

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

**Seventy-Fourth Session
February 26, 2007**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Vice Chair Joseph Hogan at 1:36 p.m., on Monday, February 26, 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 Hogan, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson
Assemblyman David Bobzien
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Tom Grady
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblyman John W. Marvel
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall
Assemblywoman Debbie Smith

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman John C. Carpenter (Excused)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst
J. Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Sherrada Fielder, Committee Secretary
Matt Mowbray, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Administrator, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Michael J. Elges, Chief, Bureau of Air Pollution Control, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Joe Johnson, Representative, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club

Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League

Ray Bacon, Executive Director, Nevada Manufacturers Association

Allen Biaggi, Director, Nevada Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, Nevada Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

Vice Chair Hogan:

[Convened Meeting.] Chairman Claborn will be leaving the meeting early and has asked me to chair. [Opened hearing on Assembly Bill 67.]

Assembly Bill 67: Revises provisions governing the control of air pollution.
(BDR 40-568)

**Leo Drozdoff, P.E., Administrator, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection,
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:**

[Read from written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)) in support of the measure.]

I will now turn the testimony over to Dr. Colleen Cripps, who will provide the remainder of the testimony.

Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Deputy Administrator, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

[Continued reading from written testimony provided by Mr. Drozdoff ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Assemblyman Claborn:

Could you explain the emission credits and how they are acquired?

Colleen Cripps:

It is the amount of pollutant that can be emitted. In this case, it is mercury.

Assemblyman Marvel:

Is the credit definitive in any way?

Colleen Cripps:

Yes, it is an amount of emission you are allowed to acquire.

Assemblyman Marvel:

How much?

Colleen Cripps:

In this case it would be pounds. You would be given a number of pounds and then allocate them.

Assemblyman Marvel:

How do you determine their value?

Colleen Cripps:

They are bought and sold on the open market and there are certain markets that have been created to determine the value of the credits.

Assemblyman Marvel:

I have a bill that is going to be written next week on geothermal heating, and there is a similar desire to acquire credits and sell them.

Colleen Cripps:

This is done through the stock exchange. There is an exchange in Chicago where the credit's value is determined.

Assemblyman Marvel:

What do you think they are worth?

Colleen Cripps:

The total value of the credits we are talking about, in excess of what we are going to distribute, is over \$2 million annually. According to the Clean Air Markets Division at the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as of February, the estimated value of the allowances for 2010 is \$1,050 per ounce. By 2015 it will be \$1,500 and by 2020 it will be \$1,900 per ounce.

Assemblyman Marvel:

Who would buy these? Other power companies?

Colleen Cripps:

Yes, power companies and other states.

Assemblyman Marvel:

And that would be a credit against their emissions?

Colleen Cripps:

They would go to states that have not received adequate allocations to cover their mercury emissions, either for new facilities, existing facilities, or facilities that they wanted to modify.

Assemblyman Claborn:

If you purchased 2,000 of the allotted amounts, and only used half of them, can you then sell the allocated emissions that you did not use?

Colleen Cripps:

Right, that is correct.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

It sounds like you could shift a portion of Nevada's allocations to another state if they were not used.

Colleen Cripps:

We could sell some of the allocations we have to other entities, other power companies that need additional credits.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Outside the State of Nevada?

Colleen Cripps:

Yes.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

How do you arrive at the figures? I am concerned with Nevada's history with mercury. In 2018, there will be 30,000 pounds available nationwide, yet Nevada only qualifies for 224. How did we arrive at those numbers?

Colleen Cripps:

There is a question as to how the EPA actually generated those numbers. There are some states that received an allocation of zero.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

So they are in the market?

Colleen Cripps:

Yes. It is not entirely clear. We have asked the Clean Air Market Division that but have not received a clear answer.

Assemblyman Grady:

In a hypothetical situation, if Nevada sold some of ours, and we were at our cap, the State would require a new company to purchase and sell to us?

Colleen Cripps:

No, there is no way we can change the cap that was allocated by the EPA. Again, these are annual allocations, and we could sell a year's worth of allocations to other companies outside the State. That is why we established the new unit account as we did. These accounts will fluctuate every year depending on how many new facilities we have coming into the State, and how many qualify for the low emission credit. That will affect the amount remaining in the special account that we could sell on the open market, bank, or retire.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

With the credits that can be sold to another state, can they be sold directly from the NDEP, or would they be distributed to entities in Nevada, and then put out in the free market?

Colleen Cripps:

If this bill became law, we would then have the authority to sell the credits directly from the NDEP as the State's representative.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Would that be at the Chicago clearinghouse rate or the rate you negotiate?

Colleen Cripps:

We would have to go through the market to establish that.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Are all the credits fully alienable interstate, or are any credits to only be alienable intrastate?

Colleen Cripps:

We will be able to sell credits outside the State. The way the system works is that we must set aside a number of credits to ensure that any in-state facilities have adequate allocations for their operations, and will not have to go outside the State to buy additional credits.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

This allocation is set, and you cannot move it outside the State of Nevada?

Colleen Cripps:

We can sell some of our allocations outside of the State, but we could not acquire more allocations.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Then why would we want to sell them outside of the State? Although 224 pounds is not a lot, I am concerned that if the State sells them out of state, would we not get in the position where we could not build more coal-fired plants?

Colleen Cripps:

No. These are annual allocations. When we sell allocations out of the State, we are not selling them forever; we are not giving them away. It is a new allocation and every year the pool will fluctuate.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

They could become expensive on an annual basis, and if you are shopping on the open market for credits, they could be extremely valuable.

Colleen Cripps:

Yes, they can become valuable.

Leo Drozdoff:

We know that when a facility is being proposed, it does not get permitted overnight. We also know what facilities are to be approved. We will make sure there are ample credits to bank, and ample credits to acquire, and then look at the open market.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Many of the plants may barely be online in 2018. Do you anticipate that 224 pounds will be adequate to meet the needs of the State, considering state-of-the art plants, such as Valmy, that are being developed?

Leo Drozdoff:

Yes, we know what the needs are.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

What would Valmy's credits be as it exists today?

Michael J. Elges, Chief, Bureau of Air Pollution Control, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

What we have tried to develop is three or four accounts that ensure we have the ability to cover the existing facilities in Nevada. To develop the amounts that would go into that account, we did a baseline study this year, where all existing facilities were tested for mercury emissions. It ranged broadly depending on the facility.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

But they were not zero?

Mike Elges:

They were not zero. The Mojave facility was the largest facility, until it stopped operating a year ago. The mercury emissions from that plant were much lower than we had anticipated just on a size comparison. A lot of it has to do with their source of coal, and if it is relatively low in mercury. It is a fluid situation, and each facility's emission rates are different. The new unit account we have developed would be used for new projects. We want to make sure they are covered so they will not have to go out to the open market. The key to remember is that the accounts will fluctuate and have the ability to grow. They are kept in balance and compared to incoming projects. The concept is resource management and not rushing to market to generate revenue.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

We are dealing with 570 pounds from now until 2017. If we do not use that, it can then be brokered. My concern is if it would delay the permitting process.

Mike Elges:

We have developed a permitting system for projects specific to the mercury regulations we passed last year. The primary purpose was to have an expeditious permitting process in place. We designed it to "dovetail" into the existing program so the projects could move forward. They are set up on a timeline.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I think we have an excess of credits, and we find ourselves with a surplus because of the Mojave situation. Is that correct? When the EPA established a threshold, a cap amount, it was before Mojave was off-line, so now we have a surplus. In recognizing that this is a federal program and states have the flexibility to configure their own plans to be consistent with the federal program, would we be the only state selling credits, or would other states be selling credits also?

Leo Drozdoff:

There is no question Mojave has an impact. It is because the numbers are lower. The reason we have more credits is that we were aware of the new federal program, and were able to anticipate what was needed. We are not in the business of retrofitting, but by knowing the rule was coming, we were able to prepare better controls.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

How many states are doing this, and how consistent is this in comparison with the federal program?

Colleen Cripps:

It is the intent of the federal market to have an open market and trading amongst all the states. Half the states have agreed to participate, and there are other states that have established caps but are not trading outside their own states.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Do we know the number of states with regulatory agencies that are selling credits?

Colleen Cripps:

I can get the number for you.

Assemblyman Marvel:

How do the states acquire the credits? If most of the generating plants are privately owned, how does the State get control of them?

Colleen Cripps:

That is what is unique about the mercury program compared to other federal programs where they gave the allocations directly to the companies. In this case, the EPA is allocating mercury emissions directly to the states for us to manage.

Leo Drozdoff:

We think this came about because there was no other federal funding that came with the program.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Where can we get a description of the program? We have heard about trading pollution credits, but we need direction to better understand the concept.

Leo Drozdoff:

We have information on our website that can be tailored to other uses.

Assemblyman Atkinson:

Could our own research staff obtain the information?

Vice Chair Hogan:

Yes, we can go in that direction.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

We are talking about 570 pounds at \$1,000 per ounce. That would be over \$9 million, correct?

Colleen Cripps:

That would depend if it goes to any of our existing facilities.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Any other questions?

Colleen Cripps:

[Continued reading testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Assemblywoman Smith:

Where is the Governor's office on fines since they are not increasing fees?

Leo Drozdoff:

On the issue of fees, we must be careful and cannot answer, but this testimony has been approved by the Governor's office.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Any other questions?

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I am apprehensive in moving ahead with the bill until I know exactly what we are emitting in the State. I want to make sure there will be adequate credits for future growth. It is being litigated now, and if it is not approved, Nevada would have to come up with a new program. Do you go through the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) process?

Colleen Cripps:

It would depend on the outcome of the court case. What the EPA is being sued for is the fact that they did not go through the same process for the power industry as we did with the mining industry when we developed the maximum achievable technology control program. What the litigants are hoping to do is to get the EPA to move away from a complete cap and trade program and implement a maximum technology control program. There may be nothing left to sell in respect to mercury. For future programs, if this legislation is in place, we would have the authority to use that for other potential pollutants.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

When I looked at the 38 tons in 2010, I wondered if we emit that much or more? Are these only power plants?

Colleen Cripps:

It is power plants. Nationwide they will be able to meet the first cap. In the second cap in 2018, facilities would have to install more controls. The two phases would allow the facilities time to budget and get the controls installed.

Vice Chair Hogan:

For clarification, if the nationwide cap is based only on power plants, but there are other sources, would there be a problem if the cap is only a partial cap?

Colleen Cripps:

In the past, EPA programs have been designed to look at industry sectors for regulation. There are rules they are proposing for cement plants, and there are different programs for different industries. This is the most recent one.

Assemblyman Marvel:

There has been publicity about the Queenstake pollution. Is there any mercury involved in that?

Leo Drozdoff:

Yes. The issues we cited are related to dust and mercury.

Assemblyman Marvel:

How much over are they? Do they have a cap?

Leo Drozdoff:

No. They have a permitted limit.

Assemblyman Marvel:

Are they permitted?

Leo Drozdoff:

We question the tests they have done and the manner in which they have done them. Our concern is whether or not they have exceeded their amount of permitted limits.

Assemblyman Marvel:

And the other is dust?

Leo Drozdoff:

Yes.

Assemblyman Marvel:

That could mitigate?

Leo Drozdoff:

We will work with them over the next 30-60 days to bring them back into compliance. We will put documents together that will explain our rationale and where we are with the numbers, and can synthesize it in a briefing document and submit it to you.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Some states choose not to participate in interstate transfer; what is the rationale for choosing not to participate?

Colleen Cripps:

Part of the rationale is that they want to control their credits and ensure additional reductions, and that some of the allocations are not being distributed around the country.

Leo Drozdoff:

Some states are suing the EPA because they did not do the maximum control requirement. Some states want maximum achievement control technologies and do not want to participate in the cap and trade.

Assemblyman Ohrenschall:

Those states that are not participating—are they following the spirit of the federal law by not accomplishing the amount of pollution reduction they could accomplish, or are they accomplishing more?

Leo Drozdoff:

That is where the judicial action will be instructive.

Vice Chair Hogan:

We have several people signed up to speak in opposition to the bill.

Joe Johnson, representing the Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

I will go on record supporting Section 2 of the bill. Testimony by the EPA is germane and it is time to review the files. I will discuss the fallacy of caps and trades. When you establish a high cap, you can have, like Nevada, an excess of credits, although they are not accrued by implementation of new technology on coal plants. What happens if you live in Ohio and are downwind from a facility operating under the old standards? Can they control or reduce mercury, or can they come to Nevada and buy the right to continue polluting? I cannot see selling the right to pollute to another state. The sale of the credits will not reduce the national caps. The sale by the EPA will not reduce emissions in Nevada. Many other states have not adopted the cap and trade program. You need to ask how many states are actually participating in the program, and how many states are proposing to sell the right to pollute. It is poor public policy to sell the right to pollute your neighbors.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Do you have some answers as to what our present emission is?

Joe Johnson:

Actually, no. The agencies have it in their records and can give you a ballpark figure.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

We have asked for the numbers and thought you had an answer for us.

Joe Johnson:

I monitored the allocations to the new and existing accounts, and my objection is to auctioneer and finance the program from the sale of pollution credits to other entities in the State. There are adequate reserves for any proposed coal plants using modern technology and low-sulfur coal.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Nevada's numbers compared to the national numbers do not look inflated.

Joe Johnson:

They are not inflated, but western coal is lower in mercury emissions. There are eastern coal-generating states with high allocations in the process.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Are there any questions from the Committee? [There were none.]

Kyle Davis, Policy Director, Nevada Conservation League:

We support Section 2 of the bill, but on the first section, it would be an irresponsible public policy for the Committee to endorse. The point is, if we sell emissions to other states, that promotes continued pollution. As a State, we do not want to encourage mercury pollution. This would be a deterrent to retire pollution credits.

Vice Chair Hogan:

If you were satisfied that the cap for the nation and our State were as tight as could be, would you have the same objection or would your objection be because the cap is too high?

Kyle Davis:

The concern is that we are not sure where the EPA number for the nationwide cap came from.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

We need to know what other states are doing in selling their credits. The whole system of cap and trade is complex and my understanding is that you want to create incentives in the marketplace for industrial technology; but what is the impact on the exchange and development of companies in the event the State becomes involved?

Kyle Davis:

I also want to know what other states are doing and why they are doing it. In terms of the incentive to develop cleaner technology, when you look at the marketplace, supply, and demand of the emission credits, from my view you are going to increase the incentive to focus on more cleaner-burning technology and pollution controls.

Joe Johnson:

The issue is that we have an account defined by the division that provides incentives for mercury reductions. If Valmy installs a mercury reduction technology, they can receive additional credits if they sell their credits someplace else. There is an incentive there, but having the state agency take a certificate they have in excess for whatever reason and sell to another place does not reduce mercury emissions.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Any other questions? [There were none.]

Ray Bacon, Executive Director, Nevada Manufacturers Association:

Cap and trade systems do work. If you look at sulfur dioxide pollutants, they have dramatically decreased. It did not reduce on a linear scale in every state because some power plants were constructed differently, and where their fuel came from made a difference. In the Midwest, sulfur dioxide polluting plants were allowed to live out their natural lives, and those states paid more money to get their emissions credits. In Nevada, Mojave was the operation that allowed us to set the basis for the cap and determine an allowable level of emissions. Nevada has more potential for renewable energy than any other state. We have more potential to do more mercury reduction than any other state, and the possibility of having no coal-powered plants at all. What the NDEP has put together is a logical approach whereby we have the potential to make some money and do the right thing.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Any questions? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 67. We have a presentation from the Division of Forestry.

Allen Biaggi, Director, Conservation and Natural Resources:

With me is Pete Anderson, the State Forester and Administrator for the Division of Forestry. We are here to discuss the activities of the Division of Forestry.

Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, and Administrator, Nevada Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

[Gave a PowerPoint presentation on the Nevada Division of Forestry ([Exhibit D](#)).]

We are celebrating our 50th year as the Nevada Division of Forestry in conjunction with the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. We moved this fall into a new office that we share with the Division of Emergency Management, on Fairview and Edmonds Streets in the Nevada Guard Facility. Starting last session, we have continued a reorganization of the agency in many areas. I have elevated Jennifer Byers, our Administrative Services Officer IV, to the Deputy level, as is our Operations Deputy Bob Ashworth, so our fire billing process and other fiscal activities are operating at a similar level. She also oversees our support services functions of the agency, which we never had before. We now have staff who are working on our facilities, equipment, and other activities that were overlooked in the past.

We have three regions. We have merged the western and state office into one facility. We receive an annual consolidated grant from the U.S. Forest Service that funds several of our resource programs. The Fuels for School Program started with funds from the National Fire Plan, and we have one project in operation at the Van Norman Elementary School in Ely. In a few months, the

Department of Corrections will be starting their coal-generating plant at the Northern Nevada Correctional Center, and we will be burning not only fuels reduction material, but also urban waste that goes to a landfill. The Fuels for School Program funding has been zeroed out at the federal level.

In our Conservation Camp Program, we operate ten camps throughout the State. The program provides manpower for labor-intensive projects, wildland fire suppression activities, community projects, and other emergency responses. Our fire management program is the most complex and diverse program we manage.

Assemblyman Goicoechea

I am concerned about the conservation camps and the fact that you are currently seeking experienced camp supervisors to fill 10-11 vacancies. What I am seeing is that the camp supervisors do not have the skills they have had in the past, and we need to improve the abilities of the supervisors.

Pete Anderson:

Yes, there is a high competition for skilled labor, not just in Clark and Washoe Counties, but in the rural counties as well. With the mining industry picking up and doing better, there are people who want to live in the rural areas. There are salary issues we face throughout state government, not only in our Division. We are expanding our recruiting efforts, but it is an ongoing problem.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

In this budget cycle, are you looking for a little parity in your pay scale?

Pete Anderson:

We support the budget as it is, but there are issues we would like to address.

Let me go back to fire management. Our program is diverse and works in all 17 counties. We are involved with federal agencies regarding shared resources and the wildfire problem our State faces. We have a fire management program in each region and our aviation section is located in Minden.

Assemblyman Grady:

Can you talk about your aviation section? I understand you have a number of helicopters, but no pilots.

Pete Anderson:

At the end of last session, we reviewed our aviation program. We had some issues that arose, and also have had personnel changes. We have rebuilt the program from the ground up. We have three helicopters, two are functional and the third will be running this spring. We have a full-time pilot, an aviation

manager, and a seasonal pilot. We have three ships and keep two up during the fire season. We are set with current staffing and are in the final hiring process for a mechanic.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

The only way you can keep two ships up with the two pilots, one aviation manager and one mechanic, is if they were flying out of one region.

Pete Anderson:

That is correct. Our goal is to take one helicopter module to where a need arises in the field. Right now, we can move the helicopter, pilot, and manager, but not the mechanic.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

So you intend to have a helicopter manager with that module too?

Pete Anderson:

Yes, we do. Every ship requires a helicopter manager. We have a pool of six division employees who are certified helicopter managers, and we share helicopter managers with our federal partners when necessary.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I would like to see one of the ships located in eastern Nevada. Is it in this budget to put one there?

Pete Anderson:

It is not in this budget, but we are strategically planning to get one there. We have screened federal excess property looking for another field truck and a mechanics truck.

Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 473, the division provides all risk emergency services to several but not all counties. We have a wide disparity with fire service across the State.

Over the last two years, we have experienced extremely dry seasons, and lightning fires across I-80 and in the north. In 1999, we had the worst fire season with a loss of 1.75 million acres.

Assemblywoman Smith:

Why do we see such a disparity with the number of fires that are similar, as compared to those that double the number of acres burned?

Pete Anderson:

If we have dry conditions on the ground, then lightning facilitates rapid burning of those dry grasses. When we get a lightning storm, we can have 100-150 lightning strikes in a short time. In 1999, we had over 65 strikes that turned into fires in one afternoon. There were not enough resources to respond, so some fires burned for days at a time and grew in size. The 2006 wildland fire season was devastating to the State. We lost 1.3 million acres. Last year, Elko County lost nearly 1 million acres. That fire season cost just under \$10 million for the State. The U.S. Forest Service cost topped \$1.5 billion. We had more activity here than throughout the United States. We rely heavily on the Nevada Air National Guard in addition to our helicopters, and also with the Conservation Camp Crews.

Assemblyman Grady:

Along with the National Guard, do you receive help from the Naval Air Station in Fallon?

Pete Anderson:

Neither Fallon nor Nellis Air force Base is involved. It takes a significant amount of training for a pilot to become qualified. We have relied on the Air National Guard and Nevada Department of Wildlife pilots. Some of our treasured places across the State, such as Mt. Charleston and the Lake Tahoe Basin, are ready for fire conflagration. I also want to mention urban development. As our State grows, people are moving to the rural areas, and as subdivisions move, we will see more urban interface fires.

Director Biaggi will address what the Governor's office is doing on the wildfire problem.

Allen Biaggi:

Mr. Anderson has outlined the problems we are experiencing. Governor Gibbons has encouraged setting up an interagency cooperative effort. We are charged to work with the agencies to put recommendations in place that include both presuppression and suppression activities to stop the fires before they become large fires. Senator Rhoads has been instrumental in assisting us in the rural communities and creating a united volunteer effort.

In 1988 and 1999, the State of Nevada, through the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO), put a task force together to develop recommendations to stop the cycle of wildfires in Nevada. We were charged by the Governor to work with the agencies to put the recommendations in place. We have to look at presuppression and suppression efforts. Presuppression is how we manage vegetation and reduce fuels on public lands. We have to rely on our federal

partners for this. For suppression activities, we have to look at how we can stop wildfires before they become bigger fires. Senator Rhoads will be introducing legislation to assist our volunteer program. We are working hard with federal and local agencies to address presuppression and suppression issues.

Pete Anderson:

An activity that Allen mentioned is wildfire rehabilitation. We are working at both federal and state levels to get funding for state and private lands. Examples would be our seed bank and fuel reduction projects. We have been implementing large-scale fuel breaks to help slow the fire and break up the fuel source. A few of our fuels reduction projects include fuel breaks, fuel reduction with livestock, Smokey the Bear, the Fuels for Schools Program, and volunteer assistance.

Vice Chair Hogan:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] We will not take action on the bill discussed; it will go to the Chairman's work schedule.

[Meeting adjourned at 3:17 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sherrada Fielder
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

**Committee Name: Assembly Committee on Health and Human Services /
Senate Committee on Human Resources and Education**

Date: 02/26/07

Time of Meeting: 1:30 PM

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
***	A	*****	Agenda
***	B	*****	Sign-In Sheet/Attendance Roster
A.B. 67	C	Leo Drozdoff, Administrator, Nevada Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Written Testimony and CAMR Table
***	D	Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, Nevada Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	PowerPoint Presentation on Nevada Division of Forestry