
STATE OF NEVADA

Statewide Ballot Questions 2026



To Appear on the November 3, 2026, General Election Ballot

State Question: No. 1 – No. 5

There will be no statewide questions 1–5 on the 2026 General Election ballot. There were a number of ballot initiatives circulated, but none of them gained enough valid signatures to qualify for the general election ballot.

Statewide Question 6 and Question 7 will be on the General Election ballot for the second time. Both ballot questions passed during the 2024 General Election and must be voted on for a second time. If they pass again during the 2026 General Election, they will amend the Nevada Constitution. The following pages include information about each ballot measure, including the arguments “for” and “against.”

[REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



State Question – No. 6

Amendment to the Nevada Constitution

Initiative Petition C-05-2023



QUESTION 6

Condensation (Ballot Question)

Should the Nevada Constitution be amended to create an individual's fundamental right to an abortion, without interference by state or local governments, whenever the abortion is performed by a qualified healthcare professional until fetal viability or when necessary to protect the health or life of the pregnant individual at any point during the pregnancy?

Yes ☐

No ☐





QUESTION 6

Explanation & Digest**Explanation:**

This initiative, if approved by the voters, amends the Nevada Constitution to create a constitutional right to abortion.

This right to abortion would apply from the start of a person's pregnancy up until the start of "fetal viability," unless the pregnant person needs medical care to protect that person's life or health, in which case the right applies throughout the pregnancy. "Fetal viability" means "the point in pregnancy when, in the professional judgment of the patient's treating health care practitioner, there is a significant likelihood of the fetus' sustained survival outside the uterus without the application of extraordinary medical measures."

The initiative makes clear that the State of Nevada, including county and city governments in Nevada, generally cannot interfere with this right. But a state, county, or city government can interfere with the right if there is a "compelling state interest" in doing so. A "compelling state interest" exists only if the government uses the least restrictive means to protect or improve the pregnant person's life or health in ways that follow clinical standards of practice.

Lastly, this proposed right to abortion does not require or force any individual in Nevada to have an abortion. Instead, it creates a right that allows an individual to make their own decision.

A "Yes" vote would create a new section of the Nevada Constitution to establish a person's constitutional right to abortion, so that a person can make decisions about matters relating to abortion and reproductive healthcare, without interference from state or local governments.

A "No" vote would keep the Nevada Constitution in its current form and would not impact the availability of abortion as a statutory right under Nevada law.



Digest:

Existing law states that abortions are legal in Nevada and must occur within 24 weeks after the start of the pregnancy. An exception currently exists to allow an abortion after 24 weeks if a physician reasonably believes that an abortion is necessary to preserve the pregnant person's life or health. Existing law also requires that abortions performed after the 24th week of pregnancy be performed in a hospital licensed by the State of Nevada.

If approved by the voters, this ballot measure would add a new section to Article 1 of the Nevada Constitution with the following information.

Section 1 of this amendment to the Nevada Constitution would create a "fundamental right to abortion." This means that the Nevada Constitution would make abortion a legal option for all individuals, not just Nevadans, that is protected by the Nevada Constitution. The proposed amendment also includes the right to have an abortion procedure done by a qualified healthcare professional.

The amendment proposes that the right to an abortion would extend until "fetal viability, or when needed to protect the life or health of the pregnant patient." "Fetal viability" means "the point in pregnancy when, in the professional judgment of the patient's treating health care practitioner, there is a significant likelihood of the fetus' sustained survival outside the uterus without the application of extraordinary medical measures."

If the abortion would be necessary to protect the pregnant person's life or health, the proposed amendment allows an abortion procedure to be carried out after the start of fetal viability.

The proposed amendment would also generally prevent the State of Nevada or any of its political subdivisions (e.g., the Nevada Legislature, county and city governments) from interfering with the constitutional right to abortion. State and local governments can interfere with this right only if they have a "compelling state interest" in doing so. A "compelling state interest" exists only if the government uses the least restrictive means to protect or improve the pregnant person's life or health in ways that follow clinical standards of practice.

Section 2 of the proposed constitutional amendment states that if any part of the amendment is challenged in court, then the rest of the amendment is not affected and remains in force. This section ensures that the right to abortion is protected to the greatest extent possible in the event of future lawsuits.





QUESTION 6

Arguments for Passage

Decisions about abortion should be left to women and qualified healthcare professionals, who take a pledge to act in their patients' best interest. When it comes to something as personal and complicated as pregnancy, politicians are never more qualified to make healthcare decisions than women and their doctors. That's why it is so important to vote YES on this amendment.

People across Nevada are voting YES because:

- YES protects doctors so that they will never have to risk jail time just to treat the patient in front of them.¹
- Extreme abortion bans are already in place across the country – from Texas² to Florida³ to right next door in Utah and Arizona – and they are having dangerous effects. A 10-year-old girl from Ohio who was raped had to travel to Indiana to get the abortion she needed,⁴ and in Texas, one woman who miscarried lost liters of blood and had to go on a breathing machine before doctors could legally help her.⁵ YES protects the right to abortion in our state for good, so these tragic stories can never happen here.
- YES establishes a permanent layer of protection⁶ so that no matter who holds office in our state, extreme abortion bans⁷ cannot become law in Nevada.

¹ Pierson, Brenden. "Texas AG Threatens to Prosecute Doctors in Emergency Abortion | Reuters." Reuters, <https://www.reuters.com/legal/texas-judge-allows-woman-get-emergency-abortion-despite-state-ban-2023-12-07/> Accessed 25 July 2024.

² Weber, Paul J., and Jamie Stengle. "Texas Governor Defends Abortion Law with No Rape Exceptions." AP News, AP News, 8 Sept. 2021, <https://apnews.com/article/health-texas-dallas-laws-greg-abbott-3717a0258b598eba06bb1baf90b645f4>.

³ Fischer, David, and Stephany Matat. "Florida's 6-Week Abortion Ban Takes Effect as Doctors Worry Women Will Lose Access to Health Care." AP News, AP News, 1 May 2024, <https://apnews.com/article/florida-abortion-ban-9509a806453e1eab50d118aaecffa2f1>.

⁴ Helmore, Edward. "10-Year-Old Rape Victim Forced to Travel from Ohio to Indiana for Abortion." The Guardian, Guardian News and Media, 3 July 2022, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2022/jul/03/ohio-indiana-abortion-rape-victim>.

⁵ Tanner, Lindsey. "Abortion Laws Spark Profound Changes in Other Medical Care." AP News, AP News, 16 July 2022, <https://apnews.com/article/abortion-science-health-medication-lupus-e4042947e4cc0c45e38837d394199033>.

⁶ From constitutional amendment text: "All individuals shall have a fundamental right to abortion... The right established by this section shall not be denied, burdened, or infringed upon..."

⁷ Lieb, David A., and Geoff Mulvihill. "Missouri Lawmakers Propose Allowing Homicide Charges for Women Who Have Abortions." PBS, Public Broadcasting Service, 8 Dec. 2023, <https://www.pbs.org/newshour/politics/missouri-lawmakers-propose-allowing-homicide-charges-for-women-who-have-abortions>.



- YES keeps families – not politicians – in charge of their own healthcare decisions, so that women can make these personal decisions in consultation with their doctors and those they love and trust.

We should trust women and doctors to make the right decisions for their own situations without government getting involved. If this amendment fails, future generations could have fewer rights and freedoms than their parents and grandparents.⁸ Vote YES to keep politicians out of our personal, private decisions.

Question 6 has no fiscal or environmental impact.

The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Lindsey Harmon (Chair), Denise Lopez, and Bradley Schrager. This argument can also be found at www.nvsos.gov.



QUESTION 6

Rebuttal to Arguments for Passage

Do you want courts and judges making decisions about pregnancy instead of women and doctors?⁹

Vote NO to stop courts from invading your personal, private medical decisions.

Vote NO to protect our current abortion laws.¹⁰ There literally cannot be “any reasonable degree of certainty”¹¹ what laws will change or how much you will have to pay to fund abortion with Question 6. Vote NO.

⁸ Pfannenstiel, Kyle. “Idaho Is Losing Ob-Gyns after Strict Abortion Ban. but Health Exceptions Unlikely This Year.” Idaho Capital Sun. Idaho Capital Sun, 5 Apr. 2024, <https://idahocapitalsun.com/2024/04/05/idaho-is-losing-ob-gyns-after-strict-abortion-ban-but-health-exceptions-unlikely-this-year/>.

⁹ Silver State Hope Fund vs. The State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Dept. of Health and Human Services, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, (Case NO. A-23-876702-W), Eighth Judicial District Court Clark County, Nevada (lawsuit financed by the ACLU to force Nevada taxpayers to pay for more abortions as a result of the “yes” vote for Question 1 on the 2022 Ballot).

¹⁰ The Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau (Aug. 1, 2024) <https://www.nvsos.gov/sos/home/showpublisheddocument/14294/638581076670730000>.

¹¹ The Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau (Aug. 1, 2024) <https://www.nvsos.gov/sos/home/showpublisheddocument/14294/638581076670730000> (this nonpartisan government body analyzed the language of Question 6 and concluded that “it is not known how the Legislature may revise existing laws



Do you want to spend millions of taxpayer dollars to fund abortions through all 9-months of pregnancy? Do you want to write a blank check to use taxpayer money to pay for abortions?¹² Last year, California spent \$200 million¹³ on an abortion-funding package to pay for abortions¹⁴ and even to create a website explaining how to have the state pay for an abortion “at no cost to you.”¹⁵ Don’t want that policy? Vote NO.

Here's a list of people NOT mentioned in Question 6:

- Women and girls – No specific protection.
- Mothers and parents – No specific protection.
- Doctors – No specific protection.

A young mother in Las Vegas recently bled to death after taking abortion pills.¹⁶ Protect our current law, women and doctors, keep the courts out of our personal lives, and vote NO.

The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Emily Mimnaugh (Chair) and Jason Guinasso. This argument can also be found at nvsos.gov.

if they are determined to not comply with these provisions, the financial effect upon the State or local governments cannot be determined with any reasonable degree of certainty).

¹² The Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau (Aug. 1, 2024)

<https://www.nvsos.gov/sos/home/showpublisheddocument/14294/638581076670730000> (concluding that the financial impact of a “yes” vote on Question 6 simply “cannot be determined”).

¹³ Gov. Gavin Newsom, “New Protections for People Who Need Abortion Care and Birth Control, Bill package builds upon more than \$200 million in state funding to create abortion.ca.gov, cover uninsured care,” <https://www.gov.ca.gov/2022/09/27/new-protections-for-people-who-need-abortion-care-and-birth-control/>.

¹⁴ California Abortion Access: How to Pay for an Abortion, Official Website of the State of California, <https://abortion.ca.gov/getting-an-abortion/how-to-pay-for-an-abortion/index.html> .

¹⁵ California Abortion Access: How to Pay for an Abortion, Official Website of the State of California, <https://abortion.ca.gov/getting-an-abortion/how-to-pay-for-an-abortion/index.html> .

¹⁶ “Nevada woman’s death after taking abortion pills spurs lawsuit, safety fears,” Washington Times (Sept. 28, 2023) <https://www.washingtontimes.com/news/2023/sep/28/nevada-womans-death-after-taking-abortion-pills-sp/>.





QUESTION 6

Arguments Against Passage

Vote NO to stop Question 6 from re-writing our State Constitution.

Vote No to stop Question 6 from writing a blank check to fund unlimited, 9-month abortions using taxpayer money.¹⁷

Question 6 may force you the taxpayer to pay for abortions.¹⁸ The cost and fiscal impact of Question 6 cannot be determined.¹⁹ It may cost taxpayers MORE than \$120-million-dollars every year.²⁰

Vote NO to protect our current abortion law. Abortion is legal in Nevada.²¹ Currently, doctors can do abortions—without restriction—up to 24 weeks (6 months).²² After that, it's also allowed to save the mom's life or health.²³

Our current law is more pro-choice than Roe v. Wade.²⁴ Only voters can change our state's abortion law, and it hasn't changed in decades.²⁵ Unlike Nevada, other states have recently

¹⁷ The total cost cannot be known, and a single abortion can cost “\$15,000 or more” according to the State of Nevada Division of (“DPBH”), “Abortion Information for Nevadans,” <https://dpbh.nv.gov/Programs/MIP/AbortionInNevada/> (For a “later pregnancy” using “induction abortion” procedure to “induce labor and delivery,” the cost is “\$8,000 to \$15,000 or more” for each delivery, labor and abortion procedure)

¹⁸ The Nevada Legislative Counsel Bureau (Aug. 1, 2024), <https://www.nvsos.gov/sos/home/showpublisheddocument/14294/638581076670730000> (this non-partisan government body analyzed the language of Question 6 and concluded that “it is it not known how the Legislature may revise existing laws if they are determined to not comply with these provisions, the financial effect upon the State or local governments cannot be determined with any reasonable degree of certainty).

¹⁹ See Notes 1-2.

²⁰ An abortion in Nevada can cost anywhere from “\$500” for a chemical abortion to “\$15,000 or more” for an induction abortion, according to the State of Nevada Division of (“DPBH”), “Abortion Information for Nevadans,” <https://dpbh.nv.gov/Programs/MIP/AbortionInNevada/> ; The Nevada Independent, “Indy Explains: What happens to Nevada’s abortion laws if Roe is overturned?,” (May 2, 2022), <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/indy-explains-what-happens-to-nevadas-abortion-laws-if-roe-is-overturned> (estimating that approximately 8,000 to 10,000 abortions were performed annually in Nevada between 2017 and 2019, with the predication that more would follow if Nevada became an abortion “refuge.”).

²¹ See Nevada Revised Statute (NRS) § 442.250 (Question 7 on the 1990 Nevada Ballot).

²² Nevada Division of Public and Behavioral Health (“DPBH”), “Abortion Information for Nevadans,” <https://dpbh.nv.gov/Programs/MIP/AbortionInNevada/>.

²³ NRS § 442.250

²⁴ The Nevada Independent, “Indy Explains: What happens to Nevada’s abortion laws if Roe is overturned?,” (May 2, 2022), <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/indy-explains-what-happens-to-nevadas-abortion-laws-if-roe-is-overturned>.

²⁵ See Notes 5-8.



changed their abortion laws, and “litigation has exploded.”²⁶ Vote NO to keep the courts out of private, personal decisions.²⁷

If you like the current law, protect it: Vote NO. If you don’t like the current law, vote NO so it’s not even harder to fix.²⁸

Question 6 has no bright-line rule saying when abortion is legal. Is it always legal at 4 months? 6 months? 9 months? Our current law is clear. Question 6 is not.

Question 6 has no bright-line rule saying when taxpayers must pay for abortions. Do taxpayers pay for an optional abortion at 9 months? Our current law is clear. Question 6 is not.

What about doctors? Can a non-doctor perform a surgical abortion at 9 months outside a hospital? Question 6 may not stop this, but the current law protects women. Vote NO.

What about parents? Can a non-doctor perform a secret surgical abortion on a 13-year-old girl? Question 6 may not stop this, but the current law protects children and parents. Vote NO.

When laws are unclear, the result is expensive lawsuits.²⁹ The legal, fiscal and environmental impacts of Question 6 are unknown.³⁰ Lawsuits cost taxpayers money.³¹

Vote NO because Question 6 is:

- Dangerous: It lets people who aren't doctors do abortions.
- Wrong: It allows abortions through all 9 months of pregnancy.
- Harmful: It strips out rules that keep women safe.
- Expensive: It may cause lawsuits and cost millions to fund abortions.
- Unwanted: It changes our current abortion laws which are clear.

Keep our laws clear. Keep tax spending transparent. Keep courts out of abortion. Keep decisions between women and doctors. Vote NO.

²⁶ Reuters, “Abortion rights: Tracking state lawsuits two years after Roe reversal” (“Nearly two years after the U.S. Supreme Court overturned its landmark 1973 ruling in Roe v. Wade, litigation over abortion has exploded”), <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-abortion-rights-still-flux-two-years-after-ro-reversal-2024-06-17/>.

²⁷ For example, Silver State Hope Fund vs. The State of Nevada ex rel. Nevada Dept. of Health and Human Services, Division of Health Care Financing and Policy, (Case NO. A-23-876702-W), Eighth Judicial District Court Clark County, Nevada (lawsuit to force Nevada taxpayers to pay for more abortions as a result of the “yes” vote for Question 1 on the 2022 Ballot).

²⁸ See above Notes 10-11.

²⁹ See Notes 10-11.

³⁰ See Note 1.

³¹ See Notes 10-11.



The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Emily Mimnaugh (Chair) and Jason Guinasso. This argument can also be found at nvsos.gov.

**QUESTION 6****Rebuttal to Arguments Against Passage**

The people against this amendment are lying to scare voters. Nevadans know that a woman may end a pregnancy for many different reasons. We also know that women and doctors do not decide on an abortion later in pregnancy unless there is a serious reason, like a risk to her life or pregnancy.

And this amendment does nothing to change parental rights in Nevada, because we all want young people to get the support they need from those who love them when making decisions.

All this amendment does is ensure families – not politicians – are in charge of their own health care decisions and can make the right choice for their unique situations without government getting in the way.

When families are making difficult, personal medical decisions, one-size-fits all laws don't work. As bans across the country are already putting lives at risk, this amendment adds a permanent layer of protection for abortion rights in Nevada so that no matter who holds office in our state, these extreme bans cannot become law here.

Again, this amendment has no fiscal or tax implications.

The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Lindsey Harmon (Chair), Denise Lopez, and Bradley Schrager. This argument can also be found at nvsos.gov.





QUESTION 6

Fiscal Note**FINANCIAL IMPACT – CANNOT BE DETERMINED****OVERVIEW**

The Statewide Constitutional Initiative Petition – Identifier: C-05-2023 (Initiative) proposes to amend Article 1 of the Nevada Constitution by adding a new section, designated as Section 25, establishing a fundamental right to abortion performed or administered by a qualified health care practitioner until fetal viability, or when needed to protect the life or health of the pregnant patient, without interference from the state or its political subdivisions, unless the denial of that right is justified by a compelling state interest that is achieved by the least restrictive means.

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE INITIATIVE

Pursuant to Article 19, Section 2 of the Nevada Constitution, an initiative proposing to amend the Nevada Constitution must be approved by the voters at two successive general elections in order to become a part of the Constitution. If this Initiative is approved by voters at the November 2024 and November 2026 General Elections, the provisions of the Initiative would become effective on the fourth Tuesday of November 2026 (November 24, 2026), when the votes are canvassed by the Supreme Court pursuant to NRS 293.395.

If this Initiative is approved by the voters at the November 2024 and November 2026 General Elections, the Legislature may be required to evaluate existing laws governing abortion to determine whether they are in compliance with the provisions of this amendment. If it is determined that existing laws are not in compliance, it is possible that the amount of resources utilized by the State or local governments for the administration or enforcement of new abortion laws that would comply with these provisions may be affected.

However, because it is unknown what laws, if any, may not be in compliance with the provisions of the Initiative, nor is it known how the Legislature may revise existing laws if they



are determined to not comply with these provisions, the financial effect upon the State or local governments cannot be determined with any reasonable degree of certainty.

Prepared by the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau – August 1, 2024

[REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]





QUESTION 6

Full Text of the Measure

Explanation - Matter in italics is new; matter between brackets [~~omitted material~~] is material to be omitted.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS

Sec. 1. That a new section, designated Section 25, be added to Article 1 of the Nevada Constitution to read as follows:

NEW TEXT – TO BE ADDED TO THE NEVADA CONSTITUTION IF APPROVED

Sec. 1. All individuals shall have a fundamental right to abortion performed or administered by a qualified health care practitioner until fetal viability, or when needed to protect the life or health of the pregnant patient, without interference from the state or its political subdivisions. The right established by this section shall not be denied, burdened, or infringed upon unless justified by a compelling state interest that is achieved by the least restrictive means.

Sec. 2. As used in this section: A “compelling state interest” means an interest which is limited exclusively to the state’s interest in protecting, maintaining, or improving the health of an individual who is seeking abortion care that is consistent with accepted clinical standards of practice; and

“Fetal viability” means the point in pregnancy when, in the professional judgment of the patient’s treating health care practitioner, there is a significant likelihood of the fetus’ sustained survival outside the uterus without the application of extraordinary medical measures.

Sec. 2. Severability. If any part of this Act be declared invalid, or the application thereof to any person, thing or circumstance is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the remaining provisions or application of this Act which can be given effect without the invalid provision or application, and to this end the provisions of this Act are declared to be severable. This subsection shall be construed broadly to preserve and effectuate the declared purpose of this Act.



State Question – No. 7

Amendment to the Nevada Constitution

Initiative Petition C-02-2023



QUESTION 7

Condensation (Ballot Question)

Should the Nevada Constitution be amended to require voters to either present photo identification to verify their identity when voting in-person or to provide certain personal information to verify their identity when voting by mail ballot?

Yes ☐

No ☐





QUESTION 7

Explanation & Digest**Explanation:**

This initiative, if enacted, changes Article 2 of the Nevada Constitution to create a requirement for voters to provide identification before they receive a ballot.

Voters who vote in person at a polling place would need to show an ID that is current or that has not been expired for more than four years. If a voter is more than 70 years old, the identification could be expired for any length of time so long as it is otherwise valid.

The acceptable forms of identification include:

1. Nevada driver's license.
2. Identification card issued by the State of Nevada, any other State, or the US Government.
3. Employee photo identification card issued by the US government, Nevada government, or any county, municipality, board, authority, or other Nevada government entity.
4. US passport.
5. US military identification card.
6. Student photo identification card issued by a Nevada public college, university, or technical school.
7. Tribal photo identification.
8. Nevada concealed firearms permit.
9. Other form of government-issued photo identification that the Legislature may approve.

Voters who vote by mail ballot would need to include certain information so that election officials can use it to verify the voter's identity. That information includes:

1. The last four digits of their Nevada driver's license number.
2. If the voter does not possess a Nevada driver's license, the last four digits of their Social Security number.
3. If the voter has neither a Nevada driver's license or a Social Security number, the number provided by the county clerk when the voter registered to vote.



A “Yes” vote would amend Article 2 of the Nevada Constitution to require in-person Nevada voters to present certain identification and mail ballot voters to provide certain information in order to cast a legal ballot.

A “No” vote would keep the Nevada Constitution in its current form.

Digest:

Under current law, Nevada voters must only show identification in certain situations. These situations are rare and related to the method and timing of how they register to vote.

Currently only voters who register to vote by mail or computer, or who preregister to vote by mail or computer, and have not previously voted in an election for federal office in Nevada must provide identification. Additionally, state law requires voters who register to vote online less than 14 days before an election must also vote in person and present an identification and proof of residency.

Because voters approved the measure during the 2024 General Election, it will appear on the 2026 General Election ballot for a second vote. If approved there, the Nevada Legislature could create related laws through legislation during the 2027 Legislative Session and these changes would go into effect for the 2028 election cycle.



QUESTION 7

Arguments for Passage

Flaws in the nation’s registration and voting laws are being seen as creating a lack of confidence in election outcomes. Many people lost trust in how elections were run.



New voting technology raised worries about mistakes. More mail-in ballots also led to fears of fraud. A national bipartisan committee reviewed voting laws in many states. One of their recommendations in their report was to require Voter ID.³²

Requiring voters to show a photo ID before voting is a sensible and effective step to help make our elections more secure and to give people more confidence in the results.

In Nevada, many people support this idea. A recent poll shows 74% of Nevadans back it. This includes 68% of Independents, and 62% of Democrats.³³

As of 2024, 36 states have laws requiring photo ID for voting. There have been no major complaints in these states, and, contrary to what people were told would happen, turnout has not decreased.³⁴

Some argue that requiring a photo ID would unfairly impact minorities. They say that many minorities and low-income people don't have a photo ID. This is not true, because people need a photo ID to apply for a job, cash a check, use a credit card, apply for a loan, see a doctor, pick up a prescription, apply to college, buy alcohol or tobacco, get on a plane, check into a hotel, and vote in some union elections.

Nevada law requires those who don't register in person show identification and address the first time they vote. This doesn't have to be a photo ID. It can be a utility bill or some other official document that shows only their name and address. Also, this is only for the first time they vote. After that, there is no requirement to show an ID when voting.³⁵

Others say that voter fraud is rare. However, identity theft is a growing problem. Close elections also show the need for every vote to be legal. For example, a 2002 race in Nevada ended in a tie. Former U.S. Attorney Jennifer Arbittier Williams said, "If even one vote has been illegally cast...it diminishes faith in the process."³⁶

³² Building Confidence in U.S. Elections: Report of the Commission on Federal Election Reform, American University Center for Democracy and Election management, Washington DC, 2005, pp 9-20.

³³ Poll: Plurality of Nevada voters approve of Lombardo, majority support voter ID - The Nevada Independent <https://thenevadaindependent.com/article/poll-plurality-of-nevada-voters-approve-of-lombardo-majority-support-voter-id>

³⁴ Requiring Photo ID Has Little Effect on Voter Turnout, MU Study Finds | MU News Bureau (missouri.edu)

³⁵ Nevada Revised Statutes 293.272, 293.2725

³⁶ Eastern District of Pennsylvania | Former U.S. Congressman and Philadelphia Political Operative Pleads Guilty to Election Fraud Charges | United States Department of Justice <https://www.justice.gov/usao-edpa/pr/former-us-congressman-and-philadelphia-political-operative-pleads-guilty-election-fraud>.



Requiring a photo ID has no environmental, public health, safety, or welfare impact.

A photo ID requirement will help people trust our election system and make sure that every vote is valid. Vote "YES" on Question 7.

The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: David Gibbs (Chair), Chuck Muth, and David O'Mara. This argument can also be found at www.nvsos.gov.



QUESTION 7

Rebuttal to Arguments for Passage

The people who support Question 7 talk a lot about fear and mistrust. They've spent years trying to make us doubt our election system. But they can't show us even one time when voter ID would have actually made our elections safer in Nevada.

They don't tell you what bad things voter ID will stop because there haven't been any. They don't mention that identity theft has never changed any election here. They don't talk about how many Nevadans—people just like you and me—don't have the ID that Question 7 needs. They also don't explain how Question 7 helps people get those IDs. It doesn't.

They just say that other states have voter ID and people there like it. But remember, not everyone does things like cash checks, go to college, or fly on planes. These aren't like voting. Voting is a right we all have to choose our leaders. We shouldn't stop anyone who can vote from voting.

Think about this: you're more likely to get hit by a meteor than to find someone cheating by pretending to be someone else when they vote. Question 7 is a step back for our democracy.

The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Jennifer Fleischmann Willoughby (Chair), Daniel Bravo, and Jessica Rodriguez. This argument can also be found at nvsos.gov.





QUESTION 7

Arguments Against Passage

When it comes to voting rights, we shouldn't be leaving anyone behind. The ID requirements in Question 7 will mean fewer eligible people will cast ballots, while the new law would do nothing to prevent voter fraud.

The measure's supporters say they want more confidence in elections, but they don't tell you that impersonating someone else at the polls never happens. One study found that out of more than a billion votes cast, it happened 31 times—statistically zero.³⁷ You have a better chance of being struck by lightning.³⁸ Question 7 overreacts to a problem that simply does not exist.

And the risks of Question 7 are big. It does not ensure that Nevadans have the kinds of ID the law demands, IDs that cost money and take time to get. Voters living in rural or tribal communities will have to travel long distances to a DMV to receive an ID. In fact, almost 21% of all voting-age Americans don't have a valid driver's license with their current name and address.³⁹ In terms of Nevada's population, that would equal more than half a million people.⁴⁰

Studies have shown that strict voter ID laws reduce turnout among underserved communities and communities of color, making it harder to have their voices heard at the ballot box.⁴¹

Voter ID laws are also a waste of taxpayer dollars. Indiana, for example, spent over \$10 million to produce free ID cards between 2007 and 2010.⁴²

³⁷ Justin Levitt, "A Comprehensive Investigation of Voter Impersonation Finds 31 Credible Incidents Out of One Billion Ballots Cast," Washington Post, August 6, 2014, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2014/08/06/a-comprehensive-investigation-of-voter-impersonation-finds-31-credible-incidents-out-of-one-billion-ballots-cast/>.

³⁸ Brennan Center for Justice, January 31, 2017, <https://www.brennancenter.org/our-work/research-reports/debunking-voter-fraud-myth>

³⁹ "Who Lacks ID in America Today? An Exploration of Voter ID Access, Barriers, and Knowledge," Analyses Led by the Center for Democracy and Civic Engagement at the University of Maryland, <https://cdce.umd.edu/sites/cdce.umd.edu/files/pubs/Voter%20ID%20survey%20Key%20Results%20June%202024.pdf>

⁴⁰ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2023/03/31/2023-06717/estimates-of-the-voting-age-population-for-2022>

⁴¹ "Voter ID Laws: What Do We Know So Far?" Berkeley Public Policy, Goldman School Working Paper, March 19, 2023, <https://ghostarchive.org/archive/UiqiW>; "Who Do Voter ID Laws Keep from Voting?," Bernard L. Fraga and Michael G. Miller, The Journal of Politics, Vol. 84, No. 2, April 2022.

⁴² ACLU Fact Sheet On Voter ID Laws, August 2021, https://assets.aclu.org/live/uploads/document/aclu_voter_id_fact_sheet_-_final__1_.pdf



Question 7 will keep eligible Nevadans from voting, and won't improve election integrity. Vote no on laws that reduce participation in democracy, like Question 7.

Requiring a photo ID has no environmental impact.

The above argument was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens opposed to this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: Jennifer Fleischmann Willoughby (Chair), Daniel Bravo, and Jessica Rodriguez. This argument can also be found at "<http://www.nvsos.gov>".



QUESTION 7

Rebuttal to Arguments Against Passage

Opponents say that “impersonating someone else at the polls never happens.” But without a photo ID required, how can they be sure?

To try to back their argument, opponents cite an opinion column from Washington, DC, from over ten years ago. This was before Nevada adopted new election laws in 2021.

Opponents also claim that “21% of all voting-age Americans don’t have a valid driver’s license.” However, the same study shows that only 1% lack some other acceptable photo ID. The Legislature can find a way to help these voters, just like 36 other states have done.

Opponents say voter ID laws “reduce turnout” among minorities. But the same study also says that “the research is mixed on whether ID laws actually reduce turnout.”

A similar claim was made against Georgia’s photo ID law in 2021. Yet, Georgia’s Secretary of State reported that turnout in the 2022 general election set new records after the law took effect.⁴³

The bottom line is this: Requiring a Photo ID won’t make it harder to vote. It will make it harder to cheat. Vote YES on Question 7.

⁴³ <https://sos.ga.gov/news/record-breaking-turnout-georgias-runoff-election>



The above rebuttal was submitted by the Ballot Question Committee composed of citizens in favor of this question as provided for in NRS 293.252. Committee members: David Gibbs (Chair), Chuck Muth, and David O'Mara. This argument can also be found at nvsos.gov.



QUESTION 7

Fiscal Note

FINANCIAL IMPACT – YES

OVERVIEW

The Statewide Constitutional Initiative Petition – Identifier: C-02-2023 (Initiative) proposes to amend Article 2 of the Nevada Constitution by adding new Sections 1B and 1C, as follows:

- Section 1B would require the presentation of a specified form of identification in order to vote in person in an election in Nevada, either through early voting or on election day.
- Section 1C would require voters who submit a mail-in ballot to provide certain specified information in order to verify that voter's identity.

FINANCIAL IMPACT OF THE INITIATIVE

Pursuant to Article 19, Section 2 of the Nevada Constitution, an initiative proposing to amend the Nevada Constitution must be approved by the voters at two successive general elections in order to become a part of the Constitution. If this Initiative is approved by voters at the November 2024 and November 2026 General Elections, the provisions of the Initiative would become effective on the fourth Tuesday of November 2026 (November 24, 2026), when the votes are canvassed by the Supreme Court pursuant to NRS 293.395.

The provisions of the Initiative are anticipated to have a financial impact upon the State and local governments relating to procedures and systems utilized during the election process. The Secretary of State's Office has indicated that these provisions will require modifications to processes and systems related to check-in of voters at the polling location and verification of



mail-in ballots, as well as ensuring that the statewide voter registration system is modified to ensure that all data necessary to implement the provisions of the Initiative is captured.

Based on information provided by the Secretary of State's Office, the estimated costs to make these changes to voter systems in Nevada would be approximately \$6,750, and these changes would need to be made in time for the elections that would be held in the year 2028.

The provisions of the Initiative additionally allow the Legislature to determine additional forms of valid identification that can be used to verify identity for voting, aside from those already specified in the Initiative, which the Fiscal Analysis Division assumes will need to be created by the Legislature for those people who do not have or cannot obtain another form of allowable identification.

The Fiscal Analysis Division additionally assumes that this alternate form of voter identification will be provided to the voter at no cost, which means that the cost for these identification documents will be wholly borne by the State or by one or more local governments. However, the Initiative does not specify the form which these alternative identification documents must take, nor does it specify which agency or agencies (either at the state or local level) will be required to provide these documents. Additionally, it is unknown how many registered voters will not have one of the specified documents that would be acceptable to provide as proof of identity for in-person voting, who would need to be issued one of these alternative documents.

Thus, the financial effect upon the State or local governments relating to the issuance of an alternative identity document to those voters who will require such a document in order to vote in person cannot be determined with any reasonable degree of certainty.

Prepared by the Fiscal Analysis Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau – July 29, 2024





QUESTION 7

Full Text of the Measure

Explanation - Matter in *italics* is new; matter between brackets [~~omitted material~~] is material to be omitted.

THE PEOPLE OF THE STATE OF NEVADA DO ENACT AS FOLLOWS

Article 2 of the Nevada Constitution is hereby amended by adding thereto new sections to be designated as Section 1B and Section 1C, to read as follows:

NEW TEXT – TO BE ADDED TO THE NEVADA CONSTITUTION IF APPROVED

Sec 1B. Photo Identification. Each voter in Nevada shall present photo identification to verify their identity when voting in person at a polling place during early voting or on election day before being provided a ballot. To be considered valid, the photo identification must be current or expired for no more than four years. If the voter is 70 years old or more, the identification can be expired for any length of time, so long as it is otherwise valid.

Acceptable forms of identification include:

1. ***Nevada driver's license.***
2. ***Identification card issued by the State of Nevada, any other State, or the US Government.***
3. ***Employee photo identification card issued by the US government, Nevada government, or any county, municipality, board, authority, or other Nevada government entity.***
4. ***US passport.***
5. ***US military identification card.***
6. ***Student photo identification card issued by a Nevada public college, university, or technical school.***
7. ***Tribal photo identification.***
8. ***Nevada concealed firearms permit.***
9. ***Other form of government-issued photo identification that the Legislature may approve.***

Sec C. Voter Verification. Each voter in Nevada who votes by mail-in ballot shall enter one of the following in the block provided next to the voter's signature for election officials to use in verifying the voter's identity:



1. ***The last four digits of their Nevada driver's license number.***
2. ***If the voter does not possess a Nevada driver's license, the last four digits of their Social Security number.***
3. ***If the voter has neither a Nevada driver's license or a Social Security number, the number provided by the county clerk when the voter registered to vote.***

[REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]



Washoe County Advisory Ballot Question No. 1

THIS QUESTION IS ADVISORY AND NON-BINDING: Do you support an annual road use fee on all electric and hybrid passenger vehicles registered in Washoe County, which would be adjusted annually for inflation? These fees are intended to approximate the annual contribution that owners of gasoline powered vehicles pay per year in local fuel taxes to support local transportation infrastructure. The revenue from these fees would be dedicated to the Regional Transportation Commission of Washoe County subject to annual audits and public disclosure of spending, and the revenue would be used solely for the funding of transportation projects that will reduce traffic congestion, repair and maintain roads, improve air quality, and increase safety.

Yes ☐

No ☐

EXPLANATION & DIGEST

EXPLANATION – This is an advisory question only. Results may only be taken to the Nevada legislature for potential further action.

In Washoe County, owners of gasoline powered vehicles pay federal, state and local fuel taxes when they pay for fuel at the pump. This advisory question relates to the Washoe County local portion of the fuel tax. Owners of electric vehicles do not pay this Washoe County local fuel tax, or any of the other portions of the fuel tax, and owners of hybrid vehicles pay considerably less in these fuel taxes. Local fuel taxes paid at the pump by drivers in Washoe County fund the construction, maintenance and repair of existing and future roads in Washoe County. However, drivers of electric and hybrid vehicles who pay no or a fraction of local fuel taxes are still utilizing the roads of Washoe County and putting wear and tear on them without equally paying into the fund that ensures the roads are properly maintained and repaired.

Therefore, the advisory question is asking the voters of Washoe County if they support changing the law to authorize Washoe County to enact an annual fee on electric and hybrid passenger vehicles, which would be adjusted annually to account for inflation. The amount of the fee would be approximately the same amount that owners of gasoline powered vehicles pay annually in local fuel tax to be in parity with what gasoline powered vehicle owners pay towards the maintenance and repair of roads in Washoe County.

The authority to enact a fee as described in the advisory question can only be extended to Washoe County through the passage of legislation by the Nevada

State Legislature. Therefore, following the November 2026 General Election in which this advisory question will appear on the ballot for Washoe County voters, the earliest legislation could be contemplated to authorize the enactment of this fee will be the 2027 (84th) Nevada Legislative Session, which does not commence until the first Monday of February 2027.

A “Yes” vote would advise lawmakers that you approve the Nevada Legislature authorizing an annual fee as described in this explanation on electric and hybrid passenger vehicles in Washoe County.

A “No” vote would advise lawmakers that you do not approve the Nevada Legislature authorizing an annual fee as described in this explanation on electric and hybrid passenger vehicles in Washoe County.

This question is advisory in nature and does not place any legal requirement on the governing body, any member of the governing body, any officer of the political subdivision or the Nevada Legislature.

DIGEST – This advisory question, if approved, will not create, generate, increase or decrease any public revenue in any form if approved by the voters of Washoe County. The fee proposed by this question is advisory only and does not add to, repeal or change any existing state law or local ordinance. The fee proposed in the question for electric and hybrid vehicles is not currently enacted into, nor authorized by, any existing state law, local ordinance or otherwise in Nevada law.

Description of Anticipated Financial Effect

The fees outlined in this advisory question are not legally binding. As such, there is no direct anticipated financial effect tied to the voter approval of the advisory question. The advisory question itself would not automatically impose an annual fee on owners of electric vehicles nor an annual fee on the owners of hybrid vehicles. The Nevada Legislature would need to enact legislation to authorize the collection of the fees described in the advisory question, and because it is not known whether the Legislature may choose to implement the fees as described herein, or how the Legislature may choose to implement these fees, the anticipated financial effect cannot be determined with certainty at this time.

Should the Legislature authorize the imposition of the fees described herein on owners of electric and hybrid passenger vehicles, the average annual cost that is expected to be incurred by the affected users would depend on the value of the fee imposed on the electric and hybrid vehicle and the number of electric

and hybrid vehicles an individual has registered in Washoe County.

The fees described in the advisory question would be imposed on the affected users on an annual basis. The advisory question does not contemplate an expiration date or a specific time period for the imposition of the fees.

Should the Legislature authorize the imposition of the fees described herein, RTC Washoe does not expect or foresee additional expenses to be incurred to pay for the programs or services funded by the fees.

Arguments For / Against Passage

Argument Advocating for Approval of the Question: Everyone who uses Washoe County's roads, should contribute equally to their maintenance and creation.

Gasoline-powered vehicle owners help fund our local transportation system every time they purchase gas. Electric vehicles pay no fuel tax, while hybrid vehicles pay less because they use less fuel. Yet all vehicles rely on the same roads, bridges, and transportation systems.

Question 1 asks voters whether they support an annual road use fee for electric and hybrid passenger vehicles. The goal is to create equitability for all drivers and help fund the maintenance of our roads. The fee would be designed to approximate what gasoline-powered vehicle owners already contribute each year through local fuel taxes. It is a fairer approach in which all drivers contribute to the transportation infrastructure they use.

As electric and hybrid vehicles become more common, relying primarily on gasoline consumption to fund transportation becomes less sustainable. Doing nothing does not eliminate the cost of maintaining our roads. It increasingly shifts that responsibility to drivers of gasoline-powered vehicles.

Revenue from the proposed fee would be earmarked to RTC transportation projects that reduce congestion, repair and maintain roads, improve safety, and improve air quality.

Revenue generated would be subject to annual audits and public disclosure of spending, providing accountability for how these transportation dollars are used.

A yes vote supports a simple principle: if you use our roads, you should help pay for them. Vote yes on Question 1.

Submitted by the Argument Committee in Support of Passage of Streets and Highways Funding Advisory Question.

Argument Opposing the Approval of the Question: Vote no on WCQ1

Approve of the EV fee now and find out what it costs later. Its own backers admit the figure is undetermined. Our estimate is \$547 per vehicle, rising every year, and that is before the new EV taxes that Congress and the state are considering.

Washoe's Air Quality Management Division found that the revenue shortfall caused by electric vehicles is "not supported by data." Ironically, WCQ1 contradicts the county's own climate plan and its directive to "Reduce transportation emissions." <https://tinyurl.com/bdfpasnw>

Washoe's fuel tax is currently the highest in the nation at \$1.14 per gallon. That tax at least follows a fair use principle: the more you drive, the more you pay.

Whereas, WCQ1 treats a 1999 hybrid clunker driven 5,000 miles the same as a 2026 plug-in hybrid driven 30,000. Hybrid owners already pay at the pump and would now unfairly pay again. While visitors and out-of-county fleets pay nothing, and anyone paying attention will register elsewhere or buy a gas car.

We estimate this fee would close roughly 3.5 percent of the projected deficit. As such, it solves little, while penalizing neighbors who bought cleaner cars to save the planet in good faith.

Additionally, WCQ1 ignores improved electrical metering for charging EVs/hybrids.

Reform is needed but WCQ1 is a blank check. It forsakes a purchase made in good faith and is unfair to hybrid owners. It won't solve the county's budget shortsightedness, either.

Vote no.

Submitted by the Argument Committee in Opposition of Passage of Streets and Highways Funding Advisory Question.

Rebuttal to Argument Advocating for the Approval of the Question: Proponents call WCQ1 fair, but one "to be determined" flat fee on electric cars registered in Washoe, whether driven 1 mile or 30,000, and on hybrid owners who already pay at the pump, is grossly unfair.

Proponents ask you to adopt a philosophy, not a proposal. The amount is unknown, with no cap, no methodology, no expiration date, and no further vote on whatever the Legislature writes. Any road funding measure should be fair,

specific, accountable, and temporary.

Supporters warn against “doing nothing.” Better nothing than the wrong thing. Fairer alternatives include a charge on miles driven, a fee at charging stations, a tire fee. Your no vote sends a clear message to lawmakers to consider other options.

Proponents tout cleaner air while penalizing the vehicles delivering it. A no vote protects your wallet and your freedom to choose what you drive.

Submitted by the Argument Committee in Opposition to Passage of Streets and Highways Funding Advisory Question.

Rebuttal to the Argument Opposing the Approval of the Question: Question 1 is not a blank check; it is a fair update to an outdated road funding system. Gasoline-powered vehicles help maintain roads through fuel taxes, while electric vehicles use the same roads but contribute far less through that system. As more drivers switch to electric and hybrid vehicles, Washoe County needs a way to ensure all road users share responsibility.

Opponents unfortunately focus on uncertainty, including their \$547 fee and 3.5% deficit guesses, but these numbers aren't facts. Question 1 is advisory only, and any fee would require action by the Nevada Legislature.

Question 1 does not conflict with climate goals. Supporting lower-emission transportation and fairly funding safe roads can both be priorities.

Revenue would be dedicated to RTC transportation projects, with annual audits and public disclosure of spending.

Voting yes supports a fairer, sustainable funding structure for roads that all residents rely on, regardless of what powers their vehicle.

Submitted by the Argument Committee in Support of Passage of Streets and Highways Funding Advisory Question.