MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS

Eighty-third Session
April 10, 2025

The Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 3:37 p.m. on Thursday, April 10, 2025, in Room 2149 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 5 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 Nicole J. Cannizzaro
Senator Lisa Krasner
Senator John C. Steinbeck

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Pepper Sturm, Committee Policy Analyst
Kelsey DeLozier, Committee Counsel
Connie Summers, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Annette Magnus, Nevada Coalition for Psychedelic Medicine

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I will open the work session with Senate Bill (S.B.) 74.

SENATE BILL 74: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-482)

PEPPER STURM (Committee Policy Analyst):
As a reminder, as non-partisan staff I cannot advocate for or against any measure. I am here to walk the committee through todays work session documents.

Since the amendments proposed in the work session documents are conceptual in nature, please be aware that the formal amendments will likely modify suggested language but will still reflect the intended change.

Senate Bill 74 was sponsored by this committee on behalf of the Secretary of State and heard on April 8. I have a work session document (Exhibit C) describing the bill together with a conceptual amendment proposed by Mark Wlaschin, Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I do see Deputy Secretary of State for Elections Mark Wlaschin here. If there are any questions regarding S.B. 74 or the amendment, I am happy to have you ask them now; otherwise, I would open it up for a motion to amend and do pass [as amended].

> SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 74.
>
> SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR KRASNER:
Because I have received numerous emails from people who live in Senate District 16 expressing concerns about the expansion of e-voting or voting by email, I will be a no on this.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Some parts of the bill I particularly like are the cyber-incident response plan in section 26. I think there are a lot of excellent cleanup provisions, and I think the expansion of EASE [Effective Absentee System for Elections] is only when something has happened that's listed in the statute that prevents the voter from being able to access their mail ballot or vote in person. So, I think it is narrowly tailored to make sure that someone is not prevented from voting when one of these life circumstances arises.

> THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS KRASNER AND STEINBECK VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next on the list is S.B. 100.

SENATE BILL 100: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-197)

The bill was sponsored by Senator Daly and heard on February 18. I have a work session document (Exhibit D) describing the bill together with an amendment proposed by Senator Daly.

SENATOR DALY:
Just for your information, in section 1, I believe the ACLU wanted a slight amendment changing the last section to say "in accordance with the Nevada law or regulations adopted." So, it shortens it but doesn't change the meaning at all.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Having no questions, I would open it up for a motion to amend and do pass [as amended].

> SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 100.
>
> SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I am still looking through the amendment, so I am going to vote yes to get it out of committee but reserve my right to change my vote prior to the floor session.

> THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR STEINBECK VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next on the list is S.B. 102.

SENATE BILL 102: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-90)

The bill was sponsored by Senator Daly and heard on February 18. I have a work session document (Exhibit E) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

SENATOR KRASNER:
Regarding the provision that pertains to a person who is convicted of this violation, do they lose their right to vote for the rest of their life?

SENATOR DALY:
No, they don't lose the right to vote; they just can't be elected to office.

SENATOR KRASNER:
Do they lose their right to run for public office for the rest of their life?

SENATOR DALY:
Yes.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Not seeing any additional questions, I would like to open it up for a motion to do pass.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 102.

SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I am going to vote no on this; but if there are any amendments, I do want to reserve my right to change my vote once it's on the floor.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS KRASNER AND STEINBECK VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Senate Bill 422 was sponsored by this committee and heard on April 3. I have a work session document (Exhibit F) describing the bill together with a proposed amendment.

SENATE BILL 422: Revises provisions relating to voting. (BDR 24-954)

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Not seeing any questions, I would like to open it up for a motion to amend and do pass [as amended].

> SENATOR DALY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 422.
>
> SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATORS KRASNER AND STEINBECK VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next is Senate Bill 428 which was sponsored by this committee and heard on April 8. I have a work session document (Exhibit G) describing the bill together with a proposed amendment from Clark County and a conceptual amendment proposed by Chair Ohrenschall.

SENATE BILL 428: Revises provisions relating to public office. (BDR 23-955)

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I want to point the committee to the amendment proposed by Clark County, Exhibit G. I went over that language with our legal counsel, and there was a concern with the language noted in green that says "as adjudicated pursuant to section 3 of this act." We came up with the alternative "in accordance with [sub]section 1 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 283.040" which I think accomplishes a lot of what we are trying to get at. I know there are still some concerns that Clark County has, and I would like to try to continue meeting with Clark County and the other stakeholders to address those. That may be something I might need to propose as a personal amendment on the floor if I can get consensus with Clark County. But for now, I believe Clark County is okay with changing that green language "as adjudicated pursuant to section 3 of this act" to "in accordance with [sub]section 1 of NRS 283.040." If I am misunderstanding, please correct me; I am committed to continuing to meet with you—Clark County—and the other stakeholders to address some of the

other concerns you had about trying to verify if an office is vacant, if an officeholder is no longer living in that district or territory they are representing.

SENATOR KRASNER:
I had a question—it was one I asked at the hearing—and I see you provided a conceptual amendment to try and address the question. But on 1, b, [of conceptual amendment submitted by Senator Ohrenschall, Exhibit G] I asked a specific question about how, within every Nevada State Senator's district, they have nested two Assembly districts. And I asked if they move from one of those Assembly districts within their Senate district to another Assembly district within their Senate district, would they have to give notification that they moved? During the hearing, you said no because it's still within the Senate district. But now 1, b says "The address described is the address that the person resides at the time of filing." Would that mean they would have to notify the proper entity?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I just want to make sure I'm looking at the same thing you're looking at. I may need to defer to counsel on this; but the way I'm reading section 2, subsection 3 on page 6 of the original bill and the amendment, I don't think that notification would be triggered. If, let's say, the member of the State Senate moved to another address in the other Assembly district where they are still residing in the Senate district, I believe the triggering event would be an address that is no longer in that district.

KELSEY DELOZIER (Counsel):
The way it's written provides that they will immediately notify the appropriate entities upon a change of address. And the piece in regard to upon an event a causing vacancy set forth is the relinquishment of office. So, it would still apply as it's a change in address as written, however, that would be an amendment.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I stand corrected. So, the officeholder would need to notify of a change of address. But again, I don't believe there would be any relinquishment of office when you still live in that district. It wouldn't trigger that.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I think in clarifying that, it appears to me from the language that's in section 2, subsection 3, the relinquishment is contingent upon it qualifying as a vacancy under NRS] 283.040. So, if you're still within the same Senate district, it wouldn't trigger the provisions of that statute in NRS and, thus, wouldn't be a vacancy. It wouldn't require you to relinquish the office, but you would still be required to update your address—and I am seeing some nods from committee counsel—so that's how I read that section.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
We are very lucky to have the former chair of this committee, our Majority Leader, here with us.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I remember during the testimony the term was it's not where your address is as much as it's where you lay your head. If for work or for family reasons you are gone for an extended time, are you going to end up having issues from this language that is presented here today?

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
That's not my intent. If someone is working temporarily out of state or for some family reason has to be out of the district or out of the state, that would trigger this. I think a lot has to do with their intent. We had a discussion with our counsel as to actual versus constructive residence, so I will defer to counsel on that.

MS. DELOZIER:
If you look, we have actual residency defined in section 1, subsection 8, which states “the place of permanent habitation where a person actually resides and is legally domiciled.” Your domicile is generally going to deal with your intent to permanently reside in a place. There can be a variety of factors that go into that determination as to where you are domiciled, but if you were temporarily dealing with something and had no permanent intent to leave, you would likely not be considered to be actually domiciled elsewhere.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Having no further questions, I would accept a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 428 with the amendments in the packet and that slight change to Clark County's amendment that I verbalized.

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 428 WITH THE AMENDMENTS AND SENATOR OHRENSCHALL'S VERBAL CHANGE FROM CLARK COUNTY'S "AS ADJUDICATED PURSUANT TO SECTION 3 OF THIS ACT" OF SECTIONS 4, 5 AND 11 TO "IN ACCORDANCE WITH SUBSECTION 1 OF NRS 283.040."

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I am going to vote yes on this but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I would at this time like to take Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 10 out of order.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10: Urges Congress to take certain actions relating to the therapeutic use of certain psychedelic compounds. (BDR R-801)

MR. STURM:
I have a work session document (Exhibit H) describing the bill together with a conceptual amendment proposed by Senator Rochelle Nguyen. The bill was heard on March 11.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I know members had a few questions as to S.J.R. 10 such as does it deal with legalization of recreational use. I appreciate Ms. Magnus coming up to try to address some of those questions and concerns.

ANNETTE MAGNUS (Nevada Coalition for Psychedelic Medicine):
I am here to reiterate today that our purpose of this joint resolution and its companion bill, Assembly Bill (A.B.) 378—which, hopefully, you will see soon—is for the resolution to address the current issues that are happening federally with the schedule I classification of psilocybin.

ASSEMBLY BILL 378: Creates the Alternative Therapy Pilot Program. (BDR 40-820)

We need to make sure that the federal government is in line when it comes to research and the rescheduling of this medicine for research purposes. But our goal for both of these bills is a medical model. We are not looking to make this a recreational use. I can tell you firsthand that we want to make sure this is done in a medical setting with guardrails, and that is why you see the secondary bill, the companion bill, as a pilot project for veterans and first responders. We want to make sure this is being done at the federal level and at the state level as a medical model.

SENATOR KRASNER:
We have not heard A.B. 378, and you just brought it up as a companion bill for this bill that we are about to vote on. You said it is a pilot project. Could you tell us just a little bit more, please?

MS. MAGNUS:
We are very proud of A.B. 378. It's a small-scale pilot project we are working on with Assemblymember Max Carter. Basically, we're trying to get a medical model set up in Nevada for a pilot project to prove that this can be done as a small-scale pilot project here; hopefully, down the road we can make it a medical model. But at no point are we trying to make this recreational. We want to keep this in a medical setting with guardrails, with professionals so we can make sure there's a chain of custody and safety measures in place to ensure it is used for people with PTSD, anxiety disorders and other things like that. As somebody who suffered from anxiety disorders, this could be revolutionary when it comes to medical treatment—and that's what we want to keep this as.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I appreciate the meetings we've had to talk about this. If this helps people as far as having clinical depression and anxiety, I would never want to stand in the way of that. My concern is recreational use. Can you tell me why the term "supervised" was removed in the amendment?

MS. MAGNUS:
It was just an amendment because we wanted to make sure we were clarifying different definitions. But if that's something you need us to work on or add back in, we are happy to take a look at that. It was a cleanup amendment because

some of the language came out a little bit wonky; but if that helps you get to a yes vote, we are happy to work with you on that.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I know this would be the sponsoring Senator's decision, but would you have any objection if this resolution also included some sort of statement that said this is not intended to endorse the additional recreational use?

MS. MAGNUS:
I think we can work on that with you after this. Senator Nguyen and I have been in conversations about making sure that the intention of this is clear and that we are really intending this to be about a medical model, both at the federal level and at the state level. I cannot speak for the sponsor, but I'm happy to work with you on that after this work session.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
My desire today would be to move the bill with the amendments in the work session, and then I would encourage you to reach out to the sponsor. It's possible there could be further amendments either on the floor or in the other House; but not having spoken to the sponsor today, I would like to move the amendment as is, and then I would encourage you to reach out to the sponsor about some of those other concerns and see if she is open to a future amendment.

MS. MAGNUS:
And we'll continue to work with you, Senator.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Having no further questions, I would accept a motion to amend and do pass [as amended] S.J.R. 10 with the amendment in the work session packet.

> SENATOR STEINBECK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.J.R. 10.
>
> SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.
>
> THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR KRASNER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
We're back to S.B. 143 in your work session binder.

SENATE BILL 143: Revises provisions relating to natural resources. (BDR 17-10)

I have a work session document (Exhibit I) describing the bill which was sponsored by Senator Nguyen and heard on April 3. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
If there are no questions, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 143.

SENATOR KRASNER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next is S.B. 225 which was sponsored by this committee on behalf of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections and heard on March 13.

SENATE BILL 225: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-361)

I have a work session document (Exhibit J) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Having no questions on S.B. 225, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 225.

SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next is S.B. 414 which was sponsored by Senator Melanie Scheible and Senator Cannizzaro and was heard on April 3.

SENATE BILL 414: Revises provisions relating to public office. (BDR 23-1111)

I have a work session document (Exhibit K) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

SENATOR KRASNER:
At the hearing, my colleague brought up some questions about the disclosure of holdings of particular stocks and securities valued at $5,000 or more. I had the same question and concern that many people, when they have a stock portfolio, don't invest in stocks personally but rather hire someone to do that for them. That person purchases a wide variety of stocks that go into that portfolio. They could be selling those different stocks daily. The prices definitely fluctuate daily. I think this could be a real concern in the attempt to report truthfully, and that's my concern with this.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I appreciate your concerns. I wish we still had Deputy Secretary of State for Elections Wlaschin here, but I think the goal behind this bill is for more transparency, and I think that perhaps, assuming this passes and is signed into law, we'll get some more insight as to whether it is the value of the stock on the day of filing the report or something else. I certainly laud the effort for more transparency, so I'll be supporting the bill.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO:
I'll be supporting passing this bill out of committee. I would note that the amendment—which puts the value of $5,000 or more currently in statute that doesn't seem to be an issue and is not clear, despite the fact that stocks may change or portfolios may change—currently requires an individual to list any business entity which they or a member of their household is involved as a trustee beneficiary, etc., or holder of a class of stock or security representing 1 percent or more of the total outstanding stock or securities issued by the

business entity. Equally, that argument would apply to current statute. So, I think putting additional reporting parameters on that doesn't seem to be an impossibility since we all seem to abide by the current law. So, I'll be supporting the bill.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Seeing no additional comments or questions, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 414.

SENATOR DALY SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR STEINBECK:
I'm going to vote yes on this bill but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR KRASNER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next is S.B. 421 which was sponsored by this committee and heard on April 8. I have a work session document (Exhibit L) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

SENATE BILL 421: Revises provisions relating to elections. (BDR 24-953)

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Seeing no additional comments or questions, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 421.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Next is S.J.R. 1 which was sponsored by Senators Krasner and Stone and heard on April 8.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1: Urges Congress to enact legislation allowing the surviving spouse of a veteran to receive the military retirement pay of the veteran after the veteran's death. (BDR R-55)

I have a work session document (Exhibit M) describing the bill and the amendment.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I want to thank Senator Daly and Senator Krasner for working together on the amendment. Seeing no questions on S.J.R. 1, I would accept a motion to amend and do pass [as amended].

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.J.R. 1.

SENATOR STEINBECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Our next bill is S.J.R. 7 which was sponsored by Senator Ohrenschall and heard on March 25.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 7: Urges the Federal Government to recognize the unsuitability of Yucca Mountain as the site for a repository to store and dispose of spent nuclear fuel and high-level radioactive waste. (BDR R-945)

I have a work session document (Exhibit N) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Seeing no questions on S.J.R. 7, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 7.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Our next bill is S.J.R. 8 which was sponsored by Senator Ohrenschall and heard on March 20.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8: Urges Congress to protect the public lands including and adjacent to Sunrise Mountain, Frenchman Mountain and the Rainbow Gardens Area. (BDR R-946)

I have a work session document (Exhibit O) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Seeing no questions on S.J.R. 8, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR DALY MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 8.

SENATOR CANNIZZARO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

MR. STURM:
Our next bill is S.J.R. 9 which was sponsored by Senators Robin Titus and Ira Hansen and heard on March 4.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 9: Urges the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee and the Postmaster General of the United States Postal Service for the creation of a postage stamp commemorating John "Snowshoe" Thompson. (BDR R-46)

I have a work session document (Exhibit P) describing the bill. There were no amendments proposed for this measure.

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
Seeing no questions on S.J.R. 9, I would accept a motion to do pass.

SENATOR KRASNER MOVED TO DO PASS S.J.R. 9.

SENATOR STEINBECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

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

CHAIR OHRENSCHALL:
I believe we are at the end of our work session. Seeing no public comment, the meeting is adjourned at 4:37 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

_____
Connie Summers,
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
S.B. 74	C	2	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 100	D	3	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 102	E	4	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 422	F	4	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 428	G	5	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 10	H	8	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 143	I	11	Pepper Sturm	Wok Session Document
S.B. 225	J	11	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 414	K	12	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.B. 421	L	13	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 1	M	14	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 7	N	14	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 8	O	15	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 9	P	16	Pepper Sturm	Work Session Document