

Library

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON NATURAL RESOURCES

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
February 23, 1981

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chairman Norman Glaser at 1:30 P. M., Monday, February 23, 1981, in Room 323 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Norman Glaser, Chairman
Senator Wilbur Faiss, Vice Chairman
Senator Lawrence Jacobsen
Senator Joe Neal
Senator James Bilbray

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

Senator Floyd Lamb

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Robert E. Erickson, Senior Research Analyst
Carolyn L. Freeland, Committee Secretary

GUEST LEGISLATORS:

Assemblyman Dean Rhoads
Assemblyman John Marvel

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 17

Assemblyman Dean Rhoads commenced testimony on this resolution. He said the resolution actually proposes what would be done with lands if the state ever actually did obtain control of them. He referred to Assembly Bill No. 413 of the 60th Session, saying that at the time that bill was passed, it was felt it contained adequate checks and balances concerning management and disposal of state lands, preventing any wholesale sale of the lands. He said the last thing legislators want to see is the land put up for sale, allowing power groups to gain control of it for uses not in the best interests of the people of Nevada.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

Assemblyman Rhoads feels putting this matter into the Constitution would lock up most of the land for multiple land use, making it virtually impossible to sell land to ranchers, land developers, speculators and others.

Assemblyman John Marvel then spoke, saying he would like to reaffirm what Assemblyman Rhoads had said. He feels this resolution would help to allay the fears of those who feel the Sagebrush movement is one designed to improve the position of large land owners, developers and speculators.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 17

Assemblyman Rhoads then spoke of the Select Committee on Public Lands; this resolution authorizes the continuation of that committee. He traced its history, noting it has been a very effective group. It has coordinated efforts among fourteen Western states to achieve legislation such as has been passed in Nevada. He feels the work of this committee is vital.

He suggested one change in the resolution. On line 25, he would like the "three" to be changed to "four" in the Assembly. The Chairman replied that he had on hand an amendment to that effect.

Assemblyman Marvel added it is necessary to have some type of structure such as the Select Committee to prevent the "Sagebrush Rebellion" from being defused, and the people sitting on the committee provide the expertise that is required to follow through.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 18

Assemblyman Rhoads feels this resolution, although it may sound repetitious, is needed to reassure the new administration that Nevada's public lands goal is the same. He noted that legislation on a national level is due to be introduced soon by Senator Hatch and by Congressman Santini, dealing with return of the public lands to the states. Secretary of the Interior James Watt has also pledged to act quickly on certain aspects of transferring of public lands to the states.

Assemblyman Marvel echoed these sentiments, saying it is imperative to keep the issue alive and in both the public and administrative eye. He referred to the legislative approach versus the judicial approach, saying the time has not been right to force a judicial issue.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

SENATE BILL NO. 238

Assemblyman Rhoads noted that Congressman Santini had been very interested in passing Congressional legislation providing payment in lieu to many counties in the Western states which are heavily burdened by a large share of federal ownership. He noted that payment in lieu funds had been deleted from the Carter budget, but that the Reagan administration might take a look at it. Assemblyman Rhoads said it is the feeling that, if in the event public lands are returned to the state, much of the money accrued be returned to the local counties because of the inability to tax in certain counties.

Assemblyman Marvel added that this bill would not change the complexion of the lands involved; they would still be public lands, but the counties are entitled to monies coming from them, as are other local governmental entities. The same financing structure would be available.

There was discussion on the total revenues now derived from the public lands. Assemblyman Rhoads said in 1979, it was about twenty-four million dollars that went to Washington from the state via the Bureau of Land Management.

Senator Bilbray asked what would happen with the highway construction funds, as he understands such funds are based on the amount of public land versus privately-held land. He wanted to know if the state would lose the highway matching funds. Assemblyman Rhoads said probably that would happen, although there is a new direction in Washington to delete these funds anyway.

Senator Neal questioned Assemblyman Rhoads regarding the pertinence of Senate Joint Resolution No. 17 and Mr. Rhoads replied he feels the resolution is the most important piece of legislation that can be passed this session which relates to public lands. Mr. Marvel added the resolution is needed to convince the public of the sincerity and credibility of the public lands effort.

Senator Jacobsen feels that a type of chart is needed to be included with the resolution, giving a breakdown of land distribution. Senator Glaser added it should be put in layman's language, so it could be easily understood.

The Chairman noted that technicians will be explaining facts and background later in the meeting.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

Senator Jacobsen wanted to know who presently are members of the Select Committee on Public Lands. He feels there is a danger of perpetuating a member or members who might not be ideally suited to the task; there is a need to have people who are willing to do what has to be done to achieve results. He also feels that there is a need for better and wider communication regarding the Select Committee.

Assemblyman Rhoads enumerated the committee members: Senator Glaser, Senator Blakemore, Senator Don Ashworth (this membership is as yet not official on the Senate side); on the Assembly side, members are Assemblyman Marvel, Assemblyman Rhoads, Assemblyman Hayes, and Assemblyman Glover, but these assignments are as yet not definite, as their assignments depend upon the Speaker of the Assembly.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 17

Mr. Robert Erickson, Senior Research Analyst, Legislative Counsel Bureau, then presented a breakdown section by section of this resolution. Mr. Will Crockett, Legal Counsel, Legislative Counsel Bureau, assisted in the explanation.

Mr. Crockett discussed Section 10 in detail. He said the latest thinking on Section 10, instead of having to redo it, would be to delete it. The items in the section dealing with land disposal are patterned after those in the Organic Act, which does not have a catch-all but does make provisions for other kinds of disposal. He added that all the sections of the resolution had restrictions contained within them so land could not be sold without public knowledge and approval of local governments and state agencies involved. Mr. Erickson noted that, by removal of this section, it is a guarantee to the public that the lands will always remain public. Mr. Crockett added that the legislature's role would still be to effectuate each of the different purposes of the land, but that a great amount of detail still has to be provided.

Senator Neal said as this resolution is a constitutional amendment, the legislature would be limited as to what it could do. He feels the legislature as a whole would not be able to consider the entire question of how to act on land transferral matters, especially if Section 10 was removed.

Chairman Glaser said Section 10 might be in conflict with the Sanini-Hatch Act, and Mr. Crockett concurred, unless a modification was made in that Act.

There was discussion on the language in Section 10 and consideration

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

of ways in which to modify it. Mr. Crockett suggested wording "if consistent with conditions imposed on the granting of lands" similar to what is in Section 2. Chairman Glaser said note would be made of that phrase for use as a possible amendment to the resolution. Mr. Crockett had an additional comment on Section 1; for commercial purposes, perhaps putting an acreage restriction in the language, in order to make it tighter. Senator Bilbray said he would like to talk with city and county people about this suggestion to ascertain if they could see any problems. Senator Glaser said he would hesitate to incorporate any more restrictions.

Senator Neal wanted to know to what uses those lands not included in the resolution are being put. Mr. Crockett replied that referring to federal lands, everything is included except perhaps those lands having historic values. It was pointed out this resolution does not address to uses except special disposals and leases.

Mr. Crockett explained he tried to preserve the existing language of the Constitution but he said the best way seemed to be to rewrite Section 3 of Article XI so Section 3 of the resolution is a rewrite of the existing language, although the substance is the same. Mr. Crockett made an additional comment on item 4 in Section 3. Mr. Erickson said it might be feasible to include mining leases in Section 5 specifically.

There was a brief discussion on the subject of renewable resources. That concluded the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution No. 17.

SENATE BILL NO. 238

Mr. Erickson gave introductory remarks regarding this bill, presenting figures and information as to what the federal government is proposing to do for in lieu payments. He explained that if the state takes over the federal lands, it would take over the in lieu payments, such payments to be based on the last, or immediately preceding, federal fiscal year.

Mr. Crockett explained Section 1 of the bill, and said the important aspects of it are the transitional provisions contained therein. There was discussion on the monies involved.

Senator Bilbray feels there is a tremendous impact on the cities and counties; their tax base is being eroded and he feels that perhaps a better formula could be devised for distribution of funds.

Senator Glaser said the intent of the Select Committee was to recognize this problem, that there is some liability on the part of the state to continue to help the cities and counties. He questioned

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

if an amount should be inserted in the bill at this time. Mr. Crockett said perhaps some mechanism should be used to give the Interim Finance Committee the opportunity of approving or disapproving a contingent sum.

Mr. Crockett said the federal formula is designed to be appropriate to the situation.

Senator Jacobsen asked if staff could develop a chart for three years showing variation of payments to counties. Senator Glaser approved Senator Bilbray's suggestion that representatives from the counties appear to testify on this and the preceding bill.

There being no further testimony, the hearing on Senate Bill No. 238 from Mr. Erickson and Mr. Crockett was concluded.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION NO. 17

Senator Bilbray wanted to know the cost over the biennium to fund the Select Committee. Mr. Erickson replied that through February 19 the committee has spent approximately \$23,000 (since July of 1979).

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 17

Mr. Jac Shaw, Director of State Lands, said that the resolution has been very thoroughly discussed, but he would like to reiterate the mineral industry should be added to Section 1. He also suggested the language dealing with sales of minerals, gravel, oil and gas on line 14 be moved down to the "all other revenue" section that starts on line 17. He had other suggestions; in Section 3, subsection 2, the language should be changed to "irrigated agricultural purposes;" Section 3, subsection 7, the language should be in (a) "The legislature by law; or"...; subsection 8, there should be considered a broader exchange policy. Continuing, in subsection 9, the 640 acres should be amended to read "one section." He feels that Section 10 should be eliminated; he said the people of Nevada have fears of how this land is to be used, and Section 10 could allow a vested interest group in the legislature to mishandle the lands. He, too, feels this legislation is the most important regarding land use to come before the Session this year.

Mr. Shaw continued, saying he feels the attitude in Washington is better than at any time in the past, and he definitely feels the state will obtain title to some of the unappropriated public lands.

Chairman Glaser noted there has been a shift in approach to the public lands question from judicial to legislative. He feels the

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

situation looks better than it did two years ago. He said people are relating to the "Sagebrush Rebellion" and states' rights issue in other terms than just public lands.

There ensued a brief discussion of the history of the State of Nevada as it relates to the admission of the state to the Union.

SENATE BILL NO. 238

Mr. Shaw referred to this bill as being the second major concern of the people in Nevada. The loss of in lieu funds is a very important subject, and Mr. Shaw feels, as does Senator Bilbray, that county commissioners should provide input on the matter. He feels there should be a new approach to the partnership between the local and the state governments on the sharing of revenue. However, Mr. Shaw feels the purpose of this legislation is to assure local communities that there would not be a loss to them by the state asserting its authority over the lands. When this does occur, there should be a change in the total method of using receipts from the land.

Mr. Shaw then spoke on the matter of highways and road building, giving figures to support his position. He added there would be testimony on this particular subject in depth from a representative of the Department of Transportation.

He concluded his testimony by saying he is in favor of Senate Bill No. 238, and that it is showing good faith to the people of Nevada of the intent of the "Sagebrush Rebellion."

Chairman Glaser asked Mr. Shaw if, assuming the state was not designated a public lands state, thereby reducing federal highway funds, the state could fund its obligations to come up with additional highway money, in lieu of funds, management and maintenance monies for the state public lands, from the revenue to be derived from the public lands. Mr. Shaw replied that such would be possible. He said the state has not gone into, in depth, a budget-making process at this point. What has been done is to utilize the Bureau of Land Management figures and other public lands states' figures to project a budget survey, and rough figures indicate the state would be in the black. Nevada would not have the expenses which the Bureau has, so using their figures does not provide a complete or accurate monetary picture.

Mr. Shaw offered a few brief remarks relative to Senate Concurrent Resolution No. 17, saying he has seldom seen a harder-working or more dedicated committee than the Select Committee. He then referred to Senate Joint Resolution No. 18, remarking it is necessary to make other parts of the country aware of what has happened

Select Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

in the development of the West. He feels this resolution is very appropriate in advising the rest of the nation of Nevada's concerns.

Chairman Glaser asked if the members of the committee would be interested in seeing and having explained a copy of the Santini-Hatch bill. It was agreed that Mr. Erickson would supply copies of the Santini Bill from the last session of Congress.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION NO. 18

Mr. Dennis Barry, of the Nevada Department of Transportation, offered brief testimony regarding this resolution; however, he noted his comments applied to all the bills under discussion at this meeting. He said at the present time, Nevada qualifies for the maximum amount of money available from federal participation in highway construction in public land states. He presented figures relating to the 1981 apportionment; if all the federal lands returned to the state's control, the Nevada Department of Transportation would require an additional 7.6 million dollars of state funds each year to match apportioned federal funds. The interstate ratio would change from 95/5 to 90/10 and other fund ratios (primary, secondary and urban) would change from 95/5 to 75/25. Mr. Barry said these figures do not include the appropriated public lands nor do they include the safety construction portion; the highway safety construction funding would remain at 90/10. Mr. Barry is referring to the 49 million acres of public land designated in the land return bills. He said, however, that due to eligibility to discretionary funds requiring a higher match, the 7.6 million dollar figure could go as high as 13 million dollars. Senator Glaser noted that this last set of figures is an assumption only, and Mr. Barry agreed. Mr. Barry said his department stands ready to supply any support data required.

Mr. Orvis Reil, speaking as a private individual, voiced concerns about highway matching funds. He does not feel the revenue from lands given the state by the federal government would produce funds to sufficiently cover highway construction costs. He feels the three resolutions and the bill under discussion today are all tied together and he is basically opposed to all of them. Mr. Erickson explained that research had been done in these matters and it is the conclusion of the Select Committee that a budget could be balanced to cover all the fund requirements of the various pieces of legislation.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

Mrs. Diane Campbell, representing the Nevada Miners and Prospectors, and the Pershing County Concerned Citizens, read a letter from the Nevada Miners and Prospectors Association, Inc., (Exhibit C), asking that it be made part of the record. She also read a personal statement (Exhibit D) asking that it be incorporated into the record. Testifying for the Pershing County Concerned Citizens in regard to Senate Joint Resolution No. 17, it is felt all proceeds from land revenues should go to the General Fund so the Finance Committee may control them.

Speaking for the Nevada Miners and Prospectors, Mrs. Campbell said the association supports all the bills being considered at this meeting. She asked why the disclaimer had not been removed from the state Constitution. Senator Glaser replied this matter was discussed in the Select Committee and it was legal counsel's opinion that if an effort was made to remove the disclaimer, it would be contradictory to the tenets of Assembly Bill No. 413. Mrs. Campbell feels it should be removed. Senator Bilbray pointed out that the disclaimer was needed for admission to the Union.

Mrs. Campbell concluded her testimony by speaking of changes in the language of Senate Joint Resolution No. 17 which were desired. Mr. Erickson clarified the existing language for her. She had questions regarding exchange of lands containing mineral rights and made suggestions for rewording of sections of the resolution. The Chairman said the committee would take them under advisement.

Mr. Lyle Campbell, representing the Pershing County Commissioners and Pershing County Sheriff, read into the record a letter from Sheriff James K. McIntosh (Exhibit E), expressing support for Senate Joint Resolutions No. 17 and No. 18, and a Resolution from the Pershing County Commissioners (Exhibit F) supporting Senate Joint Resolutions No. 17 and No. 18.

Mr. L. E. McKinney, of Hawthorne, asked a question regarding mining leasing. He asked if this legislation goes through if a miner can't stake a claim--it would have to be by the leasing method? He said such an action would put miners out of business.

Senator Bilbray said the matter could be checked out. The Chairman said the question would be researched to protect the miners' interests.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 1981

The Chair called for any other testimony. There being none,
the meeting was adjourned at 4:25 P. M.

Respectfully submitted by:


Carolyn L. Freeland, Secretary

APPROVED BY:


Senator Norman D. Glaser, Chairman

DATE: March 5, 1981

SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

EXHIBIT A

Committee on Natural Resources, Room 323.

Day Monday, Date February 23, Time 1:30 P. M.

S. C. R. No. 17--Continues existence of select committee on public lands. (Amendment attached).

S. J. R. No. 17--Proposes constitutional amendment to regulate management and disposal of state lands.

S. J. R. No. 18--Urges Congress to enact legislation transferring public lands to states.

S. B. 238--Provides for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes if state obtains title to or management of public lands.

Senate Natural Resources Committee
Nevada State Legislature
61st Session
Feb. 23, 1981

DEAR SENATORS,

EXHIBIT C

THE SAGEBRUSH REBELLION WAS BORN OUT OF FRUSTRATION AND ANGER OF THE PEOPLE. WE THAT USE THE PUBLIC LANDS, FIERCELY LOVE THESE LANDS. WE WANT TO BE THE ONES WHO MAKE THE REGULATIONS. WE FEEL THIS CAN BEST BE DONE THRU OUR STATE GOVERNMENT.

WE WITHDRAW OUR SUPPORT TO THE EXISTING AMOUNT OF CENTRAL GOVERNMENT POWER. OUR TOLERATION LEVEL HAS PEAKED. FEDERAL LAW PROVIDES A TYPE OF ORDER BUT BECAUSE IT IS AN ORDER IMPOSED ON LOCAL CONCERNS WITHOUT REFERENCE TO THOSE CONCERNS AND LACKING THE FLEXIBILITY TO SATISFY OUR EXPECTATIONS WE WONDER IF IT IS A LEGAL SYSTEM AT ALL.

WE NEED YOU TO CORRECT, WITH WISDOM, THE MISMANAGEMENT OF OUR PUBLIC LANDS BY THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT. I WOULD LIKE TO REMIND YOU OF A FEW.

IN ANTICIPATION TO THE DESIGNATION OF " WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS " THE BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT CLOSED THE ROAD TO ONE OF OUR BEST FISHING SPOTS IN 1977. BLUE LAKE NEITHER QUALIFIES AS A WILDERNESS AREA NOR A ROADLESS AREA. THIS ASININE DECISION HAS DENIED THE CITIZENS OF NEVADA ACCESS TO THEIR RECREATION.

ANOTHER BAD JOB OF MANAGEMENT BY THE B.L.M. INVOLVES NEVADA'S WILD HORSES. PRIOR TO THE B.L.M. STEPPING INTO THE PICTURE WE ON A LOCAL LEVEL CONTROLLED THE EXCESSIVE NUMBERS OF WILD HORSES. WHEN THE " WILD FREE-ROAMING HORSE AND BURROS ACT " WAS PASSED IN 1971 WE IN NEVADA HAD ABOUT 8500 WILD HORSES. UNDER THE MANAGEMENT OF B.L.M. THESE NUMBERS HAVE GROWN TO APPROXIMATELY 40,000. I CALL THIS A BIG PROBLEM FOR THE RANCHERS.

IN MINING I HAVE A QUESTION. HOW CAN WE CONTINUE TO ALLOW THE U.S. GOVERNMENT TO CLOSE DOWN A MINE BECAUSE OF A WILD MUSTARD PLANT? AS I SEE IT, IT IS THE PRODUCER WHO IS THE ENDANGERED SPECIES.

ABOUT 10.2 PERCENT OF NEVADA'S LAND CONTRIBUTE TO THE STATES TAX BASE. THIS IS A VERY LOPSIDED PICTURE. FEDERAL DOMINATION OF OUR PUBLIC

LANDS IS AT ODDS WITH HISTORY AND THE NOTION OF A UNION OF INDESTRUCTIBLE STATES. ALL OF THE EASTERN STATES HAD TO FIGHT FOR THEIR RIGHTS TO THEIR LANDS, ONE AT A TIME. IT IS NOW OUR TURN. IT IS TIME TO BECOME A SOVEREIGN STATE.

WE ARE HERE TODAY IN SUPPORT OF " STATES RIGHTS ". ~~THEREFORE WE SUPPORT SB 176. IT IS NEEDED NOW TO GIVE OUR STATE CONTROL OF OIL AND AND WATER RESOURCES.~~ WE SUPPORT "SJR 17 " BECAUSE IT PROVIDES THE VEHICLE FOR RESPONSABLE STATE GOVERNMENT WITHIN OUR STATE CONSTITUTION. WE SUPPORT S.C.R. 17 FOR THE EXCELLENT JOB THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS HAS DONE IN THE PAST. AND FOR THE NEED OF WHAT THEY WILL DO FOR OUR STATE IN THE FUTURE. WE SUPPORT SJR 18 BECAUSE UNTILL THIS RESOLUTION IS FULLFILLED BY THE UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT THE CITIZENS OF NEVADA CAN NOT ENJOY THE SOVEREIGNTY OF THEIR STATE. ~~WE SUPPORT~~ ~~AS WE AGREE THE STATE SHOULD PAY TO THE COUNTIES IN 1985 TAXES.~~ WE IN MINING WISH TO REMIND YOU THAT THE "SAGEBRUSH REBELLION" IS A PEOPLE ORIENTED ISSUE. IT IS NOT JUST ANOTHER POLITICAL ACTION.

THANK YOU,

DIANE CAMPBELL
Diane Campbell
 PRESIDENT, NEVADA MINERS
 & PROSPECTORS ASSN. INC.

I have one question for you. Why, if we are the leadership in the "Sagebrush Rebellion" , have we not removed the disclaimer from our State constitution?

*Ruby Lake
 N. X. 1000 - Mineral
 County*

Feb. 19, 1981

By: Diane Campbell

President Nevada Miners & Prospectors Assn.

EXHIBIT D

Interior Secretary James Watt ordered the Heritage Conservation and Recreation Service dismantled today. This is Interior's major land-buying arm.

In the past two years, thru Heritage Service, land has been taken from private landowners to enlarge the national parks.

There is a new tone in Washington. Interior will encourage energy development. They will involve local people in land use decisions. Watt is quoted as saying "We must take care of what we have, rather than reaching out and gobbling up other lands, taking them off the property tax rolls, there will be a shift in Interior's management decisions to reflect the needs of people and of the market place."

Mr Watts decision to dismantle is a good first step in the right direction. He has a long way to go before the "Sagebrush Rebellion" will be defused. The people will notify their representatives in their State legislature to keep the pressure on.

Just a change of policy is not enough to satisfy the people. Policies can be reversed by future administrations. We not only want, we demand State Sovereignty.



SHERIFF

PERSHING COUNTY



James K. McIntosh, Sheriff

P.O. Box 147

Phone 273-2641

Lovelock, Nevada 89419

February 20, 1981

TO: The Committee on National Resources
Nevada State Senate

EXHIBIT E

Gentlemen:

As the Sheriff of Pershing County, I would like to make known to you that I am in favor of the passage of S.J.R. 17 and 18.

In the past I have discussed the various possibilities and problems involved in trying to act as an enforcement officer for the Bureau of Land Management on the enforcement of Federal Regulations on public lands within my jurisdiction. I feel that the enforcement of these lands can be better handled by the State or the respective local officials, thereby alleviating the enforcement of often frivolous and ridiculous federal laws related to artifacts, wild horses and grazing.

I would, therefore, urge that you pass the above named bills, thereby returning control and enforcement of the public lands back to the States and local level. I believe that this could be better accomplished at the local level with strengthened departments.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,
JAMES K. McINTOSH



Sheriff, Pershing County

JM/br

R E S O L U T I O N

EXHIBIT F

THAT, WHEREAS, the County of Pershing, State of Nevada, has been presented with a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 17, which proposes a constitutional amendment to the Nevada State Constitution to regulate management and disposal of Nevada state lands; and

WHEREAS, said County of Pershing has also received a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 18, which urges Congress and the President of the United States of America to promulgate legislation transferring public lands to states; and

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the County of Pershing, State of Nevada, to support the aforementioned Senate Joint Resolutions,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT AND IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED that the County of Pershing, State of Nevada, by and through the Board of County Commissioners, hereby desires to show support for Senate Joint Resolutions 17 and 18.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 20th day of February, A. D. 1981, by the following vote:

Ayes: Robert Souza, Marvin Killfoil, James Burke

Noes: None

Absent: None

BOARD OF PERSHING COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

By Robert W. Souza, Sr.
ROBERT W. SOUZA, SR., Chairman

ATTEST:

James T. Williams
DEPUTY COUNTY CLERK