

1
2
3 **INDEX OF EXHIBITS**
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Exhibit No.	Description
1	Deposition of William H. Sousa
2	Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiffs' Third Set of Request for Admission, Request for Admission No. 38
3	Email exchange between Virginia Valentine to Lisa Logsdon, CC 348684-686
4	Email from Lisa Logsdon to Joel Browning, forwarding email from Virginia Valentine, CC 385911-915
5	Plaintiffs' Fourth Supplement to Initial Disclosures
6	Defendant Clark County's Twenty-Fourth Supplemental Disclosure and Production of Documents and Witnesses Per FRCP 26(a)(1)

Exhibit 1

Deposition of William H. Sousa

McAllister et al., vs Clark County, et al.

Deposition of
WILLIAM H. SOUSA

April 29, 2025



702.8Rocket (702.876.2538)
www.RocketReporters.com

William H. Sousa

McAllister et al., vs Clark County, et al.

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

2 DISTRICT COURT OF NEVADA

3
4 LISA MCALLISTER, an)
5 individual; BRANDON)
6 SUMMERS, an individual;)
7 and JORDAN POLOVINA, an) CASE NO.
8 individual,) 2:24-cv-00334
9)
10 Plaintiffs,)
11)
12 vs.)
13)
14 CLARK COUNTY, political)
15 subdivision of the state)
16 of Nevada,)
17)
18 Defendant.)
19)
20)
21)
22)
23)
24)
25)

DEPOSITION OF WILLIAM H. SOUSA

Taken on Tuesday, April 29, 2025

At 8:51 a.m.

At 4362 W. Cheyenne Avenue

North Las Vegas, Nevada 89032

Reported by: JoAnn Melendez, CCR 370

1 of 2022 to -- yes, for that purpose. The actual
2 agreement developed a little bit later, but yes.

3 Q. Now, prior to that in July of 2022, you
4 were contacted by Mitch Langberg; is that correct?

5 A. Correct.

6 Q. Is your understanding that he was
7 contacting you on behalf of the Nevada Resort
8 Association?

9 A. That's my understanding.

10 Q. Now, is it correct that in July of 2022
11 he stated he wanted to engage you and Professor
12 Harold to work on supporting the stopping and
13 standing ban ordinance; is that correct?

14 A. Yes.

15 Q. To your knowledge, did the NRA engaging
16 professor Harold on this project?

17 A. No.

18 Q. Do you know why?

19 A. Well, neither of us were engaged by the
20 NRA. After that initial conversation, Tamara, Dr.
21 Harold, was just unable to commit to any engagement
22 at that point.

23 Q. Do you know why?

24 A. Yes.

25 Q. Can you tell me why?

1 CERTIFICATE OF WITNESS

2 PAGE LINE CHANGE REASON

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

* * * * *

16 I, William H. Sousa, Jr., witness herein, do
17 hereby certify and declare under penalty of perjury
18 that the within and foregoing transcript, including
any corrections stated above, is a true and correct
transcription of my testimony contained therein;
19 that I have read, corrected and do hereby affix my
signature to said deposition taken on Tuesday, April
29, 2025.

20

21 Executed this day of 2025,
22 at .
(City/State)

23

24 William H. Sousa, Jr., Witness

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 STATE OF NEVADA)
3 SS:
4 COUNTY OF CLARK)5 I, JoAnn Melendez, Certified Court
Reporter in the State of Nevada, do hereby certify:6 That I reported the taking of the
deposition of the witness, William H. Sousa, Jr.,
commencing on Tuesday, April 29, 2025, at 8:51 a.m.7 That prior to being examined, the witness
was by me duly sworn to testify to the truth.8 That the foregoing transcript is a true,
complete, and accurate transcription of the
stenographic notes of the testimony taken by me in
the matter entitled herein to the best of my
knowledge, skill, and ability.9 That prior to the completion of the
proceedings, the reading and signing of the
transcript was requested by the witness or a party.10 I further certify that I am not a
relative or employee of an attorney or counsel of
any of the parties, nor a relative or employee of an
attorney or counsel involved in said action, nor a
person financially interested in the action.11 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set
12 my hand in my office in the County of Clark, State
13 of Nevada, this 22nd day of May 2025.14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

JoAnn Melendez, CCR 370

Exhibit 2

Defendant Clark County's Responses to Plaintiffs' Third Set of Request for Admission, Request for Admission No. 38

1 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
2 District Attorney
2 **CIVIL DIVISION**
3 Bar No. 1565
3 By: **JOEL K. BROWNING**
4 Senior Deputy District Attorney
4 Bar No. 14489
5 By: **TIMOTHY ALLEN**
5 Deputy District Attorney
5 State Bar No. 14818
6 500 South Grand Central Pkwy., Suite 5075
6 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2215
7 Telephone (702) 455-4761
7 Fax (702) 382-5178
8 E-Mail: Joel.Browning@ClarkCountyDA.com
8 E-Mail: Timothy.Allen@ClarkCountyDA.com
9 *Attorneys for Defendant Clark County*

10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

11 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

12 LISA MCALLISTER, an individual; and)
13 BRANDON SUMMERS, an individual;)
13 JORDAN POLOVINA, an individual,)
14 Plaintiffs,) Case No: 2:24-cv-00334
15 vs.)
16 CLARK COUNTY, a political subdivision)
16 of the state of Nevada.)
17)
18 Defendant(s).)

DEFENDANT CLARK COUNTY'S
RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS'
THIRD SET OF REQUESTS FOR
ADMISSION

19
20 TO: Plaintiff LISA MCALLISTER; and
21 TO: Plaintiff BRANDON SUMMERS; and
22 TO: CHRISTOPHER M. PETERSON, Nevada Bar No. 13932
22 TATIANA R. SMITH, Nevada Bar No. 16627
23 **AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES UNION OF NEVADA**; and

24 MARGARET A. MCLETCHIE, Nevada Bar No. 10931
25 LEO S. WOLPERT, Nevada Bar No. 12658
25 **MCLETCHIE LAW**,
26 Plaintiff's counsel of record.

27 COMES NOW, Defendant CLARK COUNTY (hereinafter "Defendant"), through its
28 attorney STEVEN B. WOLFSON, District Attorney, and by JOEL K. BROWNING, Senior

1 Deputy District Attorney, and TIMOTHY ALLEN, Deputy District Attorney, and hereby
2 responds and objects to PLAINTIFFS' THIRD SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION,
3 pursuant to the requirements of NRCP 36, as follows:

4 **REQUEST FOR ADMISSION NO. 38:**

5 Admit that the Nevada Resort Association referred Dr. William H. Sousa to YOU to
6 carry out the study that is the subject of Dr. Sousa's Expert Report attached as Exhibit A to
7 Defendant Clark County's Initial Expert Disclosures submitted by YOU in this case.

8 **RESPONSE TO REQUEST ADMISSION NO. 38:**

9 Objection. The instant Request is vague and ambiguous as it pertains to the term
10 "Nevada Resort Association" as the Nevada Resort Association is a non-sentient organization.
11 Without waiving the foregoing objections and subject to the same, Clark County responds as
12 follows:

13 Clark County admits that Dr. William Sousa was referred by Mitch Langberg, Esq.,
14 formerly of Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck and retained by Nevada Resort Association, to
15 the County to perform the study that is the subject of Dr. Sousa's Expert Report attached as a
16 portion of Exhibit A to Defendant Clark County's Initial Expert Disclosures.

17 DATED this 24th day of December, 2025.

18 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
19 DISTRICT ATTORNEY

20 By: /s/ Joel K. Browning

21 JOEL K. BROWNING
Deputy District Attorney
Bar No. 14489

22 TIMOTHY ALLEN
Deputy District Attorney
Bar No. 14818

23 500 South Grand Central Pkwy., Suite 5075
24 Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2215
25 *Attorneys for Defendant*

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

2 I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Clark County District
3 Attorney and that on this 24th day of December, 2025, I served a true and correct copy of the
4 foregoing **DEFENDANT CLARK COUNTY'S RESPONSES TO PLAINTIFFS' THIRD**
5 **SET OF REQUESTS FOR ADMISSION** (United States District Court Pacer System or the
6 Eighth Judicial District Wiznet), by e-mailing the same to the following recipients. Service
7 of the foregoing document by e-mail is in place of service via the United States Postal Service.

Christopher M. Peterson
Tatiana R. Smith
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION OF NEVADA
4362 W. Cheyenne Ave.
North Las Vegas, NV 89032
Attorney for Plaintiffs
Peterson@aclunv.org
tsmith@aclunv.org
jsmith@aclunv.org

Margaret A. McLetchie
Leo S. Wolpert
MCLETCHIE LAW
602 South Tenth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
Attorney for Plaintiffs
efile@nvlitigation.com
maggie@nvlitigation.com
leo@nvlitigation.com

/s/Renee S. Albert
An Employee of the Clark County District
Attorney's Office – Civil Division

Exhibit 3

**Email exchange between
Virginia Valentine to
Lisa Logsdon, CC
348684–686**

From: [Langberg, Mitchell](#)
To: [Lisa Logsdon](#)
Cc: [Liesl Freedman](#); [Virginia Valentine](#)
Subject: Re: Pedestrian Flow ordinance
Date: Thursday, December 28, 2023 8:38:40 AM

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your DA account credentials.**

Yep. Give me a couple of minutes.

...

On Dec 28, 2023, at 8:37 AM, Lisa Logsdon
<Lisa.Logsdon@clarkcountyda.com> wrote:

Thanks – can you please send me the language?

From: Liesl Freedman <L8706F@LVMPD.COM>
Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2023 8:35 AM
To: Virginia Valentine <valentine@nevadaresorts.org>; Lisa Logsdon
<Lisa.Logsdon@clarkcountyda.com>
Cc: mlangberg@bhfs.com
Subject: Re: Pedestrian Flow ordinance

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your DA account credentials.**

Thank you.

[Get Outlook for iOS](#)

From: Virginia Valentine <valentine@nevadaresorts.org>
Sent: Thursday, December 28, 2023 8:33:47 AM
To: Liesl Freedman <L8706F@LVMPD.COM>; Lisa Logsdon
<Lisa.Logsdon@clarkcountyda.com>
Cc: mlangberg@bhfs.com <mlangberg@bhfs.com>
Subject: Re: Pedestrian Flow ordinance

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your LVMPD account credentials.**

Paul More has informed us that the union will not oppose the ordinance with Mitch's

amended language.

Thank you for your time, guidance, and input.

On Dec 26, 2023, at 1:08 PM, Lisa Logsdon
<Lisa.Logsdon@clarkcountyda.com> wrote:

I am available anytime tomorrow. Thanks Lisa

On Dec 26, 2023, at 2:59 PM, Virginia Valentine
<Valentine@nevadaresorts.org> wrote:

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your DA account credentials.**

Lisa and Liesl,

We've run in to some complications with Paul More's interpretations of the ordinance. Do you have time to jump on a call today or tomorrow, or your first available time?

Thank you,
Virginia

Virginia Valentine
President & CEO
Nevada Resort Association
10000 W. Charleston Blvd.
Suite 165
Las Vegas, NV 89135
Ph: 702-735-4888
<http://www.nevadaresorts.org/>
<image001.jpg>

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY & DISCLAIMER: The information contained in this email message is attorney privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient,

you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by calling (303) 223-1300 and delete the message. Thank you.

Exhibit 4

**Email from Lisa Logsdon to
Joel Browning, forwarding
email from Virginia Valentine,
CC 385911-915**

From: [Lisa Logsdon](#)
To: [Jeffrey Rogan](#); [Joel Browning](#)
Subject: FW: Bridge Ordinance - Legal Discussion
Date: Thursday, February 22, 2024 4:45:00 PM
Importance: High

Also, here is the NRA's attorney to the Culinary Union.

From: Virginia Valentine
Sent: Tuesday, December 12, 2023 4:29 PM
To: Ted Pappageorge ; pmore@msh.law
Cc: mlangberg@bhfs.com; Lisa Logsdon
Subject: Bridge Ordinance - Legal Discussion
Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from an **External Source**. Please **use caution** before opening attachments, clicking links, or responding to this email. **Do not sign-in with your DA account credentials.**

Ted and Paul,

Below is the legal discussion on the pedestrian bridge ordinance. Please consider this confidential.

Look forward to our call on Thursday.

Virginia
 Virginia Valentine
 President & CEO
 Nevada Resort Association
 10000 W. Charleston Blvd.
 Suite 165
 Las Vegas, NV 89135
 Ph: 702-735-4888

<http://www.nevadaresorts.org/>



Legal Discussion – Pedestrian Bridge Ordinance

The proposed Clark County pedestrian flow zone ordinance (the “Ordinance”) is consistent with established Ninth Circuit authority that pertains to regulations that do not target First Amendment activity but may have an impact on the time, place or manner of First Amendment activity. Understandably, it is important to everyone that the Ordinance is drafted so that it accomplishes the legitimate and important purposes driving its enactment (which implicate safety for workers, tourists, entertainers, and homeless people, alike) and meets applicable legal standards (to protect, among other things, First Amendment rights).

The Ordinance does not present the issues that exist in “homeless sweep” cases such as the 2022 Federal District Court case, *Coal. on Homelessness v. City & Cnty. of San Francisco*, 647 F. Supp. 3d 806 (N.D. Cal. 2022) (“COH”). Notably, this case is not binding precedent and is currently on appeal. COH is a trial court order granting a preliminary injunction. In the order, the court sets out the current standards that apply to government action that is targeted to clearing homeless people from public areas. Notably, COH was not a challenge to any particular law. Instead, it was a challenge to the way existing laws and policy were enforced in San Francisco. Further, the challenges were not

based on the First Amendment. Rather, the primary challenges argued that imposing penalties on homeless people “for the involuntary act of sleeping outside” violated the Eighth Amendment prohibition on cruel and unusual punishment **and** that the confiscation and destruction of homeless persons’ property was a violation of the Fourth Amendment prohibition on unreasonable searches and seizures.

For context, the San Francisco Police Department issued a bulletin that described four categories of existing laws that the City could enforce to address homeless encampments, including laws that prohibit sitting, lying, and lodging, as well as those that restrict encampments on public sidewalks. However, in order to act consistent with binding precedent protecting homeless people who have no alternate place to go, the bulletin provided that these laws could only be enforced after law enforcement secured and offered appropriate shelter or a “navigation center bed.” Under the terms of the bulletin, if there was no alternative available, no citation could be issued.

Plaintiffs claimed that the laws were being enforced against homeless people who had no alternatives. Plaintiffs claimed that the City was enforcing the laws against people who had not alternatives because, among other things, there was a shortage of available shelter beds in the City. Plaintiffs sought a preliminary injunction to prohibit the City from enforcing or threatening to enforce the laws (including by issuing “move along” instructions) unless and until unhoused residents had voluntary alternatives “such that they are not being punished for the involuntary state of homelessness.”

The standard for issuing a preliminary injunction does **not** require the plaintiff to demonstrate that they are more likely than not to prevail in the case. Only that there is a “fair chance of success” and, among other things, that the plaintiff is likely to suffer irreparable harm in the absence of an injunction. Courts apply a sliding scale—a stronger showing on one element (such as harm) may offset a weaker showing on another element.

In *COH*, the court was presented with undisputed evidence that there was a shortage of shelter beds. Though the City claimed it was not engaging in enforcement action until it complied with the bulletin by offering shelter before requiring any unhoused person to vacate public property, the court concluded that the City’s evidence was unconvincing because there was substantial evidence offered by plaintiffs showing direct violation of that policy. Ultimately, plaintiffs were not asserting that any law or official policy was invalid. Rather, the challenged the unconstitutional manner of enforcement that did not comply with the policy. The *COH* court noted that the Ninth Circuit has “made clear” that a city is not required to “allow anyone who wishes to sit, lie, or sleep on the streets...at any time and at any place.” The prohibition is against “prosecuting homeless people for sleeping in public if” there are more homeless individuals in the jurisdiction than there are shelter spaces.

But, here, the Ordinance is not an effort to criminalize sleeping in public. It is not that broad insofar as it does not govern any area other than the pedestrian bridges. And, it is not so targeted as it is not focused on homeless people who are sleeping in public. Rather, it governs anyone who stops on the bridges. Thus, the Ordinance is neither targeted to “homeless sweeps,” nor does it violate the Ninth Circuit law that the *COH* court relied on. In *Martin* (the case the *COH* court primarily relied on), the ordinance at issue criminalized “the simple act of sleeping outside on public property.” *Martin v. City of Boise*, 920 F.3d 584, 617-18 (9th Cir. 2019). It prohibited people from lodging or sleeping “in **any** building, structure or place, whether public or private, without permission” or “any of the streets, sidewalks, parks or public places as a camping place at any time.” *Id.* (emphasis in original). This was

impermissible because, “[a]s long as the homeless plaintiffs do not have a single place where they can lawfully be, the challenged ordinances, as applied to them, effectively punish them for something for which they may not be convicted under the Eighth Amendment—sleeping eating and other innocent conduct.” *Id.* at 617 (cleaned up).

Here, the Ordinance neither deprives homeless people of a “single place where they can lawfully be, nor does it criminalize sleeping in public. The case authority on the issue of homeless sweeps is inapplicable.

More on point to the Ordinance is the recent Ninth Circuit case, *Camenzind v. California Exposition & State Fair*, 84 F.4th 1102, 1109 (9th Cir. 2023). This case pertained to restrictions on where First Amendment speech activities could be conducted at a fairground. As relevant to the Ordinance, the issue was whether restricting First Amendment activities to designated “free expression zones” near the entrance of a fairground was constitutionally permissible. The free expression zones were near the fairground entrance in designated 6 ft. x 6 ft. spaces that were available on a first come, first served basis. In a part of the opinion that is not relevant here, the court determined that the fairground, itself, was not a public forum. But, under California’s law, the area outside the grounds were a public forum.

Having determined the outside area to be a public forum, the *Camenzind* court identified the limitation at issue as a “time, place, or manner” regulation of speech. The court explained the well-settled standard: “In a public forum, the government may impose reasonable restrictions on the time, place, or manner of protected speech. Time, place, or manner regulations must be content neutral, narrowly tailored to serve a significant governmental interest, and leave open ample alternative channels for communication of the message.” *Id.* at 1114 (internal citations and quotations omitted). The court determined that the restrictions limiting the plaintiff’s activity to the free expression zones was constitutionally sound. The reasoning is particularly apropos:

“Camenzind concedes that the Free Expression Zones are content-neutral because they are allocated on a first-come, first-served basis. The zones also serve a substantial government interest: public safety. In the exterior area, pedestrian activity is generally confined to narrow walkways to and from the parking areas. The Free Speech Zones serve the substantial state interest of preventing congestion in that area by confining distribution, selling, and fund solicitation activities to fixed locations. From the Free Speech Zones, Camenzind would have been able to distribute his coins while not blocking the narrow walkways and causing attendees to stray into adjoining parking lots with automobile traffic. The zones are adequately tailored because they do not burden substantially more speech than is necessary to achieve the government’s public-safety interest. The zones are positioned next to the entry gates—a prime location that provides speakers with exposure to virtually everyone who enters the fairgrounds. Camenzind points to nowhere in the exterior area that he would find preferable. We therefore conclude that Cal Expo’s Free Expression Zones were a permissible regulation of the time, place, and manner of Camenzind’s speech.” *Id.* (internal citations and quotations omitted).

Dr. Sousa’s report and other readily available information demonstrates that the government interest at stake with respect to the pedestrian bridges is stronger than in *Camenzind*. Addressing the same category of interest—safety—the bridges also present confined, narrow walkways. Here, they are the exclusive means of crossing Las Vegas Boulevard in many areas. Where the government interest in *Camenzind* appears to have been limited to the **anticipated** safety issues of congestion, the Sousa report reveals actual issues experienced on the bridges, including that disorder and crime have been statistically disproportionate on the bridges as compared to the rest of the sidewalk

system. There have been actual incidents of crowd surge during perceived emergencies on the bridges. And, like in *Camenzind*, there is the anticipation of serious safety issues that could occur if the use of the bridges is not confined to free-flowing pedestrian traffic. And, while the safety issues are obviously primary, the Ordinance serves additional government interests that are recognized to be sufficiently substantial to support time, place or manner restrictions on First Amendment Activity. For example, aesthetics have been recognized as a legitimate and substantial government interest. *See, e.g., Members of City Council v. Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U.S. 789, 805 (1984) ("[T]he state may legitimately exercise its police powers to advance esthetic values."); *One World One Family Now v. City & County of Honolulu*, 76 F.3d 1009, 1013 (9th Cir. 1996) ("[C]ities have a substantial interest in protecting the aesthetic appearance of their communities by 'avoiding visual clutter.'"). Indeed, "municipalities have a weighty, essentially esthetic interest in proscribing intrusive and unpleasant formats for expression." *Members of City Council of City of Los Angeles v. Taxpayers for Vincent*, 466 U.S. 789, 806 (1984). In *One World*, the Ninth Circuit endorsed three separate legitimate and substantial government interests, all of which are at issue here: "maintaining the aesthetic attractiveness" of the tourist area; "promoting public safety and the orderly movement of pedestrians;" and "protecting the local merchant economy." *One World*, 76 F.3d at 1012. There can be no dispute about whether the Ordinance is content neutral. By its terms, it prohibits all stopping on the bridges. Unlike *Camenzind*, which prohibited First Amendment expression outside of the free expression zones, the Ordinance allows **moving** First Amendment activity on the bridges. The Ordinance does not discriminate based on viewpoint.

The Ordinance does not burden any more speech than is necessary. Again, it allows for **more** speech than in *Camenzind*. Further, like in that case, the limitations of the Ordinance allow ample alternative channels for communication. Indeed, whereas *Camenzind* was limited to small free expression zones, the Ordinance does not impact stationary First Amendment activity anywhere but on the bridges. Those who engage in such activity at the surface level sidewalks near the bridges will have "exposure to virtually everyone" who access the bridges. The required narrow tailoring of a government regulation does not require the restriction to be the least intrusive means of achieving the stated government interest. It is enough as long as it "'promotes a substantial government interest that would be achieved less effectively absent the regulation' and the regulation is not 'substantially broader than necessary to achieve the government's interest.'" *Honolulu Wkly., Inc. v. Harris*, 298 F.3d 1037, 1045 (9th Cir. 2002) (quoting *Ward v. Rock Against Racism*, 491 U.S. 781, 799–800 (1989)).

Any concerns about enforcement have been addressed by LVMPD. They are committed to applying the Ordinance equally to everyone. They have also made clear that their intent is to first request compliance by anybody that is violating the Ordinance—only escalating to citations when someone who had been informed about their obligation to keep moving is defiant and refuses.

Finally, the Ordinance will not have an improper impact on picketing activity protected under the National Labor Relations Act. The Ordinance does not purport to prevent protestors from carrying signs or marching because, by definition, marchers are moving. As in other contexts, picketing activity that results in obstructing or interfering with free ingress or egress on public sidewalks can be regulated. *See Cameron v. Johnson*, 390 U.S. 611, 625 (1968). Here, there is no issue unless picketing activity causes other people to stop on the bridge because it creates the conditions leading to the very safety issues that give rise to the Ordinance. The goal (and effect) of the Ordinance is not to inhibit picketing activity. In fact, much more restrictive laws that **target** picketing have been approved by the Ninth Circuit. For example, a San Diego ordinance that prohibited picketing within

300 feet of a residential dwelling was found to meet the constitutional parameters of a time, place or manner restriction. *See Klein v. San Diego Cnty.*, 463 F.3d 1029, 1031 (9th Cir. 2006). The pedestrian bridge Ordinance is **less restrictive** because it does not prohibit picketing in any place. It only requires that such picketing not be stationary or cause other people to stop on the bridges. And even that limitation does not exist just below the bridges—much less than the 300 feet at issue in *Cameron*.

The Ordinance is carefully (and simply) crafted to: 1) not prohibit First Amendment activity, as long as it is moving, 2) ensure that any impact on First Amendment activity is limited, leaving ample opportunity for other First Amendment activity close to the bridges and with access to a nearly identical audience, 3) make the bridges safer for Strip workers and tourists, 4) make the bridges safer for entertainers, and 5) reduce the risk of serious harm in the event of an emergent crowd rush—which, incidentally, would be most dangerous to those that are sitting or lying on the bridges.

Mitchell J. Langberg

Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck, LLP

100 North City Parkway, Suite 1600

Las Vegas, NV 89106

702.464.7098 tel

mlangberg@bhfs.com

STATEMENT OF CONFIDENTIALITY & DISCLAIMER: The information contained in this email message is attorney privileged and confidential, intended only for the use of the individual or entity named above. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copy of this email is strictly prohibited. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately by calling (303) 223-1300 and delete the message. Thank you.

Exhibit 5

Plaintiffs' Fourth Supplement to Initial Disclosures

M
d r M
d r
d r
AMERICAN CAN COMPANY BERTES
N N NEVADA

r
r r
r
M M
d r
d r
MCLETCHIE LAW
r

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

NITED STATES DISTRCT C RT
DISTRCT NEVADA

M MM d d d d | **Case. No. 224c 334 JAD NJ**
d d d d | **PLA NT S' RTH**
d d d d | **S PPLEMENT N T AL**
d d d d | **D SCL S RES**

M

MM

d

PENTALWTNESSES

r r d ddr d
r r d r r r
r d r r

Plaintiffs

M r
d

r
d
M

r **bolded font.**

M	r	r	d	d	r	d
d	r	rr	d	r	d	
		r	d			
	r					
d	M	r	d			
r	d	r	rr	d	r	d
d		d	r	d	r	r
		rd		d		
	r					
d	M	r	d			
rd		r	d	r	d	r
d		d	r	rr	d	r

Other Plaintiffs' Witnesses

M M M M M M M M M
r d r r r r r r r r r
rd r r r r r r r r r

d r r d r
 M r M rr r r r r r r
 r r r r r r r r r r r
 r r d r r r r d r d d r
 r r M r r r r r r r r r
 d r r r r r r r r r d r
 r d r d r d r d r d r
 r d r d r r d r d r d
 r d r d r r d r d r d

8. Samantha roner
c o ACL of Ne ada
4362 W. Cheyenne A e.
North Las Vegas, Ne ada 89149

Samantha roner is expected to testify regarding her personal knowledge of the results and process of her in person investigation of First Amendment activity on multiple pedestrian bridges on June 28, 2025, and July 5, 2025.

**9. Andrea Rios
c/o ACL of Nevada
4362 W. Cheyenne Avenue
North Las Vegas, Nevada 89149**

Andrea Rios is expected to testify regarding her personal knowledge regarding a stop and citation she received on the Pedestrian Bridges.

**1. Alleciana Michele Mirabelli
c/o Stephen Stubbs
626 S. 3rd Street
Las Vegas, Nevada 89101**

Alleciana Michele Mirabelli is expected to testify regarding her personal knowledge regarding a stop and citation she received on the Pedestrian Bridges

Clark County Witnesses

d
r
r
r d r
d
r r r r r
r d r
d
d r
r d
d
r d r
r r
r d
d
r d r
d
r d r
d

M d d r d r d
r d d r rr d r
d

r r r r r r r r r r r

Mr d d d d d d d
d r r d d r rr d r r d
M d r r r d r rd r

Mr r d d d r

r r r
r r r
r d r
d

r d d r d
r d d r rr d
r d

	M	rd					
r			r	r			r
	r			r		r	
r	d	r					
		d					

r M rd d d r d
 r d d r rr d
r d
 r
r r r r r
r d r r
r d r d
r r d d r d
r d d r rr d
r d
M
r r r
r r r r
r d r d
r d d r r d
r d r d d r
r r r d r d r d
rr d r d
M r
r r r r
r r r r

r d r
d

r M r d d r d r rr d
r d

r r r r
r d r d

r d d r d rr d
r d

Kimberly Horn

d r d
r d

r r r r d r d d r
r r r d r d r r
d r d r d d r
r r

The Nevada Resort Association Witnesses

M r r d r d
r r d r

Mr r r d r d
d r d

d r d r d
d r r d r d
M r d r d d
d r d r d

Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department Witnesses

d r d r d
M r M r r
M r r d rd
r d r r d r r M
r d r r d r d
M M M r r r
M r r d d
r M M d d de elopment,
d r d r d
d r rr d r d
dr M r r r d r r
M r r d

d r r dr d r d de elopment,
d r rr d r d

M r M r d r
M r d

d r d de elopment,
d r rr d r d

r d M r r r
M r d

d

M r d d r d r r d r rd

r r M r r r M
M r d

d

M r r d d d r r d d r r d

M r M r d
M r d

r r d r d d

r r r r r d

r r r d r r r

r r M r r rd r d

r r d r r r d

r r M r r rd r d

r r d r r r d

r r M r r rd r d

r r d r r r d

r r M r r rd r d

r r d r r d d
r r r r r r d
r r r r d r r
r r r r M r r rd r d
r r r r r r d d
r r r r r r d r r r d
r r r r r r d r r r d
r r r r r r d r r r d
r r r r r r d r r r d
r M r r r r d d d
r r r r r r d r r r d
r M r r r r d r r r d
r r d d d d d d d

r r r r r r d

r	r	r
M r	rd	d
M r		

r d r r r d
r r r d r r d
r r r d r r

r	r	r
M	r	r
M	r	rd
	d	

r r d r r r d d
r r r d r r r d

r
 $M\ r$
 $M\ r$
 d

r d r r r d d
r r r d r r d
r r r d r r d

r
 $M\ r$
 $M\ r$
 rd
 d

r d r d r d

r r r d r r

r r r M r r rd r

r r r d r r r d

r r r M r r rd r d

r r r d r r r d

r r r M r r rd r d

r r r d r r r d

r r r M r dr r rd r d

r r r dr d r r r d

r r
M r
M r rd
d

r d r d
r r r r r d
r d r r r r d

r r r r r
M r r r rd
M r d
d

r r r d r r r d
r r r r r r r d

r r d
M r r rd r
M r d

r d d r r r d
r r r d r r r d

r
M r
M r rd r
d

r d r d
r r r r r d

r r r d r r

. **D C MENTS**

r dd d d r rd r
d r r r r r r d r
d r d r r r r r r d
d d r r r r rd r

DESCR PT N	BATES EC N MBER S
r M r	M M
r r d r	M M
r M M r d	M M
r M r M rr r r r r	M M
r M rr r r M d d	M M
r r r d	M M
r r r r r r r r d d d d d d d d	M
r rd d r M	M
r r d r M M M	M M
r d r d	M M
r d r d	M M
M r r r	M M
r r r d r	M M
r rr d r M d r	M
r rd r r r r	M M
M r rr r	M
M r rr r	M M
M r rr r	M M
M r rr r	M M
M r rr r	M

M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	r	r	M	M
M	d	r	M	M
M	d	r	M	
M	r	r	M	

M d r rr	M M
M r d r	M
M r	M
M d r r d r	M
M r d d r d	M
M d r r d	M
M d r r d	M M
M d r r d r d	M M
M r	M M
M r r	M M
M d	M
M d	M M
M r r	M M
imley Horn Signed 5.24.22 Professional Engineering Services Contract	M S 1325 – M S 1349
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Progress Reports	M S 135 – M S 13 5
imley Horn Count Location Pictures	M S 13 6 – M S 1392
imley Horn Count Location Maps	M S 1393 – M S 1398
imley Horn Handwritten Bridge Measurements	M S 1399 – M S 14
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Data Collection Training NP Descriptions	M S 14 1
imley Horn Pedestrian Volume Comparisons	M S 14 2 – M S 14 3
imley Horn Excel Calculations of NP Data	M S 14 4 – M S 1433
imley Horn NP Data Collection Maps	M S 1434 – M S 1 26
imley Horn NP Data Collection Training Agenda	M S 1 2
imley Horn NP Data Collection Training PowerPoint	M S 1 28 – M S 1 6
imley Horn NP Data Collection Maps blank	M S 1 61 – M S 1 2
imley Horn Email Correspondence Draft 2 22 Las Vegas Boulevard Pedestrian Study	M S 1 3 – M S 1
imley Horn Email Correspondence Data Collection follow up	M S 1 8 – M S 1 8
imley Horn Email Correspondence Pedestrian Study Camera Access	M S 1 88
imley Horn Email Correspondence Strip Pedestrian Study	M S 1 89 – M S 1 91
imley Horn 2 22 Pedestrian Study Draft Conclusions	M S 1 92 – M S 1 8
imley Horn Email Correspondence pdate on the 2 22 Clark County Pedestrian Study	M S 18 1
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Exhibit A	M S 18 2 – M S 18 5
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Exhibit A 16.13	M S 18 6 – M S 1811
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Exhibit B	M S 1812 – M S 182

imley Horn Pedestrian Study Exhibit C	M S 1821 – M S 1884
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Exhibit D	M S 1885
imley Horn Pedestrian low one Sign Mockup	M S 1886
imley Horn NP Data Collection Training PowerPoint 6.22	M S 188 – M S 1919
imley Horn Pedestrian Study Document Request Letter	M S 192
imley Horn Pedestrian and Mobile Billboard Study Letter	M S 1921
imley Horn inal 2 24 Pedestrian Study	M S 1922 – M S 2134
imley Horn Pedestrian Easements 1 of 2	M S 2135 – M S 2835
imley Horn Pedestrian Easements 2 of 2	M S 2836 – M S 2993
imley Horn Pedestrian Count Data folder	M S 2994
Recording Rios Stop on Pedestrian Bridge	M S 2995
BWC Polo ina Stop on Pedestrian Bridge	M S 2996
BWC Polo ina Stop on Pedestrian Bridge	M S 299
Summers mage Disclosures	M S 2998 – M S 3 8
Summers 6.29.2 19 Stop on Pedestrian Bridge	M S 3 9
Polo ina nstagram A	M S 3 1
Polo ina nstagram B	M S 3 11
Polo ina nstagram C	M S 3 12
Polo ina nstagram D	M S 3 13
Polo ina Video A	M S 3 14
Polo ina Video B	M S 3 15
Polo ina Video C	M S 3 16
Polo ina Video D	M S 3 1
Polo ina Video E	M S 3 18
Summers Video A	M S 3 19
Summers Video B	M S 3 2
Summers Video C	M S 3 21
Summers Video D	M S 3 22
Summers Video E	M S 3 23
Summers Video	M S 3 24
Summers Video	M S 3 25
Polo ina mage A	M S 3 26
Polo ina BWC 25 5 22 A	M S 3 2
Polo ina BWC 25 5 22 B	M S 3 28
Summers BWC 18 9 3 A	M S 3 29
Summers BWC 18 9 3 B	M S 3 3
Summers BWC 18 9 3 C	M S 3 31
Summers BWC 19 6 29	M S 3 32
Summers Police nteraction 13 14	M S 3 33
Summers Police nteraction 18 9 3 A	M S 3 34
Summers Police nteraction 18 9 3 B	M S 3 35

Summers Police nteraction 19 6 29	M S 3 36
Summers Police nteraction 19 1 5	M S 3 3
Summers Video 19 11 24 A	M S 3 38
Summers Video 19 11 24 B	M S 3 39
Polo ina Citation Packet 25 5 22	M S 3 4 – M S 3 46
Summers Citation Packet 11 3	M S 3 4 – M S 3 49
Summers Citation Packet 13 4 5	M S 3 5 – M S 3 52
Summers Citation Packet 13 14	M S 3 53
Summers Citation Packet 18 9 3	M S 3 54 – M S 3 56
Summers Citation Packet 19 6 29	M S 3 5 – M S 3 6
Summers Citation Packet 19 1 5	M S 3 61 – M S 3 63
Summers Citation Packet 19 11 24	M S 3 64 – M S 3 6
Summers CRB Complaint 18 9 3	M S 3 68 – M S 3
Documents produced by Third Party LVMPD	LVMPD 296
	LVMPD 596

. C MP TAT N DAMA ES

_____ r _____ d d d
d dd r d

V. NS RANCE A REEMENTS

r r r r r r

d r

/s/Margaret A. McLetchie
M M d r d r
MCLETCH E LAW

M d d r
M d r d r

ACL of Ne ada

Attorneys for Plaintiffs

CERT CATE SERV CE

r r

d

r r

r

M

r d rr

r d dd

r

r d d

ddr

d

r

r

r

r

r r

r

d

r

r r

r d

d

M

Exhibit 6

Defendant Clark County's

Twenty-Fourth Supplemental

Disclosure and Production of

Documents and Witnesses Per

FRCP 26(a)(1)

1 STEVEN B. WOLFSON
2 District Attorney
3 **CIVIL DIVISION**
4 Bar No. 1565
5 By: **JOEL K. BROWNING**
6 Deputy District Attorney
7 Bar No. 14489
8 By: **TIMOTHY ALLEN**
9 Deputy District Attorney
State Bar No. 14818
500 South Grand Central Pkwy., Suite 5075
Las Vegas, Nevada 89155-2215
Telephone (702) 455-4761
Fax (702) 382-5178
E-Mail: Joel.Browning@ClarkCountyDANV.gov
E-Mail: Timothy.Allen@ClarkCountyDANV.gov
Attorneys for Defendant Clark County

10
11 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
12
13 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

14 LISA MCALLISTER, an individual; and)
15 BRANDON SUMMERS, an individual,)
16 JORDAN POLOVINA, an individual,)
17 Plaintiffs,)
18 vs.)
19 CLARK COUNTY, a political subdivision)
of the state of Nevada.)
Defendant(s).)
Case No: 2:24-cv-00334
**DEFENDANT CLARK COUNTY'S
TWENTY-FOURTH
SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE
AND PRODUCTION OF
DOCUMENTS AND WITNESSES
PER FRCP 26(a)(1)**

20 COMES NOW Defendant CLARK COUNTY, through its attorney STEVEN B.
21 WOLFSON, District Attorney, by JOEL K. BROWNING, Senior Deputy District Attorney
22 and by TIMOTHY ALLEN, Deputy District Attorney hereby make its Twenty-Fourth
23 Supplemental Disclosure and Production of Documents as required by Rule 26(a)(1) of the
24 Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. New disclosure in **bold**.

25 / / /

26 / / /

27 / / /

28

List of Persons with knowledge:

1. Lisa McAllister, Plaintiff
2. Brandon Summers, Plaintiff
3. Jordon Polovina, Plaintiff
c/o Christopher M. Peterson
Tatiana R. Smith
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION OF NEVADA
4362 W. Cheyenne Ave.
North Las Vegas, NV 89032 702-366-1226

10 JORDAN POLOVINA, LISA McALLISTER and BRANDON SUMMERS, as the
11 Plaintiffs, are expected to testify to each of their knowledge of the events described in the
12 Complaint.

4. William H. Sousa, Ph.D., Professor and Director
Criminal Justice Department
University of Nevada Las Vegas
4505 S. Maryland Parkway, Mail Code 5009
Las Vegas, NV 89154 702-895-0247

16 WILLIAM H. SOUSA, Ph.D., as the writer of the report titled: *Questions Related to*
17 *Public Safety on Pedestrian Bridges*, he is expected to testify regarding the findings
18 documented in the above-referenced report.

5. Kaizad Yazdani, Deputy Director
Clark County Public Works
c/o Deputy District Attorney Joel K. Browning
500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 5075
Las Vegas, NV 89155-2215 702-455-4761

22 KAIZAD YAZDANI, as a Deputy Director of Clark County Public Works, is
23 expected to testify regarding the claims asserted in the Complaint, and to Clark County
24 policies and procedures pertaining to this lawsuit.

6. Carlos Moreno Departmental Systems Administrator
c/o Deputy District Attorney Joel K. Browning
500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 5075
Las Vegas, NV 89155-2215 702-455-4761

1 CARLOS MORENO, as the Department System Administrator of Clark County
 2 Public Works, is expected to testify regarding the claims asserted in the Complaint, and to
 3 Clark County policies and procedures pertaining to this lawsuit.

4 7. FED R. CIV. P. 30(b)(6)
 5 CLARK COUNTY
 6 c/o Deputy District Attorney Joel K. Browning
 7 500 S. Grand Central Parkway, Suite 5075
 Las Vegas, NV 89155-2215 702-455-4761

8 The Fed R. 30 Civ. P. 30(b)(6) witness(es) representing Clark County are expected to
 9 testify to regarding the government interest underlying the enactment of Chapter 16.13 of the
 10 Clark County Code as determined from objective indicators like the face of the ordinance,
 11 facts surrounding the enactment of the ordinance, **the legislative history of the proposed**
 12 **amendment to Chapter 16.11 in 2022 and the enactment of 16.13 in 2024**, the stated effect
 13 of the ordinance, and the stated purpose of the ordinance.

14
 15 8. FED R. CIV. P. 30(b)(6)
 16 Kimley-Horn
 17 c/o Nicole Thal, Esq.
 4637 Chabot Drive Suite 300 Pleasanton, CA 94588

18 The Fed R. 30 Civ. P. 30(b)(6) witness(es) representing Kimley-Horn is expected to
 19 testify to regarding the deposition testimony offered in this case on or around August 18, 2025,
 20 and the documents produced in response to the subpoena duces tecum served by Plaintiffs.

21 **Defendant CLARK COUNTY reserves the right to call any witnesses identified**
 22 **by the Plaintiff or any other party up to the time of trial.**

23 **Documents Produced Herewith:**

24 1. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
 25 Meeting, November 21, 2023, item number 68 with audio and video
CC 001 to CC 032

26 2. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
 27 Meeting, December 5, 2023, item number 36 with audio and video
CC 033 to CC 070

1 3. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
2 Meeting, January 2, 2024, item number 38 with audio and video
3 **CC 071 to CC 126**

4 4. Letter dated December 4, 2023, from Nevada Resort Association to the Board
5 of County Commissioners
6 **CC 127 to CC 131**

7 5. Report titled: *Questions Related to Public Safety on Pedestrian Bridges*
8 **CC 132 to CC 139**

9 6. Amended Title 16 of the Clark County Code approved, January 2, 2024, to add
10 Chapter 16.13
11 **CC 140 to CC 145**

12 7. Lisa Logsdon's e-mails with attachment regarding Chapter 16.13
13 **CC 146 to CC 252 (please see privilege log)**

14 8. 1994 Highway Capacity Manual Special Report 209
15 **CC 253 to CC 823**

16 9. 1994 LV Boulevard S Pedestrian Walkway Study
17 **CC 824 to CC 973**

18 10. 2012 Pedestrian Study Las Vegas Boulevard
19 **CC 974 to CC 1163**

20 11. 2015.12.15 Las Vegas Boulevard Board Presentation
21 **CC 1164 to CC 1206**

22 12. 2015 Pedestrian Study Las Vegas Boulevard Update
23 **CC 1207 to CC 1383**

24 13. 1970 to 2023 Statistics Las Vegas Convention and Visitors Authority
25 **CC 1384**

26 14. 2023 Pedestrian Bridge Maps
27 **CC 1385 to CC 1389**

28 15. William H. Sousa Invoices
29 **CC 1390 to CC 1396**

30 16. Agreement Between Clark County and Dr. Sousa for Public Safety and
31 Disorder Analysis on Pedestrian Overpasses
32 **CC 1394 to CC 1404**

- 1 17. Unofficial Transcript of Board of County Commissioners Meeting, January 2,
2 2024, item number 38
CC 1405 to CC 1418
- 3 18. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
4 Meeting, April 19, 2022, item number 59
CC 1419 to CC 1427
- 5 19. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
6 Meeting, May 3, 2022 item number 65 including video
CC 1428 to CC 1437
- 8 20. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
9 Meeting, June 21, 2022 item number 76
CC 1438 to CC 1446
- 10 21. LVCVA Las Vegas Visitor Profile Study 2023
CC 1447 to CC 1499
- 12 22. LVCVA Matrix of Las Vegas Visitor Segments 2023
CC 1500
- 14 23. Excel Spreadsheet titled LVCVA Summary of Monthly Tourism Indicators for
15 Las Vegas for calendar Year 2023
CC 1501
- 16 24. Excel Spreadsheet titled LVCVA Summary of Monthly Tourism Indicators for
17 Las Vegas for calendar Year 2024
CC 1502
- 19 25. Transform Clark County Master Plan, adopted November 17, 2021
CC 1503 to CC 1724
- 21 26. Appendices to Transform Clark County Master Plan
CC 1725 to CC 2078
- 22 27. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
23 Meeting, September 8, 1994, item number 18
CC 2079 to CC 2464
- 25 28. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
26 Meeting, April 15, 2008, item number 95
CC 2465 to CC 2470

1 29. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
2 Meeting, November 16, 2010, item number 56
CC 2471 to CC 2477

3 30. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
4 Meeting, April 19, 2016, item number 49
CC 2478 to CC 2492

5 31. Certified copy of documentation regarding Board of County Commissioners
6 Meeting, November 1, 2016, item number 32
CC 2493 to CC 2496

8 32. Pedestrian Bridge and Sidewalk Exhibits provided by Clark County GIS
CC 2497 to CC 2515

10 33. Pedestrian Bridge Plans for Flamingo provided by Clark County GIS
CC 2516 to CC 2657

11 34. Pedestrian Bridge Plans for Harmon provided by Clark County GIS
CC 2658 to CC 2935

13 35. Pedestrian Bridge Plans for Park provided by Clark County GIS
CC 2936 to CC 3086

15 36. Pedestrian Bridge Plans for Spring Mountain provided by Clark County GIS
CC 3087 to 3281

17 37. Pedestrian Bridge Plans for Tropicana provided by Clark County GIS
CC 3282 to CC 3910

19 38. 66203 NOC Code for CCC 16.13.030
CC 3911 to CC 3912

20 39. Justice Court Case Search for 66203 NOC Code (Redacted as to Private
21 Personal Information of Non-Parties)
CC 3913 to CC 3930

23 40. Litigation Hold Memo and Destruction Hold Order, dated 04.02.2024
CC 3931 to CC 3933

25 41. Litigation Hold Memo and Destruction Hold Order, dated 09.24.2024
CC 3934 to CC 3940

26 42. Certified copy of minutes for Board of County Commissioners Meeting,
27 05.03.2022 item number 65
CC 3941 to CC 4029

1 43. Criminal Legal Inquiry Result Report regarding Clark County Code 16.11.030
2 **CC4030 to CC 4038**

3 44. Video of violinist Brandon Summers
4 **CC 4039**

5 45. Video of violinist Brandon Summers
6 **CC 4040**

7 46. Video of violinist Brandon Summers
8 **CC 4041**

9 47. Video of violinist Brandon Summers
10 **CC 4042**

11 48. Video of violinist Brandon Summers
12 **CC 4043**

13 49. Video of Cellist Jordan Polovina
14 **CC 4044**

15 50. Video of Cellist Jordan Polovina
16 **CC 4045**

17 51. Video of Cellist Jordan Polovina
18 **CC 4046**

19 52. Video of Cellist Jordan Polovina
20 **CC 4047**

21 53. Screenshot of Cellist Jordan Polovina
22 **CC 4048**

23 54. Clark County Pedestrian Study, Las Vegas Boulevard: Russell Road to Sahara
24 Avenue December 2022 Revised June 2024
25 **CC 4049 to CC 4261**

26 55. Clark County Pedestrian Study, Las Vegas Boulevard: Tropicana Avenue to
27 Spring Mountain Road 2016 Update of Non-Permanent Obstructions dated
28 12.2024
 CC 4262 to CC 4329

26 56. Summary of Final Action for October 4, 2016 Board of County Commissioners
27 Meeting, agenda item 26 discusses the approval of the No Obstruction Zones
28 on Las Vegas Boulevard
 CC 4330 to CC 4350

1 **57. Maps depicting the Clark County No Obstruction Zones CC Code 16.11 Las**
2 **Vegas Boulevard**
3 **CC 4351 to CC 4371**

4 **58. Bid No. 605340-19 Annual Requirements Contract for Full-Coverage**
5 **Maintenance Services for Elevators and Escalators Located on Pedestrian**
6 **Bridges**
7 **CC 4372 to CC 4454**

8 **59. Bid No. 606957-24 Annual Requirements Contract for Custodial Service on Las**
9 **Vegas Boulevard Pedestrian Bridge, Elevator, Escalator, Bollard, and**
10 **Sidewalks**
11 **CC 4455 to CC 4531**

12 **60. Daily Inspection Reports from January 1, 2021, to the present**
13 **CC 4532 to 6069**

14 **61. Dr. Sousa's expert report file**
15 **CC 6070 to 6158**

16 **62. Privilege log of documents produced as part of Dr. Sousa's expert report file**
17 **CC 6159 to CC 6160**

18 **63. Document titled: Dr. Sousa's Objections and Responses to Requests for**
19 **Production of Documents Pursuant to Subpoena**
20 **CC 6161 to CC 6170**

21 **64. Criminal files for Cases Identified in Criminal Legal Inquire Result Report**
22 **(redacted only as to the personally identifiable information of non-parties**
23 **pursuant to NRS 239.014)**
24 **CC 6171 to CC 6554**

25 **65. Complaint filed in the EJDC of Nevada titled: *Trenia Woods v. MGM Resorts***
26 ***International, et al., A-19-796711-C***
27 **CC 6555 to CC 6561**

28 **66. Documents returned from County Clerk Records in Response to search terms and**
29 **date ranges (1/1/21 to Present) agreed in March 12, 2025, meet-and-confer**
30 **conference call:**

31 44. "16.13.030" - CC 6562 to CC 6729
32 45. "Chapter 16.13" - CC 6730 to CC 7317
33 46. "Pedestrian bridge" 1 - CC 007318 to CC011745
34 47. "Pedestrian bridge" 2 - CC 011746 to CC020646
35 48. "Pedestrian bridge" 3 - CC 020647 to CC030518
36 49. "Pedestrian bridge" 4 - CC 030519 to CC044276

1 50. "Flow Zone" – CC044277 to CC044770
 2 51. "Touchdown structure" – CC044771 to CC047165
 3 52. "Pedestrian traffic" 1 – CC047166 to CC077323
 4 53. "Pedestrian traffic" 2 – CC077324 to CC097382
 5 54. "Pedestrian traffic" 3 – CC097383 to CC112628
 6 55. "Pedestrian traffic" 4 – CC112629 to CC124123
 7 56. "Disorder" 1 – CC124124 to CC131995
 8 57. "Disorder" 2 – CC131996 to CC145525
 9 58. "Disorder" 3 – CC145526 to CC155980
 10 59. "Disorder" 4 - CC155981 to CC169539
 11 60. "Stop or stand" – CC169540 to CC170033
 12 61. "Stopping or standing" – CC170034 to CC170169
 13 62. "bridge" and "Superbowl" – CC170170 to CC171730
 14 63. "bridge" and "perform" 1 – CC171731 to CC193024
 15 64. "bridge" and "perform" 2 – CC193025 to CC207861
 16 65. "bridge" and "perform" 3 – CC207862 to CC220237
 17 66. "bridge" and "perform" 4 – CC220238 to CC232044
 18 67. "bridge" and "perform" 5 – CC232045 to CC250080
 19 68. "bridge" and "perform" 6 – CC250081 to CC264538
 20 69. "bridge" and "perform" 7 – CC264539 to CC284631
 21 70. "bridge" and "perform" 8 – CC284632 to CC324364
 22 71. "bridge" and "perform" 9 – CC324365 to CC344420
 23 72. "bridge" and "show girl" – CC344421¹ (1 File, 4.66 MB)
 24 73. "bridge" and "homeless" - CC344422 (338 Files, 9.74 GB)
 25 74. "bridge" and "unsheltered" - CC344423 (86 Files, 1.23 GB)
 26 75. "bridge" and "chronic" - CC344424 (136 Files, 3.91 GB)
 27 76. "bridge" and "tour" - CC344425 (134 Files, 11.7 GB)
 28 77. "bridge" and "solicit" - CC344426 (116 Files, 7.12 GB)
 29 78. "bridge" and "disorder" - CC344427 (106 Files, 3.74 GB)
 30 79. "bridge" and "crime" - CC344428 (269 Files, 10.4 GB)
 31 80. "bridge" and "panhandle" - CC344429 (5 Files, 329 MB)
 32 81. "bridge" and "talk" - CC344430 (240 Files, 13.5 GB)
 33 82. "bridge" and "ask" - CC344431 (308 Files, 22.0 GB)
 34 83. "bridge" and "stop" - CC344432 (627 Files, 32.8 GB)
 35 84. "bridge" and "stand" - CC344433 (463 Files, 27.8 GB)
 36 85. "bridge" and "art" - CC344434 (454 Files, 27.3 GB)
 37 86. "bridge" and "music" - CC344435 (277 Files, 16.4 GB)
 38 87. "bridge" and "obstruct" - CC344436 (121 Files, 9.28 GB)
 39 88. "bridge" and "Formula 1" - CC344437 (67 Files, 1.96 GB)
 40 89. "bridge" and "F1" - CC344438 (161 Files, 15.1 GB)
 41 90. "bridge" and "Grand Prix" - CC344439 (52 Files, 1.59 GB)

26 ///

27 ¹ Due to system and human resource constraints which have severely hampered the County's ability to respond to
 28 Plaintiffs' burdensome requests, these files are provided in the form they were received, without bates numbers and without
 29 being combined into a single PDF binder. The bates number is associated with file in which these documents are saved.

1 **67.** E-mail attachments from Lisa Logsdon dated Monday, November 13, 2023
2 7:56:00 AM, attached hereto as bates **CC344439 to CC344455**

3 **68.** E-mail from Lisa Logsdon dated Monday, November 13, 2023 7:56:00 AM,
4 attached hereto as bates **CC344456**

5 **69.** E-mail from Lisa Logsdon to ACLU, dated Monday, November 14, 2023 4:26:00
6 PM, attached hereto as bates **CC344457 to CC344459**

7 **70.** Documents returned from Clark County Department of Public Works IT in
8 Response to search terms and date ranges (1/1/21 to Present) agreed in March 12,
9 2025, meet-and-confer conference call, attached hereto as bates **CC344460 to
10 CC345638**

11 **71.** Jennifer Cooper E-mails from January 1, 2024 and January 2, 2024 using search
12 terms RE: January 2, 2024 Tweet, attached hereto as bates **CC345638 to
13 CC345673;**

14 **72.** Privilege Log for Jennifer Cooper E-mails, attached hereto as bates **CC345674;**

15 **73.** Privilege Log for Documents returned from Clark County Department of Public
16 Works, attached hereto as bates **CC345675 to CC345677;**

17 **74.** Jessica Colvin E-mails in Response to search terms and date ranges (1/1/21 to
18 Present) agreed in March 12, 2025, meet-and-confer conference call, attached
19 hereto as bates **CC345678 to CC347552 and CC347553 to CC347613;**

20 **75.** Privilege Log for Jessica Colvin E-mails, attached hereto as bates **CC347614 to
21 CC347629.**

22 **76.** Minutes for BCC Meetings

23 44. January 2, 2024, BCC Verbatim Minutes for Item No. 38, attached hereto as
24 bates CC347630 to CC347640;

25 45. December 5, 2023, BCC Verbatim Minutes for Item No. 36, attached hereto as
26 bates CC347641;

27 46. November 21, 2023, BCC Verbatim Minutes for Item No. 68, attached hereto
28 as bates CC347642;

29 47. June 21, 2022, BCC Verbatim Minutes for Item No. 76, attached hereto as
30 bates CC347643;

31 48. May 3, 2022, BCC Verbatim Minutes for Item No. 65, attached hereto as bates
32 CC347644 to CC347682;

33 49. April 19, 2022, BCC Verbatim Minutes for Item No. 59, attached hereto as
34 bates CC347683 to CC347684;

35 50. November 1, 2016, BCC Minutes for Item No. 32, attached hereto as bates
36 CC347685 to CC347686;

37 51. April 19, 2016, BCC Minutes for Item No. 49, attached hereto as bates

1 CC347687 to CC347688;

2 52. November 16, 2010, BCC Minutes for Item No. 56. Attached hereto as bates
CC347689;

3 53. April 15, 2008, BCC Minutes for Item No. 95, attached hereto as bates
CC347690 to CC347691;

4 77. Dr. Sousa's IDF Code Sheet pursuant to request at Meet and Confer held on April
5 10, 2025, attached hereto as bates **CC347692**;

6 78. Dr. Sousa's Calendar for Pedestrian Bridge Research Related Meetings pursuant
7 to request at Meet and Confer held on April 10, 2025, attached hereto as bates
CC347693 to CC347702;

8 79. Additional relevant e-mails with LVMPD identified by Dr. Sousa while searching
9 calendar pursuant to request at Meet and Confer held on April 10, 2025, attached
10 hereto as bates **CC347703 to CC347705**;

11 80. E-mail search of Abigail.Frierson@ClarkCountyNV.gov between 01.01.2021 to
12 02.16.2024 for e-mails including: "Pedestrian Bridge", "16.13", "Touchdown
Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone"
CC 347706 to CC 348147

13 81. And Privilege Log for Abigail Frierson e-mail search
14 **CC 348148 to CC 348150**

15 82. E-mail search results for lisa.logsdon@clarkcountydavn.gov for Non-conjunctive
16 search terms: "Sousa", "Langberg". "Pedestrian Bridge" "Frackrell", "16.13",
"Touchdown Structure", "Flow Zone" and Conjunctive search terms: "Violent"
17 and "Statistics" between 05.03.2022 and 02.16.2024, attached hereto as bates
CC 348151 to CC 348920

18 83. Privilege Log for lisa.logsdon@clarkcountydavn.gov search, attached hereto as
19 bates
CC 348921 to CC 348936.

20 84. Search of Denis Cederburg E-mails 1 of 3 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
21 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
22 2/16/24, disclosed as bates
CC 348937 to CC 350373

23 85. Select e-mails with exhibits attached for William H. Sousa, PhD and County
24 Counsel Lisa Logsdon, produced pursuant to April 27, 2025, request of Plaintiffs'
25 counsel, disclosed as bates
CC 350374 to CC 350392

26 86. Additional E-mail Correspondence regarding compensation for Defendant Clark
27 County's expert, William H. Sousa, PhD for expert file preparation, assistance
28

1 with written discovery/subpoena responses, and potential rebuttal report, disclosed
 2 as

2 **CC 350393 to CC 350399**

3 **87. Privilege Log for Denis Cederburg e-mail search 1 of 3, disclosed as
 4 CC 350400 to CC 350408**

5 **88. E-mail search for e-mails to and from @lvmpd.com domain for key words
 6 "Pedestrian Bridge", "'16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow
 7 Zone" between 1/1/21 to 2/16/24, curated to remove irrelevant search results for
 8 fatality detail reports/press releases, sexual assault reporting/coordination with
 9 DFS and Social Services, worker's compensation and health insurance related
 correspondence for LVMPD employees, correspondence dealing with Linda
 Sousa or N. Sousa P#15058, CCDC officer overtime/comp time calculations, and
 all other e-mail dealing with off-Strip related events and/or subject matter,
 disclosed as **CC350409 to CC351392 (redacted as to restricted LVMPD
 systems access login information only)****

10 **89. Search results of all Clark County e-mail accounts to and from
 11 @nevadaresorts.org domain including key words "Pedestrian Bridge", "'16.13",
 12 "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to 2/16/24,
 disclosed as bates
 12 CC 363242 to CC 363714**

13 **90. Original 2012 Kimley-Horn contract for Pedestrian Study on Las Vegas
 14 Boulevard – Russel Road to Sahara Avenue, disclosed as
 bates CC363715 to CC363740.**

15 **91. 2013 1st Supplemental Kimley-Horn contract for Pedestrian Study on Las Vegas
 16 Boulevard – Russel Road to Sahara Avenue, disclosed as
 bates CC 363741 to CC 363757**

17 **92. 2015 2nd Supplemental Kimley-Horn contract for Pedestrian Study on Las Vegas
 18 Boulevard – Russel Road to Sahara Avenue, disclosed as
 bates CC 363758 to CC 363772**

19 **93. 2015 3rd Supplemental Kimley-Horn contract for Pedestrian Study on Las Vegas
 20 Boulevard – Russel Road to Sahara Avenue, disclosed as
 bates CC 363773 to CC 363778**

21 **94. 2016 4th Supplemental Kimley-Horn contract for Pedestrian Study on Las Vegas
 22 Boulevard – Russel Road to Sahara Avenue, disclosed as
 bates CC 363779 to CC 363802**

23 **95. Justice Court Odyssey case search for citations issued under 16.11 for NOC Codes
 24 56750 (16.11.040), 58422 (16.11.070), 58431 (16.11.060), 58432(16.11.080)
 between January 1, 2022 and January 2, 2024, disclosed as
 bates CC 363803 to CC 363865**

25 **96. All Clark County domain e-mails to and from roger.pattton@wsp.com between
 26 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of the following key words: "Pedestrian Bridge",
 "'16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone", disclosed as
 bates CC 363869 to CC 364028;**

28 **97. Exchange File 1 of 3, A through B, of All Clark County domain e-mails to and
 from the domain @kimley-horn.com between 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of**

1 the following key words: Pedestrian Study", "Las Vegas Boulevard", "Russell
 2 Road to Sahara Avenue", "Tropicana Avenue to Spring Mountain Road", and
 3 "Non-permanent obstructions", disclosed as bates CC 364029 to CC 368225;

4 **98.** Exchange File 1 of 3, C through D, of All Clark County domain e-mails to and
 5 from the domain @kimley-horn.com between 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of
 6 the following key words: Pedestrian Study", "Las Vegas Boulevard", "Russell
 7 Road to Sahara Avenue", "Tropicana Avenue to Spring Mountain Road", and
 8 "Non-permanent obstructions", disclosed as bates CC 368226 to CC 371370;

9 **99.** Search of Denis Cederburg E-mails 2 of 3 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 10 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 11 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 351393 to CC 353493;

12 **100.** Search of Denis Cederburg E-mails 3 of 3 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 13 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 14 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 353494 to CC 355091;

15 **101.** Search of Kaizad Yazdani E-mails 1 of 6 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 16 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 17 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 355092 to CC 355653;

18 **102.** Search of Kaizad Yazdani E-mails 2 of 6 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 19 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 20 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 355654 to CC 357669;

21 **103.** Search of Kaizad Yazdani E-mails 3 of 6 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 22 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 23 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 357670 to CC 360274;

24 **104.** Search of Kaizad Yazdani E-mails 4 of 6 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 25 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 26 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 360275 to CC 361959;

27 **105.** Search of Kaizad Yazdani E-mails 5 of 6 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 28 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 29 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 361960 to CC 362724;

30 **106.** Search of Kaizad Yazdani E-mails 6 of 6 for key words "Pedestrian Bridge",
 31 ""16.13", "Touchdown Structure", "Sousa", and/or "Flow Zone" between 1/1/21 to
 32 2/16/24, disclosed as bates, disclosed as bates CC 362725 to CC 363241;

33 **107.** Criminal files for Cases Identified in Justice Court Case Search for 66203
 34 NOC Code not previously disclosed (redacted only as to the personally
 35 identifiable information of non-parties pursuant to NRS 239.014), disclosed as
 36 CC371371 to CC371986;

37 **108.** Exchange File 1 of 3, E through I, of All Clark County domain e-mails to and
 38 from the domain @kimley-horn.com between 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of
 39 the following key words: Pedestrian Study", "Las Vegas Boulevard", "Russell
 40 Road to Sahara Avenue", "Tropicana Avenue to Spring Mountain Road", and
 41 "Non-permanent obstructions", disclosed as bates CC 371987 to CC 375991;

42 **109.** Exchange File 1 of 3, J through Z, of All Clark County domain e-mails to and
 43 from the domain @kimley-horn.com between 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of
 44 the following key words: Pedestrian Study", "Las Vegas Boulevard", "Russell
 45 Road to Sahara Avenue", "Tropicana Avenue to Spring Mountain Road", and

1 "Non-permanent obstructions", disclosed as bates CC 375992 to CC 379421
2 (Curated as to only e-mails dealing with the Las Vegas Strip and/or the Resorts
3 Corridor);

4 **110.** Exchange File 2 of 3, A through Z, of All Clark County domain e-mails to and
5 from the domain @kimley-horn.com between 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of
6 the following key words: Pedestrian Study", "Las Vegas Boulevard", "Russell
7 Road to Sahara Avenue", "Tropicana Avenue to Spring Mountain Road", and
8 "Non-permanent obstructions", disclosed as bates CC 379422 to CC 383388
9 (Curated as to only e-mails dealing with the Las Vegas Strip and/or the Resorts
Corridor);

10 **111.** Exchange File 3 of 3, A through Z, of All Clark County domain e-mails to and
11 from the domain @kimley-horn.com between 1/1/21 and 2/16/24 including any of
12 the following key words: Pedestrian Study", "Las Vegas Boulevard", "Russell
13 Road to Sahara Avenue", "Tropicana Avenue to Spring Mountain Road", and
14 "Non-permanent obstructions", disclosed as bates CC 383389 to CC 383873
15 (Curated as to only e-mails dealing with the Las Vegas Strip and/or the Resorts
Corridor); and

16 **112.** 2022.12.16 DRAFT Clark County Pedestrian Study with Comments, disclosed
17 as bates CC 383874 to CC 384108.

18 **113.** Daily Inspection Reports from January 1, 2021, to March 12, 2025.
19 CC 383874 to CC 385862 See opening paragraph.

20 **114.** Key and graphic of Las Vegas Strip signage as of July 2025 (New key and
21 graphic pending completion of ongoing survey. Updated materials will be
22 supplemented upon receipt from Public Works).
23 CC 385863 to CC 385837

24 **115.** Key and graphic of the Las Vegas Strip signage as of September 2025
25 CC 385838 to CC 385872

26 **116.** Case File for Event# LLV240200044159 redacted as to personally identifiable
27 information of non-parties.
28 CC 385873 to CC 385875

29 **117.** Unredacted Case File for Event # LLV250800092630 pursuant to request from
30 counsel and consented to by subject of citation,
31 CC 385876 – CC 385898

32 **118.** Unredacted Case File for Event # LLV250800092630 (Miabelli) pursuant to
33 request from counsel and consented to by subject of citation,
34 **CC 385899 – CC 385910**

35 **119.** E-mail from Lisa Logsdon titled: Bridge Ordinance - Legal Discussion
36 **CC 385911-CC385915**

37 ///

120. Frierson's Calendar portfolio Subject: Quarterly Leadership Meeting
CC 385916-CC 385937

**121. Frierson's Calendar portfolio Subject Pedestrian Flow Zone Ordinance
Meeting with Lisa Logsdon, County Counsel
CC 385938-CC 385960**

**122. Frierson's Notes Re: Subject Pedestrian Flow Zone Ordinance
CC 385961-CC 385962**

Defendant CLARK COUNTY reserves the right to utilize any documents identified by the Plaintiff or any other party up to the time of trial.

Computation of Damages by Category for Defendant CLARK COUNTY

1. Attorney's fees and costs: all fees and costs in an amount allowed by law.

DATED this 3rd day of December 2025.

STEVEN B. WOLFSON
DISTRICT ATTORNEY

By: /s/ Joel K. Browning
JOEL K. BROWNING
Deputy District Attorney
Bar No. 14489
TIMOTHY ALLEN
Deputy District Attorney
Bar No. 14818
500 South Grand Central
Las Vegas, Nevada 89154
Attorneys for Defendant

CERTIFICATE OF ELECTRONIC SERVICE

I hereby certify that I am an employee of the Office of the Clark County District Attorney and that on this 3rd day of December, 2025, I served a true and correct copy of the foregoing **DEFENDANT CLARK COUNTY'S TWENTY-FOURTH SUPPLEMENTAL DISCLOSURE AND PRODUCTION OF DOCUMENTS PER FRCP 26(a)(1)** (United States District Court Pacer System or the Eighth Judicial District Wiznet), by e-mailing the same to the following recipients. Service of the foregoing document by e-mail is in place of service via the United States Postal Service.

Christopher M. Peterson
Tatiana R. Smith
AMERICAN CIVIL LIBERTIES
UNION OF NEVADA
4362 W. Cheyenne Ave.
North Las Vegas, NV 89032
Attorney for Plaintiffs
Peterson@aclunv.org
tsmith@aclunv.org
jsmith@aclunv.org

Margaret A. McLetchie
Leo S. Wolpert
MCLETCHEE LAW
602 South Tenth Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101
efile@nvlitigation.com
maggie@nvlitigation.com
leo@nvlitigation.com

/s/Renee S. Albert
An Employee of the Clark County District
Attorney's Office – Civil Division