

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

**Eighty-third Session
May 13, 2025**

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 1:53 p.m. on Tuesday, May 13, 2025, in Room 1214 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 9 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the attendance roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair
Senator Skip Daly, Vice Chair
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator John C. Steinbeck

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Senator Nicole J. Cannizzaro (Excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Selena La Rue Hatch, Assembly District No. 25
Assemblymember Steve Yeager, Assembly District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst
Kelsey DeLozier, Committee Counsel
Suzanne Efford, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gabriel Di Chiara, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Bradley Schrager
Francisco V. Aguilar, Secretary of State
Katrin Ivanoff

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 13, 2025
Page 2

Joshua Skaggs, Nevada Republican Party
Janine Hansen, Independent American Party
Cyrus Hojjaty
Ashley Kennedy, Clark County
Cadence Matijevich, Washoe County
Emily Persaud-Zamora, Silver State Voices; Let Nevadans Vote Coalition
Jennifer Willett, All Voting is Local
Shelbie Swartz, Battle Born Progress; Institute for a Progressive Nevada
Iris Stone
Ellen Gifford
Vinson Guthreau, Nevada Association of Counties
Ryan Vortisch, Silver State Voices; Let Nevadans Vote Coalition
William Moore, Mi Familia En Acción
Edith Duarte, TechNet
Tray Abney, Nevada Broadcasters Association
Kimberly Fergus
Anne Macquarie, Nevada Rail Coalition; Rail Passengers Association
Minjia Yan
Olivia Tanager, Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter
Trystin St. Denis, Nevada Conservation League
Ross Kinson, Teamsters Local 533; Northern Nevada Central Labor Council
Gabriel Christenson, Steel Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers,
Transportation Division
Carlos Hernandez, Nevada State AFL-CIO
Trevor Parrish, Vegas Chamber
Caitlin Gatchalian, Southwest Energy Efficiency Project
Maria Nieto Orta, Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada
Hector Arreola, Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition
Aaron Harris
Matthew Wilkie
John Carlo
Ron Kaminkow, Railroad Workers United
Oscar Williams
Chanel Cassanello, All Voting is Local
Mark Wlaschin, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State
Carissa Pearce, Children's Advocacy Alliance
Noé Orosco, Make the Road Nevada
Izack Tenorio, Campaign Legal Center
Mathilda Miller, Native Voters Alliance Nevada

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 13, 2025
Page 3

Eric Wilcox, Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing
Lynn Chapman, Independent American Party

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I would like to open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 491.

ASSEMBLY BILL 491 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to elections.
(BDR 24-570)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

I am pleased to present A.B. 491 in its first reprint this afternoon. I will also let you know there is a relatively brief conceptual amendment ([Exhibit C](#)). A copy of that should be on NELIS [Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System]. This bill revises provisions relating to elections specifically regarding data requests by the Secretary of State, qualifications for elected public offices, and declarations of candidacy eligibility and residency.

So just by way of background, this bill really is more of a cleanup bill than anything, making commonsense, technical changes to elections laws that will improve communication and the flow of information, ensuring greater transparency.

It is a rather long bill, but a lot of the language repeats itself. Section 1, as proposed to be changed by the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), requires city and county clerks to respond to a request by the Secretary of State for any data or information relating to the current election within two working days of receiving the request. The clerk must respond with either the information or data requested or a written explanation as to when the data or information can reasonably be provided. The impetus here is that the Secretary of State sometimes needs information to convey to the public what is happening. Having a clear time frame in statute would be ideal.

Sections 2 and 7 through 77, the bulk of the bill, revise the qualifications for elected public offices, other than federal offices, to require the officers to be registered to vote in the state, district, county, township or other area prescribed by law where they must reside and, if elected, over which they will have jurisdiction or representation. This means candidates for these public offices must be registered to vote in the appropriate jurisdiction where they are

running for statewide offices like the Governor, Attorney General or Secretary of State.

Assembly Bill 491 would require them to be registered to vote in Nevada. Legislators and candidates of state legislative offices would be required to be registered to vote in the legislative district they are running to represent. Similarly, officers or candidates of county-level, city-level and township-level public offices would be required to register to vote in the appropriate county, city or township. I did not know this until I started looking at this bill, but right now, there is no requirement that you be registered to vote in the district you represent.

You must live there. The residency requirements are already in place, but I think it is good public policy to be registered to vote in the area you are going to run to represent. So that is simply what sections 2 and 7 through 77 do.

Section 78 clarifies that these revised qualifications do not apply to any person who holds public office on October 1, 2025. Instead, the new qualifications would apply to anyone who files a declaration of candidacy after that date. Obviously, we would hope if folks were not registered to vote in the districts they are representing, they would just go ahead and register to vote. But that would not be a legal requirement due to the ex post facto doctrine.

And then for the rest of the bill, sections 3, 6 and 13 require those filing a declaration of candidacy or declaration of eligibility after the effective date to attest under penalty of perjury to the city or town in the county in Nevada where they are registered to vote. That would be added to the forms we have to fill out when we go file declarations of candidacy.

And then sections 3, 4, 6 and 13 provide that declarations of candidacy, residency and eligibility are public records and must be made available by the filing officer to the public in electronic format.

GABRIEL DI CHIARA (Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State):

We are grateful to Speaker Yeager for bringing this bill. Data transparency is incredibly important to Secretary Aguilar. We have some similar provisions in our own bill, and we see this bill as complementary. It is incredibly important that we can provide information the public needs about our elections as they happen, and this bill helps with that.

BRADLEY SCHRAGER:

I will add very little other than to say regarding the requirement to be registered in the district which you seek to represent, not only is it good policy, but for many years, the filing officers have been the county clerks and the registrars. They have very little means of verifying any aspect of your declaration of candidacy on-site. In this instance, it will also provide the ability for the registrars who maintain the records of your voter registration to do an immediate check as to your eligibility. So that is another positive. We all know there have been residency challenges over the years. This is meant to be an immediate check upon the eligibility of candidates. The public records and the penalty of perjury flow from that as well, so I think these are very good policies.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), [reads,] "Amend Section 1 of the bill to clarify that the Secretary of State's request for information must be for the current election." I just wondered what the impetus is behind having it just for that current election versus past elections. I just wondered if you could comment on that.

MR. DI CHIARA:

We understand that when the clerks are running an election, they have a lot going on. This legislation would create the requirement for them to respond to the request of the Secretary of State, which we believe is important. However, if we are establishing that ability in statute, we want to make sure it can't be abused. For example, if a clerk is in the middle of canvassing the vote for the 2024 election, a lot of questions about what happened in 1986 would not necessarily be the timeliest. We are placing this requirement on the clerks. It is helpful to narrow the scope of what can be requested.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I appreciate that.

FRANCISCO V. AGUILAR (Secretary of State):

I am here in support of the bill. I think it really helps us build efficiencies into our elections process and build transparency for the public.

KATRIN IVANOFF:

I am in support of this bill. It makes sense that if you want to be running for public office, the least you should do is vote. But on the other hand, those

people probably do vote but do not register to vote in the area they are running for. That does not make sense either. So, I am in support of the bill.

JOSHUA SKAGGS (Nevada Republican Party):

The Nevada Republican Party is in opposition to just one section of A.B. 491. We testified on the Assembly side that we support the rest of the provisions in this bill. Like Speaker Yeager, we were surprised to learn it was not a requirement in current law for candidates to be registered to vote in their districts.

Section 1 of A.B. 491 mandates, with some exceptions, a county or city clerk must either respond to a request from the Secretary of State for election-related information or data not later than the end of the second calendar day after receiving a request [*sic*] or provide a written explanation if they are unable to fulfill the request.

Elections in Nevada are very complex. Clerks must deal with early voting, universal mail-in ballots, expansion of electronic voting and many other mandates placed on clerks by the Legislature and Secretary of State. We appreciate Amendment No. 383 clarifying the time frame from 48 hours to two calendar days for a response; however, calendar days do not take into account weekends or holidays. At a minimum, changing this to business days would be better. We also believe our county clerks are conscientious and do a good job at responding to requests whether from their constituents or the Secretary of State. We question the need for this bill.

Several bills in this Legislature seek to give the State stronger control over locally elected clerks. We generally oppose any such attempts and ask that you reevaluate section 1 of A.B. 491.

JANINE HANSEN (Independent American Party):

I concur with the testimony that has already been given. It seems to me that one bill after another seeks to transfer more power to the Secretary of State. We want to give credence to our local county clerks, recognizing they are directly elected by their own counties. There is access in those counties to them.

I suspect there's never been a time when they've been requested to hand information to the Secretary of State that they did not do it. I am wondering if

when they ask the Secretary of State for information, if the Secretary is as willing to come forward to them in two days.

I don't really feel this is an important bill—that portion of it. We don't oppose the rest of it. We just have some concerns about the time frame and the transfer again of more power to the Secretary of State.

CYRUS HOJJATY:

I will ditto everything Janine Hansen has pointed out.

MS. IVANOFF:

My apologies, I would like to change mine to opposition because I do like that part for being voting. But I would ditto what the NVGOP rep [Joshua Skaggs] and what Janine Hansen mentioned. So, can you please change my vote to opposition?

ASHLEY KENNEDY (Clark County):

We just wanted to come up in neutral and thank the Speaker on the conceptual amendment, [Exhibit C](#), which was presented today in clarification in section 1. So, I just wanted to thank him for his ongoing work and for that clarification.

CADENCE MATIJEVICH (Washoe County):

Similar to other bills that you have heard in committee, Washoe County does not have a position on the policy of the bill. But we often come forward to speak about the ability of our registrar of voters to implement the legislation consistent with the intent. We want to express our gratitude to Speaker Yeager and the other proponents of the bill for the amendments that were made that you see in the first reprint and the conceptual amendments, [Exhibit C](#), brought forth today that will allow our registrar to implement consistently without undue hardship on our operations.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will close the hearing on [A.B. 491](#) and open the hearing on [A.B. 496](#).

[ASSEMBLY BILL 496 \(1st Reprint\)](#): Revises provisions relating to elections.
(BDR 24-997)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER STEVE YEAGER (Assembly District No. 9):

A proposed conceptual amendment ([Exhibit D](#)) for A.B. 496 has been provided via NELIS for your consideration. This is an elections bill relating to data reporting on mail and provisional ballots, posting voter registration lists online and requiring certain information useful to the signature curing process to be included on mail ballot return envelopes.

Just by way of background, this bill makes what I believe are important changes to our elections laws that will ensure greater transparency because everybody will receive information sooner and on a daily basis relative to outstanding ballots, which will help ensure everybody is operating on the same information.

Many of you probably recall from the last election that there was a lot of speculation and misinformation about how many ballots remained to be counted. There would be posts on social media with handwritten numbers, and everybody would wonder if they were the actual numbers relating to how many ballots remained to be processed. This bill, I believe, will prevent that from happening.

In addition, this bill will make it easier for elections officials to contact voters who need to verify their signatures, resulting in more votes being counted rather than rejected.

Sections 2 and 8 of the bill require county and city clerks to post data on mail ballots and provisional ballots to their website every 24 hours during an election, from the start of early voting to the final canvas of election results. The Secretary of State will then compile that information and post the aggregate information from all the different counties on its website.

Specifically, starting the day after early voting begins and ending the day after the canvas of the results, clerks must report each day the total number of mail ballots that have been returned to a drop box, returned by mail, the number of mail ballots that require curing of a signature defect, and the number that have been successfully cured. Additionally, during the same period, clerks must report each day the total number of provisional ballots cast.

Sections 2 and 8 also require clerks to report additional information each day starting the day after Election Day and ending the day after the canvas of the

results. During this period, clerks must report the number of counted mail ballots not yet been tabulated and the number of cast provisional ballots.

The original language of these two sections required county and city clerks to post such information online by 10:00 a.m. each day. That was the first version of the bill. The Assembly amendment changes this deadline to 5:00 p.m., but at the request of the clerks and after further discussions, we are now proposing to change that to 11:00 a.m. In addition, these sections of the bill would require the Secretary of State to report an estimate of the number of mail ballots in the custody of the United States Postal Service (USPS) by 11:00 a.m. each day.

Originally, the bill contemplated the clerks would do that. We thought it made more sense to have the Secretary of State report that, and it would be an estimate of the number of ballots because it can be difficult to figure out to the number how many ballots are in the custody of USPS. The Secretary of State would be able to provide more information about that if the committee is interested.

Sections 5 and 7 of the bill clarify that access to information concerning an individual provisional ballot will remain restricted to the person who actually cast the ballot. However, the clerks and the Secretary of State may post aggregate data about provisional ballots as required by A.B. 496 so the public and candidates would know how many provisional ballots are still outstanding.

Section 3 of the bill requires county clerks to post online an alphabetical list of all registered voters in the county on the first business day of each month. These lists must be made available for download free of charge.

Section 6 makes a conforming change to require county clerks to include the identification numbers of registered voters on the alphabetical list of registered voters similar to how these identification numbers are included on other lists of registered voters made available for public inspection.

And then finally, sections 4 and 9 require mail ballot return envelopes to include a space for the voter to write his or her telephone number for the purpose of contacting the voter, if necessary, for signature curing or verification. I know probably all of you up there have done signature curing. It's a very labor-intensive process, and we do not always have the most up-to-date information. Often, you are going to that voter's home, hoping to find that voter

present and willing to answer the door when you knock. By allowing them to write a good telephone number, this will speed up the process and will allow the county clerks to make that phone call to let the voter know their signature needs verification to be processed. So hopefully, that is going to result in more votes being counted and less attempts of having to knock on somebody's door several times over to get a response.

MR. DI CHIARA:

This kind of data transparency continues the evolution of Nevada's election system which started recently in the 2021 session with the passage of the top-down election legislation which Secretary Aguilar and our office successfully continued with the beginning of the VREMS [Voter Registration and Election Management Solution] project and the completion of phase one, which saw the general election in 2024 run on this new system.

I would be remiss if I did not add that the one-shot funding bill to continue funding that project, to continue to improve the way our election system functions, was introduced in Senate [Committee on] Finance today. Secretary Aguilar's goals are modernization, transparency and efficiency. We strongly believe this bill helps the Elections Division with each of those things. More information provided to the voters, more information provided to the counties and the public in general is all a benefit.

MR. SCHRAGER:

I will focus on just two quick points which is the ... I cannot overstate the importance of improved and more centralized data reporting.

This is about the mitigation of confusion and anxiety regarding the election processes and the conforming of reports of ballot statuses across the State so we can achieve a coherent, up-to-date snapshot every single day. We understand people want results; they want information; they want to know what is going on. We hope this will provide the information to the press and to voters, so people have a better notion of what ballots are out there, what has happened to them and what is coming so there are fewer surprises in the process as it unfolds.

The section regarding the inclusion of the phone number is an accommodation. Nothing in law says if you do not put your phone number on there, there will be any repercussions. It will not invalidate your ballot. It is merely an

accommodation to make it easier to contact someone if that would help the cure process. So, with that, I urge adoption of A.B. 496.

SENATOR DALY:

The original bill [section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph (2)] talks about total number of mail ballots for that city [county] that have been returned by the USPS or other delivery service. So those are ballots that they tried to deliver; it was the wrong address, whatever, and the postal service returned them to the registrar of the city.

MR. SCHRAGER:

Those are ballots that had been sent out but returned to the post office as undeliverable.

SENATOR DALY:

Understood. That is what I was trying to clarify. Then one of the parts in the amendment says they must post an estimate of the mail ballots for each county in the custody of the USPS. I am not following that one as clearly. How are they going to know, if they've been delivered and not returned, who has custody of them? I am just looking for some clarification on what we're trying to get to there. I know it's an estimate. So, you are going to make your best guess. But what are we trying to hit there?

MR. SCHRAGER:

Thank you for the opportunity to clarify this because it's a really important point, and I want to make clear that we are talking about two different categories.

One is the ballots that have been sent out but return as undeliverable. The estimate refers to, and this is perhaps little known, when someone out there—it can be here in Las Vegas, it can be in Washoe, it can be in Massachusetts, it can be in Oregon—puts their mail ballot into the U.S. mail, it is scanned. It is knowable that the ballot has been scanned and received by the USPS, that a voter has put it in into the mail stream and it's on its way back to your particular county, whichever county you voted in. That's what we will be estimating.

It is not always perfect, but it is a way of knowing how many ballots are out there in the wild that are not either drop box ballots or have been handed to or

received by the registrars. It's an estimate, which should be pretty good, regarding how many ballots have been placed into the mail and are on their way back. So that's a really useful data point that we have not so far reported, but it is knowable and would be very good for people to know.

MR. DI CHIARA:

I just want to add a small point of clarification; logistically, as Mr. Schrager said, those ballots are scanned if they have an IMB, an intelligent mail bar code, applied to them. That is something the State and the counties work on with the print vendors. They ensure that those bar codes are printed, that the USPS can read them, and that is what enables that tracking. If you have the USPS's free service, that I can't recall the name of at the top of my head, they'll let you know what mail will show up in your mailbox tomorrow. It is incredibly convenient. What we want to do is utilize that technology to better serve the data needs of the public in Nevada.

SENATOR DALY:

Thank you for that. That's what I wanted to be clear on. So, it is the ones they have in custody that somebody put in the mail box, and it has not been delivered to its final destination yet, but we know how many there are. That clears it up pretty clean.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I have one question regarding section 9 and this space for the voter to put their phone number on. I talked to a lot of voters who don't like to put their phone number on their affidavit of registration or on any election-related paperwork because they don't like the polling calls and the different robocalls. They don't want to give their number out. Do you think there would be a way to encourage people to put their number on here or maybe let them know it will not be shared for campaign purposes? I just wonder if there's any way to overcome that obstacle. I just meet a lot of voters who are really hesitant to give out the number because they are so burned out on the robocalls and robotexts.

MR. DI CHIARA:

My interpretation of the language of this bill, not to speak for the Speaker or Mr. Schrager, is that phone number would be for the purposes of ballot cure only. I can tell you it would be a significant amount of work for the counties to manually update phone numbers based on what comes back or potentially set up some kind of automated process, which would be great someday but would

be very difficult in the short term. So, my understanding of the bill is this phone number would be used for ballot cure purposes only and would not translate to that kind of updated registry that a voter may object to. But I am open to any clarifications from the Speaker or Mr. Schrager.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Assuming the bill is signed into the law, maybe there's some way to let voters know that will not be shared.

EMILY PERSAUD-ZAMORA (Silver State Voices; Let Nevadans Vote Coalition):

I am the executive director of Silver State Voices here to testify in support of A.B. 496 on behalf of my organization and the Let Nevadans Vote Coalition.

Assembly Bill 496 represents a great balance between easing processes for our clerks, increasing election transparency and maintaining necessary voter privacy protections, from the accountability of daily ballot reporting requirements to ensuring specific ballot information is restricted to just the voter.

We commend Speaker Yeager for his commitment to ensuring Nevada's elections remain accessible, accurate and safe. Additionally, we'd like to thank the Speaker and his team for taking the time to discuss this bill with us and for the proposed conceptual amendment, [Exhibit D](#), which better fits the needs of our coalition, election administrators and voters. We urge the committee to support A.B. 496.

JENNIFER WILLETT (All Voting is Local):

All Voting is Local Action Nevada is an organization that advocates for legislative priorities to expand voter access. We thank the Speaker for bringing forward this bill, ditto previous comments and urge your support.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

There have been a lot of changes to elections over the last few cycles, and it is important we continue to keep up. Sometimes when we look at elections, it's not continuing to operate as we have been. It's about looking at innovation. It's looking at transparency and modernization. Sometimes we forget we are here to serve the people. We are here to serve the voters. We are trying to increase that voter experience from a transparency perspective.

SHELBIE SWARTZ (Battle Born Progress; Institute for a Progressive Nevada):

I am the executive director of Battle Born Progress and the Institute for a Progressive Nevada. We are here in support for all the reasons previously stated by Ms. Persaud-Zamora from Silver State Voices and [Jennifer Willett from] All Voting is Local.

IRIS STONE:

Assembly Bill 496 imposes very detailed daily reporting on county and city clerks. Within today's environment, I suspect much of this work will require manual tracking and supervision. It seems to me that the requirement of the level of detailed reporting is a consequence of the 2021 statutes requiring the universal mail ballot system in Nevada where voters must opt out of receiving a mail ballot. This process has been complicated and has lots of steps to manage securely and accurately. If we were to change it to an opt-in system, many of these large reporting requirements would go away.

Also, it seems the financial burden would outweigh the benefits. The fiscal note estimates from the county clerks would indicate an additional biannual cost of almost \$600,000 added to the election. It should also be noted there are no fiscal notes for the city clerks who would also be directed to comply to these detailed reporting requirements.

Lastly, with section 9 in the amendment, I doubt many voters will put their initials and phone numbers on the ballot envelope. This regulation does not instill voters' confidence. That's for sure. I urge you to vote against A.B. 496.

ELLEN GIFFORD:

We know provisional ballots are not counted until after Election Day. Section 2, [subsection] 1 includes provisional ballot counts in the list of required counts to be posted on the day after the first day of early voting.

Then in section 2, [subsection] 2, only the provisional ballots that have been confirmed are counted from the day after Election Day to the day after canvass. This is confusing even for those who understand the provisional ballot processes. Perhaps there could be a rewrite there.

Existing law gives county clerks the option of publishing a listing of registered voters in their county newspapers one time, usually around election time. Mandating the county clerk publish a listing of registered voters on their website

on the first day of every month infringes on the county clerks' right by law to provide this information one time. There's no benefit in providing information every month that is only of interest to voters closer to Election Day.

The Secretary of State has a website called NevVoter that already provides access to a statewide voter registration database reflecting the county voter registration information. Access to NevVoter involves creating a web account and completing an official request form. Then qualifications for access must be verified and granted by the Secretary of State. Mandating the county clerk to make this information available for free completely contradicts the access requirements enforced by the NevVoter system.

Voters providing their initials and phone number on the outside of a return envelope invites fraud and pranksters. Anyone can write on the outside of anyone's envelope. Hopefully, there is another optional solution.

Ms. IVANOFF:

I am in opposition of this bill for the previously mentioned reason—ditto.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The committee has received a letter ([Exhibit E](#)) in opposition to A.B. 496 from Nancy Carlson.

Ms. KENNEDY:

I first just want to thank the Speaker for all the amendments presented today and to thank him and the bill proponents for their continued work on this. Clark County is very supportive of data transparency and bringing some clarification on where we are as we're counting mail ballots. We know it is high stakes, high pressure, and we are definitely supportive of making sure voters know where we are in the process.

I did want to just talk a little bit about the request that we made changing—I know we went back and forth—on section 2 related to the timing in which we needed to report all the metrics. In talking with the Speaker and with other counties, I think we really were thoughtful in trying to understand how this would be implemented during an election cycle. Eventually we landed back at 11:00 a.m. It is really more in line with our operations. By 10 a.m., at least in Clark County, our goal is to have everything prepared for our reports of

everything that happened the day before. So, this is in line with our operations. We thought it made a little bit more sense.

We also appreciated the amendment that provided some flexibility if there is any unforeseen circumstance that we are not able to meet that deadline. We can at least report what we have with an estimate of when we will be able to report the rest of the information.

I did want to touch on the fiscal impacts simply because it was brought up during the testimony earlier. With the amendments, it is really in line with how we are operating on the election front, so I really do think the fiscal impact for the counties with the amendments, at least for Clark County, would be pretty minimal and more aligned with our operations.

We thank the Speaker for his work on this bill and working with us on some of these amendments.

MS. MATIJEVICH:

Ms. Kennedy covered similar points that we have in Washoe County. We are neutral on the bill and very appreciative to the Speaker and the proponents of the amendments that have come forward, including those presented today, that will allow us to implement this consistent with the intention of the legislation. We too support data transparency.

Recognizing this is not a fiscal committee but because county fiscal notes were raised earlier, for Washoe County, this bill would have a de minimis fiscal impact on us and can be accommodated within our existing budgets.

VINSON GUTHREAU (Nevada Association of Counties):

I am the executive director of the Nevada Association of Counties, a statewide organization that represents all counties. My colleague said it best. I will just sort of echo what they said and also just put it on the record for us that we are thankful to the sponsor for the consideration, review and, ultimately, presentation of the amendments. So, thank you for the opportunity to put that on the record.

MR. SKAGGS:

I am the legislative affairs director for the Nevada Republican Party here today in neutral to A.B. 496. We were almost in support of this bill. It makes good sense

to post registrations online as required in section 3 of the bill rather than publishing them in a newspaper, and it is probably more cost-effective.

However, the provisions in sections 2, 5, 7 and 8 are only necessary because of the way we operate elections in this State. Nevada's election results and ballot counting are a national embarrassment. Anybody that goes to any of our casinos can testify to our ability to count cash and chips in a timely manner but with ballots, we can't seem to do the same thing. If we did not have universal mail ballots and accept ballots for nearly a week after Election Day, then we could provide timely and accurate results as the majority of other states do.

Given the situation we are in with elections, the things in these sections might improve our ability to deliver results. But in the end, we need to recognize that our complex and cumbersome system makes it difficult to impossible to deliver results. Because all these complex features have not increased the voter turnout—turnout is in fact lower with universal mail-in ballots than it was before—we should not introduce more mandates and complexity but rather return to the simpler and more trustworthy election process we had prior to 2020.

MR. HOJJATY:

I will just echo all the neutral testimony.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER YEAGER:

I wanted to take just an opportunity to thank our really hardworking elections folks. They've been great to work with throughout this process, but I wanted to recognize that they do a tremendous job of running elections in this State, and none of the bills I brought this session are targeting them. It was just [focused on] how do we improve the process we currently have.

When it comes to this bill, I want everyone to think about the last election. One of the complaints we heard is, "Why don't we know the results sooner?" That was a complaint we heard over again. Embedded in that complaint was a lack of information. We did not know how many ballots were still left to be counted.

As this committee knows through data provided by the Secretary of State, we do not actually receive that many ballots in the mail after Election Day. That number is pretty small. But as I mentioned in prior hearings, what we do get is a lot of people dropping off their ballots in drop boxes on Election Day. We

receive a lot of mail from USPS on Election Day. This bill is going to help us know sooner. For instance, for the Presidential race, for the U.S. Senate race, for some of our congressional races, had we known how many ballots were left to be counted, we could have reasonably made projections about who the winner was going to be. It was the fact that we didn't know how many ballots there were. That bleeds down to Assembly and Senate races as well.

One of my consternations of the three, four, five days after the election is we had a number of races that were very close, and we just didn't know how many ballots were left to be counted. What we are going to have here is instead of speculating—because I heard all kinds of numbers, I heard it could be 10,000 ballots in Clark County, it could be 100,000 ballots in Clark County—the truth is we know how many ballots were left to be counted. We just were not able to get that information in a coherent fashion. Every county clerk is able to provide that information. But there's some real benefit to standardizing when that information is going to be provided and how it's going to be provided because then we have an entire snapshot of the State.

Ultimately, this bill is going to help us know the results of elections sooner. For that reason—and if nothing else, to prevent the massive amounts of disinformation and misinformation that are inevitably going to happen on social media—this bill standardizes and gives us one official source of information about ballots still left to be counted. That is a benefit for everybody and will help improve elections in the State. So, I urge your support of this bill.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 496 and open the hearing on A.B. 73.

ASSEMBLY BILL 73 (1st Reprint): Establishes requirements for certain communications relating to an election. (BDR 24-487)

FRANCISCO V. AGUILAR (Secretary of State):

We are here today to provide you an overview ([Exhibit F](#)) of A.B. 73 regarding artificial intelligence in elections. Over the last 30 years, there have been many changes to how candidates campaigned for elected office. The creation of the internet [and] a massive expansion of social media changed the very methods the candidate would use to communicate with voters. While walking neighborhoods and knocking on doors will always be important, how campaigns talk to voters has always been updated alongside new technology.

The changing state demographics have also led to similar changes in how we talk to voters. Back in 1990, Clark County had only 300,000 registered voters, roughly one-fifth of how many it has today. Over the years, our Legislature has found ways to address these changes.

Artificial intelligence (AI) presents another turning point when it comes to campaigning for elected office. While AI may be used to create amusing pictures of, say, George Washington surfing at Lake Tahoe, there are so many generative AI tools available for use that it is a certainty they are going to be used during political campaigns. Some will be lighthearted but slightly less obvious than the previous one, like the fake picture [included in] [Exhibit F](#) of a man surrounded by puppies, but others may be nefarious in purpose. I will also note it doesn't take much to create these artificial images. It's as easy as downloading an app, which indicates that as time goes on AI could be utilized more broadly than we have seen in past elections.

I want to clarify for the record that [A.B. 73](#) does not attempt to limit protected political speech. The First Amendment to our Constitution is sacred, and we take the protections it provides very seriously when it comes to the administration of elections. [Assembly Bill 73](#) would require certain disclosures similar to what is under the picture [included in] [Exhibit F](#). This requirement for disclosures would not apply to those items that have a retail cost of less than \$5 which is consistent with other similar items as already identified in statute.

MR. DI CHIARA:

The original draft of this bill was based on similar legislation passed in the State of Washington that we felt represented the best building blocks for legislation of this type, but every state is unique and so are their election laws.

As such, this bill was amended in the Assembly making certain changes, many of which were technical in nature. One new addition to the bill is a personal cause of action allowing a candidate targeted by a deceptive or fraudulent deepfake to seek relief through the legal system. We've had outreach from a number of stakeholders across the media landscape about the liability language included in the amendment, and I believe we have found language that should work with everyone. A brief conceptual amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) would include streaming services and entities exempt from liability under this law to ensure parity between different types of media.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

As the world changes and political campaigns change how they communicate with voters, we need to make sure we are adapting our laws as well. I firmly believe A.B. 73 will be a major step forward in modernizing and increasing transparency for voters.

SENATOR KRASNER:

I appreciate you bringing this bill, and I would respectfully ask that you make it even a little bit stronger. I think this should be a crime. I think it should be at least a misdemeanor because this conduct is intentional. It is intended to confuse the voters. It sheds a negative light on the person they're trying to fool the people about and how that person really feels. It is fraud.

This could happen to any of us. Let's say it was you. Maybe you are up for election. I don't know. Or some of our Constitutional Officers, anybody in this building, they take a picture of you. They make it look like you are talking and saying horrible things, things that you don't stand for, things that you would never believe in, and people don't know. They see it on TV, over and over and over and over even though it has that statement at the beginning or statement at the end or statement during the whole thing. They see you and your name, and your face and they think, "I always thought he was a good guy." That's all that sticks in their heads, or they hear that radio announcement—"This is Cisco Aguilar, your Secretary of State. And I think this, and I think that, and I think the other thing" and people might just turn it off before they even get to that final two-minute mark.

It is just wrong. This should be a crime. This is intentional conduct by somebody trying to confuse and mislead the voters. So, I am just respectfully asking you go a step further and make it a misdemeanor for someone to intentionally do this. Thank you, sir. Oh, and one more thing, you and I are of different political parties too, but I still would not like to see someone doing this to you.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

Senator, thank you for your comments, and I truly understand that. As we go through the innovation of AI and its implemented use, I think we have to continue to monitor. This is incremental. I think we have to look at it; we have to understand it; and we have to deal with it as it comes. Again, it's also

managing political free speech. One of the greatest protections we have in our Constitution is the First Amendment along with other amendments.

This is an opportunity for us to continue to monitor it and make sure that we continue to deal with it as we go forward. I don't know what AI is going to look like in two years when we are, hopefully, all sitting here again having this conversation. We have to start somewhere, and I believe this is a great first step, but we will take those considerations into mind as we move forward.

SENATOR KRASNER:

Respectfully, Mr. Secretary of State, I have to disagree because I am a huge advocate for our constitution, the United States Constitution, Nevada Constitution and every single right under that constitution that belongs to the citizens of our country.

However, that would be me saying, I think that person is this or that or the other thing—that is my free speech right. But for somebody to intentionally put a fraud—they are fraudulently portraying someone else, and they are doing it intentionally. They're intentionally taking a picture of you and putting words that you never said and never would say and do not believe in, and they are doing it intentionally to shed a negative light on you and to mislead the voters, trick the voters, fool the voters. It rises higher than this. I just feel like it should be at least a misdemeanor.

MR. DI CHIARA:

I absolutely understand. I do want to add that in conducting research around bills of this type, we found that attempts to prohibit or criminalize this conduct were less likely to pass and more likely to be successfully challenged in the courts.

As Secretary Aguilar said, this is something we take incredibly seriously, but we also wanted to present the Legislature with something we felt could withstand at least this first legal phase of looking at the regulation of AI.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Senator Daly gave me a question to ask because he had to step out of the meeting. In section 1, he wondered why we are not trying to capture issue advocacy types of communication and wanted to be reminded how that type of communication is currently regulated. He is happy for whatever answer you

could give right now, but also if you wanted to follow up with him later, that would be great, too.

MR. DI CHIARA:

Thank you for the question, Senator Ohrenschall, and by proxy, Senator Daly. The type of communication that Senator Daly references is not included here. That was an oversight. Again, this legislation was initially based on legislation out of Washington. I believe it should cover all political communication which would include ballot advocacy. But if it doesn't, I am happy to take a look and provide revised language.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Thank you. I appreciate that, Chief Deputy Secretary of State. I will let Vice Chair Daly know, and if you do not mind following up with him as well, I sure appreciate that because I think his desire is that it would catch those types of groups too if they are using AI in any of their advertisements.

RYAN VORTISCH (Silver State Voices; Let Nevadans Vote Coalition):

I am here to testify in support of A.B. 73 on behalf of my organization and the Let Nevadans Vote Coalition. The rise of AI poses a grave threat to our elections if voters are subject to digitally manipulated campaign communications without proper disclosures. At Silver State Voices, we believe our vote is an act of power, one that should be wielded in confidence with proper preparation and understanding. Therefore, it is imperative we provide Nevadans with the tools necessary to identify false information or perceptions of events that could influence how their ballot is cast.

We appreciate the leadership of the Secretary of State's Office in taking a stance on this complex, nuanced issue. We are in strong support of this bill for it is a commitment to upholding honest and fair elections. Let Nevada join the other 20 states that have already addressed this critical issue and please pass A.B. 73.

WILLIAM MOORE (Mi Familia En Acción):

I am testifying in support of A.B. 73. Mi Familia En Acción is a civic engagement organization that works with the community year-round to push for progress on different issues impacting us—a priority among them being voting rights.

We're here in support of A.B. 73 primarily because we need to be protected from disinformation. While in the community last year, we helped provide eligible voters with election materials and resources, and with the rise of technology, we know community members are using online information as a resource. However, we need to ensure information regarding elections is accurate. We need our laws to protect us against inaccurate information or intentional misinformation from bad actors. We urge you to support A.B. 73 because at Mi Familia En Acción, we believe that communications between people in positions of authority in our community need to be transparent. We urge the committee to support A.B. 73.

MS. SWARTZ:

As the communications hub for the progressive movement in the State and the home of a research program that specifically looks into disinformation, Battle Born Progress and the Institute for a Progressive Nevada are in strong support of this bill.

MS. STONE:

During the April 1 Assembly hearing, I opposed A.B. 73. I am pleased to see Amendment No. 379 addressed my key concern of the original bill, section 3, which required copies of the synthetic media to be sent to the Secretary of State's Office. This in my opinion represented a great overreach by this office. It will also have incurred excessive financial burden to our State as well. However, it makes sense to require political entities to disclose a clear communication stating when the synthetic media item has been altered or enhanced by artificial intelligence technique. I now support this bill, and I want to thank the committee for applying common sense by issuing this amendment.

EDITH DUARTE (TechNet):

We appreciate the Secretary of State and his staff for working with us on the amendment and are here in support. We were opposed previously but are grateful for the changes.

MR. HOJJATY:

I support it. I will echo.

TRAY ABNEY (Nevada Broadcasters Association):

We really appreciate the Secretary of State's Office and Mr. Di Chiara in particular for working with us. We have no issues with this bill. I just wanted to

make sure that broadcasters who are handed the ads and the messages are not liable for the messages and the submitted ads if they were used with AI. So, we appreciate that, and we are neutral on the bill.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Since there are no closing comments, we will close the hearing on A.B. 73 and open the hearing on A.B. 79.

ASSEMBLY BILL 79 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to governmental administration. (BDR 24-483)

FRANCISCO V. AGUILAR (Secretary of State):

We are here to provide you with an overview of A.B. 79. As you have heard me say before, my three guiding principles for the upcoming biennium are modernization, innovation and transparency. This bill is heavily focused on transparency.

Campaign finance laws are generally contained in chapter 294A of the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). That chapter is critical to my role as a regulator because it ensures an even playing field for all individuals, candidates and PACs who wish to be involved in the political process.

Assembly Bill 79 has a few main elements [in our presentation] ([Exhibit H](#)): clarifying what a PAC can spend money on; requiring candidates and former public officers to notify the Office of the Secretary of State once they dispose of campaign funds after an election; clarifying how campaign funds can and cannot be spent, which would use the same standard as the Federal Election Commission (FEC); revising the definition of a committee for political action for clarity; requiring any candidate who receives \$100 in donations before the candidate filing period to file a notice with the Secretary of State; and instituting a formal administrative hearing process for matters relating to campaign finance enforcement.

MR. DI CHIARA:

This bill has been amended after a number of conversations with seated officials, former candidates, organizations and other stakeholders whose collaboration we very much appreciate. Notably, the previously adopted amendment to section 3 codifies in state law the irrespective test used by the FEC. We firmly believe that in certain circumstances, the use of campaign funds

for child or elder care is more than appropriate. But the most effective way to do this is by formalizing that FEC standard.

Specifically, the FEC allows candidates for office to use campaign funds for childcare and has done so since 2018. An additional requested conceptual amendment ([Exhibit I](#)) was recently submitted to this committee based on feedback from Senator Daly in the hearing on Speaker Yeager's A.B. 497 which features similar language.

ASSEMBLY BILL 497 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to campaign finance. (BDR 24-996)

As Secretary Aguilar said, transparency is of paramount importance in matters of campaign finance. This amendment, [Exhibit I](#), would clarify that while entities like nonprofits and labor unions are not PACs, if they engage in political activities such as supporting or opposing candidates or ballot questions and make expenditures as part of those activities, they must report those expenses to the Secretary of State's Office.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

Transparency is such a critical part of our electoral process and ensuring voters are comfortable and confident with their choices.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Vice Chair Daly had to step out, and he left me a list of questions he'd like me to ask on the record. So, I will ask them, and if you can provide answers now, that is great. But if not, please follow up with him and the rest of the committee after the hearing.

As to section 1, subparagraph 3 [section 2.5, subsection 3] he [Senator Daly] was wondering if separate accounts would have to be opened for special election contributions or what would be required? Would there be an issue if there was not a separate account? That's the first question he asked, and I do not know if you would like me to go through them all now or have you answer them and go through the rest of his questions.

MR. DI CHIARA:

Why don't we go through them one at a time? My understanding is that for the purposes of this bill, if an existing entity such as a nonprofit or a labor union

were to engage in political activity, that would not require a separate account, separate from whatever they already have set up again. Tracking contributions to those entities is not considered in this bill. It is only the tracking of expenditures. What are they spending political funds on? If they wanted to open a separate account for their own purposes, that would be more than acceptable, but it is not required under the bill.

SENATOR DALY:

In section 4, when will the form we are talking about there on disposal be due? Won't the C&E [contribution and expense] rules capture this anyway? Why do we have a second form? It seems to me the C&Es would capture it.

MR. DI CHIARA:

This would not change the requirements related to when candidates or former officials dispose of their campaign funds. However, as of right now, that is not required to be reported to us. Yes, in theory, a C&E should be filed that tracks all of those things. However, the Secretary of State's Office is not aware if a candidate is utilizing those funds to run for office again. But potentially, if they've accepted a contribution making them a candidate again, et cetera, right now, we have no clarity on when a candidate is saying, "Okay, I am hanging up my guns. I am not a candidate anymore. I have disposed of these campaign funds." Requiring this form for them to affirmatively tell us "I am disposing of these funds because I am no longer a candidate for office," would create that finality. And if someone does not file this form with us, we could engage and follow up. But right now, there's a lack of clarity on when candidates are or are not running for office again.

SENATOR DALY:

I am trying to review it here in section 4. You are trying to make a new form so you can get additional information. I know we have rules about being able to hold on to the unspent campaign contributions for up to four years. I know another bill clarifying some of those things, assuming it passes. If not, we have got the old language. But you would still have to file those contribution and expense reports. I said C&Es earlier, but everyone may not know what I am talking about—contribution and expense forms. So, if it is an election year, you would have to file those. To me, I understand quarterly reports. If it is not an election year, you would just have the annual one. How are you not capturing that information when the person is going to turn in his final contribution ...

MR. DI CHIARA:

Senator Daly, I am not sure if you can hear us. I apologize. We lost audio here in hearing room 9 a good 10 seconds ago. So, I only caught the first half of your question. That audio has not returned yet. So, I will sit and wait until I can hear the rest of it.

SENATOR DALY:

So, in section 4, it says that there's going to be a new form that notifies the Secretary of State on a form prescribed when the candidate, public officer or former public officer has disposed of all unspent contributions.

When is he going to get this form from you? Is it going to be online? If you are already doing your C&E reports—and let's just say I am in the off year, [so] there's no election. You are in the odd-numbered year, and your C&E report is going to be due on January 15, and during that time, you are going to capture that information on the C&E report if they dispose of their cash. They have to report what they did with it in one of those categories, et cetera.

But if I am reading this, if I did that halfway through, my C&E report is not done till the end already or due to the end of the year, I am going to have to notify you separately and put in this extra report and my C&E report telling me the same stuff. I am just not seeing why you are not already capturing all of this information on the existing process of turning in a C&E report.

MR. DI CHIARA:

Nothing in the C&E report says you are not a candidate or do not intend to be a candidate for public office even if you have a zero-dollar balance.

Our office hears—and I know that [it was referenced] in the presentation on Speaker Yeager's campaign finance bill, and I believe Mr. Schrager referenced it—there is a significant amount of confusion around what funds candidates must dispose of and when. This form, yes, absolutely, will be available. Not only online, we would likely also distribute it as a notification in the packets we give out to candidates when they file for office. This would serve not just as an important tool for our office but also an educational tool for candidates who may not be reading through NRS 294A to discover exactly when and how they must dispose of those funds. This would provide our office an affirmative notification that this individual is no longer a candidate for office and would

provide them with additional information on how to complete that process. We see this as important.

SENATOR DALY:

Maybe Mark [Wlaschin] can come and talk to me later because I am not seeing the need for it, but we will go to the next question.

Section 7 is a similar type of question where you are saying that you have to provide a notice of an intent to file. I am also wondering what are we trying to capture there with that additional notice? We all know when the filing dates are. Some people decide ... You have seen it before on the last day of filing, somebody goes down and files. Would this create a situation? "You did not file a notice that you intended to. So now you can't file." I am just not understanding what this is going to accomplish. Some people are going to put in this notice. What are you going to do with it? People can change their minds after they put in the notice. We have a requirement when filing opens and when filing closes, and everyone's going to know the next day or by 5:00 p.m. that day or whenever filing closes. So, I am just not seeing it. Tell me why we have to have this.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

I am going to give you a very specific situation. I recently went to switch bank accounts, and when I went to the bank or the financial institution, they would not open the account because I could not prove that I was going to be a candidate for the next election. So, with this, it would give candidates an opportunity to declare they are a candidate for office and help them with some of the logistical things that come up prior to the filing date.

MR. DI CHIARA:

In addition to that, there is a compliance purpose here, Senator. As soon as you accept a contribution of \$100 or more, you become a candidate even if you have not filed for office. If you accept a donation of over \$100, you become a candidate, and that means that you are responsible for things like C&E reports.

There are oversight requirements. Our office is required to oversee you as a candidate. But if you accept that \$100 bill [on] January 1, the year before the election, we are not going to know that you are a candidate. If you do not file those C&Es, we are not going to be aware. So, this, again, would provide us and the public with more information. And as the Secretary says, if it happens

to the Secretary of State, we can tell you based on our emails, it happens to other candidates. This would be something official that says, "This person is a candidate; they've accepted campaign funds," and it would also allow them to open that bank account.

SENATOR DALY:

I just see it as the normal course. I am not sure what problem we are trying to fix other than the bank account thing, which I never experienced myself. I think all of the information is captured under the C&E reporting we have.

Looking at the requirement in section 11—and I can get with you guys offline on this—it seems to me when there's a complaint filed, you send out a notice, et cetera, et cetera. In my opinion, there needs to be a period where they must respond to that. I can just give you one example. I think a couple of cycles ago I had an issue. I filed a complaint. I sent it to the Secretary of State's Office. They sent out the letter to the guy. "Hey, there's been a complaint, and we need this information to do our investigation." And that person ignored you for four months. Well, the office; it was not you, Secretary, it was a different secretary [who] ignored the whole thing for four months. The whole election came, and we were in the next election cycle before they even answered the question after some back and forth to get them to finally answer. Then they answer just cursory. Not really the information that was wanted.

I know in other areas of the law when there's that type of complaint, a third-party complaint, it goes to the agency. The agency then says, "Hey, you have to answer this complaint." They give them 15 days to respond, and if they do not respond, that's fine. Do so at your peril. And then the agency can act and go forward with the information they do have. Because I think the whole process now without that requirement to respond is basically useless.

MR. DI CHIARA:

I appreciate your comments. I believe the administrative hearing process we are seeking to implement here would help address that. It would no longer just be the Secretary of State's Office asking for a response with our only course of action having the Attorney General file a suit in the First Judicial District. Having a defined administrative hearing process with a hearing officer, if that individual were to not show up, not respond, et cetera, the hearing officer could issue a written order on those penalties, et cetera. I believe this process would be of some help.

SENATOR DALY:

I know that having a requirement to respond in a timely fashion doesn't hurt anything. Then when you get that information as part of your investigation, if they don't want to respond, you can go forward and try to subpoena them, try to file a complaint, a separate complaint, and start a new one. But if they are not going to respond, they are not going to respond. Tell him, "Too bad, you did not respond. I am going forward with this complaint based on the information I have at your peril."

I am just saying, I think it would be a better process. I can get you language out of, I think, NRS 608 or NRS 607, NRS 200 and NRS 210 [NRS 607.210]. It is also in NRS 338 in regard to complaints over labor issues. That person who's been accused essentially by a third party that says, "Hey, I think there's a violation of the law in this case," the Labor Commissioner gets that information, sends it on to the respondent or the respondent is served by the person that is complaining, and they have 15 days to answer. If they do not answer, that's fine. But the complaint's going forward if there's enough information and you think there's a violation to proceed with or without them. I am just telling you that you get better compliance if you have a process like that.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

For the first time, last session, the Legislature gave us funds and resources to build an investigative team. Prior to that, there was no investigative team to do the compliance work you are talking about. Now that we have gone through a cycle where we have a compliance team, we are happy and open to an amendment, if that is what you wish to make. I understand and hear what you are saying, and it would make our team even stronger in being able to address some of these issues.

SENATOR DALY:

Thank you; that was my last question regarding this. I am just trying to help, in my view, make it better. There's existing language you can cut and paste.

SECRETARY AGUILAR:

Thank you, Senator. Again, it goes back to resources, and for the first time, we have been able to get those resources to do the work we are doing. As we go on, we'd like to make that stronger and more useful to the public to provide the transparency they deserve.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The committee has received a letter in support ([Exhibit J](#)) of A.B. 79 from Ishika Bhakta.

MS. HANSEN:

I oppose additional filings and additional requirements. I think it is a hardship on people who want to run for office. The more they have, the more they want. I think it's a problem.

Another problem I have with this bill is on page 4, section 4.5. This essentially makes the Secretary of State an administrative court. Now, we know in administrative courts people lose their constitutional rights. They lose the right to trial by jury. They lose the right to due process. They lose the right to counsel. The administrative court is essentially a kangaroo court.

What happens is they can ask for judicial review, but judicial review does not go back and look at the original facts in the case. What they see is if the procedure was right. If they did it legally correct. But a person really does not get a trial de novo, a new trial or a new opportunity to present the facts.

In this bill, a person can be guilty of a class [Category] E felony, which means a year in jail and then they lose their rights. This is a significant problem with this bill, and I do not want the Secretary of State adjudicating these things without some kind of supervision. I think it is very dangerous. I have seen what happens in administrative courts, and it can be devastating to the people who are there because they have lost their constitutional rights, which would be available in a court of law but wouldn't be available in the Secretary of State adjudicating this. So, I am very concerned about that portion of the bill and that a person can be guilty of a class [Category] E felony as well as additional filing.

MR. HOJJATY:

I will ditto what the previous commenter pointed out.

KIMBERLY FERGUS:

I stand in strong opposition to A.B. 79. This bill not only imposes unnecessary and burdensome reporting requirements on candidates and public officers but also grants government overreach in ways that are punitive and excessive.

Section 2.5 establishes a \$5,000 contribution limit for any special elections, categorizing violations at a Category E felony under NRS 193.130. This is an excessive penalty for what could be an unintentional administrative oversight.

Section 4 mandates candidates notify the Secretary of State when disposing of unspent contributions under NRS 294A.160, increasing bureaucratic red tape without providing clear benefits to election integrity. Section 7 introduces a new requirement for filing a notice of intent to file for candidacy alongside existing financial disclosures under NRS 294A.130. This unnecessary redundancy only complicates the filing process for candidates. Section 11 grants unprecedented investigative powers to the Secretary of State, removing oversight by the First Judicial District Court and allowing unilateral administrative fines without judicial review. This is clear violation of due process.

Sections 12 and 13.5 authorize the Secretary of State to maintain a public list of violators who fail to pay fines within 90 days. Public shaming as a punitive measure is inappropriate and opens the door to abuse of power.

Assembly Bill 79 burdens candidates and public officers with excessive regulations, disproportionate penalties and expanded government control. This bill is a glaring example of regulatory overreach that undermines the principle of due process and fairness. I urge this committee to reject A.B. 79.

Ms. IVANOFF:

I am in opposition of this bill. I ditto the previous speaker.

Ms. GIFFORD:

I would like to suggest that section 4.5 of this bill requires details that explain where in the Nevada statute the Secretary of State is given the powers to perform the duties that are listed in this section. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 225.080, "General duties" for the Secretary of State, does not include any of that. Neither does NRS 225.370, "[Establishment of individual lockboxes within registry;] duties of Secretary of State." *Nevada Revised Statutes* 225.540 addresses providing assistance to keep a Nevada working task force. And we found that NRS 225.115 does address the administering of oaths and affirmations. But so far, a search of the statute has not revealed that the Secretary of State has the powers to perform the duties in this bill. There must be some legal requirements that must be met by the Secretary of State to give that position the powers this bill does. Have they been met?

Section 11 of the original bill had the Attorney General involved, which seemed quite appropriate.

MR. DI CHIARA:

I want to provide a few important points of clarification. As Secretary Aguilar said, the purpose of campaign finance law is not just for the ease of use of the candidate, it is also for the public and the public good. For our office, knowing when someone has met the threshold of a candidate, meaning they are expected to abide by certain statutes, is a benefit because that information becomes public record that we can make available.

I will also add, I heard a lot of concern related to the administrative hearing provisions in sections 4.5 and 11. That language is taken straight from NRS 90 which is the Securities Act. The Secretary of State oversees the enforcement and regulation of securities in Nevada. I know the language around administrative hearings has been in statute since at least 1987. And at least for the last few decades, that power has resided within the Secretary of State's Office. I just want to make very clear to everyone that this is not giving the Secretary of State additional authority or powers we do not otherwise possess. It is adding an important process that will also help with those who want to challenge what has been filed against them. It will give them that hearing process to do so, and that is why it was added.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We'll now close the hearing on A.B. 79 and open the hearing on A.B. 256.

ASSEMBLY BILL 256 (1st Reprint): 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)

ASSEMBLYMEMBER SELENA LA RUE HATCH (Assembly District No. 25):

Assembly Bill 256 is meant to develop a plan for implementing rail systems within communities across our State. If your constituents are anything like mine, you have probably heard their complaints about traffic congestion, public transportation and wanting better solutions. Many of my constituents would like to see light rail or some similar system within our communities across the State. We know it is popular. We know it will reduce congestion and emissions, and it will create jobs and boost the economy.

ANNE MACQUARIE (Nevada Rail Coalition; Rail Passengers Association):

I am a member of the Nevada Rail Coalition and of the volunteer council of the Rail Passengers Association.

In 2021, NDOT [Department of Transportation] completed an updated Nevada State Rail Plan to assess Nevada's current rail system and identify opportunities for improvement.

Though Nevada has little passenger rail service now, the plan points out that our existing and historical rail footprint offers a foundation for cost-effective rail projects. Existing tracks and rights of way may mitigate land acquisition and engineering costs.

While NDOT was preparing the rail plan, a group of Nevada organizations including rail advocates, rail unions, and environmental and social justice nonprofits organized the Nevada Rail Coalition to advocate for implementing the State Rail Plan so passenger rail would become a part of our future transportation system in Nevada.

The Regional Rail Transit Advisory Working Group that would be established by this bill would continue these Nevadan-led efforts to establish an effective regional rail system in Nevada to serve the transportation needs of families, businesses, tourism, and urban and rural communities.

I would like to talk a little bit about our system of transportation planning in Nevada, which is similar to those in all other states in that we have regional transportation commissions (RTC), generally on a county-to-county basis. So, what does that mean? This is just the way we do it and the way other states do it, [but] it means there's a certain amount of siloing where sometimes the RTCs don't talk to each other. So, this bill would sort of unsilo the potential of regional rail. This is being done in other states.

I would just like to give two examples. In California, they have the Capitol Corridor route which goes from San Jose through Oakland, through Sacramento and up to Roseville. Hopefully, eventually, it is going to go to Reno. So that crosses many jurisdictions. And another example, which is not quite as far along as that, is in the state of Colorado. Colorado has already planned for and begun to develop a regional rail system on the east slope between Denver and Fort Collins, which again goes between several jurisdictions. So that's the kind

of thing I would hope, if this bill passes, the Regional Rail Transit Advisory Group would be thinking about and working on.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH:

There's a reason we used regional rail in this bill. We did not want to say light rail specifically because many different kinds of rail may be appropriate to different communities. We wanted to say regional because it might connect multiple counties. We may need a rail that takes us from Reno to Carson. So, when you fly in, you could just take that nice train down to your office and not have to rent a car. It might be connecting us to the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center, which is a huge source of traffic for my constituents. It might be within communities across Clark County as well, and across cities. That is why we said regional rail.

MINJIA YAN:

I am a commercial real estate professional with a background in housing and land use policy. I have served on multiple stakeholders' committees about regional planning, land use and transportation in Southern Nevada.

I hope I will be able to add some broader perspective about the benefits of this bill and a regional rail system. I am seeing this bill as not only about a transportation issue, it's also about economic development and housing issues, and creating pathways to opportunity for all Nevadans.

Nevada needs to maintain its economic competitiveness, and it needs forward-thinking infrastructure and modern transit to do that. Nevada is competing with other states to attract young, good talent and companies in different industries. Companies increasingly prioritize regions with reliable, multimodal transit systems when relocating or expanding their headquarters or their second location.

Having a regional rail network would make Nevada more attractive to employers, especially in sectors like tech and health care. Similarly, skilled workers, especially younger generations, strongly prefer cities with robust public transit. Without action, Nevada risks losing talent to states like Utah, Colorado and Arizona which already prioritize regional rail connectivity.

Nevada is not the only region in the country that can host conventions, concerts and sports games. Other regions like Phoenix and Miami can do all the above.

They have regional rail systems that connect all their economic hubs, universities, libraries, stadiums, hospitals and airports. Having a rail system can help boost tourism and visitor spending. Tourism drives Nevada's economy, yet congestion on key routes like the Las Vegas Strip and I-15 negatively impact the visitor experience. A rail system would enhance visitor satisfaction, extend stays and encourage spending.

Cities like Phoenix with its Valley Metro Rail have seen tourism revenue rise by reducing reliance on overcrowded roads and traffic congestion. Therefore, investing in a rail system represents an opportunity to improve accessibility and the overall experience for our visitors.

Housing is actually a transit issue. Housing and transit are two sides of the same coin. Our affordable housing crisis is inseparable from our transportation challenges. This bill would reimagine Nevada's landscape through transit-oriented development. Where you live determines how easy or difficult it is for you to get to important places like your jobs, your children's school, hospitals or the grocery store, which in turn determines how much money you must spend on transportation. This concept is known as location affordability.

The true cost of housing is the cost of housing plus the cost of transportation. By funding reliable, expanded transit like a regional rail system, this bill can unlock real estate development opportunities along the transit route, reduce sprawl, lower housing costs by cutting residents' transportation expenses and create walkable neighborhoods. Every dollar we invest in transit amplifies housing affordability.

For low- and middle-income families, transportation is the second-largest household expense after rent. According to a report published by the Center for Transit-Oriented Development for HUD [U.S. Department for Housing and Urban Development], "For households in car-dependent neighborhoods, transportation costs can comprise as much as 25 percent of income, compared to just 9 percent for households in more walkable, transit-rich neighborhoods."

Without reliable public transit, families are forced to spend 25 percent to 30 percent of their income on car payments, gas, maintenance, oil changes, insurance, all those expenses, leaving less money to pay for housing. Investing in a regional rail system reduces the need for car ownership and lowers the true cost of living.

Meanwhile, developers are more likely to include affordable units in projects near public transit when service is frequent and reliable. Investing in public transit also creates jobs in construction for both transit and housing and supports local businesses by connecting workers and customers to commercial corridors. Affordable housing cannot exist without affordable transportation.

Another example we have—Phoenix created the Valley Metro Rail system in 2008 alongside a transit-oriented communities initiative. Since the construction of its light rail, it has added about 25,000 housing units along its transit route. It also created a housing trust fund paired up with its route expansion projects to subsidize low-income units.

I am also seeing this as an opportunity to create pathways to opportunity for all Nevadans. The key for these regional rail systems is to plan with the community not to the community. A regional rail system guided by community-driven planning and proactive policies can transform transit infrastructure into a force for opportunity for all Nevadans. Nevada can ensure its rail investments uplift communities. This urban planning approach is called equitable transit-oriented development to integrate public transit infrastructure with community development [and] to ensure that people of all incomes, ethnicities and abilities can enjoy the benefits of dense, mixed-use and pedestrian-oriented developments near transit hubs.

So why does it matter now? Because Nevada cannot afford to wait. Cities like Phoenix, Seattle and Denver have gained economic and environmental benefits from their regional rail systems. Meanwhile, our current reliance on cars makes us fall behind, and the opposite of strong is not weak, it is dependent. We are a car-dependent state. This is not just about trains; it's about redefining what Nevada can be. States that invest in modern train infrastructure are winning the race for businesses, jobs and talent. Nevada cannot afford to fall behind.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

This is so timely. Growing up in Las Vegas, the congestion and the traffic is worse than it has ever been. I know everyone's working hard to try to make streets better and make roadways better. It would be helpful if we had something like this.

SENATOR DALY:

I think it's an easy question. It's just when we list out all the people on there, the two Legislators—and maybe you left it that way, open. It doesn't mention which House; doesn't mention north or south. Everything else is split north and south. I don't care about the party nearly as much, but it doesn't mention that either. It doesn't make that much difference to me. I just did not know if it was an oversight or if we wanted to specify north and south or split the Houses or not.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH:

I appreciate that question. We also got it on the Assembly side. You'll notice in the group, we were careful to try to make sure we had north and south and also rural so there is representation.

I was concerned, knowing this building, that if we start saying which House and which party and which geographic area for Legislators, all of us are going to want to be in there, and then we'd end up adding ten Legislators to the bill. I wanted to keep this as a manageable group. In my mind, because there was so much geographic diversity and diversity of experience built into the rest of the group, I just wanted to make sure we have two Legislators. They will be appointed by the Legislative Commission, so we can also have that safeguard in there to make sure they are representing the diversity of the State.

SENATOR KRASNER:

Thank you, Assemblymember La Rue Hatch for bringing this bill. This is a really good idea. Do you envision it being a slow train like a traditional train or a fast train like they have over in Europe? What are your thoughts on this?

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH:

That is why I wanted this group to come together. One of the things they are tasked with is identifying the need. The need for Washoe County connecting to those other counties nearby may be different than the need in Clark County. The group is to decide what kind of track is already existing that we might utilize. What kind of system would work best, and where is the greatest need for it? I imagine this group would determine that, and then they will report back to interim growth and infrastructure [Joint Interim Standing Committee on Growth and Infrastructure].

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I really like the bill as well. I and one of your Assembly colleagues and a bunch of other people were stranded at the Las Vegas Airport yesterday due to the high winds. The planes could not fly, and I would have really loved a rail option to try to get up here to the north yesterday, especially when the winds were so fierce that planes could not land.

And another anecdote, I remember my dad had mentioned in the late sixties or early seventies, there was a passenger rail service from Las Vegas to Ely that he used to take and ride up there. Now it is no longer, but it would be great to see more of this happen.

OLIVIA TANAGER (Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter):

I am the director of the Sierra Club's Toiyabe Chapter. We're the State's largest grassroots environmental organization, representing 40,000 members and supporters across our State. We support transit-oriented development across the State and support our transportation systems.

As our State experiences rapid population growth, particularly in our urban centers like Las Vegas and Reno, the demand for efficient, sustainable and interconnected transportation has never been greater. Assembly Bill 256 represents a proactive step toward addressing these challenges by facilitating a comprehensive study of regional rail options.

The establishment of this working group will enable Nevada to explore the potential benefits of regional rail, including reduced traffic congestion, lower greenhouse gas emissions and enhanced economic development through improved connectivity. We urge your support on this important measure.

TRYSTIN ST. DENNIS (Nevada Conservation League):

I am the policy associate for the Nevada Conservation League. We could not have said it better than Olivia, so I just wanted to ditto what she just said.

ROSS KINSON (Teamsters Local 533; Northern Nevada Central Labor Council):

I want to briefly share a story. I was recently visiting my family in Washington. To get an Uber from the airport to where I needed to go was \$80. Instead, I paid \$3, got on to light rail and made it there quicker than I would have if I had gotten an Uber. I had Wi-Fi the entire way and was able to get some work done.

That is the convenience of having light rail and having it put together sensibly. That is what this bill accomplishes. It takes all the experts from all different walks of life to put together a plan so we don't end up in a situation where we are wasting time and money. We are also connecting our communities together, which I think is something we all should share and value because it ultimately benefits our economy and benefits jobs in the area, which is something very near and dear to my heart.

GABRIEL CHRISTENSON (Sheet Metal, Air, Rail and Transportation Workers, Transportation Division):

I am the Nevada State legislative director for SMART-TD [Sheet Metal, Air, Rail Transportation, Transportation Division]. I represent conductors, brakemen and switchmen in the State. I am also a freight railroad conductor.

I have been on a lot of different groups separately trying to work on getting passenger rail in Nevada. Every time I take a freight train east out of Sparks, I see traffic backed up for five to ten miles trying to get out to the Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center. My friends, family and neighbors all want this. Every time I go to Vegas to do business and things like that, traffic is a nightmare. It'd be really cool to have light rail or something like that to get people in and out of The Strip and downtown and things and get employees in and out.

With our budget and everything, it would create new business in Nevada. It would bring rail carriers here, and the maintenance and everything that is associated with the roads would be pushed off on the people who own and operate on the tracks. I think A.B. 256 is a win-win, and I hope you guys can support it.

MR. HOJJATY:

I am the local chapter leader of Strong Towns Las Vegas. We are an urban planning organization fighting for alternatives for land use and transportation. I gotta tell you, this is perhaps the best bill conducted by the Legislature. We'd like to thank the sponsor and many others who have brought this bill over.

The cost of private vehicles is too high for a lot of people. It is strongly overpriced. Car infrastructure has its benefits, but the public costs and maintenance is very high. We know there are a lot of issues sustaining this policy. The benefit of transit is that it has a larger capacity, a higher volume to move large amounts of people in a very short period of time.

Urban planning is the top issue living in the Las Vegas Valley. People defend the car-dependent lifestyle, yet they fail to realize Las Vegas is the sixth-densest urban area in the country. Why? Because I take two of my hands and I touch two houses. Not to mention these policies that are very car-dependent, a result of our road design which I call “strodes”—arterials are conducted by codes and regulations along with parking requirements. The policies are not favorable to transit in addition to our land use policies. This has obviously created an unfavorable environment.

Now, I do believe transit is going to help commuter rail, light rail, bus, rapid transit. However, I am concerned that in the long term, the costs will be higher than expected. We should learn from Europe and East Asia how they build these systems at a smaller fraction of the costs. One system we support, an idea that San Jose is implementing, is personal rapid transit. It costs far less, and pretty much you can get from A to E without stopping in between.

We also hope that federal lands, as outward expansion is continued, are going to follow transit-oriented development because we know that if you are doing the infill, the outwork development has to work together. We have to make sure that we plan for mass transit, and we build the kinds of environments—as you can see here, [for example] this five-story, multi-use building—that are attractive to pedestrians and transit-oriented development. And no, we are not against car. I believe people should drive fast. We get a lot of heat, a lot of criticism.

CARLOS HERNANDEZ (Nevada State AFL-CIO):

The AFL-CIO represents over 120 unions and more than 150,000 members across Nevada.

We like the comments made by our union affiliates, especially Mr. Ross Kinson and Mr. Gabe Christenson on this bill. We especially like to thank Assemblymember Selena La Rue Hatch for championing this issue and bringing this bill forward, and we urge the committee to support the bill.

MS. MATIJEVICH:

Washoe County is proud to be here in support of A.B. 256, and we are grateful to Assemblymember La Rue Hatch for bringing it forward.

Northern Nevada's largest source of air pollution is motor vehicle emissions for the obvious reason that it is particularly problematic given the valley-basin

environment in which we work, recreate, have our businesses and our schools. We believe the outcome of this advisory working group may indeed be solutions that will help reduce that and make our community more livable. We appreciate the efforts in this bill to have an advisory working group of a manageable size but also represent the varied interests on this matter. We urge your support.

TREVOR PARRISH (Vegas Chamber):

The Chamber has a long history of supporting transportation infrastructure and views A.B. 256 as another tool to help boost our Nevada communities. We'd like to thank the bill's sponsor for bringing this forward and for working to build a very diverse working group which includes a representative from a chamber of commerce. Thank you for your time and consideration of A.B. 256.

CAITLIN GATCHALIAN (Southwest Energy Efficiency Project):

The Southwest Energy Efficiency Project or SWEEP is a public interest nonprofit dedicated to advancing energy efficiency, beneficial electrification and clean transportation in Nevada and five other states. The Southwest Energy Efficiency Project supports A.B. 256 and echoes the previous statements.

Also, I would like to mention that on Mother's Day, I got hit by a semitruck which would not have happened if we had a rail system in Nevada. Something else that is really important is considering the safety of our constituents when it comes to having transportation.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Thank goodness you are okay. Thank you for sharing what you went through and testifying on the bill. Thanks for your testimony.

MARIA NIETO ORTA (Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada):

The Regional Transportation Commission of Southern Nevada (RTC) supports A.B. 256.

As a metropolitan planning organization and public transit provider for Southern Nevada, the RTC oversees public transportation, traffic management, roadway design and construction funding, transportation planning and regional planning, and efforts including Southern Nevada Strong. The RTC has been committed to advancing an integrated, forward-thinking mobility strategy that includes high-capacity transit corridors such as light rail.

Our onboard mobility plan completed in 2020 includes much of the comprehensive plan analysis outlined in A.B. 256. This plan identifies key transit corridors and integrates extensive stakeholder input, data analysis and funding considerations to guide the future of high-capacity transit in Southern Nevada. We appreciate the bill sponsor and the opportunity to contribute to this important conversation and remain committed to enhancing mobility for our communities.

HECTOR ARREOLA (Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition):

I am the policy fellow with the Nevada Environmental Justice Coalition. We are a statewide coalition of community organizations fighting for sustainability, justice and equity in all levels of government decision-making. We are here in support of Assembly Bill 256 and believe this step toward creating more connected, transit-friendly communities is crucial for long-term and sustainable growth.

Last year, over 200 Nevadans shared their vision with us for reliable, convenient and accessible transit options to transform our communities. Regional rail could fuel economic growth, connecting people to jobs, education and essential services. Nevadans can't afford to lag behind the other fast-growing metro areas like Denver, Phoenix and Salt Lake City that have already invested in light rail. Even Tucson, a city half the size of Las Vegas, has a modern streetcar which has attracted billions in economic development and created thousands of new jobs for residents. Additionally, rail and public transit enhance walkability, increasing foot traffic to local businesses and supporting vibrant communities.

Electrified rail particularly offers significant environmental benefits by reducing emissions, improving air quality and alleviating traffic congestion. Regional rail is a proven solution, not a new experiment. Los Angeles once thrived on a robust electric rail system from 1902 through 1955. The Pacific Electric Railway connected Los Angeles to Long Beach and fueled unprecedented economic growth between the cities. Prioritizing regional rail isn't about reinventing the wheel. It's about ensuring our communities have access to safe, reliable and affordable transportation.

AARON HARRIS:

I am a volunteer with the Sierra Club, but I am also a knowledge worker, and I want to testify in strong support of this bill. The truth is, I don't know how else to put it, but places that have democratized access to rail just absolutely

economically dominate the places that do not. As has been mentioned, billions of dollars [in] economic development are spurred by investments in rail systems that allow people to get where they need to go fast, comfortably and sustainably.

A lot of people talk about the cost, but the truth is if you ask any place that has built rails, none of them regret the cost, but they do regret one major thing—not building it sooner and building it bigger and building it faster. This is a great opportunity for us as a state to invest in our economy, to reduce our liability when it comes to continuing to widen our roads and other infrastructure, when there are alternatives that will save us money in the long term as well as last hundreds of years rather than tens of years.

And there's also the element that places that have rail are able to reduce their parking requirements, which allows us to get better land value out of the spaces we are building [on] and allows us to build denser while still providing the same great access people expect to have when visiting our State as well as traveling around their neighborhoods. For these reasons and many of the reasons that have been brought up before, I strongly urge you to vote in favor of this bill.

MS. IVANOFF:

I am in support of this bill mainly because my son thinks that [it] is a great idea, and he is pretty smart. I want to ditto what Mr. Hojjaty said and everybody who is in support. Actually, I am just very confused. Why is this bill in this committee? But that is beside the point.

MATTHEW WILKIE:

I am calling in support. I believe passing this bill is a smart, forward-thinking move that could lead to transformative improvements in mobility, economic development and environmental sustainability for Nevada. I urge your support, and for respect for your time, I will ditto those speakers in support.

JOHN CARLO:

I am calling on behalf of the Strong Towns, and I want to ditto Mr. Hojjaty. I would advise the Legislators to listen to the young man. He has some really good things to say. He says this is the number one bill that this Legislature has.

So, let's think about the green aspects and the fuel industry that we are trying to combat. We know Carson City has higher gas prices than Las Vegas and so

green renewable energy, alternative sources are good. I am just wondering why we don't have it already.

I have been privileged to be able to go to Paris and ride the Paris Metro, which was built in the 1900s. I have ridden different subways, which I am going to say we should do subways for the common people and for the tourists. But let us think about the common people that live on the outskirts, on the east side. Traveling underground would be a very good solution. In the summertime there are RTC bus stops that don't even have shade out there for those people who barely have bus fare money. We do not even have shade for those people.

And let us consider the 130 people that died because of poor planning in Clark County. As of April 30 of this year, 130 people died on the roads in Clark County. So yes, the mass people mover is a good thing. We actually would support you guys on this. This is something we can come together and talk about. So anyways, I ditto my friend up there and congratulate him for doing a good job.

RON KAMINKOW (Railroad Workers United):

I live in Reno, Nevada, and am a recently retired locomotive engineer of 25 years. I am here representing Railroad Workers United, speaking in support of A.B. 256.

What people may not realize is that regional rail came into big-time existence all throughout the West in the last 25 years or so, including Denver, Colorado, and a surrounding five County Regional Commission, Salt Lake City and Ogden, the front-runner. The RTC out there has promoted a very successful regional passenger rail system, as has Albuquerque, New Mexico; the SMART train in Sonoma, Marin County over in California; and of course, Amtrak's California Corridor between Sacramento, the Bay area and San Jose. All of these are examples that have come about in the last 25 years as these metro areas have exploded in population similar to what is happening in Northern Nevada and in Southern Nevada. We need a commission. We need this committee, if you will, to study the feasibility of doing something just like what has been so successful in these other areas around the West.

I urge the Assembly and Nevada to move forward with investigating the prospects of being able to emulate those other passenger rail systems throughout the West and support A.B. 256.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The committee has received three letters in support ([Exhibit K](#)) of A.B. 256.

OSCAR WILLIAMS:

The presenter suggested that A.B. 256 was cost-effective. I challenge that. What are the actual numbers we are talking about? I do not believe any have been presented. I would suggest to you that it is not cost-effective. It will never be cost-effective. For example, in comparison, let us look at the South Florida Brightline connecting Miami to Orlando—\$6 billion in debt and growing. Is that what we are looking at in Washoe County? Are we going to be encumbered with another \$6 billion in debt? The State is already in the hole for \$200 million. Washoe County is \$35 million in the hole. Reno is \$21 million in the hole. Sparks is cutting services right and left. Where is the money going to come from? This is a bad bill for taxpayers. It seems to favor the Reno Tahoe industrial park [Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center]. You heard several people mention that.

I do not know how that benefits me. Why should my tax dollars go to help Lance Gilman and the tenants of the Reno Tahoe industrial park [Tahoe-Reno Industrial Center]? And I asked, will the rail system stop at Gilman's brothel? Why wouldn't it? This bill couldn't have been written any better by Lance Gilman himself. It is a boon to him to expect the taxpayers to foot the bill to bring employees to his tenants at the industrial park. I just don't think that's in my best interest.

I think this bill runs into some constitutional issues adjudicated by the Nevada Supreme Court. Please allow me to cite a couple of cases. I am not going to read the cases. I am just giving you the citations and let the Legislative Counsel, legal counsel sift through it. Basically, it is of *County Clark v. City of Las Vegas*, 550 P.2d 779 (1976): "Whenever a state or local government decides to select persons by popular election to perform governmental functions, the Equal Protection Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment requires [that each] qualified voter must be given equal opportunity to participate in that election."

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Mr. Williams. Sorry to interrupt you. We are at two minutes. If you could wrap up your comments.

MR. WILLIAMS:

Man, that was a fast two minutes. Darn it, I must be getting slower, but I am told if I talk too fast, nobody can hear me. Yes, it has no benefit to me. Please vote no on A.B. 256 and Amendment No. 100.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I will close the hearing on A.B. 256 and open the hearing on A.B. 367.

ASSEMBLY BILL 367 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes related to language access in elections. (BDR 24-364)

CHANEL CASSANELLO (All Voting is Local):

I am the campaign manager at All Voting is Local Action, an organization that advocates for policies and legislation that expands voter access. It is a pleasure to present A.B. 367 before you today. Unfortunately, Assemblymember [Cecelia] González cannot be here, but I want to thank her for her support on this interim committee bill addressing language access in elections.

Before proceeding with the presentation, I will just share some remarks she had prepared:

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 toward 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 as per the 2020 U.S. 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 and Pacific Islander (AAPI) and the fifth-largest population of those who identify as Hispanic. Compared to the 2010 Census, both communities grew significantly in just a decade. The AAPI population grew 45.6 percent, and the Hispanic 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 additional state standards for providing voting materials and interpretive services in various languages to ensure equitable access to the ballot box. The bill codifies five main components which will be reviewed shortly.

This concludes Assemblymember González's remarks. As she expressed, the intent of this bill is to ensure 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 Secretary of State's Office 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.

First, I just want to review the makeup of Nevadan voters and highlight findings of the 2020 U.S. Census [in my presentation] ([Exhibit L](#)). As mentioned, Nevada is the third most diverse state in the country with about 30 percent of the population speaking a language other than English at home. Spanish is spoken by 21 percent of the state population and 12 percent of its 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.

Again, our State has the fourth-largest population of people who identify as AAPI and the fifth-largest population of those who identify as Hispanic. The top languages spoken other than English are Spanish, Tagalog/Filipino, Chinese/Mandarin/Cantonese, Amharic/Somali/other Afro-Asiatic and German.

As a state that is highly diverse and will continue to grow in that direction, it is critical that every future Secretary of State continues to provide voting resources and election information for voters who do not primarily speak English. Currently, there is no State mandate to require [this of] voting materials

unless voters meet thresholds established by the Voting Rights Act. Our population of LEP [limited English proficiency] voters who do not fall within these thresholds is 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; have a chance to better understand their ballot; and can make well-informed decisions in every election moving forward.

For additional background, [Exhibit L](#), the VRA [Voting Rights Act] of 1965 was enacted to make sure all citizens, especially Black Americans in the South at the time, could vote without facing unfair impediments such as literacy tests or poll taxes. It banned 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 VRA 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, [Exhibit L](#), requires that if a certain number of people in an area speak a language other than English, the government must provide voting materials such as ballots and instructions in that language. This ensures voters who do not speak English fluently can still understand how to vote and have an equal opportunity to participate in our elections. Section 208 of the VRA, [Exhibit L](#), ensures that individuals who need help when voting can receive assistance from a person of their choice.

Section 203 of the VRA requires the state or local jurisdiction to provide voting materials to the following protected communities: Native American, Asian American and Pacific Islanders, Alaska Native, and Hispanic and Latino. To qualify for a federal mandate, these groups must meet a threshold of 5 percent of the voting age population or 10,000 citizens [and] must be LEP of the same language and have an illiteracy rate higher than the national average. Language determinations are made every five years by the U.S. Department of Justice using U.S. Census data with the next one taking place next year in 2026.

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 location. In the 1980s, Congress amended the VRA by adding section 208 to primarily establish an accommodation measure for disabled and illiterate voters, but it also has been applied to LEP voters when those voters require assistance to understand an English-only ballot.

Section 208 applies nationwide and is not limited to specific groups or areas. It allows any voter who needs assistance whether due to a disability, limited English proficiency or any other reason to have someone help them vote.

In Nevada, 2 of our 17 counties are required to abide by section 203. Clark County must provide voting materials and ballots in Spanish and Tagalog. Nye County must provide translation and interpretation services for Shoshone which does not have a standard writing system. And although not required, Washoe County voluntarily provides bilingual sample ballots and ballots in Spanish, which serves 17.6 percent of the population that speaks Spanish.

Through five components, [Exhibit L](#), [A.B. 367](#) cultivates a more inclusive system for Nevadan voters who face language barriers and are not protected by section 203. It fills a gap for voters who cannot confidently utilize an English language ballot. In addition, this bill provides the Secretary of State's Office with directions in order to plan out language accessibility and programming in their budget.

These five components you see, [Exhibit L](#), would first codify the Secretary of State's telephonic interpretation and translation services for voting-related questions and more than 200 languages including ASL [American Sign Language]. The Secretary of State's Office launched this hotline in 2024 which was utilized by voters seeking information on voting methods, candidates, ballot measures and more, all 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 they speak. They can use this hotline year-round to receive interpretation or translation assistance about voting information and assistance.

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 which include Spanish, Tagalog, Chinese, Vietnamese, Korean, Thai and ASL.

Third, it would authorize the use of certain devices such as cell phones or tablets inside polling places to ensure voters in the deaf and hard of hearing community can access virtual interpretation services at any location within their county.

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 to continue targeted efforts toward addressing gaps in language accessibility.

To wrap up, we're grateful to the Secretary of State's Office for implementing these language resources and their commitment to expand their efforts. We strongly believe these resources should be protected to limit voter confusion and to cultivate a more inclusive electoral process. To be clear, the ability to vote does not equate to the access to vote. No voter in our State should feel intimidated by an English-only ballot and information, and they should not feel hesitant to vote due to a lack of translation or interpretation options in any county in our State.

This legislation makes a meaningful impact on all Nevadan voters in both rural and urban communities. It gives direction to the Secretary of State's Office, and it strengthens our democracy by ensuring all eligible voters have access to the information and resources they need to make well-informed decisions in every election.

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

I have one clarification to make. The conceptual amendment mentioned earlier has been applied to the first reprint of A.B. 367 that you have in front of you.

SENATOR KRASNER:

Do we have anything for Nevada voters who are blind or visually impaired? Can they vote in Braille? What do we do for them?

MR. WLASCHIN:

Yes, absolutely. In fact, there are federal requirements mirrored in state law to support all voters with disabilities. With in-person voting, the machines can read the ballot so voters who are visually impaired or blind are able to get support.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We'll now open support for A.B. 367.

MS. PERSAUD-ZAMORA:

I am the executive director of Silver State Voices testifying on behalf of our organization and the Let Nevadans Vote Coalition in strong support of A.B. 367.

During the 2020 census, Nevada was ranked the third most diverse state in the country. Despite this, Silver State Voices continues to see language barriers prevent voters from fully and confidently participating in our elections.

We run our nonpartisan election protection programs and the get-out-the-vote campaign each election cycle, and we witness voters continuously express concerns about language access and translation services regarding voting materials, their ballots or receiving assistance at the polls. We appreciate the dedication of the Secretary of State's Office and clerks in all 17 counties providing resources and accommodations for Nevada's diverse voters. However, it is clear there's more work to be done.

Assembly Bill 367 represents the crucial intersection of language justice, disability rights and voting rights. By codifying these necessary accessibility measures into law, we will be able to protect the constitutional right of all eligible voters to participate in the electoral process which exists regardless of their preferred language or disability status. For this reason, we urge your support on this bill.

CARISSA PEARCE (Children's Advocacy Alliance):

We are in strong support of A.B. 367.

Nevada is home to many diverse communities, and when families are unable to fully understand voting materials, they may feel overwhelmed or [that] they are going to make a mistake which leads them to abstain from voting. This not only silences their voices but also affects their children who rely on their parents to advocate for their future. When parents vote, they are voting for their children's

education, healthcare and overall well-being. By providing voting materials in multiple languages, A.B. 367 ensures more families can participate in our democracy, making decisions that will shape a better future for their children.

Assembly Bill 367 is a simple solution that will have lasting positive impacts on Nevada's elections. Passing this bill ensures more families can engage confidently and meaningfully in our democracy, making decisions that will shape stronger futures. Thank you for your consideration on this legislation, and we ask you to pass this bill.

NOÉ OROSCO (Make the Road Nevada):

We are a proud member of the Let Nevadans Vote Coalition.

This country has long upheld that language should not be a barrier to citizenship or civic engagement. Under the U.S. naturalization laws, certain individuals can qualify for exemptions from the English language requirement when applying for citizenship. These policies reflect the fundamental truth that proficiency in English is not a prerequisite for voting. Furthermore, many voters do have proficiency in English but feel more comfortable reading critical election materials in their mother tongue. Elections are too important for any voter to have uncertainty about the meaning of their ballot. Access to accurate, translated election information ensures all voters, regardless of the preferred language, can make informed choices with confidence.

By recognizing and supporting A.B. 367, we strengthen our democracy in affirming that all citizens, whether they are fluent in English or more comfortable in their *madre lengua* [mother tongue], have the right to participate fully in shaping our communities and our futures, and for that we ask you to support it.

IZACK TENORIO (Campaign Legal Center):

Campaign Legal Center supports A.B. 367 to help ensure all voters, no matter what language they speak, can fully participate in the electoral process. America is made better by the democratic participation of all citizens, not just those who speak fluent English. Communities using a different language or American Sign Language as a primary means of communication should unequivocally be afforded the same opportunity to critically engage with the full scope of the American electoral process.

This bill will help codify important improvements made by the Secretary of State, such as making information about elections translated and available online into a minimum of seven of the most widely spoken non-English languages in the State. Limited English proficiency should not limit political participation, and a lack of meaningful language assistance should not be a barrier to citizens in 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 enshrined into state law to ensure that communities will be able to access them for decades to come. We urge you to support this bill.

MR. MOORE:

I am the Nevada civic engagement director with Mi Familia En Acción testifying in support of A.B. 367.

Mi Familia En Acción is a civic engagement organization and a proud member of the Let Nevadans Vote Coalition. We are here in support of A.B. 367 because our electorate needs to meet our diverse community where they are. Our Secretary of State showed leadership by showing up for our community last election. The next step is codifying language access into law.

Here in Nevada, our hard-of-hearing community is roughly 100,000 strong, and for them, language interpretation is essential. We also have seen that around one-fifth of Nevadans speak another language besides English at home, even when a lot of them are proficient in English. We also saw this firsthand because during this last election cycle when we did outreach to our community to share election resources, we did so in multiple languages.

At Mi Familia En Acción, we believe that to facilitate a more active community, we need to support bills like A.B. 367. We urge the committee to support A.B. 367.

MATHILDA MILLER (Native Voters Alliance Nevada):
We are in strong support of A.B. 367.

If we believe in democracy for all, then we must mean all. Language should never be a barrier to voting. But right now, too many voters are left behind, not because they are unwilling but because they are left unheard. I have seen what

happens when someone wants to vote, but they don't have the words to ask for help. I have watched elders get so frustrated they decide not to vote at all because they don't understand the instructions. In fact, my dad is 70 years old, and even at the oncologist's office, I must be right by his side because he is afraid he might misunderstand what his provider is saying to him about his care. He's afraid he will fumble the paperwork or the instructions and accidentally do something wrong. I have seen young people try to translate important documents for their parents. They're scared they'll get it wrong.

This isn't just a language issue. It's a dignity issue. It's also a power issue. This bill is about making sure every single Nevadan has the tools to participate fully, confidently and equally. Voting should feel like a welcome mat to every single eligible voter, not a closed door. We urge your support.

MS. SWARTZ:

I will go ahead [on behalf of Battle Born Progress and Institute for a Progressive Nevada] and ditto what all my colleagues and partner organizations have said and say that nobody should be locked out of our democracy because of the language barrier.

ERIC WILCOX (Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing):

I am the parent of a deaf child and chair of the Nevada Commission for Persons Who Are Deaf and Hard of Hearing testifying today on behalf of the Commission.

This issue of voter accessibility is of paramount importance to the community we represent. The first and primary language for many in our community is American Sign Language, which is a visual language 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. We have documented that in our regular town hall meetings with the community around the State. For these reasons, the Commission is in strong support of this bill. We thank the Legislature for addressing this, and we urge your support.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

The committee has received six letters ([Exhibit M](#)) in support of A.B. 367.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Independent American Party):

According to the twenty-second edition of *Ethnologue*, there are currently 7,111 living languages in the world today. Chinese has 13 variations and Arabic has 20 [*sic*]. English is the number one language used in the world today. According to Worlddata.info, only 1,000 years ago there were 9,000 languages. Due to increasing globalization, the number is decreasing.

According to Worlddata.info, the top languages spoken in countries are: French in 46 countries, Spanish in 34 countries, Chinese in 25 countries, Russian in 22 countries; English is spoken in 58 countries [*sic*]. If a person is a naturalized citizen, they are required to demonstrate proficiency in English which includes reading, writing and speaking.

Now remember, the taxpayer is responsible to pay all the costs for printing election materials in all the numerous languages, for the toll-free phone numbers and for the certified translators. So, we must be careful and be cautious of the taxpayer's money.

We are in favor of the blind and disabled section of this bill. Please vote no on A.B. 367.

MR. HOJJATY:

[Due to technical issues, a portion of this meeting's recording has been lost and is unable to be transcribed.] We believe that discourages people to learn English and blend in with our values and everything else, so we urge you to vote no.

MS. STONE:

While I am pleased to see Amendment No. 382 reduced the proposal for an extremely broad mandate to provide close to unlimited language support for all the elections processes, I continue to strongly oppose A.B. 367. This bill would have a significant fiscal and workload burden at the State and county level with relatively minor impact.

The fiscal notes quoted from the Secretary of State and Clark, Washoe, Douglas, Elko and Lyon Counties add up to \$3.1 million in additional costs just for 2025 and 2026—then a biannual ongoing expense estimate of about \$2.3 million. For example, it includes the establishment of a new position called the Language Access Coordinator for the Office of the Secretary of State. Since there are at least seven languages under consideration for the printed materials

and the website, there would need to be resources to maintain supporting the election system, providing for each of these languages and the toll-free number would provide for up to 200 languages. That seems excessive.

I immigrated many years ago, and I was anxious to learn English so I could assimilate into American society, get a job, make new friends and study in English. While I can 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 spoke to Latino immigrants who shared my perspective. They objected to receiving brochures in Spanish. They found it unnecessary and condescending. I suggest that Nevada would do better assigning a budget to offering English classes to people with limited English proficiency. That would align well with President Trump's March 1 executive order which states that common language fosters national cohesion, helps newcomers engage in communities and traditions, and enriches our shared culture. It further states that establishing English as the official language promotes unity ...

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

I am sorry. Thank you for your comments. We are over two minutes. Could you try to wrap up your comments?

MS. STONE:

I will. It establishes efficiency in government operations. I will leave it at that, and I say it is going to be very expensive and totally unnecessary. I appreciate your voting against A.B. 367.

MR. WILLIAMS:

I oppose A.B. 367. For example, regarding foreign languages, the solution is to learn English. You do not have to learn too much to be able to vote in our elections. And of course, our school districts provide an adult language program. There's no excuse for not getting into the program. It is free, and it is right there that we offer. So, the opportunity is there to learn English, and that is the way to do it. And of course, our President has issued a mandate making English the language of the land. So, it would be nice to bring it all together in that regard.

With respect to disability, when you go to the polls you can ask for a large-type ballot that they produce on the machines or you can use the auditory tactile interface (ATI) which is like a little hand controller, and you got a little headset that speaks to you, and you go, "Oh, okay. That's the selection."

However, I do not believe there are any statistics on the numbers of the ATI units used in the election. There's not really a good statistical base to say you need more of that or the cell phone will supplant it because they're not really used that much. If people have disabilities, they go and talk to the election board; that is usually what you get, and that is why voting in person is so great because you have a human there to help you.

Regarding deaf, deaf people can still read, okay. Regarding illiteracy, which I think is really the crux of this bill, let's face it. The schools are failing. Our kids are illiterate. The solution is to fix the schools. Don't give them a cell phone, right? This is really hidden in this. This is driving everybody to use their cell phones in elections. There is a techno mission creep going on here. I urge you to vote no on A.B. 367 and Amendment No. 382.

Ms. GIFFORD:

I oppose, and I encourage new citizens to learn to speak our country's language of English.

Ms. IVANOFF:

Why do we Americans—and I consider myself American even though I obviously, you can hear my accent, immigrated not too long ago. Why do we have to change things to help—not to help but ... people have to assimilate to the American culture. It takes many years to become a citizen and to be able to vote. People should learn the language enough to be able to vote. If they don't, then they are not here for the right reasons. They don't want to assimilate. If they don't want to assimilate, they shouldn't be coming here.

I know it sounds harsh, and I should find better words to say the same thing. But it is upsetting to me. I came here; I worked hard to get a citizenship. I learned the language, and now my taxpayer money that is so hard-earned, you want to take my money to spend it frivolously. There are a bunch of nonprofits that are helping. Those nonprofits are also getting paid by our taxpayers' money.

There hasn't been a problem for people who cannot vote. I haven't heard it. Everybody's telling everybody—even people that don't speak English, their family is telling them what to do and how to vote. There is no point of us spending millions of dollars extra on top of everything else. You are trying to raise our taxes in this very fashion. So please be mindful on how we spend our money. Thank you so much. I know you are trying your best. The intent is very good, and I believe we already have provisions to help the disabled people. So, if we don't, I agree with the disabled part of the bill; however, we should not be spending our money willy-nilly. People should assimilate.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 367, and we have one item on our agenda before we go to public comment. We have a bill draft request (BDR) regarding a potential Senate concurrent resolution. This has to do with recognizing antimicrobial resistance as a public health crisis and encouraging certain actions be taken in response.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST R-1234: Recognizes antimicrobial resistance as a public health crisis and encourages certain actions be taken in response. (Later introduced as [Senate Concurrent Resolution 5](#).)

SENATOR KRASNER MOVED TO INTRODUCE BDR R-1234.

SENATOR STEINBECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:

Our last item on the agenda is public comment.

MS. GIFFORD:

I will try to be brief. I know we're grateful for the opportunity to provide testimony at Nevada's slated sessions. We do know Nevada's Legislators put hard work and many hours into developing and legislating proposed bills, and we are grateful for what you all do as well. Please know that we try to satisfactorily meet all the requirements to participate in this important process, and we try to present meaningful information and opinions that could be helpful

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 13, 2025
Page 60

to you. We would respectfully like to share two things with you that have hindered our participation recently. We've been caught off guard at the last minute lately with new information and amendments that have an impact on what we have prepared to share with you. If there were an appropriate deadline for such items, we would be able to review them ahead of the session.

In addition, please know that when both the Senate and the Assembly committees address the same topic, i.e., Legislative Operations and Elections meet at the same time on the same day, we'd be so grateful if we did not have to make a choice between the sessions. It would be so beneficial if we could attend both. We'd be grateful for any solution you can provide that will remedy these situations.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections
May 13, 2025
Page 61

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
This meeting is adjourned at 5:08 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Suzanne Efford,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
A.B. 491	C	3	Assemblymember Steve Yeager	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 496	D	8	Assemblymember Steve Yeager	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 496	E	15	Nancy Carlson	Letter of Opposition
A.B. 73	F	18	Secretary of State Francisco Aguilar	Presentation
A.B. 73	G	19	Gabriel Di Chiara / Office of the Secretary of State	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 79	H	24	Secretary of State Francisco Aguilar	Presentation
A.B. 79	I	25	Gabriel Di Chiara / Office of the Secretary of State	Conceptual Amendment
A.B. 79	J	31	Ishika Bhakta / Children's Advocacy Alliance	Letter of Support
A.B. 256	K	46	Senator James Ohrenschall	Three Letters of Support
A.B. 367	L	48	Chanel Cassanello / All Voting is Local	Presentation
A.B. 367	M	55	Senator James Ohrenschall	Six Letters of Support