

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

**Eighty-second Session
April 11, 2023**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Julie Pazina at 3:30 p.m. on Tuesday, April 11, 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

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Jeff Stone, Senatorial District No. 20

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Tim Shestek, American Chemistry Council
Prapti Muhuri, American Chemistry Council
Therese Laxalt, Nevada Manufacturers Association
Harrison Bohn, Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schrek
Tom Clark, Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce
Kyle Rudolph, Senior Counsel, Berry Global
Warren Hardy, SA Recycling; Urban Consortium
Joelle Gutman-Dodson, Washoe County Health District
David Kelly, Washoe County Health District
Bradley Mayer, Southern Nevada Health District

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2023
Page 2

Nick Christenson, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter
Daniel Burns, Engineering Manager, Southern Nevada Health District
Jeffrey Kinder, Deputy Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection,
State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

CHAIR PAZINA:
We will open the work session on Senate Bill (S.B.) 112.

SENATE BILL 112: Revises provisions governing groundwater basin assessments. (BDR 48-600)

ALYSA KELLER: (Policy Analyst):
I will read the summary of the S.B. 112 and the amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR PAZINA:
I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended S.B. 112.

SENATOR HANSEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 112.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PAZINA:
We will move to the work session on S.B. 113.

SENATE BILL 113: Revises provisions relating to groundwater management plans. (BDR 48-595)

Ms. KELLER:
I will read the summary of the bill and the amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).

CHAIR PAZINA:
I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended S.B. 113.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 113.

SENATOR HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PAZINA:
We will move to the work session on S.B. 180.

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

MS. KELLER:
I will read the summary of the S.B. 180 from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).

CHAIR PAZINA:
I will entertain a motion to do pass S.B. 180.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE MOVED TO DO PASS S.B. 180.

SENATOR FLORES SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PAZINA:
We will move to the work session on S.B. 364.

SENATE BILL 364: Makes various changes relating to cultural remains. (BDR 33-533)

MS. KELLER:
I will read the summary of S.B. 364 from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2023
Page 4

CHAIR PAZINA:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass as amended S.B. 364.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 364.

SENATOR HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR PAZINA:

We open the hearing on Senate Bill 361.

SENATE BILL 361: Revises provisions relating to solid waste. (BDR 40-935)

SENATOR JEFF STONE (Senatorial District No. 20):

I agreed to sponsor this legislation because it provides a unique opportunity to not only improve Nevada's environment, but also help diversify our State's economy by attracting new private sector investment and creating new manufacturing jobs. Senate Bill 361 seeks to provide a clear permitting pathway for what are known as advanced recycling facilities. These are innovative technologies that can take many of the plastics currently sent to landfills, like toothpaste tubes, pouches, film packaging and foam containers to convert them back into their basic molecular components. These molecules can then be used again to make new plastics. Manufacturers can reduce their reliance on virgin resources to make new plastics and packaging, and we can create new recycling markets for collected materials that may not exist today.

So why is this bill necessary, and why would facilities decide not to locate to Nevada today? On the surface, they could. However, regulatory certainty is the one important thing to companies looking to invest significant resources, secure capital investment dollars and line up customers. Senate Bill 361 seeks to provide those assurances by clearly categorizing advanced recycling as manufacturing. Nevada will not be alone, as Arizona and Utah and 20 other states have passed similar legislation.

As you will hear, these facilities do not accept mixed waste. They do not sort waste on the site, nor do they incinerate these materials. I would also like to point out that S.B. 361 does not exempt these facilities from any required federal, state or local air, water, wastewater, hazardous waste or land use permitting requirements. They must be compliant. We have the opportunity to reduce plastic waste and create an economic development opportunity for all of Nevada.

With me today is Tim Shestek with the American Chemistry Council who can provide some additional context and answer any technical questions you may have.

TIM SHESTEK (American Chemistry Council):

By way of background, American Chemistry Council is a national trade association representing approximately 200 companies manufacturing the raw materials that are the building blocks for almost every manufactured product. Home and personal care products, clothing, sports equipment, automobiles, electronics, food and medical-grade packaging are just some examples made possible through chemistry. Our members are also at the forefront of deploying innovative technologies to help increase the recycling of hard-to-recycle plastics. The result is less material disposed of in landfills, while also creating plastic resin to be used to make new packaging and products.

Advanced recycling refers to several different technologies that can convert post-use plastics back into their original building blocks to help produce new plastics and chemicals. As a rule, these facilities use pyrolysis or gasification technologies, which are also deployed in many other industries. Both technologies heat used plastics, which breaks down the solid material into liquid or gaseous raw materials which are then used to remake plastics or products for other industries.

Plastics are not burned during these technologies or these processes. They often use thermal heat, but these take place in the absence of oxygen. Therefore, there is no combustion. It is a recycling and manufacturing process, where materials are processed to make new products, plastics, chemicals, et cetera. While beverage bottles and milk jugs are typically recycled via mechanical recycling processes, advanced recycling works well for plastics difficult to sort and process mechanically, like flexible pouches and toothpaste tubes. Using both processes can further reduce landfill disposal.

As Senator Stone mentioned, S.B. 361 seeks to provide a clear permitting pathway for advanced recycling facilities by categorizing them as manufacturing. The bill seeks to clearly define the types of processes that qualify for advanced recycling, as well as the types of material used as feedstock in the manufacture of new products. These facilities do not receive mixed garbage or waste; plastics segregated or sorted from the waste stream. They do not do the traditional things that facilities regulated under solid waste laws. They do not dispose of waste incineration, nor do they sort plastics from other materials. What they are doing is using plastics as a raw material in the manufacture of new products.

As companies look to site these facilities around the Country, identify site locations, line up supply agreements, and secure investors, this bill would help provide clear regulatory certainty. Arizona and Utah, as well as 20 other states have adopted legislation like S.B. 361. Consumer brand companies today are utilizing plastic resin produced from these types of facilities in new packaging and products. By doing so, they are reducing their reliance on virgin materials, incorporating more recycled content in their packaging and products and reducing landfill disposal. Senate Bill 361 is an opportunity to further increase the amount of plastic material diverted from landfills, while also creating new economic development opportunities in the State. We respectfully ask this Committee to support S.B. 361.

PRAPTI MUHURI (American Chemistry Council):

I am happy to answer any technical questions from the Committee members.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

Does this include plastic bags?

MR. SHESTEK:

Some of those types of materials would be part of a feedstock that could be utilized in these types of technologies.

SENATOR STONE:

I would like to go through the bill.

Section 2 notes advanced recycled products do not include any products that will be sold as fuel.

Section 3 defines advanced recycling as a manufacturing process for the conversion of post-use polymers and recovered feedstock into advanced recycled products.

Section 4 defines an advanced recycling facility as a manufacturing facility that receives, stores and converts post-use polymers and recovered feedstocks into advanced recycled products using advanced recycling.

Section 5 defines “depolymerization” as a manufacturing process in which post-use polymers are broken into smaller molecules, including, without limitation, monomers and oligomers or raw materials or intermediate or final products, including, without limitation, plastics and chemical feedstocks, basic and unfinished chemicals, waxes, lubricants and coatings.

Section 6 defines gasification as a manufacturing process through which post-use polymers or recovered feedstocks are heated in an oxygen-controlled atmosphere and converted into syngas.

Section 7 defines post-use polymer plastics.

Section 8 defines pyrolysis which is the manufacturing process for post-use polymers that are heated in the absence of oxygen until melted and thermally decomposed and are then cooled, condensed and converted into new raw materials or intermediate or final products.

Section 9 defines recovered feedstock.

Section 10 defines solvolysis, which is the manufacturing process that purifies post-use polymers using solvents.

Section 11 makes conforming changes to indicate the proper placement of sections 2 through 10 in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 444.440 to 444.501.

Section 12 revises the definition of solid waste to provide that the term does not include post-use polymers and recovered feedstocks.

Section 13 revises the definition of solid waste management systems so it does not include advanced recycling.

CHAIR PAZINA:

You mentioned the conversion of post-use polymers and recovered feedstock into advanced recycled products. Can you explain what those advanced recycled products are?

Ms. MUHURI:

You can produce anything from the basic building blocks to making new processes and chemicals. In the case of polymer-based advanced recycling, you take plastics, heat them and then cool and condense them in the absence of oxygen. You then get a liquid feedstock which is used as a raw material to make new plastics. There are about 60 products in the marketplace globally. About 40 percent of those are in the U.S., things like eyeglass frames, reusable water bottles and Wendy's drink cups. All of these contain material made from plastics processed by advanced recycling.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I am reading the bill again; it looks to me like all it does is provide definitions. What does the bill do? Where does it mention something regarding advanced recycling? Is it buried in there or are we just putting definitions in the NRS?

MR. SHESTEK:

What we are attempting to do is provide a clear understanding. If a facility wanted to locate in Nevada, they would know those types of processes would be regulated under this statute. It does not mandate anything. It does not require companies to do anything. It ensures them, if they are going to locate here, that they would have a clear understanding the operation they are conducting is not solid waste. It will be treated as a manufacturing facility and would be regulated as such.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

The bill is adding a new section to NRS 444.440 through 444.620, which is the manufacturing chapter of NRS. By virtue of adding this to chapter 444, are we creating a regulatory scheme? I am confused. Is there another part of NRS not reflected in the bill saying advanced recycling is regulated by so and so in the State, and to conduct advanced recycling, you must do X Y Z? Now are we defining it, or are we just providing the definition so later, somebody can write regulations?

MR. SHESTEK:

Advanced recycling is currently not defined in statute. We are trying to clearly define it, so if a company decides to locate in Nevada, they will understand what the permitting process would look like.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I understand it is not defined in statute. Is it used in statute?

MR. SHESTEK:

I do not believe that is the case. This is a new proposal and a new language that would be incorporated in the statute.

SENATOR SCHEIBLE:

I do not understand what we accomplish by adding a definition if the term is not used anywhere in the statute.

MR. SHESTEK:

It would be used in the statute. And, if a company were to be located here and operating an advanced recycling facility, they would understand where they fall in terms of potential permitting and that they would be considered a manufacturing process and not a solid waste operation.

SENATOR STONE:

That is the importance of section 3 of the bill which defines advanced recycling as a manufacturing process for the conversion of post-use polymers and recovered feedstock into advanced recycled products. It is taking it back to its virgin form to be remanufactured into other plastics, instead of buying virgin plastics. In addition, it is taking plastics that right now are going into landfills, which have no value to trash haulers, and putting a value on them. It is allowing them to be reused with new technology to get them back into their virgin state.

SENATOR FLORES:

If we do not define it now, and advanced recycling comes to Nevada, what are your concerns? I think it would make it easier if you could just explain why it is important to define it now.

MR. SHESTEK:

The concern is there is a lack of clarity in terms of how some of these facilities may be permitted. As Senator Stone mentioned in his opening, I do not believe

there is any prohibition on a facility locating here. If it is not defined in the NRS, there is a concern that someone coming into Nevada may suggest they could be permitted in a different fashion. When you have states like Arizona and Utah clearly defining it, as we are suggesting here in S.B. 361, it provides clarity.

CHAIR PAZINA:

We will hear testimony in support of S.B. 361.

THERESE LAXALT (Nevada Manufacturers Association):

We are here in support of S.B. 361 as it expands the definition for the types of post-consumer recycled plastics used for the creation of alternative products and advanced recycling. There are a multitude of examples of consumer and commercial plastics being recycled. My shoes are made of recycled plastics. As a local example, recycled plastics are also used to create decking for your outdoor porch. We appreciate the thoughtful ideas that help Nevada move into our future.

HARRISON BOHN (Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schrek):

This bill will provide legal certainty to important and emerging new industries and allow Nevada to be a regional leader in next generation recycling. Not only will this bill give all Nevadans more and better recycling and environmentally conscious options, but this bill will open the door to new, good paying jobs and a more diversified State economy. We support this bill and we respectfully ask for your support on this bill.

TOM CLARK (Reno + Sparks Chamber of Commerce):

We are very much behind this reclassification in the manufacturing space. We know there are companies willing to come to Nevada, especially northern Nevada. They want to fit into the manufacturing definition because they are doing something different in recycling than we traditionally do. There is a lot more science to it than I previously understood. We are very much in support of S.B. 361.

KYLE RUDOLPH (Senior Counsel, Berry Global):

Our organization manufactures packaging and engineered products across 265 locations in 39 countries, including here in Nevada. We employ over 360 people at 3 separate sites in Jean, Henderson and Sparks, Nevada. We are a buyer of advanced recycled materials. We make products abroad, using trash bags recycled from advanced recycled materials. In fact, we just received an

innovation and packaging award in the United Kingdom using post-use grocery bags and hard-to-recycle films. We converted them using advanced recycling to material we use to make food-grade bean pots, marketed and sold by Kraft Heinz. The Wendy's drink cups are also products our organization makes, utilizing 20 percent certified advanced recycled material.

Our organization believes advanced recycling is important. Not only do we buy that material, but we also use it. We could use it in regulated food and pharmaceutical packaging applications that require higher quality raw material to achieve regulatory compliance. Existing mechanical recycling is great for things like water bottles. Our organization makes over 100,000 distinct product skews for around 19,000 customers. A lot of what we sell is regulated for quality. Advanced recycled material has the quality characteristics allowing us to use post-use plastic in food and pharmaceutical grade applications. We support S.B. 361 and we would respectfully request this Committee to do the same.

CHAIR PAZINA:

Tom Salmon, CEO of Berry Global, has submitted a letter of support ([Exhibit G](#)). We will open the testimony in opposition of S.B. 361.

WARREN HARDY (SA Recycling):

SA Recycling is one of the largest metal recyclers in the U.S. I am not here to speak to the concept of manufacturing; my concern is what the definitional changes will do to the balance of power in the industry. Senator Scheible hit on the key point for us—the definitional changes will have a significant impact on the regulatory process.

I brought a bill like this to the Legislature in either 2011 or 2013 that looked at exempting scrap metal, because I do agree recycling products are not solid waste, they are commodities. The reason I brought the bill forward was because SA Recycling was contacted by the health district saying they needed to have a closure plan for the landfill. They do not have a landfill, but if they were to close, they would have a commodity on the property worth several thousand dollars that people would want to buy.

As I explored the idea and the concept for definitional changes, such as these for the scrap metal recycling industry, I realized it is tipping a balance which has been achieved over many years. We were able to talk to both health districts and work out our issues. My concern is, by making these definitional changes,

particularly in section 12, exempting post-use polymers and recovery feedstock from the definition of solid waste, will have the effect of creating a competitive disadvantage for other recyclers.

I have proposed an amendment ([Exhibit H](#)) explaining what we are trying to do. I am not sure it is workable, but I will be happy to continue to work with the sponsors to find a way to address our concerns. We also are concerned about calling out a specific type of recycling, to have a special category and statute such as advanced recycling. We believe recycling is recycling. I will leave the discussion about manufacturing to people smarter than I am, but those are my concerns on the definitional side.

JOELLE GUTMAN-DODSON (Washoe County Health District):

My colleagues and I have been working on this bill with the sponsor, Senator Stone, trying to get to a place where we would not have to oppose it. We did not get there, so I am testifying in opposition to S.B. 361.

DAVID KELLY (Washoe County Health District):

I am a supervisor over the Waste Management Program for Washoe County Health District, Environmental Health Services. We are in opposition to S.B. 361 because the bill exempts a portion of the waste stream from regulatory oversight. We encourage the use of post-use polymers and recovered feedstock, but we do not believe they should be exempt from regulations governing the collection, storage and disposal of waste. Any facility that collects, stores and recycles these products could end up with large volumes of material that could create a nuisance, harbor vectors that will be viewed as harmful to the public health, if they are handled in an unapproved manner.

As indicated by the people who brought the bill forward, there is nothing at this time preventing these types of recycling facilities from operating. They would just need to ensure materials are being stored in a nuisance-free manner and potential cleanup costs were covered through some sort of financial bonding.

We are of the opinion that advanced recycling facilities that collect, store and process these types of materials should be required to meet the same operational requirements as any business that collects, stores and processes recycled materials in Washoe County.

The current permitting requirements for the Washoe County Health District for these types of facilities are quite low. A one-time plan review costs \$762 and a permit fee of \$317 totals just over \$1,000, aside from the cost of creating the plan. There is an annual fee of \$300. This permitting would allow for an annual inspection to make sure the materials are being handled in a responsible fashion.

It would also require the company to put a method in place for financial responsibility for any cleanup costs should the company go bankrupt or something else go wrong. We had a recent smaller-scale business that went out of business and the cost would have been \$20,000 to the municipality if they had not been set up to cover those cleanup costs.

These facilities costs are so minor, to the point of being inconsequential, and it is not a heavy regulatory burden. While having the regulatory oversight, we will make sure the materials are stored right, without creating any potential health hazards, and any secondary waste streams that may come out of the process are correctly discarded.

BRADLEY MAYER (Southern Nevada Health District):

We also have an environmental health expert who is on the phone if you have questions. We have been working with the proponents of this bill. There have been many discussions with them, but unfortunately, we did not find a solution and are in opposition to S.B. 361.

NICK CHRISTENSON (Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter):

I have submitted my testimony in writing ([Exhibit I](#)). We are opposed to S.B. 361.

DANIEL BURNS (Engineering Manager, Southern Nevada Health District):

While it is not the intention of the sponsors, this bill would remove a level of protection to the environment and to public health which is in place by the permitting process, including the regulatory oversight that exists for this type of facility. Southern Nevada Health District has the following concerns regarding the bill and therefore cannot support it.

Section 3, subsection 1 references recovered feedstock, such as unfinished chemicals and lubricants. Lubricants could imply waste oils, synthetic or refined crude oils and solvents from automotive repair facilities. Removing these items

from consideration as solid waste also removes the evaluation of hazardous environmental toxic characteristics they likely present in waste streams. Outside of the waste regulations, no other evaluation mechanism exists to protect environmental public health.

Section 13 amends NRS 444.500 to exempt advanced recycling from regulatory permitting and oversight processes that come with solid waste management. It opens possible environmental and public health consequences.

The primary concern regarding this type of bill is that it removes numerous types of operations from regulation, which all present their own unique environmental hazards. The removal of permitting requirements would remove the financial assurance that permitted facilities are required to maintain to fund the removal of the maximum amount of solid waste allowed for their permit. Southern Nevada Health District has been forced to utilize these mechanisms on more than one occasion to fund the cleanup of a failed facility. The most recent of these was a failed facility that utilizes pyrolysis, one of the processes included in advanced recycling.

Companies who are considering utilizing advanced recycling can already do this today under existing regulations. For the reasons I provided, this is better left to the regulatory process which cannot be changed on a whim. Instead, they must go through a public process and be approved by either the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) or the local public board. Within Clark County, the current permitting process cost and timeline are minor to obtain a permit to operate a solid waste management facility. Depending on the applicant, a permit can be obtained within 90 days if everything is in order.

CHAIR PAZINA:

Seeing no one else testifying in opposition, we will open testimony in neutral.

WARREN HARDY (Urban Consortium):

Urban Consortium does not have a position on the bill, but wants to make sure nothing gets in this bill that removes or otherwise inhibits the current oversight by local governments for zoning and entitlements. I do not see anything in the bill regarding that, but we wanted to make sure it was on the Committee's mind. At present, these facilities must have a conditional use permit. We just want to make sure nothing in this bill, if it goes forward, removes the current oversight.

JEFFREY KINDER (Deputy Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

Joining me today is Darren Winkelman, Chief of our Bureau of Sustainable Materials Management. As a quick overview, the NDEP regulates solid waste and recycling under NRS 444 and 444A, with the mission of protecting public health and our air, water and land. They are the State's solid waste management authority and work in collaboration with the Southern Nevada Health District and the Washoe County Health District. We appreciate the goals of S.B. 361 to divert plastics from landfills and expand their lifecycle uses. Opportunities to increase recycling align with the overall goals of the NDEP Sustainable Materials Management plan.

We have prepared a diagram for the Committee ([Exhibit J](#)) to explain the State's current regulatory structure and what we understand S.B. 361 hopes to achieve. This bill exempts the terms post-use polymers and recovered feedstock from the definition of solid waste. This would be the second carve out from the statutory definition of solid waste; the first being an exemption for vehicles intended for wrecking or dismantling for parts.

Without passage of S.B. 361, advanced recycling facilities, as defined by the bill, would be considered a recycling center under the current statutory structure and regulated as a disposal site. This would require a permit issued by NDEP prior to construction and operation. Additionally, by regulation, within NDEP authority, the application for such a facility would need to include the amount and types of solid waste anticipated to be received, as well as the design and operational plans for the site. Issuance of the permit would also require a public notice process. Presently, within NDEP authority, there is no fee for such a facility. Alternatively, with passage of S.B. 361, NDEP or the appropriate local authority, would still regulate environmental protection aspects for air and water, but would not regulate the land component due to this exemption.

Our understanding is that this type of facility may produce hazardous waste as part of its process and, with or without S.B. 361, that activity would still be regulated. Lastly, we appreciate the time the proponents have made available to us to discuss the bill. As we understand it, one of their concerns is a changing regulatory landscape in the future. I would note though, under Nevada's Administrative Procedures Act, the rulemaking process requires public

involvement and an NDEP hearing, which would occur through the State Environmental Commission with final approval by the Legislative Commission.

CHAIR PAZINA:

We have received two informational documents ([Exhibit K](#) and [Exhibit L](#)). The first one is "Frequently Asked Questions about Advanced Recycling" and the second is "The Potential Economic Impact of Advanced Recycling and Recovery in Nevada."

SENATOR STONE:

Solid waste regulations have not been addressed in a long time because there have not been changes in technology. Now changes in technology allow us to do things in an economical way we have not been able to do in the past. I appreciate the opposition proposing an amendment for scrap metal. Unfortunately, we are not able to support the amendment at this time, but I will continue to work with all the opposition to try to reach an amicable compromise.

The question is, where are all the plastics going now? All of them are going into landfills. This new process is going to provide an opportunity for all haulers to segregate these materials, place a value on them, and sell them, which potentially could lower rates for the trash hauling fees our constituents pay.

This type of regulation has been passed in 23 states. I would like Nevada to compete for some of those high-investment companies to come here, help clean our environment and create jobs. Again, this is a manufacturing process different from typical recycling. We are not just taking recycled products and reusing them for other things; we are taking these advanced recyclable products and taking them back to their original polymers. That is what is different from traditional recycling.

We urge the Committee to approve [S.B. 361](#), and I commit to continue working with the opposition to reach a compromise to enable the industry to move forward.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

Do you envision, with your program, some of the waste haulers could separate the products you need and then deliver them offsite to you as a product?

SENATOR STONE:

Absolutely. They call the separated products “merce.” I can guarantee you if the haulers can find value in something they are putting into landfills, they are going to instruct their sorters to make sure they sort these items like toothpaste tubes and food packaging materials and put them in a separate pile. I would imagine they would not even have to haul these to advanced recyclers; they would go by and pick them up.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 11, 2023
Page 18

CHAIR PAZINA:

We will close the hearing on Senate Bill 361 and move to public comment.

With no public comment and having no further business, this meeting is adjourned at 4:24 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. 112	C	2	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 113	D	2	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 180	E	3	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 364	F	3	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document
S.B. 361	G	11	Chair Julie Pazina	Tom Salmon, Berry Global Letter of Support
S.B. 361	H	12	Warren Hardy SA Recycling	Conceptual Amendment
S.B. 361	I	13	Nick Christenson, Sierra Club	Testimony
S.B. 361	J	15	Jeffrey Kinder Nevada Division of Environmental Protection	Chart of Nevada's Regulatory Structure
S.B. 361	K	16	Chair Julie Pazina	Frequently Asked Questions about Advanced Recycling
S.B. 361	L	16	Chair Julie Pazina	The Potential Economic Impact of Advanced Recycling and Recovery in Nevada