

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Eighty-first Session
April 27, 2021**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Fabian Donate at 3:34 p.m. on Tuesday, April 27, 2021, Online and in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Fabian Donate, Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible, Vice Chair
Senator Chris Brooks
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Ira Hansen

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Cecelia González, Assembly District No. 16

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Policy Analyst
Allan Amburn, Counsel
Christine Miner, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Christi Cabrera, Nevada Conservation League
William Pregman, Battle Born Progress
Nick Christenson, Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter
Larry Johnson, President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife
Jaina Moan, The Nature Conservancy
Taylor Patterson, Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada
Russell Kuhlman, Executive Director, Nevada Wildlife Federation
Janine Hansen, Nevada Families for Freedom
Martin Paris, Executive Director, Nevada Cattlemen's Association
Lynn Chapman, Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 27, 2021
Page 2

Jake Tibbitts, Natural Resources Manager, Eureka County

Bob Russo

Colby Prout, Natural Resources Manager, Nevada Association of Counties

Adam Sullivan, Acting State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Micheline Fairbank, Deputy Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Charles Donohue, Administrator, Division of State Lands, State Land Registrar,
State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Marla McDade Williams, Reno Sparks Indian Colony

Steve Walker, Douglas County; Carson City

Will Adler, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe

Stacey Montooth, Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission

Cynthia Laframboise, Chair, Nevada State Board on Geographic Names

CHAIR DONATE:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution (A.J.R.) 3.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3: Urges various actions relating to the
protection and conservation of land and water. (BDR R-775)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CECILIA GONZÁLEZ (Assembly District No. 16):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit B](#)) outlining the provisions in
A.J.R. 3.

CHRISTI CABRERA (Nevada Conservation League):

Many prominent scientists have called for the conservation of 30 percent of the
world's land and waters by the year 2030. I will refer to this as the 30x30 goal.
I will touch on why this goal is important to the Country and Nevada.

A massive environmental crisis is facing the Country. Every 30 seconds, a
football field worth of America's natural areas disappear. One-third of America's
wildlife is at risk of extinction. Climate change is having disastrous impacts
across the globe.

In the last two decades, Nevada has lost more than nine million acres of wildlife
habitat to wildfires and ranks third in the Nation for the number of its species at
risk. Nevada is home to two of the fastest-warming cities in the U.S.

Eighty percent of Nevada lands are owned by the federal government. Nevada has the unique opportunity to lead the charge in achieving the 30x30 goal. Conserving the State's lands and waters will help mitigate the effects of climate change and protect wildlife, their habitat and its precious natural resources.

Conserving lands is good for our economy. A report out of Cambridge University found that the economic benefits of protecting at least 30 percent of the world's lands and oceans outweigh the costs by a 5-to-1 ratio. The report offers that protections in today's economy bring more revenue than the alternatives, adding revenue to agriculture and forestry while preventing climate change, water crises, biodiversity loss and disease.

The 30x30 goal will help support Nevada's booming outdoor recreation economy which contributes significantly to our State's revenue, boosts local businesses and creates jobs. This is especially important as we continue to recover from the Covid-19 pandemic. The 30x30 goal has widespread support across the Country and the State.

In January, 2021, 450 elected officials from 43 states signed an open letter supporting a national 30x30 goal, and last month, 70 mayors from across the Country published a similar letter. In Nevada, 2 county commissioners, 2 mayors and 11 Legislators signed similar letters. Clark County Commissioners unanimously approved a resolution supporting the 30x30 goal. I have submitted a letter ([Exhibit C](#)) in support of A.J.R. 3 signed by 19 Nevada organizations and businesses.

A 2021 Conservation in the West Survey found that 82 percent of Nevadans support the 30x30 goal, and 85 percent support creating new national parks, monuments, wildlife refuges and tribal-protected areas.

Passage of A.J.R. 3 sends a message to the U.S. Congress and federal land managers that Nevadans value their public lands, communities, plants and wildlife. It sends the message that Nevadans want to be active participants in conservation actions concerning their State lands and waters, and those conversations and actions need to have robust and inclusive stakeholder processes.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 27, 2021
Page 4

Conserving 30 percent of Nevada lands and waters by 2030 will help mitigate climate change impacts, protect treasured outdoor spaces and boost the economy.

SENATOR BROOKS:

On page 2 of A.J.R. 3, lines 12 through 16 read:

WHEREAS, The conservation of land and water in the State may be accomplished through a combination of federal and state action including, without limitation, designating or establishing wilderness areas, national parks, state parks and wildlife management areas;

Is the intent to have other methods of keeping our public lands available beyond those methods mentioned in this portion of the resolution?

MS. CABRERA:

It is not an inclusive list; there can be other designations. The point of the resolution is to start conversations and for Nevadans to be included in the conversations while moving forward to protect 30 percent of our lands.

SENATOR BROOKS:

It is stated in the resolution that 70.2 million acres are administered by various federal agencies. Do you see multiple-use mandates and multiple uses in conflict with 30 percent of the land we want to protect? We have designated protected lands and multiple uses available which include transmission lines, grazing, mining and off-highway vehicles.

MS. CABRERA:

Multiple uses in designated areas will remain. The lands designated for protection, whether it is a national recreation area or wilderness with designations and multiple uses, will continue. It is not the goal to shut down designated activities.

CHAIR DONATE:

Where does Nevada stand in reaching the 30x30 goal?

MS. CABRERA:

Nevada has achieved protections of between 12 percent to 15 percent depending on what is considered protected. It covers most of the major designations such as wilderness, wildlife refuges and national parks.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I am concerned about the water portion of the 30x30 goal. Nevada does not have 30 percent of unappropriated water. How is that going to be addressed?

MS. CABRERA:

The goal is for water conservation, not quantity of water. It is to ensure protection from degradation of 30 percent of Nevada's water bodies including streams, lakes and big water bodies.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I question the ability to protect water if someone has the right to use it.

SENATOR HANSEN:

There are so many false premises A.J.R. 3 is based upon. It is vague as to what is being conserved and protected, and how it will be accomplished. Nine million acres was mentioned as being destroyed in Nevada by wildfires. Wildfires are temporary, as are the setbacks. Fires can prove beneficial over time. Beautiful wildlife habitat has been restored by nature in areas where wildfires destroyed habitat 15 to 20 years ago. The assumption that once a fire occurs it is a permanent scar without recovery is one example where the resolution does not align with reality.

Conservation measures have been aggressively addressed by the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service in Nevada for over 100 years. Under federal control, Nevada has had nine million acres of wildfires and one-third of wildlife facing extinction. How much more federal oversight of the public domain, as proposed by the 30x30 goal, must we allow?

MS. CABRERA:

The intent is not to assume areas destroyed by wildfires could never be fixed. A large part of the 30x30 goal is restoring and reseeding wildfire areas. The resolution does not allow more land be transferred to the federal government but to give higher levels of protection to areas under federal management. Perhaps designating some of the lands as national recreation areas or national

monuments can occur depending on what kind of designation makes sense in the area.

SENATOR HANSEN:

This resolution will expand federal oversight over federal public domain. Giving more control to the federal government has proven to worsen the situation. The resolution starts on the flawed premise of climate change and carbon dioxide poisoning. Over the last 100 years, we have dramatically expanded oversight and control by the federal government of the public domain in Nevada, and things have gotten extensively worse by your own definition. Rather than expanding State and private control of our resources, the 30x30 goal will set up more monuments, and more areas will be eliminated from multiple-use opportunities. Restricting people and vague conservation is not defined in the resolution. There are significant holes in statements made as facts as the basis behind this resolution.

CHAIR DONATE:

There is some opposition coming from rural counties and communities. Have you reached out to address their concerns?

MS. CABRERA:

The Nevada Conservation League has had preliminary conversations with the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) prior to the initial hearing for the Nevada State Assembly. The emphases on wanting local governments, business owners, ranchers and grazers to be included in the conversations influenced NACO to be neutral on A.J.R. 3. The counties will be included in the decisions on what the protections mean and what areas deserve higher levels of designation.

WILLIAM PREGMAN (Battle Born Progress):

Battle Born Progress supports A.J.R. 3. Nevada is in the front lines on the issues this resolution addresses. Nevada is home to some of the most unique and valuable wildlife species. It is sixth in the Nation for the number of its unique species, ninth in mammal diversity and eleventh in the Nation in total species diversity.

Nevada is third in the Nation for the highest number of species at risk. To confront the rapid loss of Nevada's precious wildlife, we must accelerate land

and water conservation and restoration efforts. A State commitment to the 30x30 goal will help ensure protections of its wild heritage.

NICK CHRISTENSON (Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter):

The Sierra Club Toiyabe Chapter and its Nevada members and supporters favor A.J.R. 3. The Biden Administration has committed the U.S. to protecting at least 30 percent of the Country's lands by 2030. This overlaps with what is proposed in A.J.R. 3. Nevada should make the same commitment to protect this amount of space. There are many natural spaces warranting additional protection. It is good climate policy and good for our outdoor recreation industry. Over capacity crowds visit Red Rock Canyon. Additional accessible protected wild spaces can help to avoid overuse of Nevada's established protected spaces.

Two years ago, the Nevada Legislature passed a bill to identify policies that would help fight climate change. There are steps Nevada could and should take to ensure a livable future. This resolution is one of the easier steps. The resolution recommends establishing Avi Kwa Ame as a national monument and advocates permanent protections for the Desert National Wildlife Refuge. These are positive developments for Nevada and the Nation.

LARRY JOHNSON (President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):

The Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife supports the concepts of A.J.R. 3, not necessarily adding special federal land designations. Opportunities for local representation to be involved in advancing these proposals are positive parts of the narration. The Coalition recognizes and supports Nevada ranchers for water resource development and maintenance of public lands utilized by all wildlife. Irrigation of wet meadows on both private and public lands is vital to such species as sage grouse. The Coalition supports any initiative to restore wildfire burned areas and habitat.

JAINA MOAN (The Nature Conservancy):

The Nature Conservancy supports A.J.R. 3 and the 30x30 goal. It has submitted a letter of support signed by Mauricia M.M. Baca, Nevada State Director of The Nature Conservancy, and a fact sheet ([Exhibit D](#)) offering guidance to achieve the 30x30 goal. A broad definition of protection is warranted for conservation efforts inclusive across all land ownership types including public, private and indigenous lands.

All ecosystem types need a minimum level of protection with effective management and conservation efforts to be durable and equitable. The Conservancy recommends 30x30 efforts be focused on conservation goals and principles that could be applied broadly across lands and waters. The 30x30 goal is not intended to transfer ownership or control of lands and rights of way, rather to conserve wildlife habitats and biodiversity. [Exhibit D](#) provides a visual example of areas warranting further investigation as being suitable places for protections to meet the 30x30 goal. The resolution is the first step to achieve this goal.

TAYLOR PATTERSON (Executive Director, Native Voters Alliance Nevada):
Assembly Joint Resolution 3 is a step in the right direction in honoring the lands taken from their rightful stewards—Indigenous peoples of Nevada. Those that took these lands used them with complete disregard and without consultation from the stewards. This is an opportunity to treat our lands and waters with deserved respect. Two of the areas recommended for conservation in the resolution, Avi Kwa Ame and the Desert National Wildlife Refuge, are sights sacred to Native Americans. This represents a new chapter in healing the relationship between Indigenous people and the State. The Native Voters Alliance Nevada supports A.J.R. 3.

RUSSELL KUHLMAN (Executive Director, Nevada Wildlife Federation):
The Nevada Wildlife Federation supports A.J.R. 3. Nevadans cherish their public lands and landscapes. These lands are the largest economic drivers in many rural communities providing approximately 59,000 jobs and \$1.1 billion annual tax revenue. This resolution expresses the need for broad collaboration between all public land user groups, including the sporting community which historically has a very successful track record for large-scale conservation objectives. The Pittman-Robertson Act and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Federal Duck Stamp Program and the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation come to mind as examples of successful conservation programs.

The Wildlife Federation supports A.J.R. 3 recognizing that hunting and fishing are sustainable activities in harmony with many other management goals using science-based strategic implementation to conserve our wild landscapes. The resolution has the potential to be an historic conservation victory and supporting it contributes to the protections of important areas for future generations.

JANINE HANSEN (Nevada Families for Freedom):

Nevada Families for Freedom is seriously concerned with A.J.R. 3 and considers it a threat to one of the most essential freedoms—the right to own private property. John Adams said “The moment the idea is admitted into society that property is not as sacred as the law of God, and that there is not a force of law and public justice to protect it, anarchy and tyranny commence.”

Private property owners are mentioned in the resolution as an afterthought encouraging them to participate in voluntary programs. There is no recognition of the critical importance of private property to our State’s economy or the wonderful job most private land owners do to preserve our State’s wildlife and resources.

The sponsors of this bill are uninformed about the realities of land and water in Nevada. The federal government controls 87 percent of Nevada lands and has mismanaged it dreadfully resulting in destructive wildfires and loss of agricultural enterprises in ranching and farming while harming wildlife by destroying natural habitat.

This resolution does not acknowledge the many inheritable property rights on federally controlled lands. These include grazing and mineral rights. Legal water rights are attached to most of the water in Nevada, and there is no water for the resolution to lockup.

The goals of this resolution are possible only if the government plans to steal or confiscate the property and water rights owned legally in Nevada. Is that the real plan?

MARTIN PARIS (Executive Director, Nevada Cattlemen's Association):

The Nevada Cattlemen's Association opposes A.J.R. 3. Four months ago, Executive Order 14008 was signed by President Joe Biden containing the 30x30 goal. No further information has been provided to anyone regarding the meaning, objectives or implementation of the 30x30 program. We are left to assume the implementation of the 30x30 goal would prescribe a protectionism approach, chocked-full of top-down decrees and land use restrictions based on highly politicized science and widely varying public opinion.

Working and properly managing landscapes at the local level will help address the issues identified in A.J.R. 3. Ranchers and farmers have worked for

generations on Nevada's landscapes and rely on and help promote healthy public and private lands through various conservation measures. Livestock can be a major tool in carbon sequestration and wildfire prevention but can only be used as a tool if we choose a conservationist approach to land management as opposed to protectionism, which often leads to protecting our landscapes to death.

LYNN CHAPMAN (Treasurer, Independent American Party of Nevada):

The goals of A.J.R. 3 remind me of the federal takeover of States' sovereignty in America. Private property is an important reason why people left birth countries to come to America. Private property and liberties are important in our Country. George Washington wrote "Freedom and Property Rights are inseparable. You can't have one without the other." Private property owners take care of their lands and waters, especially when making a living on the land. Using words "protecting land and water" are deceiving to Nevada citizens; it looks like a taking. The resolution is not truthful.

JAKE TIBBITTS (Natural Resources Manager, Eureka County):

Eureka County opposes A.J.R. 3 and is concerned with the 30x30 goal. It is a hyperpartisan top-down decree and alienates many rural Nevadans and Americans who otherwise support healthy lands, waters and wildlife. The 30x30 goal will reduce working lands, implement hands-off management, increase wildfires, reduce productivity and impair rural communities.

Scientific research has shown many areas labelled protected or wilderness were actively manipulated by human activities for thousands of years. A paper by 18 respected scientists found more than 95 percent of U.S. temperate lands have been actively shaped by people for at least 12,000 years. Researchers concluded that land use history confirms that empowering the environmental stewardship of Indigenous peoples and local communities will be critical to conserving biodiversity across the planet.

Assembly Joint Resolution 3 and the supporting testimony proposes to establish land designations proven to remove active influences of man with a false narrative about protecting the lands. At the national level, the rhetoric supporting the false narrative is rampant.

Keeping agricultural lands profitable, including public land grazing, is crucial. Collectively focusing on incentive-based conservation measures benefits rural

communities and does not disenfranchise and offend those dependent on and making a living from natural resources.

BOB RUSSO:

I oppose A.J.R. 3. It states the scientific community recommends the steps in this resolution to mitigate climate impacts. Who is the scientific community being referenced?

As much as we are told that science is settled in the field of climate change, it is not. There are numerous scientists worldwide challenging the climate change model of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The 97 percent scientific consensus standard has been challenged and debunked by other studies. There is disagreement! Dr. Ed Berry, climate physicist from Bigfork, Montana, has written a book challenging the IPCC's data on carbon by showing that nature, not humans, has caused most of the carbon dioxide (CO₂) increase since 1750. Former NASA scientist, Dr. Leslie Woodcock, stated that "the theory of man-made climate change is an unsubstantiated hypothesis."

Glacial records show geological periods with rising CO₂ and global cooling and periods with low atmospheric CO₂ and global warming. According to astrophysicist, Dr. Willie Soon, atmospheric CO₂ tends to follow rather than lead temperature and biosphere changes.

Assembly Joint Resolution 3 promotes expensive and hefty government measures based on climate science yet to be settled. This resolution is unconstitutional. There is nowhere in the Constitution permitting the federal government be in the land-grabbing business. Most of the waters in Nevada have associated water rights. Thirty percent of Nevada lands and waters are unavailable for lockup by the government.

I fear this resolution will impinge upon the property rights of Nevadans. Individual property rights must be protected. I believe this resolution will be economically problematic for rural counties and foster more government waste.

COLBY PROUT (Natural Resources Manager, Nevada Association of Counties):
The Nevada Association of Counties is neutral on A.J.R. 3. Eureka County is in opposition and not included in this neutral testimony. The resolution outlines legislative support of an admirable goal set by the Biden Administration to conserve 30 percent of the Nation's lands by 2030. Nevada's counties are

strong believers in conservation. Eighty-six percent of Nevada lands are managed by the federal government, and the majesty of our natural resources is an essential part of the quality of life in our communities.

Much of the work of NACO is focused on ensuring the federal government listens to local concerns and coordinates land use and management decisions of counties. Counties seek seats at the table on large federal projects impacting natural resources and public lands. By encouraging the federal government to move forward with the 30x30 goal, the Legislature recognizes that whatever future designations or restrictions on public land use occur, they be consistent with local land use plans, not incapacitate mandated county functions, and infrastructure implementation will occur after consultation and coordination with local governments. It is important for counties to participate in the conversations.

County, State and federal interests are often aligned with conservation goals. A recent Clark County Lands Bill introduced to the U.S. Senate by U.S. Senator Catherine Cortez Masto was the result of extensive local consultation and conversations demonstrating the importance of conversations in local communities with local governments.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ:

The intent of A.J.R. 3 is not to take away any land or water rights. It is to protect and address the intense climate change the State and Country are experiencing. Scientific data and facts have led the way. I am committed to ensuring all voices be heard and am willing to continue conversations. The intent of the resolution is that every voice at every level be heard.

CHAIR DONATE:

I will close the hearing on A.J.R. 3 and open the hearing on A.B. 6.

ASSEMBLY BILL 6 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing an application for a temporary change relating to appropriated water. (BDR 48-309)

ADAM SULLIVAN (Acting State Engineer, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I will read from my written testimony (Exhibit E) introducing and supporting A.B. 6.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

When, in practice, are you holding hearings on contested applications, and when are you not holding hearings?

MR. SULLIVAN:

When a water right application is filed, it is published for a period of four weeks. Anyone with a protest to the application may file it with the Office of the State Engineer with supportive circumstances and data. If there are concerns the application could conflict with public interest, it is at the discretion of the State Engineer to hold a hearing.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

What are the factors utilized by the State Engineer in exercising discretion to determine when to hold a hearing?

MICHELINE FAIRBANK (Deputy Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

The factors utilized to determine when a hearing is held varies. It is dependent on the nature of the protest and if there is sufficient information and evidence to make a determination.

The Office of the State Engineer tends to conduct more hearings rather than less hearings on more contentious issues, even if sufficient evidence and information is available to support a decision. Based on the nature of particular protest claims and elements and location of an application, a hearing may be warranted to assure full and adequate opportunity for interested individuals or those challenging the application to present their positions and viewpoints. The trend for more hearings is increasing.

There is no set criteria on a checklist. The determination to conduct a hearing is made on a case-by-case basis based on the application, evidence and associated factors.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Would you direct me to the statute about how this would mirror the requirements for contested permanent applications for changes in water rights?

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 27, 2021
Page 14

MS. FAIRBANK:

Nevada Revised Statutes 533.365 provides protest procedures applicable to permanent and temporary change applications.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Does statute contain provisions on time limitations of temporary change applications?

MR. SULLIVAN:

A temporary change application is limited to one year or less from the date it is approved.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

So, in reality, the time limitation for a temporary change application would be over before a hearing would be warranted.

CHAIR DONATE:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 6 and open the hearing on A.B. 52.

ASSEMBLY BILL 52 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes related to the Land Use Planning Advisory Council. (BDR 26-342)

CHARLES DONOHUE (Administrator, Division of State Lands, State Land Registrar, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)) on A.B. 52 proposing changes to statute regarding the State Land Use Planning Advisory Council (SLUPAC). I will review the changes in the proposed amendment ([Exhibit G](#)) which add the Nevada Indian Commission member as a voting member.

CHAIR DONATE:

To clarify, the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#), changes membership on SLUPAC from 17 members to 18 members.

MARLA MCDADE WILLIAMS (Reno Sparks Indian Colony):

The Reno Sparks Indian Colony supports A.B. 52 and the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#). The Colony appreciates SLUPAC and the Division of State Lands for recognizing the opportunity to increase communication between county and tribal issues.

STEVE WALKER (Douglas County; Carson City):
Douglas County and Carson City support A.B. 52 and the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#).

WILL ADLER (Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe):
The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe supports A.B. 52 and the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#), and supports the sentiments of the Reno Sparks Indian Colony.

MR. TIBBITTS:
Eureka County supports A.B. 52 and the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#). It is important to have tribal interests represented as Governor-appointed voting members of SLUPAC because of their unique roles and perspectives on land use planning and policy. Clarifying the role and duties of SLUPAC is needed.

STACEY MONTTOOTH (Executive Director, Nevada Indian Commission):
The Nevada Indian Commission supports A.B. 52 and is tasked with improving the quality of life for all Indigenous people in Nevada. The Commission focuses on developing and improving cooperation and communication between tribal nations, State and local governments and related public agencies. The purpose is to facilitate greater access to education, employment, health, well-being and growing the socioeconomic status of Nevada's American Indian citizens while enhancing tribal sovereignty, economic opportunities and community development.

Section 1 adds a voting member of SLUPAC appointed by the Nevada Indian Commission. The Commission fully supports the additional member on the Council, and this voting member will help provide a vital Native American perspective on land use planning.

The Indian Commission supports the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#), for representation on the Council to be appointed by the Governor as a voting member. The Commission's intent would be to make a nomination of its representative to the Governor, then the Governor would make the appointment, just like the other voting members of SLUPAC. There are 27 federally recognized tribal nations in Nevada, and each Indian reservation, colony and band has its own land use plan. There are millions of acres of lands the tribal nations own or manage, and they implement land use planning.

MR. PROUT:

The Nevada Association of Counties supports A.B. 52 and the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#), and supports the addition of a voting member nominated by the Nevada Indian Commission. The members of SLUPAC will benefit from the added perspective and experience. Nevada counties are allowed by SLUPAC to participate in meaningful coordination and collaboration on federal management and land use decisions that impact county functions, rangeland and watershed health and the lives and livelihoods of county constituents. The bill properly articulates the ability of SLUPAC to participate and advise federal land management agencies on the impacts of proposed federal actions. The challenge for many individual counties is the ability to participate and coordinate with federal agencies. This is due to either the county's capacity to do so or the federal agency's unwillingness to consider county needs.

CHAIR DONATE:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 52 and open the hearing on A.B. 72.

ASSEMBLY BILL 72: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada State Board on Geographic Names. (BDR 26-258)

CYNTHIA LAFRAMBOISE (Chair, Nevada State Board on Geographic Names):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)) outlining the intent of A.B. 72.

MS. WILLIAMS:

The Reno Sparks Indian Colony supports A.B. 72 for the inclusion of a tribal member on the State Board of Geographic Names. Prior to settlement, Nevada was a territory of the Paiute, Shoshone and Washoe Tribes. Many historical names used by the tribal people were replaced by settler names. Tribal representation on the Board will contribute to accurately enriching Nevada's history.

MR. ADLER:

The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe supports A.B. 72 for recognizing the need for inclusion of diverse voices on the Board.

MS. MONTTOOTH:

Nevada Indian Commission supports A.B. 72. The Commission is tasked with improving the quality of life for all Indigenous people in Nevada. The Commission focuses on developing and improving cooperation and

communication between tribal nations, State and local governments and related public agencies.

There are 27 federally recognized tribal nations, bands and colonies in Nevada. A place-name is a reference point for the language and identity of American Indians. The bill recognizes our Native Americans as the first caretakers of this land. Paths and trails established by the Numa, Newe, Wa She Shu, Paiute, Shoshone and Washoe Tribes evolved to become paths, wagon roads, paved roads and highways. Several paths and geographic landmarks exist today.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In section 1, subsection 2 of A.B. 72 states "An Executive Secretary who is a nonvoting member of the Board. The voting members of the Board shall select the Executive Secretary." Are they selecting from the other 12 members on the Board or an outside person?

MS. LAFRAMBOISE:

The Executive Secretary will be selected from the Nevada State Board on Geographic Names, and there will be 11 voting members.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Is the Executive Secretary selected from one of the 12 members on the Board and becomes a nonvoting member?

MS. LAFRAMBOISE:

That is correct.

CHAIR DONATE:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 72.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 27, 2021
Page 18

CHAIR DONATE:

Having no further business, we will adjourn this meeting at 5:03 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Christine Miner,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Fabian Donate, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Begins on Page	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
A.J.R. 3	B	1	Assemblywoman Cecelia González	Written Testimony
A.J.R. 3	C	1	Christi Cabrera / Nevada Conservation League	Support Letter by 19 Businesses and Organizations
A.J.R. 3	D	1	Jaina Moan/ The Nature Conservancy	Letter of support signed by Mauricia M.M. Baca / Fact Sheet
A.B. 6	E	1	Adam Sullivan / Division of Water Resources / State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Written Testimony
A.B. 52	F	1	Charles Donohue / Division of State Lands / State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Written Testimony
A.B. 52	G	1	Charles Donohue / Division of State Lands / State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Proposed Amendment
AB. 72	H	1	Cynthia Laframboise / Nevada State Board on Geographic Names	Written Testimony