

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AGRICULTURE,
AND MINING**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
May 2, 2013**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Skip Daly at 1:16 p.m. on Thursday, May 2, 2013, in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada and to Great Basin College, High Tech Center, Room 137, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, Nevada 89801. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Skip Daly, Chair
Assemblyman Paul Aizley, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Anderson
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman James W. Healey
Assemblyman Pete Livermore
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank
Assemblyman Tyrone Thompson
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None



GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Clark County Senatorial District No. 11
Assemblyman Tom Grady, Assembly District No. 38
Senator Mark Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Clark County Assembly District No. 28

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Cheryl Williams, Recording Secretary
Ashlynd Baker, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Steve Walker, representing Lyon County
Beverlee McGrath, representing Hidden Valley Horse Rescue; Best Friends Animal Society; Nevada Humane Society; Northern Nevada SPCA; Nevada Political Action for Animals; Lake Tahoe Humane Society; Lake Tahoe SPCA; Compassion Charity for Animals; Pet Network of Lake Tahoe; Wylie Animal Rescue Foundation; PawPack; and Lake Tahoe Wolf Rescue
Margaret Flint, representing Nevada Humane Society; and Canine Rehabilitation Center and Sanctuary
Christine Schwamberger, representing Nevada Political Action for Animals
Kevin O'Neill, Senior Legislative Director, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals
Kristina Swallow, representing City of Las Vegas
Holly Haley, representing The Humane Society of the United States
Stacia Newman, President, Nevada Political Action for Animals
Neena Laxalt, representing Nevada Cattlemen's Association
Alejandro Golindo, President, Mexican Federation of Charrería
Susane Tagauyev, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Don Molde, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada
Denise DeLucia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Robin Warren, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada

Chair Daly:

[Roll was taken and housekeeping matters were explained.] Now that we are in the crossover, as they say, we have people from the Senate here, and other people wanting to testify in Committee, so we will get right to it. We are going to start with Senate Joint Resolution 14. We will go ahead and open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 14. Welcome to the Assembly, Senator Ford, and welcome back again, Assemblyman Grady.

Senate Joint Resolution 14: Urges Congress to enact the Lyon County Economic Development and Conservation Act. (BDR R-1114)

Senator Aaron D. Ford, Clark County Senatorial District No. 11:

I am here to speak about Senate Joint Resolution 14. The Lyon County Economic and Conservation Act, House Resolution 696, was first introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives on February 14 of this year by Congressman Steven Horsford. [Mentioned letter in support ([Exhibit C](#)). Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Those are important figures in a county that has one of the highest, if not the highest, unemployment rates in our state. Again, we are talking about 800 mining jobs, 500 construction jobs, and a plan to invest \$80 million in infrastructure for the mine that can be used for other land uses and economic development. [Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Assemblyman Tom Grady, Assembly District No. 38:

This area that we are talking about is in my district. In fact, it is in my hometown of Yerington. We have had mining in the Yerington area for years. The Anaconda Copper Mine, which is now owned by British Petroleum (BP), was in that area. They were tremendous corporate citizens while they were there. Because of that, we are welcoming mining back into our area.

As Senator Ford mentioned, we have had high economic stress levels with the unemployment and the foreclosures, and we are looking at this as a real boom. Congressman Horsford has worked very judiciously on this piece of legislation, along with Congressman Amodei. They are working hand-in-glove with this. As was mentioned, and as is mentioned in the resolution, not only will Yerington see economic growth with the property that they will receive from this, but they are working hand-in-glove with Nevada Copper in order to expand the area that we have.

The Wovoka Wilderness area is named after a Paiute Indian who years ago, as a medicine man who lived along the east Walker River, developed the

Ghost Dance. The area that we are looking at is a national wilderness area, and it is probably about 20-25 miles away from the mining area. It is in the east part of Smith Valley, where the mine is just outside the City of Yerington.

We are looking forward to this bill passing. I am not sure if it was through my friend's presentation in the Senate, or because we have Congressman Horsford going with us on this bill when it was presented in the Senate, but I will tell you that it passed the Senate the same day as the presentation was made. We were very, very pleased with that. We have quite a few proclamations from different areas that are being forwarded to the Washington delegation for their assistance. I would welcome any questions about the area, or about the mine. However, again, I want to stress that the people in Yerington and Lyon County are welcoming this mine into our area.

Assemblyman Ellison:

With this bill proposed, Lyon County is hopeful that this new mine will create 900 new employees. Is that correct?

Senator Ford:

It will create 800 mining jobs and about 500 construction jobs.

Assemblyman Ellison:

With these increases it will take that 2.5 percent unemployment even higher. Nevada's unemployment is really increasing. With the bill that is being proposed on the fourth floor right now in the Assembly Committee on Taxation, Senate Joint Resolution 15 of the 76th Session, what kind of impact is that going to have on the future of that mine? I can tell you, as we speak, a lot of these mining companies are looking at shutting down the smaller mines.

Senator Ford:

The short answer from me is that I have no idea. Assemblyman Grady may have a different answer.

Assemblyman Grady:

I will tell you that the mine, just within the last three weeks, secured \$200 million worth of financing. As we know, the gold prices have dropped from \$1750 per ounce down to \$1450, roughly. If it drops much further, they will be looking at what else to do. I would remind you that in this particular project there will be a tunnel shaft. There will also be open-pit mining. They have the headframe already built for the underground mine and they are progressing. They have put about 50 people to work so far, just in the preparations. They would like to do phases one and two together so they can do the shaft and they can do the open-pit mining. They are all still on schedule

to go, but like in your area, we are holding our breath that the price of gold does not drop any further. However, we are mainly looking at copper.

Assemblywoman Swank:

If these 1,300 jobs come, that is about a 43 percent growth in the city. Correct? I understand that some of these jobs will be for people in Yerington, but there will be a lot of people probably moving to Yerington. Correct? Therefore, I wonder if there are plans for that. What are the plans for thoughtful development for Yerington to accommodate all these new folks?

Assemblyman Grady:

We have a number of projects that people are waiting to see what happens with as soon as they get the land. I will remind you that we are not asking the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to give the land to Yerington; they are paying fair market value for it. However, there are a number of subdivisions which have been planned over the last couple of years, but they have just been on hold. I think we are ready for it. We have the infrastructure—the water, the sewer, it is all in place. We think we can accommodate the growth. They are not going to hire the whole 800 at once, so it will give us time, hopefully, to grow with them in this area.

Assemblywoman Swank:

Not only is it important for them to start to build out, but also, my suggestion is to rethink how you are using the existing city and the older parts of the city so that you do not just build out and end up with an isolated, not-so-used spot in the center.

Assemblyman Grady:

Basically, Yerington is an older part. We will grow within that. It is an old mining community. We have some development that has gone on, but we want good, clean structured growth. We have a good city council. We have good county commissioners, and that is their aim as well.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

I guess this goes out to anybody at the table who wants to answer. These 1,300 jobs that we are looking at, are they going to be minimum wage? Obviously, we want to make sure that these men and women are getting benefits as well. Are we looking at the big picture here? As long as this mine is going to be there, how are we looking at that side of it? Are we looking at the benefit side of it as well, and not just for the benefit of the City of Yerington?

Assemblyman Grady:

The mining wages in Nevada, presently, are some of the highest wages that there are. In order to attract this type of mining, especially underground, you are looking at paying anywhere from \$80,000 to low \$100,000 a year. That is why we are excited. The old miner out there with the pick and shovel is gone. Now, it is a million-dollar piece of equipment and they need people that will be able to run that. They have already worked with Western Nevada College to get some college courses to help the type of employee that they want. That is part of the excitement in our area. These will be good-paying jobs with full benefits.

Assemblyman Thompson:

Being that you have discussed the unemployment rate, I think it is great that we are going to potentially bring 1,300 jobs. What is the employment plan for the community to ensure that many of the residents become employable? We know that others will come in and we definitely want to lower the unemployment rate. Are there training programs that are going to be in place? That would really engage those in your community right now, so they can be very competitive for these jobs.

Assemblyman Grady:

As I mentioned, we are working with Western Nevada College to do some of the training programs. They will be doing some of them on site. One of our biggest problems is that our young people, when they leave for college, do not return because there are no jobs. I can tell you because I have three children who went through the Yerington school system. One of them is now teaching in Fernley, another is teaching in Fallon, and my son is a juvenile probation officer in Winnemucca. They all had to leave because there are no jobs in Yerington.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Will Weed Heights serve as a resource for the workers? There are a lot of living units there that I think could be available.

Assemblyman Grady:

For those who are not familiar with our area, Weed Heights was the company town for Anaconda. It is roughly a mile and a half out of the City of Yerington. They still have a number of houses there. A lot of those houses have been refurbished, are rented, and yes, I am sure that they will use whatever they can. We also have another mine that is looking at that area: the Singatse Peak Services. If they come online after Nevada Copper, we will be back to our heydays with Anaconda. Therefore, we are looking forward, and I am sure that

the area can absorb it. I think we have a lot of people waiting to build houses, but we have to have the mine come in first.

Assemblyman Aizley:

The copper pit is going to be open-mined, is it not?

Assemblyman Grady:

Yes.

Assemblyman Aizley:

South of Tucson there was a copper mine. They did restoration for it on the side pile. It was absolutely ugly. Forty years later, it is still ugly. Now, if you go out to Elko and look at the Carlin trend, the restoration there is beautiful. I am hoping that you have a guarantee for the proper restoration after the mine is closed, or even while it is active.

Assemblyman Grady:

I will tell you, we have the same problem with the old Anaconda pit. This was before the state of Nevada put in the reclamation that you have to do on mining now. Now, it is controlled. Now, the mining companies put up a bond. There is a lot of work done to restore the mines. We are in some litigation right now to try to resolve some of the problems that were unintended, but that was before the rules and regulations for reclamation were put in place.

Assemblyman Aizley:

That is good to hear, Assemblyman.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Is there any chance of ecotourism happening in the Wovoka Wilderness area with this?

Assemblyman Grady:

Yes. In fact, there are hiking trails. That area is used quite a bit now. Senator Reid wanted a wilderness area in our area. Frankly, this wilderness area was one of the trade-offs with him. It started out about five years ago as a small wilderness area. It grew to about 500,000 acres, and the people in Smith Valley, Yerington, and Lyon County said, "No. No way of doing that." Now, they have come back with a realistic proposal of roughly 50,000 acres that Senator Reid has viewed, accepted, and is pushing. He wants the wilderness area, and it is used year-round by hikers, birdwatchers, and everyone else. The only thing that the wilderness area would do is close off the motorized traffic that is in the area.

Chair Daly:

Are there any other questions from the Committee? [There were no questions.] If I understood that correctly, you are going to buy the land from the BLM, but it is going to be financed by the mining company. You mentioned there may be another company, or a company that buys this one. I know they are doing underground and above-ground projects, or they are contemplating it. They are drilling the shaft. I do not know what stage they are at; I know they started, but I do not know if they are finished yet.

We all saw the article a few days ago with the concerns about hiring Nevada workers. I am not sure that was the total question. I think Assemblyman Carrillo started to hit on this, but not only do we need to hire Nevada workers, they need to have wages, benefits, and all of that. I know you said that they will have full benefits, but I do not know that you can know that.

You started out by saying that when you had Anaconda there, they were a good corporate partner. We have had a couple of questions already about planned development and economic tourism. We know people are in hard-pressed areas, and Lyon County has had the highest unemployment. There are a lot of issues. However, are you needing it too much? Are we making the right decisions here on some of this stuff? Is the development going to have long-term adverse impacts like the Anaconda operation did?

I do know a little of the history on this. You have a company, Guy F. Atkinson Construction, coming out of Colorado, drilling that shaft, and there were no Nevada workers. I met with those people before they ever came here. They hired 50 people and they said, "Oh, well half of them are locals." I said, "Well, what are you doing? Are these the archaeologists and engineers?" What is the rest of the story? When are they going to gear up? How are they going to be hiring people?

You say you are working with the community college. You know, there is a pretty good group of unemployed people in the Washoe County area, and it is not that far to commute. I know I put a lot on your plate there. When Anaconda was there they worked well with a lot of other people. I know they used to have a collective bargaining agreement there with the union company. I am not sure that these guys are the corporate citizens you think they are. At least, they have not been in the discussions that I have had with them. I have my concerns about what is being offered and what the bill of goods is.

As far as the city council goes, everybody says it is a great city council when they are doing the things you agree with, and when they are doing things you do not agree with, they are not so good. I guess that all depends on your point of view.

Assemblyman Grady:

First off, let me disclose that I was the mayor in Yerington for about 13 years, so I have worked closely with those people.

Chair Daly:

I knew that.

Assemblyman Grady:

You have one of the same questions as Senator Reid. There is no company in Nevada that is qualified to put those superstructures in. They all come with the people that build the shaft. They are hired under a contract. They come in and put up the shaft. That is theirs. They will be gone. I know the other 50 people that are there now are mainly local people. As you mentioned, when we say "local," we are hoping all of our area from Mineral County at Hawthorne, to Fallon, to Fernley, to Reno, that we will draw from all of these areas to help that. We are confident.

Keep in mind, if they get that property tomorrow, there will not be 800 employees on Saturday that are waiting to go to work. This is a long-term build-out for them. Please do not hold me to it, but I think they are talking late 2014 or 2015 before they will get their first bit of silver, gold, or whatever they are going to take first. This is going to be a slow build-out and we recognize that.

To the question that was asked before, we think that is why our housing and all can build along with that. We will not need all the houses the first day. Are we overconfident? I hope not. That has been my home for a long time, too. Are we confident? You bet we are. We have worked with these people. They have been in the area now for probably better than 2 years. They are members of our Lion's Club, our Rotary Club, and our Soroptimist Club. They go to our churches. These people who have come in, and I will name Tim Dyer specifically because he is the main man up there now, have become involved in everything, including the Boys and Girls Club. He wants his people to be part of the community and he is leading by example.

Chair Daly:

Thank you, and I understand. The price of copper needs to stay up, all to fix the bottom line. Believe me, I know about the construction and how all that

works, and the specialty trades and various things. I am just saying that when you have these people coming in and you guys are desperate, it all sounds really good. I understand doing some things to be good in the community, but not all of the other things that we need to do from other points of view—that does not warm my heart too much.

On the financing part, if they are going to finance it and hold the paper on money that the city has banned to BLM, how is that structure going to work?

Assemblyman Grady:

I am not sure that I can answer that. I can tell you what I understand is happening. The mine has put the money up to purchase the properties. It will be in the city's name. They will take a certain portion of it. The rest of it is up to the city to develop, including some recreational parts of it, such as a motorcycle off-road track, and an arena for concerts like our Night in the Country concert, and things of that nature. As the city sells this, they will repay the mine for the property that they still hold.

Chair Daly:

I am just trying to understand the structure. I know you were a banker, and you know how these deals pencil out. They are going to put up \$100 million, or whatever it is, and they are going to say, "Here you go. It is in the name of the city. Now, city, you owe us \$100 million." Realistically, if you own the land straight up, then you would say, "Well, we are going to lease it to you. We are going to allow you this access, and you are going to pay us. Then, we are also going to get all the tax that is generated, and the net proceeds," or however that is going to work.

However, it seems to me, when they are putting up the money—and I understand it may not work if you do not do this—then you are going to be paying them for something. In other words, I am not seeing where that balances out. As far as you guys would be making money, you are going to be paying them. Are you going to put a bond up, or something, and have the rest of the taxpayers pay in order to pay that mortgage? What if proceeds and various things do not come in to pay back that \$100 million?

Assemblyman Grady:

Mr. Chair, from what I understand, and again, I do not feel I am qualified to answer for the city, or Nevada Copper, but I do not think there is any set payment plan as such. The debt will be reduced by the amount of the property that they take, which has already been agreed upon. Then, as the property sells, portions of it will go back to the mine for repayment.

Eventually, sure, the city is going to have to pay the rest of it. However, right now, the city is providing them with the water because it is close enough to the city that they can provide the water for the first part of it—not forever, because they cannot do that forever. We have capacity in our sewer facilities to take whatever growth is coming both from the mine and for the town, where we will not have to look at increasing any of the infrastructure within the city.

Chair Daly:

If the BLM is willing to sell the land and do all of this stuff, why do they need the City of Yerington? You will be involved, you are still going to get the taxes, and you are still going to get the jobs and all of that stuff. It sounds to me like they need the City of Yerington to be the government entity that BLM is going to even consider selling the land to, and that you guys may not be, from what you say, at fair market value. You should get a discount because they need you. That is just a thought.

Assemblyman Grady:

I agree with you. I do not think the city is going into this naïvely. They are going into it because they want the mine to come, and the mine wants the city because that is an easier way to obtain the ground than if you go in and try to buy it outright. There has been give and take both ways.

Chair Daly:

Maybe if other people are listening to this they will come talk to me about it and give me some more information.

Assemblyman Grady:

I will have Mr. Dyer from the mine come and talk to you. In fact, they were just over here visiting the Governor yesterday. I should have had them come and talk to you.

Chair Daly:

Have the city come talk to me and say, "They need to leverage their position more."

Assemblyman Grady:

I will have Mr. Dini, the mayor, come over and talk to you.

Chair Daly:

Are there any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. At this point, we will open up the microphones for testimony in support of S.J.R. 14.

Steve Walker, representing Lyon County:

Lyon County is in full support of the resolution. I would also add that in 1978 I did a range environmental analysis of the proposed wilderness area. It was called Bald Mountain at that time. It is quite unique. If you do go there, make sure you take some water.

Chair Daly:

Are there any questions from the Committee? Seeing none, is there any other support for S.J.R. 14? Seeing none, we will take opposition. Is there any opposition for S.J.R. 14? Seeing none, is anybody in the neutral position for S.J.R. 14? Seeing no one, we will close the hearing on S.J.R. 14.

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 72 (1st Reprint). Senate Bill 72 (1st Reprint) has a mock-up ([Exhibit E](#)) that should be on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) if you do not have a paper copy. It is my understanding, and I spoke with the chair from the Senate side, that as long as everybody is still in agreement, we are all still good.

Senate Bill 72 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes concerning cruelty to animals. (BDR 50-114)

Senator Mark Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21:

Mr. Chair, may we have a one-minute recess? I apologize. This is very odd.

Chair Daly:

Yes, I will give you time. [The Committee recessed until 1:54 p.m.]

Senator Manendo:

I apologize for that, Mr. Chair. I know that was extremely odd.

Chair Daly:

No, it gave everyone a chance to look at the mock-up, because we did not get it until just this afternoon. Oddly enough, it probably worked out for the best.

Senator Manendo:

Mr. Chair, I also apologize because the law enforcement memorial is going on and I wanted to put a \$20 bill on Senator Raggio's tree, and I did. I was just thinking of him. I was hoping people would run out, and then we could just pass the bill.

I have some prepared remarks, but the bill before you today is a result of many hours of discussion and compromise between animal welfare groups, the Hispanic Caucus, the Senate Natural Resources Committee, particularly

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, agricultural interests, and myself. Those discussions resolved in a measure that won unanimous support in both the Committee and throughout the full Senate. Much of the discussion in the Senate Natural Resources Committee revolved around what constitutes horse tripping, whether during an event a horse is tripped intentionally or accidentally. I was going to go into some of the concerns that the Hispanic Caucus had, but I will just bypass that.

Ultimately, the core supporters of the bill, including the American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals (ASPCA) and the Nevada Humane Society, agreed to language that makes that distinction in the bill. Specifically, S.B. 72 expressly prohibits events where horses are intentionally tripped, thus allowing events to continue where the horse is drawn to a standing stop, and any instance where a horse is brought to the ground is rare and accidental.

Additionally, there were concerns expressed in the Senate and we took amendments to take care of those concerns. Specifically, we deleted the bill's reference to steer-tailing, facial hot-shodding, focusing solely on the intentional horse tripping. We also made clear that the bill does not impact normal ranching practices. Moreover, we made sure that if a horse needed to be brought down for medical purposes, there was a reason for that and it would not apply to this bill.

I want to thank Senator Goicoechea and Senator Settelmeyer, who worked extremely hard on this, as well as Senator Ford, the Chair of the Senate Natural Resources Committee. Yesterday, Assemblywoman Flores, animal welfare advocates, and I got together and redefined some new language. Thus, is another mock-up. We are getting close. This has been 20 years in the making, to be honest with you. It dates back to Senator Titus's days in the early 1990s. I do not know if I should say a labor of love, but we are getting close to that. However, before you is a wonderful mock-up ([Exhibit E](#)).

As for that one-minute recess, we will see what else transpires with that, but we have worked extremely hard to get to this point. I cannot thank my colleague enough. She has worked extremely hard. I am going to yield because I know she has to leave and I want to make sure that she gets through. She is a lawyer and she is going to get you through all the technical stuff. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Clark County Assembly District No. 28:

I certainly echo all the comments that Senator Manendo made. We have spent a lot of time working on this. I would have loved to have come here and just presented on what was passed through the Senate. Unfortunately, in reviewing

it yesterday, and because another small issue had come up, I realized that the way in which we use some of the language in the ultimate version of the bill that passed out of the Senate actually required some technical changes. Nothing has changed in terms of what this bill will achieve once it has passed, which is addressing any kind of intentional tripping of a horse in any situation.

Situations that are allowed in this bill have not changed. There were still some exceptions that were required for ranching purposes, for example in section 1, subsection 11, on page 4 of the bill, for the caring or treatment of an animal. That has not changed. The technical amendments are fairly short, but if you look on page 3 you will see that a person shall not "intentionally engage in horse tripping for sport, entertainment, competition or practice." Moreover, it says a person shall not "Knowingly organize, sponsor, promote, oversee or receive money for the admission of any person to a charreada or rodeo that includes horse tripping."

The reason why we had to delete that other language is because it actually created an unintentional loophole. It was completely unintentional, but it created a situation where, because we defined horse tripping in the bill on page 4 in subsection 11 as the intentional tripping of a horse via all of these methods that are listed in that definition, we actually created an unintentional loophole in that we said, "unless the horse tripping event is allowed by local government where the horse tripping event is conducted." That is not what we were trying to accomplish.

We do not want any kind of intentional tripping going on, even if it is at a sanctioned event. That was never the purpose. Because we ended up using horse tripping afterward in subsequent language, we were essentially creating an exception for what we were trying to prohibit. That is what ended up requiring the technical changes that you have before you now.

Also, you will see, if you go back to page 4, subsection 11, paragraph 2, "Catching such an animal by the legs and then releasing it as part of a horse roping event." We could not use the word "tripping" again because it says, "for which a permit has been issued by the local government." That is the same situation.

Even if a permit was issued by a local government, we obviously cannot say that horse tripping is allowed there because horse tripping is defined as intentionally tripping and it is illegal—should this bill pass. That is all this amendment does. It is just technical cleanup. We are making the bill because it was silent on when it was going to be in effect upon passage and approval. That is it.

I will say that, on behalf of the Nevada Hispanic Legislative Caucus, this bill was very important to us because it dealt with a cultural practice that we call charreadas, which is essentially just a rodeo. However, the type of roping events that go on, which are very similar to what I would call mainstream rodeo events, have been around for hundreds and hundreds of years. As much as it is a cultural tradition, ranching and dealing with animals in western culture is especially important in Mexican culture as well.

The way the bill was originally written, it could have affected the practice of charreada in a very negative way, almost to the point of outlawing it completely. That is why we got involved. That is why we thought that this was very important and why we spent so much time with the bill sponsor and with all of the associated interest groups. It was important to preserve that practice, but it was even more important to ensure that animals were not being intentionally hurt, because we absolutely all agree that no one wants to see a horse intentionally tripped and hurt. Therefore, we thought it was important that something got on the books in terms of ensuring that we make a statement that we do not want to intentionally hurt animals in Nevada. With that said, and unless you want someone else to make some comments, I am open to questions.

Chair Daly:

Thank you for the explanation. I was following that as you went through and I can see where you create an exemption. The words you have now, as I was following through, look to be in order. If we have everybody on board again we should be fine. Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Thompson:

What are some of the details for local government for the permits? On page 4, line 21, it talks about permits. What are some of the requirements?

Assemblywoman Flores:

For the record, Commissioner Chris Giunchigliani was not able to be here. She did submit a letter ([Exhibit F](#)) and she is in full support. She has spent a lot of time working with us because Clark County has a major charreada event coming up at the South Point Hotel and Casino. Obviously, for economic development purposes, that was also very important to the City of Las Vegas and Clark County to be able to have that kind of event.

Ms. Giunchigliani assures us that through the permitting process in Clark County, this bill will actually work in tandem with the animal ordinances that they have in Clark County. They will still be able to effectively permit, or

not permit, whatever rodeos and charreadas and other types of events that occur. Therefore, it will not have a substantial impact in that way.

I will note for the record, though, that this is important because all counties have different permitting processes. Some counties are actually silent on this. Therefore, we think this bill is important because if a county is silent in terms of whether or not they permit these types of events, it is still in state law that regardless of whether or not a permit exists, you cannot intentionally trip a horse.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Thank you Senator, and Assemblywoman. It is great to see both of you sitting side by side. I know a lot of times there are movies that are made and you always see something on the trailer toward the end that the Humane Society was observing this movie being made, and no animals were hurt in the process of this movie, or something to that extent. Was that ever thought of, that when there is a sanctioned event somebody from the Humane Society attend, or at least be in observation of events in general—not so much just charreadas, but rodeos as well? Maybe I am opening up a can of worms, but I was just curious about that.

Senator Manendo:

I know that in American rodeos they usually have a medical staff person on hand. I do not know if they have anybody from animal organizations. There might be some, but I do not think they are required to have anybody. They are watching, but I do not know if they are required to be there. We appreciate folks that go out and spend their own time to observe and document these things because that is important to know. It is like community policing. I think that is why it has been so successful.

Assemblyman Carrillo:

Obviously, there is a difference between observing and being in the shadows recording stuff, trying to catch somebody doing something that they are not supposed to be doing. Obviously, if you know that there are police in the area, you are going to be on your best behavior. That goes for anything, for the most part. If they know that somebody from the Humane Society is going to be in the area or is going to be attending the event, you might see it in a different way. I am just throwing that out there. I do not see anything pertaining to that, and I was just curious.

Senator Manendo:

I do not think it is required.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I have actually been watching this for more than 20 years. The interesting thing is, to follow up on my colleague's question, the reality is that the animal rights groups oppose all forms of rodeo. For example, I wanted to wait until our next witness testified, but just for the organization that she represents, the ASPCA website says, "The ASPCA firmly believes that rodeo is a cruel form of entertainment that involves painful, stressful and potentially harmful treatment of livestock—not only in performance, but also in handling and transport. Furthermore, the ASPCA is opposed to children's rodeo events such as goat tying" Then they go into a big thing about calf roping: "Since the terrified calf is running at such a high speed when lassoed, the rope often snaps with a force strong enough to yank the calf off of its feet and into the air. The action may result in neck injury—at times, death occurs."

The point that I am getting at is this is really the classic camel's nose under the tent. I have never been to a Mexican rodeo. I have never seen a horse tripped. I am a big rodeo fan and I have been around that my whole life. However, I have never seen this event. Therefore, it is very easy for me to say, "Yeah, let us get rid of this." This is really just an attempt by these groups to find a little loophole where they can get their way here. Obviously, if it is cruel to do this to a horse, then it is going to be cruel to do it to a calf, and it is going to be cruel to bulldog, and it is going to affect all of the other events in rodeo, so they also say those are cruel and inhumane. I have to say, it is a little disingenuous to pick on the poor Mexican rodeo thing, which is brand new in the United States, for the most part. I guess the question, if there is one, is, if it is wrong to do this to horses, why is it okay to do it to all the other animals that are involved in American rodeos?

Assemblywoman Flores:

This is exactly why the Hispanic Caucus strongly opposed this bill during the first hearing. We felt that it was an effort to try and get at something larger. That being said, the reason why I am here today, as opposed to sending our intern or other folks who had been working on this, is because I actually do believe that this bill only deals with what someone is intentionally doing to an animal to hurt that animal. I agree with you. I think that rodeo is a strong tradition and a value that we have, especially in the western United States.

All of the other interested parties and I have often agreed to disagree. I do not agree with some of the other things that they claim and that they state. I certainly say that on the record. With that said, we have spent a lot of time

coming to consensus so that we can deal with one very tiny issue. As I said, that tiny issue is intentionally hurting an animal. More specifically, in this bill, the issue is intentionally hurting a horse. It is very narrow. It is a lot less than what they originally wanted. If you said, "Do you just want it to go away?" Well, that might be the easier thing to do, but we do think that it is tailored narrowly enough so that we are dealing with the very specific issue.

The language is very specific in that it is intentional. You must intend on hurting the animal by intentionally tripping it. I agree with you, and you know that you and I do not agree very often. However, I do believe in what this bill does, and what it is trying to get at, in that it will not be used to try to expand into other areas. If it was used for that purpose, we would certainly be there opposing it.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Thank you. Frankly, I do not know the first thing about horse tripping or Mexican rodeo. Obviously, your culture has that in it, and mine does not. Therefore, I am going to rely on your judgment, but the bottom line is I do not want these people starting to break cultural heritage, starting with your culture, because it is going to roll over to where they are going to start affecting our tradition here in the west. So, I am relying on you on this one because I do not want them finding some loophole where they can pick on just some poor, small, obscure Mexican practice that nobody else knows about.

Assemblywoman Flores:

I agree with you, and thank you.

Chair Daly:

At this time, I think we have got the framework of the bill, the structure, and the idea of the change, so you are welcome to stay, but if you do need to go, we will give you a couple of minutes.

Beverlee McGrath, representing Hidden Valley Horse Rescue; Best Friends Animal Society; Nevada Humane Society; Northern Nevada SPCA; Nevada Political Action for Animals; Lake Tahoe Humane Society; Lake Tahoe SPCA; Compassion Charity for Animals; Pet Network of Lake Tahoe; Wylie Animal Rescue Foundation; PawPack; and Lake Tahoe Wolf Rescue:

Just briefly, to answer your question Mr. Hansen, you know I have been working on this issue for over four years. I have personally competed in barrel racing, and my sons compete in team penning. Therefore, if we were anxious to undermine all of the rodeo events, I doubt that I would be the one to

pursue that, and we would not have taken out the steer-tailing and facial hot-shods.

Traditionally, horse tripping is a very inhumane activity, causing death, broken necks, broken bones, et cetera. For instance, the charreada rodeos in Mexico require that a horse be brought to the ground in order to score the proper points. These individuals who are practicing for the Mexican rodeos—and they are practicing in obscure locations—have been the subject of controversy. Senate Bill 72 (1st Reprint) addresses that concern about these underground rodeos. We are very comfortable with the compromise that has been worked out. We appreciate everyone working on it. We did not show the videos today of the horse tripping because we felt it would be inappropriate. We encourage you to support what we have before you. Thank you.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Are there questions from the Committee? Seeing none, I thank you for that testimony. That additional piece of the puzzle fills in the part which fits with the amended bill of the intentionally tripping underground rodeo practice for something that is allowed in Mexico, but considered cruel activity that is not allowed in the United States. Thank you for filling in that piece of the puzzle.

Assemblyman Paul Anderson:

I am just curious how we are going to prove intention, because part of the rodeo practice in the videos that I have seen, they actually get zero points for bringing the horse down. I do not understand it. That is just the basic information that I have. How are we going to prove intention if we are trying to protect these horses?

Beverlee McGrath:

As with any issue that is brought before the courts, it will have to be proven in the courts that it was an intentional act.

Chair Daly:

Are there any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, we will take any additional testimony in support of S.B. 72 (R1).

Senator Manendo:

We know you did not want a four-hour hearing like we had in the Senate. I appreciate your time, and we ask you to not vote "neigh." I had to throw that in there. I am sorry.

Chair Daly:

You just had to do it.

If you have new testimony that has not already been said, please give it to us. However, if it has already been said, "me too" or a little bit of a comment will be fine. We do not need a lot.

Margaret Flint, representing Nevada Humane Society; Canine Rehabilitation Center and Sanctuary:

We would like to thank the sponsor of the bill for bringing this bill forward. We would also like to thank the Hispanic Legislative Caucus for working so willingly and so diligently with us to come to the compromise in the mock-up that you are looking at today.

One thing you might want to talk about regarding intention is that there are so many of these rodeos happening underground. There are two aspects of this bill that will play into that now because it will target these underground events with the permit process as well. There is a lot of this happening on back roads and in rural counties and such.

Again, we did not want to bring in a lot of the nasty pictures and all of that type of thing because they are very distasteful and you really do not want to see that. That is something that came out in the other house, and since we came to this compromise, we felt that those were not necessary to put before you on this event.

We were talking with Oscar Peralta yesterday, and he talked about these events and the way they rope. You can see the way they rope because in order to intentionally trip a horse, they have to tighten on the rope, whereas traditionally what they do is just basically throw the rope out there, attach it to the leg and they let go so there is no tension or anything on that rope. You can see if they are putting tension on that rope, and then that is a pretty intentional act going on there. That might help you clarify some of that.

We really just want to be on the record that we have worked very hard on this bill. It has been a very emotional process. We would also appreciate your support on this bill. Thank you.

Christine Schwamberger, representing Nevada Political Action for Animals:
We support S.B. 72 (R1). Thank you.

Kevin O'Neill, Senior Legislative Director, American Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals:

We are in strong support of the bill. I, too, want to add my thanks to the Hispanic Legislative Caucus for being willing to work with us. I would just stick to the point that the ASPCA was founded on horse welfare 147 years ago, and

that is our interest in this measure. Any further measures beyond that are not within what my intent is, and S.B. 72 (R1) represents a good compromise on this issue. We thank you for taking the time to listen to this hearing. [Referred to ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Mr. O'Neil, you and Beverlee McGrath and I had a conversation in my office and I just wanted to put it on the record that the ASPCA has absolutely no intention of going after anything rodeo from this point on, using this as a camel's nose under the tent, like we were speaking of.

Kevin O'Neill:

My intent is not to use this as a camel's nose under the tent.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Thank you. I just wanted to get that on the record.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I went to your website and I looked it up. Your organization is actively opposing rodeos as being cruel, and if they had their druthers, would have it outlawed across the nation. Is that not what you say on your own website?

Kevin O'Neill:

Our government relations team is not actively seeking to try to ban rodeos throughout the country. California has much stricter rodeo regulations in place. There is no effort there. There has been no effort there over the last 10 to 15 years to try to strengthen any kind of regulations to make rodeo. I know for a fact the Folsom Rodeo is still a huge event in northern California. Therefore, no, it is not something that our government relations team is actively pursuing.

Chair Daly:

We want to stick to the bill, Assemblyman Hansen. If you want to pick on his organization, you are going to have to do it in another forum.

Assemblyman Hansen:

They are definitely saying that rodeo is a cruel form of entertainment, and if they had their druthers it would be gone.

Chair Daly:

Are there any other questions about the bill? Seeing none, please proceed.

Kristina Swallow, representing City of Las Vegas:

We currently have an ordinance within the city that bans horse tripping and we support this bill.

Holly Haley, representing The Humane Society of the United States:

We support this bill.

Stacia Newman, President, Nevada Political Action for Animals:

I am here on behalf of several of the members here and I would like to have a show of hands of the other people here today in support of S.B. 72 (R1). We are in favor of passing the bill. Thank you.

Chair Daly:

Just for the record, the camera did not show the rest of the room. How many people are there? How many raised their hands?

Stacia Newman:

Five people raised their hands; six including myself.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Is there anybody else here in Carson City or in Las Vegas in support? Seeing no one, is there anybody in opposition of the newly amended, refined and reviewed Senate Bill 72 (1st Reprint)? Seeing no opposition here or in Clark County, is there anybody in neutral?

Neena Laxalt, representing Nevada Cattlemen's Association:

I just want to say that there was an agreement that was met on the Senate side with the language prior to this mock-up. Those legislators that have the same concerns agreed to those changes and agreed to the legislation that passed the Senate. I will address my comments only to the mock-up, which some of us have not seen. I do not believe the intent is changing at all, but we would like to take some time to make sure we have others look at it and make sure that the verbiage that is used in there does not, in fact, unintentionally change what originally was agreed upon in the Senate.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Having gone to lots of rodeos that have wild horse events, typically in that wild horse event, the guys will tie up the legs of the horse and try to hold them in place, or whatever. Will this bill in any way impact that practice among traditional American rodeo?

Neena Laxalt:

Assemblyman Hansen, I do not represent the rodeo. I represent the Cattlemen's Association. I cannot speak for that, but I am sure Mr. Gill would be happy to answer that, and I will make sure he gives you that answer.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Thank you. Mr. Chairman, I have a question for Legal when you get a minute.

Chair Daly:

Go ahead.

Assemblyman Hansen:

When I read the definition, under the section where it talks about what horse tripping means, there is a section that says that what would be allowed is "catching such an animal by the legs and then releasing it as part of a horse roping event for which a permit has been issued." We just heard from Las Vegas, and apparently, that is already outlawed there. Basically, this type of event in a Mexican-style rodeo would be allowed. Apparently, as I read that, by calling it roping instead of tripping, you could still have some very similar event. Is that what the intent of that section of the bill is trying to address?

Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel:

Yes, if I understand your question correctly. I think what the proponents of the bill are trying to get at is yes, if you want to. There is still a prohibition against intentionally causing a horse to fall, by roping it or doing whatever to make it fall intentionally. I think what they are simply trying to get at is this catching and releasing idea for which there is a permit by the local government where the "roping event" takes place. I think that is the intent, anyway. I did not work on this language, so I cannot make any insightful comments other than that.

Assemblyman Livermore:

It may not be so much of a question, but going back to that last question and the discussion that took place with legal counsel, if I recall what I saw on a video one time, it was a static rope that was being used to run a horse through and trip. It was not what a roping event would be with this individual twirling the rope around his head and throwing it. Does that describe anything of any importance? I just want to make sure that the difference is clear between American rodeo that we typically go see, or something like what we have been taught to see, and something that is new to us.

Neena Laxalt:

Assemblyman Livermore, I am sorry, I am not the rodeo gal, although I wish I were. However, I can answer, perhaps, for the Cattlemen's Association, but I cannot answer for the rodeo people.

Chair Daly:

Assemblyman Livermore, you might have to find someone who will be able to answer that question for you.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Chairman, I am satisfied. I just wanted to add that as I am sitting here debating. What in the world are we trying to enact, here? I just see that in the sense that there is a difference between the two operations.

Chair Daly:

Very good. Well, we are all going to get a chance to go back and look at the mock-up after we have heard the testimony and reread it again before it comes to work session. I think a lot of work has gone into this, as everyone has seen. I do encourage you to take a look at it and let me know. Let the proponents, Senator Manendo, and Assemblywoman Flores know that you have concerns. However, as I look through it, it seemed to be in order in terms of the intent and the clarifications they were trying to make in this. The intentional tripping of a horse versus the events for roping with a permit; it seems to have all the pieces in order there.

Neena Laxalt:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have no intention of holding this bill up. We just want to make sure the verbiage is okay. We do not think there have been any intentional changes to the agreement that was met.

Chair Daly:

I see we have some other people who have testimony in the neutral position at this point. Down in Clark County, are you in neutral?

Alejandro Golindo, President, Mexican Federation of Charrería:

That is correct. Even though we oppose bills like this that are directed toward rodeo and animal husbandry, in this instance we are completely neutral on S.B. 72 (R1). Our organization already disallows intentional horse tripping. Actually, here in Clark County, the original definition of the act of horse tripping is "to intentionally trip or throw any equine animal by the legs or by any means whatsoever for the purpose of entertainment." That is basically it. This was drafted back in 1996. Our organization banned the act back in 1994 or 1995, after California passed a bill.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Is this going to affect any events, currently, that you guys do? I mean, is this actually going to have any impact on Mexican rodeo in Nevada?

Alejandro Golindo:

Actually, it basically just reiterates what we already have drafted up. The notion of these speculated back-house rodeos is unfounded. It is just speculated. In order to conduct these four-legging events, it takes years. I started twirling a rope at the age of four. For people to speculate that this happens in the backyard just for mere fun of hurting the animal, I know that it takes at least \$250 a month, probably more, to maintain a horse. This act has been eliminated from within our organization. This bill's true intention is just that: to eliminate the act of horse tripping, but not to eliminate our event, which is four-legging.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Thank you. I am relying on your testimony because I do not want to outlaw anything that is an important cultural part of your rodeo system.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

During the testimony here, something occurred to me. In American rodeo there is an event, and it is a rather rare event, called a wild horse race. Usually, only the larger rodeos have it. Even Reno does not have it. However, during that event, there are times when they actually tie a horse's legs together, because these are wild animals. They will put the saddle on it, on the ground, put the cowboy on it, then turn it loose, and the race is on. Usually, there are four or five of them out there. It is actually a really great event to watch. But, the way I read this bill, this horse would actually have to be tripped—even though they are really pretty much laid down, that is really tripping. I believe that would be intentionally tripping. I need you to tell me. Would that not be the same thing? Would this bill outlaw wild horse races?

Kevin O'Neill

I am looking for it. There is a section in here that exempts all rodeos. It is on page 4, line 10: "Carrying out the activities of a rodeo or livestock show." That has been in the bill. It is in the mock-up. It probably went in the bill when the new amendments went in, but I think it is in current statute, too.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I am looking at page 4, line 10, and it says, "perform not less than 100 hours of community service."

Chair Daly:

On the mock-up, page 4, line 10 says, because it is part of "The divisions of this section do not apply with respect to an injury to or the death of an animal that occurs accidentally within the normal course of: (a) Carrying out the activities of a rodeo or a livestock show; or (b) Operating a ranch." So, they do not apply with that respect.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I see it now. It was not in the first reprint. It was only in the mock-up.

Senator Manendo:

Mr. Chairman, I think that is current law anyway. We did not touch that. We did not try to remove that for that reason.

Chair Daly:

It is current law. Thank you, Senator Manendo.

Assemblyman Hansen:

This is about the bill. The bottom line is that there is absolutely nothing in this bill that is going to outlaw or impede any of the current practices that occur in American traditional rodeos.

Chair Daly:

I think we are almost done here. Seeing no further questions from the Committee, and having gone through support, opposition, and neutral, we will close the hearing on S.B. 72 (R1). Thank you, everybody. We will open the hearing on our third bill, which is Senate Joint Resolution 1 (1st Reprint).

Senate Joint Resolution 1 (1st Reprint): Expresses support for wild horses and burros in Nevada. (BDR R-115)

Beverlee McGrath, representing Hidden Valley Horse Rescue; Best Friends Animal Society; Nevada Humane Society; Northern Nevada SPCA; Nevada Political Action for Animals; Lake Tahoe Humane Society; Lake Tahoe SPCA; Compassion Charity for Animals; Pet Network of Lake Tahoe; Wylie Animal Rescue Foundation; PawPack; and Lake Tahoe Wolf Rescue:

Senate Joint Resolution 1 (1st Reprint) presents an opportunity for additional tourism for one of Nevada's very important natural resources: the wild horses and burros. Moreover, it encourages protection for them.

Senate Joint Resolution 1 (1st Reprint) is proposing safari-style tours to the wild horse herds. We feel this is a resource that has been untapped, and certainly Nevada is one of the top five states for national and international tourism, with 40 million visitors to Las Vegas annually. This is an untapped resource and it should be pursued aggressively.

Nearly 30 percent of southern Nevada's economy is in retail, trade, and tourism. The United States ranks first in international visitor spending and second in international traveler volume. International tourism is seen as a growth area. The average international traveler spends about \$1,000 per stay, and remains in Las Vegas longer than four days each visit. Compare that with domestic tourists who average \$645 per visit and stay about three days. In 2010, 18 percent of the 37.3 million tourists who came to Las Vegas, or 6.7 million people, were international travelers. Therefore, we imagine this as an opportunity to create jobs and provide many of the smaller cities in Nevada, which are very appealing and have wild horse herds, an opportunity for more tourism.

In addition to the tourism, a smaller section of S.J.R. 1 (R1) is for the State Department of Agriculture to enter into cooperative agreements. Assemblyman Wheeler has been working on that issue for some time, and they have reached an agreement on Senate Bill 264, so this is probably not necessary in S.J.R. 1 (R1), but that is a component of the resolution.

Senator Mark Manendo, Clark County Senatorial District No. 21:

I agree with Ms. McGrath, it really is an untapped resource. Nevada is a leader in tourism anyway. We feel that this is going to be a wonderful way to actually increase tourism, especially in those smaller, less populated areas in the state. This will have a greatly positive economic impact on the State of Nevada.

I know just from the people that contacted me in regard to Senate Bill 72 (1st Reprint) from all around the world, they were also very excited about this particular piece of legislation. They would say, "My gosh! We would love to come to your state. We do not gamble. We do not party. We do not go to clubs. What we like is the outdoors. We want to go see your wild horses because we do not have that where we live, and we are really excited about coming to your state to see this." We feel that the increase in business and ecotourism is a positive thing. It is a win-win situation for Nevada.

I brought this forward on behalf of my friends. We appreciate your time and support of this resolution. I will not say "Do not vote neigh." I guess I will, if I have to. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Chair Daly:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I just wanted to say thank you for bringing this forward. This is a good bill.

Assemblyman Hansen:

One of the big problems we have had with wild horses in Nevada has been the failure of the federal government to keep the herd management areas in the numbers that are required by federal law. My concern with this is that I think we have 30,000 now, and if they actually had them at the numbers where they are supposed to be, I think it is 15,000. Is there anything in this bill that is going to possibly harm efforts to move those horses and get them down to the levels they are supposed to be at in relation to the horse management areas set up by the federal government?

Beverlee McGrath:

There was, initially, a section in the bill that would deal with the appropriate management level for the wild horses. Because of the conflicting views as to what that would be and how that should be addressed, that was removed because the basic intent of this resolution has always been the tourism aspect.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Are you on record, then, as supporting getting the herds into the federally required standards?

Beverlee McGrath:

Assemblyman Hansen, I am here today to address the resolution as presented before you.

Assemblyman Hansen:

You have no answer to the question, then. On the record then, Mr. Chairman, I want to make sure that in part of this resolution we make sure that we insist that the federal government comply with its own laws because there is tremendous impact to the ranges in Nevada because of their failure to do so.

Chair Daly:

Thank you, Assemblyman Hansen. You learned well. Try to keep them on the bill. I have some of the same concerns, but I am not going to bring them up. I spoke with the sponsor of the bill and we have an agreement, but I think he has got us the one he needs. With that, are there any other questions from the Committee?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

It is my ecotourism day. Has anyone stepped up? Have any of the companies approached you that said they were interested in starting ecotourism and working on that?

Beverlee McGrath:

Yes, we have been working with a couple of tour companies in Las Vegas, since that is the first location that we have been zeroing in on, and it is our intent to start with that area.

Chair Daly:

Are there any other questions from the Committee? Seeing none, we will take testimony in support at this time for S.J.R. 1 (R1).

Susane Tagauyev, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I am also here representing Bless the Animals (for they have no voice, they have no choice), and also Save Our Wild Horses, Stop the BLM. As an animal activist and advocate I am in favor of our wild horses as tourism because I think people recognize Nevada and they think about the wild horses. They are also on our state quarter. However, the main thing is, I am in support of keeping them on their land, which was given to them. I truly believe, as an advocate, these animals cannot speak for themselves, so I am going to speak for them. I believe that the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is in violation of the Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).]

This is an enormous cost to us as taxpayers. I, for one, as a taxpayer, do not agree with this. [Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

Chair Daly:

May I interrupt you? We are perfectly willing to take all of your testimony in writing. Are you almost done? This is not really about the bill. I said the same thing to Assemblyman Hansen. This bill is about promoting tourism.

Susane Tagauyev:

Forgive me, though, Mr. Chairman. I do believe it is related, because first of all, if you are promoting tourism of the wild horses, people come to see the wild horses on their land. I have had friends come from out of state, and they go, "Suzie, where are the wild horses?" You can look out here and see thousands of acres of land that are sitting vacant. Most of it is because the BLM has basically sold the land to private stockholders or ranchers and these horses are put in holding pens indefinitely. I am just saying, if we are promoting tourism and the wild horses, why do we not promote them on their own land that, under the law, was given to them?

Chair Daly:

I understand your argument. I hope you are almost done. I will give you a little more latitude. If not, we will take all of the testimony on that. Please try to wrap it up, because I do not want to argue with you. I understand you have just a little paragraph left, so please proceed.

Susane Tagauyev:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. To wrap it up, these horses have survived hundreds of years without our help. It is man that is the problem, and man's greed that has made their suffering. The law, I feel, is in violation, and the BLM should not have the right to oversee the Wild Horse and Burro Act. An agency should be implemented to protect the wild and free-roaming horses before they are gone.

Christine Schwamberger, representing Nevada Political Action for Animals:

We support S.J.R. 1 (R1). Thank you.

Don Molde, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:

Thanks for having this hearing today. I could not resist coming down because I am old enough to remember, as maybe some of you are, that 20 or 30 years ago, any wild horse resolutions that came before this body were aimed exactly in the opposite direction. They were not friendly to horses, and there was always a resolution or two every year. Therefore, I am extremely pleased to see that somebody is looking forward on this matter. I am a horse enthusiast and I appreciate the intention of the resolution. I support it. Thank you.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Are there any questions from the Committee? Seeing none, before we continue in Carson City, I see people patiently waiting in Clark County. Let us go ahead and go down to Clark County for people with testimony in support of S.J.R. 1 (R1).

Stacia Newman, President, Nevada Political Action for Animals:

I just wanted to say that a couple of the people here that were going to testify had to go back to work, so we have four people here that are supporting the bill. I wanted to mention that about a year and a half ago, Governor Sandoval launched his new tourist program called Discover Your Nevada. The intent of that is to keep the residents here in the state when they go on vacation, and to bring tourists into our state. I think this would be a wonderful enhancement to his program. We are in favor of the resolution 100 percent.

Denise DeLucia, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

My daughter, Robin Warren, would like to speak.

Robin Warren, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I believe in sanctuaries for wild horses and burros. As it says in S.J.R. 1 (R1), "Wild horses and burros helped to build this nation and are living symbols of freedom and our American Western heritage." There are over 50,000 horses and burros wasting away in crowded, small pens. Foals cannot run around and play as they used to. They will not be as free as they were, but they could run around and be in herds as they used to. Thank you for letting me speak. I hope you consider a sanctuary.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Is there anybody else down in Clark County in support? [There was no one.] Are there any questions from the Committee before we come back to Carson City? Seeing none, thank you very much.

Margaret Flint, representing Nevada Humane Society; Canine Rehabilitation Center and Sanctuary:

We just want to ditto our support and be on the record.

Holly Haley, representing The Humane Society of the United States:

Us, too. We are in strong support of the resolution.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Is there anybody else wishing to get on the record in support of S.J.R. 1 (R1)? Seeing no one, we will take testimony in opposition. Seeing none, we will take testimony in neutral.

Susane Tagauyev:

I am neutral in the respect that I am for the wild horses as being a tourism attraction and bringing people into our fine state to be able to see these magnificent animals. However, I am in opposition that they have land that was allotted to them by law. They should be allowed to be released on their land and the wild horses already on their land should be able to stay there, so that people who do come to Nevada can see them in their natural habitat, the way it should be. Thank you.

Chair Daly:

Thank you. Is there any further testimony in neutral? Seeing none, we will close the hearing on S.J.R. 1 (R1). At this time we will open the microphones to public comment, either here or in Clark County. Seeing none, I will mention—as staff reminds me almost every meeting—that there were

some exhibits and various things that got sent in, but were not directly mentioned here in the meeting, which will be added to the record. They are up on NELIS for the record of this Committee meeting. [Exhibits submitted but not mentioned include ([Exhibit I](#)), ([Exhibit J](#)).] With that, we are adjourned [at 2:56 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Recording Secretary
Cheryl Williams

John Budden
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Skip Daly, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining

Date: May 2, 2013

Time of Meeting: 1:16 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.J.R. 14	C	Congressman Steven Horsford	Letter in Support
S.J.R. 14	D	Senator Aaron Ford	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 72 (R1)	E	Legislative Counsel Bureau	Mock-up
S.B. 72 (R1)	F	Chris Giunchigliani	Letter in Support
S.B. 72 (R1)	G	Kevin O'Neill / ASPCA	Letter in Support
S.J.R. 1 (R1)	H	Susane Tagauyev	Prepared Testimony
S.B. 72 (R1)	I	Bonney Brown / Nevada Humane Society	Letter in Support
S.B. 72 (R1)	J	Stacia Newman / Nevada Political Action for Animals	Letter in Support