

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AGRICULTURE, AND
MINING**

**Seventy-Fourth Session
April 30, 2007**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Jerry D. Claborn at 1:38 p.m., on Monday, April 30, 2007, in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn, Chair
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson
Assemblyman David Bobzien
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblyman John W. Marvel
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 2
Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Christina van Fosson, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Fred Messmann, Deputy Chief Game Warden, Boating Law Administrator,
Department of Wildlife
Robin Listman, Private Citizen
Paula Berkley, Representative, Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance
Carrie Sandstedt, Director of the Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance
Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League
Susan Fisher, Executive Director, Nevada Power Sport Dealers
Association
Pete Anderson; State Forester Fire Warden, Division of Forestry
Jason King, Deputy State Engineer, Division of Water Resources
Andy Belanger, Senior Management Analyst, Las Vegas Valley Water
District, Southern Nevada Water Authority

Chair Claborn:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill 306 (1st Reprint). Senator Washington, Fred Messmann, or Robin Listman please come forward. Do you have a PowerPoint presentation for us?

Senate Bill 306 (1st Reprint): Regulates the operation of a motorboat equipped with an engine cut-off switch. (BDR 43-81)

**Fred Messmann, Deputy Chief Game Warden, Boating Law Administrator,
Department of Wildlife:**

I do, but I will present it at a later time. We expected Senator Washington to be here this afternoon. I will begin without his testimony. Robin Listman came to my office about one year ago. She had been involved in a boating accident, and wanted to know how to get a law passed to protect boaters.

Robin Listman, Private Citizen:

I was an avid boater from May 1991 to August 2001. One Saturday afternoon I fell overboard and the driver of the boat was unaware of it. He shifted the boat into reverse, and I got sucked into the propeller. Nine hours later my husband decided that I had a greater chance of survival as an above-knee amputee. I boated for ten years. I was wounded so severely that I could have died. I am here in support of Senate Bill 306 (R1).

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

As I look over S.B. 306 (R1) I notice the suggestion of an engine cut off switch. Usually the driver of a motorized water vehicle would have an attached cut off switch. But you were not driving the boat when your accident occurred.

Robin Listman:

It is difficult to get the manufacturers to design and apply propeller guards. An alternative solution is for newer boats to have an engine cut off. An engine cut off is a wireless device. When a person falls overboard an alarm is activated. By the time that person falls into the water, the cut off mechanism immobilizes the engine so that it cannot drive forward or backward. This device would not have saved my leg or prevented what happened to me, but this technology could save children or other people in similar situations.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

This bill would require the wireless cut off device to be on all boats.

Robin Listman:

No, it would only be required on boats that the manufacturers are currently building. We are requesting that people who purchase boats with an engine cut off switch already in place, be required to use it.

Chair Claborn:

This legislation applies to the purchase of a new boat with a factory installed cut off switch. It does not require boaters to install a cut off switch to the boats they currently own. This bill applies only to new or factory installed cut off switches.

Fred Messmann:

The engine cut off switch is referred to as a "kill switch." We prefer to call them "live switches" or "engine cut off devices." The devices would be installed by boat manufacturers. The bill would require the operators of all boats to use their preinstalled device. We are not requesting retrofitted devices. Boat manufacturers know that it is good business to be concerned with their customers' boating safety. I attended a National Boating Safety Advisory Council (NBSAC) meeting in Dubuque, Iowa. We discussed this safety measure on a national level. Most states require personal watercraft, like jet skis or Sea-Doos, to be manufactured with a cut off device. The technology that Robin discussed is demonstrated in the following DVD. This footage will give you a better idea of how the engine cut off device works. The current devices are attached only to the operator of a vessel. When Robin fell overboard, the current, widely used device would not necessarily have prevented her accident. The newer devices are similar to keyless entry systems on automobiles. The

operator has one. The passengers get one to place on their life jackets or in their pockets whether they are passengers or operators. If they happen to go out of the boat it immediately cuts off the engine.

Chair Claborn:

I notice that Mr. Washington has arrived.

Senator Maurice E. Washington, Washoe County Senatorial District No. 2:

I agree with everything that has been said regarding this bill. Robin called me one day and said that there was a measure that she wanted to have passed. She felt it would be a reasonable precautionary measure to promote public safety. I think that it is a good piece of legislation. Her testimony is compelling. The amendment allows individuals who do trawling or fishing at five nautical miles or less to abstain from using an engine cut off switch.

Fred Messmann:

Senator Washington covered the final point that I was going to make. We were asked to allow for trawlers so that they can move around the boat while they fish. It makes sense because when boaters are at the dock, they may need to leave their station to tie up their boats. Next I would like to present the DVD footage that I brought. We presented this footage at Lake Mead for the NBSAC that I hosted from Washington, D.C. We support this new device because it is an officer safety issue. If one of our officers were involved in an incident while in a boat and were to fall overboard, this would protect him.

Chair Claborn:

We anticipate viewing it.

Fred Messmann:

The beeping noise that you heard was the alarm on the boat. There is an override for the operator to be able to reengage and conduct a rescue. We caution you not to try the same boating demonstration on your own.

Assemblyman Hogan:

It seems that if this safety device were disabled, broken, or was missing parts; the boat could be operated only up to five knots until it could be fixed. A boater would have to operate his vessel very slowly if the device became dysfunctional.

Fred Messmann:

We are more concerned about people who have their new boat at home and decide to disconnect the wiring on the safety device because they disagree with

its purpose. As is customary in all enforcement of new boating legislation, we have about a two-year time period in which we conduct a campaign for boating safety and public education. We give stern warnings. If a person has received a warning and is stopped again, a judicial ruling would probably be the appropriate consequence. Even if boaters have to make a court appearance, they can still request that the judge allow them to take a boating safety course. So the consequences behind breaking this legislation are not really painful. The only pain would result from this legislation not passing because then we could not, to the best of our ability, prevent a person from getting cut up by a propeller.

Assemblyman Hogan:

I want to mention that it is encouraging when we see our constituents take interest in the law, to generate a bill that states what it should, and getting it to address problems that others may not have had the chance to think about. I commend Ms. Listman for coming forward. Congratulations for what you have done.

Chair Claborn:

If there are no further questions or comments, the hearing on S.B. 306 (R1) is closed. We will open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution 10 (1st Reprint).

Senate Joint Resolution 10 (1st Reprint): Expresses support for the designation of trails for off-highway vehicles by certain federal agencies. (BDR R-1350)

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District:

Chair Claborn, Assemblymen Marvel, and, occasionally, Goicoechea are on the 2005-2006 Interim Legislative Committee on Public Lands. We regularly discuss off-road vehicles (ORV) even when they are not listed on our schedule of topics to be discussed. We estimate that there are about 400,000 ORVs in the state of Nevada. There are about 20,000 new ones each year. Nevada is the only western state that does not require any form of titling or registration for ORVs. This resolution was put together by Paula Berkley of the Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).] As many of you know, we tried to get a bill through both houses that would license and regulate ORVs. But we could not find a state agency that wanted to take this matter up. This Session we will probably only get a resolution. That may give us more time to work out the details for the next legislative session.

Paula Berkley, Representative, Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance:

I would like to have Carrie Sandstedt present her testimony on this matter.

Carrie Sandstedt, Director of the Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Chair Claborn:

I would like the Committee to know that we have been working on this particular issue for an extensive period of time. We have been anticipating the Forest Service's designation of ORV specific trails. I am concerned with the Nevada Land Plan Management Act. There are millions of dollars, actually billions of dollars in there. That money was intended to be applied to federal parks and to these ORV trails.

Senator Rhoads took us back to Washington, D.C., to his committee two or three different times. We talked to the people in charge to get this process going so that the money does not get spent on other projects. Perhaps this resolution will get them to take action. I realize that it is difficult to motivate the Committee to take action. When we gather in Washington, D.C., we express our concerns. This legislation is very important because it applies to 10 or 11 states. I am 100 percent supportive of this legislation. I speak on behalf of the entire Committee when I thank Senator Rhoads for bringing it to our attention again.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

You mentioned that it did not look like we had a state agency that was willing to collect the fees for the program. I am curious to know if the state agency was unwilling to collect the fees because there was a fiscal note involved.

Senator Rhoads:

I was not on the committee that heard the bill. It was heard in the Transportation Committee. One of the main reasons fees were not collected was that initially there was no money to get a program started. I spoke with some of the staff and suggested that maybe they could get a four-year loan from the State. That type of loan would assist them in getting started. With 400,000 ORVs out there, growing in increments of 20,000 per year, the money would be repaid quickly. The dealers, users, and the government agencies came very close to working together, but their cohesiveness fell apart. We have been trying to get them to work together for at least six years. I do not know how other states are able to accomplish this type of measure.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Perhaps next session we will seek to appropriate some funds to start up and recapture this bill. I agree that most of us, whether we are in the motor sports industry or a trails club, would like to see this matter move forward. I would like to see a visible tag of some kind, at a minimum. Then there would be

clearly established boundaries for ORV owners if their property gets damaged by another entity.

Senator Rhoads:

We have heard several unfortunate accounts of ranchers who were unable to efficiently manage their land because of ORV activities taking place close to their water holes, fences, or cattle guards.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Several of us have witnessed increasing numbers of cut fences. It is a few ORV operators who create unfavorable circumstances for all ORV operators. I speak on behalf of this Committee when I say that we support this legislation. At this time our main challenge is attaining unison from all involved parties by next session.

Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League:

I support the bill. I want to draw attention to the fourth "whereas" clause where it states that unregulated ORV use has led to significant damage to our environment, and to our wildlife and its habitats. We extend our support of the intent of the bill. I anticipate that we can reach some type of compromise with regard to ORVs either this Session or in the next.

Susan Fisher, Executive Director, Nevada Power Sport Dealers Association:

We are in cautious support of S.J.R. 10 (R1). We support the intent of it. We are concerned that this intends to decrease the number of existing trails. Prior testimony discussed the thousands of miles of unauthorized trails. There are no authorized trails in the state of Nevada. Under the current circumstances, people are not doing anything wrong or illegal. In the off-highway vehicle (OHV) power sport communities we do not use the term "off-road vehicles." We say "off-highway vehicles." Trails are also roads. We encourage people and groups to stay on trails. We do not encourage off-trail, or off-road use. We only encourage off-highway use. The current trails have had mandates applied to them by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and Forest Service. If roads and trails are not marked by "date-certain," they do not exist. They are closed to access. The federal agencies involved do not have sufficient funding to map and provide signage on trails. Individuals who are part of the OHV community have been purchasing Global Positioning Systems (GPS) independently. This community has trained its members to map existing roads and trails for jeep, quad, or single track use. These groups go out and do trail maintenance as well. Trail maintenance is an important factor in keeping people on the trails. When you get several obstructions on the road, people start to go around them rather than staying on the trails. We want to implement a registration program in Nevada. We also want a well-funded

program that supports the promotion of trail-maintenance, public education, and signage. The OHV community wants that as a protective measure.

Assemblyman Marvel:

Is it possible for us to get a registration bill through this Session?

Susan Fisher:

I never say "never." It is looking bleak, sir.

Assemblyman Marvel:

Nevada is losing a great deal of money by giving other states the sales tax.

Susan Fisher:

We are.

Assemblyman Marvel:

People go out of state to buy their off-road vehicles. We would be collecting the tax if we sold them here. It would be a protection to our own local dealers.

Susan Fisher:

In addition to losing the tax revenue, a conservative estimate of \$3,000,000 to \$4,000,000 per year in sales tax, we are losing the sales to Nevada businesses. That amount is about \$40,000,000 to \$50,000,000 per year lost to other states. We are also losing the potential revenue that could be generated from a registration program. It would take numerous years to get all 400,000 existing OHVs in Nevada registered, but it would be another \$10,500,000. We have a program for motorcycles. We should be able to get that implemented for OHVs.

Chair Claborn:

Does this measure require retroaction?

Susan Fisher:

Different versions of the bill have been discussed. We originally suggested all new vehicles. Then we discussed phasing in older vehicles. After that we would phase in the old ones from prior to 1977. We discussed several ways of handling this. The titling portion of the measure is important because it would bring OHV sales into Nevada. It also protects OHV owners if their vehicle is stolen and makes provisions for insurance purposes. The OHV community supports a well-regulated registration program. They want to benefit from this measure. They do not want it to create obstacles to OHV use.

Chair Claborn:

It would be prudent to discuss this in the interim.

Susan Fisher:

We have discussed it at interim on a couple of occasions.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Then you concur with Senator Rhoads that the biggest obstacle is the cost of implementing the titling and registration program?

Susan Fisher:

Yes, I definitely concur with Senator Rhoads.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Assemblyman Marvel and I will sponsor legislation for next session.

Chair Claborn:

Is there anyone else who has questions or comments regarding S.J.R. 10 (R1)?
Hearing none, the hearing on S.J.R. 10 (R1) is closed.

Chair Claborn:

This Senate Joint Resolution 13 relates to wildfires.

Senate Joint Resolution 13: Urges Congress to provide additional appropriations for the prevention and suppression of wildfires and the rehabilitation of public rangelands in Nevada. (BDR R-468)

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).] I introduced a bill to strengthen the volunteer fire departments throughout the state of Nevada. Hopefully, I can get it out of the Senate Committee on Finance so that it will reach you. The volunteer firemen are the first responders to fire and they know where ranchers and landowners are located. They also know the location of the water, highways, and gates. This bill would assist them in doing a better job.

Chair Claborn:

There was previous testimony given on the fires we had in Elko. The fire department had the wrong equipment when they reached the fire. Are they working to resolve this issue? The firemen should know what equipment they need when they leave their station.

Pete Anderson, State Forester Fire Warden, Division of Forestry:

I am unfamiliar with the details surrounding the incident in Elko. There have been occasions where an engine from a different area reported to a fire. Because they were unfamiliar with the area they were unfamiliar with the specific wildfire situation. They were also limited in what they could do to suppress the fire because they possessed equipment that was inappropriate for the fire they reported to. We receive equipment and resources from different areas. As a result we potentially have inappropriate equipment. Most people recognize the need for appropriate equipment. In response to these incidents the State is increasing its consistency of hose sizes and radio frequencies.

Chair Claborn:

The fire which occurred in Elko County was discussed in a different committee. I am confident that the matter is being further investigated. There is no way of knowing which equipment is necessary unless the person notifying the volunteer firemen tells them the needed details. I hope that they implement a superior system so that we do not waste time when we need to extinguish fires.

Pete Anderson:

I agree with you. I brought a map that was prepared by the National Interagency Coordination Center ([Exhibit F](#)). The map displays predictable weather, fuel type, and moisture content information. We are facing another potentially critical and long wildfire season. We support S.J.R. 13, it is an appropriate solution. We can spend a lot of money on fire suppression. We need to focus on prevention. We need to make the vegetative landscape scale changes so that we can handle these enormous wildfires. This resolution is 100 percent necessary. It is just as critical to focus our funding on fire prevention as it is to fire extinguishing.

Chair Claborn:

I agree.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Your bill is going to increase funding to volunteers for initial attack. Is there a fiscal note in your bill for prevention as well?

Senator Rhoads:

It contains various provisions. One of the main elements of the bill is that it strengthens the volunteer fire department so that they can do a better job at initial attack. But it also makes provisions for other necessary things.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

We all agree that the prevention and immediate suppression of fires are necessary.

Senator Rhoads:

The fiscal impact is about \$1,000,000 the first year and \$500,000 after that.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Would most of the funds provide for apparatuses?

Pete Anderson:

Yes, the first year there is a seasonal brush truck included. That is the reason why the price is higher. We also made provisions for some additional seasonal resources to support the northern region. More importantly, there are radios and personal protective gear. We provided for targeted training at volunteer fire departments so that they are well informed across the northern tier of the state of Nevada.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I commend the National Department of Forestry as well as local volunteers. They all do a tremendous job for us and we are well aware of it. I do not think that Pete or anyone else has seen any apparatus they could not use out there. It may not have been exactly what they wanted, but there is no such thing as the wrong tool when you adapt it to suit your purpose.

Senator Rhoads:

If you think we had problems with fires two years ago and last year, you have not seen anything yet. It is very dry out there, and it is only April. The only thing growing is cheatgrass. Dry cheatgrass burns like gasoline, so we have big problems.

Chair Claborn:

Are there any more questions? Would anyone else like to testify on S.J.R. 13? I do not see anyone. The hearing on S.J.R. 13 is closed. We will open the hearing on Senate Concurrent Resolution 11.

Senate Concurrent Resolution 11: Urges cooperation among the State Engineer and certain local governments, water authorities and districts concerning issues relating to water resources in this State. (BDR R-204)

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District:

[Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).] This came out of the 2005-2006 Interim Legislative Commission's Committee to Study the Use, Management,

and Allocation of Water Resources. We have the best water laws in the western states. We have been fortunate to have had water department administrators who are very fair. The recent rulings down in Lincoln and White Pine Counties demonstrate that. This resolution seeks to commend them, and to urge more cooperation and perhaps a compilation of information systems. It appears that occasionally one agency does one thing and another agency does something different. We would like to see more cooperation and consistency.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

As I review this resolution, I notice that it discusses the inadequacy of domestic well use. It encourages the state engineer to implement a statewide system for managing them. We see that there are serious issues in the south. We are quite scattered, especially in the southern parts of the State. The authorities deal with community wells which are completely different from domestic ones. How are we going to address the community well structure? It seems to be one of the bigger issues left for us to resolve, not only in rural Nevada, but in southern Nevada as well. I do not see it adequately addressed in this resolution.

Senator Rhoads:

I am glad that Jason King is here to address that.

Jason King, Deputy State Engineer, Division of Water Resources:

Assemblyman Goicoechea, I want to be certain that I understand your question. Are you asking how we are going to deal with community well issues in the south?

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Yes. I notice that the fifth "whereas" clause discusses domestic wells. It discusses trying to develop a format to at least register them into a log. There is emerging legislation that would establish a priority date for domestic wells. I do not understand how local jurisdictions will deal with community wells.

Jason King:

The ability to have a mother-in-law quarter hooked up to a domestic well is different than a community well. These basins are fully appropriated. It gives people an opportunity to add an additional dwelling to a domestic well when they are faced with having to spend a lot of money to purchase a water right. The community well issue is occurring primarily down south in the Las Vegas area. The issue pertains to over-pumping. The burden will be on the state engineer to prove any kind of over-pumping. The community well program down south stemmed from revocable water rights. The intent was that as soon

as the Colorado River was available, we could revoke their rights and hook them up to the system. That is still our goal. We hope that will resolve the community well issue in southern Nevada.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Although it enters the broader topic we are handling, we should not debate this because we are discussing a resolution. I understand we have some concerns with community wells. It might be better to wait until we have heard testimony on S.B. 274 and S.B. 275. The required connection fees are very high in cases where municipal water is made available to community wells. I understand that they have a revocable permit. Do we need another "whereas" clause to address the community well structure? They are appropriated rights. In some cases a very small amount of water is appropriated to each individual user of a community well. How do we ensure that their water right is protected?

Jason King:

There is an established process which includes supplemental funding to the people who would like to be integrated into the system. Southern Nevada Water is trying to work with those users and help alleviate some of that financial burden.

Andy Belanger, Senior Management Analyst, Las Vegas Valley Water District, Southern Nevada Water Authority:

In 1997 the Nevada Legislature passed a law that created the groundwater management program in the Las Vegas Valley. That program is designed to address, holistically, groundwater issues for all types of groundwater use in the Las Vegas Valley, including community wells. Jason was correct about the issue we have witnessed in southern Nevada. In 1955, the Nevada Legislature chose to issue temporary revocable permits in the Las Vegas Valley to allow the valley to grow until the treatment facilities at Lake Mead were developed. Since then, rebalancing the groundwater basin has been a dominant issue. It is not an issue due to a lack of laws being in place. It is an issue because there are serious concerns about how water rights can be revoked from the people who they are given to. What criteria are used to connect them to a municipal system in the Las Vegas Valley? At the Southern Nevada Water Authority we can impose a \$30 fee per acre-foot. It is charged to everyone, including the Las Vegas Valley Water District. They have 40,000 acre feet of water rights. The fee pays for community wells. It also allows other voluntary connections to the municipal system to occur. We provide 85 percent of the costs of the grant to connect. We also plug the well at no cost to the well owner. This program is in place to ensure that we address the community well issue as it arises. It is also in place to reduce the demand on the aquifer that is already over appropriated.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Are we discussing a range of 1,800 wells that used to be community wells? Has that number increased or decreased?

Andy Belanger:

In the Las Vegas Valley there are about 5,000 domestic wells and about 1,700 of them are permitted wells. Those figures include community wells. They are probably the majority of wells. That also includes all of the commercial, industrial, and municipal wells, and any other type of well in the Las Vegas Valley.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

How much time would it take to connect them and to retire them?

Andy Belanger:

If the well has a revocable permit issued after March 24, 1955, and if the property is within 180 feet of an existing water line, and the well fails, then by the state engineer, those properties could be mandated to connect. We have also extended that program voluntarily to individuals who choose to get off of their well rather than wait for the state engineer to require them to. Over 90 percent of the grant funds have gone to voluntary connections over roughly the last seven years that the program has been in place.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

You would not have water lines within 180 feet of any portion of the 1,700 community wells? Several of them are in relatively remote locations.

Andy Belanger:

Some are in remote locations, but most of the wells are currently within close proximity to a development. At the Southern Nevada Water Authority we are in the wholesale business. The municipal agencies are the ones that have the retail lines that a customer might connect to. At the Las Vegas Valley Water District our policy is not to pioneer lines. The developer would pay to extend the line. Well owners who are within the 180 feet of that line, if their wells fail, would be subject to connection.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

What is that connection fee? I realize that you grant it. How much does it cost?

Andy Belanger:

The cost is about \$15,000 to \$20,000 before the grant. After the grant the well owner typically pays about \$1,500 to \$3,000.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

It is good that you are making it affordable. Technically, several of the complaints about community wells are unfounded, since for \$3,000 they can connect to a municipal provider.

Andy Belanger:

The Groundwater Management Program has addressed most of the issues that well owners in the Las Vegas Valley have had. The program provides a local solution to a local problem.

Chair Claborn:

That is a large sum of money. I am not surprised that well owners are concerned. Are there any further comments or questions?

Andy Belanger:

We are in support of S.C.R. 11.

Chairman Claborn:

Hearing no further comments or questions I close the hearing on S.C.R. 11. Is there any other business that needs to be addressed by the Committee? Before we adjourn, I would like to inform you that we need to conduct a work session. We have 21 bills that were sent to us by the Senate. They need to be addressed by this Committee in order to proceed from here. We are adjourned [2:35 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Christina van Fosson
Committee Secretary

Patricia Evans
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture,
and Mining

Date: April 30, 2007

Time of Meeting: 1:38 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.J.R. 10 (R1)	C	Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District	Testimony
S.J.R. 10 (R1)	D	Carrie Sandstedt, Nevada Responsible Trails Alliance	Testimony
S.J.R. 13	E	Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District	Testimony
S.J.R. 13	F	Peter Anderson, Division of Forestry	Map
S.C.R. 11	G	Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Rural Nevada Senatorial District	Testimony