability to vote, because at a time when Nevada had a lack of language accessibility, they were not given the opportunity to even read or fill out their ballot. For families like mine and other families coming to Nevada today seeking a new life, A.B. 367 is the change we need to ensure that no one is barred from our democracy.

As the functions of A.B. 367 have already been discussed at length, I urge you to vote yes to A.B. 367, like you did on Assembly Bill 246 of the 82nd Session in the past, in order to ensure that our democracy continues to be protected by the people who deserve to be a part of it.

Kaylah Maese, Civil Rights Analyst, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada:
I will just ditto what these wonderful students have said today.

Brenda Zamora, Deputy Director, Make It Work Nevada:
We believe that language access is integral to ensuring that all voters can make informed decisions that impact their lives, their communities, and their future. We urge you all to please support A.B. 367 and support an inclusive, just, and democratic Nevada for all.

Julian Salvador, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a proud member of Youth Power Project with Make The Road Nevada, and I am a junior at Spring Valley High School in Las Vegas. As a Latino Nevadan, I have seen how language barriers can discourage civic participation. My parents primarily speak Spanish, and I remember sitting with them during the 2024 Election, trying to translate complex ballot language. Even though they wanted to vote, they almost gave up because they did not understand the process. This left them feeling excluded from a system that is supposed to represent everybody.

This issue is not unique to my family. I have seen neighbors struggle with the same problem at polling places. In fact, nearly 30 percent of Nevadan households speak a non-English language at home. Without bilingual support, many voters are left confused and discouraged. Voter registration forms do not even ask about language preference, which means important materials like ballots and voter guides arrive in English by default, even for people who are not fluent. Assembly Bill 367, also known as "language access for all," would change this by requiring a language access coordinator, bilingual poll workers, and ballots in preferred languages. It would give families like mine the confidence to vote independently and make informed decisions without relying on someone else to translate.

Passing this bill would make our elections more accessible and ensure that every Nevadan, regardless of language, feels like their voice matters. Lawmakers have the power to fix this. Language should never be a barrier to democracy. Please pass A.B. 367 and ensure that every single Nevadan can participate in our elections with dignity and with confidence. I am counting on your support; Nevadans across the state are counting on your support. Thank you.

Abigail Negate, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a Youth Power Project member at Make the Road Nevada and a senior at Spring Valley High School, and I am here to support A.B. 367 because no child should have to act as a translator for their family just for them to vote or to access an education. For many first-generation Americans, translating documents for their parents or guardians is not just an occasional task—it is a daily responsibility. I grew up having to translate school documents, report cards, and even medical forms and legal documents for my family. But I did not always know the right words and that meant that they never fully understood what was happening, a crucial part of voting. If these documents had been available in Amharic, the language that my family speaks, it would have made a huge difference for their understanding.

I know that I am not the only child put in this position, and even now, many children across Nevada are still forced to take on the role of translators because their families do not have

access to information in their native language. That is a responsibility that children should not have to carry. Parents and guardians should be able to communicate with American institutions without needing a child to interpret for them. A child—I am going to repeat once again—should not be given that responsibility.

Assembly Bill 367 will change that. It will ensure that language is not a barrier to civics education and voting. It will help first-generation families understand documents firsthand and allow students to focus on an understanding instead of translation for their families.

I urge you guys to pass this bill because civics education and access to voting should not depend on whether a family is fluent in English. Every person deserves an equal opportunity to succeed and to vote, and A.B. 367 will make that possible. Can I count on your support?

Emily Persaud-Zamora, Executive Director, Silver State Voices:
At Silver State Voices, we work on democracy issues year-round, from Get Out the Vote to election protection. Every election, without fail, we receive questions and concerns regarding language access. This is unsurprising given that the 2020 Census ranked Nevada as the third most diverse state in the country. Our organization has been asked to find interpreters for Chinese voters at polling locations, and we have actually helped translate election materials for city municipalities before their elections. Despite this diversity, language barriers continue to prevent voters from fully participating in elections.

The Secretary of State's Office has been doing an amazing job. They have worked really hard in the last two years to ensure that they are providing more language resources and disability accommodations for elections, and we are confident that A.B. 367 will expand that and codify that into law. But I want to be clear, this bill is not just about expanding translation and interpretation services. It represents the intersection of language justice, disability rights, and voting rights altogether. Nevada voters have the right to contribute to the decisions that shape our state no matter what their preferred language. If we want to be a truly representative democracy, we need to ensure that Nevada's voters can fully participate in our elections. We can make that a reality by supporting A.B. 367, and we urge the Committee to do the same.

Yaneli Jimenez Rodrigues, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I support A.B. 367 language access. This issue has personally impacted me because I often had to cancel plans and arrange my life to help my parents with important meetings. I am the one who has to translate documents and write for them since they do not have papers in their language. This is not just an inconvenience, but it is a responsibility I carry to ensure my parents can understand everything they need to know, even when I hardly even understand it myself.

The lack of language access has led to several struggles in my daily life. I have had to make sacrifices in order to tell my parents—missing out on personal commitments—because they cannot navigate through important tasks without assistance. I believe A.B. 367 would make a huge difference by ensuring that people in situations like mine do not have to bear this

burden alone. It would create better language access for everyone to help eliminate the barriers that prevent non-English speakers from fully understanding the important information. To lawmakers, I urge you to pass this bill because it is essential to ensure that people, regardless of their language, can fully participate in society. This is not just a policy; it is about fairness and dignity for people who are too often left behind. At the end of the day, this bill matters because everyone deserves equal access to information, no matter what language they speak, to understand what they signed and learn.

Chair Mosca:
We are about halfway through the support testimony, so we will go to Las Vegas after the two at the table.

Izack Tenorio, representing Campaign Legal Center:
Campaign Legal Center supports A.B. 367 to help ensure that all voters, no matter what language they speak, can participate fully in the electoral process. America is made better by the democratic participation of all citizens, not just those who speak fluent English. Limited English proficiency should not mean limited political participation, and a lack of meaningful language assistance should not be a barrier to citizens making their voices heard in our electoral process. While our organization is grateful for all the efforts made by the Secretary of State on this front, it is important that these programs are codified into state law to ensure that our communities will have access to them for decades to come, and we urge you to support this important piece of legislation.

Pio Rejas, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am a political science student at University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), a former student body president at Consolidated Students of UNLV, and a strong advocate for equitable access to civic participation. I am here today in strong support of A.B. 367, because language should never be a barrier to democracy. Nevada is home to a diverse electorate with many voters who primarily speak languages other than English. Assembly Bill 367 takes a necessary and long-overdue step in ensuring that every eligible voter regardless of language proficiency has the tools they need to fully participate in our elections.

Whether you think these changes are a waste of taxpayer funds or not, these measures are not about convenience, they are about equity and inclusion. I have seen firsthand how language barriers prevent eligible voters from fully understanding their ballots or being able to vote at all. I plead to this Committee to also consider clear accountability measures to ensure that these provisions are effectively implemented, and that bilingual election officers are properly recruited to serve our communities. I ask this Committee, as a Nevadan, to support this bill and uphold every resident Nevadan's right to participate in our democracy.

Chair Mosca:
Now to you in Las Vegas.

Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:
I am testifying in support on behalf of Secretary of State Francisco Aguilar. Secretary Aguilar has strong support for this bill. Language access is a priority for him all through the office. The office is presently working on other bills that would expand language access through our other divisions as well, but obviously, elections are an incredibly important component of why language access is important. So, thank you very much to the sponsors, and the Secretary urges your support.

Rachel Leddy, Rural Outreach Organizer, Make the Road Nevada:
Thank you for the opportunity to speak today in strong support of A.B. 367. Nevada's rural communities are home to hardworking voters who deserve the same access to election information as those in urban areas. Yet many rural voters face additional barriers due to language access gaps. In Elko County, Spanish-speaking residents have shared concerns about receiving election notices only in English, making it harder to meet deadlines or understand ballot measures. In Nye County, voters from a growing Thai-speaking community struggle to find official translations, often relying on secondhand interpretations that may be inaccurate. In Churchill County, Basque-speaking elders who have lived in Nevada for generations have difficulty understanding complex ballot language with little to no assistance available near them. Unlike urban areas where election offices offer in-person resources, rural voters often have to travel long distances to seek help, making language accessibility even more critical.

Assembly Bill 367 addresses these challenges by making telephonic interpretation services a permanent resource, ensuring election websites are available in multiple languages and allowing voters to use personal devices for interpretation at polling places. Every Nevadan, whether they live in Las Vegas or Lovelock, should have the same opportunity to participate in elections without unnecessary barriers. Assembly Bill 367 is a necessary step toward an inclusive democracy where all eligible voters can confidently cast their ballots. I urge you to support this bill.

Shelley Freed, representing the Las Vegas Deaf Seniors:
[Translated from American Sign Language.] I recently moved here from California, and I have a large number of deaf individuals who live in this area who may have been born in the community, but their first language is not English. Their first language is American Sign Language. I found out there are very few resources for those who do not understand election processes, the rules, and the questions without translation. For the last Las Vegas election, we worked very hard and tried to support A.B. 367 for the platform where deaf individuals can find an American Sign Language translation, comprehension of the questions in the bill, and the options for voting, and have that equity as others have—to be part of the democracy process in voting. I hope you have listened and will pass A.B. 367.

Sean Mulholland, President, Las Vegas Deaf Seniors:
[Translated from American Sign Language.] Hello. I am the president of Las Vegas Deaf Seniors about our support of A.B. 367. Talking about going back to November 5, 2024, Election Day, so "shall Section 1 of Article 13 of the Nevada Constitution be amended to: (1)

revise the description of the persons who benefit from institutions that the state is required to foster and support; (2) replace the term 'institutions' with 'entities' and (3) add entities for the benefit of persons with intellectual or developmental disabilities to the types of entities that the State is required to foster and support." That language was not accessible for many deaf Americans. Talking about "deaf and dumb," changing that to "deaf and hard of hearing," that hurts my feelings. And the language in the electorate is not accessible. We need to add maybe another, maybe an iPad, so that it could be translated into sign language, and change the language from "deaf and dumb" to "deaf and hard of hearing."

Next, for no one left behind in the *Constitution*, so people have a right to understand what language says, and American Sign Language is the language that the deaf Americans use. So, last two weeks, Secretary of State and another woman at that office was explaining this, but they do not understand the struggle. So, how can we improve the language that is quite elevated, because we want it to be clear through American Sign Language for all?

Chair Mosca:
With that, we will move on to the phone line, if you are here in support today.

Paula Luna, Deputy Director, Battle Born Progress:
I am calling in support of A.B. 367. I will ditto what has already been said in support, thank the members for bringing this bill, and urge the Committee to pass.

Trystin St. Denis, Policy and Advocacy Associate, Nevada Conservation League:
We would just like to ditto the previous testimony and thank you for hearing this bill.

Bethany Kahn, Spokeswoman and Director of Communications and Digital Strategy, Culinary Workers Union Local 226:
The Culinary Union is Nevada's largest immigrant organization, and we are in support of this bill.

Hieu Le, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am here in my personal capacity, personal time, just to ditto everything else that has been said. And just like all the students who became their family's personal and professional translator, the least we can do is get paid an iPhone, right?

William Moore, Nevada Civic Engagement Director, Mi Familia en Acción:
Mi Familia en Acción is a civic engagement organization and a proud member of the Let Nevadans Vote Coalition. We support A.B. 367 because it is the logical next step to codify language access for all Nevadans. We were in our community again during the last election and spoke to people time and time again who need these services. Our hard of hearing community in Nevada is over 100,000 strong, and here in Clark County alone, folks speak over 40 different languages, and they deserve interpretation services.

Additionally, it is important to ensure all communication from the Secretary of State would also be issued in Spanish. When we institutionalize and fund language access, more Nevadans are informed, and they show up to the polls.

Our electorate in Nevada is diverse. Policies like A.B. 367 allow more people to live in and love the Nevada we all know. Mi Familia en Acción believes that our community, regardless of ability or language barriers, deserve to be heard too. Thank you to the Committee for sponsoring this bill. We recommend the Committee support A.B. 367.

Eric Wilcox, Chair, Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing:
I am the parent of a deaf child, and I am chair of the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing. This issue of voter accessibility is of paramount importance to the community that we on the commission represent. The first and primary language for many in our community is American Sign Language, a visual language that is completely distinct from either written or spoken English. Limited English proficiency for some of these individuals continues to be a serious impediment to fully participating in elections in Nevada, as we have documented in our regular town hall meetings with the community and you have heard from a few members of our community today. For these reasons, the Deaf Commission is in support of the bill, and we thank the Legislature for addressing this critical issue.

[Exhibit M, a collection of letters in support, was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Mosca:
We will now move on to testimony in opposition of A.B. 367. Remember to please keep your comments to the bill and not the sponsor or anyone else.

Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada:
According to the twenty-second edition of the *Ethnologue*, there are currently 7,111 living languages in the world today. Chinese has 13 variations and Arabic has 20. English is the number one language used in the world today. According to worlddata.info, only 1,000 years ago, there were about 9,000 languages. Due to increasing globalization, the number is decreasing. It is assumed that by the beginning of the twenty-third century, there should be only 100 different languages. According to worlddata.info, the top languages spoken in countries, French is spoken in 46 countries, Spanish in 34 countries, Chinese in 25 countries, Russian in 22 countries, but English is spoken in 58 countries.

My father worked in the polling places in California for many years. He told me year after year that they had many boxes full of ballots with different languages in each box. He said they would use a couple out of all those boxes—just a couple of them—and at the end of the election, the full boxes were thrown away. If a person is a naturalized citizen, they are required to demonstrate proficiency in English, which includes reading, writing, and speaking, so I do not think it is wise that taxpayers be responsible to pay the extra cost for printing election materials in numerous languages.

We are in favor of the authorized use of cell phones, tablets, and other devices inside the polling places to ensure that the deaf and hard of hearing community has access. That is important. So, we are in favor of that part of it. And I do like the new legislator over here.

Chair Mosca:
Anyone else in Carson City? [There was no one.] We will move to opposition in Las Vegas. Seeing no one, making sure we are giving people time—seeing no one come to the table, we will then move to the phone lines.

Iris Stone, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I oppose A.B. 367. It will have a very large fiscal cost with a significant workload on the election department with relatively minor impact. This bill will require the establishment of another committee consisting of multiple people, and since there are at least seven languages under consideration, there will need to be resources for each of these languages.

I personally immigrated many years ago to America, and I was anxious to learn English so that I could assimilate into society, get a job, make new friends, and study English. While I still speak my native language with family, I am an American citizen now and proud that I can speak English as good as my native tongue.

During some electioneering efforts in 2024, I actually spoke to Latino immigrants who shared my perspective, and they objected to receiving brochures in Spanish. They found it unnecessary and even condescending. I think Nevada would do better assigning a budget to offer English classes to anyone with limited-English proficiency. That would align well with President Trump's March 1 Executive Order; it states that a common language fosters national cohesion, helps newcomers engage in communities and tradition, and enriches our shared culture. It further states that establishing English as the official language promotes unity, establishes efficiency in government operations, and creates a pathway for civic engagement. The executive order celebrates multilingual Americans who have learned English and passed it down while empowering immigrants to achieve the American dream through a common language. I urge you to vote against A.B. 367. It is going to be very expensive and unnecessary.

Oscar Williams, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
No, it is a bit unfortunate. I see this really as two bills in one. You have got the needs of the hearing impaired, and that is important and certainly needs to be dealt with, but it has unique needs compared to those who speak a foreign language and have limited English proficiency or even those who are illiterate, because, of course, our schools are failing. There are really two different issues, but they were merged together here. I am going to try to tackle the foreign language thing for the most part in my testimony here.

By the way, this is a regurgitation of failed legislation in 2023, Assembly Bill 246 of the 82nd Session. It got vetoed for all the reasons this one is going to get vetoed, and I will get into it. Actually, there is an added bonus here which I might as well jump into. You know, our President, Donald J. Trump, on March 1 signed an executive order making English the

official language of the United States. This bill is completely irrespective of that and irrespective of the requirements of naturalization as a private speaker just mentioned.

We need to teach people English, and we have a lot of resources to do that, including the Washoe County schools. There is an adult language services program for people just like many of the people in support of this bill testified. They have family members who struggle with English and yet there are services out there and they are not getting the services. You know, be aware they are available to your folks, and you should take advantage of that. The presentation made was that—and I agree that the two biggest demographics of limited English proficiency in the state are Spanish and Tagalog, but we already provide voter election materials in those languages. So, I am not quite sure how we are adding that.

This is really more about allowing cell phone use inside a polling location, which I think is a security issue, although I appreciate that there are laws that allow you to have electronic devices to access your sample ballot. So, this is kind of a progression—

Chair Mosca:
Thank you, Mr. Williams, for calling in. You are at two minutes, so you can always give your testimony to the Committee secretary. Next caller, please. [There was no one.]

[Exhibit N, a collection of letters in opposition, was submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

We will now move to anyone wishing to testify in neutral on Assembly Bill 367 here in Carson City. Seeing no one approaching, we will move to Las Vegas, if you are here to testify in neutral on Assembly Bill 367. Seeing no one approaching the table in Las Vegas, we will move to the phone lines for anyone who would like to testify in neutral on A.B 367. [There was no one.] With that, I would like to invite Vice Chair González up for closing remarks, or your copresenter.

Chanel Cassanello:
I just want to say thank you for listening to this very different bill from Assembly Bill 246 of the 82nd Session for clarification, and also for the questions from Assemblymember Moore and Assemblymember Cole. I have done some research, and it is too complicated and would take too long to go into depth here because in some cases, rather than state by state, it is county by county implementing much more robust language access resources and lowering thresholds to meet their community needs. I will follow up with that information. Otherwise, thank you again.

[Exhibit O and Exhibit P were submitted but not discussed and will become part of the record.]

Chair Mosca:
With that, I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 367. We are going to a one-minute recess. [The meeting was recessed at 4:53 p.m. and reconvened at 4:58 p.m.]

[Assemblymember González assumed the Chair.]

Vice Chair González:
I will now open the hearing on Assembly Bill 254. This measure revises provisions relating to the Legislature.

Assembly Bill 254: Revises provisions relating to the Legislature. (BDR 17-691)

Vice Chair González:
We have our very own Chair Mosca presenting Assembly Bill 254 today. As a reminder, please limit your presentation to 15 minutes. I also want to note that if you are in the overflow room, we do have room, so please feel free to come in and fill in the seats in here. Due to time constraints today, we will be limiting testimony to 30 minutes total for each side—30 minutes for support, 30 minutes for opposition testimony, and 30 minutes for neutral. With that, begin when you are ready.

Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14:
I just want to make sure that the PowerPoint is up [Exhibit Q.]. I have a copresenter in Las Vegas, so I will have my copresenter briefly introduce himself.

Miles Dickson, CEO and Founder, Nevada GrantLab:
I am Miles Dickson, CEO and Founder of Nevada GrantLab.

Assemblymember Mosca:
This is my first time ever presenting to this Committee, so I am excited to be here today. I will first go over the why behind A.B. 254—what is the purpose, and where did it come from. We will start by talking about some important facts about the nonprofit sector, and then I am going to share my experience as a nonprofit founder and former executive director, as well as the work with the Nevada Nonprofit Legislative. After that, I will go over the bill and the amendment review. The amendment [Exhibit R] is basically a bill rewrite, so I will be going over that, and of course, happy to answer any and all of your questions.

This session I have had ten pieces of policy that all go under my three pillars of good governance: higher education, workforce attainment, or community support [Exhibit Q]. This is my last bill under good governance today, and I really do not see it as a problem. I always like to frame all of my legislation under a problem and a solution. I do not see this as a problem; I see it more as an opportunity where we can help more Nevadans through Nevada nonprofits as well as continue the work that so many have done before us. We are proposing creating a competitive grant program within the state of Nevada. With that, I will kick it over to my copresenter.

Miles Dickson:
I want to begin by talking a little bit about the importance of the nonprofit sector here in partnership with state government. In every corner of our state every day, nonprofits deliver a wide range of services that benefit Nevadans, enrich our communities, and contribute to our economy. Despite their tremendous importance, however, Nevada's nonprofit sector is significantly underfunded, understaffed, and undersized. For example, nonprofits in the Las Vegas region have annual expenditures of just $783 per capita per year compared to an average expenditure of about $4,000 in comparable regions. Likewise, many nonprofits have low rates of net assets and cash on hand, with most unable to cover more than three months of expenses.

Even though it is a small but mighty nonprofit sector, it is a major and significant contributor to our economy. In fact, our sector employs more than 46,000 people. We spend more than $3 billion annually in the state of Nevada on payroll, buying goods and services, paying rent and mortgages, owning office spaces, operating service sites, and the like. And really importantly, we also contribute to the attraction of more investment to our state, whether that is through federal grant resources or national philanthropy.

The state of Nevada, as you all know so well, regularly provides critical funding to the sector via appropriations, grants, and contracts. Those dollars are critical to funding the services that our organizations provide every single day. Most state grants and contracts are awarded and administered by state agencies. These grants are funded by a combination of federal dollars as well as state dollars, and sometimes a combination of both. Additionally, from time to time when funding is available, the Governor and/or the Legislature are able to—and together I should say—award appropriations to support worthy projects for qualified nonprofits. These appropriations are remarkably important and impactful for nonprofits and more importantly, the communities they serve.

While I know that you would probably like me to sit and spend quite a bit of time talking about all the good work of the nonprofit sector, what I would rather do is refer the Committee—or any members who are not part of IFC [Interim Finance Committee]—to listen or to review the incredibly compelling testimony and reporting provided during the January 29, 2025 IFC meeting from the more than 60 nonprofits throughout the state who received appropriations from the 82nd Legislature, as they described how they spent those dollars to benefit Nevada communities and families, creating jobs, increasing access to everything from wraparound support that helps students, to increasing access to primary care, mental health care, or for that matter access to the arts, affordable housing, and truly everything in between. You know, these appropriations really are so critical to how nonprofits operate.

Finally, I want to end before turning it back over to the Assemblymember by saying that so many nonprofits are prepared and capable of administering government grants. In fact, more than 500 Nevada nonprofits received more than $1.25 billion in government grants from local, state, and federal sources in 2021 alone. This sector is capable of doing the important work that Nevadans and taxpayers rely on it to do. In fact, it does that work every single day,

and the opportunity to put into place a process that builds on the great work that has already been done with appropriations and complements state governments and government contracts and grants is something that we are really excited about here at Nevada GrantLab. We appreciate the bill sponsor, as well as the many other members of the Legislature and the nonprofit community who have provided input on this.

Assemblymember Mosca:
For me, it is really about what nonprofits actually do to help people. It is not about trying to fund folks or help them with their operating. It is really, How can we make sure Nevadans are fed, are able to go to school, and have everything that they need to succeed? The first photo [Exhibit Q] is of some students a very long time ago who are now—one is a physician's assistant in our state, one is a communications director in our state, the other one is a small business owner in our state. She owns her own coffee shop. My experience as a nonprofit founder and former executive director was really just helping the community and making sure that they could reach their dreams and not have barriers in their way.

Through this Legislature, I have been really excited to chair the Nevada Nonprofit Caucus, which, for the past interim, has been doing a lot of bipartisan, bicameral work to really just help members understand more about nonprofits, as well as help nonprofits understand more about the legislative process, whether it is how to invite your legislator to an event, to how to testify on a bill. We have had many, many representatives. We have had four different counties come to an event. We had over 120 nonprofits at the one in southern Nevada and over 30 at the one in Carson City we just did, and these are some photos here as well. This bill really just comes from direct feedback from the Caucus. We wanted to make sure we were bringing something they were saying they would like to see. For me, it is really building on the work so many of you on this Committee have already done and continued to do previous to my serving.

With that, I will go over the bill, which again is really in the amendment [Exhibit R]. So, the goal was to really just try to start something, create a competitive, merit-based grant process in the state of Nevada, and getting some good feedback [Exhibit Q]. We saw that a good place where this could be—and you see it in section 2, subsection 2—would actually be the Office of Federal Assistance (OFA) could potentially house this program. In section 2, subsection 3, we have that the Interim Finance Committee may adopt the regulations that the OFA comes up with so that IFC and the legislative body can still give feedback and make sure that our thoughts are heard.

When you go to section 3, we see the Office of Federal Assistance as the source of funds, because we know here in the state of Nevada, with the way our revenue is set up, we do not have a lot of State General Funds that we can just give to nonprofits, so we want to make sure we can have a different way that we can help our nonprofits in our state to make sure they can continue the good work for constituents and that we can continue to work together to help our state. And with that, we will love to open it up to questions.

Vice Chair González:
Thank you so much. Members, do we have any questions?

Assemblymember Monroe-Moreno:
I do not have a question, but I do have a comment. I have worked on our grant management in the state every session, and I just want to thank you for picking up the torch and continuing on with this work because we know we are limited in the work we can do at the state level. It is truly our nonprofits who are on the ground day in, day out, that are having a positive, long-lasting, meaningful impact with our constituents. So, thank you for coming up with a creative way to assist them in doing that.

Assemblymember Cole:
I am looking at the amendment, and I am just looking at section 2, subsection 1, where the change was made from private nonprofits to public nonprofits. I guess my question is (a) why was that done; and (b) what is the difference?

Assemblymember Mosca:
Assemblymember Cole, I am going to pitch that question to Mr. Dickson down south.

Miles Dickson:
I think the best answer, Assemblymember, is that *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) in different places defines nonprofits in different ways. I think one of the things that we are trying to make clear here is, a public nonprofit is one that services the public, as opposed to perhaps a private nonprofit—like a foundation, for example—that is funded by individuals or corporations. The focus here really is on the nonprofits that are in direct services that qualify as a public nonprofit under, for example, IRS 501(c)(3) sections.

Assemblymember Hibbetts:
Can you just put on the record where the Office of Federal Assistance is located within the governmental organization so that it is clear for anybody watching, listening, thinking about this, reading about it on social media—so that people understand where this is going to be housed?

Assemblymember Mosca:
The Office of Federal Assistance is in the Office of the Governor, so it is located in the Executive Branch.

Vice Chair González:
I was wondering if you could speak to maybe how other states do this, and/or maybe where you got the idea for this very creative way to help our nonprofits?

Assemblymember Mosca:
Yes. I definitely cannot take credit. It really is the people, especially our chairwoman that is here today, who has done so much work actually on grants, as well as those who are behind me and down south. So, I am not going to take credit.

I would just say that in the listening sessions with the multiple convenings we had with nonprofits, it was one of the top things they bubbled up. It is just, they would love a way to apply if there was funding. So, we came up with that, and then for other states, I will let Mr. Dickson answer.

Miles Dickson:
The majority of government grant funding is going to be controlled by contracts and grants administered by state agencies directly. As you all are familiar, in most states, those are going to be approved by the Legislature and then administered on the Executive Branch side. States have different treatments for how they do appropriations, if you will, so those dollars that fall outside of a funded contractor grant, there really are many different approaches here.

Several states, as well as the federal government, allow for an appropriations process. That is really based in the idea that legislators, yourselves, are often the folks who know the most about the communities you represent. Outside of the traditional—or in addition to the traditional grants and contracts process, it allows policymakers, representatives of the people, to really help direct resources to the organizations and the needs that are most critical and most compelling in the districts you represent. So, appropriations are a pretty common part of many government entities.

Vice Chair González:
Members, any last questions?

Assemblymember Dickman:
How would the nonprofits apply to get the grants? Just an application process we have to set up?

Assemblymember Mosca:
Great question. It is under section 2, subsection 3, that it would be the Office of Federal Assistance. It says under section 2, subsection 3(a), subsection 3(b), and subsection 3(c), they are the ones that would come up with the ways, like the rubric, because we would want to make sure that it is merit-based. It is not just you can apply, right? You have to do an application, you have to get approved based on a rubric, and it would actually be brought to IFC so that we could also make sure the people who manage the money agree with the regulations that were set up.

Assemblymember Dickman:
The money that comes in could be federal, could be state, could be donations, right?

Assemblymember Mosca:
Yes, and please correct me if I am wrong, Mr. Dickson, but in section 3, subsection 3, we did put that the Office of Federal Assistance could raise money or get money for this, because we are trying really hard to not touch state funding because we know that it is a small pot. We want them to go out and find money through the federal, or other ways, and it would actually just live there, if that makes sense. Mr. Dickson, do you want to add anything?

Miles Dickson:
Sure, I would add that the vast majority of federal dollars that the state receives come with really clear use restrictions, and those are going to be administered by your agencies. So, to the extent that this program has funding in the future, it is most likely to come through, whether—as the Assemblymember pointed out—contributions to the program, or on occasion, when the state does have the resources, it can invest in direct grantmaking to nonprofits, probably there. And again, I think that the point here is recognizing or trying to put into place a process that allows that when the state has those resources, there is a process to allow applicants' applications to come forward, be reviewed on a merit-based system, and ultimately, have award decisions made.

Assemblymember Moore:
I do have a question in regard to how will this office ensure that smaller nonprofits are aware this program exists and they are able to apply? I know the bigger nonprofits would not necessarily have an issue.

Assemblymember Mosca:
I really appreciate that question, Assemblymember Moore. I saw this like way too close to the meeting, but if you go to the last page [Exhibit R] under section 2, subsection 3(b), it says, "including; and" and then there is nothing after "including; and"—it is supposed to say, "Including; and rubrics for both newer nonprofits"—we had language. It was either newer nonprofits or less established nonprofits because we know that they should have different criteria, if that makes sense?

As someone who started my nonprofit from my own savings and had to have another job for five years before I could be paid and have a staff, I very much understand the importance of having different criteria versus a very large nonprofit that maybe has a million in budget. That actually is supposed to be included in there. It will be included in there, and Mr. Dickson helped with the language and actually can say that better than me.

Miles Dickson:
Chair Mosca, throughout the interim, made a priority in our conversations around making sure that the process was equitable and inclusive. One of the things we talked about, which is a standard, and you can find in different federal agencies as well as in private philanthropy, is essentially a rubric that recognizes certain organizations that have larger infrastructure could be scored differently than maybe an organization that is smaller. It is a combination of both proactive outreach and promotion.

And, I can tell you, so many nonprofits—over the last few years and in my day job—reach out more and more than they ever have before looking for resources. So, I think there is a lot of interest among all sorts of nonprofits. I think if the state is able to kind of put together the application and make the merit review process clear, I think you will find a really broad interest in participation in the program, again, when funding is available, recognizing that may not be the case every biennium.

Vice Chair González:
With that, I will now open testimony in support of A.B. 254. As a reminder, we will be doing 30 minutes in support, 30 minutes in opposition, and 30 minutes in neutral. Each person has two minutes to provide testimony. We will start here in Carson City.

Tom Clark, representing United Way of Northern Nevada and the Sierra; and The Children's Cabinet:
I want to very much thank the sponsor of this particular piece of legislation, the Chair of this Committee, for thinking not just outside the box but also kind of inside the box by amending the bill to use an existing office to do this service. It is an office that is trusted; the staff there is trusted, nonprofits know them, and whatever rubric, whatever application they put forward, I think is one that can be recognized, that will be fair for all nonprofits across the board. They are looking to use these resources to move things forward.

As a very active board member of a number of nonprofits that are always seeking additional resources, this will be one more place where we can go to hopefully garner the resources that we need to accomplish our missions.

Cindi Rivera, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
As a board member for a nonprofit organization, I am in favor of Assembly Bill 254. Nonprofits are passionate about our missions, and the teams that lead them are 110 percent committed to the missions. However, lack of access and actual acquisition of funding is one of the things that keep us up at night. Setting up a competitive, merit-based, streamlined grant process will provide a nonprofit organization the ability to apply for grants and to be able to gain that funding that is much needed. It will provide us with the opportunity to be able to have this money provided to us that otherwise we would not be able to apply for or have the ability and access to it.

The process A.B. 254 proposes will give nonprofit members the ability to regain at least a little bit more of sleep at night, which is well deserved. But more important than sleep, A.B. 254 will give nonprofits the ability to continue our community-based missions once we have, of course, successfully completed the process and have been awarded the grants.

Marco Rauda, representing Green Our Planet; and Jobs for American Graduates Nevada:
We are in support of this bill. I wanted to thank not just the sponsor, but also the Committee for hearing this bill. I also wanted to thank the youngest Chair for being here as well. So, I just wanted to ditto what everybody else said.

Henry Rosas, representing United Way of Southern Nevada:
Just really wanted to very quickly start with just thanking the bill sponsor as chair of the Nonprofit Caucus for all of her work in partnership over the interim. The numbers that were highlighted during the presentation just scratched the surface of the amount of investment that not just the Chair has made, but also many members of this Committee and of the Legislature, to really partner and engage with the nonprofit sector. I think that was very much

demonstrated yesterday with Nonprofit Day at the Legislature with over 110 nonprofits, is really a testament to just the growing partnership and engagement between the sector and the Legislature.

And this just offers another opportunity and pathway to continue that partnership and relationship with community organizations. So, just want to really emphasize the support of the sector and just strengthening the state's investment, making sure that we can propose innovative ideas to meet community need, but overall just strengthening public and private partnerships in the state. This bill tackles each of those objectives and visions for the sector to strengthen the work that we do every single day. I urge your support for this bill.

Lea Cartwright, representing Foster Kinship; and Boys Town Nevada:
I am here today on behalf of Foster Kinship and Boys Town Nevada, two public nonprofits here in the state. Foster Kinship specifically had a statement for me to read. Unfortunately, they are providing services today.

> For over a decade, Foster Kinship, Nevada's leading nonprofit dedicated to supporting kinship families, has worked directly with thousands of caregivers and children across the state. As a public nonprofit, we rely on a patchwork of funding sources, grants, donations, and limited state and federal funds to provide critical services like legal navigation, financial assistance, trauma-informed respite, and caregiver education.

As others have said before me, this bill will streamline and strengthen the ability of Foster Kinship and Boys Town Nevada to bridge those gaps in services in the state and make sure that services are given and resources are provided to the folks who need them most.

Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada:
Yes to everything that was said before. I would just like to add that we have around 155 partner agencies. Many of those are nonprofit organizations themselves, and it is really important that we are able to support everybody who helps us, as the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, do the work that we do. We are grateful to the work that the Legislative Nonprofit Caucus has done over the interim. We thank the bill sponsor for bringing this forward, and we thank the Committee for taking the time to hear the bill.

Eric Jeng, Executive Director, One APIA Nevada:
As executive director of One APIA Nevada, advocating and empowering the fast-growing Asian Pacific Islander American community, here in strong support of A.B. 254. We also want to thank the sponsor, Chair Mosca, and also the strong collaboration, public/private sector partnership in the interim with the Nonprofit Caucus, and from GrantLab and United Way's Nonprofit Connection.

Nevada's population has grown significantly, and our community development needs those resources. I am just wrapping up our Advocacy Day. Yesterday we brought tens of dozens of nonprofit partners to Carson City, and they are always asking where can they find the

resources, just a little bit, to jump start or just bring them to the next level? For all these folks who are putting in their volunteering time or just starting to help, they can address specific needs for their community. Assembly Bill 254 is a necessary step towards empowering our local organization to address these challenges through targeted projects, and we urge you to support A.B. 254 to support our community through localized and nonprofit-driven work that we do.

Vice Chair González:
Let us go down in Las Vegas. You may begin.

Sally Balecha, Region President, Desert Mountain, National Federation of Filipino American Associations:
As the president of the Desert Mountain Region for the National Federation of Filipino American Associations, a nonprofit organization to empower our 270,000 Filipino Americans in Nevada, I strongly support A.B. 254. This bill funds nonprofit organizations that directly benefit Nevada communities. It ensures resources go where they are needed most while maintaining transparency and accountability. I urge for your support.

Vice Chair González:
Is there anyone else in Las Vegas who would like to testify in support of A.B. 254? Seeing no one, can you please open the phone lines?

Gil Lopez, Executive Director, Charter School Association of Nevada:
I am here today to express our strong support for A.B. 254. I wanted to thank the bill sponsor for this important bill. Charter schools are deeply embedded in our local communities, and we work to provide high-quality education while also addressing the broader needs of students and families. This grant program creates an opportunity to support initiatives that enhance educational access, student well-being, and community engagement. We urge your support for this bill to help strengthen community-driven initiatives that uplift families, neighborhoods, and students across Nevada.

Hieu Le, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am on my personal time and my personal capacity as a nonprofit management student who will be graduating at University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV) next year. This bill helps us provide more opportunities for all the students in UNLV who are getting their nonprofit degree. And hey, it helps out with the community and then builds an inspiration for new leaders.

Lisa Habighorst, Cofounder and CEO, Spread the Word Nevada:
Spread the Word Nevada is the largest children's literacy nonprofit in the state, started 24 years ago in my home and now serving over 57,000 children monthly across the state with family literacy training, mentoring, and book distribution programs. I welcome the opportunity to testify in support of A.B. 254 this afternoon. As a mid-size nonprofit in our great state, I see great value in creating a system of equal footing and opportunity for all

public nonprofits to have access to funding. Assembly Bill 254 levels the playing field for all of us and puts our focus where it should be—on our constituents.

It also allows the Office of Federal Assistance to set eligibility for projects that are most needed by the state during a certain grant cycle. I also think that the accountability of this system such as this would be much greater and ensure our nonprofits are doing what they propose to do with the requested funding. I would guess that this new way of opening up potential funding to all of Nevada's nonprofits might certainly bring about more collaboration amongst our sector to tackle major issues we face together. So many are doing great work. Let us give all of them an equal opportunity.

Anthony Curry, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I want to thank Chair Mosca and Mr. Dickson for this presentation, and I will just ditto the rest of the comments that have been in support.

Kipp Ortenburger, Director of Strategy, Vegas PBS:
On behalf of our organization, which is also a nonprofit, we share our support of A.B. 254. We believe a structured community project grant program will provide more transparency and equitability on how state funding is allocated to the nonprofit sector. Also given the application reporting structures that will be built as part of the bill, we feel this is a great opportunity for state agencies and the Legislature itself to better understand how nonprofits can support greater statewide economic, community, and social impact. And finally, we believe a formal grant process will foster greater engagement and collaboration between the nonprofit sector, our Legislature, state agencies, and of course, the new Office of Federal Assistance itself.

Tameka Henry, Executive Director, Obodo Collective:
I am testifying in support of A.B. 254. For small nonprofits like ours, A.B. 254 can unlock access to state funds that are necessary for us to continue the work we do with our local community. So, I just want to say that I am in full support of A.B. 254.

Jordan Hankins, Founder and Executive Director, Southern Nevada Black Educators Initiative:
I am in full support of Assembly Bill 254. I also believe that having access to state funds is just going to allow us to support community, the children in the community, and also the educators so much more.

Vice Chair González:
I will now close the testimony in support and open testimony in opposition. If you would like to testify in opposition to A.B. 254, please come to the table. We will start in Carson City.

Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families for Freedom:
Every day in the Legislature as I testify on different bills, there are numerous nonprofits who are in direct philosophical opposition to what we believe. We find that continuously because we believe in less government, lower taxes, and more individual responsibility, and therefore,

we have nonprofits always seeking more government money, more government help, and more government. One example of this I would mention is Planned Parenthood. They receive a lot of federal money, and I am not sure about the state money, but we have often been in opposition in this building with them on numerous issues. There have been a few occasions where we were able to come together on the same thing and that is always a wonderful thing, but we are concerned about the fact that so much of the money continually goes to organizations which have such a different philosophy of expanded government instead of less.

I was very pleased with the intent of the amendment which wanted a merit-based program and had increased accountability. I think that was very positive. I appreciate Chair Mosca in changing it from earmarks, which are open to a lot of corruption, to this kind of a program. I think that is very admirable and we appreciate that. But our concern remains the same—so many of these nonprofits that get money from the government are involved in empire building and continually expand for more government, and more government, and more government. We are concerned about that, and that is why we oppose this bill, but we love you all.

Vice Chair González:
Seeing that in Carson City there are no more, let us go down to Las Vegas. Is anybody wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 254 in Vegas? Seeing none, we will move to the phones.

Iris Stone, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I echo the comments that Ms. Janine Hansen just made, and I am in total agreement with what she mentioned. Therefore, I also do not support this bill.

Oscar Williams, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:
I am opposed to A.B. 254 because it is a bad bill for taxpayers. The funding mechanism we will see—whether it is state funds, federal funds—it is taxpayer funds. And for me, I think the big concern is nonprofit; that is supposed to be nongovernmental but is primarily funded through government taxpayer funds. The Children's Cabinet happens to be a great example; 97 percent funded by taxpayer funds in the tune of $128 million. That is a lot of cheese.

The nongovernmental organizations—these nonprofits and the funding mechanisms can be easily biased in a way, pursuing ideological goals of a majority party of the Legislature. And I just think there are some problems with that. If you could maybe limit it to these contributions of maybe only 10 percent of what the revenue is, that would, I think, spread it out more which might help more people and would maybe limit the soft government operation that is the essence of what this bill really is.

And in terms of funding, I want to finish on this point. Stuff like this and many other bills we have seen through this Committee all have this unfunded mandate and to me it is, if all of it was to pass, we are going down the path of a state income tax, and I oppose that. So, you

know, without a better funding mechanism, the biases inherent into it, and lack of controls, I have got some problems with it.

Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I am in opposition of this bill. I love nonprofit organizations. I volunteer for a lot of them. Me and my kids volunteer for—say the word, I do not mind volunteering. I do not mind giving my own money to that, but I am against taxpayer money used for nonprofit organizations, especially after we see what happened with the United States Agency for International Development that was giving our money away like hotcakes for things that taxpayers should not be paying for.

I do appreciate the nonprofit organization's work. I do not mind people volunteering, but the taxpayer money should be used for things that directly affect all the taxpayers. And if you have that much extra money, like last year, the last session, you guys had the Christmas bill last minute, that pretty much a bunch of legislators gave money to their favorite nonprofit. And even one of the legislators had to leave because they put in the *Las Vegas Review-Journal* that she actually gets a salary of—if the memory serves me correct—like half a million for a yearly salary with the same nonprofit that she voted to give money to.

So, until those things are fixed—I believe they are not—not one nonprofit should be getting taxpayers' money. If you have extra money that we pay taxes, give it back to us, the taxpayers, and we will give it to the nonprofit we want to give it to. You should not be deciding what to do with the extra money you have from me, and if you do not have extra money, they should not be going to nonprofits. They should be going to schools, to make sure the veterans are taken care of; we have a bunch of homeless people, and do not get me wrong, a lot of the nonprofits that were mentioned I like, and I support and—

Vice Chair González:
Thank you so much. You can continue to submit your comments to the Committee. You are at your two minutes. I will now open the testimony for those who would like to testify in neutral for A.B. 254. We will start here in Carson City. Please begin when you are ready.

A'Keia Sanders, Director, Office of Federal Assistance, Office of the Governor:
First, I would like to express our appreciation for the opportunity to participate in this important discussion. Expanding access to community-focused funding is a crucial step in ensuring that resources reach the organizations and initiatives that serve Nevada's communities. We are encouraged to see these conversations taking place and value the opportunity to contribute. As the state centralized office for federal financial assistance, the Office of Federal Assistance (OFA) plays a key role in supporting Nevada's agencies, stakeholders, and community members in navigating and securing federal funding. Additionally, we administer the state grant matching program [Grant Matching Fund Program] and provide technical assistance to ensure efficient and effective grant processes statewide.

While Assembly Bill 254 does not specify where the community project grant program will ultimately be housed, we recognize that its purpose and administrative requirements could align with OFA's existing functions. We acknowledge the proposed amendment that identifies OFA as the administrator of the program and the ability for OFA to act as a clearing house to ensure efficiency and transparency. And we appreciate the confidence placed in our offices, expertise, and infrastructure.

At this time, OFA remains neutral on where the program is housed. Again, our focus remains on ensuring that any grant program serving Nevada's community is administered efficiently, transparently, and in alignment with best practices. Should it be determined that OFA is the appropriate entity to support the implementation of this program, we are committed to collaborating with legislators and stakeholders to ensure its success. We appreciate being included in this discussion and look forward to seeing how this initiative develops. The Office of Federal Assistance stands ready to assist as needed to support the efficient and transparent administration of grant programs that benefit our state.

Vice Chair González:
Is there anyone else who would like to testify in neutral on A.B. 254? Seeing none, we will go down to Las Vegas. Seeing none, we will go to the phones. [There was no one.] I will now close the testimony in neutral on A.B. 254, and I would like to invite Chair Mosca back up to make closing remarks.

Assemblymember Mosca:
Thank you so much, Committee, for your questions, for considering this policy. I want to thank all those who are in the work, helping people. It is not about the nonprofits; it is about the work that they do for people in Nevada, no matter where they live—in the rurals, or in the south or the north. And no matter who you represent, we know we need to help people of our state to have every opportunity possible, so thank you for considering the bill.

Vice Chair González:
With that, I will now close the hearing on A.B. 254, and I will allow our Chair some time back to resume chairing.

[Assemblymember Mosca reassumed the Chair.]

Chair Mosca:
I think the Chair that was here before is a much cuter chair than myself, so thank you for sharing it with me. At this time, we will move on to the last item of our agenda, which is public comment. And please, public comment is for items pertaining to the Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and not on the two bills that were heard today. Is there anyone in Carson City here to give public comment? Seeing no one, we will go to Las Vegas. Anyone in Las Vegas? Seeing no one, can we please go to the phone line for public comment?

Ellen Gifford, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:
The bill Assembly Bill 261, which was just passed in the work session, reads as a duplication of the existing statute, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 269.927. When the people of Nevada's counties elect their county—

Chair Mosca:
We have already considered that bill, but you are more than welcome to comment on anything else within Legislative Operations and Elections.

Ellen Gifford:
I thought if it was not a hearing that I could speak. I apologize. Very well then. Can I start over?

Chair Mosca:
Yes, within the purview of the Committee. Yes, you can start over.

Ellen Gifford:
Well, I hope this is within the purview. I am so sorry. Nevada has a law addressing harassment, which is a crime punishable by imprisonment. Harassment includes threatening someone's life among other threats of harm. This law applies to anyone anywhere in Nevada. Nevada also has a law that describes what a person can do to protect themselves if the crime of harassment is performed against them. There is a process in place, there is a clear guidance, there is some level of recourse given to victims of harassment whether they are a candidate, a judicial officer, a juror, or a cashier. These existing laws cover all harassment victims.

It is troubling to know that members of Nevada's Assembly have been victims of this crime. It is even more troubling that the steps that can be taken for protection were not taken, perhaps due to being unaware of the existing law. These steps can be taken immediately, which they should be when your life is threatened. There should be no 30-day wait for a report from the Secretary of State, followed by another investigation by the Attorney General. A death threat is a death threat. Nevada has a law addressing the duties of the Secretary of State. Included in those duties are investigations of civil matters. Criminal matters are not included. Threats against our lives are criminal matters and existing law enforcement measures must be applied as soon as possible. Assembly Bill 123 does not protect anyone. Existing laws do, and it is important that everyone knows they are in place. Thank you very much.

Katrin Ivanoff, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:
I just want to mention that I do not know what is the procedure for you taking our opinion into consideration, but for example, A.B. 123 is 94 percent no, and I am talking NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System], what I got from the NELIS report. Assembly Bill 235 is 93 percent no; Assembly Bill 328 is 84 percent no; and Senate Bill 245 is 90 percent no. This is not just a simple no, this is a hell no. And yet you guys seem to not hear us when we talk.

I am not saying specifically this Committee; that would probably be a comment that I will make in almost every committee that I talk to at the end of the [unintelligible]. I just want to find out, is there any way that you guys even look at NELIS in our comments? Because from where I am standing, and not just me, I am speaking about others as well, it does not seem like you guys are listening to our opinions and if there are any other ways of you kind of listening to us, please let us know what that is. We are trying to use the tools that you have given us, and it does not seem to get to some of you. I hope that changes in the future. Maybe you are really busy, and you forgot to look at NELIS. So, I am hoping to remind you, please look at our opinions on NELIS. Is that not why you guys put it on? I am looking forward to working with all of you and passing some good legislation and not passing a bad one. Please think about the taxpayers and the voters—

Chair Mosca:
Thank you. You are at two minutes.

Iris Stone, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Assembly Bill 123 had a hearing last Tuesday, but there was a last-minute amendment that was rather significant. The original A.B. 123 was prefiled on January 25, and then the amendment was submitted on March 19 and represents a complete reversal of the original intent of this bill. The original bill isolates and targets political candidates from engaging in harassment, and the amendment is worded just the opposite and is quote, Designed to protect the safety and wellness of candidates for public office, unquote. What happened to warrant such a drastic change?

But most importantly, this still duplicates NRS 200.571 under the rubric of harassment and stalking. The harassment clause outlines clear consequences for violations which, by the way, are repeated verbatim in this proposed bill. Is not anyone subject to harassment equally victimized? What is the need for A.B. 123 I will ask? While I condemn any harassment, the law should apply to all Nevadans equally. Why create a special process tailored for candidates?

My last observation is regarding the role of the Secretary of State. The Secretary of State, possibly with the help of county clerk, is instructed to "Write a report to the candidate within 30 days describing the alleged conduct." The Secretary's responsibility for investigations is limited to civil cases such as security frauds, Ponzi schemes, investment fraud, corporate ownership fraud, and election fraud: duplicate voters, voter challenges, et cetera. It does not include criminal cases such as harassment or stalking.

Therefore, let us remove the Secretary of State as a middleman and have candidates work directly with the State Attorney General's criminal investigators. And if the Attorney General's Office deems it necessary to engage with the Secretary of State, then let them do so. Assembly Bill 123 is superfluous and NRS 200.571 is adequate for the purpose of the intent of the statute.

Chair Mosca:
Next caller, please. [There was no one.] Seeing no further business before us, this meeting is adjourned [at 5:54 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Kristi Howard
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.J.R. 6	C	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.J.R. 7	D	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B 148	E	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 256	F	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 261	G	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 262	H	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 287	I	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 348	J	Haley Proehl, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
A.B. 367	K	Chanel Cassanello, Campaign Manager, All Voting is Local Action Nevada	Proposed conceptual amendment
A.B. 367	L	Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16; Chanel Cassanello, Campaign Manager, All Voting is Local Action Nevada	PowerPoint presentation titled "AB 367: Language Access for All Voters"
A.B. 367	M	Various Individuals	Collection of letters in support
A.B. 367	N	Various Individuals	Collection of letters in opposition

A.B. 367	O	Assemblymember Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16	Document titled "ASSEMBLY BILL 367; IMPROVING LANGUAGE ACCESS IN ELECTIONS"
A.B. 367	P	Chanel Cassanello, Campaign Manager, All Voting is Local Action Nevada	Brochure titled ACCESS FOR ALL
A.B. 254	Q	Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14	PowerPoint presentation titled "Assembly Bill 254"
A.B. 254	R	Assemblymember Erica Mosca, Assembly District No. 14	Proposed conceptual amendment