

February 3, 2026

Greetings,

I submit this testimony on SB 1590 (2026) as a private citizen who is interested in good governance and precision in the legislative process. I support SB 1590 conceptually, but I am concerned about whether – as presently drafted – it provides sufficient guidance to public bodies about what actions the legislation permits and what actions the legislation forbids. Because I am concerned about the way in which the bill is currently drafted, I am filing this testimony with a “neutral” label.

As introduced (and as would still be the case with the -1 amendment), the bill states in part that public bodies “may not use any moneys, data, technology, equipment, personnel or other resources \* \* \* for the purpose of assisting the federal government \* \* \* with the sale or transfer of [certain federal] real property in this state to a private person.”

My concern relates to the actions that public bodies (like county planning departments and county records offices) may routinely take in such areas as: giving members of the public information about who owns particular parcels of land; what local land-ordinances may apply to certain parcels of land; recording deeds; etc. **My question is whether this legislation would prohibit public bodies from giving information to federal agencies (or recording deeds involving federal land transfers) in circumstances where the public bodies would give that information to any other person or entity that inquires (or record any other deed).**

I doubt that the sponsors of SB 1590 intend to prohibit public bodies from giving publicly available information to the federal government (or anybody else) if the public bodies believe that giving that information would somehow assist in a sale of federal land to a private party. Or maybe I’m wrong, and that is the sponsors’ intent.

Either way, I think it would be helpful for an amendment to clarify the scope of what it means for a public body to “use” any resources “for the purpose of assisting the federal government” with the sale of federal land to a private party. If the meaning of those terms remains unclear, confusion may follow.

Thank you for taking the time to consider my comments.

Respectfully,

Erika Hadlock