

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Eighty-second Session
March 21, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Julie Pazina at 3:31 p.m. on Tuesday, March 21, 2023, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair
Senator Melanie Scheible, Vice Chair
Senator Edgar Flores
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Ira Hansen

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst
Erin Sturdivant, Counsel
Donna Crawford Kennedy, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Christine Johnson, Executive Secretary, Department of Geography, University of Nevada, Reno; Executive Secretary, Council of Geographic Names
Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Central Nevada Regional Water Authority
Steve Walker, Eureka County
Kyle Roerink, Executive Director, Great Basin Water Network
Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation
Chaunsey Chau-Duong, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Wade Poulsen, General Manager, Lincoln County Water District
Jacob Brinkerhoff, Natural Resources Manager, Nevada Association of Counties
Adam Sullivan, P.E., State Engineer
Micheline Fairbank, Deputy Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 21, 2023
Page 2

Sheila Bray, Coordinator, Community Partnerships, Extension College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, University of Nevada, Reno

Jacob DeDecker, Director of Extension and Associate Dean for Engagement, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, University of Nevada, Reno

James E. Faulds, Director and State Geologist, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Professor, Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno

CHAIR PAZINA:

Christine Johnson will present Senate Bill (S.B.) 77.

SENATE BILL 77: Revises provisions relating to the Nevada State Board on Geographic Names. (BDR 26-344)

CHRISTINE JOHNSON (Executive Secretary, Department of Geography, University of Nevada, Reno; Executive Secretary, Council of Geographic Names):

I appreciate the opportunity to introduce and provide testimony and support of S.B. 77, which might be one of the least complicated but more socially important legislative proposals for you to consider this Legislative Session. Senate Bill 77 simply proposes to provide a per diem allowance and travel expenses for the members of the Nevada State Board on Geographic Names (NSBGN). The NSBGN was established in 1985 and is comprised today of representatives from the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), the University of Nevada, Las Vegas, the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, (NBMG), the Nevada Department of Transportation, the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), the Division of State Library Archives and Public Records, the State Records Advisory Board, the Inter-Tribal Council of Nevada, the Nevada Indian Commission, and three federal agencies, the Bureau of Land Management, the U.S. Forest Service and the National Park Service.

Since its inception, the NSBGN, in coordination with the federal government, has administered states' place names. The Board meets three times a year in public and open meeting forums and has, until recently, been a largely unnoticed Board. Since its beginning in 1985, the Board has been unfunded. Place names are now becoming one of the most important social dialogues in our Nation. The NSBGN is now tasked with recommending changes to any racially discriminatory geographic place names on the State's landscape because of

A.B. No. 88 of the 81st Session. Now, the Board is requiring more direct communications with the public and the tribal communities.

The 12 members of NSBGN, who have full-time jobs in the agencies they represent, need funding to complete the required travel or secure other resources without impacting their agencies' budgets. Examples include paying personally for postage, gas to travel to meetings out of the local area members and other items. A more significant example is when UNR recently agreed to absorb the cost of redeveloping and hosting the web page for the NSBGN. The University is working to align the past NSBGN website with current requirements of the University system to meet accessibility standards. Without this support, the NSBGN would be even more restricted, invisible and ineffective. To be able to do what is now legislatively assigned to this Board, we are requesting members who participate in outreach and consultation opportunities across the State be allowed compensation in the form of per diem allowances and associated travel expenses, as presented in S.B. 77.

Additionally, I respectfully request S.B. 77 be amended to include the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS). It is the only remaining federal agency associated with Nevada lands not currently represented on the NSBGN. This request is supported by the FWS and is also fully supported by the current NSBGN representatives.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

A letter has been submitted ([Exhibit C](#)) requesting the FWS be added to the list of voting members. The language of an amendment, which may not exist yet, will be ready for the work session. Is that correct?

Ms. JOHNSON:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Typically, a federal agency, such the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, is not allowed to accept per diem. Is there a change in that policy?

Ms. JOHNSON:

As I understand the way the bill is written, the per diem will be reimbursed only to the State agency.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 21, 2023
Page 4

CHAIR PAZINA:

Since there is no additional testimony in support, opposition or neutral, we will close the hearing on S.B. 77 and open testimony on S.B. 180.

SENATE BILL 180: Revises provisions relating to groundwater boards.
(BDR 48-597)

SENATOR PETE GOICOECHEA (Senatorial District No.19):

I am presenting S.B. 180 and will provide a brief history. In the early nineties, I was on the board of county commissioners. We requested establishing a groundwater board under the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 534.035. It required the Governor's approval, which was denied. Senate Bill 180 facilitates the process of establishing groundwater boards in designated basins by the board of county commissioners. The commissioners would ask the State Engineer to authorize and select a groundwater board comprised of seven members. The appointment would be for four years. At the end of four years, the board would disband unless members ask the State Engineer to reappoint them for another four years. The board is a tool that would allow some local input. We are hopeful some of these local communities with groundwater boards can bring ideas to deal with an over-appropriated basin.

CHAIR PAZINA:

Will you be providing an amendment for our work session?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Yes.

JEFF FONTAINE (Executive Director, Central Nevada Regional Water Authority):

As Senator Goicoechea stated, this bill amends NRS 534.035. Under current law, if the board of county commissioners wants to create a groundwater board, it must first be approved by the State Engineer and its members must be appointed by the Governor. The State Engineer must confer with the groundwater board to obtain written advice before making any management decision in the groundwater basins. These existing requirements impede the creation of any new groundwater boards as they currently exist.

Walking through the bill, section 1, subsection 2 enables the board of county commissioners to create a groundwater board by request to the State Engineer,

who then would appoint seven board members based on the priority and quantity of water rights they hold in that designated basin. Subsection 3 states the board of county commissioners may appoint a nonvoting member to the groundwater board.

Subsection 5 makes it clear that the groundwater board meetings are public and subject to Nevada's Open Meeting Law.

Subsection 8 removes the requirement for the State Engineer to confer with the groundwater board before approving a water right application, a well drilling permit or issuing an order for water regulation. Instead, it requires the State Engineer to consider the written advice and recommendations of the groundwater board on reducing over-pumping in the designated groundwater basin. It makes it clear that any decision of the State Engineer that does not comply with the recommendation of the Board is not subject to judicial review.

Subsection 9, paragraph (a) sunsets the groundwater board after four years, unless the board of county commissioners requests the State Engineer approve an additional four-year term. It also allows the board to dissolve by a majority vote of its members.

Section 2 removes any reference to State funding for the groundwater board. We believe that allowing counties to create groundwater boards for designated basins is proactive and appropriate and can lead to some place-based solutions to local problems.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Are we taking the Governor's approval out of the process?

MR. FONTAINE:

That is correct.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

What is the relationship between the groundwater management board and the Groundwater Management Plan? Is there one, or do they simply have similar names?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

There is nothing required between a groundwater management board and the Groundwater Management Plan. I would assume the board would at least review the Plan and offered their recommendations to the State Engineer, but there is no requirement for them to do so.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

We just heard a bill a couple of weeks ago about having a ten-year review of the Groundwater Management Plan. I am wondering if the four-year term of the groundwater management board is designed to fit into the ten-year plan, or do we need to try to align those terms.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Correct. There is no connection between them. One is there to offer advice; the other is a plan for a critical management area for ten years under the State Engineer.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

Reading Section 2 regarding the appointment of the membership, it does not explicitly call for the county to make recommendations or make requests of the State Engineer regarding who is appointed to the management board. Is it fair to assume there will be some communication? Is the State Engineer empowered to accept recommendations and work with county commissioners to determine who he or she appoints to the board?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

There is no requirement for the State Engineer to consult the board. I would assume the State Engineer would reach out to the county.

CHAIR PAZINA:

Section 1, subsection 9 regards the dissolution of the board. Subsection 9, paragraph (a) calls for the board be dissolved four years after the date such a board is established. The State Engineer establishes the board after a request is received from the board of county commissioners. If the board of county commissioners did not make such a request and the State Engineer believes the groundwater board was making progress, could the board continue without the request from the county commissioners?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That is a good question for the Legal Division. If they are making headway, the board of county commissioners would be the first to request the State Engineer continue with the board. As is allowed, they can be reappointed for an additional four years.

SENATOR HANSEN:

The bill states that if there is any disagreement between the State Engineer and the groundwater board, the views of the State Engineer shall prevail. Additionally, there is no judicial review. This is strictly an advisory board of local people. The groundwater board is a go-between for the commissioners and the State Engineer. It cannot be used as a judicial decision. The State Engineer cannot be sued over it if it is strictly advisory.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Yes, it is strictly an advisory board.

CHAIR PAZINA:

We will hear testimony in support of S.B. 180.

STEVE WALKER (Eureka County):

I represent Eureka County. Eureka County is in support of S.B. 180. It clarifies and bolsters groundwater boards.

KYLE ROERINK (Executive Director, Great Basin Water Network):

We support S.B. 180. One important thing to consider is that, in a designated basin under NRS 534.035, the State Engineer can levy fees. This would give people who are being assessed fees the ability to come together and discuss the further administration of a basin that is experiencing a likely drawdown. The bill makes a lot of sense.

DOUG BUSSELMAN (Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation):

We have several water-related policies that draw attention to the importance of local engagement. Our support for S.B. 180 is based on this foundation. We have a specific policy which states that the Division of Water Resources needs to be more engaged with underground water right owners to assist in improving water management. In our view, the formation of local groundwater boards will provide a consistent structure to make these engagements more effective. We ask your support for S.B. 180.

CHAUNSEY CHAU-DUONG (Southern Nevada Water Authority):
Southern Nevada Water Authority is in support of this bill; we think it is good policy.

WADE POULSEN (General Manager, Lincoln County Water District):
We are in support of S.B. 180. We agree with everything that has been said. Local input is an important piece for water. The people who use the water and whose livelihoods are based upon the water should have input for the State Engineer to consider. We believe in groundwater boards.

JACOB BRINKERHOFF (Director of Extension and Associate Dean for Engagement, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, University of Nevada, Reno):

The Nevada Association of Counties is in support of S.B. 180 as it streamlines and provides clarity to previously approved groundwater board formation processes. This enabling legislation benefits our members seeking to establish these boards to engage in meaningful collaboration with the State Engineer to manage critical groundwater resources in their local jurisdictions. We echo the previous testimonies and appreciate your support on S.B. 180.

CHAIR PAZINA:

A letter in opposition was submitted by Michael M. McGreer ([Exhibit D](#)).

We will hear testimony in neutral on S.B. 180.

ADAM SULLIVAN, P.E. (State Engineer):

I am testifying in neutral on this bill. The intent of this bill is a good one. It is for the State regulator to cooperate with local entities, the people using the water, to develop good plans for reducing commitments where necessary. I agree with that. Where there is a need to reduce pumping, it is critical that the State is engaged with the people affected by that reduced pumping to decide on a good strategy that is not overly harmful and is supported by the data. It is a mission of ours. Having boards is the right way to accomplish that mission. We have a lot of data to share. It is important to communicate the options for local communities under water law and the benefits of different strategies.

There are a couple of points I want to make. First is regarding the intent to have place-based solutions to local problems. We already have the ability for counties or local organizations to accomplish place-based solutions. There are several

examples all around the State where we have groups that, in my view, can do what is envisioned by this bill. Some counties have established water districts that have similar objectives—to track the water issues and groundwater issues within the county.

There are regional water authorities. For example, the Humboldt River Basin Water Authority and the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority, where local county commissioners or water users interested in accomplishing some of the same goals can meet. One example we have in the State, is to develop a local groundwater advisory board that is specific to the basin. We have also had success working with local irrigators in basins that have groundwater drawdown problems. The intent is to share the data and talk about what the options are within water law. Once the irrigators understand the options and the implications of doing something or doing nothing, they can make decisions. This shows a measure of success for the board. This is a process initiated by counties that require action at a groundwater basin scale.

Most of the time, groundwater basins span county lines. For example, Eureka County has 17 different groundwater basins, but there is only 1 that is entirely within Eureka County. I have some questions about administratively or procedurally how that might work out with county boundaries.

My last point is about funding. We are creating a new process for the State Engineer to establish the board at the discretion of the county. But there is not a straightforward way of how that would be funded going forward.

MICHELINE FAIRBANK (Deputy Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I am testifying in neutral. An area of concern is in section 1, subsection 8. The language that Senator Hansen noted, stating that the decision of the State Engineer that disagrees with the views of the groundwater board is not subject to judicial review. The State Engineer is subject to judicial review pursuant to NRS 533.450. Is S.B. 180 intended to make NRS 533.450 inapplicable to decisions by the State Engineer based upon recommendations from a groundwater board developed under the NRS and then not subject to judicial review? There is some ambiguity with respect to how that would apply. I do not believe that is the intent of the legislation.

My other concern is that this language increases the likelihood of challenges to decisions of the State Engineer. Is the intent of the language such that the

groundwater board cannot sue the State Engineer for not agreeing with its recommendation? That distinction will then become a basis on which people can challenge the State Engineer's decision as being arbitrary and capricious and not supported by substantial evidence. Our concern is that this will increase litigation, increasing agency expenses.

CHAIR PAZINA:

Senator Goicoechea, do you have any closing remarks?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

We will work with the State Engineer to answer his questions. We agree, county lines bisect some basins; however, the appointees all hold rights to the waters in those basins so they will reside in one county or the other. They could be board members depending on their priority of water rights. For example, if they are one of the four major water rights holders, the two juniors or the at-large, they would be on the board.

I do not see the language pertaining to litigation as an obstacle. I thought it was clearly stated that the State Engineer's decisions are not subject to judicial review. This bill allows public input on an issue that is near and dear to all of us.

CHAIR PAZINA:

I am sure there will be conversations with DCNR and the State Engineer as we move forward with conceptual amendments based on our discussion here today. We will receive those prior to the work session.

I will close the hearing on S.B. 180. We will have a presentation from the University of Nevada, Reno, College of Agriculture Biotechnology and Natural Resources.

SHEILA BRAY (Coordinator, Community Partnerships, Extension College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, University of Nevada, Reno):

With us today are two Statewide organizations and agencies affiliated with UNR.

JACOB DEDECKER (Director of Extension and Associate Dean for Engagement, College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources, University of Nevada, Reno):

The College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources has a broad scope; we talk about agricultural, landscapes, molecules, wildlife and several things in between. We focus on agriculture, veterinary and rangeland sciences; biochemistry and molecular biology; natural resources and environmental science; and nutrition and dietetics as shown in the presentation ([Exhibit E](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request of the Research Library.).

We are home to over 1,300 enrolled students and have 325 faculty and staff engaged. As Nevada's original land grant University, our mission is to use research, education and outreach to serve Nevada and the key elements that impact us. We do that by being present in the State; we have 20 extension offices, and over 10 agricultural experiment stations that are conducting research. We are also proud to say that we have two 4-H youth development camps, one at Lake Tahoe and one in Alamo in Lincoln County. They serve youth across the State, providing experiential education and teaching them in the areas of natural resources, agriculture, food and life-skill development.

The UNR Extension is the primary outreach arm of the College of Agriculture, bringing research and scholarship opportunities from the University. We help families, producers, businesses and ranchers make informed decisions that help them be successful in their occupations. We have served for many decades. As proud as we are of these programs, we add the most value by working in partnership and defining the key issues, barriers and boundaries the State is facing now and deciding how we can partner with all interested parties. We want to help bring the scholarship, research and knowledge base from the University and apply it directly to the issues facing Nevada. We want to find solutions together. I am excited about continuing to focus on these areas. Agriculture continues to be a leading industry in Nevada.

The agricultural experiment station does research on biotechnology, crops, animals, climate, weather, natural resources and other crucial elements. Our station in Reno, the Desert Farming Initiative, does research on 90 varieties of fruits and vegetables. We provide 15 tons to 20 tons of produce to food pantries and wholesale food to the community at large. It is exciting to do the research, but we also produce food for those in need.

The Great Basin Research and Extension Center at Rafter 7, near Yerington, has sheep that are known for their wool and meat quality and for other innovative products. We are excited to conduct research in that space in those environments that are unique to the western region. Those are just two examples of what research centers throughout the State can accomplish. We have a vast network of support resources to provide to Nevadans, connecting to various audiences. We want to serve all the people of Nevada. While sometimes we might not have the faculty to specialize in an area that needs research, we know those who do. We can make those connections across the State, nationally or even internationally, bringing those individuals to the table to help us deal with the issues that must be addressed.

We have faculty researching fire, water and drought, all aspects of the effects of natural disasters or weather. A major effort of our College is applied research outreach and education within these spaces.

The State climatologist has an extension appointment helping us to be directly engaged in climate work that is occurring within the State. I hope you see us as a resource, an element of scholarship and of research and that we can come to the table to partner together.

We want to be able to work in collaboration to solve some of these issues that our State is facing, and we are excited to engage all our faculty around these areas.

JAMES E. FAULDS (Director and State Geologist, Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology; Professor, Mackay School of Earth Sciences and Engineering, University of Nevada, Reno):

I am the Director of the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology, which is your State geological survey. The mission of NBMG is typical of most states' geological surveys. I will provide an overview ([Exhibit F](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request of the Research Library.).

Think of us as a bureau of analysis, information and exchange on Nevada geology, natural resources and geologic hazards. In other words, we apply geology and unbiased science for the public good. The NBMG is a public service unit within the College of Science at UNR. We serve every corner of the State and do just as much work in southern Nevada as in northern Nevada.

Every state has a state geological survey that complements and works collaboratively with the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and state agencies.

The main objectives of the NBMG and other state geological surveys is to analyze our geologic framework. We do that with detailed geologic mapping across the State. We assess our natural resources and geologic hazards. We archive and disseminate this geologic data so it is available to everyone. Since we are part of the University, we play a role in education by educating the next generation on Nevada's natural resources and geologic hazards. We have 30 employees, faculty and staff. More than ten of those are funded by external grants. Our overarching goals are to enhance public safety and facilitate environmentally sound economic development across the State.

Geologic maps provide two-dimensional representations of complex three-dimensional geologic relationships. It is a primary goal of any state geological survey essential for analyzing natural resources and geologic hazards. An independent study of geologic mapping, conducted for Nevada in 2014 found that every dollar allocated to NBMG returns greater than 50 times in benefits to the State. But, in Nevada, only 30 percent of the State is mapped, so there is much more to do. Because of the size of our staff, we have eight or nine geologists working across this vast State, so we focus on three primary areas, southern Nevada, the Reno-Carson City area and northeast Nevada, because of the mineral and energy resources.

There are two examples of geologic maps in the presentation. One is from the Carlin area and includes some of the largest gold mines in the State and, for that matter, in the world. The other is a new draft geologic map of the Las Vegas Valley that shows all the earthquake faults. The assorted colors represent various deposits associated with potential flood hazards. We hope to release the Las Vegas map by the end of this calendar year.

We all know that Nevada is well endowed with mineral resources and we commonly lead the Nation in nonfuel mineral production. In a typical year we are the fifth largest gold producer in the world. But we are also a leader in various other strategic minerals, such as lithium. The NBMG plays a role in discovery of new deposits, developing methods for more efficient exploration, and producing several products that are critical for analyzing mineral resources across the State. The geologic maps detail studies of individual ore deposits. They analyze how ore is formed in a particular environment. There are various

reports in [Exhibit F](#) that we produce on an annual basis. The bar graph shows the production of various minerals and types of resources over the many decades.

We also play a role in educating undergraduate and graduate students in understanding our mineral resources. Those students are a direct pipeline into various industries in the State.

There is a lot of talk today about lithium resources, and for good reason. Lithium is one of 50 critical minerals defined by the USGS as essential to economic and national security. It is used for batteries in electric automobiles and for power storage, but also for various alloys for the aerospace industry. Global production has increased dramatically over the past several years, and Nevada plays a critical role in that production.

The presentation shows a color-coded map of lithium deposits. Nevada contains the largest U.S lithium deposits and, for that matter, some of the largest deposits in the world. Nevada has the primary lithium-producing operation in the Country in Clayton Valley, producing lithium from brines that produce about 5,000 metric tons a year. The Tesla factory alone uses almost 25,000 metric tons annually.

Currently, the U.S. imports most of the lithium needed in this Country. The Bureau plays a critical role in this by producing good geologic maps. A map of the Thacker Pass area in northern Nevada that we produced several years ago was key to lithium exploration in that area. We are also researching other lithium deposits in the State as we speak.

Geothermal resources are also important for the State. Nevada is currently second in the Nation in geothermal energy production. Right now, we produce 450 megawatts net energy from geothermal. Realizing that one megawatt has enough energy for 752,000 homes, Nevada produces enough geothermal energy for well over a million people. A lot of Nevada's geothermal energy is exported to California, and a lot of it stays in Nevada. Within NBMG is the Great Basin Center for Geothermal Energy, a research hub. The mission is to work in partnership with industry to establish geothermal energy as a sustainable, environmentally sound economic contributor.

We work on the geologic factors that control geothermal activity and develop innovative approaches to geothermal exploration. For example, we obtained a \$2.8 million grant from the U.S. Department of Energy from 2014 to 2019 that culminated in the discovery of two new hidden geothermal systems.

More than three-quarters of our geothermal resources are hidden beneath the ground with no hot springs at the surface. We have produced a map showing the geothermal potential of about one-third of Nevada, [Exhibit F](#). The map on page 6 shows about 20 areas in Nevada that currently have geothermal power plants.

To summarize, all the data we collect on natural minerals and diverse energy resources is in the public domain. There are types of data dissemination, digital databases and physical collections that we house in the Great Basin Science Sample and Records Library. The facility is particularly important for economic development in the State. It saves industry and municipalities millions of dollars by being a repository for all the geologic information collected across the State over the last 150 years. Nearly every state and Country in the world accesses the Great Basin Science Sample and Records Library facility either online or in person each year.

It is a pleasure to be the State Geologist for such a geologically fascinating State. One little factoid that is neat about Nevada is we are the fastest-growing State tectonically speaking. We add about an acre or so per year to the State, thanks to the kind of tectonics that also control all our mineral and energy resources. So, Nevada is a special place for that.

CHAIR PAZINA:

I heard you say Nevada has the most geothermal resources in the Country, but we are second in production. Who is first in production?

MR. FAULDS:

California is first in the amount of production. California produces about 2,500 megawatts, about five times more than we produce; but all studies show that Nevada has more geothermal resources than California. They are more spread out in California and are focused in only a few areas, making it easier to develop. Soon Nevada will produce more geothermal energy than California.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 21, 2023
Page 16

CHAIR PAZINA:

There being no public comment and having no further business, this meeting is adjourned at 4:30 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Donna Crawford Kennedy,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Julie Pazina, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit Letter	Introduced on Minute Report Page No.	Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	1		Attendance Roster
S.B. 77	C	3	Senator Melanie Scheible	Letter from Kevin DesRoberts, U.S. Department of Interior Fish and Wildlife Service
S.B. 180	D	9	Chair Julie Pazina	Letter of opposition from Michael M. McGreer
	E	11	Jake DeDecker	University of Nevada Reno College of Agriculture Presentation
	F	12	James Faulds	Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology Presentation