

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
OF THE  
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Eighty-Second Session  
March 14, 2023**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Selena Torres at 9:34 a.m. on Tuesday, March 14, 2023, in Room 4100 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. 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/82nd2023](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair  
Assemblywoman Bea Duran, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Max Carter  
Assemblyman Rich DeLong  
Assemblyman Reuben D'Silva  
Assemblywoman Cecelia González  
Assemblyman Bert Gurr  
Assemblyman Brian Hibbetts  
Assemblyman Gregory Koenig  
Assemblyman Richard McArthur  
Assemblyman Duy Nguyen  
Assemblywoman Angie Taylor  
Assemblywoman Clara Thomas

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill, Assembly District No. 40

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst  
Judi Bishop, Committee Manager

Minutes ID: 439



Geigy Stringer, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Austin Osborne, County Manager, Storey County  
Keith Loomis, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Storey County  
Jana Seddon, County Assessor, Storey County  
Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager,  
Washoe County  
Clay Mitchell, Commissioner/Vice Chairman, Storey County  
Will Adler, representing Storey County  
Mary Walker, representing Douglas County, Lyon County, and Storey County

**Chair Torres:**

[Roll was taken. Committee rules were explained.] We have a lot of stories in today's Committee. We are going to go ahead and open the hearing on [Assembly Bill 143](#) which revises provisions governing counties, and I will invite the Minority Leader to begin.

**[Assembly Bill 143](#): Revises provisions governing counties. (BDR 20-460)**

**Assemblyman P.K. O'Neill, Assembly District No. 40:**

Chair, I apologize. I am having flashbacks to the July 2009 legislative hearing when I testified as a division chief and Mr. McArthur regularly grilled me and took great joy in it. I hope we all enjoy this testimony today, and I am worried about what is going to happen next. But it is truly an honor to be here in front of you. This is one of the first times I have testified or presented in this Committee.

I am here today to introduce to you [Assembly Bill 143](#). The purpose of this legislation is to allow the transfer of lands from the federal government to Storey County. Should the legislation pass, Storey County will receive land transfers of approximately 1,200 acres from the federal government for the purpose of removing a cloud over the title of property. Storey County will be legally permitted to convey real property to anybody with an interest in that property without considerations or, in short, for free. Current law requires consideration for such property transfers; *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 244.281 only authorizes counties to sell or lease such property.

This legislation empowers counties with an additional development tool and recognizes that local government knows best when it comes to best practices. Today with me to assist in this endeavor, we have Storey County Manager Austin Osborne, and Storey County Deputy District Attorney Keith Loomis. They will be happy to present the bill to you in detail. Additionally, there has been a friendly amendment which has just been posted to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit C](#)]. It has to do with moving the

effective date from what it currently reads in the bill—upon passage—to October 31, 2023, to allow the county and registrars to be ready for this action. With that Chair, I would like to hand it over to Mr. Osborne with your permission.

**Austin Osborne, County Manager, Storey County:**

With me today also is our deputy district attorney, Keith Loomis, as well as our assessor, Jana Seddon. We are going to copresent portions of this bill respective to our areas of expertise. We thank Assemblyman O'Neill for sponsoring, and this Committee for its consideration of, A.B. 143. I would like to provide you with a little bit of background leading to why we are here today. Mr. Loomis is going to talk about the legalities of the bill and talk about the structure of the bill.

In the early 1900s, like a lot of mining towns that you see throughout the western United States, Virginia City and Gold Hill were created on federal land without patent. What that means is, they did not get the land privatized first before they created a townsite. They just stuck the townsite on federal land and called it good. We are all still living there today with the situation. It is just one of the fun things about living in Virginia City and Gold Hill. This is a very typical situation, and today, because of this, there remains clouded title on everybody's homes and businesses in town—including mine.

When you get a nice home mortgage, your deed is going to have something on it that says we cover you; this house is yours, except for any potential ownership of the federal government; if the federal government comes and says we want your house—it might happen—we might give it away; we are not quite sure. That has not happened, fortunately. When you get title insurance for your homes or your businesses, most title companies will not touch that community. You cannot get anybody, and when you do get the one or two that will, then they will come in and do a title search. They know that there is clouded title. The federal government still claims ownership to this land, so there are tremendous disclaimers in your title insurance that say we will cover you if Joe Smith says he owns your land. However, if the federal government comes and has a conflict, we are out of it; we are not going to mess with you. This is a real problem. A lot of times people will lose home loans; they will not be able to buy properties. There are issues because of this.

Fortunately, after 20 years working in Washington, D.C., we were able to get a U.S. Department of the Interior lands bill. This lands bill was for Virginia City and Gold Hill, for the purpose of removing clouded titles on people's properties throughout these communities. It was not based on economic development, mining, or agriculture. It did not have a lot of exterior land that would provide opportunities for the future or whatever. It was really just for the purpose of the core areas of these communities getting this problem solved.

In 2018, through Public Law 113-291 of the 113th Congress, we were able to get the lands bill. It actually came to us as an act. At this point, the federal government said we are going to quitclaim approximately 1,200 acres of land in Virginia City and Gold Hill. This affected roughly 1,100 people—about 600 dwellings and about 200 businesses. The federal government said we no longer have interest in it anymore. It is now deeded over in that

manner. It is not a transfer of title like an actual deed; it is just a quitclaim. Nevertheless, we believe that, through two houses of the U.S. Congress and the President of the United States, this quitclaim holds some merit and hopefully can get this clouded title removed from these properties.

How that worked was, the quitclaim was given to Storey County as one big parcel, and then Storey County quitclaimed it to properties throughout Virginia City and Gold Hill. Pretty simple, it sounds. But there is an issue with the NRS that Mr. Loomis is going to talk about, on how you get that quitclaimed back to these private residences and businesses.

That is why we are here today. I want to emphasize this: at no time does Storey County actually have ownership of these people's properties. The federal government quitclaimed it to us—they do not have interest anymore—and we are trying to quitclaim it over to these people. We say we do not have interest anymore, and at that point, that clouded title will be removed.

I want to note that Storey County is okay with Washoe County's request for this to be effective on October 31, 2023. I am going to pass it over to Mr. Loomis.

[[Exhibit D](#), [Exhibit E](#), and [Exhibit F](#) were submitted but not discussed and are included as exhibits of the hearing.]

**Keith Loomis, Chief Deputy District Attorney, Storey County:**

I will go through sections of the bill to explain what it is that we are trying to get accomplished. The heart of this bill is section 1, which says that the board of county commissioners may convey real property without consideration. We are not going to charge for it. We do not have to go through an appraisal process. We do not have to go through an auction or any other type of process. We are just entitled to convey the property directly to the owners—people who have interest in the property within the area that has been quitclaimed to the county.

Section 1 says if we do convey the real property, the board must execute and record a deed, which is going to be a single deed that will be recorded with the recorder's office and will encompass all of the properties. We are then to send notice, and this deed is going to be effective upon recordation. Typically, in order for a deed to be effective, you must deliver it to the person who is going to be receiving the property and they have to accept it. If we were to try to get acceptances from everybody in the county who is within the area of the federal lands bill, that could pose a real problem; what this does is it reverses that, and it says that the deed is effective upon recordation. We are supposed to give notice to the people that are going to be affected by this deed by certified mail and advise them that if they do not want to accept the deed, we will explain to them how they can disclaim their interest in the property and then record that. The bill reverses the usual way of handling something like this. Instead of their accepting it for it to become effective, this becomes effective upon recordation, but it can be subject to reversal if they want to disclaim their interest. That is section 1.

Section 2 excepts the process from the requirements in NRS Chapter 244 that the county first have the value of the property appraised. There is a process by which we select an appraiser, and we are not going to do that. In this case, we are not going to have the property appraised; this authorizes us to not have to do that.

Section 3 of this bill makes a similar exception to NRS 244.281, which says if you have to have the property appraised, this is how you have to sell it: you can go through an auction, you can go through a real estate agent or other one. This bill says you do not have to do that either. The deed is effective upon recordation.

Section 4 of the bill is an amendment to NRS 371.047, which is the chapter that authorizes the imposition of government services tax. It says if you are going to use a vehicle on a public highway, you are going to pay a percentage of the value of the vehicle to, in this case, the Department of Motor Vehicles, or if the county adopts it, it would be to the county. I am not exactly sure why this is in here, but what it says is, if the local government wants to purchase residential real property abutting a limited-use highway, we can do that. After we get that, we can sell it according to the provisions of NRS Chapter 244 if we purchased it. In this case, we are not purchasing the property from the federal government; they are quitclaiming it to us without charge. I am not sure why that is in here; this might be something the Legislative Counsel Bureau would want to check on.

The last section is section 5; it amends NRS 375.090, which is the chapter on real property transfer tax. The bill creates an exception from the requirement to make that payment if it conforms with the requirements of section 1 in that the parcel has been given to the county by the federal government, and we are, in turn, going to give it to the citizens affected by the property that has been transferred to the county. There will be no requirement that a transfer tax be paid. A lot of these people already paid transfer tax when they first acquired the property, so there is not really a purpose to be served by the county requiring another payment of the transfer tax in this particular case. Those are the provisions of the bill that are essentially before you today. I am happy to answer any questions.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you for the presentation. Before we dive into questions—I had the opportunity to meet with stakeholders yesterday to talk a little bit about the background. I just want to make sure that the history is on the record and the Committee members understand what that history is. In the early 1900s when these townsites were built, my understanding is that they were built on federal land with essentially no permission. It was the Wild, Wild West of Nevada in Virginia City and Gold Hill. But in 2018, Congress and the President transferred that land to the county; once that land was transferred to the county, now we can transfer it to the private landowners. My understanding of this bill is that this would help allow for that. Is that correct?

**Keith Loomis:**

That is correct.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you. That will help us out before we go into questions from members.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

Thank you, Assemblyman O'Neill. We had a chance to have a brief conversation—I feel up to speed. It was very clear when I read it. About how many property owners, business owners, or parcels of land are affected?

**Jana Seddon, County Assessor, Storey County:**

There are about 1,227 parcels that are in this lands bill act. Among those, there are about 614 improved parcels. Out of those improved parcels, about 582 dwellings are going to be in that.

**Assemblywoman Taylor:**

Is this bill for all 1,227 of them?

**Jana Seddon:**

Yes.

**Chair Torres:**

I remember during the presentation, there was a request for more information regarding the intent of section 4. We did consult the Legal Division about the intent. The information we received is, it is used to indicate the placement of section 1 in NRS; it is just language to make sure that it is clear in the NRS.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

Of the 1,200 acres, are the individuals that have an "interest in the property" all known to the county?

**Jana Seddon:**

There may be a few unknown owners, but not very many. We do know the owners of most of the properties in this area. The ones that are unknown, I guess that would be a question for our assistant district attorney, Keith Loomis. I am assuming we would be going back to our last known information we have on that.

**Assemblywoman González:**

Would this apply to all counties? If so, what would that look like?

**Keith Loomis:**

It would apply to all counties. The Legislature made an attempt in 2001 to address this problem. It was being pushed by Nye County at the time. At that time, we did adopt a statute, NRS 244.2825, which addresses a similar issue but not quite the same as this one. That particular law did not work; this is based on anecdote. I talked to the person in charge

of lands in Nye County and she said, Yes, they did push it, but they never utilized it because it was not going to be effective for what they wanted to do. It was the same or similar issue—townsites that had never been patented. This is going to apply statewide.

**Assemblywoman González:**

Is there any other situation in which this law would be used, or is it just this one scenario in Storey County?

**Keith Loomis:**

There are a number of townsites around the state that were not patented. I am pointing particularly at Nye County, which is the one that tried to get this done once before, in 2001. There are other townsites throughout the state that have similar issues. I do not know how many there are, but this is not specific to Storey County. I think that is why Washoe County wanted to have an amendment because they could see some application there too.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

I am going to follow up on the Assemblywoman's question about the applicability in other counties. These changes would only then go into effect in those counties if there were a separate lands bill in those other counties that would quitclaim the federal property to the respective counties. Is that correct?

**Keith Loomis:**

That is correct.

**Assemblywoman Duran:**

Are the deeds already in their name, or do they have to go through the whole process to get the cloud off of those deeds? Is there a cost to them for that right now?

**Keith Loomis:**

The proposal is, we are going to have one deed. We are going to have a civil engineering company standing by that has the identities of all known owners of the property, and they will provide that to the county. We will do a single deed, which will have all the names of the people on that deed along with the assessor's parcel numbers, and we will record that deed. We are not going to send out individual deeds to every individual; we are going to send the one deed that is recorded to everybody when we send a notification about how to do the disclaimer.

**Assemblywoman Duran:**

As an example, if that happens, how do I get the deed to my own property? If I want to sell it, do I have to pay a fee at that time? How do I get out of that one deed for my property?

**Keith Loomis:**

If you are going to sell the property, you get your own deed with your own legal description and assessor's parcel number. That would be conveyed to whomever you are going to sell it to. This is somewhat similar to the delinquent taxes where we name all of the delinquent

taxpayers on a single deed and have all the assessor's parcel numbers on that deed. Then we record that, and then send notice to the people that this is delinquent and we need to get the taxes paid. It is going to be similar to that process.

**Jana Seddon:**

When you sell your property, you are going to use the last deed that you had with a legal description on it. When your title company does a search, this other deed will be there to clear up any sort of ownership issues we have had from this whole thing back to the 1900s. When your title company does your title search, they are going to see this. They are going to go, Oh, here is this other deed, great—now we have cleared title; there are not going to be any issues. You are basically going to be using your last transfer deed if you are going to sell your property or do anything else to it as far as transferring it into a trust, as far as splitting it, maps, doing any sort of thing.

**Austin Osborne:**

I also did confirm with the Storey County recorder's office as well as with our team that, as Mr. Loomis has explained regarding transferring this one deed over for recording, property owners in Virginia City and Gold Hill will not receive any fees. They will not endure any type of fee. The county itself will not have to pay the \$37 fee either because it is a local government recording onto itself. We believe there will be no fiscal impact to anybody on this.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

I have a technical question in terms of the appraisal. I read in the language that this particular change would skip the appraisal process. How would the land value be determined for each of the individual parcels in this massive one deed?

**Jana Seddon:**

Land value would be based off of the taxable value of the property that we have listed in the assessor system.

**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

That means that the value is already in there before this deed is being given. Once this particular change has passed, they do not need to go through an individual appraisal process to get their land value. I just want to clarify that.

**Jana Seddon:**

That is correct. I believe Mr. Loomis can speak further on that.

**Keith Loomis:**

The value of the land is not really relevant to what we are trying to accomplish because we just want to clear the titles, and we do not have to go through the appraisal process. We do not have to know the value of the property when it is transferred to determine what the transfer tax is because we are not going to have a transfer tax.



**Assemblyman Nguyen:**

I just want to clarify for the record that when we are clearing the process and skipping certain things, folks are still able to get what they need.

**Assemblyman Gurr:**

Maybe I could simplify this a little bit since I have been in the business most of my life. It appears the federal government, the state government, and the county governments never transferred the property properly, right? Then when I built my house or bought my house or whatever I did in Virginia City, everybody thought everything was fine. You assessed it; you appraised it; we had a deed; we did everything right. Now that the counties and the feds have figured it out, all we are going to do is make the transfer happen. It does not change anything on the record except now I really do own my property. The feds do not have anything to do with it. Is that pretty much the intent?

**Keith Loomis:**

Yes, sir.

**Chair Torres:**

Members, are there any additional questions? [There were none.] I have one question, especially because I did not know about NRS 244.2825; it is different than what is in the context of this bill. I did not have the opportunity to take a look at that, but I will after this meeting. I am just trying to understand what is different about what we are going to be doing in this piece of legislation to what was done in Nye County; is that what you mentioned?

**Keith Loomis:**

That is right.

**Chair Torres:**

Can you clarify what is different about what is being done in this piece of legislation to what was done historically with Nye County?

**Keith Loomis:**

To my knowledge, Nye County never followed through on NRS 244.2825. There are a lot more requirements as to what a person has to establish in order to get a transfer of land from the county under that bill than there is under this bill. There are some requirements that, in certain circumstances, they will have to pay for the land.

In talking to Lorinda Wichman, who is in charge of lands in Nye County, she explained that they had looked around and found some people had been on their land for two generations, and they just could not justify charging them to buy the property for a second time. This does not have that requirement. There is a requirement in NRS 244.2825 that says you cannot get the land unless your property taxes are current. Well, they have a different way of handling property taxes down in Nye County than we do in Storey County. We do not have

a requirement in here where the people who are going to be the beneficiaries of the deed that we record have to have their property taxes current. There are some other differences, but those I think are the major ones.

**Chair Torres:**

As it is right now, would we be able to apply NRS 244.2825 to Storey County?

**Keith Loomis:**

We could.

**Chair Torres:**

I have larger questions. We are keeping other pieces of legislation—other pieces of the NRS—in statute that you are saying are ineffective and do not allow us to resolve this issue. I do not know what is going to happen in the future around the quitclaiming of federal lands. I would be eager to see some type of sunset provision so that rather than keeping pieces of the statute in place that are ineffective and inefficient, the Legislature can look at this after it is done and say: this worked; this was effective, whereas NRS 244.2825 was not effective; it did not work for Nye County; they did not use it. Now, we are just adding to it even though there is clearly some part of the NRS right now that does not make sense for local government. It might make sense for us to strike that language and have this language, but then also sunset it so that we can have this conversation again with the Legislature.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

Chair, I would be in agreement with you. I am not on that side, so I cannot ask a question. I would suggest, ask the question about how long it will take Storey County to do the quitclaim deed, and we could work that into the sunset.

**Chair Torres:**

How long will that take?

**Jana Seddon:**

Since this is being done as one deed, the recordation will not take that long—maybe four days to get updated information from our GIS [geographic information system] company. They already have everything ready to go. We have already pulled all the information, but we will pull the current information in this area. The recorder's office will not record for a couple of days until we get this because we do not want a new deed to come through and then have the incorrect owners on this other deed. We will halt recording of new documents in this area for about two days; then we will record this document; then the others will go through. What will be time-consuming is getting this input into our assessor data; it is probably going to take a couple of weeks. It really should not take that long to get this done if we do not have any issues going through.

**Austin Osborne:**

Putting a sunset on this, if this Committee has an idea how long that would be, or if that works in the time frame of our assessor's office or if it is a one- or two-year period of time, we believe Storey County would be just fine with that. We could revisit this item in the future.

**Chair Torres:**

Members, are there any additional questions or comments?

**Keith Loomis:**

One other major difference between this bill and NRS 244.2825 is the fact that the acceptance versus disclaimer process is reversed.

**Chair Torres:**

Members, are there any additional questions?

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

As it relates to Nye County—you may or may not know this—did Nye County ever get a lands bill that then could implement that other statute?

**Keith Loomis:**

There is a provision in NRS 244.2825 that says if the federal government gives them the property, they have to go through it. Whether the federal government did that or not, I do not know.

**Assemblyman DeLong:**

My understanding is Nye County has not had a lands bill like this. I do not know whether that statute has ever been implemented in Nye County.

**Chair Torres:**

For the conversation, if it has never been used—I just do not want to have two options for counties where this is option A or option B, choose your poison. You can do either one. I definitely think we can continue to have a conversation with local governments and find which one of these solutions makes the most sense. It looks like there is a piece of legislation before us that makes sense for multiple counties. I am definitely eager to continue this conversation.

At this time, I do not see any additional questions from members. Assemblyman McArthur, are you not going to grill your good friend? He is saving it for later. At this time, we will go ahead and invite anyone wishing to testify in support of A.B. 143.

**Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager,  
Washoe County:**

I am here with the aforementioned friendly amendment [[Exhibit C](#)]. The amendment would strike the bill's section 6. It simply strikes "This act becomes effective upon passage and

approval." My understanding of that action would be that the bill would then be effective on October 1, 2023—perhaps your staff could confirm that—rather than October 31, 2023. We appreciate the bill sponsor and Storey County considering that. Because this bill has statewide applicability, it may have applicability in Washoe County. We are not currently aware of any parcels, but we are doing some checking. As a county that was established in 1861, we have a little Wild, Wild West in us, too, so we appreciate the extra time.

**Clay Mitchell, Commissioner/Vice Chairman, Storey County:**

I have the pleasure of living in and representing Virginia City. My family also owns a few parcels in Gold Hill. Living in Virginia City is unique in many ways. In fact, we just had our first big event of the year which was a Rocky Mountain Oyster Festival. It was snowing, and we still had a good time.

As a resident, I just want to confirm a couple of things that have been said. The first one is that there are very few options available for title insurance. We are lucky if even one company will cover a transaction with title insurance, due in large part to the ambiguity that arises from this particular situation. It is fairly common for residents to have trouble acquiring financing as a result. A lot of the more conservative financial institutions just do not want to touch it if there is any question about the state of the title.

I feel strongly that this bill would also help us with the preservation of historic structures. The entire community is part of a National Historic Landmark and is subject to the Comstock Historic District. That adds another layer of complexity when it comes to preserving and restoring these buildings. When you add any ambiguity about clarity of title on top of that, it makes it more difficult. This would also help economic development, which is also a challenge. Anything that makes it even more unique takes away options as far as people trying to improve their property in this area. I strongly encourage consideration of this bill. We are thankful for the diligence of our neighbors to the west in looking through how this might affect them as well, and we are happy to take their amendment as well.

**Will Adler, representing Storey County:**

I want to thank Assemblyman O'Neill for bringing this bill forward. It is a unique bill and a niche one that is related to the long-term history of Virginia City and the lack of paperwork and the can-do spirit of the West that started a town without telling the federal government. We do need to clean up that paperwork. This has been years in the works and a long-term process that the county has led. I want to applaud them for this. Hopefully this bill will clean up a lot of their local titling issues. Thank you for supporting it.

**Mary Walker, representing Douglas County, Lyon County, and Storey County:**

Even though we do not believe this bill affects Lyon County and Douglas County, we do support them because we know they have tried to fix this for about 20 years. We support our neighbor and rural community.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you. Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support of A.B. 143 in Las Vegas? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in support of A.B. 143? [There was no one.] At this time, I invite anyone wishing to testify in opposition to A.B. 143. [There was no one.] I will invite anyone wishing to testify in neutral to A.B. 143. [There was no one.] At this time, I will invite the bill sponsor for any closing remarks.

**Assemblyman O'Neill:**

I did not know this bill would be so exciting as to get such interest from people. In closing: two decades of work has been devoted to helping the families and small businesses get clear title on land that they really own. They are on the Comstock Lode. Assembly Bill 143 will close that and will allow them to have clear title to deal with their property as everyone else does across the state.

On the sunset provision, I would offer as a friendly amendment with your concurrence, Chair, that we sunset it on June 30, 2024, which gives it one year to be an act that is utilized and then is brought to closure. That would be enough time also for the next Legislature if they want to continue it forward, to study, see the results, and deal with it then, in the next term. With that, I want to thank you, Chair, and all Committee members, for listening to this most exciting bill, particularly to Assemblyman McArthur for his studious review of it.

**Chair Torres:**

Thank you, Assemblyman O'Neill. I spoke with Assemblyman McArthur this morning; he told me he was up all night reading through this legislation, so I am very happy he was able to come prepared today. Thank you, Assemblyman. I look forward to continuing the conversation. At this time, we will close the hearing on A.B. 143 and we will open the public comment portion of this meeting. [Rules for public comment were reviewed.] Is there anyone in person wishing to testify in public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in Las Vegas wishing to testify in public comment? [There was no one.] Is there anyone on the line wishing to testify in public comment? [There was no one.]

Are there any additional comments from members before we adjourn? [There were none.] [Meeting reminders were given.] Since there are no other additional remarks from members, we will adjourn [at 10:17 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Geigy Stringer  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Selena Torres, Chair

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

## **EXHIBITS**

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 143](#), submitted by Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Office of the County Manager, Washoe County.

[Exhibit D](#) is a handout titled "Federally owned lands in Storey County," submitted by Austin Osborne, County Manager, Storey County.

[Exhibit E](#) is handout titled "Storey County Land Conveyance," submitted by Austin Osborne, County Manager, Storey County.

[Exhibit F](#) is a memorandum dated November 10, 2022, from Storey County Commissioner's Office, regarding "Summary of Storey County Lands Transfer Nevada BDR," submitted by Austin Osborne, County Manager, Storey County.