STATE OF NEVADA

Statewide Ballot Questions

2026

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

ISSUED BY

Francisco V. Aguilar

SECRETARY OF STATE

FRANCISCO V. AGUILAR
NEVADA SECRETARY of STATE

101 N Carson Street, Suite 3
Carson City, NV 89701
775.684.5708

Dear Nevada Voters:

This guide is intended to help you understand the statewide questions that will appear on your ballot – in simple, clear language. As your Secretary of State, this is one of the more important tasks that I have; it helps each of you understand what you are being asked to decide about Nevada's future.

This year is unique. There will only be two statewide ballot measures on the general election ballot this November. Both of these questions were on the ballot in 2024 and will appear exactly as they did then. None of the petitions that had been circulated leading up to this year's election received enough valid signatures to be included on the ballot.

The two ballot questions in this guide, along with the arguments "for" and "against" each, are easier to understand than some ballot measures have been in the past. That is because I asked my team to develop questions and explanations using plain language and avoiding complicated legal wording whenever possible. This was a deliberate effort to make the ballot more accessible, so voters can confidently understand their choices and what those choices mean for their lives.

As you read through the arguments "for" and "against" each question, I encourage you to do your own research with trusted sources. The more informed we are as voters about candidates, ballot questions and the electoral process, the better off our state will be.

Thank you for doing your part as a citizen and engaging with our democracy!

Respectfully,



Francisco V. Aguilar

SECRETARY OF STATE

> *For questions regarding the upcoming general election or the contents of the ballot question guide, please reach out to the Secretary of State's office at (775) 687-VOTE (8683) or nvelect@sos.nv.gov.*

NEVADA STATE CAPITOL
101 N. Carson Street, Suite 3
Carson City, Nevada 89701-3714

PAUL LAXALT BUILDING
COMMERCIAL RECORDINGS
401 N. Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701-4201

DOWNTOWN LAS VEGAS
70 E. Bonneville Ave.
Las Vegas, NV 89101

STATE OF NEVADA CAMPUS
1 State of Nevada Way, 3rd Floor
Las Vegas, Nevada 89119-4339

nvsos.gov

Statewide Ballot Questions

2026 Summary

Question No.	Subject	Originated	If Passed in 2026
1	None	None	None
2	None	None	None
3	None	None	None
4	None	None	None
5	None	None	None
6	Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to make abortion access an individual right	Constitutional Initiative petition C-05-2023	Amends the Nevada Constitution
7	Proposes to amend the Nevada Constitution to require voter ID	Constitutional Initiative petition C-02-2023	Amends the Nevada Constitution

[REMAINDER OF THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK]

CONTENTS

State Question: No. 1 – No. 5 ..... **5**

State Question - No. 6 ..... **6**

Condensation (Ballot Question) 6
Explanation & Digest 7
Arguments for Passage 9
Rebuttal to Arguments for Passage 10
Arguments Against Passage 12
Rebuttal to Arguments Against Passage 14
Fiscal Note 15
Full Text of the Measure 17

State Question - No. 7 ..... **18**

Condensation (Ballot Question) 18
Explanation & Digest 19
Arguments for Passage 20
Rebuttal to Arguments for Passage 22
Arguments Against Passage 23
Rebuttal to Arguments Against Passage 24
Fiscal Note 25
Full Text of the Measure 27

2026 County & City Ballot Questions Summary **29**

Churchill 29
Clark – Boulder City 29
Douglas 30
Lincoln 30
Washoe 30

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 Texas[2] to Florida[3] 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 protection[6] so that no matter who holds office in our state, extreme abortion bans[7] 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 it 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 million[13] on an abortion-funding package to pay for abortions[14] 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-roe-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]

2026 County & City Ballot Questions Summary

County/City	County/City Ballot Question	Clerk's Office Information
Churchill 	Shall Churchill County be authorized to levy an additional property tax rate for major fire equipment and apparatus purchases for the Fallon Churchill County Volunteer Fire Department in the amount of up to $0.03 per $100 assessed valuation for a period of up to six years commencing July 1, 2027 and ending June 30, 2033? The cost for the owner of a new $100,000 home is estimated to be up to $10.50 per year. If this question is approved by the voters, any property tax levied will be outside of the caps on a taxpayer's liability for property (ad valorem) taxes established by the legislature in the 2026 session.	**Website:** http://www.churchillcountynv.gov/ **Email:** elections@churchillcountynv.gov **Phone:** (775) 423-6028
Clark – Boulder City 	Should data center facilities be an approved land use within the Eldorado Valley Transfer Area outside of the Multi-species Habitat Conservation Easement?	**Website:** clarkcountynv.gov/vote **Email:** elinfo@ClarkCountyNV.gov **Phone:** (702) 455-VOTE (8683)
	Shall the City of Boulder City be authorized to expend available funds from the Capital Improvement Fund in an amount up to fifty percent (50%) of the most recent audited fiscal year's ending cash balance in the Capital Improvement Fund each year in place of the previously authorized amount of One Million ($1,000,000.00) per year for capital improvement projects for the benefit of Boulder City residents and visitors?	

County/City	County/City Ballot Question	Clerk's Office Information
Douglas 	Shall the current single Office of Douglas County Clerk-ex officio Treasurer be separated into two distinctly elected county offices creating the Office of County Clerk and Office of County Treasurer?	**Website:** www.GoVoteDouglas.com **Email:** elections@douglasnv.us **Phone:** (775) 782-9014
Lincoln 	GENERAL OBLIGATION SCHOOL BOND QUESTION: Shall Lincoln County School District be authorized to issue general obligation school bonds to finance the acquisition, construction, improvement and equipping of school facilities? District projections at the time the bonds are issued must indicate that issuance of the bonds will not result in an increase of the existing school bond property tax rate of 22.31 cents per $100 of assessed value. That portion of the taxes generated by this tax rate that is not needed for the payment of bonds and purposes related to bonds including the required reserves for bonds in any year may be used for capital projects for the District. If approved, this authorization will expire November 3, 2036.	**Website:** https://lincolncountynv.org/ **Email:** llloyd@lincolncountynv.gov **Phone:** (775) 962-8077
Washoe 	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.	**Website:** washoecounty.us/voters **Email:** electionsdepartment@washoecounty.gov **Phone:** (775) 328-3670

More information on county and city ballot questions can be found by contacting the county and/or city. Contact information can be found here.