

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE OPERATIONS AND ELECTIONS**

**Seventy-Seventh Session
March 21, 2013**

The Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections was called to order by Chair James Ohrenschall at 4:06 p.m. on Thursday, March 21, 2013, in Room 3142 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 nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair
Assemblywoman Lucy Flores, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblyman Wesley Duncan
Assemblyman Pat Hickey
Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick
Assemblyman Andrew Martin
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblyman James Oscarson

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33
Senator Pete Goicoechea, Senatorial District No. 19
Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Assembly District No. 32
Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14
Senator Greg Brower, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 15

Minutes ID: 565



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Kevin Powers, Committee Counsel
Karen Pugh, Committee Secretary
Macy Young, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Reverend Father Stephen Karcher, St. Anthony Greek Orthodox Church,
Reno, Nevada
Ramir Hernandez, representing Fennemore Craig Jones Vargas
John Wagner, representing Independent American Party
Elliot Karp, President and Chief Executive Officer, Jewish Federation
of Las Vegas
Demar Dahl, Commissioner, Elko County
Nancy J. Boland, President, Nevada Association of Counties, and
Commissioner, Esmeralda County
Lorinda A. Wichman, Commissioner, Nye County
Steve K. Walker, representing Eureka County, Lyon County, and Storey
County
Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Committee for Full Statehood
Doug Busselman, representing Nevada Farm Bureau
Cliven D. Bundy, Private Citizen, Bunkerville, Nevada
Richard Brengman, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Juanita Clark, representing Charleston Neighborhood Preservation,
Las Vegas, Nevada
Kyle Davis, Political and Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League and
Education Fund
Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District
Scott F. Gilles, Esq., Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary
of State
Randolph J. Townsend, Commissioner, Nevada Gaming Commission

Chair Ohrenschall:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and procedures were reviewed.] Since several people have signed in to testify today, I will ask that when speaking, you not repeat anything that has already been said. I will now open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 4.

Senate Joint Resolution 4: Urges the Government of Turkey to grant the Ecumenical Patriarch international recognition and to respect the human rights and property rights of the Ecumenical Patriarchate. (BDR R-885)

Senate Joint Resolution 4 is sponsored by Senator Barbara Cegavske. Unfortunately, she is not able to be here today; however, she did submit written comments ([Exhibit C](#)), which are available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). This measure passed unanimously out of the Senate on March 12, 2013.

Reverend Father Stephen Karcher, St. Anthony Greek Orthodox Church, Reno, Nevada:

Our church and parish community is a diverse ethnic community. Administratively we are part of the Archdiocese of America, which falls under the jurisdiction of the Patriarch in Istanbul. Senate Joint Resolution 4 is a resolution to urge the government of Turkey to grant the Ecumenical Patriarch international recognition along with respect of human rights as well as property rights. There are five issues ([Exhibit D](#)) that we have been very interested in. The Turkish government continues to interfere with the Patriarchal elections, which essentially prohibits the election of future Patriarchs. Secondly, there is the Turkish government's failure to recognize the Patriarch's Ecumenical status even though there are 1,000 to 2,000 Greek Orthodox Christians in Istanbul. The Patriarch is Ecumenical because he oversees a church that has about 300 million members around the world.

Chair Ohrenschall:

That is something, Father, I do not think people realize. It is not just a Greek community. There are the Armenian Orthodox, Russian Orthodox, and Orthodox in North Africa and in the Middle East. A comparison might be if the Vatican were located in Turkey, but was not allowed to be self-governing.

Father Karcher:

The Ecumenical Patriarch is the visible unifier of the Orthodox Church that includes many others, such as the Russian Orthodox Church. On top of this, the Turkish government gives the Patriarchate no legal identity. Since 1453, the time of the Ottoman Empire, the Turks and the Greek Orthodox have been living side by side. We would hope that in the 21st century things would be getting better, but instead we have seen declines in a number of areas. Forty years ago, the Turkish government closed the Halki seminary, which was an important training facility for new clergy and the continuation of the Patriarchate and the Church. Since the time of President Carter, the Turkish government has promised to reopen the seminary, but they have not been able to follow through. We want to encourage them to do the right thing and reopen the seminary.

Another issue of concern is the confiscation of property. Many of the Patriarchal properties have been confiscated. In 1936, there were some 7,000 properties. Throughout the 20th century, that number has declined as more and more properties, such as schools and hospitals, have been confiscated. We see this as a concerted effort to take away the rights of the Patriarch and reduce the Ecumenical Patriarchate to nothing.

The Patriarch is the visible center, the unifier, of the Orthodox world that consists of over 300 million Orthodox Christians. The Bishop of Constantinople has been there since the time of Constantine in the fourth century. I would ask for your support and encourage you to once again pass this resolution and urge the Turkish government to act in a good faith toward the Patriarchate.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you, Father. As I understand it, many other states have passed this resolution. Here in Nevada it will be a reaffirmation of a resolution passed in 2009, and it was very good of Senator Cegavske and Assemblyman Hardy to bring this resolution again this year. We think now that whatever government comes to power in Turkey would certainly allow the Patriarch to conduct the activities he needs to. Are there any questions for Father Karcher? [There were none.]

I do recall that Patriarch Bartholomew had come to Washington and met with President Obama. I also read that he was the first Ecumenical Patriarch to attend the installation of a Catholic Pope, as he was present at the installation ceremony for Pope Francis. It seems that he has tried his best to reach out to persons of other faiths, and hopefully a resolution like this will encourage the Turkish government to do the same.

Is there anyone else who might wish to testify in favor of S.J.R. 4?

Ramir Hernandez, representing Fennemore Craig Jones Vargas:

As founder of the William S. Boyd School of Law's St. Thomas More Society, I think this resolution is an excellent idea. To give you some context, in 1054, the Catholic Church and Orthodox Church split, but during the last 40 or 50 years there has been a lot of effort to bring the two churches together. At this critical juncture, I think they are closer than they have ever been in 1,000 years to potentially reunifying. I believe we need to give the Patriarchate as much support as possible to ensure that the dialogue between the two churches, and between all the churches of the world, continues.

The Patriarch of Istanbul has been there, if I am not mistaken, longer than even the Islamic religion. As one of the world's ancient churches, dating back to St. Andrew, with hundreds of millions of believers, they deserve as much respect as anyone else to practice their faith.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you. It is wonderful seeing a Greek Orthodox priest and a very devoted Roman Catholic here testifying in favor of this resolution. I want to note that Stephen Georgeson, a member of the Archons of the Ecumenical Patriarchate, Order of St. Andrew the Apostle, submitted copies of letters from the United States Senate ([Exhibit E](#)) and the Chicago Archdiocese ([Exhibit F](#)) in support of the Patriarch. Copies have been uploaded to NELIS. Are there any questions? [There were none.]

I will close the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 4, and I will now open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution 6.

[Assembly Joint Resolution 6](#): Recognizes Nevada's partnership and friendship with, and expresses support for, the State of Israel. (BDR R-458)

Chair Ohrenschall:

Assemblyman Ellison, thank you very much for being here.

Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33:

I am here today to present A.J.R. 6. Senator Barbara Cegavske is a cosponsor but could not be here today. She did submit a copy of her written presentation ([Exhibit G](#)), which has been uploaded to the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS), and I will touch on a couple of points in her presentation later.

This resolution is meant to recement the close relationship that Nevada and the United States has with the State of Israel. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit H](#)).]

Senator Cegavske shared her thoughts about some of the people that have been involved in shaping Nevada ([Exhibit G](#)). One of those men was Herman Bien, who was elected to the first Territorial Legislature and gained fame for carrying a gun after a dispute with a newspaper editor. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Chair Ohrenschall:

Assemblyman Ellison, how did you decide to carry this measure?

Assemblyman Ellison:

I have many friends across the country, and with the Jewish Federation of Las Vegas Day coming up at the Governor's Mansion, I thought this would be the best way to recognize and remember some of those people. By this resolution, we show our support of what is going on around the world. If you look at the names of the people who have signed on to this bill, you will see that there is no party line. Hopefully, we can move this bill quickly so the Governor can sign it at the Jewish Federation of Las Vegas Day ceremony.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I want to thank Senator Cegavske and Assemblyman Ellison for presenting this resolution. Are there any questions for Assemblyman Ellison? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support of A.J.R. 6?

John Wagner, representing Independent American Party:

I support this measure. Israel has always been a friend to the United States, and I think we should reciprocate. I believe we have always been on friendly terms, but this measure would put that fact in writing.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Mr. Wagner? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to testify in favor of Assembly Joint Resolution 6?

Elliot Karp, President and Chief Executive Officer, Jewish Federation of Las Vegas:

It is particularly significant that today's hearing is taking place while the President is in Israel, where he has spoken directly and with conviction to the tremendous friendship and strategic partnership between the United States and Israel. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit I](#)).]

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to speak in support of A.J.R. 6? [There was no response.] Does anyone wish to speak in opposition to the measure? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral on A.J.R. 6? [There was no response.] Mr. Ellison, do you have any closing remarks?

Assemblyman Ellison:

We were hoping we could dispense with the rules and to try to expedite this due to the time frame involved. Assembly Joint Resolution 6 will need to pass the Assembly and then go through the Senate before returning to the Assembly on its way to the Governor.

Chair Ohrenschaal:

Thank you, Assemblyman Ellison. I am going to close the hearing on A.J.R. 6 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 227.

Assembly Bill 227: Creates the Nevada Land Management Implementation Committee to conduct a study addressing the transfer of certain public lands in this State. (BDR S-594)

Assemblyman John C. Ellison, Assembly District No. 33:

Appearing here with me today to help present this bill are two of my friends, Senator Pete Goicoechea and Elko County Commissioner Demar Dahl. Mr. Dahl's mother passed away last night, but he believes so strongly in this bill that he is here today to present Assembly Bill 227.

Chair Ohrenschaal:

I remember when Mr. Dahl was the head of the Nevada Cattlemen's Association and ran for the U.S. Senate. Our deepest condolences to you. Thank you for being here to testify in support of something that you believe in.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Over 80 percent of our state is owned by the federal government—the highest percentage in the west. Utah has already taken the first step in this western effort, passing House Bill 148, which requires the federal government to turn over the federal lands in Utah. In order for Nevada to be ready for that day, we need to develop a plan so that the transfer will be orderly and effective in meeting our goals. Therefore, this bill creates the Nevada Land Management Implementation Committee, made up of 17 members, one appointed by each county commission. [Read from prepared text ([Exhibit J](#)).]

Chair Ohrenschaal:

Are there any questions from the Committee for Assemblyman Ellison? [There were none.] Senator Goicoechea, please proceed.

Senator Pete Goicoechea, Senatorial District No. 19:

I will quickly walk through A.B. 227 with you. I know that the make-up of the committee is a little different when we are looking at 17 representatives, one from each of the counties. The reason for that was to avoid the fiscal note to the extent possible because it will be the member counties that will pay the per diem travel expenses and salaries of those committee members. If we followed a traditional interim committee, it would be triple the cost. Since this concerns the Nevada Land Management Implementation Act, the best place to start is with the rural counties and move back up to the Legislature. The counties know the wants, needs, and demands on those resources and

public lands out in the state. The committee will require the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) to provide administrative and research staff. Because of that, we anticipate that fiscal note will be large, due to the number of issues addressed in this bill, which will cause the committee to meet regularly. It would not be a surprise if they meet a dozen or more times.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I am confused, Senator Goicoechea. The fiscal notes on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) from both the local government and the LCB show zeros.

Senator Goicoechea:

We love that, but we know that is not going to be the case. I do believe that most of the local governments, because they believe so strongly in this bill, are willing to support it, and I am hoping we will hear that testimony today. I know Mr. Dahl, as well as being a commissioner, is with the American Lands Council, and there is tremendous support there as well.

We all understand that this question is not going away. Eleven Western states have been pushing for the Enabling Act and the Equal Footing Doctrine. The Western states want to be admitted to the Union on the same footing as the Eastern states, where only 4 percent of the land is federally controlled. As you move west, especially here in Nevada, it is 80 percent and more.

This bill's aims are different from House Bill 148 in Utah, where they brought forth the bill to transfer lands from the federal government to the state. Now they have to go back through their Constitutional Defense Council and try to come up with answers on the how, when, where, et cetera. We want to find the answers to such questions as what lands should revert, how they would be managed, how we would fund the management, and bottom line, what do we do with the revenues, if in fact there are any revenues. This way, if there is a Congressional action that returns some of the federal lands to Nevada, we will have those critical answers to guide us through the process.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Senator Goicoechea?

Assemblywoman Flores:

Since we are expecting such a large fiscal note on this bill, I was wondering what alternatives were considered, such as an interim study or an interim committee that can be established through the body. Why this vehicle, especially such an expensive vehicle?

Senator Goicoechea:

This will be cheaper than an interim committee because we do not pay the travel per diem or the salaries of the committee members. I envision this as an interim committee and interim study done through this legislative body, but again, we were trying to avoid the fiscal note of a full-blown interim committee. However, I am hopeful that it would be one of the six interim committees that are scheduled out of this Legislature.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Senator Goicoechea, can you explain the difference between this committee and the Legislative Committee on Public Lands?

Senator Goicoechea:

The representation clearly would be the biggest difference. It could be possible to let the 17 members be a subcommittee to Public Lands. I know one issue with Public Lands is their meeting schedule, as they are only holding five or six meetings. In order to answer the questions as posed in the bill, this committee will have to meet at least twice that often to make sure we get the information we want for the 2015 Session.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you. Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

Conceptually, everyone believes in getting our land back. However, when I think about the potential cost of not only studying this but actually having to implement federal environmental policy and administer all of that land, I have real concerns. I believe it is an excellent goal to strive toward, but the administration of those federal mandates will affect what we can and cannot do. Do you actually see it reaching a point where we would need an implementation plan and funding program to handle the administration? I believe it would cost a great deal of money to administer the land.

Senator Goicoechea:

That is exactly why we need this committee—to find out what lands we could afford to accept and how we would manage them. If in fact we were fortunate enough to have a Congressional act that would return a percentage of those lands, what would they be? What would they look like? What lands would Clark County want to see? We all have not been as fortunate with the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act and funds. The bottom line is to get out from under some of those federal mandates that are crushing our economy today.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Does that answer your question, Assemblyman Anderson?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I agree that it is good to have some plans for the possible future, should these lands ever come back to us, although I am not sure if this is the right vehicle. However, in reality I do not think there is any chance that we will ever get out of any of the environmental acts, such as the Clean Air Act.

Senator Goicoechea:

We are not saying we will move away from the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Clean Air Act and Clean Water Act. They are federally mandated acts. We are talking about land management and possible expansion. In southern Nevada, you have the ring around Las Vegas. When you move into the truly rural areas of Clark County, some entities are looking to extend their communities. Again, this is what this act would address. Does it make sense to have a buffer around those communities that could be administered by the State of Nevada?

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblywoman Kirkpatrick:

I want to make a comment. The Assembly and the Senate both receive three legislative studies each, and we do have the Public Lands Committee, so there is budget already set aside for that. Just today, I spoke to the Speaker of the House from Idaho. Idaho, Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah are all working together to try to form a regional plan for sage grouse. Tonight I will be talking with the Speaker of the Assembly in California, because Utah, Arizona, California, and Nevada are working toward a regional plan on transmission lines and energy assists. I have been working with some legislators from Arizona and New Mexico on other issues concerning solar and wind use. My comment is that all of these states appear to be well prepared to discuss regional issues when it comes to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands within their state. They have identified many potential issues and have a plan of some type.

In Nevada, I have dealt with energy issues for years. When you talk about energy transmissions crossing five counties, you end up with three that agree and two that do not. So what happens? In our state we stall things, because we do not come together to talk. I believe this bill is an attempt to try to plan what needs are important to Nevada—what is usable, what is not, and what would be plan B if this came forward. We are probably the only Western state not headed in that direction. This is something that we have to talk about.

It is something that we need to be on the forefront with and I do not want to be the Speaker of the Assembly from Nevada who says, "We thought about it, but we did not do anything."

I hope that we can consider this proposal. But I know that we have to start working on some of these regional plans and participating in these regional discussions about the federal lands and what we want for our state. It is so much easier to identify wants and needs ahead of time. I know it is not an easy process, but I serve on a nonprofit for the state for energy transmission, and we did exactly that. We went through the whole state and identified potential areas, which helped us know where to start when funding came in. The Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act did the same thing. They went in, addressed what lands they wanted to obtain, and what their long-term plan was. I am just trying to say that we need a vision, a plan.

Senator Goicoechea:

If it makes you feel any better, we are leading the way on this one. New Mexico, Wyoming, and Idaho have picked up on our legislation and are running it through their legislatures. I agree with all that you said. This bill will produce a living, breathing document. It will not be unchanging, but then again, if we do not start, we are never going to get there.

Chair Ohrenschall:

What signals are there that the federal government is going to imminently turn over any of the lands to our state or any of the other Western states?

Senator Goicoechea:

At this point, it would require a Congressional act that more closely aligns with the Enabling Act that allowed the Eastern states to have their lands. To me, it would be the worst-case scenario if legislation came down and we were not prepared to accept any lands.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Senator Goicoechea? [There were none.] Please proceed, Commissioner Dahl, and again, thank you for being here today.

Demar Dahl, Commissioner, Elko County:

I would like to provide the Committee with some background information on how this effort came about. In Elko County in 2009, the U.S. Forest Service came to us with a travel management plan. We were a bit dubious yet enthused at first because we were going to be included, but then we found out we were not. So, we started working with the Forest Service to come up with something that would work for us. We commissioned a study and found that

the economic impact to Elko County could be \$168 million, so we went to Congress and asked the House Committee on Natural Resources to hold a hearing, which they did. We heard some good testimony and in the process worked with many counties from the surrounding states. In the end, the Forest Service ignored the Congressional committee and us and did what they had planned in the beginning.

With all of the contacts that we made with commissioners in other states, we came together and talked about what we could do to bring some local control to the resources that are so important to our economy and our way of life. We determined that the only effective thing to do would be to follow the example of Utah. Last year Utah passed House Bill 148, which called for the transfer of federal lands within Utah back to the state. The only exceptions were the wilderness areas, monuments, and national parks. So we put an organization together and tried to get some traction. Right now, we are active in eight states. Some are further along than others are; however, we are all moving in the same direction.

The idea behind this bill was to figure out how we transfer and keep the multiple uses that exist on these public lands when they are given back to the state. If you can hunt on it now, we want to make sure you can hunt on it then. If you can cut wood on it now, you will be able to then. If you have mining claims or grazing rights now, you will have them then. To me, this is a great way to do things because it is a real bottom-up effort. The committee in this bill, being made up of representatives from each of the counties, gives everybody in the state an opportunity to question and discuss what could happen in a transfer.

Let me give you a quick example of what I envision. One of the first questions that always come up is will the land be sold. Well, if it were going to be sold, the commission in the county where the land is would have to approve it. The beauty of that is that you would have complete transparency on anything that is done there. By law, a county commission has to post a public agenda listing everything to be discussed, which would give everybody an opportunity to see what is happening and to comment and learn about it. What I see in the end is a bill that would be fully vetted and a proposal that would go to the 2015 Legislature with something of real benefit to the State of Nevada.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Several years ago, the Legislature considered a ring around Las Vegas to try to curb the developmental sprawl around the valley. Commissioner Dahl, can you foresee a problem where federal lands in your home county are turned over,

and you end up with the opposite problem, and it is no longer the Elko you know so well?

Demar Dahl:

For one thing, if this idea is implemented—that any land to be sold will have to have approval from the county commission—you will not have some outfit buying up a bunch of land through a deal made under the table. Everything would be transparent and everybody would know what is happening. Remember, the land would not be transferred from the federal government to the local county; it would be transferred to the state.

Another potential advantage is illustrated by what is happening in North Dakota, where they spend \$3,700 more per pupil than the national average on education. In contrast, Utah spends \$3,700 below the national average on education. North Dakota has only 4 percent of the land under federal ownership, and 64 percent of the land is federally owned in Utah. That is what made this bill fly in Utah, because the educators came on board.

In Elko County, we have a lot of interest in oil. Noble Oil from Houston is there doing seismic work, and Lone Wolf Energy is there, but 90 percent of the land in Elko County north of the freeway is off limits to oil and gas exploration. That would not be the case if this were state land. There is no sense having the resources if you cannot access them.

Senator Goicoechea:

I do not think we want to lose focus of the fact that even though this committee is comprised of county commissioners, if there is a reversion of land, it will be state land.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Thank you for clarifying.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Right now, we have no idea what the recommendations from the committee will be. That is what is so important about this committee having ideas and everyone having a voice at the table. The City of Elko for years has been trying to expand to the west of the city limits. That is BLM land. It has been almost impossible to get the needed permits and this same situation happens all over the state. Imagine being able to expand city boundaries for future growth. Look at Elko right now; we do not have enough houses as it is. Therefore, this could open the door for so many things. At least allow us the opportunity to get the study and understand it.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I appreciate your comments, Assemblyman Ellison. Are there any questions for the panel? [There were none.] Is there anyone in support of A.B. 227 who would like to be heard?

Nancy Boland, President, Nevada Association of Counties, and Commissioner, Esmeralda County:

The Nevada Association of Counties supports this bill for reasons that have already been stated. I believe that having a committee comprised of county commissioners would be beneficial, as we are intimately aware of what is required by the federal managers and we deal extensively with the State of Nevada. We know what expertise lies within our existing departments. We deal with the Bureau of Land Management and the U.S. Forest Service on a regular basis. To address Mr. Anderson's question, we know that this bill would not in any way change compliance with the Clean Air Act or the Clean Water Act. Our state officials already enforce those.

I would like to say this is one unfunded mandate the counties do not mind. We would very much like to see if this would benefit our state. Many of us in the rural counties think that it will. We also believe it will create an atmosphere where we can have more development within our state. So much of the center of our state contains federally controlled lands, which occurred when the legislature traded off school lands for lands that were more desirable in the north and the south, creating larger chunks of private land in those two places. This bill could enhance the services we provide to our guests, as they might find better transportation alternatives because there would be more people to serve.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Commissioner Boland? [There were none.]

Lorinda Wichman, Commissioner, Nye County:

It is with pleasure that I support this bill, mostly as Assemblyman Anderson mentioned, because I need to answer a pile of questions. The statistics that were given for the state are impressive when you look at how many agencies we have to deal with and what the percentage of federally managed land is in Nevada. My district comprises 17,933 square miles. That is the largest commissioner's district outside of Alaska. Ninety-seven percent of Nye County is managed by federal or state agencies. In my county alone, when I need to deal with the permitting processes through the BLM, I have to deal with five different BLM districts. Less than 3 percent of the land in the county generates the property taxes that provide all of the essential services for everyone who

lives in or visits Nye County. There is a huge disparity in where our revenue comes from and the services that we have to provide.

Although I think they are pretty bold for doing what they did, I believe Utah got the cart before the horse. I would like to have the answers before I make a decision on whether or not we should do something like that, simply because you do not know the unintended consequences when you take those actions. I do know that the current management practices on our public lands are not the most beneficial.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

I want to focus more on the makeup of the committee that we are considering in this legislation. I would be the first person to tell you that I like to be prepared. When I am looking at this, the one thing that stands out is the cost. If we go through with this and we get all of our federal lands back, the Legislature will have to raise taxes to pay for the administration of these lands, yet there are no legislators on the committee. There are 17 members, one from each county, is that correct?

Lorinda Wichman:

That is the way I understood it, yes.

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

That is my question: Why are we on the hook for paying for this with no representation on the committee?

Lorinda Wichman:

I agree with you wholeheartedly, because that is my concern as well. How does this all take place? It was very easy for Utah to pass a law that says we want our land back, and now they have to go back and figure out how they do that. Our county commissioners are extremely involved with our legislators and I work very closely with Assemblyman Oscarson, Senator Goicoechea, and Assemblyman Ellison; we are in constant contact. I am not sure what the bill asks for regarding the structure of the committee. I do know that it is absolutely essential to have this committee before the 2015 Session, when somebody might try to pass a law without having those answers.

Assemblywoman Flores:

I am trying to identify the primary motivation for this. You were talking about land and its use and administration. Is this basically an issue of not liking how the federal government is managing those lands?

Lorinda Wichman:

I do not believe so. As mentioned earlier, there are revenue streams that are generated by our public lands. That money goes to the federal government. In very few situations they do share with the state or the local counties. You may have detected in my testimony that I have some frustration in trying to deal with all these agencies, and I do. That is not the motivation for this. The motivation is how you economically run a state, and a county, when you do not get to take advantage of the resource that is available to you.

Nancy Boland:

What Commissioner Wichman stated is true. The purpose of this committee is to determine whether it is revenue-positive or revenue-neutral for the state to take over those lands. As an example, in 2011 the BLM collected over \$31 million in mining claim fees from this state. There was almost \$10 million more collected under the Southern Nevada Public Lands Management Act. They did not sell any land under the Federal Land Transaction Facilitation Act of 2011, which also lets them sell land that is outside of that bill. There was absolutely nothing sold in the state of Nevada. I believe the county commissioners would be a good pick for the committee because we deal with this day in and day out and we are most familiar with those structures.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Do you get many people interested in development or trying to put a company in your county but there is not enough land? Have you had that situation?

Lorinda Wichman:

Nye County has been very fortunate so far. I have heard talk about individuals who could not find any land for disposal around the communities. However, I have not been personally involved in that.

Nancy Boland:

Yes, we have had companies interested. We are the host county for the only lithium operation in North America. There has been interest about people coming in to recycle lithium and add to that operation, and possibly some interest in battery manufacturing, but we have absolutely no land near any of our towns that already has utilities.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions for Commissioner Boland or Commissioner Wichman? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in support of A.B. 227 who would like to be heard?

Assemblyman Ira Hansen, Assembly District No. 32:

I would like to turn the focus back to what we are trying to do here. We are looking to set up a committee. In answer to Mr. Anderson's question, if you look at the bill, the whole purpose of the committee is to answer many of the questions that we are talking about right now. It is not to actually specify what we should or should not do. It is to go over the points on pages 3 and 4, such as economic analysis, identification of costs, and sources of potential revenue. All the bill is doing here is setting up a study that will come back to the Legislature, where we all will look at it and see if there is a feasibility factor. If it does not work, then it does not work, but at least we have a committee in place through which everybody has a chance to review the very questions that have been brought up here.

We are not trying to take all the land away from the federal government or kick out the BLM. We are simply looking at the feasibility of what would happen if the state did get some of the lands back. Again, the results of this study would come back to us in the Legislature so everybody can see whether or not this is something that the state wants to go forward with.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Assemblyman Hansen? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of A.B. 227?

Steve Walker, representing Eureka County, Lyon County and Storey County:

Storey, Lyon, and Eureka Counties are all in support of Assembly Bill 227. Eureka County addressed this issue within its existing county code, under Title 9, Chapter 60, which concerns the reversion of public lands. Eureka County has 22.1 million acres of federal land, or 81 percent of all the land within the county. Decisions concerning federal lands have direct impact on the citizens of Eureka. The deliverables of this study, section 1, subsection 6, were extensively studied by Eureka County in 1994 and a comprehensive report was developed. Eureka County fully supports and would like to fully participate in this effort.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Have you had an occasion where someone has wanted to open a business but there was not enough land in Storey County, Lyon County, or Eureka County?

Steve Walker:

I cannot answer that question as I am a lobbyist for them and do not know.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of A.B. 227?

Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Committee for Full Statehood:

Nevada has never been on an equal footing with the rest of the states in the Union. We have more of our land controlled by the federal government than any other state.

Over the years, I have spent a lot of time in Lincoln County, and I have learned that there is only about 1 percent private land available in the county. This makes it difficult to raise the taxes to pay for the public services. As the county is essentially landlocked, there is no real way to expand for economic development. Last year one of the county commissioners told me they still did not have a particular mine ready to go into operation because of the delays and problems with the federal agencies that have been going on for the last ten years. This is the problem in many rural counties, where they are in desperate need of jobs and economic development. I think it is a very good time to study this issue, and I think the county commissioners are an excellent choice for committee membership because they are the ones on the ground dealing with these problems. Then, of course, as stated earlier, it would be coming back to you for any kind of action.

In 2002, the State of Utah had a project called the Action Plan for Public Land and Education (APPLE) Initiative that showed how much it would help education if they could use the revenues from their public lands. I think that is a very fine objective, to be able to see what some of the revenue could do to help education in our state.

In March of 2012, I attended the hearing in Elko that Commissioner Dahl mentioned. I was astonished by the number of county commissioners who told stories about the problems in their own communities because of the mismanagement, especially that of fires.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to come forward in favor of A.B. 227?

Doug Bussleman, representing Nevada Farm Bureau:

We are in support of A.B. 227 and urge you to pass it. We look forward to working in the upcoming interim with the committee as they study the

questions and address the issues to bring about necessary solutions that currently are not available.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to come forward in favor of A.B. 227?

Senator Donald G. Gustavson, Senatorial District No. 14:

I represent the second-largest district in the state, with approximately 90 percent federal lands. I am very strongly in support of this bill. We need to pass it in order to get this study going and see about getting our lands back, so we can be a more productive state and have more tax revenue coming in.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Senator Gustavson? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to come forward in favor of A.B. 227?

John Wagner, representing Independent American Party:

We agree that the people who should be running our state lands are you, the ones that we elect, not somebody from Washington, D.C. I do not expect that after this committee meets, the public lands will be dropped in our lap and the federal government will walk out the door. That is not going to happen. However, maybe we can get some of our own lands back.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I would like to go to Las Vegas to hear the testimony from the person who has waited patiently for recognition from this Committee.

Cliven Bundy, Private Citizen, Bunkerville, Nevada:

I would like to give my condolences to Mr. Dahl. I stand here as a rancher in southern Nevada. I am somewhat well known as the last man standing. I must say that I am glad to see you people stand for state sovereignty today. I do not support nor oppose this bill. *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 321.596 states, "The State of Nevada has a strong moral claim upon the public land retained by the Federal Government within Nevada's borders." Let us strengthen that bill and go on and claim this land and our sovereignty.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Does anyone else wish to testify in favor of A.B. 227?

Richard Brengman, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:

I have come up to the Legislature for the last 20 years, and every session you talk about how we are going to increase revenue in the state. We talk about economic diversification, but it does not happen. We cannot have true economic diversity in Nevada with the federal government controlling 87 percent of the land.

I did not bring copies for everyone, but I wanted to show you this. It is one volume of a ten-volume report from the Bureau of Land Management. It is the *Nevada BLM Statewide Wilderness Report* for 1991. If you read this, you will see that an awful lot of it exists solely for the purpose of preventing Nevada from opening additional areas to mining. I feel that this bill is, with all apologies to the authors, weak, but it is a start, so I support this bill.

Chair Ohrenschaal:

Thank you. Are there any questions? [There were none.] Does anyone else wish to speak in favor of A.B. 227?

Juanita Clark, representing Charleston Neighborhood Preservation, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I have brought a letter in support of A.B. 227 from June Ingram, President of the Charleston Neighborhood Preservation ([Exhibit K](#)).

Chair Ohrenschaal:

Is there anyone else in support of the measure who would like to speak? [There was no response.] Is there anyone in opposition to A.B. 227 who would like to come forward and be heard?

Kyle Davis, Political and Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League and Education Fund:

We are here today in opposition to the bill. I have spoken to Assemblyman Ellison about many of these issues over the years, so I understand the intent of the bill, but as written, we have some concerns with it. There has been talk regarding to what degree the federal government owns lands in Nevada and the management of those lands for as long as Nevada has been a state. That being said, we are today considering what we are going to do when the federal government gives these lands back to the state. I do not see it happening. Utah and Arizona have been brought up as examples of other Western states that are considering this right now. Arizona put on the ballot this last cycle whether they ought to try to get all federal lands turned over to state ownership. That issue lost at the polls because most people looked at the cost, and the impacts, that would come from it and did not feel that was a very good thing to do.

Probably the biggest concern we have is talking about some of the federal environmental laws that currently are enforced. For instance, the National Environmental Policy Act, which is very important for many of the developments that happen on public land, is not required for state or private lands. Currently, Nevada does not have an environmental review process for large-scale projects, and for the most part that is okay, because we have so much federal land and most of the process goes through the federal agencies. However, this would not be the case if these lands were just turned over to state control.

Another concern with this bill is that there is no mention of the positive things that come from federal management of lands. The below-market prices they charge for some of the economic activities that happen, benefits from the recreational values of public lands, and the positive things that we get from national parks, national conservation areas, and wilderness areas—these things are not mentioned, and neither are the economic benefits from the tourism that goes with public lands.

There was some discussion today about the potential tax revenues that could come from this. What is not mentioned is the payment in lieu of taxes that comes from the federal government to these counties in place of the property tax. Certainly, that is not as much as they would get if this land was privately held and developed, but I do not think there should be an assumption that if we turned all these lands over to state ownership, and then sold them to private interests, that all of that land would be developed or that people would even be interested in buying that land. The fact is there are many remote and rugged areas in this state that are not necessarily appropriate for economic development.

I appreciate the direction that the sponsors have gone, in that they are looking at a study rather than just saying this is something that we ought to do. I do not have any issue with discussing this, but when we you consider putting together a state committee that has representation from each county—which I feel lacks the expertise needed, and at a significant cost to the state for a process that is probably never going to happen—that is where I fall off board. I am happy to work with the sponsors of the bill and continue to discuss these issues as we do every session in the Legislature, but I cannot support A.B. 227.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who is in opposition to the measure? [There was no response.] Is there anyone who is neutral on A.B.? 227?

Nicole Rourke, representing Clark County School District:

The district is neutral on the bill, but as we currently have, under patent lease and pending applications, over 3,100 acres of BLM property, we want to ensure a seat at the table as we discuss the potential use of those lands.

Chair Ohrenschaal:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] Assemblyman Ellison, do you wish to make any closing remarks?

Assemblyman Ellison:

You have heard the testimony. What we are after and trying to stay focused on is the study. There is only one way to eat an elephant, and that is one bite at a time. If you look at the list of people who have signed on to this bill, there are 24 Assembly members and 19 Senators, 43 in all. It is so important to get this study up and running so we can understand the issues. If it does not go anywhere, that is fine. However, if it does, we have to start to understand what is going on in our state. If we are going to have economic development, we have to start by doing this.

Chair Ohrenschaal:

Thank you, Assemblyman Ellison. I am now going to close the hearing on A.B. 227 and open the hearing on Assembly Bill 178.

Assembly Bill 178: Revises provisions relating to the disposition of unspent campaign contributions. (BDR 24-751)

Assemblyman Pat Hickey, Washoe County Assembly District No. 25:

I am here today to introduce Assembly Bill 178. With me is Senator Brower who also represents Washoe County, and he has a companion bill, Senate Bill 194, so I asked him to come here to fill in a few of the blanks.

This bill addresses a loophole that I think is inadvertent but significant. It is expected by anyone who is a candidate or has successfully served in public office that, upon the completion of your service, you turn over any of your unspent campaign monies. State law, as it exists, calls for that to be done. The problem we are trying to address is one that this body examined in 2009 and a previous version of this bill, Senate Bill No. 210 of the 75th Session. The problem is that the definition of a candidate allows someone to receive a contribution of only \$100 a year regardless of whether or not he has filed to become a candidate.

I think we can appreciate, as elected individuals, that if you finish your term in the Assembly, for example, and hope to run for the state Senate or for higher office, there certainly is a way that those monies contributed to you can legally be transferred to a future campaign. Statutes allow for that, and I think we would all agree here that is fully appropriate. I do not think the intent of the law was to have a loophole whereby simply receiving a \$100 contribution annually could, in effect, keep a campaign fund open in perpetuity. As you will see on page 3, in section 1, subsection 6, this bill specifies that any person who has been on an official ballot in any election, meaning he was either a candidate or an elected person, "shall, not later than the 15th day of the month after the end of the 2-year period, dispose of all contributions that have not been spent or committed for expenditure through one or any combination of the methods set forth." And those methods have been outlined for some time.

So this bill would codify what really was the legislative intent, and that would be that after two years you would have to dispose of any unspent contributions, and it would close the loophole of being able to receive \$100 a year whether or not you ever intended to be a candidate again. Therefore, with your permission, I will pass it over to Senator Brower to add a few points.

Senator Greg Brower, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 15:

I appreciate the opportunity to join my Assemblyman, Pat Hickey, in presenting this bill. As mentioned, we are working on a companion bill on the Senate side. Mr. Hickey asked me some time ago to assist with this, and I am happy to do so. This issue was previously presented to the Legislature in 2009, in the form of Senate Bill No. 210 of the 75th Session. Senator Lee brought the bill. I do not know how Senator Lee had recognized that the loophole existed, but I assume it was in anticipation of many members being termed out, and the issue became known. A bill to close the loophole was brought; it was passed out of this Committee's counterpart in the Senate and passed the Senate 21 to 0. Apparently, the bill did not get a hearing in the Assembly, and so it never became law.

Assemblyman Hickey and I saw that the loophole was still there and that it was probably worthy of closing. We thought it made sense, in the context of a broader package of campaign finance reform legislation—I know you have heard at least one or two bills from Assemblyman Hickey already—that this Committee would at least consider this loophole.

Some people suggested a four-year period, some a two-year period. Our bill contains a two-year period, but it is our feeling that the status quo, which is no period, does not make sense and is not good public policy. We offer this bill for your consideration.

Chair Ohrenschall:

On page 4, line 16, it reads, "If, within 2 years after the expiration of his or her term of office, a former public officer described in subsection 8 does not" What if I get hit crossing Carson Street tonight? That would be the expiration of my term of office and me. Does this take that into account, if I leave office other than expiration of the term?

Senator Brower:

I think someone from the Office of the Secretary of State is here and might be able to put a finer point on it. I believe whether through term limits, resignation, losing an election, or being hit by the proverbial bus, it is at that point that the former member under current law has until the 15th day of the second month after his or her expiration of office to dispose of campaign funds. Therefore, that hypothetical event you suggest, Mr. Chairman, would constitute an expiration of the member's term in office and trigger that obligation.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Senator, do you feel the current language is sufficient for that kind of expiration?

Senator Brower:

I do not think that the hypothetical you bring up, or some other type of sudden resignation, is something that is contemplated in the bill. Actually, I believe the current law would address that.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Assemblyman Hickey or Senator Brower?

Assemblyman Duncan:

How do other states typically handle this matter? Is it four years or two years?

Assemblyman Hickey:

I do not have an answer. I did not do a comparison of that.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to speak in favor of A.B. 178?

John Wagner, representing Independent American Party:

I ran in a primary election in 2006, and at the end of the year I filed and disposed of the rest of the money in my campaign account by donating it to a Christian school. I assumed that was the normal thing to do. I was under the impression, and I received this documentation from the Secretary

of State's Office, that was the normal procedure. I believe disposing of the money in a campaign account, unless you are going to run again for another term or office should be the norm.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Mr. Wagner? [There were none.] Is there anyone else in favor of A.B. 178? [There was no response.] Is anyone in opposition to the bill who would like to testify? [There was no response.] Is anyone neutral to A.B. 178 and would like to testify?

Scott F. Gilles, Esq., Deputy for Elections, Office of the Secretary of State:

The Secretary of State's official position on this bill is neutral. We believe the decision to disallow public figures from retaining candidate status and retaining their unspent campaign funds is a policy determination for this body to make. I did want to make a few comments on the bill.

The mechanics of the bill seem fine to achieve the policy goal that Senator Brower and Assemblyman Hickey testified to. And to echo Senator Brower's comments on the two- or four-year period, that is just something that the Committee may want to consider. As you know, some offices are on a four-year cycle and some are on a two-year cycle. You could end up with a situation where someone has termed out of office or her term is over, and she wants to seek another office, but it may not be available for up to four years. That could put her in a different position from someone in the same situation who wants to go for an office within the two-year cycle. Again, the Secretary of State's Office does not have an opinion on that, but it is something to consider. As for the question posed by Assemblyman Duncan, as far as what other states do, I do not have that information but I can look into it and get some context for you. My predecessor tells me offhand that he believes there is no state that has a period longer than four years.

The other thing I wanted to talk about relates to the current reporting standards in general. This bill could create some difficulty for our office to enforce this requirement to dispose of the unspent funds, similar to the situation that we deal with now, without the cash on hand reporting. In a nutshell, without the requirement that a candidate disclose her full campaign account, we would have no idea what that total is and what the total disposal amount would be. However, this body is in luck, because we have a bill over on the Senate side, Senate Bill 49, which would require the annual reporting of the campaign accounts year after year. I hope it comes before you soon.

Regarding the unfortunate situation where you are crossing the street and hit by a car, I believe we would consider that the end of your term. However, I believe our office would be flexible in the event there were issues with your estate being able to actually write the check to dispose of those funds.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Any questions? [There were none.] Assemblyman Hickey and Senator Brower, are there any final remarks you would like to make?

Assemblyman Hickey:

I believe this Committee is the vehicle in this body to consider regulating ourselves. I think the bill is good public policy. I certainly support a number of the open-government reforms that the Secretary of State is bringing forth this time, and I think this is good policy. It is good for the public to see that we do the right thing and, in this case, I think it is.

Senator Brower:

Let me briefly echo what Assemblyman Hickey just said. There seems to be a lot of confusion about the issues amongst members and former members, as indicated by the informal polling I have done, and so I think this bill and other bills as referenced by the Secretary of State's Office and Mr. Hickey, would go a long way toward clearing up that confusion.

Chair Ohrenschall:

I see you have mirror-image bill drafts. Senator Brower and I had that same situation in 2011 with Senate Bill No. 358 of the 76th Session. We had a good, positive end in helping the blind down in Clark County.

Assemblyman Hickey:

Mr. Chairman, speaking of Clark County, I think the ghost of someone past seems to be sitting there in Las Vegas.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Commissioner Townsend, greetings.

Randolph J. Townsend, Commissioner, Nevada Gaming Commission:

I think this bill has gained a lot of notoriety for all the wrong reasons, as do most bills that deal with campaign finance reform. In 2009, a version of this bill, Senate Bill No. 210 of the 75th Session, passed through the Senate with a vote of 21 to 0. Senator Raggio, whom the Legislature will be honoring next week, was so articulate on this issue, and I think Mr. Hickey hit on it—that is, this is about building public confidence. This is about doing the right thing, not anything else. In reading that statute, those of us who have left, and who

did dispose of it, did so because we believe that is what the law said. And we did so in the appropriate manner.

None of us knows whether we are going to be a candidate in the future. We do not have a clue. Maybe the period should be the four years that the Secretary of State's representative stated so articulately; I am sure that the committee process will work through that. I also think that the Secretary of State's bills have a tremendous amount of value in building the public's confidence in the election process and those that they elected. It is absolutely crucial. This is really about the credibility of those of us who were fortunate enough to serve and those who serve now. I hope these bills are debated vigorously, and I will trust, whatever results that those of you who will be under those laws, will see their value in creating credibility with the public.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any questions for Commissioner Townsend?

Assemblyman Elliot Anderson:

You are talking about the public and the perception that many see the election process as broken. Do you really think that this bill on its own is going to fix that? We live in an age where millionaires and billionaires can throw around millions of dollars like it is pocket change, using all kinds of different vehicles without having to disclose. Is this bill on its own going to do that? We have a lot bigger fish to fry if that is what we are trying to do, correct?

Randolph Townsend:

It is a good question Assemblyman and I appreciate it. I am not sure any bill is going to fix the problem. But if you put them all together and look at the issues of the ability and the requirements to disclose all of your campaign contributions and all of your expenses within a 72-hour of period on the Internet, showing cash balances and other information, no matter who donates to you, the public is going to see it. No matter whom you pay an expense to, the public is going to see it. I think that has value.

So I think in the totality, yes, you can go a long way in trying to provide that confidence that the public deserves. I do not think any one bill solves the problem. It is a good question, but like other serious issues, whether it is workers' comp or electric energy or telecommunications, no one bill fixes the problem. You have to start by looking at all of the components. I think you have a number of those bills in front of you that would go as a package to address the issues in the minds of the public. Whether it is you, Assemblyman Anderson, or your colleagues or myself, we all still work for

everybody in the state of Nevada. That is whom, we have to remember, we are here to serve.

Chair Ohrenschall:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] I will now close the hearing on A.B. 178. I want to mention that Assemblyman Hickey made a reference to intent and deliberations regarding Senate Bill No. 210 in the 75th Session from the May 30, 2009 minutes ([Exhibit L](#)), which are available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS). Also, during the hearing on A.B. 227, a letter of support from Elaine Barkdull-Spencer ([Exhibit M](#)) was uploaded to NELIS. I do not believe she was here to testify.

Now I want to open the meeting to public comment. Is there anybody who would like to speak? [There was no response.] We will close today's hearing of the Assembly Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections.

Meeting adjourned [at 6:08 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karen Pugh
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman James Ohrenschall, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections

Date: March 21, 2013

Time of Meeting: 4:06 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.J.R. 4	C	Senator Barbara Cegavske	Introductory Remarks for S.J.R. 4 Presentation
S.J.R. 4	D	Rev. Fr. Stephen Karcher	S.J.R. 4 Presentation
S.J.R. 4	E	Stephen Georgeson	Nov. 21, 2011 US Senate letter to President Obama re: Ecumenical Patriarch
S.J.R. 4	F	Stephen Georgeson	Feb. 24, 2013 Archdiocese of Chicago letter to Senator Cullerton
A.J.R. 6	G	Senator Barbara Cegavske	Introductory Remarks for A.J.R. 6 Presentation
A.J.R. 6	H	Assemblyman John Ellison	A.J.R. 6 Presentation
A.J.R. 6	I	Elliot Karp	Email in support of A.J.R. 6
A.B. 227	J	Assemblyman John Ellison	A.B. 227 Presentation
A.B. 227	K	Juanita Clark	June Ingram's Letter in support of A.B. 227
A.B. 178	L	Assemblyman Pat Hickey	Selected pages of May 30, 2009 minutes, Senate Committee on Legislative Operations and Elections re: S.B. 210
A.B. 227	M	Elaine Barkdull-Spencer	Letter in support of A.B. 227