

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Eighty-First Session  
March 22, 2021**

The Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 4:02 p.m. on Monday, March 22, 2021, Online. 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 [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chair  
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson  
Assemblywoman Annie Black  
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen  
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst  
Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel  
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager  
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary  
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League  
Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity  
John Hadder, Executive Director, Great Basin Resource Watch  
Ian Bigley, Mining Justice Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada  
Tyre Gray, President, Nevada Mining Association  
Steve Walker, representing Eureka County  
Lynne Volpi, Secretary, Women's Mining Coalition  
Susan Fisher, representing Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition  
David Dazlich, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber  
Alan Morris, Private Citizen, Spring Creek, Nevada  
Michael Visher, Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral Resources  
Greg Lovato, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of  
Conservation and Natural Resources  
Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom  
Colby Prout, Natural Resources Manager, Nevada Association of Counties  
Ashlee Forman, Cochair, Legislative Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club

**Chair Watts:**

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] Our first order of business today is a bill draft request (BDR) introduction.

**BDR 26-718**—Revises provisions governing certain public lands. (Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 378](#).)

I will entertain a motion to introduce BDR 26-718.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MADE A MOTION TO INTRODUCE  
BILL DRAFT REQUEST 26-718.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? Hearing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN CARLTON AND ELLISON  
WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

[Assemblywoman Cohen assumed the Chair.]

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I will open the hearing on [Assembly Bill 240](#).

**[Assembly Bill 240](#)**: Revises provisions governing mining. (BDR 46-936)

**Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:**

I am glad to present Assembly Bill 240 for your consideration today. While the bill is a bit lengthy, the intent is fairly simple. Assembly Bill 240 looks to streamline state government by consolidating five agencies with some role in the environmental oversight of mining into two agencies. The bill seeks to dissolve the Commission on Mineral Resources, the Division of Minerals, and the Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission, and merge their core functions into the Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and the State Environmental Commission, both within the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. I would like to point out that it is correct, a fairly liberal Democrat is proposing to reduce the size of state government and make it easier to navigate.

Here is why. Nevada has at least eight entities tasked with some form of regulation and oversight of the mining industry: the Mine Safety and Health Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, which is focused on health and safety issues; the Department of Taxation handles revenue issues; the Division of Environmental Protection and State Environmental Commission handle regulations and enforcement for a range of environmental issues including reclamation and air and water quality; the Commission on Mineral Resources handles the filing of mining claims, exploration, oil and gas permitting, geothermal, and dissolved minerals permitting regulations, although the latter is also partially regulated by NDEP. The Commission on Mineral Resources and the Division of Minerals also take on certain educational, economic development, and advocacy roles for the industry. The Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission was designed to try and consolidate all of this information from the other agencies into one place to provide a holistic view on the industry's compliance as well as a public forum to raise issues. Under A.B. 240, the state would house all of the permitting and environmental regulation for minerals in one place, so members of the public know where to go. It would also separate out the advocacy and economic development responsibilities from any regulatory responsibilities.

I want to be clear about what this bill is not intended to do. It is not seeking to disparage or halt the mining industry in any way. It is not intended to increase or decrease existing regulations or to imply that any previous decisions that have been made in regulation or permitting were somehow improper. It is not intended to lay off all the existing staff or halt the key services the Division of Minerals provides in its regulatory and oversight role, including for exploration, oil and gas permitting, and securing abandoned mine lands. I believe this proposal can instead provide some efficiencies and reassure the public that Nevada has the gold standard in mining regulation. Pun intended.

With that, I would like to go over each of the entities addressed in this bill. The first is the Commission on Mineral Resources (CMR), which was created in 1983 and is made up of seven members appointed by the Governor. Six of those members must have direct experience in the mining industry, including exploration, large-scale mining, oil and gas, small-scale mining, and geothermal energy production. They are charged with keeping informed with minerals policy, making recommendations on such policy, and adopting the regulations for programs housed within their purview, which as I mentioned include oil and gas, abandoned mine reclamation, and others.

The Division of Minerals (NDOM) is housed under the Commission on Mineral Resources. Its administrator is appointed by the Commission. Its duties include encouraging and assisting in the exploration and development of minerals, oil and gas, and geothermal energy; sharing information to educate the industry; maintaining a register of all such operations and annual production; and carrying out the programs prescribed by statute and regulation. Those programs include recording mining claims, managing the reclamation bond pool, and identifying and securing legacy abandoned mine lands. It also includes permitting and environmental compliance for oil and gas, including fracking and the plugging of abandoned wells, geothermal energy, and, in collaboration with NDEP, dissolved mineral resources.

The concept of A.B. 240 is to move these programs and associated staff into NDEP, which also conducts permitting and compliance for mines, particularly related to maintaining air and water quality for large-scale mining projects. The rulemaking authority would be transferred from the Commission on Mineral Resources to the State Environmental Commission, which includes the agency leaders for the Department of Wildlife; State Department of Agriculture; the Division of Forestry, and the Division of Water Resources, both of which are under the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; and the State Board of Health, within the Division of Public and Behavioral Health, Department of Health and Human Services; along with gubernatorial appointees representing engineering and contractors, conservation, reclamation, and the general public. The idea is that we would have one regulatory body with diverse perspectives, and one administrative agency would handle all things mining when it comes to permitting and environmental oversight. I believe the activities to encourage and support the industry are best left to the Office of Economic Development, within the Office of the Governor, which has played a supportive role in these endeavors, and I think it will continue to do so. Education can be handled by entities such as the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology and the Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering, both at the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and the Nevada Mining Association, which should also lead on matters of policy advocacy.

Now let us look at the Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission (MOAC). This entity was created in 2011 and was intended to be a one-stop shop to ensure the industry was properly overseen by all of the other agencies, that it was meeting its fiscal, environmental, and safety responsibilities, and that there was additional review of regulations affecting the industry. However, after a few years, the activity of the MOAC slowed down and the last meeting as a body was in December 2015. Since then it has lost and never regained sufficient appointments for a quorum. Given that and the simplification from consolidation that I mentioned earlier, A.B. 240 proposes the elimination of this body.

The bill has many sections, and instead of walking you through them all, I will provide a high-level overview. Again, it dissolves the CMR and the NDOM and transfers all their regulations, authority, programs, fees, and budgets to the State Environmental Commission (SEC) and the NDEP. The Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission is proposed to be eliminated in its entirety. In general, this is accomplished through the repeal of certain sections of statute, noted at the end of the bill. Much of this is done by changing the meaning of "Commission" and "Division" where it is referenced in existing statute. Where before the

"Commission" was the Commission on Mineral Resources, we changed the definition to refer to the State Environmental Commission. Where it was the Division of Minerals, we changed it to the Division of Environmental Protection. Section 52 of the bill specifically ensures that all existing regulations, contracts, and actions remain in effect following the transition. The other sections at the end of the bill ensure that as the statutes are updated, everything is moved over to this new place.

I would also like to make you aware that I prepared a conceptual amendment [[Exhibit C](#)]. The conceptual amendment makes a few additional changes in line with the intent of the bill. Some of the reports under current statute are said to go through the MOAC and the bill proposed to send them to the SEC, including reports on health and safety as well as revenue. Since the SEC really deals with environmental issues, the proposed amendment instead sends those reports to the Legislature. The Legislature and the Governor will be kept apprised of those efforts. In addition, I am removing some additional language that relates to the encouragement and support of the industry from existing statutes because those statutes would be modified to guide NDEP and SEC. I think it is important that we carve that out and create distinct boundaries between education, advocacy, economic development, and regulatory and permitting functions between the different entities within our government. The amendment also removes the proposed alternative language that would have NDEP take on a consulting role for commemorative minting that is currently held by the Division of Minerals.

I would like to note again that the intent of this bill is not designed to stifle the mining industry. Our state geologic survey, the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, will remain in place, along with its duties to conduct research and disseminate information about and in support of the mining and mineral industries. The Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering at UNR will still be training people to work in the industry and providing relevant high-quality research. The goal of A.B. 240 is to streamline the venues that various aspects of the industry are regulated under, and to eliminate any perception that the industry may have undue influence in its oversight by ensuring all regulations are adopted by the diverse membership of the SEC.

Other states have moved in this direction. Arizona transferred the duties of its Oil and Gas Conservation Commission to its Department of Environmental Quality in 2016, and its mining bureaus and departments, prior to being transferred to the University of Arizona under the geologic survey, were always separated from its regulatory responsibilities, which were housed either under the State Land Department or the elected office of the State Mine Inspector. California's State Mining and Geology Board is housed within the state's Department of Conservation, with members representing engineering, conservation, geology, seismology, planning, hydrology, environmental protection, and the public. Colorado merged several agencies into the Division of Reclamation, Mining and Safety within the Department of Natural Resources, with regulations developed by a reclamation board with representation from mining, conservation, agriculture, and state agencies.

I think it is time to take a look at modernizing and streamlining the oversight of mining in our great state, and I think A.B. 240 provides the opportunity to do just that. I ask for your support and thank you for your consideration.

I would like to note that we will hear from some folks who are opposed. I think the conceptual amendment helps with some of those concerns, and I welcome the continued thoughts and suggestions to ensure that as we hopefully move this proposal forward, we address it so that the language matches the intent of this bill.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I know there is different federal funding, which sometimes goes along with the different divisions. Is there any matching funding that would possibly be impacted based upon this possible change in the divisions? Or is that covered in section 52 of the bill?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

As far as I know, this would not have any positive or negative impacts on funding for these activities. There are different fees associated with filing claims, maps, obtaining various permits, et cetera, and we are not eliminating any of those; we are transferring them. Where the Commission or Division may have accounts right now, an account for mining specifically would be created, and any restricted funds for specific purposes would remain so; they would just be coming within NDEP. The intent is that any federal matching, or other support, would also be transferred over to that fund. I do not think there is any impact with having these activities housed under the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources versus the independent Commission on Mineral Resources.

**Assemblywoman Anderson:**

I am concerned about the MOAC not meeting since December 2015. We are adding the responsibilities to the SEC? Are they paid or will this continue to be a group of volunteers? I am concerned about the added workload for the SEC.

**Assemblyman Watts:**

This is something that you will also hear about from NDEP when they provide testimony. They will be available to answer your more specific or technical questions. There would be some fiscal and efficiency benefits realized by having one board instead of two. The workload for the SEC would increase. The gubernatorial appointments essentially serve as volunteers; they do not receive a significant salary. Some of those members are heads of state agencies and this falls within their responsibility in those roles. The workload will be increased, and you will hear a little about the fiscal implications. This is proposing to eliminate certain budget accounts and change others. This is certainly heading to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means for additional consideration if it gets out of this policy Committee.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

Section 46, subsection 1, states, "created a Board of Review composed of" and strikes out paragraph (c), which eliminates the Administrator of the Division of Minerals from being on

that Board of Review, but does not replace it with anyone representing the mining industry. I understand that this bill would eliminate the Division of Minerals, but it is not replacing it with anyone related to mining. I am wondering why.

**Assemblyman Watts:**

Two notes on section 46: The Board of Review has not met. It is a board tasked with making or reviewing certain public land decisions and making recommendations. The other thing I would note about that is all the positions listed are state agencies' heads, and the administrator of NDEP already has a position on that Board. That is why I did not add any additional seats to it.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

By eliminating this Division and moving it into different divisions, do you see any possible delays in applications for mining exploration?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

I do not expect delays. We do have the Division of Minerals testifying, and I would encourage you to ask a brief follow-up question of them. The intent is not to create complete upheaval. I expect that many, if not all, of the staff would essentially be moved over. The entities they exist under would change, but the staffing would remain in place. The programs that they administer would remain in place. The intent is certainly not to create any backlog as a result of this transition.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

When I look at the makeup of MOAC now, and in moving it over to NDEP, I do not see anyone from the oil and gas industry moving over with it. Would their voice be completely silenced in this?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

I believe you are referencing the State Environmental Commission (SEC) since MOAC would be eliminated under this proposal. There is a seat on the SEC by the Division of Minerals. The current draft of this bill does remove that position. However, I am more than open to working with you and other stakeholders to figure out an appropriate representative of the mining industry, given the role that the SEC already has and would continue to play in the oversight of the mining industry moving forward.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I am all for streamlining, but sometimes that creates a whole lot of other situations, burdens, and costs. This is a pretty heavy lift, with an awful lot of shuffling. Is it realistic for an effective date of July 1, 2021?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

More time may be needed to implement this, and I would certainly be open to moving the implementation date to ensure the state has the time to make this transition in a way that is effective and does not create unintended consequences.

**Assemblywoman Hansen:**

I know we are a policy committee, but we are being asked to deal with things that could have some fiscal impact with these transfers. My question is, why now? It is always good to get to the genesis of why a bill is brought forward. I am curious, what problems arose and came to your attention?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

In doing some research and review of how things work in our state and what is going on in other states, I have personally followed the issues with MOAC for some time. I have also heard from some people who are concerned about the fact that both the Division of Minerals and the Commission on Mineral Resources play regulatory, advocacy, education, and economic development roles. I decided to bring this forward, not due to any particular incident, but because I think the time is always appropriate when it seems that there is an opportunity to take a step back and look at how we have our state government organized and what we might be able to do to move it around and streamline. For other folks who serve on the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, we have several proposals that have come forward including some agencies to move programs and offices around within our state. I decided to bring this forward so we could have that conversation and figure out what sort of organization does work best for the regulation of the mining industry in our state, and what makeup works best for the bodies that are overseeing that.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will move on to those wishing to testify in support of A.B. 240.

**Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:**

The Nevada Conservation League is in support of A.B. 240. We appreciate Assemblyman Watts for bringing the bill forward. This bill makes needed changes to the regulatory structure of extractive industries in our state. Currently, most of hard rock mining is regulated by NDEP, yet oil and gas, geothermal, and dissolved minerals are regulated by NDOM. The Division of Minerals exists outside of the normal structure of our state government and lacks oversight from the Executive Branch. Its Board, the Commission on Mineral Resources, is entirely made up of current or retired industry representatives.

We do not feel it is appropriate to have industries that develop our state's natural resources regulated by representatives from that same industry. It is a classic "fox guarding the henhouse" situation. This can be seen by the various advocacy positions the Division and the Commission have taken from time to time. In order to ensure that our state maintains a high degree of public confidence in the regulation of these industries, we urge this Committee to support A.B. 240 to protect our air, water, and land.

**Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity:**

We are in support of A.B. 240. Mr. Davis' comments are almost verbatim of what I was going to say, so I will not repeat it. I will say that folks are aware that we engage in mine permitting in this state, and in some cases, site mines. You have the situation where, since



they are professionals in the industry, members of the Commission are actually working on permitting new mines in this state. The opportunities for conflict of interest are quite significant. The state of MOAC has certainly been disappointing to all of us. By not having had a meeting in five years, it clearly has not been an effective mechanism for providing oversight and accountability of the mining industry. As much as we hate to see MOAC go away, the benefits of folding the Division of Mining and Commission of Minerals into NDEP and SEC just make sense. It will help reduce the undue influence of the extractive industries on the state's environmental regulatory structure.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Is there anyone else wishing to provide testimony in support? Hearing no one, we will go to those in opposition.

**John Hadder, Executive Director, Great Basin Resource Watch:**

We are a Nevada-based public interest organization, and we have been working with communities to protect their land, air, water, and culture from the adverse effects of mining and extraction since 1995. The Great Basin Resource Watch is only opposed to A.B. 240 because of the elimination of MOAC. We feel MOAC is needed as a meaningful public forum on regulations and policy of mining and extraction in Nevada. The State Environmental Commission (SEC) is a quasi-legal body that does not serve this role. Currently, we are grappling with the reality of mining operations that will need to treat polluted water for hundreds of years, largely from acid mine drainage. For example, the Phoenix Project expects treatment of roughly 330 million gallons of polluted water annually with no end in sight. This issue of long-term management of water treatment at mine sites is a growing problem in Nevada and across the United States. The Phoenix Project is not an isolated case. The recently proposed Thacker Pass lithium mine is also expected to require active treatment for at least 300 years. Nevada regulations are silent on what we call "treatment in perpetuity" and would allow permitting of mines that will require management in perpetuity.

Recently, the state of Colorado passed regulations addressing this aspect of modern mining. This is only one of a number of policies and regulatory considerations that needs an open and transparent public forum for deliberations so that well considered statutes and regulations can be developed. The MOAC has been, and can be, an excellent vehicle to discuss possible policy and regulatory consideration for all parties present. The Legislature and the Governor need to follow existing law and appoint members to MOAC and get on with the business of reviewing and modifying needed regulations on mining in the state of Nevada.

**Ian Bigley, Mining Justice Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada:**

Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada (PLAN) opposes A.B. 240. This was not an easy position for us to take, and both the Nevada Division of Minerals and the Commission on Mineral Resources should be dissolved. However, it should not come at the expense of MOAC, which serves as a much-needed watchdog on mining regulation.

The Division of Minerals and CMR serve as a state-paid public relations agency for the mining industry. According to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 513.023, members of this commission are required to be extractive industry insiders. We believe that it is a clear conflict of interest to have individuals working for extractive industries to direct the formulation of administrative policies for a regulatory agency ostensibly established to oversee mining. Furthermore, the Division of Minerals' purpose, as stated on its webpage, is to encourage and assist in mining. We do not believe that a multi-billion-dollar industry led by international corporations requires an entire government agency to assist in its efforts.

As much as we would like to see the elimination of CMR and NDOM, we are not prepared to sacrifice MOAC. Ten years ago, PLAN fought for the establishment of MOAC. The Legislature established it to stop the piecemeal approach to oversight of the mining industry in Nevada. The Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission has been inactive since 2015 due to the failure of our state leader to appoint members. The failure is not based on process or any apparent flaw with MOAC, rather it is a political failure of our elected representatives' fears of the mining industry.

If the Governor thinks that MOAC cannot be sustained because of lack of government appointment, then he needs to dissolve all other boards that are created through this exact appointment process. It would be one thing if this was a practical matter, but it is purely political. We stand in opposition to A.B. 240 and believe the public's voice in mining regulations should not be muzzled due to the inability of the Governor to uphold his responsibilities to the people by making the necessary appointments to MOAC. The problem is not MOAC, the problem is our government's unwavering support for corporations at the expense of Nevadans. [Written testimony was also provided, [Exhibit D.](#)]

**Tyre Gray, President, Nevada Mining Association:**

It is with a heavy heart that I testify today in opposition. It is the custom of the Nevada Mining Association to be neutral on regulatory bills, but some bills seriously threaten the stability of the mining industry. Assembly Bill 240, in our estimation, is such a bill. Like the vast majority of Nevadans, before representing the mining industry, I had very little understanding of what the Division of Environmental Protection did and did not even know that the Division of Minerals existed. My knowledge base has grown over the past decade, and these two agencies are critical to the mining operations in Nevada. Crafted by a unique coalition composed of regulators, environmental activists, and industry representatives, Nevada's modern mining laws are known around the globe as the most comprehensive statutory and regulatory schemes.

The Division of Environmental Protection is a regulatory arm that is tasked with executing the schemes, and it has done so masterfully. On the other hand, NDOM and CMR exist to promote and assist in responsible exploration and production of minerals, oil and gas, and geothermal energies, which are economically beneficial to the state.

Though not a new concept on its face, A.B. 240 appears to just consolidate government agencies, but the reverberations can be much more than this. First, it will unreasonably add

to the SEC workload, which may not possess the subject matter expertise. Second, it places a regulatory arm in an uncomfortable position of advocating for the mining industry while hearing violations and contested cases. Third, it may result in increased costs as NDOM is funded without the use of State General Fund dollars, and a reduction of service means a reduction of fee collections and the need to supplement. Last, as expressed by the Governor in his State of the State address, there is a need to develop Nevada's lithium resources in order to secure the green future of Nevada and the United States. Assembly Bill 240 may complicate that mission.

Simply put, these two agencies have very different missions and are appropriately housed in separate agencies. As such, I urge this Committee to do what previous Legislatures have done and reject the transfer of duties and responsibilities and reduction of services contemplated by A.B. 240.

**Steve Walker, representing Eureka County:**

Eureka County is opposed to A.B. 240 as written. We reviewed the amendment [[Exhibit C](#)] and tried to understand what it does to address our concerns. We fully support strong oversight and regulatory programs over the mining industry. Our stance is that NDEP has provided an important role successfully and adequately for over 30 years. The NDOM and CMR have a very different mission, one more of advocacy for the industry. This is not misplaced. We see this mission as inconsistent with NDEP's. The same is true with the State Environmental Commission and we should not add the responsibilities of MOAC to their already full docket. Most of our state's primary economic drivers and state entities play advocacy roles. The state should be proud of supporting and promoting the mining industry while also ensuring separate oversight and accountability of mining.

**Lynne Volpi, Secretary, Women's Mining Coalition:**

The Women's Mining Coalition (WMC) is a grassroots organization with members nationwide who work in all aspects of the mining industry and advocate for it. Our many Nevada members are concerned about the proposals in A.B. 240 to eliminate the Commission on Mineral Resources and to fold the Division of Minerals into NDEP. Based on these concerns, WMC opposes A.B. 240 for the following reasons.

Assembly Bill 240 is a solution in search of a problem. Because A.B. 240 would not achieve any cost savings, there are no fiscal reasons for it. Dissolving CMR would eliminate a public body of subject matter experts who develop NDOM's policies and regulations and provide valuable recommendations to the Governor and Legislature pertaining to the state's mineral, oil and gas, and geothermal resources.

The Division of Minerals' mandate to encourage mineral exploration and production and assist companies involved with these efforts does not fit well with NDEP's primary mission as the state's mining regulatory agency.

Getting rid of NDOM would eliminate a frequently used and trusted source of information that is widely used by Nevada state agencies, Nevada county governments, federal regulatory and land management agencies, and the public.

The Division of Minerals' abandoned mine land identification and safety abatement program provides essential services to the state that significantly reduce public safety hazards associated with abandoned mine land.

The Division of Minerals' bond pool provides an important and efficient way for small mineral exploration companies to obtain financial assurance reclamation bonds for their exploration activities.

The WMC appreciates this opportunity to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 240, demonstrating what a proposal to eliminate CMR and to integrate and consign the functions of NDOM to NDEP is not in the state's best interest. [Written testimony was also provided, [Exhibit E](#).]

**Susan Fisher, representing Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition:**

The Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition is a nonpartisan grassroots group of individuals and small companies engaged in or servicing mineral exploration in Nevada. We are opposed to A.B. 240. You will find our position letter in the exhibits [[Exhibit F](#)]. The number of comments I planned to make have already been made, and there is much more detail in our letter than I can provide in a two-minute statement.

The Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, until this session, was called the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining for a good reason. These industries are the backbone of our state. The Division of Minerals does for mineral exploration and mining what the Governor's Office of Economic Development does for other industries. The natural resource industries are extremely important components of Nevada's economy and NDOM, along with CMR, provide essential science-based, advisory, educational, and oversight services to Nevada's executive and legislative leaders, the public, and the state's natural resource industries. According to Nevada's own 2020 Climate Strategy, which is quite an eloquently written document, resources, including minerals and metals, underpin the world's economy for almost all sectors providing crucial raw minerals for their industrial processes. Much of the Division's budget and activities are related to public safety and education. Thank you for the opportunity to talk today. I encourage you to read the additional points in the letter that was submitted.

**David Dazlich, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:**

I am here to testify in opposition to A.B. 240. As you have heard from the mining industry and several other mining resource groups, NDOM and CMR are critical for the mining industry as it exists today. The mining industry is a key component of Nevada's economy and one that deserves its own expert regulations and permitting processes. Currently, NDOM and CMR are doing a stellar job, and Nevada mining regulations and rules are considered exemplary nationwide and worldwide, as you have heard. For these reasons we

do not feel this is the right time to be moving NDOM and CMR to the Division of Environmental Protection.

**Alan Morris, Private Citizen, Spring Creek, Nevada:**

I am an independent contract geologist and I draw much of my income from companies offshore, primarily Canada and Australia. Elimination of NDOM would send a message to these companies that their investment monies are not welcome in Nevada. Currently, the Fraser Institute ranks Nevada as the number one destination for mining investment in the world. We have great resources, we have a great tax structure, we have great encouragement, and we have fair and balanced regulations. The problem with this bill is if NDOM is eliminated, the functions of advocacy and preservation will need to be dispersed somewhere. Also, how will the money that comes in from taxes on mining claims be allocated? I can easily see that NDEP will end up with these functions and no money to pay for them. There are some great things being done with innovative regulations to allow some good stuff with lithium. The Division of Minerals has put these regulations forward, but they are up before the Legislature for revision of some of the water law in order to make those sorts of things happen. At a time when the state is looking for economic innovation zones, to eliminate NDOM, which is at the forefront of some of these innovations, would be a waste.

**Michael Visher, Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral Resources:**

I am here to provide testimony in opposition to A.B. 240. The Nevada Division of Minerals is part of the Commission on Mineral Resources. The Commission is made up of seven Governor-appointed members who are each chosen for their knowledge of a specific facet of the Nevada mineral industry. As the bill calls for the dissolution of both the Commission and Division, I would like to provide some historical context on these two entities.

Their roots can be traced back to 1943, when the Nevada Legislature in its 41st Session established the Mining Advisory Board; then as now, its members were appointed by the Governor. The purpose of this board was to study ways and means of furthering the mining industry of the state; further explore and develop the oil and gas industry; report results of such studies to the Governor; and call upon the Nevada Bureau of Mines and its analytical laboratory in furthering the objectives and purpose of the legislative act.

In 1977, the Legislature combined the then two-year-old Oil and Gas Commission with the Mining Advisory Board to create the Oil, Gas, and Mining Board to serve in an advisory capacity to the newly created Division of Mineral Resources within the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR). It was the responsibility of this office to study the means of furthering the mining industry, develop the oil and gas industry, evaluate federal policies in this area, and administer the Oil and Gas Conservation Law. In 1983, the agency left DCNR when the Legislature created the Department of Minerals, supervised by the Commission on Mineral Resources, all the authority and duties of which remain the same today.

Sweeping departmental changes occurred in 1993 and the Department was changed to the Division of Minerals within the newly created Department of Business and Industry. This

only lasted for six years when the Legislature, in recognition of the importance of the mining, oil and gas, and geothermal industries to Nevada, moved the Division for the last time and it became a stand-alone, noncabinet executive branch agency consisting of the Commission on Mineral Resources and the Division of Minerals. It is the Division's current organizational position within state government, with oversight by the Commission, that has proven to be the most efficient and cost-effective, which is why, on the grounds of good governance, we are opposed to the bill. [A document was also provided but not mentioned, [Exhibit G.](#)]

**Greg Lovato, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

The Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and the Division of Minerals (NDOM) coordinate in several areas. Our Bureau of Water Pollution Control works closely with NDOM to address underground injection control requirements under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act associated with oil and gas and geothermal operations. The Division of Environmental Protection's Abandoned Mine Lands Program, which focuses on environmental and water quality aspects of abandoned mines, coordinates an abandoned mine project prioritization and execution with NDOM's Abandoned Mine Lands Program, which focuses on physical safety issues associated with abandoned mines. The Nevada Division of Mines actively participates in the Interstate Mining Compact Commission with other states and relays important national initiatives or trends to NDEP.

The Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) has one primary, but significant, concern regarding this bill: the transfer of duties from the Commission on Mineral Resources to the State Environmental Commission (SEC). I am concerned about the additional burden placed on the SEC members. This relates to the question posted by Assemblywoman Anderson earlier.

The State Environmental Commission membership is broad, and members do not have the expertise or specialization in oversight of the oil and gas and geothermal industries. The NDEP administrator does not sit on the SEC. The bill as proposed will eliminate the only general mining and minerals expert on the SEC, which is currently the NDOM Administrator. The primary role of the SEC is to review and approve NDEP's proposed rulemakings, levy administrative penalties for the air programs, and to review any final NDEP decisions that are appealed. Appeals may be brought on permits, enforcement actions, or other final agency determinations. The NDEP anticipates keeping the SEC busy with the existing workload of significant rulemakings, air enforcement penalty hearings, in addition to any other appeals that may arise. Aside from members of the general public, six of the members of the current SEC and five of the members of the SEC in the bill proposed already have full-time jobs within state government in addition to their SEC duties.

Based on discussions with NDOM, we anticipate the SEC will need to double the time it currently devotes to meetings, in addition to any start-up orientation and education. I do not believe this will provide the SEC adequate time to carefully consider all the matters put before the Commission and will create scheduling conflicts, as being a SEC Commissioner would move more towards a full-time commitment.

For purposes of our fiscal planning, NDEP has assumed the intent of the bill is that all of NDOM's programs, budgets, and personnel would come to NDEP. The Division of Environmental Protection does have higher indirect cost rates than NDOM, being a larger agency and part of a larger department, the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

I understand SEC Chair Tom Porta has phoned into the hearing today and would be available for questions.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

For clarity, Mr. Lovato, was your testimony in opposition or neutral?

**Greg Lovato:**

I am testifying in neutral.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral? Hearing no one, are there any closing remarks?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

I actually could not agree more with the opposition on some of the points that have been made. Regulation and advocacy should be separate. However, the Division of Minerals holds regulatory responsibility for oil and gas, geothermal, and dissolved minerals programs. As we heard during some of the testimony, it is clearly recognized as an advocate for the industry. I do not think there is anything wrong with advocacy for the industry, as well as some regulation to ensure they are responsible. I think that those two should not be combined, which is why I am proposing that all of those regulatory responsibilities be moved over from the Division of Minerals to NDEP.

This is not an attack on mining. As you heard, this consolidation has aspects that do not appeal to environmental advocates either. I would be fine leaving the Division of Minerals and the Commission as advocacy entities. I thought it was simpler and would create more efficiencies for government if we had those responsibilities taken up by the Governor's Office for Economic Development, which as you heard, does that for a range of other industries in our state and has the background and expertise to do that.

Just to be clear, the staffing will not go away. The bond pool would still exist and continue to function. The Abandoned Mine Land Program would still continue. As we just heard from NDEP, there are a lot of areas where there are crossovers, communication, collaboration, and I think those areas would be strengthened by housing many of these programs in one place.

Regarding having mining expertise on the SEC, I will commit right now to the members of this Committee to make an additional amendment to ensure that there is a position with specific mining expertise on that entity in this proposal.

I look forward to working with those in opposition and others on the effective date of the legislation and anything else that could assist in guaranteeing that this would be a smooth transition that follows through on the intent of the bill as I have laid out. Thank you for your time and consideration, and I ask for your support on A.B. 240.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I will close the hearing on Assembly Bill 240. [Also submitted but not mentioned are [Exhibit H](#) and [Exhibit I](#).]

[Assemblyman Watts reassumed the Chair.]

**Chair Watts:**

I will now move on to our work session.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 3: Urges various actions relating to the protection and conservation of land and water. (BDR R-775)**

**Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:**

Assembly Joint Resolution 3 was heard in this Committee on March 10, 2021, and urges various actions relating to the protection and conservation of land and water. Specifically, the measure does the following: expresses support for the goal of protecting 30 percent of the lands and waters in Nevada and across the United States by 2030; urges the President and the United States Congress to support a long-term goal of protecting 50 percent of the planet, inland waters, and oceans; and urges various government entities to take certain actions to address these goals [[Exhibit J](#)].

**Chair Watts:**

Are there any questions? Hearing none, I will accept a motion to do pass A.J.R. 3.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

As we have seen in this building for many years, many bills are introduced with well-meaning intentions. I for one feel that I am a great conservationist of land: I protect it and love to enjoy it. Most of you on this Committee also feel that it is important that we have it for our children and grandchildren for many years to come. However, I feel this bill is an overreach with potential unintended consequences of taking of private rights, especially for water rights and land rights. I will be a no on this bill.



**Chair Watts:**

Is there any other discussion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON,  
HANSEN, TITUS, AND WHEELER VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman González.

[Assemblywoman Cohen assumed the Chair.]

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I will now open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution 5.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 5: Urges Congress to sell or transfer certain public lands to local governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations. (BDR R-470)**

**Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15:**

I am presenting Assembly Joint Resolution 5 today as a member of the Legislative Committee on Public Lands over the 2019-2020 Interim.

The Eureka County Board of Commissioners submitted a recommendation to the Public Lands Committee regarding the status of lands held by the federal government under H.R. 4362, the Recreation and Public Purposes (RPP) Amendment Act of 1988. These lands are owned by the federal government and leased to public and not-for-profit agencies. In many cases, permanent structures and improvements such as fairgrounds, schools, and shooting ranges have been constructed by the lessees. However, modifications to these facilities or the activities at these locations may be limited by the terms of the leases, slowing down or stopping some of these changes. For example, there has been discussion in Clark County about extending access of school grounds to the community, but the terms of leases with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Department of the Interior, have potential issues or barriers. Senator David R. Parks, who chaired the Public Lands Committee, noted the significant workload he saw for Clark County to review, renew, and update RPP leases over the last few decades.

As a result, the Public Lands Committee unanimously recommended the drafting of A.J.R. 5, which asks that the federal government sell or otherwise convey land ownership to the entities that are currently leasing these parcels. This is a fairly narrow ask focused on these lands used for these purposes, not a broader ask for transfer of federal lands. With that, I am happy to answer any questions that the Committee may have.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I am wondering about the checkerboard squares along the railroad corridor. Would that fall under this bill?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

Only if those parcels were RPP lands. Again, this does not address any broader public lands transfer issues. It is specifically schools and nonprofits that have leases and are operating facilities on land that is still currently owned by the federal government, asking that the land be turned over to them.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I like the bill. I am wondering if there is a list of the lands we are requesting to come back.

**Assemblyman Watts:**

I am sure there is a list somewhere of RPP leases; I do not have it. Perhaps Mr. Tibbitts in Eureka County has a list for the lands within that county. I believe there are 50 or more schools in Clark County that are on BLM RPP land. I would offer to get the list to you, but I do not know where that list is.

**Assemblywoman Brown-May:**

You stated that this is for RPPs that are currently owned by the federal government. In the history of Clark County, there have been a number of land transitions that started out as federally owned lands and were traded to the county in order to be able to lease some to nonprofit organizations or other groups. Do you know if those properties would fall under this, or is that not specifically for county property?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

If the land was transferred to the county, then that would not be contemplated under the ask of this resolution. This is for lands that are currently owned by the federal government. I know there were quite a few discussions about lands-related legislation in Congress, and this does not single out a particular measure; it makes the ask for this specific type of transfer.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

In this situation, if a nonprofit receives the lands, then goes out of business, is the land handled as part of the closing of the nonprofit, as any land would have been handled as part of that closing?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

Assuming that the intent of this resolution was followed out by Congress and the transfer was made, the ownership of that land would be with the nonprofit and would be held as any other private entity. When the nonprofit goes out of business, or something else happens, they could choose to transfer the land or handle it however they see fit.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will move onto those who wish to testify in support of A.J.R. 5.

**Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom:**

We are in support of A.J.R. 5. Nevada, more than any other state, is handicapped in our tax revenues, growth of cities, and reasonable management of Nevada's land by the control of the federal government.

None of the states east of the Mississippi River are burdened by control of their land by the federal government because the federal government only controls 4 percent of their land. The *United States Constitution* limits the federal government's control of land in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 17: "to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards and other needful Buildings." However, in the 11 western states, the feds control 47 percent of the land; in Nevada, that exceeds 84.9 percent of our land. The U.S. Government has greatly exceeded its limited authority in the *U.S. Constitution* over Nevada's land. Counties like Lincoln County have testified during this legislative session that they are "welfare" counties because so much of their land is controlled by the feds, they do not have a sufficient tax base to support their county. This is wrong and hurts Nevada's citizens. Today, the feds control approximately 640 million acres of land, and after decades of very poor management, many are calling on the states to take a larger role.

Does the Bureau of Land Management really need to have 247 million acres? Does the Forest Service really need more than 192 million acres? We just want to point out how much the federal government has taken over the land, and we need to get it back to the schools and nonprofits in our own state. This is our land and we should be able to have that. Assembly Joint Resolution 5 is a small step in the right direction. [Written testimony was also provided, [Exhibit K](#).]

**Steve Walker, representing Eureka County:**

Eureka County supports A.J.R. 5. This resolution came from one of the requests that the Eureka County Board of Commissioners made to the interim Legislative Committee on Public Lands. The resolution we approved is a change in the language, so it speaks only to the transfer of land where "permanent public infrastructure" has been built. Some leases have planned infrastructure that is yet to be built. The resolution should request all lands under a lease, regardless of what is permanently built on the land.

It is critical to understand and acknowledge that the federal lands under these leases went through a thorough and rigorous planning and analysis process in the first place, under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The disposal of land planning and cost process through FLPMA and NEPA requires the coordination with all stakeholders including and not limited to federal, state, resource management agencies, local governments, land-user interest groups, and individuals, including the environmental groups. Coordination and planning at the management level has been employed for decades since the inception of FLPMA in 1976. Research, methodology, and protocols require FLPMA and NEPA to evaluate these plans; BLM resource management plans are by far more integral and provide a proven and useable tool for land use classification and allocation. The protocol is mandated to onsite

evaluations, ecological site correlations, and existing and historical land management implications. The Federal Land Policy and Management Act has strict criteria limiting how lands can meet the standards to be labeled as suitable for disposal to then offer as a lease.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Mr. Walker, I would like to confirm, are there any changes you are seeking to the bill? Are you in support or in opposition?

**Steve Walker:**

We are in support. Eureka County brought the request to the Public Lands Committee. I do feel if you could modify the resolution to include leases where the structures have not been built but the lease has gone through the environmental review, that would strengthen the resolution.

**David Dazlich, Director, Government Affairs, Vegas Chamber:**

We support A.J.R. 5 as it is the Vegas Chamber's long-standing position, generally, to use public lands in southern Nevada, especially federal lands, for economic and housing development purposes. It was noted in the presentation that some of the Clark County School District locations have difficulties in dealing with BLM. We would like to see those lands disposed to the local government.

**Colby Prout, Natural Resources Manager, Nevada Association of Counties:**

All 17 Nevada counties would love to offer our support for A.J.R. 5. Nevada is unlike any other state in the lower 48 because the federal government manages 86 percent of the state's lands. Some counties contain as much as 98 percent federally managed lands. Despite the ownership of these lands, counties still provide mandated and crucial services and infrastructure. However, differences in ownership, use, and management sometimes results in obstacles for proper management, including when counties' facilities are on such a claim. Leases may restrict the holder in a variety of ways, including permits for maintenance and making changes in the land use, without expressed authorization, which often requires additional time and expense.

It is estimated that over 200,000 acres of land across Nevada are leased by the federal government. Examples of activity and use that occur on these lands include but are not limited to fire stations, police stations and training facilities, public schools, public parks, community centers, even some public pools, trailheads, and related facilities. The intent of the Recreation and Public Purposes Act with certain provisions of FLPMA already provide for the transfer of these lands to states and counties. It makes sense, therefore, to convey such lands to counties and reduce delay in management decisions and help guarantee proper management of these lands and the taxpayer-funded facilities on them to ensure desirable outcomes and reduce interference with services in the community.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Is there anyone else in support of A.J.R. 5? Hearing no one, I will move onto those in neutral.

**Patrick Donnelly, Nevada State Director, Center for Biological Diversity:**

We are weighing in as neutral on A.J.R. 5. Recreation and Public Purposes leases are an important service our federal land managers provide the community, but they could be cumbersome to administer and challenging for both the land management agency and the lessee of the land. It is worth noting that the main place we have heard a proposal like this is in the Clark County lands bill [Southern Nevada Economic Development and Conservation Act] which was recently introduced in Congress. We do not object to the provisions in the Clark County lands bill transfer and RPP leases to Clark County. As an advocate for BLM protecting our lands, the last thing we want them doing is messing around with the land underneath a school or a fire station. This just makes sense. However, we want to note that the current proposal where this idea is being pursued in the Clark County lands bill would also allow for a huge expansion of sprawl developments south of Las Vegas. This sprawl would eat up desert tortoise habitat, contribute to carbon emissions, and exacerbate environmental quality. We are opposed to the Clark County lands bill and would only support A.J.R. 5 if it explicitly excluded the possibility of being paired with a massive expansion of other land disposal as is currently proposed.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I will now go to anyone wishing to testify in opposition.

**Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:**

We are opposed to A.J.R. 5. The resolution makes the claim that the sale or transfer of these public lands to state and local governments or nonprofit organizations can improve land management outcomes. There is very little evidence to support this. The fact is the RPP program works well and allows for development of projects of public purpose. If all lands under RPP leases were transferred, it could open them up for sales to private entities that would not utilize them for public purposes. Such a transfer could also unnecessarily increase costs in nonprofit organizations that force them into buying land and paying property taxes with no discernable benefit.

**Ashlee Forman, Cochair, Legislative Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:**

On behalf of the Sierra Club and our more than 40,000 members and supporters statewide, I am speaking in opposition to A.J.R. 5.

Assembly Joint Resolution 5 urges Congress to sell or transfer certain public lands to local governmental agencies and nonprofit organizations. We support the current method of public land provision in Nevada. The recreation and public purpose provision works well and allows for multiple public purposes of public lands. The transfer or sale of public lands to these entities could result in their use no longer being available to the public. If this resolution passes, the public could lose the benefits that come from these public places and infrastructure.

Overall, the reasoning for passing this resolution is unclear to us. This session poses many problems for the Legislature to solve, but we do not believe that this is one of them. Let us keep our lands public and accessible for current and future generations of Nevadans.

For these reasons, we urge you to oppose this bill. [Written testimony was also provided, [Exhibit L.](#)]

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

Are there any other callers in opposition? Hearing none, I will open it back up to those in neutral. Hearing no one, are there any closing remarks?

**Assemblyman Watts:**

I waive my closing remarks.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I will close the hearing on A.J.R. 5.

[Assemblyman Watts reassumed the Chair.]

**Chair Watts:**

We are now at the last item on our agenda, which is public comment. Hearing none, our next meeting will be on Wednesday, March 24, 2021. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:38 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Davis  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is a conceptual amendment to [Assembly Bill 240](#), submitted by Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter dated March 22, 2021, signed by Christine Saunders, Policy Director, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, submitted and presented by Ian Bigley, Mining Justice Organizer, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 240](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony dated March 22, 2021, submitted and presented by Lynne Volpi, Secretary, Women's Mining Coalition, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 240](#).

[Exhibit F](#) is written testimony submitted and presented by Susan Fisher, representing Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 240](#).

[Exhibit G](#) is a document titled "Commission on Mineral Resources, Nevada Division of Minerals," submitted by Michael Visher, Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral Resources.

[Exhibit H](#) is written testimony dated March 22, 2021, submitted by Dennis Bryan, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 240](#).

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter dated March 23, 2021, submitted by James E. Faulds, Ph.D., State Geologist and Director, Bureau of Mines and Geology, University of Nevada, Reno, in opposition to [Assembly Bill 240](#).

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Joint Resolution 3](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit K](#) is written testimony dated March 22, 2021, submitted and presented by Lynn Chapman, State Vice President, Nevada Families for Freedom, in support of [Assembly Joint Resolution 5](#).

[Exhibit L](#) is written testimony dated March 22, 2021, submitted and presented by Ashlee Forman, Cochair, Legislative Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, in opposition to [Assembly Joint Resolution 5](#).