

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

**Seventy-Fourth Session  
May 2, 2007**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Jerry D. Claborn at 1:33 p.m., on Wednesday, May 2, 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/](http://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](mailto: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 Bob Beers, Clark County Senatorial District No. 6

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

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

Minutes ID: 1119



**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation  
Richard Haskins, Chief of Fisheries, Department of Wildlife  
Roger Works, representing the State Department of Agriculture  
Rick Gimlin, representing the State Department of Agriculture  
Zachary Hymanson, Executive Director, Tahoe Science Consortium  
Julie W. Regan, Communications and Legislative Affairs Chief, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency  
Allen Biaggi, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; Member, Nevada Delegation of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board  
Jim Lawrence, Deputy Administrator, Division of State Lands, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Jason Frierson, representing Clark County  
Craig Kadlub, representing the Clark County School District

**Chairman Claborn:**

[Meeting called to order. Roll called.]

**Senate Bill 366 (1st Reprint): Limits the authority of the Department of Wildlife over Australian red claw crayfish raised for sale as food for human consumption. (BDR 45-1328)**

**Senator Bob Beers, Clark County Senatorial District No. 6:**

Senate Bill 366 (R1) passed out of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources. It passed 20 to 1 on the Senate Floor. I will explain the background of this bill. My father, son, and I took a five-day trip to central Nevada. The second day we stopped at Sodaville Spring. We bought five pounds of the so-called desert lobster. They are called Australian red claw crayfish. Three weeks later I was at home when the proprietor of the crayfish establishment called me. He notified me that the State was going to shut down his operation. The Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) informed me that Australian red claw crayfish are a prohibited species by regulation, not by law. I called the proprietor back to inform him of what I had learned. I told him that if the crayfish appeared in other springs and reproduced, they would decimate the population of the Railroad Valley springfish in that spring. The gentleman laughed at this. He informed me that Australian red claw crayfish are available on the Internet for mail order. Anybody can have them delivered and place them in a spring. It is not like he was the sole purveyor of these creatures.

So the next time I stopped in, he walked me over to one of his tanks. He pointed at the tank and said, "Look, do you see that? That is a Railroad Valley springfish." The crayfish appeared to coexist nicely with the springfish. I spoke with individuals from the NDOW and told them what I witnessed. They informed me that crayfish eat springfish eggs. In that manner they would decimate the springfish population. I gave the proprietor this information. He said that if it were true, the authorities could simply remove crayfish and reintroduce springfish in those cases. I asked the wildlife rangers about this matter only to discover that they had already killed the crayfish and the springfish in the Sodaville Spring. Since Sodaville Spring is 75 miles from Railroad Valley, I asked how the Railroad Valley springfish got into the Sodaville Spring. They explained that during the 1950s they had a biologist that spread the eggs of the springfish in several warm springs throughout the central Nevada area. This bill moves the Australian red claw crayfish into the alternative wildlife statute so that it becomes an agricultural product. Hopefully, it enables a fraction of Mineral County's economic development to resume.

**Chair Claborn:**

The Department of Agriculture will oversee this instead of the Department of Wildlife?

**Senator Beers:**

Yes.

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

How many of these enterprises are there?

**Senator Beers:**

There have been two. The one at Sodaville Spring is right on Highway 95. It is the better known of the two for that reason. Another couple began raising these critters and taught the gentleman in Sodaville what he knows about them.

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

How large is the market?

**Senator Beers:**

The proprietor has done his best to market them, but I do not know.

**Assemblywoman Smith:**

If this requires regulation by an agency, why is a fiscal note not included in this bill?

**Senator Beers:**

There would not necessarily be a fee involved because the fee is already in the statute for alternative livestock.

**Assemblywoman Smith:**

If there is no fee, why is there no fiscal note?

**Senator Beers:**

It is comprised of an existing licensing fee. At the top of page five it states that the Board of Agriculture shall establish by regulation a schedule of fees. That language appears to be inserted. I do not know how this would differ from the existing fees that they charge for other alternative livestock. You can see that the language established by regulation and schedule of fees is not new language. That exists in state law. There are one or two other alternative livestock species. The testimony in the Senate against this bill was from the NDOW. They were concerned about the beginning of an invasive species statute and process. We have had some invasive species in Lake Mead, such as mussels and non-native fish, that have caused trouble. Invasive species are a problem and the specific one in the alternative livestock category was an elk that was introduced ten years ago. It was removed four years later when we had determined there was a probability that they could transmit mad cow disease or chronic wasting. With regard to these creatures, I have outlined the concern. It does not seem very plausible that the elimination of the Railroad Valley springfish is likely to occur through the domesticated consumption of these creatures.

**Assemblywoman Smith:**

I want to continue to explore the impact on other state agencies. It seems that someone is going to be required to do something that they are not currently required to do. If we could address that it would be helpful.

**Chair Claborn:**

It appears that the proprietors would need a business license.

**Senator Beers:**

The sales would be taxable.

**Chair Claborn:**

I am certain of it. We need to determine what the Department of Agriculture would do with this bill.

**Senator Beers:**

The Department of Agriculture would not be responsible for the sales tax. The Department of Taxation would probably handle that. The Department of Agriculture would create regulations or fit existing regulations for alternative livestock to this new example of alternative livestock. We might be assigning more responsibility to them, but we are encouraging enterprise.

**Chair Claborn:**

I noticed that there are other states that sell these crayfish.

**Senator Beers:**

Yes, there are at least a dozen places where they can be ordered.

**Chair Claborn:**

In researching alternative species, I found there are tilapia which were introduced here from Africa. We have fish ponds of tilapia in Nevada. They are regulated and there are guidelines. It seems like that is similar to what you are trying to accomplish here.

**Senator Beers:**

These creatures are unsuitable for most waters. They do not tolerate cold water well. That severely limits their ability to spread.

**Chair Claborn:**

If the temperature drops below 50 degrees, they die. Are there any more questions for Senator Beers? Is there anyone in support of this bill?

**Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation:**

I am partially responsible for suggesting the idea of adding the crayfish to the alternative livestock statute. Several sessions ago, I was involved in creating the alternative livestock section. Originally, it was created for Reindeer, Fallow Deer, and Rocky Mountain Elk. In the last session we removed Rocky Mountain Elk from that designation. It was intended to create economic opportunities for niche markets that people might want to pursue. Instead of taking the broad base of what the bill originally was drafted to do, this was intended to be very narrow in its construction and purpose. One of the questions that arose pertains to the fees involved. When we created the other alternative livestock enterprises such as the Fallow Deer that are in place and operating, we did it without adding any staff or money. There was no fiscal impact that I am aware of. People who are involved in these enterprises would pay on a fee basis.

Based on the model we have used, this would follow the same kind of approach. The Department of Agriculture would be responsible for developing the regulations that safeguard and protect lobsters from escaping and going on pillaging expeditions out into the desert. There may need to be some inspections and there would be fees associated with those types of things. Beyond that there should not be any kind of significant impact. There was not when we did the other alternative livestock bill. I do not see how this is much different.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions? Is there anyone else in support of S.B. 366 (R1)? Is there any opposition to S.B. 366 (R1)? [There was none.]

**Richard Haskins, Chief of Fisheries, Department of Wildlife:**

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

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any Committee questions?

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

I need to know how the alternative livestock statute squares with how you manage other wildlife. Is it typical for species previously classified as alternative livestock, like the Rocky Mountain Elk, to be pulled out because new information comes to light? If it is discovered that the species is a problem and requires NDOW management, does that case have to go to the Legislature each time to move a species back and forth between classifications? Is there no cooperative arrangement with the Department of Agriculture to handle the management?

**Richard Haskins:**

I am not the person to talk about alternative livestock.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Perhaps that is a question that should be addressed to Mr. Meyer or to our staff.

**Chair Claborn:**

You were discussing selling them alive. What if the crayfish were sold dead?

**Richard Haskins:**

We have no problem with that.

**Chair Claborn:**

The gentleman could reopen his business. He could get his license and get registered and do what he wishes as long as he sells them dead.

**Richard Haskins:**

The issue you are referring to was our worst-case scenario. He was selling them alive a dozen at a time. Under those circumstances there is no control over where they are going. Someone indicated that lethal temperatures for the species are below 50 degrees. That is correct. Most of our springs in Nevada where we have native species of fish are at thermal or constant temperatures. So we have the environment across Nevada for them to flourish.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

How many places in the state of Nevada are there where we have Australian crawfish?

**Richard Haskins:**

I do not believe anyone in the State possesses them right now. There were three permits issued. One was in Pahrump, and that person never started a business. We had a gentleman in Nye County who tried to run a commercial operation for a period of time, but it did not work. The last was the person we have been talking about. Those are the only three we are aware of.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

What happened to the ones at Hot Creek?

**Richard Haskins:**

I doubt that we permitted them. Most of our permits were in a contained system on his property. They were not introduced into the wild.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

I am skeptical and curious of that.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

What would have been the conditions of the permit?

**Richard Haskins:**

He did not have a permit, initially. There was some discussion about whether they were lobster or crayfish. They are crayfish. He was issued a permit, but ultimately he let his permit lapse. The condition of the permit that he objected to was selling them alive. Because that is how he was able to market them to passersby. He did not have the capacity to develop a processing type of

operation. On an annual basis he was producing hundreds of them, not thousands.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Ultimately, the NDOW objected to selling the crayfish alive?

**Richard Haskins:**

Yes, live sale was the ultimate objection. Part of the terms on the permit was a record of sale. He did not comply with that condition. The permit required a person who sold them live had to sell them to another licensed individual. He could have sold them to another person wanting to start a commercial operation, but not under any other circumstances.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

The end result of this bill would be to sell the crayfish alive, is that correct?

**Richard Haskins:**

That would be a determination made by the Department of Agriculture. The Australian red claw crayfish are on a prohibited species list in the Nevada. It is illegal to possess them alive without a permit. Part of the regulation that places species on that list also has a clause that allows for their possession with a permit for commercial and scientific purposes.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Are the crayfish in the Las Vegas Wash Australian Crayfish? Are those crayfish also considered an invasive species?

**Richard Haskins:**

The ones in Las Vegas were also introduced to the area. They are not native to Nevada.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Are they less threatening than the ones we are discussing today?

**Richard Haskins:**

No, they are not. That is an ongoing statewide issue. We have two species in the southern part of the State. The situations we have encountered in Nevada, where they are found along with our native aquatic species, are a serious issue for us. In the west there will be a symposium this summer that will address this issue. Once they are established in an aquatic ecosystem, they are very difficult to remove. We can reduce their numbers, but they come right back. Our attempts to control their numbers have been unsuccessful.



**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Is most of the State free of these invasive crayfish or are they well-established?

**Richard Haskins:**

There are portions of the State where they are well established. There are also huge portions of the State where we do not have crayfish at this time.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

Is there a market to purchase them dead, or do consumers want them alive?

**Richard Haskins:**

When you get into that realm, you get into commercial processing. No business in Nevada would be able to compete with commercial processing out of the southeast part of the country. It is a big business. Nevada aquaculture would be unable to compete with that. It is always going to be a niche or novelty market. I get calls from people who want to get involved in raising trout, but they are competing with aquaculture in southern Idaho and places like that. There is no competing with them unless the entrepreneur is going to open a commercial company.

**Chair Claborn:**

I understand that they make good fish bait.

**Richard Haskins:**

If you are saying that they provide a resource for fish, that is a common misconception. My former biologist enjoyed stocking crayfish in certain waters under the assumption that they would provide a forage base that would cause a fishery to thrive. What actually occurs in the wild is crayfish eat most of the same things that fish consume. They go into atrophic level and substitute for what is already there. They are a part of several natural ecosystems around the country.

**Chair Claborn:**

Please explain to me the other species you are discussing that are not indigenous to our springs and creeks. Is there anything big enough to capture and sell?

**Richard Haskins:**

No, I cannot think of any life form below the crustacean level that people would want to try to market.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any more questions? Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to S.B. 366 (R1)? [There was none.] Is there anyone who would like to provide neutral testimony?

**Roger Works, representing the State Department of Agriculture:**

While we are fairly neutral on this issue, we have concerns about the invasive species aspect. Contrary to the position of the NDOW, the only way that we would want entrepreneurs to sell this product is live. There is a food-safety issue involved. For him to do anything any different would require him to make a substantial investment and become licensed by the State Health Division as a food processor. Otherwise people could die from the improper handling of this commodity. Regarding the impact of this bill on our Department, we can probably borrow a lot of expertise. Mostly this will become a matter of personnel time to travel out to the area to inspect these establishments to enforce current regulations. That is substantial.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

Are you saying that if a business model arrives in which it is more profitable to sell them dead, they will have to be given back to the NDOW?

**Roger Works:**

No, that is not the case at all. Our interest is in assisting the entrepreneur of a crayfish business become successful. We would be concerned with ensuring that he provides a safe and wholesome product to consumers. The latter is our primary concern.

**Assemblyman Bobzien:**

I recognize that this alternative livestock statute is a relatively new concept. Is there some mechanism for being able to go back and forth between alternative livestock versus species management of an invasive species? I am not comfortable making species-specific legislation. We are not wildlife biologists or agricultural experts.

**Roger Works:**

We do not want to see other species introduced. When we are approached by an industry with a lot of supporting evidence pointing to a strong business model, and we believe we can contain these animals, we are not introducing an adverse risk to the domestic livestock within the State. In those cases we look at that data. Fallow Deer and Reindeer are specific examples. There was not a huge market for those, but in some venues there may be. Because of the potential impact that they have on our existing cattle and sheep production in the State, we have to consider these cases carefully.

Consequently, from that standpoint, we do not want to see them arbitrarily brought in. We want that Legislative process.

**Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel:**

There is no way to go from regulated wildlife to alternative livestock to the Board of Wildlife Commissioners and then to the State Board of Agriculture. The reason is that the term "alternative livestock" is set in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS). The Board of Wildlife Commissioners has no authority to set the definition of what qualifies as a species of alternative livestock.

**Rick Gimlin, representing the State Department of Agriculture:**

The only additional item that needs consideration in this matter is cost. There is a cost associated with promulgating the regulations involved with this measure. We would need to levy a fee of \$100 annually. In addition, there is a \$200 application fee and a \$100 initial inspection fee. The only additional cost to our staff traveling fee is the onetime cost of promulgating the regulations.

**Chair Claborn:**

Is there any further testimony on S.B. 366 (R1)? Hearing no further comments, the hearing on S.B. 366 (R1) is closed.

[The meeting recessed at 2:16 p.m. and reconvened at 2:30 p.m.]

**Chair Claborn:**

We will begin with Senate Concurrent Resolution 3.

**Senate Concurrent Resolution 3: Expresses support for the Tahoe Science Consortium. (BDR R-251)**

**Zachary Hymanson, Executive Director, Tahoe Science Consortium:**

This bill is a resolution of support and is based on the memorandum of understanding. It would be more helpful to give a brief overview of the consortium, then I can answer any questions. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

**Chair Claborn:**

Does the money for this come out of the Nevada Land Plan Management Act?

**Zachary Hymanson:**

Yes, it does. There is a pot of money that comes to Lake Tahoe. It is about \$40 million per year. Most of it goes to capital projects, but \$3.75 million is reserved for science and research.

**Chair Claborn:**

How is that funded to your organization?

**Zachary Hymanson:**

It funds the operation of our organization. The funding pays for my position, our administrative assistant, and our peer review and science planning activities which need to incorporate science expertise.

**Chair Claborn:**

When all of the funding for your program has been disbursed are you able to provide tracking of how the funding has been spent?

**Zachary Hymanson:**

That is correct. We have a work plan that we operate under. The basis for an audit would be the work plan which accounts for how the money is allocated and the products are delivered. The rest of the money is for other research.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Hymanson? [There were none.]

**Zachary Hymanson:**

Several agencies would like to make remarks on this matter. We found their testimony very effective in the Senate hearing.

**Julie W. Regan, Communications and Legislative Affairs Chief, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency:**

I have a few words to say in support of S.C.R. 3. [Read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).]

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.] I have two other people who would like to testify.

**Allen Biaggi, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources; Member, Nevada Delegation of the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency Governing Board:**

We support S.C.R. 3. We support the efforts of the consortium. I will gladly answer any questions.

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

Has California been coming up with its money?

**Allen Biaggi:**

Yes, they are. There is some concern with any budget cuts made on the Nevada side reflecting potential cuts on the California side. There is a one-third, two-third split of funding, and those cuts made in Nevada are magnified on the California side.

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

How much is their obligation?

**Allen Biaggi:**

I do not know, but I can find out for you.

**Jim Lawrence, Deputy Administrator, Division of State Lands, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

The Division of State Lands is pleased to express its support of S.C.R. 3. The Division of State Lands coordinates Nevada's implementation of the Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program (EIP). Many state agencies participate in the EIP program including the Division of State Parks, the Division of Forestry, the Department of Wildlife, the Division of Environmental Protection, and the Department of Transportation. The success of the EIP depends on a foundation of sound science. The creation of the Tahoe Science Consortium (TSC) was a key component in coordinating the work of scientists and managing agencies in the Lake Tahoe Basin. We are working closely with the executive director of the TSC and its committee of scientists to ensure the success of this multi-agency effort. So far the TSC has developed a draft science plan, a peer review process for research needs, as well as a review process for capital project implementation in the Basin. These initial efforts are major first steps toward an effective, adaptive management process which is critical to protecting Lake Tahoe. The TSC has proven its skill in facilitating the coordination of the research community and the natural resource agencies. The TSC should be commended for their initial successful achievements and encouraged to continue their important work.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions for Mr. Lawrence?

**Assemblyman Hogan:**

With the research and coordination work that has been done by the TSC, can we anticipate any interesting information that would be useful to us in Nevada? I would like to know if there is any new information pertaining to agriculture, timber, or other topics that are related to your work.

**Chair Claborn:**

Is there any more testimony in support of S.C.R. 3? Is there anyone who would like to express opposition or neutrality to S.C.R. 3? [There were none.] We will close the hearing on S.C.R. 3 and open the hearing on Senate Bill 60 (R1).

**Senate Bill 60 (1st Reprint): Establishes requirements concerning the expenditure of proceeds collected from administrative penalties for certain violations concerning the control of air pollution. (BDR 40-347)**

**Jason Frierson, representing Clark County:**

I am here to present Senate Bill 60 (R1). In its original form this bill was brought forth to continue to advance the air quality status in Clark County. The original bill provided that Clark County would receive additional money to run the program. In 1993 when the air quality program started, it yielded about \$100,000 in fines. At that time Clark County received \$17,500. In statute that was the cap that Clark County could receive. Since then, and more recently, the program yields over \$400,000 in fines, yet Clark County receives the same \$17,500. The bill requires that the school district provide a plan to Clark County and to the local Air Pollution Control Board with their intentions on using that money to provide educational programs for air quality and to provide projects to improve air quality. We expect for the program to continue to grow and yield additional money. We expect S.B. 60 (R1) to help address air quality issues in Clark County and to ensure that the money goes towards that purpose.

**Chair Claborn:**

The bill clearly states that it is not a bill to disburse money in different ways?

**Jason Frierson:**

The bill limits the money to be spent on educational programs and projects to improve air quality. That is what all the money generated from the fines will be used for.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any Committee questions?

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

How much do you usually collect in fines?

**Jason Frierson:**

I am unaware of how much we collect in each individual case. In 2006, there was approximately \$400,000 total collected in fines.

**Chair Claborn:**

I see on page 3 that you want to refit school buses to use biodiesel, and compressed, natural gases. Is that how you want to cut down on pollution and save money through the school districts?

**Jason Frierson:**

That is the idea. It is my understanding that the school districts practice many of the measures outlined in the bill. This will ensure that the money generated by the fines will continue to support the schools' efforts.

**Chair Claborn:**

That is very good. Are there any more questions? [There were none.] Would those in support of this bill please come forward?

**Craig Kadlub, representing the Clark County School District:**

I signed in neutral primarily because there is no change in revenues. The school district is engaged in environmental education and programs that reduce air pollution. We use biodiesel and have retrofitted the buses to use that type of fuel. This bill formalizes the reporting process with respect to how we use the air pollution dollars.

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

How much money do you collect every year?

**Craig Kadlub:**

That has been an escalating amount. As Mr. Frierson stated, I think this year it was about \$500,000. It all depends upon what the Clark County air quality office collects. The program began in the middle of the 1990s. It was about \$100,000 then. It has been incrementally increasing since then with the growth of residential areas.

**Assemblyman Marvel:**

What is your share?

**Craig Kadlub:**

We get the total amount collected minus the \$17,500 collected by the Clark County air quality office.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any other questions or comments? Gary Milliken signed in to testify, but I do not see him. The hearing on S.B. 60 (R1) is closed. Now we have a work session. Hopefully, we can get these accomplished this afternoon.

**Senate Bill 118 (1st Reprint)**: Requires the State Environmental Commission to adopt regulations relating to the handling and storage of certain quantities of mercury. (BDR 40-209)

**Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).] Senator Titus brought it to our attention that this was mentioned in the Senate. The State Environmental Commission (SEC) wanted the regulation reduced from 1,000 tons down to 100 tons, but in the unit measurement of pounds. They requested that because that is what their regulations are in. The amendment changes only the unit measurement from tons to pounds. It is still the same equivalent amount.

**Chair Claborn:**

They only created this amendment so that they could be consistent with their regulations. Is that correct?

**Jennifer Ruedy:**

That is correct.

**Chair Claborn:**

Is there any discussion? [There was none.] I will accept a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 118 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chair Claborn:**

Ms. Ruedy.

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

**Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).]



**Chair Claborn:**

Is there any discussion on S.B. 306 (R1)? I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN OHRENSCHALL MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE BILL 306 (1st REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMAN MARVEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chair Claborn:**

Assemblyman Kihuen will you please do the floor statement on this one?

**Assembly Kihuen:**

Yes, sir.

**Chair Claborn:**

Ms. Ruedy, 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.**

**Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chair Claborn:**

If there is no further discussion I will entertain a motion to adopt S.C.R. 11.

ASSEMBLYMAN ATKINSON MOVED TO ADOPT  
SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 11.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chair Claborn:**

Ms. Ruedy, Senate Joint Resolution 10.

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

**Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chair Claborn:**

This is a good bill. I will entertain a motion on S.J.R. 10 (R1).

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10.

ASSEMBLYMAN GRADY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chair Claborn:**

I will do the floor statement on S.J.R. 10 (R1). Senate Joint Resolution 11, Ms. Ruedy?

**Senate Joint Resolution 11**: Encourages certain activities relating to the use of biomass in the production of energy in Nevada. (BDR R-402)

**Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chair Claborn:**

Is there any need for further discussion of this bill? Hearing none, I will entertain a motion on S.J.R. 11.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 11.

ASSEMBLYMAN MARVEL SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Goicoechea will do the floor assignment on S.J.R. 11. Ms. Ruedy?

**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)

**Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Read from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)).]

ASSEMBLYMAN CARPENTER MOVED TO DO PASS  
SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 13.

ASSEMBLYMAN GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

**Chair Claborn:**

Assemblyman Carpenter will do the floor assignment on S.J.R. 13. Is there any other business to come before the Committee? Hearing none, the meeting is adjourned [at 3:01 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:** May 2, 2007

**Time of Meeting:** 1:33 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A	*****	Agenda
	B	*****	Guest List
S.B. 366 (R1)	C	Richard Haskins / Department of Wildlife	Prepared Text
S.C.R. 3	D	Zachary Hymanson / Tahoe Science Consortium	Prepared Text
S.C.R. 3	E	Julie W. Regan / Tahoe Regional Planning Agency	Prepared Text
S.B. 118	F	Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.B. 306	F	Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.C.R. 11	F	Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 10	F	Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 11	F	Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document
S.J.R. 13	F	Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst	Work Session Document