



NEVADA LEGISLATURE JOINT INTERIM STANDING COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

(Nevada Revised Statutes [NRS] 218E.320)

MINUTES

August 23, 2024

The sixth meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Natural Resources for the 2023–2024 Interim was held on Friday, August 23, 2024, at 11:30 a.m. in Room 4100, Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 335 of the Nevada Legislature Office Building, 700 East Warm Springs Road, Las Vegas, Nevada.

The agenda, minutes, meeting materials, and audio or video recording of the meeting are available on the Committee's [meeting page](#). The audio or video recording may also be found at <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Video/>. Copies of the audio or video record can be obtained through the Publications Office of the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) (publications@lcb.state.nv.us or 775/684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT IN CARSON CITY:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Vice Chair
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Melanie Scheible
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch

COMMITTEE MEMBER PRESENT IN LAS VEGAS:

Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod

LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU STAFF PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division
Lisa Creamer, Senior Research Policy Assistant, Research Division
Erin Sturdivant, Senior Principal Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Jeffrey Chronister, Deputy Legislative Counsel, Legal Division
Adam Drost, Principal Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division

*Items taken out of sequence during the meeting have been placed in agenda order.
[Indicate a summary of comments.]*

AGENDA ITEM I—OPENING REMARKS

Chair Pazina:

I would like to call this meeting to order and welcome you all to the final meeting of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Natural Resources for the 2023–2024 [Interim].

[Roll call is reflected in Committee Members Present.]

Today's meeting is going to be the Committee's Work Session where we will be considering which bills to bring forward to the next session.

[Chair Pazina discussed meeting guidelines for Committee members, presenters, and those providing public comment.]

AGENDA ITEM II—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Pazina:

Let us start our first public comment session for today. If there is anyone wishing to speak in either Las Vegas or Carson City, please approach the table now. I will remind you that during [the] Work Session, we will not have support or opposition testimony. This is a great chance to share your thoughts on the bills being work sessioned, and I thank you again for being here today.

Kyle Davis, Pinyon Public Affairs, Representing Interwest Energy Alliance:

Thank you, Madam Chair and Members of the Committee, for the opportunity to provide comment this morning. I am here to discuss Recommendation B-6 from the Public Lands [Sub]committee's recommendations. This was considered earlier this morning, and a version of it was recommended for your full Committee. I did submit a letter ([Agenda Item II](#)) on behalf of Interwest to this Committee in anticipation that the resolution could move forward, which it has. But the Committee did provide guidance to continue to work on that language, which we certainly do appreciate. I wanted to clarify—I did submit that letter based on the original draft that was in the [Public Lands] Work Session. But based upon the Committee's discussion and my conversations with Committee Members, we would appreciate the opportunity and are happy to work with the Committee and other stakeholders to help craft something that I think would work for everybody. Thank you.

Olivia Tanager, Director, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

Good morning, Madam Chair, Members of the Committee. The Toiyabe Chapter represents 40,000 members and supporters across our great State. We are thrilled to talk about Transit to Trails with this Committee and look forward to answering any questions you may have. As I previously noted, we have chatted with both regional transportation commissions (RTCs) in our great State as well as land management agencies and other stakeholders. We will continue to connect with stakeholders leading into the 2025 Session. So far, we have not received any concern or opposition. This proposal is simply for a commission of relevant stakeholders to identify high-priority trailheads for transit and to identify sources of funding for expanding transit. We do not want to strain our existing transportation resources and cause problems for folks using transit to commute or run errands. Our organization strives

to get people outside to enjoy, explore, and protect our public lands. And as such, I know kids and people in Reno who have never been up to Lake Tahoe or at Mount Rose Highway, and similarly, folks who live in Southern Nevada, who have never been out to Red Rock or Mount Charleston. In talking with different folks, we have learned that people going up Mount Rose Highway and going up Mount Charleston in the winter, who are not adequately prepared, causes a strain on law enforcement resources, and therefore we support Transit to Trails as a public safety issue as well. This issue is also personal to me. When I first moved to Nevada, my husband got in a serious car accident and was in the hospital for a little while. A few weeks later, our remaining car broke down, and I was not able to get outside and recreate. It impacted my mental health by not being able to exercise outside or connect with nature.

We also support many of the other items you will be discussing today, including the Healthy Soils bill, the letter supporting the Ash Meadows mineral withdrawal, water for wildlife, water rights retirement, and the wildlife crossings funding. Thank you for these important discussions. We look forward to working with you throughout the remainder of this interim and in the next session.

Chair Pazina:

I enjoyed hearing the solicitation proposal for the Transit to Trails.

Cadence Matijevich, Government Affairs Liaison, Washoe County:

Good morning, Chair Pazina, Members of the Committee. [I] wanted to come before you today to voice our support for an item that will be coming from your Public Lands Subcommittee, and that is the letter to our federal government on the *Revised Statute* (RS) 2477 Rights-of-Way. In September of 2023, the Washoe County Board of County Commissioners adopted resolution R 23118, expressing to Congress and to the Executive Department the importance of creating and supporting an administrative adjudication process for titling of these historic county rights-of-way. This is an important issue to counties, and doing so will allow us to access funding to help maintain and repair these important pathways—roadways—in our communities. We appreciate the State considering lending your voice to that call for action to our federal government as well. On behalf of Washoe County—and I think I speak for other local governments—[we want] to express to Senator Goicoechea our sincere thanks for your decades of advocacy. You have been our champion for local government in this body. We will miss you very much, Senator.

Chair Pazina:

Thank you for the comments. I feel very certain everyone up here and, in this room, agrees with you.

Jaina Moan, Director, External Affairs, The Nature Conservancy (TNC) in Nevada:

We support several of the recommendations in the “Work Session Document” (WSD). First, we are pleased to see the Smart from the Start resolution move forward from the Public Lands Subcommittee. We encourage your passage of that. We support [Recommendation B-3], which will uplift regenerative agriculture practices and help producers by creating a structure and mechanism for improving soil health in Nevada. We support [Recommendation C-4] for the Committee to send a letter to the United States Department of Interior, urging an administrative withdrawal of public lands in Amargosa Valley. This important action would demonstrate support for protecting the water resources that feed the Ash Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, which is an environmental,

cultural, and community treasure that is like no other on this planet. We support [Recommendation D-5] to create a Transit to Trails Task Force. This effort would enhance equitable access for people of varying economic levels to visit and experience Nevada's beautiful parks and trails. Expanding these opportunities for all people not only improves public health, but such a program can alleviate vehicle to congestion at our crowded trails. We very much appreciate Senator Goicoechea proposing [Recommendation E-9] on the agenda. This would create the Nevada Water Conservation and Recreation Program consisting of the Nevada Water Buy-Back Initiative and a grant program to establish an advisory committee for the initiative. We recommend that at least \$275,000 be attached to the bill to cover staff time and travel for establishing regulations for the program and for staffing the advisory committee. Also in the water category, we support [Recommendation E-6] regarding extensions of time for converting agricultural water rights to wildlife purposes or to improve water quality. This change would provide a temporary means to conserve water as we look for solutions that permanently reduce consumptive use that work for both people and nature. We support [Recommendation F-10] regarding support for the Nevada Shared Stewardship Agreement and [Recommendation F-11] to allow for Nevada's Division of Forestry (NDF) to enter into fire compacts. In the face of increasing wildfire threat, it is imperative that we maintain wildfire readiness and response tools and communications.

Chair Pazina:

We are at two minutes—if you [can] close us out.

Ms. Moan:

To close out, we support [Recommendation G-12] to appropriate \$5 million to fund the wildlife crossings, and we truly appreciate your support and for hearing our comment. Thank you so much.

Peter Stanton, Chief Executive Officer, Walker Basin Conservancy:

Good morning, Chair Pazina and Members of the Committee. I lead the Walker Basin Conservancy in our efforts to save Walker Lake and secure a resilient water supply for our region's communities. This morning, I would like to express my support for two bill draft requests (BDR). The first—to establish a groundwater retirement program under State statute; and the second—to extend the period for temporary permits to increase instream flows for wildlife benefit. Over the last year, the Conservancy [has] worked with local farmers and the State to develop a pilot program for water rights retirement. Sellers came forward in our region expressing interest in retiring approximately ten times as much water as there was funding available. These initial results demonstrate substantial interest in retiring water rights, enough to make a long-term positive impact for agriculture in our industry and in our region and quality of life indicators. Last week, we successfully completed the first transaction in our region and filed relinquishment paperwork with the State to conserve 500 acre-feet of groundwater in perpetuity. In these transactions, we are also leveraging federal funding, stretching the State's investment, and expecting about a 2:1 federal match on these transactions. In our region, declining groundwater tables have taken domestic wells offline and led to decreasing flows of the Walker River. Stopping groundwater decline is vital to providing sustainable water supply for future generations of Nevadans, and I commend the Committee for it is foresight in requesting this BDR.

I would also like to voice our support for [Recommendation E-6], a BDR to extend the time limit for temporary conversion of agricultural water rights to instream benefit for wildlife

purposes. The future of Walker Lake and the Walker River depend on Nevada statute supporting instream flow enhancement. Extending the time period for temporary conversions will provide more flexible management tools for our region while mitigating administrative burdens in the change application process. Thank you for your consideration of both of these BDRs today.

Mason Voehl, Executive Director, Amargosa Conservancy:

Good morning, Chair Pazina, Members of the Committee. We are a nonprofit working toward a sustainable future for the Amargosa River here in Nevada and in California. I want to thank the Committee for considering, as part of today's meeting [Recommendation C-4] concerning an important issue affecting the Amargosa River, the communities of the Amargosa Valley and the protected landscapes of Ash Meadows National Wildlife Refuge, and Death Valley National Park. This is an extraordinary landscape known and beloved around the world for its scenic beauty, its biodiversity, its storied past, and sadly, it is also a landscape facing extraordinary threats to its future. The mining is an important cornerstone of Nevada's economy. Mining in the Amargosa Valley poses a direct threat to precious groundwater resources depended upon by the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe, the community of Amargosa Valley, and exceptionally rare wildlife species.

In one of the planet's hottest and driest deserts, there is nothing more valuable than water. We have come before this Committee because our coalition sees an opportunity to enhance safeguards for this special corner of Nevada through placing a temporary pause on new mining claiming on approximately 276,000 acres of public land in the Amargosa Valley. And this action has robust and diverse support from the Timbisha Shoshone Tribe; local governments; Nye County; Senators Cortez Masto and Rosen; and Representatives Horsford, Lee, and Titus. A letter of support from this Committee would be meaningful and an impactful action in demonstrating Nevada's commitments to sticking up for water conservation, for rural communities, and for wildlife that are part of our fabric of our State's identity. Opportunities like this that are authentically bipartisan and community-driven are something of a rarity in our modern era. We sincerely hope that this Committee will join us in securing these needed safeguards and giving the Amargosa Valley a fighting chance at a bright and sustainable future. Thank you. I will look forward to addressing questions or concerns at the appropriate time.

Ed James, General Manager, Carson Water Subconservancy District:

We are here to express our support for the Healthy Soils Initiative. For the past three years, the Carson Water Subconservancy District [has] been working with our partners, looking at the benefits of healthy soils to the farming community. We found that not only [do] healthy soils improve production for the farmers, but also enhances the water holding capacity of the soil and dealing with water quality improvements. This is something that we feel is really important. We have been working with several different ranches. We have one in Churchill County, one with Joe Frey. We have also been working with the Break-a-Heart Ranch and TCN in Douglas County to look at using and enhancing some pilot projects on healthy soils and seeing how this would improve soil moisture, crops, and also improve water quality. We hope you will support this initiative. Thank you.

John Hadder, Executive Director, Great Basin Resource Watch:

[I] appreciate this opportunity for public comment—going to shift gears a little bit on you. At the last Committee meeting, there was a lot of discussion regarding lithium mining, and we cannot ignore the heavy use of water by mining operations, including existing

and proposed lithium mines here in Nevada. There was also a lot of heralding of a process called direct lithium extraction—DLE—and as a softer mining path. I recommend caution here. The DLE process is actually a suite of seven different kinds of methods, five of which still use an evaporation component to them. So, there is still a lot of limited public availability about these various methods and their ecological/environmental footprint. For example, a recent article that was published last year called the “Environmental impact of direct lithium extraction from brines,” published in *Nature Reviews [Earth and Environment]*, [February] 2023 discussed the potential freshwater use of this process compared to others. According to the article, brine evaporation operations in South America—and I hope I get these pronunciations right—Salar de Atacama and Salar de Olaroz, which are similar to our Silver Peak operation here in Nevada, use roughly 5,940 and 13,200 gallons of water for every ton of lithium carbonate equivalent. That is the sort of [trade used] terminology. The article went on to talk about one of the few existing DLE operations—in Salar del Hombre Muerto—[that] uses about 18,700 gallons of water per lithium carbon extract. [It] actually uses more water than [other] existing [DLE operations]. The article goes on—further reviews 57 reports on this method.

Chair Pazina:

Mr. Hadder, we are at two minutes. I know time goes fast. If you can close it out for us—we have one more public comment.

Mr. Hadder:

I will wrap up real quick to say that I am not discouraging this method; I am wanting caution here—it can be very water intensive, and there is still a lot to be known about it—and that we be mindful and careful [of] the consequences of various mining methods in the setting where they are proposed. Thank you.

Chair Pazina:

I would remind anyone whose minutes go over two minutes that you are also welcome to submit those to the public record as well.

Doug Martin, President, Nevada Association of Conservation Districts:

Thank you. Madam Chairwoman and Members, I am here today to encourage you to support our soil health initiative in the State of Nevada. We have the authority under [Chapter] 548 to create such initiative, and this [is] an initiative that will open up a lot of avenues of funding in the areas of research, education, and implementation of best soil management practices. It is a nonregulatory, voluntary initiative to work with farmers and ranchers in the areas of soil health. Thank you very much.

Tracy Bower, Director of External Affairs, Desert Research Institute (DRI):

Madam Chair, Members of the Committee, I want to echo the comments, too, about Senator Goicoechea and thank him for his leadership. He has been a champion for DRI, and we sincerely appreciate that. I am also here today in support of the recommendation on your Work Session—E-7—for DRI's Cloud Seeding Program. Desert Research Institute is a nonprofit research institute that includes more than 600 scientists who are world renowned experts in their field, including in the area of cloud physics. Cloud seeding is a scientifically proven method that allows DRI to elicit additional precipitation from winter storms. We can generate about 10 percent more precipitation from a winter storm when we seed those clouds during the wintertime. Desert Research Institute is a world-renowned expert in the

area of cloud seeding, and again, it is practiced very widely in the West. The State funded a cloud seeding program for a number of decades. That funding went away during the Great Recession. We thank Senator Goicoechea for his leadership in bringing that back with Senate Bill 99 in the 2023 Session. We appreciate you considering continuing that funding in the 2025 Session, and we support the request. Thank you.

Chair Pazina:

Not seeing any further comment in Carson City or Las Vegas—Broadcast and Production Services (BPS), do we have anyone on the phones?

BPS:

[BPS staff informed the public how to call in for public comment.]

Sheila Bray, University of Nevada, Reno (UNR):

Hello, Chair Pazina and Members of the Joint Interim Natural Resources Committee. I do want to share my thoughts. Thank you to Senator Goicoechea, on behalf of UNR, for all of your support throughout the many years of your service in the in the Legislature. I [am] also calling today to voice our support of two of the items on your recommendation list. The first is [Recommendation B-2]—the Home Feeds Nevada Program—the urging of a letter to support this Program. Our Nevada Wolfpack Meat area has been able to take advantage of this Program, and [it] provides opportunities for producers as well as our meat harvesting facility, based in Reno, to produce meat protein for Northern Nevada. We are completely in support of the continuation of this, and the impact it has had on our State. Additionally, we are also in support of the Healthy Soils [Recommendation B-3] that is on your list today. We were in support of this bill that was set forth in the 2023 Legislative Session, and we are glad to see that it is made a return. As many of you know, we are home to the only agriculture college in the State. And we have a number of researchers and educators that are invested in the sustainability of our land, including soil-based research. We look forward to working with this Committee and other stakeholders throughout session on this and other things that can come up. Thank you.

Chair Pazina:

Do we have anyone else, Broadcast, on the lines?

BPS:

You have no more callers wishing to participate at this time.

Chair Pazina:

Thank you, and thank you for all the kind comments for Senator Goicoechea as well. By the end of today, we might inspire some blushing over there from the amazing job he has done through 22 years here in the Legislature moving forward phenomenal policy. Seeing no more public comment, we are going to move on to our next agenda item—approval of the minutes of the meetings of April 5, May 10, and June 4.

AGENDA ITEM III—APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES FOR THE MEETINGS ON APRIL 5, MAY 10, AND JUNE 4, 2024

Chair Pazina:

Committee Members, You should have all received the minutes and had time to review them. Are there any questions or concerns from the Committee? [There were none.]

Would everyone be all right with approving the minutes from these meetings in one motion rather than separating them out? Okay, great. I am seeing head nods and thumbs up.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS HELD ON APRIL 5, MAY 10, AND JUNE 4, 2024.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Pazina:

That quickly moved us out of Item III, and into Item IV on the agenda, which will bring us to our Work Session.

AGENDA ITEM IV—WORK SESSION—DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION ON RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO:

Chair Pazina:

Members, the Committee's WSD ([Agenda Item IV](#)) is posted on the Committee's meeting page, and it contains a list of the proposed recommendations relating to various matters in the purview of our Committee. The Joint Interim Standing Committee on Natural Resources (JISCNR) is allotted 14 BDRs, at least 4 of which must be related to public lands. I will share at this time that the Chair of the Subcommittee on Public Lands, Chair Scheible and I did have a discussion prior to this Committee meeting to determine 6 BDRs could come forth from the Subcommittee and 8 could come forth from the Natural Resources Committee, which would lead us to 14. When you look at the additional letters, which do not constitute BDRs, that means everything that was passed by the Subcommittee this morning could pass through here today without taking away any of the bills that were presented online on the Legislature's website and to the Committee. I did want to share that. Nothing needs to die as a result of quantity of bills.

The Subcommittee on Public Lands met earlier this morning and voted on which items to bring forward to the Committee, as a whole, to consider. The Subcommittee's WSD is available on the Subcommittee's web page. I hope everyone has had a chance to review [it]. As a reminder, during the Work Session, we typically do not take testimony unless Committee members have questions, and the need arises to call on certain people to clarify those specific questions. I would also like to remind the Committee that voting for these proposed recommendations for BDRs does not constitute your support or vote in favor of a policy, come session. There will obviously be a lot of discussion when those BDRs come to life—into legislation—at that time.

I would like, at this point, for Mr. Stinnesbeck to walk us through the Committee's WSD beginning with a compilation of the items brought forward from the Subcommittee on Public Lands.

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

As a reminder, as nonpartisan staff, I cannot advocate for or against any measure that comes before his body. At the pleasure of the Chair, I will walk the Committee through the WSD. The Chair and staff of the Committee have prepared this document to assist the Committee in determining which legislative measures it will request for the 2025 Session of the Nevada Legislature as well as other actions the Committee may endorse. The WSD contains recommendations presented during public hearings, through communication with individual Committee Members, or through correspondence submitted to the Committee Members or staff.

The Members of the Committee do not necessarily support or oppose the recommendations in the WSD, and staff has compiled and organized the proposals so the Committee Members can review them and decide whether they want to accept, reject, modify, or take no action on a recommendation. The Chair went through the number of legislative measures that are allocated to the JISCNR. With that, the first section in the WSD pertains to the Subcommittee on Public Lands. As the Chair mentioned, the Subcommittee made its recommendations earlier today, and I will now go through the ones that were recommended and see how the Chair wants to proceed with those.

A. SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC LANDS

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

[The first is] a resolution on land use planning to encourage: (1) local led efforts; (2) coordination between federal, state, and local government; and (3) multiple use of public lands while providing for a sustainability of these lands economically, socially, and environmentally. This recommendation was passed unanimously as well as the next one, which was the proposal for a resolution declaring Smart from the Start solar development as the State policy for Nevada. There is the possibility to smooth the language a little bit.

The next two sets of recommendations were letters. The first was to send a letter to Congress expressing support for congressional action to provide clarity on protocols to address the RS 2477 rights-of-way. Next is a letter to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) expressing support for the Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan, and its Conservation Credits System in managing greater sage-grouse in Nevada.

The next set of recommendations from the Subcommittee are related to water. The first of those is to propose legislation that revises various provisions of water law that would encourage water conservation. This includes but is not limited to revising NRS 533.024 to include encouragement of the efficient use of water as a matter of State policy; adding language to NRS related to filing conservation plans with the State Engineer; revising NRS 533.0241 to require the State Engineer to treat water conservation under a conservation plan as appropriate water; and excluding water conservation under a conservation plan from the abandonment provision of NRS 533.060 and 534.090. This was the only recommendation that was not unanimous from the Subcommittee.

The next recommendation pertaining to water is to propose legislation to remove the minimum charge and establish a maximum charge for a special assessment levied upon

certain designated basins where groundwater use is predominantly for agricultural purposes; limit the use of the special assessment to activities that are directly related to the groundwater basin; and require annual reporting on expenditures and activities funded by the special assessment. In addition to that, the Subcommittee passed adding an appropriation of \$1 million to the Division of Water Resources (DWR) of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) to support the Nevada State Engineer and the Nevada Water Initiative. The next recommendation passed by the Subcommittee was to propose legislation to authorize a board of county commissioners to establish a groundwater board.

The last recommendation was on tribal consultation, specifically, to propose legislation to amend Title 26 of NRS related to public lands to add language to prioritize tribal expertise and knowledge to public lands. That concludes the recommendations from the Subcommittee.

Chair Pazina:

At this point, what I would like to do is move forward first with both the BDRs and the two letters that passed unanimously this morning from the Subcommittee as a vote, which would include looking at the [Public Lands] WSD from earlier today. [Recommendations A-2 and A-3] are now combined, so that would be one bill. [Recommendations A-4, B-5, B-6, B-7, and B-8] and our new [Recommendation B-9], which would be the tribal bill that was discussed regarding expertise and recommendations. Do we have any objections to putting all of those forward as one? I am seeing nods and thumbs up. I think we are okay there.

Committee Members, are there any questions regarding [Recommendations A-2 through B-9 from the Subcommittee on Public Lands? [There were none.]

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO APPROVE PUBLIC LANDS' RECOMMENDATIONS A-2 AND A-3, COMBINED INTO ONE BDR, AND PUBLIC LANDS' RECOMMENDATIONS A-4, B-1, B-2, B-3, B-4, B-5, B-6, B-7, B-8, AND B-9.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Is there any discussion before we move forward to a vote? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Pazina:

With that, we are going to discuss [Recommendation A-1]. I believe there was dissent on that one this morning. That was, again, [Recommendation A-1] from this morning's Subcommittee of Public Lands' Work Session requesting the drafting of a bill that revises various provisions of water law that would encourage water conservation, including revision of NRS 533.024 [and] 533.0241, as well as excluding water conserved from a conservation plan from the abandonment provisions of NRS 533.060 and 534.090. I would remind the Committee this is moving forward with BDR recommendations, and by no means is this moving forward with a bill itself. I am certain there will be robust conversation during session.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO APPROVED PUBLIC LANDS' RECOMMENDATION A-1.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Any discussion on the motion before we vote?

Senator Goicoechea:

We all know we have to address water and water conservation, but in this particular bill, it is so encompassing. I was one of the opposing votes. I would like to see language before I vote in favor of bringing a bill like that forward and the ramifications that could come out of a bill like that. That was why I opposed it. We are going to have to conserve water. We recognize that, but some of the stuff was going to be pretty far reaching, I am afraid.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I want to echo the Senator's comments, but then also add I think this issue—the concept of creating water conservation as an ability to appropriate that water for that purpose—is so different from the way we have been treating water law, to date, that I do not think the discussions have matured far enough to be able to put together a BDR that will meaningfully address the issue. I think it is too soon to do this.

Vice Chair Anderson:

I hear what my colleagues are saying from the Subcommittee, but I would like to reiterate that I think it is important, also, that we work together on bringing forward language during the drafting and also during the legislative process. So, even if they are no longer here in 72 days, we would still be able to call individuals and ask for advice as well as help. This way, we can at least get the conversation started understanding it is not going to solve it. We have to get this conversation started, and this is one step in doing so.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I would echo my colleagues' statement. I think we all agree conservation is essential. I would argue this is not official language. We are not approving a bill. I believe this is starting a conversation. It is important that we start this and work together with stakeholders and each other [to] get the language correct. It is important we start here so we can have that conversation and be working on it throughout the next session, because I do not think our State is getting in any better position water-wise if we wait. We need to get started as soon as possible.

Chair Pazina:

Do we have any further discussion from the Committee before taking a vote?

Assemblyman DeLong:

I want to put on the record that [I] appreciate everyone's thoughts on this. I do not think we should be starting a conversation during a legislative session. We need to be hashing out these issues in an interim in a more collaborative process. Trying to do that during session, we will not actually get anything done. I do not think that is a good use of time.

Chair Pazina:

The beauty of having this discussion now is those conversations do not need to wait until the legislative session. We can start having those conversations now. I would especially encourage Senator Goicoechea—who many people in the room have said how much they will miss his knowledge of water and his knowledge of natural resources around the State—and Assemblyman DeLong to start those conversations now and share feedback [on what] you would like to see if this does end up passing. Any further discussion?

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I will not be here in the next legislative session, but I want to get on the record that I do think there are times where it is completely necessary to start those conversations during the legislative session. I do not have quite the tenure Senator Goicoechea has, but I have done four sessions. There are times when you start with a process, and you do not quite get there by the end. But at least those discussions have been made, and you can work again. We are the driest State in the nation, and this bill is a good jumping off point. I will be a 'yes.'

Chair Pazina:

Any further comments before we move to a vote? [There were none.]

I appreciate all the discussion. That is one of the things I love about work sessions—getting to have an open discussion.

THE MOTION PASSED. (SENATOR GOICOECHEA AND ASSEMBLYMEMBERS DELONG AND GURR VOTED NO.)

Chair Pazina:

That closes out our voting on the Work Session from the Subcommittee on Public Lands. I will hand it over again to Mr. Stinnesbeck to get us going on our next Work Session [recommendations].

B. AGRICULTURE

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

The next recommendations of the Work Session pertain to agriculture, under B. It is my understanding the Chair would like me to go through both of those recommendations, so I will do so. First, Recommendation B-2 is to send a letter to the Governor and the Director of the State Department of Agriculture expressing support for the Home Feeds Nevada Agriculture Food Purchasing Program. This recommendation is based on testimony made during the February 29 meeting.

The next recommendation on agriculture is [Recommendation B-3], which requests the drafting of a bill to create a Healthy Soils Initiative, including the creation of a Soil Health Advisory Board run through the conservation districts. This recommendation was made by Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch based on testimony made during the February 29 meeting. It was also recommended by Mr. Martin, President of the Nevada Association of Conservation Districts, and Kelli Kelly. You can see also Attachment B-3 to the WSD. There was also public comment made earlier on this and public comment through a letter, which is uploaded to the website from the Lincoln County Conservation District.

Chair Pazina:

I would like to move us one topic at a time as you look through the agenda; so, we are only going to look at voting on agricultural bills at this time and not moving any further past that. I am going to look around to the Committee again to see if we are okay with that. Committee, are there any questions regarding [Recommendations B-2 and B-3] from the WSD? [There were none.]

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LA RUE HATCH MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS B-2 AND B-3.

THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY SENATOR GOICOECHEA.

Chair Pazina:

Any discussion on [Recommendations B-2 or B-3] from the Natural Resources' WSD before we proceed? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Pazina:

We will ask Mr. Stinnesbeck to move into Mining for [Recommendation C-4].

C. MINING

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

[Recommendation C-4] is to send a letter to the Department of the Interior urging the Secretary of the Interior to enact an administrative withdrawal of public land in the Amargosa Valley from new mining for a temporary period of 20 years. This was recommended by Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch, Jaina Moan with TCN, Laurel Saito with TCN, and Mason Voehl with the Amargosa Conservancy. You can see additional information in Attachment C-4.

Chair Pazina:

We only have the one proposal for mining, so we are not combining anything together. I would like to ask Committee Members if there are any questions.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I have one or two questions for the sponsors of this, or the people who recommended it. If they could come up, that would be appreciated. In developing this proposal were KMI Zeolite or Lhoist involved in any of your discussions with regard to the development of this?

Mr. Voehl, Previously Identified:

Yes, we actually have had several conversations with Lhoist executives on this issue to ensure they have all the briefing materials and a very full understanding that a new withdrawal of this nature is subject to valid existing rights.

Assemblyman DeLong:

Did you have any discussions with KMI Zeolite?

Mr. Voehl:

No, we have not had direct conversations with KMI Zeolite at this time.

Chair Pazina:

Do we have any other questions from the Committee regarding this one? [There were none.]

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION C-4.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Is there any discussion on the motion before we vote?

Assemblyman DeLong:

Thank you for accommodating me, Chair. I am concerned any time we are thinking about withdrawing lands in the State [from] multiple use. We already have millions of acres that have been withdrawn from multiple use. The only way I [will] consider it is appropriate to withdraw more land is if we release land that is currently withdrawn from multiple use. We need, as a State, to encourage multiple use of our lands, which are mostly managed by the BLM. I am not in favor of this because of the withdrawal issue.

Chair Pazina:

I would remind the Committee this is a letter and not a BDR. It will not be a resolution or a change in statute.

Senator Goicoechea:

I also am concerned any time we start asking for administrative withdrawals of public lands. However, I do represent this area, and I know it is super sensitive. Again, a letter—it will probably take 20 years before they ever get it looked at anyway. But I am going to support it, because I am supporting my constituents down there, and it is a sensitive area. I typically would not be in favor of any administrative land withdrawal, but this is a unique case. I will support it.

Assemblyman Gurr:

Normally, I would be in the same boat with Senator Goicoechea to not withdraw—along with Assemblyman DeLong. But it is an area I represent also, and it is a very sensitive area. I have looked; I have not been on the ground there, but I have seen pictures. I have had conversations with people who represent them, and it is a sensitive localized issue. I think it is a little broad by taking the whole Amargosa Valley out. But, like Senator Goicoechea says, it is going to be a long time before the feds ever get around to addressing the issue, I am afraid. Right now, I am going to vote for it.

Chair Pazina:

Do we have any other comments before we move forward? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN DELONG VOTED NO.)

Chair Pazina:

We will hand this back over to Mr. Stinnesbeck to review Outdoor Recreation.

D. OUTDOOR RECREATION

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

Outdoor Recreation—[Recommendation D-5] requests the drafting of a bill to create a “Transit to Trails” Task Force that is charged with identifying and securing funding for public transit that runs to trailheads and identifying high-priority areas for a potential future Transit to Trails Program. This was recommended by Olivia Tanager with the Sierra Club, and you can also see attachments to the WSD.

Chair Pazina:

Committee Members, do we have any questions?

Senator Goicoechea:

I hope they consider public transit to the top of the Rubies.

Olivia Tanager, Previously Identified:

I too would like to see that, Senator Goicoechea.

Vice Chair Anderson:

Mine is not a question; it is more of a comment. I so appreciate this being brought forward, especially when we think about our Tahoe area, in particular. I recognize the people from the northern area—we hear about it often. This is something [for which] we are desperate. Thank you for bringing this forward.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATION D-5.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LA RUE HATCH SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Any discussion before we vote? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Pazina:

We will turn it back over to Mr. Stinnesbeck in regard to water—something we have quite the scarcity of here in Nevada.

E. WATER

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

[Recommendation E-6]—Water. The first recommendation on water is to request the drafting of a bill revising NRS 533.0243 to extend the time limit of a temporary conversion of agricultural water rights for wildlife purposes or to improve the quality of flow of water from three to ten years. This recommendation was made by Mr. Roerink with the Great Basin Water Network during the May 10 meeting. Unfortunately, Mr. Roerink is not available today.

The next recommendation under water is E-7—to request the drafting of a bill based on Senate Bill 99 from the 2023 Session that appropriates \$600,000 per year for each year of the 2025–2027 Biennium from the State General Fund to the DRI to support the Nevada State Cloud Seeing Program, which was recommended by Ms. Bower with the DRI and Mr. Fontaine with the Humboldt River Basin Water Authority. You can see Attachment E-7 for that one.

[Recommendation E-8] requests the drafting of a bill that revises various provisions of water law. This includes but ,it is not limited to: an addition to Chapter 445A of NRS to encourage and promote water reuse as a policy of the State; an addition to NRS 445A.520 related to standards of water quality that authorizes the State Environmental Commission to consider the establishment of a water quality standard variance, pursuant to federal law, which meets certain criteria; defining “eligible property owner” in Chapter 439 of NRS for purposes of a district board of health voluntary financial assistance program to pay for costs related to abandoning existing septic systems served by a municipal water system to connect to community sewerage; and the establishment of the Account for Retiring Water Rights in the State General Fund and the Volunteer Water Rights Retirement Program and expires the Program on June 30, 2035. This was recommended by Mr. Chau-Duong with the Las Vegas Valley Water District. You can see Attachment E-8 for bill language and support letters signed by various stakeholders.

The next recommendation on water is [Recommendation E-9], which requests the drafting of a bill based on the amended version of Senate Bill 176 from in 2023 Session, excluding the sections creating the Account for Purchasing and Retiring Water Rights and the appropriation from the State General Fund to the Account. The bill would create the Nevada Conservation and Recreation Program, consisting of the Nevada Water Buy-Back Initiative and a grant program, and establish an advisory committee for the Initiative. This was recommended both by Chair Pazina, Senator Goicoechea, Ms. Moan with TNC, and Ms. Saito with TNC. You can see Attachment E-9 for the bill language from 2023 in addition to

information provided by TNC in [Attachment C-4]. That concludes the recommendations under "Water."

Chair Pazina:

That was quite the robust discussion we had in regard to those water bills. What I would like to do before we start discussion is to see, if it is okay with the Committee, if we take all of those votes at once for all of those water bills we discussed, which would be everything under "Water"—[Recommendations E-6, E-7, E-8, and E-9]—so all four. Are there any comments from the Committee—any challenges with that? [There were none.]

I will open it up to any questions on [Recommendations E-6, E-7, E-8, and E-9].

Senator Goicoechea:

This is more of a comment. I can definitely support all the bills, but if we get short of BDRs when we get towards the end, my least favorite is [Recommendation E-6]. My concern with that is it looks like the request is going to be from three to ten years, and I am very apprehensive about moving beyond the five years, which is what the law requires for maintaining your water rights. That is one thing. Looking at it, if one is going to fall off, that is what I would like to see fall off.

Chair Pazina:

As luck would have it, we have the appropriate number of BDRs between the Subcommittee and the larger Committee, so we can move forward with everything without having to make a priority listing. We are very fortunate in that case. The Chair of the Subcommittee of Public Lands and I made sure we would be in agreement.

Vice Chair Anderson:

Looking through these—and again, these are in idea form at this time; I recognize that. Is there a possibility some of these BDRs might be dealing with similar issues and/or even have some of the same language based upon the different things. There seems to be overarching items. Is it okay to do that?

Chair Pazina:

Legal, would you like to answer that one?

Ms. Sturdivant:

The Committee could recommend as many bills as they want on the same subject, making different or the same changes. It is not a problem from a legal or drafting perspective.

Chair Pazina:

I had this conversation with Ms. Sturdivant, but I thought she would answer it a lot better and more concisely than I would with a law degree to back her up. Any other questions from the Committee in regard to the water bills?

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I had a similar question. [Recommendations E-8 and E-9] are both talking about the water rights retirement. Are we going to have to square those during session to make sure they are matching or only pass one? Is that something we will have to deal with as we get closer?

Chair Pazina:

Discussions have been had with stakeholders of both bills. I think we are in agreement on the importance of water rights retirement, and we will make sure we are square. Those conversations, of course, will be ongoing as well. Good question. They have all been good questions and good comments. Do we have any other questions coming in? [There were none.]

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVE RECOMMENDATIONS E-6, E-7, E-8, and E-9.

SENATOR SCHEIBEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Any further discussion on the motion before we take a vote? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Pazina:

That brings us to wildfire, which has certainly been a huge topic of discussion in Northern Nevada lately.

F. WILDFIRE

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

The next two sets of recommendations [include] F-10—to send a letter to the Governor encouraging the State General Fund appropriation to support the continued work of the Nevada Shared Stewardship Agreement. This recommendation is based on testimony by Ms. Gabor with the U.S. Forest Service during the May 10 meeting, and was also recommended by the Directors of DCNR, the State Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Wildlife. You can also see Attachment F-10 for background information on it. The next one is F-11, which requests the drafting of a bill authorizing the Governor of Nevada and Nevada's Division of Forestry to enter into certain fire compacts. It was recommended by State Forester Firewarden Kacey KC during the May 10 meeting, and you can also see Attachment F-11 for background information.

Chair Pazina:

I would also like to point out—before we get into questions and comments—[to] please notice F-10 is a letter and is not a BDR. It is not a resolution. It is not requesting a BDR or change in statute. It is a letter to the Governor encouraging the continuation of the work on

the Nevada Shared Stewardship Agreement. With that, Committee, are there any questions in regard to these items—[Recommendations F-10 and F-11]?

Vice Chair Anderson:

I greatly appreciate, in particular, F-11 as we are going into the fire season, and it is getting so much earlier. As Senator Goicoechea has brought forward many times, it is a large State. There [are] not many areas our firefighters are able to meet, so any sort of help we can get is always incredibly important. Having these certain fire compacts, as discussed by Ms. KC in May, would be incredibly helpful for our whole State. I wanted to make that little plug.

Chair Pazina:

Any other comments or questions before we move forward? [There were none.]

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON MOVED TO APPROVED RECOMMENDATIONS F-10 and F-11.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Is there any other discussion on the motion before we vote?

Senator Scheible:

I was going to say something similar to Assemblywoman Anderson. [Recommendation F-11] is incredibly important. I am glad we discussed this during the interim and it made it to our final determination.

Chair Pazina:

[I am] seeing no further comment.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

G. WILDLIFE

Chair Pazina:

That moves us to the last item on our WSD for Mr. Stinnesbeck in regard to wildlife—[Recommendation G-12].

Mr. Stinnesbeck:

[Recommendation G-12] requests the drafting of a bill that appropriates \$5 million from the State General Fund into the Wildlife Crossings Account to support the construction of new wildlife crossings in Nevada. It was recommended by Mr. Callero with the Pew Charitable Trusts and Mr. Davis with Pinyon Public Affairs, representing the Pew Charitable Trusts, during the June 4 meeting. There is also an attachment under G-12.

Chair Pazina:

Do we have any questions?

Assemblyman Gurr:

It is not a question; it is a comment in support of this. It is terribly important. I believe in Elko County, we have at least three crossings, and they have saved human lives. They have saved wildlife lives—deer, elk. So far, the moose have not gotten in the way. But boy, if you ever hit a moose, it is worse than hitting a horse. I am 100 percent behind this. I do not know if \$5 million is enough, but we need to have this passed and keep the program going throughout Nevada wherever you have a problem with animals crossing roads.

Senator Goicoechea:

I met with the sponsors on this too, and we had the same discussion. It is fine to talk about wildlife crossings, but they are not effective until you have highway fencing, and it has to be wildlife fence. If you build a crossing, they do not have to cross the road, but they can jump four [foot] wire fence, and that is what is happening. I want to remind the Committee and everyone that in the end, you have to make those highways to where they cannot cross them, so they use the crossing.

Vice Chair Anderson:

When I take a look at [Recommendation F-10] with the letter to the Governor—wondering if, in addition to drafting of that bill, there is a way for us to possibly amend this to also ask for the Governor to consider putting it into his budget for next time. That [way] we can be prepared, in case, but ask for a letter as well as the drafting of the bill. That way, when the Governor is creating his budget, it is also made into a priority coming from our Committee—if that is a possibility.

Chair Pazina:

On [Recommendation G-12], you would like to—in addition to the drafting of the bill for the appropriation—also reach out to the Governor with a letter request for continued appropriations, which may include fencing? I want to make sure I understand.

Vice Chair Anderson:

Thank you for that clarification. Basically, asking the Governor—and it is up to you [which] wording you would like to use—to also include an appropriation to have that State General Fund of the Wildlife Crossings Account to support the construction of new wildlife crossings in Nevada. As Chair of this Committee, that would be your decision as to what exactly that money would go towards. I would trust you to make that decision. But this way, it would be wonderful to have the Governor also show right away that he supports this idea as opposed to trying to amend it into the budget after his budget has been proposed.

Chair Pazina:

I wanted to make sure I understood since that would change the vote on [Recommendation G-12] to add additional verbiage.

Senator Goicoechea:

I would also ask the Vice Chair if she would consider, in that letter [on the] construction of new wildlife crossing, wildlife fencing as well. Include those because I feel very strongly, they have to be hand in hand. I can build all the bridges in the world, but if they do not have to use it, they will not.

Vice Chair Anderson:

That totally makes sense to me. I think that is a wise addition, as the Chair sees fit.

Assemblyman Gurr:

In response to Senator Goicoechea's comments, when they first built the overpasses on [U.S. Route] 93, they did not fence far enough down, and yes, it was a mess. But since then, they have miles and miles of fence. I would ask that you include fencing if we have to be specific in the bill—that it includes the fencing. You do not have to come in and put in 20 miles of fence behind it. But the way they are fenced now, and especially on the Pequops and on top of HD Summit is an amazing process that has happened up there. I have driven that since I was a little kid. Well, not me driving personally, but over those mountains, time and time again, and there would be springs where they cross them back where you count 25, 30, 40 head of dead deer on the Pequops. So, yes, the fencing has helped. If we need underpasses, they work too. They have proven that in Utah. Whatever we need to do to make the highway safer for both wildlife and humans is a great plan.

Chair Pazina:

My understanding is our plan for [Recommendation G-12], [includes] two things. One is requesting the drafting of a bill for a \$5 million appropriation from the State General Fund into the Wildlife Crossings Account to support the construction of new wildlife crossings in Nevada. At the same time, including a letter to the Governor asking for future appropriations, moving forward, with appropriations for both the crossings and the fencing for wildlife. All right, good—making sure we are on the same page.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I support this. I agree with this change, but I see Mr. Davis is ready for questions. I do have one for him if that is okay. I was wondering if the Governor has been approached, and if this is already in discussion to include in his budget; where [do] we stand on that process?

Kyle Davis, Previously Identified:

We certainly have had conversations with the Governor's Office about this issue. As for whether it is being included in their budget or not, I do not know and certainly would not want to speak for the Governor's Office.

Chair Pazina:

Are there any further questions before we move forward with a motion for this combined bill appropriation request and letter to the Governor's office? [There were none.]

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO APPROVE A BDR AS STATED UNDER
RECOMMENDATION G-12 WITH THE ADDITION OF SENDING A LETTER TO THE
GOVERNOR REQUESTING FUTURE APPROPRIATIONS INCLUDE FUNDING FOR BOTH
WILDLIFE CROSSINGS AND WILDLIFE FENCING.

VICE CHAIR ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Pazina:

Please let the record show, Mr. Stinnesbeck and Ms. Sturdivant, as we submit this BDR for [Recommendation G-12], that added to it now, [is] a letter to the Governor including a request for appropriation, moving forward, that would assist in both crossings and fencing to protect wildlife and humans. Discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Pazina:

Thank you for the wonderful suggestions and feedback that have led to a change in this particular item on the Work Session agenda. With that said, this moves us into public comment again—Item V on our agenda.

AGENDA ITEM V—PUBLIC COMMENT

Chair Pazina:

Please come forward in Carson City, in Las Vegas, and over the phones if you would like to make public comment.

Robyn Orloff, Carson City Resident:

Good afternoon. This has been a really interesting process for me. It is all new with the bills, and I appreciate being here. I am thrilled that you voted to protect the Amargosa River. That is a really important area for me. Water in the desert is so very important, and my husband and I have explored it from Beatty—there is a conservation easement right next to Beatty protecting it—and then through Ash Meadow and Shoshone, Tecopa, China Basin, Saratoga Springs, and Dunes, and all the way to Death Valley. It is a really special resource for our State. I also want to thank you for adding the fencing to the bill; that is so important. Thank you very much, for when I came out here from back East, everything was free grazing, and a very close friend of mine actually died when a car hit a deer coming the other direction. The deer hit her windshield, and it was a terrible many years for that. So, I appreciate your consideration and everything you do here for our State. Have a safe trip home. Thank you.

Chair Pazina:

Thank you for taking part in so many of the public comments in our meetings. We always enjoy hearing from you.

Jaina Moan, Previously Identified:

I wanted to take a minute to also recognize and say thank you to Senator Goicoechea for his long-term service and his commitment to protecting water resources in this State.

Chair Pazina:

We will induce a blush by the end of this meeting. Seeing no one else in Carson City and no one in Las Vegas—BPS, do we have anyone on the phones?

BPS:

[BPS staff informed the public how to call in for public comment.]

Chair, you have no one wishing to participate at this time.

Chair Pazina:

That will close us out of our final public comment of the JISCNR. I think all of us here have shared our thoughts on Senator Goicoechea and his many years of service in the Legislature and the Natural Resources family—22 years serving—and this is his last session and his last special session, though we hope [it is] not the last time we hear his voice sharing and working in forwarding his commitment on water bills. He will be missed, I think by the entire body, [and] definitely by those of us on the Natural Resources Committee. He served his community as a Eureka County Commissioner for 16 years prior to his election to the Assembly, and we have benefited from his knowledge and kindness in the Senate and on this Committee.

[Chair Pazina led a round of applause for Senator Goicoechea's service.]

Senator Goicoechea:

Be careful what you wish for. [I think] there are bad pennies.

Chair Pazina:

I somehow doubt this will be the last time we see you at a Natural Resources meeting, and we would have it no other way. I would also like to share a thank you to everyone who served on this Committee in the interim, because I know how much time it takes—the commitment it takes to move forward the policies that we did here at this meeting today between the Subcommittee on Public Lands. Thank you, Chair Scheible, for your work on that, and for all the members who have been part of both Committees. I would like to thank everyone who has been part of this Committee. It has been such a wonderful experience. Thank you to the hardworking staff. I do not know what we would do without the LCB staff, Mr. Stinnesbeck, Ms. Peratt, Ms. Sturdivant, everyone—Ms. Creamer who has made it such a pleasure, BPS, [and] our IT staff. Thank you so much to everyone, and to all of you who come to these meetings and who advocate so passionately on behalf of the issues we care about. We would not have these meetings without you and without the issues you bring forward to us. With that, Senator [Goicoechea], would you like to adjourn us?

Senator Goicoechea:

One quick comment. I also want to recognize staff. You know, they are very good. They prepare a book for me because I am so "techie," and not only [with] this Committee, but every committee. I appreciate it. Thank you, staff.

Additional written public comment was submitted ([Agenda Item V](#)):

- Anamaria Boustred; Carson City Resident;
- Maggie Orr, Lincoln County Conservation District;
- Amanda Hilton, Nevada Mining Association; and
- Taunee Jensen, Nevada Resident.

AGENDA ITEM VI—ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the Committee, the meeting was adjourned at 12:56 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Lisa Creamer
Senior Research Policy Assistant

Jann Stinnesbeck
Principal Policy Analyst

APPROVED BY:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair

Date: _____

MEETING MATERIALS

AGENDA ITEM	PRESENTER/ENTITY	DESCRIPTION
Agenda Item II	Kyle Davis, Pinyon Public Affairs, Representing the Interwest Energy Alliance Sam Johnston, Senior Policy and Regulatory Manager, Interest Energy Alliance	Written Public Comment - Letter
Agenda Item IV	Jann Stinnesbeck, Principal Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Becky Peratt, Senior Policy Analyst, Research Division, LCB	"Work Session Document"
Agenda Item V		Compilation of written comments received from members of the public who did not speak during the meeting. These comments are posted individually on the Legislature's website for this meeting and can be found on the Committee's meeting page .

The Minutes are supplied as an informational service. All meeting materials are on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, Carson City, Nevada. For copies, contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or <https://www.leg.state.nv.us/Division/Research/Library/About/Contact/feedbackmail.cfm>.