

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

**Seventy-fourth Session
May 16, 2007**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Dean A. Rhoads at 3:30 p.m. on Wednesday, May 16, 2007, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Chair
Senator Mike McGinness, Vice Chair
Senator Mark E. Amodei
Senator Joseph J. Heck
Senator Bob Coffin
Senator Michael A. Schneider
Senator Maggie Carlton

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Warren B. Hardy II, Clark County Senatorial District No. 12
Assemblyman John Carpenter, Assembly District No. 33
Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn, Assembly District No. 19
Assemblyman Joe Hogan, Assembly District No. 10

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Shirley Parks, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Gerry Lent, Nevada Hunters Association
Allen Biaggi, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Andy Belanger, Las Vegas Valley Water District; Southern Nevada Water Authority
Steve K. Walker, Truckee Meadows Water Authority

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
May 16, 2007
Page 2

Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League
John O'Brien, Administrator, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of
Agriculture

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the meeting with the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 259.

ASSEMBLY BILL 259 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing wildlife.
(BDR 45-100)

ASSEMBLYMAN JERRY D. CLABORN (Assembly District No. 19):

Assembly Bill 259 requires the Nevada Department of Wildlife to provide a financial report for each regular session of the Legislature to set forth the activity and status of the wildlife obligated reserve accounts, and all other accounts and subaccounts administered by the Department of Wildlife (DOW) that is related to restricted funds. This bill will ensure that the DOW complies with all recommendations of the Legislature's auditor.

CHAIR RHOADS:

They do not do this now?

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN:

No, they do not. If the Legislative Counsel Bureau were to ask for it, I presume they would give us their financial reports. We get them only if we audit them in order to review the obligated funds. We do not receive reports on many of their activities. We have a new Governor, a new director and a new direction for the Department of Wildlife. We want to be proud of our record, and all our cooperative efforts will make this possible.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Does the June audit recommend more accountability?

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN:

Yes, there was a request that the Department correct these problems. We have an agreement with the DOW to do this very thing. There was more to this bill than what you see today. We finally came to an agreement that satisfied everyone with the financial report stipulation intact. We have a bright future as we maintain the system that we initiated with A.B. 259.

ASSEMBLYMAN JOHN CARPENTER (Assembly District No. 33):

This bill is very important. It requires the DOW to make financial reports to the Legislature. They will provide a status report regarding their special projects and how the money is used. For example, I read a report the Department's upland bird program was costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. I still have some unanswered questions about how these funds were spent. This bill is a good first step to better, more accurate financial reports.

SENATOR COFFIN:

There are many changes to the bill with this second reprint. Are we accurate with the Department title?

ASSEMBLYMAN CLABORN:

Assembly Bill 259 began with 44 pages and is now narrowed down to what you see here today.

RANDY STEPHENSON (Committee Counsel):

There may be some confusion because this bill is a rewrite of an existing bill. We decided it needed to be modernized and the language brought up to date. It is not intended to be a substitute amendment. If this is a problem, we will delete it from the bill.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Is this transition language in section 26 of A.B. 259? Does this change the name of the Department? It could read like new language. Are we talking about an amendment to old language, or what?

MR. STEPHENSON:

No, this is an amendment to the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 501.331. It is a very old provision. The changes are being made to clarify the language by today's standards.

SENATOR COFFIN:

Could this mean that we change the sections or chapters of the NRS that are a concern?

MR. STEPHENSON:

No, it does not, because they refer to the Department or Department of Wildlife. The name remains the same.

GERRY LENT (Nevada Hunters Association):

I am in support of A.B. 259. This is a needed bill. The DOW has restricted funds that are designated funds, and State law delineates specifically where these funds will be allocated. There are many various fees and costs, all having to do with state wildlife. The audit revealed the DOW took just under a million dollars out of restricted resources to fund other projects which the law did not approve. The Wildlife Commissioners would not know of this diversion of funds because it is not part of their responsibility. The auditor recommended additional procedures are also needed to ensure expenditures from restricted revenues are in compliance with State law. The agency will then provide an accurate and complete report at each session of the Legislature.

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 259. We will open the hearing on a proposed amendment to Assembly Bill (A.B.) 573.

ASSEMBLY BILL 573 (1st Reprint): Revises certain provisions governing wildlife.
(BDR 45-1413)

SENATOR WARREN B. HARDY II (Clark County Senatorial District No. 12):

A constituent has made a request asking for a clarification on one of the statutes. Today, I will address this concern through a proposed amendment I will bring to the Floor of the Senate ([Exhibit C](#)). It may be modified slightly. I needed the opportunity to present this new concept to you. I want to explain the reason behind the amendment; this will eliminate any confusion on the Senate Floor. What you see before you is an amendment to take certain provisions out of the NRS 501.376 that deals with poaching. The statute contains a penalty that is a Category E felony as provided in the NRS 193.130.

In the field, the way things are done now, hunting has changed. There is a need for clarification. The first change would remove prohibition for shooting from a motor vehicle from the poaching section of the statute. Provisions relating to shooting from a motor vehicle still stand. If you are on the back of an all-terrain vehicle (ATV) or in a truck and shoot, you should be liable for the provisions that make that illegal. However, to have it included in the poaching standard is the problem. It provides for a Category E felony. In addition, if you kill an animal outside of the management area or another area specified on the tag, that too, is illegal, but if it is included in the poaching statute, it is a Category E felony. What the amendment attempts to do is to better define poaching.

There is another issue related to this amendment. It is paragraph (d) of subsection 1, to change "In a manner, during a time or in a place otherwise prohibited by a specific statute or a regulation adopted by the Commission;" to "With the aid of any artificial light." I am not sure why the constituent would ask for this change. The bill is A.B. 573. It has some cleanup language revisions and then a provision added for a one-day fishing license.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I do not understand the motor vehicle portion of the amendment. Are you actually saying that people are hunting from the back of ATVs, and doing this is considered poaching, even if they have a legitimate license to hunt?

SENATOR HARDY:

This statute is the poaching statute. There is no reason anyone would hunt from an aircraft or helicopter unless they are poaching. It is appropriate to have this section in the statute. A motor-driven vehicle is different than a motor vehicle which is a passenger-type vehicle. It is included for some reason. The constituent was concerned he might be in violation of the poaching statute if he was to hunt and discharge his rifle while on the back of his ATV.

SENATOR CARLTON:

I do not understand the criteria for poaching. If someone has a legitimate license, how can it be considered poaching?

SENATOR HARDY:

This is true. The bill does not address this issue. It is an awkward way to do a poaching statute. The bill does address game tags issued to hunt a particular animal. We may need to ask Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel, for help with the language to accomplish the proposed amendment changes. There are several things that could occur. There are statutes about firing a rifle from the back of the motor-driven vehicle which we are not changing. For example, if while teaching someone how to hunt, a mistake is made during training in which a rifle is discharged from a moving vehicle and an animal is killed, that person could still be subject to a misdemeanor. This will not change.

MR. STEPHENSON:

The existing language reads that you cannot hunt game through the use of aircraft, helicopter or motor-driven vehicles in violation of this particular section

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
May 16, 2007
Page 6

of the statute. We can discuss this later as to what we are clarifying in regard to the bill.

CHAIR RHOADS:

It would be good for you to work with Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel, to clarify the language of the amendment. We will now open the work session. We will begin with the hearing on A.B. 42.

ASSEMBLY BILL 42: Authorizes the State Department of Agriculture to accept and make certain grants. (BDR 50-634)

SUSAN SCHOLLEY (Committee Policy Analyst):

The bill was submitted by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture and Mining on behalf of the State Department of Agriculture. It relates to authorizing the Department to accept gift grants and donations or contributions from any source. The measure authorizes the Department to make grants or subgrants to the entities listed there. Please note the grant authority does not apply to the revolving account for agriculture, working capital and the plant industry program which already has grant-making authority.

SENATOR MCGINNESS MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 42.

SENATOR COFFIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR SCHNEIDER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 115.

ASSEMBLY BILL 115 (1st Reprint): Enacts provisions governing mines (BDR 46-858)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

The bill was sponsored by Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie. It requires the Division of Industrial Relations in the Department of Business and Industry to adopt regulations for mine health and safety. The regulations must be adopted no later

than June 30, 2009. The bill also directs the State Environmental Commission to adopt by regulations, fees to be imposed on mines that have the potential to emit mercury. The fees must be sufficient to add two full-time compliance personnel to the mercury air-emissions control program. The regulations must be adopted by the end of 2007.

CHAIR RHOADS:

The mining companies have agreed with this bill.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

I understand that all parties have come to an agreement with this bill. I have a problem with the fees that will provide for the full-time personnel. Does this mean, next time when there is a need, there will be an increase in fees to add more people, or will we add fines to do this? This is my main concern with the bill.

CHAIR RHOADS:

It is a possibility. The mining industry has thoroughly reviewed the bill. The Department of Business and Industry has also scrutinized the bill.

SENATOR COFFIN:

We may have to increase the fees later on. We may need more personnel, depending on how we comply with the mercury emissions regulations. What must not happen is a lack of enforcement. Increased fees may be necessary.

ALLEN BIAGGI (Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

Since their regulations first began in 1989, we have had a long relationship with the mining industry. Our programs are fully funded by the mining industry through fees assessed to them. We work closely with them when there are fee increases. We are judicious with these fee changes. When we do have a fee, increasing it is only with the concurrence of the mining industry.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Regarding mercury and emissions programs, are we leaders in the nation with our regulation policies?

MR. BIAGGI:

Yes, this is correct. In 2001, we put in place a voluntary program to control mercury emissions for the mining industry. This past year it has become a mandatory program. It is the only program like this in the country. We are moving forward with additional legislation during this Session to further enhance efforts towards less mercury emissions for Nevada.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

Are all the lakes and rivers in Nevada polluted by mercury? I know the Carson River is polluted because of the mining activity in the Comstock. Are there others, as well?

MR. BIAGGI:

Yes, you are correct. The Carson River site is Nevada's only Superfund site. It is a direct result of the Washoe process from Comstock mining during the 1850s, 1860s and 1870s. We have other streams and water bodies within Nevada that recently had mercury consumption advisories placed on them. It remains to be seen where the sources of mercury came from. We are in a highly mineralized area and mercury is typically associated with gold, silver and other metal deposits. There is a global mercury pool that circles the globe. Mercury is ubiquitous to the environment from both natural and manmade sources. We will continue to study its effects in Nevada.

SENATOR MCGINNESS:

This could very well be natural sources within the state. As Russell Fields said, "We have gold, therefore we have mercury."

SENATOR COFFIN:

It was mentioned that these fees are not established unless the mining industry is in concurrence. We do have to consider that though they pay the bill, we would not always have their concurrence. We may have to increase these fees to pay for things we need for public protection. Mining might not always agree with these increased fees.

MR. BIAGGI:

This is correct. It is a possibility that we would not be in concurrence with the mining industry. If there is a public health issue or an environmental concern, then we would find other means to pay for the mercury emissions inspections and other needed services.

SENATOR COFFIN:

It is definitely a public health issue. It is true that mercury is part of the atmosphere during the mining process. It is not the same as the old quicksilver that came down from the Washoe. This is a different set of problems.

MR. BIAGGI:

Yes, this is correct. My reference is that the mining industry recognizes a public health and environmental concern as well. They are willing to provide the resources necessary to address the situation. I have considered the day when the mining industry would not agree with requests for fees or perhaps not be able financially to respond to these concerns. We would still move forward with public health and environmental concerns, finding the resources needed for funding.

SENATOR COFFIN:

It is a known fact that we get mercury from fish. We know we can receive it from the depths of the ocean. Tuna is one example. Has there been a mercury comparison made to the amount of mercury found in fish from the ocean to fish found in Nevada's lakes and rivers? Do we have a similar amount of mercury, more or less to canned tuna?

MR. BIAGGI:

The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) and the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) have health-based advisories and limitations on the edible portions of fish. This information is the basis with which we in the Health Division of the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Wildlife establish our consumption advisories. For example, the Carson River, over a decade ago was determined to have fish that exceeded safe levels of mercury for consumption by children, for pregnant women and other individuals with health issues. Consequently, a food advisory was issued according to the national FDA and EPA guidelines.

SENATOR COFFIN:

I still would like to know how the mercury content in fish from the lakes and rivers of Nevada compares to fish from the ocean.

MR. BIAGGI:

Tuna from the ocean has some elevated levels of mercury, but it does not exceed the FDA limitations. Most of the bodies of water in Nevada are below

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
May 16, 2007
Page 10

the FDA limitations as well. The exceptions are the Carson River and several other recent mercury advisories we have discovered.

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 115.

SENATOR COFFIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR SCHNEIDER WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 331.

ASSEMBLY BILL 331 (1st Reprint): Makes various changes relating to the conservation of water. (BDR 48-915)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

Assembly Bill 331 declares it is the policy of the State to encourage water suppliers to establish water rates that maximize water conservation. Additionally, water conservation plans must contain an estimate of the amount of gallons of water per person per day that will be conserved each year as a result of the conservation measures in the plan. To the extent that it is practicable, the state engineer will provide links to the various water conservation plans on the engineer's Internet Website. Amendments are proposed as suggested in the mock-up (Exhibit D). A request was made by several water suppliers during the hearing on the bill to delete the "gallons of water per person per day" element of the bill and require only the estimated water conserved for the overall plan.

ASSEMBLYMAN JOE HOGAN (Assembly District No. 10):

I have not seen the amendment. From the public's point of view, there is a considerable advantage to have water conservation listed in terms of gallons of water per person per day. The alternative would tend to be in gross gallons of water saved. Most of us cannot visualize the size of the pool of water when it is described as some huge amount of water. We can understand, for example, if the customer has been using 270 gallons of water per person per day, and with the new pricing structure, water-use estimates could bring the numbers down to

235 gallons of water per person per day over a period of years. People will be able to evaluate their use of water. They will see where they need to conserve. I think this terminology is most helpful for public awareness.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Do you have a problem with the amendment? Would you prefer that the portion of A.B. 331 which states, "gallons of water per person per day," remain in the bill?

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN:

Yes, I prefer that the bill continue to read gallons of water per person per day.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I think Assemblyman Hogan makes a good point. In the context of the individual user, when the water bill is received, the customer can see how much water is being used. This will lead to conservation. I agree with Assemblyman Hogan's analysis.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Committee, do you want the bill to remain unchanged?

SENATOR CARLTON:

During the Committee hearing on this bill, we were trying our best to find a simple way to handle this issue. The graph printed on the water bill and the information flyers are helpful to the public. They can evaluate their individual water use. I believe this is the clearest way to get the public to understand the importance of water conservation.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Are you satisfied with the term, gallons of water per person per day?

SENATOR CARLTON:

No, I think it is more confusing. I think the language is clearer when you look at it in conjunction with the information that is already provided on the water bill.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 331.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CARLTON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

SENATOR COFFIN:

I am confused. Is the motion on the original A.B. 331 or the amended bill? I have one other question. Will this bill affect all water purveyors in Nevada?

MS. SCHOLLEY:

The bill as currently proposed in its first reprint has a requirement that the water conservation plan include, for each conservation measure, an estimate of the water conserved on gallons of water per-person per-day basis. There was a proposal at the hearing by some water suppliers to bring an amendment to the bill that would delete gallons of water per-person per-day. So a "Do Pass" vote means that the term gallons of water per person per day estimate for each conservation measure. A motion to "Amend and Do Pass" would change that to the mock-up amendment. The bill does not dictate what the water rates will be.

MR. STEPHENSON:

Yes, anyone who prepares a conservation plan will be required to comply with the language in A.B. 331. This would include all water purveyors in Nevada.

ANDY BELANGER (Las Vegas Valley Water District; Southern Nevada Water Authority):

From our perspective, we would prefer that state planning have more discretion in how they receive the data. As long as there is a form that can be used to ensure the gallons of water per-person per-day number is applied equitably and calculated the same way throughout the State, we can agree with this bill. If you look at past data, White Pine County's water use was 38 times per capita. Per capita numbers are different. They reveal all water use divided by population as a number that can be manipulated whether you have a large or small population with a large water use. We can agree with A.B. 331 as long as the water numbers are calculated the same way among all the different people who have to submit these reports.

STEVE K. WALKER (Truckee Meadows Water Authority):

I support the amendment. I have prepared conservation plans for both Truckee Meadows Water Authority and Washoe County. The unit we use is acre-feet. That is the unit you see in the newspaper, the amount of acre-feet saved will

give you a certain amount of water for so many homes. It is a very common unit to use. Having a measurement of a volume of water is different than using acre-feet. With a volume of water by gallons, you are tied to something that cannot be visualized. The acre-feet measurement gives you a definition for each home's water use.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Do you prefer the amendment over the original bill?

MR. WALKER:

Yes, because it does not specify a method of measurement to use.

KYLE DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

I have one point of clarification to make. This estimate would not necessarily be on customer's bills, but instead will be in the overall conservation plan that the purveyor files with the state engineer. I support A.B. 331 as written.

CHAIR RHOADS:

The motion on the floor as I understand it is that we support A.B. 331 without the amendment. This is correct. We will open the hearing on A.B. 228.

ASSEMBLY BILL 228: Revises provisions governing licenses to engage in pest control. (BDR 49-626)

MS. SCHOLLEY:

Assembly Bill 228 authorizes the director of the State Department of Agriculture to refuse to issue a pest control license to persons convicted of certain specified crimes and prohibits the director from issuing a license prior to the expiration of the person's parole, probation or sentence. A license to engage in pest control may be refused if the applicant has had a similar license suspended or revoked anywhere within ten years of submitting the application for license.

The bill prohibits a person from engaging in certain pest control activities concerning wood-destroying pests or organisms without a license issued by the director of the Department of Agriculture in connection with any real estate transaction.

Based on concerns raised by Senator Carlton, she has prepared a conceptual amendment proposal in consultation with the Department of Agriculture

([Exhibit E](#)). This will be a fresh approach. The current bill, A.B. 228, is no longer viable. It will be substituted with the conceptual amendment proposal. The proposal requires, for new licenses for primary principles who are the managers of a pest control business, to be subject to the provisions of the Department. The Department may refuse to issue a license if the person was convicted of a felony or any crime involving moral turpitude. It would not specify any of the crimes mentioned in A.B. 228. It would require a new applicant of the primary principles to submit fingerprints for purposes of a background check. This would apply to new applicants. There are more details provided in the amendment summary.

SENATOR CARLTON:

This conceptual amendment is a consensus of the Department of Agriculture and my concerns with the original bill's language. This is a first step towards professionalism in the pest control industry. It addresses the Department's concerns about public safety issues. The pest control employees going into homes without background checks and fingerprint verification cards are a major reason why this amendment is necessary. Some of these requirements are not completely new. There are companies in the industry that are already doing this.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Is there a fiscal impact? Is the Department of Agriculture comfortable with the amendment?

JOHN O'BRIEN (Administrator, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture):

The fiscal impact could be worked out in regulation. It would deal potentially with the cost of obtaining the fingerprints. The pest company would bear the cost. It probably would not include the licensing fees, but it would be part of their fee structure. Yes, we are comfortable with the language of the amendment.

SENATOR HECK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 228 AS PROPOSED BY SENATOR CARLTON IN THE CONCEPTUAL AMENDMENT IN CONSULTATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE.

SENATOR CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 285. The bill advises provisions governing the adjudication of water rights.

ASSEMBLY BILL 285 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing certain transfers of groundwater. (BDR 48-913)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This bill relates to water protests. It essentially has two parts. The first part requires the state engineer to reopen the protest period if the engineer fails to act on certain applications within seven years. This measure applies to applications for interbasin transfers of more than 250 acre-feet of water a year.

The second part of the bill provides that a person who has filed a written protest may in effect pass that protest on to their successor for the right of continued protest within a given time. There is a mock-up of the proposed amendment (Exhibit F) to A.B. 285. Page 2 of the mock-up, section 1, subsection 5, of the amendment encapsulates these two amendments. The amendment broadens the successor provision to all protests, not just interbasin transfers.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Will this mean that all protests will have hearings? Does the state engineer agree with this language?

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

If the amendment is accepted, it allows any protest to continue. The state engineer is to be notified of the protest. The State Engineer requested the language in the amendment to A.B. 285.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I have a problem with section 3 of the mock-up. The effective date is July 1, 2007. The standard language should be added. The reason for this is to ensure the bill comes before the Committee in a first-reprint form. There is a fiscal note associated with the bill, tied to the state engineer's retroactive file

search regarding water protests. I would add to section 3 of the amendment, "The mandatory provisions of sections 1 and 2 of the amendment apply only to applications filed after the effective date of the act." This will move the action forward and there will not be an expense with retroactive applications.

SENATOR CARLTON:

Could we have a clarification on the amendment, page 4, line 38, subsection 10 has been stricken. A citation, the NRS 533.365 has been added. To what does this refer?

MR. STEPHENSON:

The new language will be transferred to the NRS 533.365.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I have additional discussion for the Committee to consider. Senate Bill (S.B.) 405 which this Committee processed, and as you will recall, was reworked by Committee Counsel and other interested parties, received a super majority of support from this Committee and on the Floor of the Senate. It did not receive a hearing in the Assembly.

SENATE BILL 405 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the appropriation of public waters. (BDR 48-1158)

Assembly Bill 285 is germane for purposes of amendment to the content of that bill. I propose, with the amendments already discussed, that we also amend S.B. 405 to be inserted as part of A.B. 285. I intend to do this and my reason for doing this now is to do it early in the process so that it does not happen on the Floor of the Senate by surprise. I have had some concern over the lack of an Assembly hearing. The decision to have no hearing on S.B. 405 was made by the leadership of the Assembly.

SENATOR AMODEI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED A.B. 285 AS SET FORTH IN THE MOCK-UP IN THE WORK SESSION AND AMEND SECTION 3 TO INCLUDE LANGUAGE TO THE EFFECT OF "THE AMENDATORY PROVISIONS OF SECTIONS 1 AND 2 APPLY ONLY TO APPLICATIONS FILED AFTER THE EFFECTIVE DATE OF THE ACT" AND TO ADD S.B. 405 IN ITS FIRST REPRINT FORM.

SENATOR HECK SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR CARLTON VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the hearing on A.B. 296.

ASSEMBLY BILL 296 (1st Reprint): Expresses the sense of the Legislature concerning the temporary conversion of certain water rights. (BDR 48-978)

Ms. SCHOLLEY:

This bill finds and declares that the policy of Nevada is to allow temporary conversion of agricultural water rights for wildlife purposes or to improve water quality or water flows.

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 296.

SENATOR MCGINNESS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will open the discussion on A.B. 259.

ASSEMBLY BILL 259 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions governing wildlife. (BDR 45-100)

SENATOR CARLTON MOVED TO DO PASS A.B. 259.

SENATOR COFFIN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
May 16, 2007
Page 18

CHAIR RHOADS:

There is no other business to come before the Senate Committee on Natural Resources. This is the last meeting of the Session. The meeting is adjourned at 4:43 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Shirley Parks,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Chair

DATE: _____