# IN THE SUPREME COURT OF THE STATE OF NEVADA

EDUCATION FREEDOM PAC,

Appellant,

vs.

BEVERLY ROGERS, AN INDIVIDUAL; RORY REID, AN INDIVIDUAL; AND BARBARA K. CEVASKE, IN HER OFFICIAL CAPACTY AS NEVADA SECRETARY OF STATE,

Respondents.

Supreme Court Case 2022 10:35 p.m. Jul 25 2022 10:35 p.m. District Court Case No. 270 C000271B Elizabeth A. Brown Clerk of Supreme Court

# APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX, VOLUME ONE OF ONE

## **ATTORNEYS FOR APPELLANT**

JASON D. GUINASSO, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 8478 ALEX R. VELTO, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 14961 ASTRID A PEREZ, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 15977 5371 Kietzke Ln Reno, Nevada 89511 jguinasso@hutchlegal.com avelto@hutchlegal.com aperez@hutchlegal.com Tel.: 775-853-8746 Fax: 775-201-9611

# CHRONOLOGICAL INDEX TO APPENDIX

Document Name	Date Filed	Bates	Vol No.
<i>Transcript of Hearing held on March 29, 2022</i> <b>Case No. 22-OC-0027-1B</b>	3/29/22	SA 1-43	Ι

# **ALPHABETICAL INDEX TO APPENDIX**

Document Name	Date Filed	Bates	Vol No.
Transcript of Hearing held on March 29, 2022			
Case No. 22-OC-0027-1B	3/29/22	SA 1-43	Ι

# **AFFIRMATION**

The undersigned does hereby affirm that the foregoing document filed in this

matter does not contain the social security number of any person.

DATED this 25<sup>th</sup> day of July, 2022.

HUTCHISON & STEFFEN, PLLC

By: /s/ Jason D. Guinasso, Esq.

Jason D. Guinasso, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 8478 Alex R. Velto, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 14961 Astrid A. Perez, Esq. Nevada Bar No. 15977 5371 Kietzke Ln Reno, Nevada 89511 *Attorneys for Appellant* 

# **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Pursuant to NRCP 5(b), I hereby certify that I am an employee of Hutchison & Steffen, PLLC and that on July 25, 2022, APPELLANT'S SUPPLEMENTAL APPENDIX, VOLUME ONE OF ONE was electronically filed with the Clerk of the Court for the Nevada Supreme Court by using the Nevada Supreme Court's E-Filing system. Pursuant to NRAP 30 (f)(2), all Participants in the case will be served and provided an electronic copy.

Bradley Schrager, Esq. Samberg, Esq. Daniel Bravo, Esq. 3773 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 590 South Las Vegas, NV 89169 <u>bschrager@wrslawyers.com</u> <u>jsamberg@wrslawyers.com</u> <u>dbravo@wrslawyers.com</u>

Aaron Ford Attorney General Craig Newby, Esq. Laena St-Jules, Esq. Office of the Attorney General 555 E. Washington Ave., Suite 3900 Las Vegas, NV 89101 <u>cnewby@ag.nv.gov</u> <u>lstjules@ag.nv.gov</u>

/s/ Kaylee Conradi

Kaylee Conradi

# In the Matter Of:

Audio Transcription: Education Freedom PAC

# FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT, SECOND HEARING

Job Number: 891552

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	TRANSCRIPT OF AUDIO-RECORDED
10	HEARING IN THE FIRST JUDICIAL DISTRICT
11	IN RE: FREEDOM EDUCATION PAC
12	
13	SECOND HEARING
14	
15	CASE NO. 22 OC 00027 1B
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	Litigation Services Job Number: 891552
23	
24	
25	

1	Page 2
2	MR. FOLETTA: [inaudible].
3	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you both. I, uh is
4	there anything further [inaudible]?
5	MR. SCHRAGER: No, Your Honor. Thank you.
6	THE COURT: Um, I [inaudible] give some thought
7	[inaudible] because of the importance of the issue
8	somewhat. You guys have piqued my curiosity. And this
9	is not in my normal wheelhouse, this kind of, uh,
10	litigation.
11	I want to go back over your excellent briefs and
12	your arguments before I render a decision. I am going
13	to maintain some kind of bifurcation between the two
14	cases, um, whether that's keeping the same case and
15	caption number and just administering them different
16	or just keeping them separate. I don't know. It
17	doesn't matter too much, I think.
18	But I so that means that I'm going to rule on
19	the constitutional, uh, issue first. And I won't take
20	very long in doing so. I appreciate the quality, the
21	amicacy [sic] that I've seen here this afternoon from
22	both of you.
23	MR. SCHRAGER: Thank you for your time, Your
24	Honor.
25	MR. FOLETTA: Your Honor, can I ask a point of

Page 3 1 order? 2 THE COURT: Sure. 3 MR. FOLETTA: Are -- are we going to have -- hold 4 the hearing on the second case? 5 THE COURT: Yes. 6 MR. FOLETTA: Right now, after we're concluded 7 here? 8 THE COURT: No. Unless you want one. I do want one. 9 MR. FOLETTA: THE COURT: [inaudible]. 10 11 MR. FOLETTA: We're supposed to have a hearing 12 within 15 days. And Your Honor issued an order, 13 setting hearing for today at 1:30 in that case, as I 14 understand it. 15 THE COURT: Okay. Go -- wha- -- what do you want to say on that case? 16 MR. FOLETTA: Well, Your Honor, if -- if -- I-- I 17 18 think we need to open the hearing on the second case, if that's -- if that -- that -- I understood Your 19 20 Honor's orders to be -- to set both cases for hearing 21 today. 2.2 THE COURT: Fine. 23 MR. FOLETTA: Are -- are you not setting both 24 cases for hearing today? 25 THE COURT: I recall the language that was used.

Page 4 1 I wanted to listen to how intertwined they were before 2 brewing that they are to be treated as one case 3 together. But the outcomes is substantially different. 4 Right? 5 MR. FOLETTA: Uh --6 MR. SCHRAGER: Yes, sir. Potentially. MR. FOLETTA: 7 -- well, no -- no. The -- the 8 question presented is the same. D- -- do -- do 9 petitions, including the description of the fact meet 10 the procedural requirements such that my client can 11 circulate the petitions to the voters at state? 12 And the requirements of the law are the same as 13 to both. We are supposed to have a hearing on both 14 within 15 days of the filing of the complaint. And Your Honor's orders says -- sets, uh, that second case 15 16 for an evidentiary hearing, March 29th at 1:00. 17 THE COURT: Do you have a preference? 18 MR. SCHRAGER: I didn't prepare to go forward. 19 Uh, I obviously prefer that -- that your -- more 20 importantly, that Your Honor feels prepared to go 21 forward. 2.2 MR. FOLETTA: Yeah. We're -- we're entitled to a 23 hearing many, many days ago. Uh, uh, the court did not 24 set it. I'm not blaming Your Honor, but we're -- we 25 are supposed to have a hearing on our case within 15

1	Page 5 days.
2	THE COURT: No, I know did I
3	MR. FOLETTA: We're we're five weeks, six
4	weeks in
5	THE COURT: in deference to that I set it. I
б	truncated the time and set it now.
7	MR. FOLETTA: But but if we don't hear it
8	today, if we don't hear the second case today, then we
9	will not have he held a hearing within the 15-
10	w we we still would not have held a hearing.
11	THE COURT: How soon can you, um, leave out the
12	second case if we don't do it today?
13	MR. FOLETTA: Well, Mr. Schrager and I were
14	prepared to argue today. As I I I'm sure we
15	were interpreting your orders the same way, that
16	that's what we would be doing.
17	THE COURT: Okay. What time is it? All right. Go
18	ahead.
19	MR. SCHRAGER: Thank you, Your Honor. Opening the
20	hearing on, what I refer to as, uh, Rogers v.
21	Cegavske, uh, case number 220-C-000271B. Correct, Your
22	Honor?
23	THE COURT: Yes.
24	MR. SCHRAGER: Very good. Your Honor, this is a
25	different animal. This is a statutory petition. And

Page 6 1 the questions presented are not the same. I mean, they 2 are the same in the sense at any murder trial, uh, you 3 -- you know, two murder cases -- the -- the questions 4 are, "Did you murder him?" But they are not the same. 5 They are different cases.

6 This, however, I think will take less time. Less, 7 I think. And the questions, I think, we could focus. 8 Because I don't think it's -- we -- we -- we obviously 9 made lengthy complaints about the description of 10 effect, uh, contained in the petition that -- that the 11 proponents put forward.

12 They have rather helpfully, sort of admitted 13 everything we said and submitted alternative description of effect. That is very helpful. Now, 14 15 they'll say, "Well, if it will make things faster, we'll do it." What they're really doing is saying, 16 "Okay, you got us. It should be written like this." 17 18 And we are largely in agreement with the description 19 of effect that they've proposed, the alternative 20 description of effect.

There are some things we're not perfect with. We don't get everything perfectly. We would like to say that, you know, just as in the other one, it's not -there could be attacks or there could be a diminution of services, but rather, obviously, the same thing is

Page 7 1 true of this, as is true of the constitutional 2 amendment, which is one of those three things has to 3 happen.

So if the order was to say, okay, we can more or less work with this alternative description -- and I'm -- I'm sure you have already looked at it. It's the exhibit to their -- to their, uh, uh, uh, to their answering [inaudible, technical difficulty]. We understand that. Um, they have a solemn duty to get it right, not to get it quickly.

11 So the fact that they're like, "Okay, fine. 12 Whatever you want, put it in there. Let's do it." 13 Right? That's not how we're doing this. We were right 14 to bring our challenge. Only by bringing our 15 challenge, are we going to have a description of 16 effect on this second statutory provision. This is in 17 fact closer to what's necessary under the rules.

18 So, you know, with some alterations that we can 19 talk about, the alternative description of effect, 20 which is at the back of their -- of their submission, 21 is more or less okay.

But we've made two other claims, and one of them is completely different from any of the ones you've heard today, which is another aspect, something you cannot do in any initiative petition, constitutional,

1	Page 8 statutory, any kind of initiative petition in which
2	the people are acting in their legislative capacity,
3	you cannot include administrative details.
4	Now, there's only been a couple of cases in
5	Nevada as to what that means. But if you look at
6	Nevadans for the Production of Property Rights and
7	Garvin, the simple answer to that is, don't tell
8	agencies how to be agencies. That's for agencies to
9	do. That's their expertise. That's what they do for a
10	living. That's why we have them.
11	So for example, in Nevadans for, uh, uh, Private
12	Property Rights [sic], the initiative tried to tell
13	courts which cases they could and couldn't publish,
14	and how they were to handle specific categories or
15	cases. Supreme Court said, no, you can't do that. You
16	can do everything else and this, can't do that. That's
17	administrative. That's for the court's purview, uh, as
18	a judicial system to handle.
19	In this initiative, there are a slew of
20	provisions. They try to tell the treasurer how to do
21	his job, how to be a treasurer. And we've listened to
22	our brief. I won't go through them right now. They
23	were complaints, they were in our brief. Those are the
24	kinds of things you can't do.

25 Now, proponents are in luck because it's not

1	Page 9 necessarily utterly disqualified. We can sever those
2	out. The initiative could in fact go forward. Several
3	of of those provisions, and with an alternative
4	description of effect. We could have probably work it
5	out, where they could be on the streets, having
6	signatures in some future capacity before too long.
7	Right?
8	So this one isn't going to detain us in the way
9	that the first one will, because essentially, other
10	than the administrative details, which they very much
11	need to let go of, or the Supreme Court will tell them
12	they need to let go of them, uh, they have conceded
13	other description of effect infirmities, and we more
14	or less accept those.
15	The other aspect of it is again, in Article 19,
16	Section 6, unfunded mandate. Because once again,
17	there's a bit of a shell game going on, which is, yes,
18	this is a statue, yes, it's there's there's
19	there's an unfunded mandate maybe, but we're also
20	telling the legislator they don't have to do it. They
21	don't have to do it. Is it obviously, if the if
22	the constitutional passes, legislator has to go do it.
23	But if if if the statutory passes,
24	nothing in the statute says legislator has to go fund
25	it. So they're sort of dancing around the program.

1	Page 10 I mean, it's it's, uh I think, a delicate
2	way to put it, is they are telling people, there's
3	going to be a program when they have no idea whether
4	there's going to be a program, which is really the
5	only real problem left with the description effect
6	because it says things like, um,
7	parents will be able let's see uh, maybe
8	account funds may be used to pay, establishes the
9	program, may establish an account.
10	All those things are going to leave people who
11	read it, to believe that these things are going to
12	happen. And they sort of buried the lead down in the -
13	- d down in the bottom they say nothing in the
14	issue that requires the legislator to appropriate
15	money for the accounts. And if no money is
16	appropriated, then there won't be any program. Right?
17	Well, that's absolutely true. That's true of any
18	program.
19	But it kind of buries the lead because you've
20	gone through a paragraph and a half of, isn't this
21	great, we're going to get all this money. This will be
22	wonderful. You may get this money. You may do this.
23	You may establish an account, when in fact, they've
24	done nothing in the statute to to to make that
25	any kind of reality.
1	

1	Page 11 So I so I I I guess I would say it's
2	not entirely a solid 196 claim because they haven't
3	made the statutory mandate, but they haven't exactly
4	made a statute either. Because they're because
5	because they off at the very least, they should be
6	made to describe what they're offering to people
7	THE COURT: Playing the devil's advocate
8	[inaudible]
9	MR. SCHRAGER: as a loser.
10	THE COURT: Why why does it make a difference?
11	In other words, um, if the legislator is free to
12	choose whether to adopt any of the guidelines of a
13	non-mandatory di um, direct [inaudible]
14	MR. SCHRAGER: Uh, yeah.
15	THE COURT: then who cares?
16	MR. SCHRAGER: The only thing that's
17	discretionary in the statute is the money. Everything
18	else I mean, it's a it's a it's a lengthy,
19	highly technical, in-depth statute that they graphed,
20	which has every other aspect of the program set out.
21	So those details will absolutely matter. The only
22	thing that in the end is discretionary with the
23	legislator in the statute is, will there be any money.
24	So it's so in essence, they are laying out
25	this complex statute, telling people they're going to
1	

	Page 12
1	be able to do this and parents are going to have this,
2	and and children and students are going to have
3	that and they can leave public schools. Oh, but by the
4	way, none of it may happen.
5	It seems to me that, as I said, that's going to
6	bury in the lead. But that's for Your Honor's, you
7	know, consideration regarding the description of
8	effect.
9	THE COURT: Thank you. But once again, if you can
10	redline one of the provisions or all of them, isn't
11	the ultimate discretion left to the legislator?
12	MR. SCHRAGER: Well, no. The court could redline
13	some of the provisions now.
14	THE COURT: Right.
15	MR. SCHRAGER: Once it gets the signatures and
16	goes see let me just lay out briefly the
17	difference between what happens to a constitutional
18	amendment, what happens to a statutory.
19	A constitutional amendment, proposed by
20	initiative, needs to have signatures by the middle of
21	the summer, and it will go on the ballot this fall, if
22	they get it, this November, will go right to the
23	people and then it has to pass twice. But there's no
24	way to interact with it. There's no there's no
25	amending, there's no interference with the text of the
1	

1	Page 13
2	If it passes this year and it passes again in the
3	exact same form two years from now, it will become
4	law. Right? That's the constitutional one.
5	A statutory, if it gets the signatures, and
6	doesn't have to have them until November, right, after
7	the elections, so they've got plenty of time to get
8	the signatures, um, there will be a, uh, uh, it's goes
9	to the legislator, in the form
10	THE COURT: Is that the same
11	MR. SCHRAGER: it's been adopted.
12	THE COURT: is it the same 140,000 signatures
13	is [inaudible]?
14	MR. SCHRAGER: That's correct. That's correct.
15	Because it's based on the last election.
16	THE COURT: Oh yeah.
17	MR. SCHRAGER: So it goes to the legislator. And
18	the legislator has a number of options. It can adopt
19	it immediately as law as is. It can propose its own
20	version, and both of those go to the best ballot; or
21	it can ignore it entirely, do nothing, and then just
22	this would go to the ballot.
23	So once it is um, um, once the signatures are
24	garnered, there is no amending the provision, there's
25	no redlining. The only ability to redline it, is now,

1	Page 14 for the court to be able to say, "You can't have this
2	and this, and this administrative detail in it," that
3	can't come out later. So that's where the process
4	there.
5	THE COURT: This is probably
6	MR. SCHRAGER: And
7	THE COURT: overdicting a little bit, but one
8	of the leading candidates of governor's one of the
9	planks of his political platform are to eliminate
10	harvesting ballots. I think it's the word [inaudible].
11	MR. SCHRAGER: I've heard that. Yes, sir.
12	THE COURT: Um, I've seen in earlier initiatives
13	substantial efforts to harvest ballots when they
14	advertise [inaudible]. In one case there was even
15	money paid. It's probably, you know, reason to, uh,
16	look for corruption. Is is that process still
17	permitted in Nevada, with these this initiative?
18	MR. SCHRAGER: You mean, can can ca ca-
19	can someone assist someone in handing in their
20	ballot?
21	THE COURT: Can someone stand in front of the
22	[inaudible] with a peg board and a whole list of
23	things and get signatures? Is what I mean. [inaudible]
24	MR. SCHRAGER: Yes. That's the signature
25	gathering process for getting something onto the

Page 15 1 ballot. That's not the voting process. 2 THE COURT: Right. 3 MR. SCHRAGER: But -- but yes. What -- what would 4 typically happen, is there's a -- the -- you actually have the form. This format here that is in the --5 THE COURT: Yeah. I saw it. 6 7 MR. SCHRAGER: -- that is in it. Right? Someone 8 would go to an -- an -- an event or a shopping 9 mall or -- or a baseball game and will go up to people 10 with the clipboard and give them the opportunity to 11 read the description of effect. 12 The actual petition must also be there. So they 13 have to add it if they want to read it. And then if 14 they approve, they can affix their name, um, and their -- and their address. And there will be a signatory of 15 16 the -- of -- of the petition. So yes. 17 I'm just trying to anticipate THE COURT: 18 whether, um, there are any new laws or proposals that 19 would, uh, discourage the petition gathering process. 20 Apparently not [inaudible] --21 MR. SCHRAGER: You know what, recently -- and I 22 don't know what this discourage is because it was 23 upheld because of the -- because it -- it -- it 24 was adjudged to, uh, to carry with an -- an important 25 state interest, is that, you can't just go to one

Page 16 1 place. You have to get your signatures from all four 2 petition districts, which are coequal with our -- with 3 our congressional districts. 4 THE COURT: Right. MR. SCHRAGER: 5 So you have to get an equal number 6 from each of those, to demonstrate that you have support from all of the state. 7 8 So, I mean, I ju- -- I mean, I assume that some 9 people might see that as daunting because it's harder than -- than going to, for example, Las Vegas and 10 11 doing it in one place. 12 But that would also mean that people who approved 13 to something in Las Vegas, would be able to run roughshod over the rest of the state, just for 14 15 signatures from that area. 16 So I think it's a -- it's a -- it's -- it -- it makes it more difficult but it's good for the process 17 18 overall. THE COURT: And fi- -- finally, if legislation 19 20 does emerge or if the initiative emerges on its own, 21 becomes the law, uh, does it have any greater strength 22 or weakness than a normal legislative enactment? No? 23 MR. SCHRAGER: Not in a substantive, not in a, hey -- hey this will -- okay, let me answer it this 24 25 way. Legally, no. It does -- once you pass something

Page 17 1 by initiative and it's a statute, it cannot be amended 2 for three years.

So it is locked in for three years. So that's at 3 4 least two legislative sessions. So it has that strength. It is essentially protected. The -- the --5 the, uh, uh, the constitution gives people who have 6 passed an initiative, time to see how it works. Right? 7 8 So -- so a legislator can't immediately say, no, we're striking that down. Now, from the political 9 standpoint, obviously, if something passes with 70 10 11 percent of the vote, that is a signal to legislators 12 regarding the su- -- the statewide support. 13 You had essentially a public plebiscite on -- on the subject. So there may be informally, some 14 15 political strength that an initiative has that is not immediately available for legislation. But that's, I 16 think, how I would describe fully what you're asking. 17 THE COURT: Yeah. Thank you. Let me hear from 18 19 counsel. 20 Thank you, Your Honor. Um, so, uh, MR. FOLETTA: 21 similar to the -- to the last case, uh, Mr. Schrager's 22 client's is making a number of arguments here. And as 23 he pointed out, some of them are related to the description of effect and some of them relate to other 24

25 procedural and supplementary requirements.

1	Page 18 Um, he opened by indicating that maybe with some
2	tweaks, that, uh, you know, they could accept the
3	alternative that we've proposed. I would just note
4	that w we are certainly not saying, okay, you got
5	us. Uh, we are looking for an, uh, expeditious path
6	forward to circulate our petition, given the fact that
7	we have to, uh, secure a hu over 140,000
8	signatures, uh, near the end of the year.
9	That is a that is a burdensome process. We are
10	no way conceding the points they're making. And I'll
11	also note that although he said with a few tweaks it
12	could be acceptable to them, it's not clear to me what
13	those tweaks are. Uh, he's not volunteered them,
14	either in argument or in the filing with the court. So
15	I'm not sure, uh, what his invitation is.
16	I'd certainly happy to talk to him offline of
17	what they might be. But it it shouldn't just sway
18	the from, uh, reaching the merits, uh, because there's
19	obviously no, uh, uh, indication that we wouldn't
20	necessarily agree with what those changes are.
21	Uh, we that that said, we obviously have,
22	uh, articulated an alternative. And the point there is
23	to try to adjust the concerns that they've raised.
24	That said, uh, the one point that Mr. Schrager
25	seem to argue here, uh, orally, uh, with respect to

1	Page 19 the description of effect, is to, uh, contend that we
2	should have specially told voters, or excuse me,
3	potential signatories, of the petition, um, that in
4	the absence of a legislative appropriation, the
5	provisions, uh, of this, uh the provisions of this
6	measure do not come into effect.
7	Um, uh, you know, we we responded to that in
8	our briefing. And I I think it is, uh, kind of a
9	curious thing to say, because none of the other
10	provisions, uh, really we well all the mo
11	- most of the provisions in the petition itself
12	support the main substantive provision which is, that
13	the legislator, uh or excuse me that the people
14	would have established this Education Funding, uh,
15	Freedom Program by statute.
16	Um, and so it it is unclear to me why, uh,
17	people would would need to know what the, um
18	what what what the balance of all these
19	provisions are conditioned upon, uh, when the
20	description of effect, um, describes in a non-
21	argumentative straightforward way, exactly what it's
22	trying to do. And and I'll propose.
23	Again, I resort back to the to the test that
24	the court, um, should apply. Um, and and I should
25	also say that the description of effects specifically

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Page 20 does say that nothing requires the legislator to 1 2 appropriate money to fund the accounts. 3 So the question is: Am I going to get money or 4 not? That question is answered. Whether that sta- -that statute is technically, uh, effective, uh, or 5 what the conditions are of that, is irrelevant. Um, or 6 -- or it's not as relevant as to whether there will be 7 money available, which is described. 8 9 The -- the other point I would -- I would like to rebut, is this idea that we haven't proposed a statute 10 11 at all because it's conditioned on some future 12 occurrence. Well, as we pointed out in our briefing, 13 there are a number of statutes that are conditioned on 14 -- upon future occurrences that had not yet occurred. 15 And in fact, there's an entire statutory scheme 16 around, uh, the -- the so-called Nevada Regional, uh, the -- the Nevada re- -- title -- regional title plan 17 agency, um, that only take effect if certain things 18 are -- if certain things occur, none of which have. 19 20 The governor hasn't certified that. TRPA is not 21 doing its job nor is the governor of California 22 withdrawing his state from the compact. So this is 23 just one example of a statute that no one debates a 24 statute, uh, being in existence, notwithstanding the 25 fact that its effectiveness is conditioned on

1	Page 21 something that happens in the future.
2	Um, the the other point I wanted to address is
3	the administrative details argument, the idea that we
4	have page after page of administrative details,
5	telling the treasurer how to do his or her job. Um, we
6	disagree with that characterization.
7	I think it's important to state the rule; um, "A
8	policy enactment originates or enacts a permanent law
9	or lays down a rule of conduct or course of policy for
10	the guidance of the citizens or their offices.
11	Whereas, impermissible administrative matters simply
12	put into execution, previously declared policies or
13	previously enacted laws, or direct a decision that has
14	been delegated, um, to" this is my paraphrase a
15	governmental body without authority.
16	Um, this this administrative details point of
17	law came out of a case involving a train trench in
18	Reno, which you may recall, where there was a valid
19	question to, uh, essentially prohibit the city from
20	building a train trench in a specific a specific
21	trench in a specific, uh, city right of way.
22	And the court, uh Nevada Supreme Court said
23	no, that's administrative details. You're not telling
24	you're not enacting a policy about building train
25	trenches. You're dictating a an administrative
1	

Page 22 1 outcome with respect to a particular train trench. Uh, 2 in this case, we're not doing that. 3 Yes, the petition describes duties that the 4 treasurer will have and will have to effectuate if it's in en- -- enacted. But that is -- we're not, uh -5 - we're not directing, uh, the execution of authority 6 7 previously granted to the treasurer. We're merely giving him, uh -- giving him responsibility pursuant 8 to the policy. And as such, he- -- he's --9 THE COURT: How -- how does he tell whi- --10 11 which, uh, provisions are precatory and which are 12 mandatory? 13 MR. FOLETTA: Well, they are mandatory. We're not 14 debating that. What we're saying is that the -- the 15 test for administrative detail is not whether, uh, a 16 condition on a government office is mandatory. It's whether you are, uh -- whether you are putting into 17 execution, previously declared policies or previously 18 enacted laws or directed decisions that has been 19 20 delegated to a government body. 21 The state treasurer has not been delegated 22 authority to -- to -- to fund Education Freedom 23 accounts. If the program existed, as it did at one 24 time, and we were to pass a petition that says, um, 25 okay treasurer, um, you will send money to -- to --

1	Page 23 you, uh, you will fund the following three Education
2	Freesum Freedom accounts, John Smith, Joe Smith,
3	and Josh Smith. We will be directing administrative
4	details, but we're not doing that.
5	We're creating a policy, which includes
6	providing, um, uh providing authority and requiring
7	government action in a particular way. And that is not
8	an administrative detail.
9	Um, the only other point I wanted to make is the
10	unfunded mandate, uh, argument. I want to address
11	that. Um, the Rogers v. Heller, which is a case that
12	we cite, and, uh, Mr. Schrager cites it, too, uh, says
13	that; "An appropriation is the setting aside of funds,
14	and an expenditure of money is the payment of funds."
15	The petition on its face does not set aside
16	funds. As we pointed out, as Mr. Schrager, uh,
17	concedes, there are multiple provisions, which say
18	that the a legislator does not have to provide
19	funding for the for the accounts, um, and in fact,
20	the entire scheme is conditioned on the existence of
21	an appropriation. And therefore, it does not include,
22	uh, an appropriation because it does not set aside
23	funds, um, and include, it doesn't spend any money
24	either.
25	Because the spending money in the accounts,

1	Page 24 giving them parents access to them, uh, can only
2	occur if the funds if if the accounts are
3	funded, which requires appropriation of the
4	legislator. So there is no outlay.
5	Again, um, thank you, Your Honor. I'll just
6	reserve my time for rebuttal if necessary.
7	MR. SCHRAGER: Nothing further, Your Honor.
8	THE COURT: Nothing further? Anything further
9	from your side?
10	MR. FOLETTA: No, Your Honor.
11	THE COURT: Okay. One of the reasons why
12	[inaudible] jump again to the Beverly half of this,
13	um, litigation this afternoon, was that on a quick
14	count, I did not have a complete file where's
15	Jackie [ph] on on the Beverly case.
16	So Jackie, before we leave here today, it almost
17	might be better for them to just do it overnight.
18	MS. TUCKER: What?
19	THE COURT: It might be better for them to just
20	xerox it and copy everything. I I want complete
21	files on both, because there there's even one
22	briefing in the Beverly case that I haven't read, that
23	they've been referring to.
24	MS. TUCKER: Okay.
25	THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.
1	

1	Page 25 MR. SCHRAGER: If, uh if it would help you,
2	Your Honor, we can also make sure that Ms. Tucker has
3	a completed list. We could email it to her if you'd
4	like.
5	THE COURT: Okay. That would be good, too.
6	MS. TUCKER: I just think I've, um I think
7	I've got them
8	MR. SCHRAGER: We just want
9	MS. TUCKER: I just haven't printed them.
10	MR. SCHRAGER: Yeah. Okay.
11	THE COURT: Okay.
12	MR. FOLETTA: That will be all for me.
13	THE COURT: Okay. Court will stand in recess.
14	Thank you, gentlemen.
15	MR. SCHRAGER: Thank you, Your Honor.
16	MR. FOLETTA: Thank you, Your Honor.
17	MS. SCHRAGER: Thank you for coming down to talk
18	to us.
19	THE COURT: [inaudible] would you go and check
20	these with the clerk? Jackie?
21	MS. TUCKER: [inaudible]. What?
22	THE COURT: I just want you to go check to see
23	[inaudible].
24	MS. TUCKER: You're ready for [inaudible]?
25	THE COURT: Yeah.

1	Page 26 MS. TUCKER: Are we going to set another time?
2	Are we going do it by Zoom? What are we going to do,
3	on the other case?
4	THE COURT: I'm going to decide it.
5	MS. TUCKER: Oh, you're going to decide it?
6	THE COURT: Yeah.
7	MS. TUCKER: [inaudible].
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 27
1	
2	
3	I, Chris Naaden, a transcriber, hereby declare
4	under penalty of perjury that to the best of my
5	ability the above 26 pages contain a full, true and
6	correct transcription of the tape-recording that I
7	received regarding the event listed on the caption on
8	page 1.
9	
10	I further declare that I have no interest in the
11	event of the action.
12	
13	July 6, 2022
14	Chris Naaden
15	Ph h
16	com n
17	
18	
19	
20	(First Judicial District, Freedom Education PAC second
21	hearing)
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	Page 28 HEALTH INFORMATION PRIVACY & SECURITY: CAUTIONARY NOTICE
2	Litigation Services is committed to compliance with applicable federal
3	and state laws and regulations ("Privacy Laws") governing the
4	protection andsecurity of patient health information.Notice is
5	herebygiven to all parties that transcripts of depositions and legal
6	proceedings, and transcript exhibits, may contain patient health
7	information that is protected from unauthorized access, use and
8	disclosure by Privacy Laws. Litigation Services requires that access,
9	maintenance, use, and disclosure (including but not limited to
10	electronic database maintenance and access, storage, distribution/
11	dissemination and communication) of transcripts/exhibits containing
12	patient information be performed in compliance with Privacy Laws.
13	No transcript or exhibit containing protected patient health
14	information may be further disclosed except as permitted by Privacy
15	Laws. Litigation Services expects that all parties, parties'
16	attorneys, and their HIPAA Business Associates and Subcontractors will
17	make every reasonable effort to protect and secure patient health
18	information, and to comply with applicable Privacy Law mandates,
19	including but not limited to restrictions on access, storage, use, and
20	disclosure (sharing) of transcripts and transcript exhibits, and
21	applying "minimum necessary" standards where appropriate. It is
22	recommended that your office review its policies regarding sharing of
23	transcripts and exhibits - including access, storage, use, and
24	disclosure - for compliance with Privacy Laws.
25	© All Rights Reserved. Litigation Services (rev. 6/1/2019)

Index: 00027..animal

			IIIdex.	00027ammai
0	6	<b>account</b> 10:8, 9,23	<b>adopt</b> 11:12 13:18	<b>all</b> 5:17 10:10 12:10 16:1,7 19:10,18
<b>00027</b> 1:15	<b>6</b> 9:16	accounts 10:15 20:2	adopted 13:11	20:11 25:12
1	7	22:23 23:2, 19,25 24:2	advertise 14:14	almost 24:16
<b>140,000</b> 13:12 18:7	<b>70</b> 17:10	acting 8:2	advocate	already 7:6 also 9:19
<b>15</b> 3:12 4:14,	8	action 23:7	11:7	15:12 16:12 18:11 19:25
25	<b>891552</b> 1:22	actual 15:12	<b>affix</b> 15:14	25:2 alterations
<b>15-</b> 5:9	A	actually 15:4	after 3:6 13:6 21:4	7:18
<b>19</b> 9:15	ability 13:25	add 15:13	afternoon 2:21 24:13	<b>alternative</b> 6:13,19 7:5,
<b>196</b> 11:2 <b>1:00</b> 4:16	<b>able</b> 10:7 12:1	address 15:15 21:2 23:10	again 9:15,16	19 9:3 18:3, 22
<b>1:30</b> 3:13	14:1 16:13	adjudged	12:9 13:2 19:23 24:5,12	although 18:11
<b>1.30</b> 3.13 <b>1B</b> 1:15	absence 19:4	15:24	agencies 8:8	amended
2	absolutely 10:17 11:21	<b>adjust</b> 18:23	agency 20:18	17:1
	accept 9:14 18:2	administering 2:15	<b>ago</b> 4:23	amending 12:25 13:24
<b>22</b> 1:15	acceptable	administrativ e 8:3,17 9:10	<b>agree</b> 18:20	<b>amendment</b> 7:2 12:18,19
220-C- 000271B 5:21	18:12	14:2 21:3,4, 11,16,23,25 22:15 23:3,8	agreement 6:18	amicacy 2:21
<b>29th</b> 4:16	access 24:1	admitted 6:12	ahead 5:18	animal 5:25
			I	l

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: another..can't

another 7:24 26:1	<b>argue</b> 5:14 18:25	authority 21:15 22:6,22 23:6	believe 10:11	20:12 24:22
answering 7:8	<b>argument</b> 18:14 21:3 23:10	<b>available</b> 17:16 20:8	best 13:20 better 24:17, 19	briefly 12:16 briefs 2:11
anticipate 15:17	argumentativ e 19:21	B	between 2:13	bring 7:14
anything 2:4 24:8	arguments	<b>back</b> 2:11	12:17	bringing 7:14
Apparently	2:12 17:22	7:20 19:23	<b>Beverly</b> 24:12,15,22	<b>building</b> 21:20,24
15:20	<b>around</b> 9:25 20:16	<b>balance</b> 19:18	<b>bifurcation</b> 2:13	burdensome 18:9
apply 19:24 appreciate	Article 9:15	<b>ballot</b> 12:21 13:20,22	<b>bit</b> 9:17 14:7	buried 10:12
2:20	articulated 18:22	14:20 15:1 ballots 14:10,	blaming 4:24	<b>buries</b> 10:19
<b>appropriate</b> 10:14 20:2	<b>aside</b> 23:13, 15,22	13	board 14:22	<b>bury</b> 12:6
appropriated 10:16	aspect 7:24	baseball 15:9	<b>body</b> 21:15 22:20	C
appropriation 19:4 23:13,	9:15 11:20 assist 14:19	based 13:15 become 13:3	<b>both</b> 2:3,22 3:20,23 4:13	<b>ca-</b> 14:18
21,22 24:3	<b>assume</b> 16:8	becomes	13:20 24:21	California 20:21
approve 15:14	attacks 6:24	16:21	bottom 10:13	came 21:17
approved 16:12	AUDIO-	<b>before</b> 2:12 4:1 9:6 24:16	brewing 4:2 brief 8:22,23	<b>can't</b> 8:15,16,
area 16:15	RECORDED 1:9	being 20:24	briefing 19:8	24 14:1,3 15:25 17:8
			00 000 1110	

Index: candidates..court

				1
<b>candidates</b> 14:8	18:4,16	<b>clear</b> 18:12	7:23	12:7
cannot 7:25	certified 20:20	<b>clerk</b> 25:20	complex 11:25	<b>constitution</b> 17:6
8:3 17:1	challenge	<b>client</b> 4:10	conceded	constitutional
<b>capacity</b> 8:2 9:6	7:14,15	client's 17:22	9:12	2:19 7:1,25 9:22 12:17,19
caption 2:15	<b>changes</b> 18:20	<b>clipboard</b> 15:10	concedes 23:17	13:4
cares 11:15	characterizati on 21:6	closer 7:17	<b>conceding</b> 18:10	contained 6:10
carry 15:24	<b>check</b> 25:19,	coequal 16:2	concerns	contend 19:1
case 1:15	22	<b>come</b> 14:3	18:23	<b>copy</b> 24:20
2:14 3:4,13, 16,18 4:2,15, 25 5:8,12,21	children 12:2	19:6	concluded 3:6	<b>correct</b> 5:21 13:14
14:14 17:21 21:17 22:2	choose 11:12	coming 25:17		
23:11 24:15, 22 26:3	<b>circulate</b> 4:11 18:6	compact 20:22	condition 22:16	<b>corruption</b> 14:16
<b>cases</b> 2:14 3:20,24 6:3,5 8:4,13,15	cite 23:12	<b>complaint</b> 4:14	<b>conditioned</b> 19:19 20:11, 13,25 23:20	counsel 17:19
	cites 23:12	complaints	conditions	count 24:14
categories 8:14	citizens 21:10	6:9 8:23	20:6	couple 8:4
Cegavske 5:21	city 21:19,21	<b>complete</b> 24:14,20	conduct 21:9	course 21:9
<b>certain</b> 20:18, 19	<b>claim</b> 11:2	<b>completed</b> 25:3	congressiona I 16:3	<b>court</b> 2:3,6 3:2,5,8,10,15, 22,25 4:17,23
	claims 7:22	completely	consideration	5:2,5,11,17,
certainly				

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: court's..election

<b></b>				
23 8:15 9:11	20:23	4:9 6:9,14,18,	direct 11:13	duty 7:9
11:7,10,15		20 7:5,15,19	21:13	
12:9,12,14	La La Cara	9:4,13 10:5		
13:10,12,16	debating	12:7 15:11		E
14:1,5,7,12,	22:14	17:24 19:1,	directed	
21 15:2,6,17		20,25	22:19	
16:4,19 17:18	decide 26:4,5	20,20		<b>each</b> 16:6
18:14 19:24			directing 22:6	
		detail 14:2	23:3	
21:22 22:10	decision 2:12	22:15 23:8	23.3	earlier 14:12
24:8,11,19,25	21:13			
25:5,11,13,			disagree 21:6	
19,22,25		details 8:3		Education
26:4,6	decisions	9:10 11:21		1:11 19:14
	22:19	21:3,4,16,23	discourage	22:22 23:1
court's 8:17		23:4	15:19,22	
courts 8:17	declared			effect 6:10,
			-l'	,
courts 8:13	21:12 22:18	detain 9:8	discretion	14,19,20
			12:11	7:16,19 9:4,
	deference 5:5	devil's 11:7		13 10:5 12:8
creating 23:5			discretionary	15:11 17:24
			11:17,22	19:1,6,20
	delegated	<b>di-</b> 11:13	11.17,22	20:18
curiosity 2:8	21:14 22:20,			
	21		disqualified	offective 2015
curious 19:9		dictating	9:1	effective 20:5
		21:25	-	
	delicate 10:1			effectiveness
D		difference	DISTRICT	20:25
	demonstrate		1:10	20.20
		11:10 12:17		
<b>d</b> 1.0 10.10	16:6		districts 10.0	effects 19:25
<b>d-</b> 4:8 10:13		different 2:15	districts 16:2,	
	describe 11:6	4:3 5:25 6:5	3	
dancing 9:25	17:17	7:23		effectuate
		1.20	done 10:24	22:4
daunting 16:9	described	difficult 16:17		efforts 14:13
	20:8		down 10:12,	<b>CITULS</b> 14.13
			13 17:9 21:9	
days 3:12		difficulty 7:8	25:17	either 11:4
4:14,23 5:1	describes			18:14 23:24
	19:20 22:3	diminution		
debates		6:24	duties 22:3	
	description	0.27		election

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: elections..funded

13:15	entitled 4:22	19:21	18:6 20:15,25 23:19	7,13 17:20 22:13 24:10 25:12,16
elections 13:7	<b>equal</b> 16:5	example 8:11 16:10 20:23		
eliminate 14:9	essence 11:24	excellent 2:11	faster 6:15	following 23:1
email 25:3	essentially 9:9 17:5,13	<b>excuse</b> 19:2,	feels 4:20	<b>form</b> 13:3,9 15:5
<b>emerge</b> 16:20	21:19	13	<b>few</b> 18:11	format 15:5
emerges	<b>establish</b> 10:9,23	<b>execution</b> 21:12 22:6,18	<b>fi-</b> 16:19	forward 4:18, 21 6:11 9:2
16:20	established 19:14	exhibit 7:7	file 24:14	18:6
<b>en-</b> 22:5	aatabilahaa	existed 22:23	files 24:21	four 16:1
enacted 21:13 22:5,19	establishes 10:8	<b>existence</b> 20:24 23:20	<b>filing</b> 4:14 18:14	free 11:11
enacting 21:24	<b>even</b> 14:14 24:21	<b>expeditious</b> 18:5	finally 16:19	Freedom 1:11 19:15 22:22 23:2
<b>enactment</b> 16:22 21:8	event 15:8 every 11:20	<b>expenditure</b> 23:14	fine 3:22 7:11 first 1:10 2:19	<b>Freesum-</b> 23:2
enacts 21:8 end 11:22	<b>everything</b> 6:13,22 8:16	expertise 8:9	9:9 five 5:3	front 14:21
18:8	11:17 24:20	F	foous 6:7	fully 17:17
<b>entire</b> 20:15 23:20	<b>evidentiary</b> 4:16	face 23:15	focus 6:7	fund 9:24 20:2 22:22 23:1
entirely 11:2 13:21	exact 13:3	<b>fact</b> 4:9 7:11, 17 9:2 10:23	2:2,25 3:3,6, 9,11,17,23 4:5,7,22 5:3,	funded 24:3
	exactly 11:3			

Index: funding..importantly

<b>funding</b> 19:14 23:19	<b>gives</b> 17:6	<b>guidance</b> 21:10 he- 5:9 22:9		4:20,24 5:19, 22,24 17:20
<b>funds</b> 10:8 23:13,14,16,	<b>giving</b> 22:8 24:1	guidelines 11:12	<b>hear</b> 5:7,8 17:18	24:5,7,10 25:2,15,16
23 24:2	<b>goes</b> 12:16 13:8,17	<b>guys</b> 2:8	heard 7:24 14:11	Honor's 3:20 4:15 12:6
24:7,8	<b>gone</b> 10:20	н	<b>hearing</b> 1:10, 13 3:4,11,13,	however 6:6
<b>future</b> 9:6 20:11,14 21:1	<b>good</b> 5:24 16:17 25:5	half 10:20	18,20,24 4:13,16,23,25	<b>hu-</b> 18:7
G	government	24:12	5:9,10,20	
	22:16,20 23:7	<b>handing</b> 14:19	held 5:9,10	<b>I-</b> 5:14
<b>game</b> 9:17 15:9	<b>governmental</b> 21:15	<b>handle</b> 8:14,	Heller 23:11	<b>I</b> 3:17
garnered		18	help 25:1	
13:24	<b>governor</b> 20:20,21	happen 7:3 10:12 12:4	helpful 6:14	idea 10:3 20:10 21:3
Garvin 8:7	<b>governor's</b> 14:8	15:4	helpfully 6:12	ignore 13:21
gathering 14:25 15:19	granted 22:7	happens 12:17,18 21:1	<b>here</b> 2:21 3:7 15:5 17:22 18:25 24:16	immediately 13:19 17:8,16
<b>gentlemen</b> 25:14	<b>graphed</b> 11:19	<b>happy</b> 18:16	<b>hey</b> 16:24	impermissible 21:11
get all 10:21	<b>great</b> 10:21	harder 16:9	highly 11:19	importance
getting 14:25	greater 16:21	harvest 14:13	hold 3:3	2:7
give 2:6 15:10	guess 11:1	harvesting 14:10	Honor 2:5,24,	important 15:24 21:7
<b>given</b> 18:6		having 9:5	25 3:12,17	importantly

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: in-depth..listen

4:20	<b>initiatives</b> 14:12	16 25:20	largely 6:18	Legally 16:25	
<b>in-depth</b> 11:19	interact 12:24	<b>job</b> 1:22 8:21 20:21 21:5	Las 16:10,13	legislation 16:19 17:16	
inaudible 2:2, 4,6,7 3:10 7:8	interest 15:25	<b>Joe</b> 23:2	<b>last</b> 13:15 17:21	legislative 8:2 16:22	
11:8,13 13:13 14:10,14,22,	interference 12:25	John 23:2	later 14:3	17:4 19:4	
23 15:20 24:12 25:19, 21,23,24 26:7	interpreting	<b>Josh</b> 23:3	<b>law</b> 4:12 13:4, 19 16:21	legislator 9:20,22,24	
include 8:3	5:15	<b>ju-</b> 16:8	21:8,17	10:14 11:11, 23 12:11 13:9,17,18	
23:21,23	intertwined 4:1	judicial 1:10 8:18	laws 15:18 21:13 22:19	17:8 19:13 20:1 23:18 24:4	
includes 23:5	into 19:6 21:12 22:17	jump 24:12	<b>lay</b> 12:16	legislators	
including 4:9	invitation	К	laying 11:24	17:11	
indicating 18:1	18:15	keeping 2:14,	<b>lays</b> 21:9	<b>lengthy</b> 6:9 11:18	
indication 18:19	involving 21:17	16	<b>lead</b> 10:12,19 12:6	<b>less</b> 6:6 7:5, 21 9:14	
infirmities 9:13	<b>irrelevant</b> 20:6	kind 2:9,13 8:1 10:19,25 19:8	leading 14:8	<b>let</b> 9:11,12	
informally 17:14	<b>issue</b> 2:7,19 10:14	kinds 8:24	<b>least</b> 11:5 17:4	12:16 16:24 17:18	
initiative 7:25	issued 3:12	L	<b>leave</b> 5:11 10:10 12:3	like 6:17,22 7:11 10:6 20:9 25:4	
8:1,12,19 9:2 12:20 14:17 16:20 17:1,7,	J	language 3:25	24:16 <b>left</b> 10:5	list 14:22 25:3	
15	Jackie 24:15,		12:11	listen 4:1	

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: listened..occurrence

				40.00
listened 8:21	making 17:22 18:10	<b>meet</b> 4:9	N	16:22
litigation 1:22 2:10 24:13	<b>mall</b> 15:9	merely 22:7	name 15:14	note 18:3,11
little 14:7	mandate	merits 18:18	<b>near</b> 18:8	nothing 9:24 10:13,24
living 8:10	9:16,19 11:3 23:10	middle 12:20	necessarily 9:1 18:20	13:21 20:1 24:7,8
locked 17:3	mandatory 22:12,13,16	<b>might</b> 16:9 18:17 24:17, 19	necessary	notwithstandi ng 20:24
long 2:20 9:6	<b>many</b> 4:23	<b>mo-</b> 19:10	7:17 24:6 need 3:18	November 12:22 13:6
looked 7:6	<b>March</b> 4:16	<b>money</b> 10:15,	9:11,12 19:17	number 1:22
looking 18:5	matter 2:17 11:21	21,22 11:17, 23 14:15 20:2,3,8	needs 12:20	2:15 5:21 13:18 16:5
<b>loser</b> 11:9	matters 21:11	22:25 23:14, 23,25	<b>Nevada</b> 8:5 14:17 20:16,	17:22 20:13
luck 8:25		<b>more</b> 4:19	17 21:22	
М	<b>may</b> 10:8,9, 22,23 12:4 17:14 21:18	7:4,21 9:13 16:17	Nevadans 8:6,11	<b>obviously</b> 4:19 6:8,25
<b>made</b> 6:9 7:22 11:3,4,6	<b>maybe</b> 9:19 10:7 18:1	<b>most</b> 19:11	<b>new</b> 15:18	9:21 17:10 18:19,21
<b>main</b> 19:12	<b>mean</b> 6:1	<b>much</b> 2:17 9:10	<b>non-</b> 19:20	<b>OC</b> 1:15
maintain 2:13	10:1 11:18 14:18,23 16:8,12	<b>multiple</b> 23:17	non- mandatory 11:13	occur 20:19 24:2
make 6:15 10:24 11:10 23:9 25:2	<b>means</b> 2:18 8:5	<b>murder</b> 6:2,3, 4	<b>none</b> 12:4 19:9 20:19	occurred 20:14
makes 16:17	measure 19:6	<b>must</b> 15:12	normal 2:9	occurrence

Index: occurrences..Potentially

20:12	opened 18:1	24:17	payment	<b>place</b> 16:1,11
			23:14	
occurrences 20:14	Opening 5:19	<b>own</b> 13:19 16:20	<b>peg</b> 14:22	<b>plan</b> 20:17
	opportunity			planks 14:9
off- 11:5	15:10	P	<b>people</b> 8:2 10:2,10 11:6,	
offering 11:6	options 13:18	<b>PAC</b> 1:11	25 12:23 15:9 16:9,12 17:6	platform 14:9
office 22:16	orally 18:25		19:13,17	Playing 11:7
onice 22.10	Urally 10.25	paid 14:15	percent 17:11	plebiscite
offices 21:10	order 3:1,12 7:4	paragraph		17:13
offline 18:16	7.4	10:20	perfect 6:21	plenty 13:7
omme 18.10	orders 3:20		perfectly 6:22	pienty 13.7
once 9:16	4:15 5:15	paraphrase 21:14	penectry 0.22	point 2:25
12:9,15 13:23 16:25	originates	21.14	permanent	18:22,24 20:9 21:2,16 23:9
10.20	21:8	parents 10:7	21:8	21.2,10 20.0
one 3:8,9 4:2		12:1 24:1	permitted	pointed 17:23
6:23 7:2,22 9:8,9 12:10	outcome 22:1	particular	14:17	20:12 23:16
13:4 14:7,8,	outcomes 4:3	22:1 23:7		points 18:10
14 15:25 16:11 18:24			petition 5:25 6:10 7:25 8:1	
20:23 22:23	outlay 24:4	<b>pass</b> 12:23 16:25 22:24	15:12,16,19	policies
24:11,21	over 2:11		16:2 18:6 19:3,11 22:3,	21:12 22:18
ones 7:23	over 2:11 16:14 18:7	passed 17:7	24 23:15	policy 21:8,9,
		<b>passes</b> 9:22,	notitiona 4:0	24 22:9 23:5
only 7:14 8:4	overall 16:18	23 13:2 17:10	petitions 4:9, 11	political 14:0
10:5 11:16,21 13:25 20:18	overdicting			political 14:9 17:9,15
23:9 24:1	overdicting 14:7	<b>path</b> 18:5	<b>ph</b> 24:15	
opon 2:19		<b>pay</b> 10:8	piqued 2:8	potential 19:3
open 3:18	overnight		piqueu 2.0	Potentially

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: precatory..requirements

4:6	16:17 18:9	<b>provision</b> 7:16 13:24	quickly 7:10	<b>recall</b> 3:25 21:18
precatory 22:11	Production 8:6	19:12	R	recently
prefer 4:19	program 9:25	provisions 8:20 9:3 12:10,13	raised 18:23	15:21
preference 4:17	10:3,4,9,16, 18 11:20 19:15 22:23	19:5,10,11,19 22:11 23:17	rather 6:12,25	recess 25:13 redline 12:10,
prepare 4:18	prohibit 21:19	public 12:3 17:13	<b>re-</b> 20:17	12 13:25
prepared	<b>Property</b> 8:6,	publish 8:13	<b>reaching</b> 18:18	redlining 13:25
4:20 5:14	12	pursuant	read 10:11	refer 5:20
presented 4:8 6:1	proponents 6:11 8:25	22:8 purview 8:17	15:11,13 24:22	referring 24:23
previously 21:12,13	proposals		ready 25:24	regarding
22:7,18	15:18	put 6:11 7:12 10:2 21:12	<b>real</b> 10:5	12:7 17:12
printed 25:9	propose 13:19 19:22	putting 22:17	reality 10:25	<b>regional</b> 20:16,17
Private 8:11	proposed 6:19 12:19	Q	<b>really</b> 6:16 10:4 19:10	relate 17:24
probably 9:4 14:5,15	18:3 20:10	quality 2:20	reason 14:15	related 17:23
problem 10:5	protected 17:5	question 4:8	reasons	relevant 20:7
procedural 4:10 17:25	provide 23:18	20:3,4 21:19 questions	24:11 <b>rebut</b> 20:10	render 2:12
process 14:3,	providing 23:6	6:1,3,7	rebuttal 24:6	Reno 21:18
16,25 15:1,19		quick 24:13	1 <b>6501101</b> 24.0	requirements

Index: requires..something

r				
4:10,12 17:25	<b>run</b> 16:13	12:12,15 13:11,14,17	17:4	15:15
<b>requires</b> 10:14 20:1 24:3	S	14:6,11,18,24 15:3,7,21 16:5,23 18:24 23:12,16 24:7	<b>set</b> 3:20 4:24 5:5,6 11:20 23:15,22 26:1	signature 14:24
<b>requiring</b> 23:6	<b>said</b> 6:13 8:15 12:5 18:11, 21,24 21:22	25:12,10 24.7 25:1,8,10,15, 17	sets 4:15	signatures 9:6 12:15,20 13:5,8,12,23
reserve 24:6	<b>same</b> 2:14 4:8,12 5:15	Schrager's 17:21	<b>setting</b> 3:13, 23 23:13	14:23 16:1,15 18:8
resort 19:23	6:1,2,4,25 13:3,10,12	<b>second</b> 1:13 3:4,18 4:15	<b>sever</b> 9:1	similar 17:21
respect 18:25 22:1	<b>saw</b> 15:6	5:8,12 7:16	Several 9:2	simple 8:7
responded	<b>say</b> 3:16 6:15,	Section 9:16	<b>shell</b> 9:17	simply 21:11
19:7	22 7:4 10:13 11:1 14:1 17:8 19:9,25	secure 18:7	<b>shopping</b> 15:8	<b>sir</b> 4:6 14:11
responsibility 22:8	20:1 23:17	seem 18:25	abauld 0:47	<b>six</b> 5:3
<b>rest</b> 16:14	<b>saying</b> 6:16 18:4 22:14	seems 12:5	should 6:17 11:5 19:2,24	<b>slew</b> 8:19
<b>Rights</b> 8:6,12	<b>says</b> 4:15 9:24 10:6	<b>seen</b> 2:21 14:12	<b>shouldn't</b> 18:17	<b>Smith</b> 23:2,3
<b>Rogers</b> 5:20 23:11	22:24 23:12	send 22:25	<b>sic</b> 2:21 8:12	so-called 20:16
roughshod	<b>scheme</b> 20:15 23:20	sense 6:2	side 24:9	solemn 7:9
16:14	schools 12:3	separate 2:16	signal 17:11	solid 11:2
<b>rule</b> 2:18 21:7,9	Schrager 2:5, 23 4:6,18	services 1:22 6:25	<b>signatories</b> 19:3	<b>someone</b> 14:19,21 15:7
rules 7:17	5:13,19,24 11:9,14,16	sessions	signatory	something

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

Index: somewhat..told

r				
7:24 14:25 16:13,25	22:21	<b>su-</b> 17:12	21:22	there- 24:21
17:10 21:1	statewide 17:12	subject 17:14 sway 18:17		therefore 23:21
somewhat 2:8	statue 9:18	submission 7:20	system 8:18	thing 6:25
<b>soon</b> 5:11	<b>statute</b> 9:24 10:24 11:4,	submitted 6:13	T	11:16,22 13:1 19:9
<b>sort</b> 6:12 9:25 10:12	17,19,23,25 17:1 19:15 20:5,10,23,24	substantial 14:13	<b>take</b> 2:19 6:6 20:18	things 6:15, 21 7:2 8:24 10:6,10,11 14:23 20:18,
specially 19:2 specific 8:14	statutes 20:13	substantially 4:3	talk 7:19 18:16 25:17	19
21:20,21	statutory		technical 7:8	thought 2:6
<b>specifically</b> 19:25	5:25 7:16 8:1 9:23 11:3	substantive 16:23 19:12	11:19	three 7:2 17:2,3 23:1
spend 23:23	12:18 13:5 20:15	<b>such</b> 4:10 22:9	technically 20:5	through 8:22 10:20
<b>spending</b> 23:25	<b>still</b> 5:10 14:16	<b>summer</b> 12:21	telling 9:20 10:2 11:25 21:5,23	time 2:23 5:6, 17 6:6 13:7
<b>sta-</b> 20:4	straightforwar d 19:21	supplementar y 17:25	<b>test</b> 19:23 22:15	17:7 22:24 24:6 26:1
<b>stand</b> 14:21 25:13	streets 9:5	support 16:7	text 12:25	title 20:17
<b>standpoint</b> 17:10	strength 16:21 17:5,15	17:12 19:12 supposed	<b>than</b> 9:10 16:10,22	<b>today</b> 3:13, 21,24 5:8,12, 14 7:24 24:16
state 4:11	striking 17:9	3:11 4:13,25	their 7:7,20	together 4:3
15:25 16:7,14 20:22 21:7	students 12:2	<b>Supreme</b> 8:15 9:11	8:2,9 14:19 15:14,15 21:10	told 19:2

Index: train..year

			111402	• trainyear
train 21:17, 20,24 22:1	7	upheld 15:23	wanted 4:1 21:2 23:9	9:9,11 10:7, 21 11:21,23 12:21,22
<b>TRANSCRIPT</b> 1:9	<b>tweaks</b> 18:2, 11,13	<b>used</b> 3:25 10:8	<b>way</b> 5:15 9:8 10:2 12:4,24	13:3,8 15:9, 15 16:24 20:7 22:4,25 23:1,
treasurer 8:20,21 21:5	twice 12:23	utterly 9:1	16:25 18:10 19:21 21:21 23:7	3 25:12,13
22:4,7,21,25	two 2:13 6:3 7:22 13:3 17:4	V	<b>we-</b> 19:10	withdrawing 20:22
treated 4:2	typically 15:4	valid 21:18	weakness 16:22	within 3:12 4:14,25 5:9
trench 21:17, 20,21 22:1	U	<b>Vegas</b> 16:10, 13	weeks 5:3,4	without 21:15
trenches 21:25	ultimate	version 13:20	<b>wha-</b> 3:15	wonderful 10:22
trial 6:2	12:11 unclear 19:16	volunteered 18:13	Whatever 7:12	word 14:10
tried 8:12	under 7:17	<b>vote</b> 17:11	wheelhouse 2:9	words 11:11
<b>TRPA</b> 20:20	understand	voters 4:11 19:2	2.9 Whereas	work 7:5 9:4
true 7:1 10:17	3:14 7:9 understood	voting 15:1	21:11	works 17:7
truncated 5:6 try 8:20 18:23	3:19	W	whether 2:14 10:3 11:12 15:18 20:4,7	written 6:17
trying 15:17	<b>unfunded</b> 9:16,19 23:10	<b>w-</b> 5:10 18:4	22:15,17	
19:22	Unless 3:8	want 2:11 3:8,	<b>whi-</b> 22:10	<b>xerox</b> 24:20
<b>Tucker</b> 24:18, 24 25:2,6,9, 21,24 26:1,5,	<b>until</b> 13:6	9,15 7:12 15:13 23:10 24:20 25:8,22	whole 14:22	Y
21,2720.1,0,		,	will 5:9 6:6,15	<b>year</b> 13:2

Litigation Services | 800-330-1112 www.litigationservices.com

			1
18:8			
<b>years</b> 13:3 17:2,3			
<b>yet</b> 20:14			
Z			
<b>Zoom</b> 26:2			
	Comuiana	L 800 220	