



# **NEVADA LEGISLATURE**

## **JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

*(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] [218E.320](#))*

### **MINUTES**

**August 29, 2022**

The fourth and final meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections for the 2021–2022 Interim was held on Monday, August 29, 2022, at 4 p.m. in Room 4412, Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2134, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's [meeting page](#). The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) ([publications@lcb.state.nv.us](mailto:publications@lcb.state.nv.us) or 775/684-6835).

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:**

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair  
Senator Roberta Lange  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblyman Andy Matthews

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:**

Assemblywoman Jill Dickman

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBERS ATTENDING VIA REMOTELY:**

Senator Fabian Doñate (Alternate for Senator James Ohrenschall)  
Senator Heidi Seevers Gansert

#### **COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:**

Senator James Ohrenschall, Vice Chair (Excused)

**LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:**

Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst/GIS Specialist, Research Division

Nicolas C. Anthony, Research Director, Research Division

Lisa Creamer, Research Policy Assistant, Research Division

Erin Sturdivant, Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division

Karen Hoppe, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.  
[Indicate a summary of comments.]*

## **AGENDA ITEM I—CALL TO ORDER AND OPENING REMARKS**

### ***Chair Miller:***

I would like to call this meeting to order for the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections. Senator Doñate is attending as an alternate for Senator Ohrenschall.

[Chair Miller discussed meeting guidelines, including procedures for providing public comment, and noted meeting materials, including the "Work Session Document" (WSD) have been uploaded to the Committee's [meeting page](#).]

Today's agenda includes a work session during which the Committee will decide which legislative measures it will request for the 2023 Legislative Session and any other actions the Committee may endorse.

## **AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT**

### ***Chair Miller:***

I would like to open up public comment. Please open the lines, Broadcasting. I do not see anyone coming forward in Las Vegas to make public comment. Is anyone there in Carson City, Assemblywoman Dickman?

### ***Assemblywoman Dickman:***

There are people here, but they do not want to speak right now.

### ***Chair Miller:***

We will wait to see if anyone is on the phone line.

### ***Broadcasting and Production Services (BPS):***

[BPS staff explained how callers can take their place in the queue.]

### ***Steven Cohen, Nevada Resident:***

I want to draw the Committee's attention to the written remarks I submitted for work session Topics C and D, including an amendment for Topic D ([Agenda Item II](#)).

### ***Dora Martinez, Nevada Disability Peer Action Coalition:***

I want to say "ditto" with what Mr. Cohen said. We support Topics C and D. "Special needs" should be changed to "people with disability." I thought Assembly Joint Resolution 1 (2021) changed all of the wording pertaining to people with disabilities, so I echo his comment.

It was hard for me to find a pdf of this WSD. I know it is out of your hands, but I want to see who will hear and help me. I have been trying to reach Director Erdoes to let her know and help her ensure documents at the LCB are accessible to all. When a pdf is embedded and is an image, an iPhone or Android cannot read the pictures for people who are blind such as myself. I want to thank Stephanie Wilcox with the Research Library who was able to

help me. I was unsure whether AJR 1 is part of Topic D on this WSD; I did not know what it was about. We, as blind people, want to be on the same playing field. We do not want to sound ignorant due to the fact that it is not accessible. I do not want to sound like I do not know what I am doing. I want to advocate for all people with disabilities.

***Chair Miller:***

We appreciate your bringing that to our attention. We want to make sure that everything is accessible for all Nevadans. It has been noted.

### **AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETING ON JUNE 17, 2022**

***Chair Miller:***

We will move on to the next agenda item, which is approval of the minutes for the meeting that occurred on June 17, 2022. All members were emailed the draft minutes; everyone had an opportunity to review them. Are there any questions on the minutes, Committee members? I do not see any.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE JUNE 17, 2022, MEETING.

ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

\*\*\*\*\*

### **AGENDA ITEM IV—WORK SESSION—DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO:**

***Chair Miller:***

We will move on to our next agenda item, which is the work session portion of today's meeting. The purpose of the work session is for the Committee to decide which legislative measures, if any, it will request for the 2023 Session of the Legislature and which letters of recommendation or support will be sent to interested parties. Staff has assisted in preparing the WSD ([Agenda Item IV](#)), which has been revised, to guide us through the work session. The document contains a combination of recommendations based upon testimony heard by this Committee throughout the interim as well as recommendations from Committee members. The recommendations outlined in the document are not necessarily set in stone. If the Committee is so inclined, recommendations may be amended prior to the vote. Staff will guide us through each one of the items in the document. There will be an opportunity to discuss each recommendation, and if you are so inclined, I will accept a motion to approve them. I would like to turn things over to Ms. Proehl.

***Ms. Proehl:***

As nonpartisan staff of the LCB, I neither support nor oppose any proposals before you today. You should all have the WSD. It is also available on the Committee's [meeting page](#). The document has been prepared to assist the Committee in determining which legislative measures it will request for the 2023 Session of the Nevada Legislature as well as other actions the Committee may endorse. The members of the Committee do not necessarily

support or oppose the recommendations in this WSD. The recommendations have been organized so that Committee members can review them and decide whether they want to accept, reject, modify, or take no action on each of the recommendations. The document organizes the proposals by topic, and they are not preferentially ordered. Committee members are advised that LCB staff, at the direction of the Chair, may coordinate with interested parties to obtain additional information for drafting purposes or inclusion in the Committee's final report.

#### **A. REVIEW OF FUNDING FOR VOTING SYSTEMS**

##### ***Ms. Proehl:***

The first recommendation in the WSD is under Topic A. Recommendation A-1 is to request the drafting of a bill to provide that if a county was allocated or awarded state money from the Legislature or the Secretary of State (SOS) for the purchase of voting machines and the county wishes to discontinue using a voting machine purchased with such money to instead implement voting by printed ballot, the county must return the money originally allocated for the voting machine. This was recommended by Assemblywoman Carlton and Chair Miller.

##### ***Chair Miller:***

Any questions, members?

##### ***Assemblywoman Carlton:***

We had a conversation about this. It is my understanding that this will not be retroactive. We are not going to change the rules of the road after we have asked people to drive down the road. Moving forward, if the state gives money to a county after they testify that they would like to receive an appropriation to update their voting machines, and then they decide that they do not want to use those, it is appropriate that the taxpayers get a refund or get the voting machine back. We know there are areas of the state that do not have as much access as they would like. We never would have thought that a county that came to us and asked for money to purchase something would put it in a closet and not want to use it. It was unheard of in the past. Usually, when we give people money, they are thankful and they use it. We need to address the possibility of this happening in the future. It is sad that state funds from the taxpayers were given to a county that bought machines that are gathering dust.

##### ***Chair Miller:***

Are there any additional questions?

##### ***Assemblywoman Dickman:***

The fact that this is not retroactive makes it a little easier to support. Assemblywoman Carlton mentioned either paying the money back or returning the machines. Why do we not have "return the machines" in this recommendation for a bill draft request (BDR)?

##### ***Chair Miller:***

We looked into it, and I will let Ms. Proehl elaborate. There is a contractual issue with the company; we cannot take machines from a county that does not want them. Is that correct, Ms. Proehl?

**Ms. Proehl:**

Yes, that is correct. Due to contractual limitations, they cannot be reallocated to other jurisdictions.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Could the state take them back and sell them back to the company?

**Ms. Proehl:**

The machines go back to the voting machine vendor; they do not go back to the state.

**Chair Miller:**

Assemblywoman, are you asking if they are refundable—if the state could sell them back to the company?

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

Yes.

**Ms. Proehl:**

I do not believe they are refundable. They have to return the machines. The money is already spent.

**Assemblywoman Dickman:**

If the machine that they were allocated money for became obsolete, would this bill require them to pay back the state even if they could not use the machine anymore?

**Chair Miller:**

No. Technology becomes obsolete and requires updates and upgrades. As done before, they will have the opportunity to approach the state for that additional funding, if necessary.

As Assemblywoman Carlton said, we are looking at this moving forward. We want to ensure taxpayer money is used efficiently and effectively. Currently, no county must return the funds to the state; none fall under the qualification for that to occur.

**Senator Seevers Gansert:**

Thank you for the clarification. We currently have a decentralized voting system, but we are spending money for the SOS to convert to a centralized voting system. Would that affect this type of bill draft?

**Chair Miller:**

[Chair Miller conferred with Ms. Proehl.]

Ms. Proehl says “no.”

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

Given that it is not retroactive, I am going to support it; however, it is important that we make sure everyone has the ability to vote. We have to be careful and ensure that we have a system with access for everyone. There may be counties that choose not to use electronic machines.

***Chair Miller:***

I echo the fact that we want to ensure all Nevadans have access to voting. We want to make sure that our state funds are used properly as well.

I want to remind everyone who is listening that this is a meeting about determining which BDRs we will request to be written. They would come from the Committee, but there will be extensive and robust work with full discourse and discussion during session. We are talking about ideas to build a BDR, but the decisions and votes made today are not implementing any laws; we are requesting that a bill be written. Hopefully that clarifies it for everyone.

Are there any other questions? Not seeing any, I will accept a motion.

SENATOR LANGE MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION A-1.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

***Chair Miller:***

Any discussion on the motion?

***Assemblywoman Dickman:***

I will support this BDR; but I would like to reserve my right. I could not support the bill if it comes out without clarifying that this is not retroactive. I do not see that anywhere in here. I hope it is written that way.

***Chair Miller:***

Of course, you may reserve the right once we all get to Carson City. While it may not be written specifically, if you compare the revised to the original, the language pertaining to being retroactive was removed so it will not be included in that BDR. Any further comments?

***Assemblyman Matthews:***

I too had some concerns about the way this was initially put together. With the clarification regarding retroactivity, I will also be supporting it today.

***Chair Miller:***

Let us take our vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chair Miller:**

We will move on to our second item.

**Ms. Proehl:**

Recommendation A-2 is to send a letter to Nevada's county clerks reminding them that NRS 293B.1045 prohibits the purchase or lease of a mechanical voting system for use in any election in the state unless the system is approved by the SOS. This was recommended by Chair Miller.

**Chair Miller:**

A little background—we originally thought there was a need for this; however, it was researched and found to be in NRS. We are talking about the voting system approved by the SOS who went through an extensive process to vet different companies and machines. All of those that work basically work anywhere. When it comes to leasing technology and machines, you want to ensure you are able to support it and that the technology offers the services you need. I believe there is a list with six different companies that the SOS has vetted. They are determined to be of quality, and we are able to support them. This letter would remind counties that any machines they purchase are required to be on that approved list. They are not required to go with one particular company; they have a choice. Do we have any questions?

**Senator Seevers Gansert:**

I am going to support it, but it seems like the letter should be coming from the SOS rather than the Legislature. It sounds like it is already in statute; it is a reminder. I do not think it hurts for us to send a letter, but it does seem that that is the job of the SOS.

**Chair Miller:**

Any further questions or discussion? Not seeing any, I will take a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION A-2.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chair Miller:**

We will move on to the next item.

**B. VOTING BY MEMBERS OF TRIBAL NATIONS**

**Ms. Proehl:**

We are moving on to Topic B—Voting by Members of Tribal Nations. Recommendation B-3 is to request the drafting of a bill to require county clerks to establish and maintain working relationships with tribal nations within the county's jurisdiction and allow a tribal nation to submit a request to the SOS for a tribal identification (ID) card to be recognized and



accepted through Nevada's online voter registration. This recommendation was developed by the Committee's Chair and Committee staff in response to testimony provided by the Nevada Indian Commission (NIC) at the April 29, 2022, meeting.

***Chair Miller:***

Do we have any questions, Committee members? Not seeing any questions, I will go ahead and take a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION B-3.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

***Chair Miller:***

Our next item, please.

***Ms. Proehl:***

Recommendation B-4 is to send a letter to the SOS and the NIC requesting their collaboration to provide photocopies of tribal ID cards to county election administrators to facilitate compliance with existing state law, which provides for the acceptance of a tribal ID card as a valid form of identification for in-person voter registration. This recommendation was developed by the Committee's Chair and Committee staff in response to testimony provided by the NIC at the April 29, 2022, meeting.

***Chair Miller:***

Do we have any questions, Committee members? Not seeing any, I will go ahead and take a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION B-4.

SENATOR LANGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

***Chair Miller:***

Next item, please.

***C. VOTING BY PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES***

***Ms. Proehl:***

We are now on Topic C—Voting by Persons with Disabilities. Recommendation C-5 is to:

- a. Request the drafting of a bill to require county election administrators, including county clerks and election board officers, to be trained on how to operate accessible voting systems compliant with the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 [Pub. L. 101-336, 104 Stat. 327 (1990)] in order to assist voters who have difficulty using such voting systems;
- b. Require a minimum of two accessible voting systems at a voting site and provide for the establishment of more than two accessible voting systems at a voting site if deemed necessary by the county clerk to accommodate the expected number of voters with disabilities at the voting site; and
- c. Require ballots that are cast in person at polling sites to be cast by a voting machine.

This recommendation was developed by the Committee's Chair and Committee staff in response to testimony provided by the Nevada Governor's Council on Developmental Disabilities and the Nevada Disability Advocacy and Law Center at the April 29, 2022, meeting.

***Chair Miller:***

Do we have any questions, Committee members?

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

Recommendation C-5(c) requires "ballots that are cast in person at polling sites to be cast by a voting machine." We have some counties that may want to have people cast manually or count manually. I do not know why that is with disabilities. I agree with Recommendations C-5(a) and (b). We want to make sure that people have access. When someone is casting a ballot at the polling site, they might be dropping their mail ballot in the box; that is not a voting machine. The language precludes them from casting a ballot, which would be delivering the ballot to a site. It seems there is a conflict with the intent because we all want people to be able to vote. Maybe I can get a little more background on why that is part of this BDR.

***Ms. Proehl:***

I will give a little background on why this was included. Testimony from the April 29, 2022, meeting indicated that paper ballots are not accessible to persons with a visual impairment or a disability that implicates dexterity or reading. Even if there is still one accessible voting machine at a polling place, votes cast through this machine will be easily identifiable because they look different than a paper ballot. It risks the privacy of individuals with disabilities. Additionally, there would be the potential issue of who would determine whether voters have a disability sufficient to use the one machine. That is background on the testimony. In response to the mail-in ballots, the intent was not to preclude those. The casting of the ballot would be when the voter is essentially marking their ballot; they are dropping it off at the polling site. I would defer to legal counsel for any additional clarification.

***Ms. Sturdivant:***

I will add more information. *Mail ballot* is a defined term for the chapter. If we say "ballot" in one of the recommendations, that would be limited to ballots and would not include mail ballots unless the Committee specifically asked for a recommendation to apply to mail ballots. In this case, the mail ballot could still be dropped off at the voting site. The

recommendation would only apply to voting in person at the site. We would certainly draft to be consistent with what the Committee decides on today.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

I think someone should be able to fill out their ballot and have a means of confidentially turning it in if we already have a mail ballot system. I want to make sure this does not preclude people from potentially bubbling in a ballot and having a confidential way of submitting it. I do not know if this is intended only for people with disabilities, or if this is trying to say that no one can go to a polling place and bubble the ballot and turn it in a confidential manner.

***Chair Miller:***

Would you like to respond to that, Legal? Can a voter still walk into a polling place, fill in their own mail-in ballot while they are standing there, secure the envelope, and then drop it off in the box?

***Ms. Sturdivant:***

I do not understand this recommendation to prevent that. It ultimately depends on what the Committee decides today—what policy you choose. If the intent is that you can go into any voting site during voting and also fill out your mail-in ballot, then we can ensure that is clear when drafting.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

You differentiated between ballots and mail-in ballots, and I appreciate the Chair who converted my confidential way of turning it in into a mail-in ballot; however, I do not know that someone is going to have their envelope and everything ready to go. I understand this is just a BDR, but I want to make sure people have access to voting; I do not want to suppress anyone's vote. I am not going to support this because I am not clear if this disallows anyone from casting a ballot in person. They must have a confidential way of doing it. I would rather say you can cast a ballot in a confidential manner versus you cannot cast a ballot if you are walking in and trying to do it without using the machine. I am not going to support it because I think Recommendation C-5(c) needs to be clarified to ensure everyone can vote whether or not they bring their mail-in envelope.

***Chair Miller:***

Do you have a question, Assemblywoman Dickman?

***Assemblywoman Dickman:***

There could be persons with disabilities who do not want to use the machine. The word "require" would preclude certain people from voting. I agree with Senator Seevers Gansert; this would have to be clarified a lot for me to support it.

***Chair Miller:***

As I read it, the language requires that the machines be there and available for individuals who need and choose to use them. We are not requiring individuals to use the machines.

***Assemblywoman Dickman:***

It says that it is required to cast a vote.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

It limits how a vote can be casted at a polling site; it can only be cast by a voting machine.

***Assemblywoman Carlton:***

When I read this, I am thinking of the disability world and the comments that we have heard about not being able to read a regular-type ballot. Some of these machines are geared for persons with disabilities so that they can cast a real ballot. I see this as more about access for people to cast a ballot. When they walk in, there has to be a machine available for them so they can actually cast a ballot. I am a little confused by the context. A mail ballot is a mail ballot and casting a ballot is casting a ballot. There are two different worlds; two different NRS. People who have special needs or disabilities need to have access to a voting machine. There are places where they show up and there is not one, and they have to go someplace else. I see this as making sure that no matter what—since we have pollbooks now—you can show up wherever you want to vote. If you have a special need or disability, there is a machine there for you. I see it as an access issue.

***Chair Miller:***

Any additional questions or comments? [There were none.] I will go ahead and take a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION C-5.

SENATOR LANGE SECONDED THE MOTION.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

I have a comment. Are you taking discussion between the motion and the vote?

***Chair Miller:***

Can you make the comment right after the vote since we are in the middle of it?

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

[Senator Seevers Gansert nodded in confirmation.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATOR SEEVERS GANSERT, ASSEMBLYWOMAN DICKMAN, AND ASSEMBLYMAN MATTHEWS VOTED NO.)

\*\*\*\*\*

***Chair Miller:***

Please proceed with your comment, Senator.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

When I look at this request, Recommendation C-5(a) and (b) are absolutely about individuals with disabilities, and we want to make sure they have access to voting machines and to any system that they need to be able to vote. When I look at Recommendation C-5(c), it does not relate to persons with disabilities. It has plain language that says, "require that ballots that are cast in person to be cast by a voting machine." That is why I am opposing this. It is not about disabilities. We want to make sure they have access, but I think Recommendation C-5(c) could suppress some people from voting. That is why I was a "no" on the bill draft.

***Chair Miller:***

Thank you, Senator. Next item.

***D. INTERIM COMMITTEE STRUCTURE OF THE LEGISLATURE***

***Ms. Proehl:***

This is our final recommendation, which is under Topic D. Recommendation D-6 is to request the drafting of a bill to revise provisions relating to the interim committee structure of the Legislature, as follows:

- a. Provide that in the vacancy of a chair, the vice chair shall become acting chair until the chair is appointed;
- b. Clarify that alternates should be of the same party if a committee member cannot attend a meeting;
- c. Transfer the duties to evaluate and review issues relating to governmental purchasing, including, without limitation, the review of recommendations from the Commission to Study Governmental Purchasing, from the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs;
- d. Require the biennial report on recommendations for legislation relating to governmental purchasing to be submitted to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Government Affairs and not the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections;
- e. Repeal the requirement that the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services review regulations related to health care; and
- f. Revise the date that a teacher who wishes to serve on the Nevada State Teacher Recruitment and Retention Advisory Task Force must submit an application to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education from January 15 of an even-numbered year to December 1 of an odd-numbered year.

This was recommended by the Committee's chair.

***Chair Miller:***

A little background on this bill—it is not my general practice to bring up a BDR for issues and topics that we have not discussed and vetted throughout the interim Committee. This is

the first interim that our new interim committees are operating under the bill and the new structure. The interims have been running smoothly, but some areas could be tweaked and improved. This is an opportunity for us to improve the interim structure. It was opened up not only for Committee members, but also for the LCB and its perspective with things on the back end—what would help their work run smoother. We received recommendations from some of the subcommittees as well, which could be included. Once we get to Carson City [during the 2023 Legislative Session], when we have more time to discuss and vet the bills, there could be more opportunity to improve the new law—now that we have fulfilled an entire interim. It seems like a hodgepodge of different issues, but that is where it stems from. It is going to be a cleanup bill.

I will take any questions or comments.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

I appreciate the background that you gave. It makes a lot of sense because we need to move things around and clean up. Recommendation D-6(e) is to “repeal the requirement that the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services review regulations related to health care,” and there is a reference to NRS 233B.063; that NRS says that if an agency has regulations, they could potentially be reviewed by the LCB and amended. I want some background on why that one is there. Are other interim committees required to review regulations, such as the Joint Interim Committee on Education? Are they required to review regulations on education and so forth? I am trying to figure out what why that is in there.

***Chair Miller:***

Those were my exact questions when the recommendation came in. I know from serving on other committees, specifically the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Education, that we are not required to review regulations. Ms. Proehl can continue to respond to your question.

***Ms. Proehl:***

It is unique to the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Health and Human Services to review regulations. My understanding is this requirement was carried over from the former Legislative Committee on Health Care, which had this requirement before the Legislative Commission was reviewing regulations. Now that the Legislative Commission does review regulations, the review of health care-related regulations by the former Legislative Committee on Health Care and the new Joint Interim Committee on Health and Human Services could be seen as a redundant process.

***Senator Seevers Gansert:***

Do any other committees review regulations related to the subject matter that they address?

***Ms. Proehl:***

My understanding is “no,” but I would defer to Legal Counsel on that.

**Ms. Sturdivant:**

As far as I am aware, no other interim committee reviews regulations. The only other similar process is for mining regulations to be reviewed; however, I am not sure that board exists anymore. That is the only other comparable requirement of which I am aware.

**Chair Miller:**

Any additional questions?

**Senator Lange:**

I have a question about Recommendation D-6(a) and the vacancy of a chair. Is there existing language that says in the vacancy of a chair, a new chair would be appointed out of the same house and the same party? You deal with the same party in Recommendation D-6(b) for alternates.

**Chair Miller:**

That is an interesting area that has not been defined in the new law. This would pertain until the Legislative Commission could appoint someone. The whole reason we have a vice chair is so that person can step in until another chair is appointed. Yes, that person would be from the same majority party and the same house. It is specific to the interim.

**Senator Lange:**

Would the person be appointed by the Legislative Commission or by the leader in that house?

**Chair Miller:**

It would be approved by the Legislative Commission.

Any additional questions? I am not seeing any. I will take a motion.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION D-6.

SENATOR DOÑATE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

\*\*\*\*\*

**Chair Miller:**

Thank you, Committee members, for your votes and valuable discourse on the items. We will close that agenda item.

**AGENDA ITEM V—PUBLIC COMMENT**

**Chair Miller:**

We will move on to our final agenda item, which is public comment. Everyone will have the opportunity to speak for two minutes.

[Chair Miller provided call-in information for the public.]

I am not seeing anyone coming forward here at Grant Sawyer in Las Vegas. Is anyone approaching in Carson City, Assemblywoman Dickman?

***Assemblywoman Dickman:***

There is no one here.

***Chair Miller:***

Is there anyone on the line, Broadcasting?

***BPS:***

[BPS staff explained how callers can take their place in the queue.]

***Ms. Martinez:***

Assembly Bill 121 (2021) is in use, and it will be utilized during this coming election. I am volunteering my time to help people with disabilities who choose to use Nevada's Effective Absentee System for Elections (EASE). It is a law that you passed, which allows people with disabilities to vote independently in their homes using their preferred accessible computer. Today, there was an Advisory Committee on Participatory Democracy meeting. There are 69 military voters, 150 disabled voters, and 133 overseas voters using the EASE system. The system is new, so we are publicizing it on Twitter and Facebook. Thank you for passing this bill.

***Doug Goodman, Founder and Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform:***

You should have a copy of my public comment in your packet ([Agenda Item V A](#)), so I will not go over that. It is important for Nevada to have uniform, standardized voting practices; doing the top-down voter registration process is one indication that the Legislature recognizes this. My comment, which was submitted too late for this Committee to consider, has to do with a small change to NRS 293B.050. I am hoping this is something that individual legislators or the Legislative Operations and Elections Committees will consider during the regular session. Thank you for your consideration.

***Chair Miller:***

Your comment has been submitted to us.

***BPS:***

Chair, the public line is open and working, but there are no additional callers who wish to speak at this time.

***Chair Miller:***

I will go ahead and close public comment.

[Chair Miller expressed her appreciation for Committee members, alternates, LCB staff, and the public.]



It has been an honor to chair the Committee this interim.

The following additional public comments were submitted for the record:

- Glenn Birk ([Agenda Item V B](#));
- Joseph DeCollibus, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V C](#));
- Carl Elwell, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V D](#));
- Chris Frohnen, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V E](#));
- Bill Harenburg, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V F](#));
- Charles Harmon, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V G](#));
- Dave Haskins, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V H](#));
- Terry Heyne, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V I](#));
- Stephanie Hohlt, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V J](#));
- Douglas Johnson, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V K](#));
- Janice Kim, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V L](#));
- Niadra Lemons, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V M](#));
- Rick Lorio, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V N](#));
- Frances McConnell, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V O](#));
- Scott Meyer, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V P](#));
- Denise H. Palmer, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V Q](#));
- Sadmira Ramic, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada ([Agenda Item V R](#));
- Siavosh Shamshirpourian, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V S](#));
- Thomas Sled, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V T](#));
- Judith Sorce-Bauman, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V U](#));
- Judy Spencer, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V V](#));
- Chris Unger, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V W](#));
- Dean Willmore, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V X](#)); and
- Robert Zoellner, Nevada resident ([Agenda Item V Y](#)).

## **AGENDA ITEM VI—ADJOURNMENT**

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:09 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

---

Lisa Creamer  
Research Policy Assistant

---

Haley Proehl  
Senior Policy Analyst/GIS Specialist

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Brittney Miller, Chair

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

## MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
<a href="#">Agenda Item II</a>	Steven Cohen, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item IV</a>	Haley Proehl, Senior Policy Analyst/GIS Specialist, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau	Work Session Document
<a href="#">Agenda Item V A</a>	Doug Goodman, Founder and Executive Director, Nevadans for Election Reform	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V B</a>	Glenn Birk	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V C</a>	Joseph DeCollibus, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V D</a>	Carl Elwell, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V E</a>	Chris Frohnen, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V F</a>	Bill Harenburg, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V G</a>	Charles Harmon, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V H</a>	Dave Haskins, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V I</a>	Terry Heyne, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V J</a>	Stephanie Hohlt, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V K</a>	Douglas Johnson, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V L</a>	Janice Kim, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V M</a>	Niadra Lemons, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#">Agenda Item V N</a>	Rick Lorio, Nevada resident	Public Comment

<b>AGENDA ITEM</b>	<b>PRESENTER/ENTITY</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V O</u></a>	Frances McConnell, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V P</u></a>	Scott Meyer, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V Q</u></a>	Denise H. Palmer, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V R</u></a>	Sadmira Ramic, American Civil Liberties Union of Nevada	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V S</u></a>	Siavosh Shamshirpourian, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V T</u></a>	Thomas Sled, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V U</u></a>	Judith Sorce-Bauman, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V V</u></a>	Judy Spencer, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V W</u></a>	Chris Unger, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V X</u></a>	Dean Willmore, Nevada resident	Public Comment
<a href="#"><u>Agenda Item V Y</u></a>	Robert Zoellner, Nevada resident	Public Comment

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.