

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

**Seventy-Fifth Session  
February 25, 2009**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Jerry D. Claborn at 1:33 p.m. on Wednesday, February 25, 2009, 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/75th2009/committees/](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/75th2009/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 Paul Aizley  
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien  
Assemblyman John C. Carpenter  
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea  
Assemblyman Tom Grady  
Assemblyman Don Gustavson  
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford  
Assemblyman James Ohrenschall  
Assemblyman Tick Segerblom

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None

**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

J. Randall Stephenson, Committee Counsel  
Jennifer Ruedy, Committee Policy Analyst  
Judith Coolbaugh, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl McClellan, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State  
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources  
Joe Johnson, representing the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club, Reno,  
Nevada  
Henry Krenka, representing the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association,  
Ruby Valley, Nevada  
Walt Gardner, representing the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association,  
Ruby Valley, Nevada  
George Corner, representing the Nevada Outfitters and Guides  
Association, Elko, Nevada  
John Capurro, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada  
Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League, Las Vegas,  
Nevada  
Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden, Law Enforcement Division,  
Department of Wildlife

**Chair Claborn:**

[Roll was called.] I am opening the hearing on Assembly Bill 75 (A.B. 75).

**Assembly Bill 75:** Requires the State Forester Firewarden to submit annual reports concerning fire prevention and forest health in the Nevada portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin to the Governor, the Legislature, the Nevada Congressional Delegation and the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency. (BDR 47-439)

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

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

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

The establishment of the California-Nevada Tahoe Basin Fire Commission and its annual report is a great start. The report details plans and activities that have been undertaken for fire prevention and forest health in the Nevada portion of the Lake Tahoe Basin. I would like to see the program expanded to other essential and threatened habitats throughout the state. There are a number of other wilderness areas in the state where similar conditions exist, but they do not have the same recognition or status to garner the necessary attention.

**Assemblyman Hogan:**

Are you anticipating any difficulties in assigning these additional responsibilities to your existing staff since it will increase their workload?

**Pete Anderson:**

Because of the uniqueness of the Lake Tahoe Basin and the amount of current work in progress there, the report has become the focus of our goal to have all the information available in one place. We will have a compilation of all the federal, state, and local efforts, policies, and practices to control the wildfire threat and promote forest health. From a workload standpoint, we foresee a minimal amount of printing costs, but I believe we can pull the report together smoothly.

**Assemblyman Hogan:**

I echo Mr. Goicoechea. The list of recommendations and findings detailed in the report is well-thought throughout. Perhaps, without too much modification, a long-term plan could be developed from this report for other vulnerable areas in the state. Do you see this as a springboard for that, or do you already have the plans adapted in a different format for those areas?

**Pete Anderson:**

The springboard concept is a good one. If we can get this project off the ground, and see how well it works in the Lake Tahoe Basin, we can learn from it. Then, we would be ready to incrementally develop projects statewide. We would have a larger diversity of elements to consider when developing a plan to mitigate the threat of wildfires and restore forest health in other areas of the state. Implementation of the projects would not be as focused as the work being done in the Lake Tahoe Basin for the last five years. However, we can start in the Basin, and come back to the Legislature for suggestions for the rest of the state.

**Assemblyman Grady:**

I am a member of the Tahoe Regional Planning Commission's Marlette Lake Committee, and have gone through the legislative process with them to establish controls for mitigating wildfire vulnerability in the Basin. We have cooperation from all local government entities around the Lake Tahoe Basin. It is a great first step, and I applaud the efforts being made. I encourage this Committee to get behind this effort. When this one is complete, we can expand it further.

**Assemblyman Carpenter:**

Can you explain your plan to reduce fuel sources, and to provide for rehabilitation education in the Basin?

**Pete Anderson:**

A lot has been going on in the Lake Tahoe Basin. There is a Basin-wide plan, but the regulations and challenges on the California side of the Basin are somewhat different. On the Nevada side, we have been proactive in reducing fuel sources at the Lake Tahoe-Nevada State Park by utilizing national fire plan funds, and working in cooperation with the Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program. The local governments, including the Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District, North Lake Tahoe Fire District, Incline Village, and other North Lake Tahoe cities, are using proscribed fire on the ground in and among existing structures. Using their expertise and knowledge and by working with the landowners, they have made impressive progress and have been very successful in reducing fuel sources. We would be happy to take you on a tour. The Nevada side of the Lake is taking the lead. We still have a lot of issues to deal with on federal lands, and we have to deal with access problems created by the steep slopes and terrain. The California side of the Lake is still struggling with challenges that we have overcome on the Nevada side.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions? A couple of sessions ago the Legislature was trying to eliminate the State Forester's job, but this Committee went to bat to keep the position. Hopefully, we will be able to pass this bill, and provide more protection. Presenting this annual report on measures being taken to help control the wildfire threat in the Lake Tahoe Basin strengthens your position.

**Joe Johnson, representing the Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club, Reno, Nevada:**

Although our position is neutral on this bill, we are very supportive of the Nevada Fire Safe Council and funding for that agency. There are significant appropriations in the federal stimulus package for national fuel reduction programs. I would expect the Lake Tahoe Basin and parts of Nevada that have

existing programs to receive an influx of funds. My concern is the State Forester already has the authority to do all the items required in this bill, so it is simply putting into statute a mandatory requirement for a report. A report takes a lot of work, time, and effort to complete. The information could be conveyed with a letter from the Chairman of the Commission. We support the efforts that have been undertaken.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Carpenter:**

What is the Sierra Club's position on fuel reduction?

**Joe Johnson:**

In policy, the Sierra Club supports the reduction of fuels particularly around habitations. The plan does not always meet the criteria of retaining large diameter trees, or leaving intact areas around riparian sites. Our national policy is to support the broader issue of keeping our citizens safe. The Sierra Club does like to review individual plans, and has on occasion, in the past, disagreed with plans for the Lake Tahoe area.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any more questions? [There were none.] Would anyone like to speak against the bill, or from a neutral position? [There were none.] I am closing the hearing on A.B. 75, and opening the hearing on Assembly Bill 194.

**Assembly Bill 194:** Makes various changes to provisions governing master guides and subguides. (BDR 45-258)

**Assemblyman Peter (Pete) J. Goicoechea, Assembly District No. 35:**

This bill was brought forward by the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association (NOGA) in response to unlicensed guiding, and encroachment guiding by guides from neighboring states who are not licensed in Nevada. Although the bill is long, there are very few changes in the legislation. You will hear testimony from the Chief Game Warden of the Nevada Department of Wildlife's (NDOW) law enforcement unit to expand efforts to solve the problem, and to provide for stiffer violation penalties. The positive aspect of this bill is that it will open a dialogue that will clarify some of the gray areas in the existing statute. Examples of those areas include what is the definition of compensation and when is a person truly "guiding." We need to establish in the record the true intent of the legislation. One question I will ask is, if you are hunting with a licensed master guide and you are a friend of his, do you have to be a licensed subguide to be there?

Section 5 of the bill has the predominant changes in the bill's language. Sections 1, 2, and 6 also have some changes. Some language is being deleted from sections 7 and 8. Section 7 deleted language states: "...and includes the transportation of another person and his equipment to hunting and fishing locations within a general hunting and fishing area whether or not the guide determines the destination or course of travel." The problem with this language is determining who is a guide. If you are just going out hunting with another person who is a friend, are you guiding him? The rest of the bill is existing statute.

There is some "push-back" on requesting a felony for violation. Perhaps, a felony conviction should be reserved for the poaching of larger game, or multiple offenses. The other key language in the bill is, if a client knowingly pays an unlicensed person to be a hunting guide, the client has committed a misdemeanor offense. There are people offering themselves as guides who are not licensed. Like any other regulation, if a license is required, we should enforce the law.

**Chair Claborn:**

My biggest concern with this bill is the felony language. We have to find suitable language to ensure a friend or family member of someone can go out hunting with that person, and not be charged with a crime. Another problem is defining compensation.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

I could not agree more. That is exactly why the bill is here. We must find agreement on the questions: Who is a guide? What is compensation? When are you just an assisting party? We want to stop unlicensed people guiding hunters for compensation.

**Chair Claborn:**

I agree with you. Legitimate licensed guides are having their business cut because of the situation.

**Henry Krenka, representing the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association, Ruby Valley, Nevada:**

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

**Chair Claborn:**

Can you define the term "subguide"?

**Henry Krenka:**

A subguide is a person working under a master guide.

**Chair Claborn:**

Does a subguide require a license?

**Henry Krenka:**

Yes, a license is required to be a subguide.

**Chair Claborn:**

Is it a junior license or is it called a subguide license?

**Henry Krenka:**

A master guide is usually an outfitter, and the subguides work under the outfitters.

**Chair Claborn:**

I do not want anyone who is just helping another person to hunt and fish be charged with committing a crime because he does not have a license to guide. What is your definition of "compensation"? I am concerned that young hunters might be charged with a felony for making a mistake.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

If someone is staying at a dude ranch, and he is taken on a trail ride where the guide points out a spot that has good hunting or fishing, what happens to the dude ranch guide if his client returns on his own to hunt and fish? Would the guide for the dude ranch be in trouble?

**Henry Krenka:**

No, he would not be charged with a crime because no compensation changed hands for that information.

**Assemblyman Munford:**

Are there many dude ranches in Nevada?

**Henry Krenka:**

There are not too many of them in Nevada. You do not need to be a licensed guide to own a dude ranch. You only need a license if a client is after game.

**Chair Claborn:**

Is a contract for services required to hire a licensed guide?

**Henry Krenka:**

Yes, a contract is required.

**Chair Claborn:**

Some of the language in this bill needs to be refined to address these issues.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

I want to point out that many of the issues you are referring to are already covered in the existing statute. It is only the penalty that is being addressed in this bill.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any more questions?

**Walt Gardner, representing the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association, Ruby Valley, Nevada:**

The definition of a guide is in the current law. Most of the language being changed by this bill is the penalties for violation. There is some clarification in the bill defining what is guiding and what is not guiding. You may transport a person to a hunting area, and that is not considered to be guiding, whereas before that was a gray area. In order to be a guide, a person must be compensated. In order to be convicted of a felony, the state must prove intent. Regardless of whether or not this bill moves forward, the existing language covering some of these issues remains in the statute.

**Chair Claborn:**

If I take my brother out hunting and he kills a deer, then he gives me \$100, can I be charged with a felony or fined for that?

**Walt Gardner:**

No, you would not be because you did not intend to guide him. You are going with him; you are not guiding him. In our business, to be a legal guide in Nevada, you have to have a verbal or written contract which involves agreed upon compensation. If there is no compensation in an agreement or contract, you are not guiding.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

In the existing section 8, subsection 2, I would like to point out the language which states: "Each person who provides guide service for compensation...." The intent of this bill is to establish for the record what the definition of compensation is. A lot of money is changing hands in this business. It can cost \$5,000 to \$6,000 to go on an elk hunt. There is a big difference between going hunting with friends or family and going on a paid guided hunt.



**Walt Gardner:**

Under current law, I do not believe it is illegal to go on a hunt with friends or family and split the costs or have one person pay for the trip. It is not our intention to prohibit this activity. This bill is strictly for unlicensed people who are generating revenue by outfitting and guiding.

**Chair Claborn:**

I wanted that point clarified. Are there any more questions?

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I am looking at an excerpt from the handout you distributed to the Committee from the *Montana Code Annotated* ([Exhibit E](#)). The language states: "...if the person purposely or knowingly engages in outfitting while not licensed...." Further, the language in the next section states: "A person or entity that represents to any other person, any entity, or the public that the person or entity is an outfitter and who commits the offense of outfitting without a license..." and it continues: "...for any portion of five or more days for consideration." Is it your goal to have the Nevada statute mirror the *Montana Code*?

**Walt Gardner:**

No, that is not our goal.

**Assemblyman Ohrenschall:**

I like the wording "purposely or knowingly" used in the *Montana Code*. I would prefer to see the words "purposely or knowingly" added to the language in section 9 of A.B. 194. That would eliminate the possibility of people being charged with an offense when they are just going out to hunt informally with friends or family. Would the addition of that language be acceptable to you?

**Walt Gardner:**

We could look at adding that language. In my mind, in order to be convicted of a felony, you have to show intent to commit one, and basically the words "purposely or knowingly" would show that intent.

**Chair Claborn:**

Mr. Ohrenschall's suggestion to add the language is well-founded. It is a good idea. Are there any further questions?

**Assemblyman Hogan:**

Another approach to clearly establish the intent of the bill's language is to look at the situation from a business point of view. It is outrageous to have unlicensed people pretending to be guides. It should be punished to the fullest

extent of the law to discourage people from even trying to do it. We need to establish exactly what actions constitute a felony violation, and exactly what relationships generate it. We are trying to prevent this grossly unfair cheating, and the bill's wording should reflect our intent.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any more questions? [There were none.]

**George Corner, representing the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association, Elko, Nevada:**

I did a lot of the research for the language in this bill. I have more information than just the *Montana Code*, but I included it as an exhibit because it is the only code in the western United States where illegal guiding is considered to be a felony offense. In the rest of the states, the charge is a misdemeanor. The Department of Wildlife has expressed support for the language we are incorporating into this bill. The people I contacted in Arizona indicated they have a bill currently before their legislature to clarify exactly what constitutes compensation. They have the problem of illegal guides accepting paid vacations in exchange for taking people hunting. It is a problem across the West and in the rest of the country. The intent of the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association is very simple. We are requesting this Legislature to make illegal guiding a felony, instead of a gross misdemeanor. That is the sole intent and purpose of this bill. There is no hidden agenda. We welcome the opportunity to work with you in clarifying the language because the problem has been plaguing our industry for years.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

We have raised a number of issues, and I think we need to hear about the problems from the law enforcement officer, Rob Buonamici. On occasion, do any of the licensed guides testifying today have a friend go along on a hunt to help out? Are you careful about ensuring that anyone with you is a licensed subguide? How do you handle a situation where you have a person with you who is just a friend?

**Walt Gardner:**

Personally, I do not allow anyone to go with me who is unlicensed because I am being compensated. I only have people with me who are working for me. If someone wants to go hunting with me, I have to do it when I am not with a client.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

So your bottom line is, as long as you are not being compensated, you are like every other person. However, if you have a written or verbal contract with a person to hire you and your services, anyone with you would have to be a licensed subguide. Is that correct?

**Walt Gardner:**

Yes, that is correct.

**J. Randall Stephenson, Committee Counsel:**

A subguide law currently exists in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), and it does clarify some of the activities that do not require a license. It states: "If a person is employed by or assists a person who has a master guide license as a cook, woodcutter, or horse wrangler...", a subguide license is not required.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

I agree with that. However, it would be easy for someone to say he was just cooking for the group.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any more questions? [There were none.] We will hear more testimony.

**John Capurro, Private Citizen, Sparks, Nevada:**

My family and I are native Nevadans. I have been hunting and fishing in this state for over 50 years. The concept of this bill is good. The people I have talked to have the same concerns that you have, Mr. Claborn. What is the definition of compensation, and what are the other capacities and duties of a master guide? I have often gone on hunts where friends will ask me to go along because I am familiar with an area. In exchange, they will provide me with fuel or food. Those items cost money, and it might be considered compensation. Sometimes, my friends get a deer; sometimes they do not. I do not believe that form of compensation is what the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association is including in their definition of compensation for this bill. I agree we need to get the unauthorized guides out of the business. The licensed guides in this state spend lots of time and money keeping their reputation intact. However, I do not want to see someone who has hunted for years—like myself—be caught in a situation that could result in a possible criminal charge. I do want clarification on the bill's language with regards to the compensation issue.

**Chair Claborn:**

Would you like to help work on this bill's language?

**John Capurro:**

I would be happy to do so.

**Chair Claborn:**

We know what the problem is, and we need to find a resolution. Are there any questions? [There were none.] We will contact you to work on this bill.

**John Capurro:**

The guides, here, are addressing my concerns. We are all in the same boat, and I do not want to see the guides or their businesses damaged. We can come up with suitable language for the bill.

**Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Most of my concerns with the bill have been outlined. When you elevate offenses to a felony conviction, you do get people's attention. We want to ensure the bill is specifically addressing only guides who are in the business, and it does not involve people, such as family or friends, who are going hunting. We do not want them caught up in possible criminal charges. I would welcome the opportunity to work with the Committee on refining the bill's language. I would recommend the penalties remain the same for all types of game since our purpose is to protect a natural resource.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions?

**Assemblyman Hogan:**

When we get in a tough job of drafting legislation, we sometimes create a new problem when we are trying to solve one. We need to clearly define the language without creating other problems. I see problems with being a guide based on a verbal contract with another party. Could we specify a written contract is required for large expeditions, or would that stipulation introduce other complications? Maybe we should look at other statutes for similar cases to see if they have found a suitable method to nail down the intent. The existence of a contractual relationship and clearly defining the occupational term for "guide" would help solve the problem.

**Chair Claborn:**

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

**Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden, Law Enforcement Division, Department of Wildlife:**

The Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association did bring this legislation forward, and we are in support of it. Illegal guiding is big money in Nevada. We are in

agreement that the bill is not directed towards individuals who are out on a friendly hunt. I am comfortable stating this for the record. We have been enforcing this law for years. We are directing this legislation towards individuals who are conducting an illegal guiding business. There are other issues besides wildlife concerns that enter into this. A licensed guide has a myriad of requirements—including first aid training, wilderness survival skills, and background checks—to meet in order to get a license. A client is virtually entrusting his life to the guide. An illegal guide without the required training could potentially put the public in jeopardy. A master guide is also required to have liability insurance whereas an illegal guide would not. The license is required to regulate the business. There is also a myriad of regulations in the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) that address many of the issues talked about today. For example, written contracts with clients are required by NAC 504.685. My suggestion is to provide all interested parties access to the existing NACs relevant to licensing outfitters and guides. The regulations have been in continual flux and evolving over the years, so it would be helpful to have all the related material available.

**Chair Claborn:**

Perhaps subguides could be enlisted to patrol and help law enforcement officers catch poachers and people operating as unlicensed guides.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

Section 6 of this bill does require a licensed master guide or subguide to promptly report any violations. I do not like the written contract requirement. What is the maximum loss of privileges on a misdemeanor penalty?

**Rob Buonamici:**

A misdemeanor penalty would result in a loss of privileges under our demerit system. It would be a 12-point demerit which means loss of their hunting, fishing, and/or trapping license for three years. We would also pursue revoking their guiding license, if they had one, for the same time period.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

That is the misdemeanor penalty.

**Rob Buonamici:**

That is the penalty for a gross misdemeanor which is the charge for being an unlicensed guide.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

A perpetrator would lose his license for three years. I am looking at the Montana Code which states they lose their license for five years. If you are

a guide without a hunting license for five years, you would probably be out of business. Since we are struggling with the definition of compensation, maybe we should require all compensation to be monetary. It would probably be possible for law enforcement to track the money by subpoenaing bank records. Maybe, a felony charge should be brought on a second offense. I would like to see the gross misdemeanor penalty strengthened by making it a five-year instead of three-year license suspension.

**Assemblyman Segerblom:**

You could also add a fine to the penalty to strengthen the charge without making it a felony. Do you believe making the violation a felony instead of a misdemeanor would restrict the activities of unlicensed guides?

**Rob Buonamici:**

Almost every illegal guide we come in contact with has read the statutes and the NACs, and has thoroughly studied all of them. They are looking for any loophole. In response to Mr. Goicoechea's suggestion that compensation be only monetary, we like that idea, but I think we need to tie compensation to a business relationship. By state law, there is a \$2,000 maximum fine for gross misdemeanors. Therefore, the fine is capped. There is an option with civil penalties. The fine could be raised to \$50,000 or \$100,000.

**J. Randall Stephenson, Committee Counsel:**

If the Committee wants to impose civil penalties for engaging in this activity without a license, it can do that. You would simply have to determine an amount for the fine.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

In the rural counties, the law enforcement officers still have a difficult time getting the district attorney's office to prosecute a misdemeanor. I am thinking ahead to all the options this Committee should consider in a subcommittee on A.B. 194. The illegal guides are out there because they want money, and I believe a fine would be a good method to stop them. Have you had any convictions on an illegal guiding charge?

**Rob Buonamici:**

The cases are extremely difficult to make because it is difficult to identify the real illegal guides from someone who is just out hunting with friends. It takes a lot of investigative time to determine if an illegal activity is taking place. When we do find what we believe is a potential case of illegal guiding, additional intensive investigative time is required to make the case. We have to look at the situation from a business perspective. We try to determine if they are conducting a business operation, and if we can prove it. Interviews with

multiple suspect clients and subpoenaing bank records are also necessary. We have had cases where we have sent officers to five different states at once to perform simultaneous interviews with suspect clients. The cases take a lot of police legwork and time. We have one or two cases a year that we can make, but it varies. There have been years where we had none.

**Assemblyman Goicoechea:**

It is a long drive from Elko for the gentlemen who represent the Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association, so I would like to get some more of their input before we assign the bill to a subcommittee. Perhaps, we could specify a felony for a second offense, and put in a civil penalty too. I agree with Mr. Segerblom that it will be extremely difficult to get a first offense felony on the books.

**George Corner:**

I am retired and probably the only representative from the Association that will be available to make multiple trips here for the hearings.

**Chair Claborn:**

Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition to the bill? Do any neutral parties wish to testify? I am closing the hearing on A.B. 194. We are now going to talk off the record.

This meeting is adjourned [at 3:00 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Judith Coolbaugh  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn, Chair

DATE: \_\_\_\_\_

**EXHIBITS**

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

**Date:** February 25, 2009

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

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 75	C	Pete Anderson	Verbatim Testimony
A.B. 194	D	Henry Krenka	Verbatim Testimony
A.B. 194	E	Henry Krenka	<i>Montana Code Annotated</i>