

AB321 Summary

Sponsored By: Jason Frierson

Topline: Would make all mail elections permanent and makes it virtually impossible to contest elections. It fixes none of the issues with the 2020 election. Guts government transparency while adding additional unfunded costs to the election.

Summary

AB321 is not just a bill to make Nevada a vote by mail state. It would codify voter intimidation and election suppression, while removing any safeguards to a clean election. The worst parts: *de facto* eliminates any election contest or challenge, removes ID checks for voters, does not allow election workers to ask your birthdate to verify identity, and has no penalties if election officials fail to secure ballots. The floods of loose ballots seen on the streets in 2020 in Las Vegas—if a voter picked those up to turn them in, they would now be guilty of a category E felony. It ensures that registrars/clerks have complete control over vote counting boards—instead of an open, transparent, and bipartisan process. This bill is designed to have election procedures be shielded from the public eye, with partisan cronies in charge of counting the votes in secret.

Details

- Page 6, Sec 3.1—Mail in ballots to every active voter
- Page 8, Sec 5.1—Any voter who registers at the DMV does not have to show ID even if their first time voting in Nevada
- Page 12, Sec 7.1—Allows ballots to be completed by another person, including for people who
 can't read or write. There is no description of how clerks/registrars must maintain records for these
 "assisted" ballots.
- Page 14, Sec 2—This section basically prevents people from picking up the loose ballots noted in many different places in the state in the 2020 primary and general.
 - "Except for an election board officer in the course of the election board officer's official duties, a person shall not willfully impede, obstruct, prevent, or interfere with the return of the voter's mail ballot"—Why would an Election Board Officers be impeding ballots?
- Page 15, Sec 11.2—Allows electronic review of mail in ballot signatures
- Page 15, Sec 11.3.b—Only allows signature challenges if two election board employees think there is an issue with the signature
- Page 16, Sec 5—No penalties if the clerk fails to maintain properly secured ballot boxes
- Page 18, Sec 12—Establishes a mail ballot counting board that are exclusively appointed by the clerk/registrar. Does not mandate a party split, just says they can't be the same political party.
- Page 22, Sec 21.1.a—Allows the Sheriff to deputize the mail ballot central counting board or other election board officers—voter intimidation and suppression
- Page 36, Sec 31.2.B—If there are more ballots in a container than names listed as voted (not sure how they would track this)—they just pull out a random number of ballots. No comparison to voter rolls (these are mail in ballots so the voter name is on the outside and could be compared easily)



- Page 39, Sec 34.2—Lets unused ballots not be subject to the 22 month holding period—subject to immediate destruction. Odd. Why?
- Page 39, Sec 34.3—This guts election contests. No one can review voted ballots and records of machines unless a judge orders it and both parties agree—why would the winner agree?
- Page 51, Sec 44.7—Says SOS needs to coordinate with Bureau of Vital Statistics to note deaths no mandated removal process from rolls
- Page 52, Sec 45.1.a—Targets meaningful observation/any observation
- Page 54, Sec 46.1—Allows certain government employees to have their addresses made private and hidden from assessor records. Public Defenders, Social Workers, District Attorneys, Registrars/Clerks. Limits transparency for voters contacting elected officials.
- Page 57, Sec 48.1—The public can't apply for mail ballot processing and counting board—appointed by the registrar/clerks
- Page 58, Sec 49.1—Guts meaningful observation of the election process. Says you can only observe if you don't interfere—what qualifies as interference? What about meaningful observation?
 If you observe something illegal and report it, wouldn't that count as interference?