

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

**Seventy-Sixth Session
February 24, 2011**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 1:31 p.m. on Thursday, February 24, 2011, 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/76th2011/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:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Aizley
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Ed A. Goedhart
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Kelly Kite
Assemblyman Pete Livermore
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Judith Coolbaugh, Committee Secretary
Sherwood Howard, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ken Mayer, Acting Director, Department of Wildlife
Elmer Bull, Chief, Habitat Division, Department of Wildlife
Patrick Cates, Deputy Director, Administrative Services, Department of Wildlife
Rob Buonomici, Chief Game Warden, Law Enforcement Division, Department of Wildlife
Richard L. Haskins II, Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife
Maureen Hullinger, Program Officer III, License Office Supervisor, Administrative Services, Department of Wildlife
Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League

Chair Carlton:

[Roll called. The Chair reminded Committee members, witnesses, and members of the audience of Committee rules and protocol.] I am opening the work session on Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3. You have received a copy of the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).

Assembly Concurrent Resolution 3: Urges proactive protection and restoration of the population and habitat of the greater sage grouse in Nevada. (BDR R-214)

Mr. Bobzien, is there anything you would like to put on the record regarding A.C.R. 3? [There was nothing.] I will entertain a motion.

ASSEMBLYMAN BOBZIEN MOVED TO ADOPT ASSEMBLY CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 3.

ASSEMBLYMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION WAS ADOPTED UNANIMOUSLY.

Next, we will have an overview of the Department of Wildlife (DOW), which Mr. Mayer will present.

Ken Mayer, Acting Director, Department of Wildlife:

We have distributed a copy of our PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit D](#)) and a report ([Exhibit E](#)) highlighting the diversity of our state's wildlife. Our division chiefs are here to answer your specific questions. Slide 2 is our mission statement. It reads: "To protect, preserve, manage, and restore wildlife and its habitat for its aesthetic, scientific, educational, recreational, and economic benefit to citizens of Nevada and the United States, and to promote the safety of persons using vessels on the waters of this state." [Mr. Mayer continued to read from the prepared testimony. Supplemental dialogue has been added where it is appropriate.]

Assemblyman Aizley:

What do you put on your Geographic Information System (GIS)?

Ken Mayer:

We put on just about everything you can name. On our GIS, we have our species survey work; our habitat mapping; data layers from other agencies; Ruby Pipeline information, which we garner from consultants; and all other useful information. It all goes on our GIS, so it can be referenced. All environmental work completed on federal land comes under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). For example, if you want a permit for a wind generation turbine, you would have to complete the federal NEPA process for that project. All biological information submitted is analyzed. Then, the feds ask the state to provide them with the state's perspective on that information. If we do not complete the surveys and have fresh data, the feds will move forward with whatever they choose to do. The independent choice, which they will make without the state's input, is not always in the best interests of the state.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Are you posting data on bear, elk, and mule deer on it?

Ken Mayer:

Yes.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Is the posting stationary?

Ken Mayer:

No, all of our divisions provide information and data layers to the GIS, and it is the collective place where we store all incoming data. We encourage our people to accumulate spatial data as well as data for wildlife habitats. In the Wildlife Diversity Division, we have a couple of people at our headquarters, but

most of the people are out in the field. [Mr. Mayer continued to read from the prepared testimony.] If you have any questions, I would be happy to answer them.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I wanted to comment on your statement about apprentice hunting licenses. I rechecked my notes, and to date 148 apprentice licenses have been sold. Also, I wanted to talk a little more about your reference to the 1,500 project proposals, which your department reviewed. Can you give this Committee a step-by-step outline of the NEPA process, which must be completed before a project can be built on federal lands? Even though a project is on federal land, the state is still responsible for the wildlife. Your department gets a miniscule amount of State General Fund money, and most of your funding comes from sportsmen. What exactly is your department's responsibility when you are working with the feds? Can you estimate if the current 1,500 project proposal number is going to increase? With your department's limited resources, what is the breaking point for the total number of project proposals you can analyze, evaluate, and comment on?

Ken Mayer:

I think Mr. Bull can give your more specific information. We have a great working relationship with the United States Forest Service (USFS) and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM). When the NEPA process is started on a project proposal, the USFS and the BLM contact us and provide the plan. We do a wildlife analysis of that plan and provide comments. Sometimes we have to complete our work in a very short time frame, and we are currently operating at capacity. I am not sure we could handle any increase.

Elmer Bull, Chief, Habitat Division, Department of Wildlife:

Technical review is one of the sections of the Habitat Division that I oversee. We are booked out in our ability to effectively monitor and comment on the various project proposals. With the increased emphasis on renewable energy projects, we are anticipating more of these projects being brought before us. We are currently in a triage mode. We take a look at each and every one of the project proposals coming in. We do our best to provide comments, but frankly, right now, we look at a project and determine how much impact there will be on wildlife. If it has minor impact, we rush through it. We focus our efforts on larger projects that we know will have a greater impact on wildlife. For example, in fiscal year (FY) 2010, we evaluated and commented on 103 energy development projects. That was 15 more than FY2009. It is not just the number of projects; it is also the size and magnitude of them. We are starting to see project proposals for solar energy development increasing. The ones we have looked at and evaluated are averaging somewhere between 9,000 acres

to 10,000 acres in size. It is very challenging to be able to effectively protect the interests of wildlife and assure their well-being on a project of that size. It is not just the number of projects; it is also the geographical size of the projects that is very time consuming. We have a staff specialist in Reno, and we have one habitat biologist in each of the regions—three in total. They are booked up trying to keep up with the evaluations. We just received an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) from the BLM that is 1,100 pages long. It is a significant challenge to efficiently and effectively evaluate a document of that size. If we receive any more of these projects, we will have a lot of trouble trying to evaluate them in a timely manner. We do not want to hold up projects, but we do want to protect the interests of wildlife.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Two possible scenarios come to my mind that I would like you to respond to. If the sage grouse is listed on the endangered species, there will be no development. There is the possibility of lawsuits being brought on the basis of an improper EIS. When I hear words like "triage mode" and "at capacity," I am concerned that the DOW is not keeping up with quality data and science, which could leave the final product more exposed to litigation. That puts the legislators, as policymakers, in a bind because we are trying to do everything we can to push renewable energy projects and get the jobs created. If we are not keeping up with endangered and threatened species issues, we will be in a jam. Am I on track with that thinking?

Ken Mayer:

You are right on track, and that is what keeps us awake at night both from being the cog that is slowing progress and from potentially not doing the right thing for the public and wildlife resources. The triage mode is going to get worse.

Chair Carlton:

If you have any ideas on how to address that issue in the future, I would like you to share them with the Committee members. Green energy is going to be the "thing," so if we need to fix something now, let us fix it before we go too far.

Assemblyman Ellison:

When I first met with the DOW, they showed us the plan to build a migratory animal overpass. I thought the idea would never work. However, it has been a very successful solution for getting the deer across the highway.

Ken Mayer:

I did ride along with the wardens, and the first place I asked them to take me was to see the over- and underpasses built on U.S. Highway 93. They said they had not seen any deer going over the overpass. We pulled up and parked, and I saw about 100 deer run up to the edge of the overpass and jump right over the top of it as well as the fence on the other side. They are using the overpass better than the underpass. The problem with the underpass is the deer cannot see daylight, and they are wary a predator might be waiting on the other side. The deer are a little hesitant, but we are seeing more and more of them use it.

Assemblyman Ellison:

It was amazing the number of people who were in car wrecks in that area from striking deer on the roadway. The wrecks included several deaths.

Ken Mayer:

Annually, 250 deer were being killed along that one small stretch of U.S. Highway 93. The Department of Transportation is excited about the use of the passes, and the engineers are taking real ownership of the project.

Assemblyman Livermore:

I want to thank you for your assistance and strong support for Bailey Pond in Carson City. When they had the first fish plant day, one fish called "Ralphie" was put in the water, and people were speculating on how long it would take before Ralphie was caught. It took three days. Do you monitor all wildlife on federal lands? Do the 892 regularly occurring species in Nevada include the wild horse/mustang population?

Ken Mayer:

No. It does not.

Chair Carlton:

We are not talking wild horses today.

Ken Mayer:

They are not in our purview. They are under the Department of Agriculture.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

On slide 11, is that a sage grouse in the lower right-hand corner?

Ken Mayer:

Yes, it is. It is a male strutting.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

I think it is a good looking bird.

Ken Mayer:

Traditionally, the males annually return to the same lek, and they strut and boom to attract the females. Then eventually, the females select a male to be bred by. The mating season ends in late May or early June. It is important to keep the leks from being disturbed. The females go off and lay their eggs and raise their young. They do not just go to one location. They often migrate quite some distance from the lek; from where they raise their young; and from where they winter. This makes the situation more complicated.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

On slide 16, could you explain the acronym you used?

Ken Mayer:

The federal funding comes from the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act (commonly called the Wallop-Breaux Act). Dingell and Johnson, federal legislators, established an excise tax on fishing equipment. Sportsmen pay the special tax when they purchase equipment, and the tax money goes to Congress, which rolls it back to state agencies. Similarly, a hunting excise tax was generated by the Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Act, and the excise tax funds are handled in the same way. There are certain restrictions on the funding, and it can only be used by agencies authorized by the state to be the wildlife management agency. For every 25 cents we collect from hunting or fishing license sales, we receive 75 cents in matching funds from the federal government.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

I do not understand why we are emphasizing mule deer conservation while, at the same time, we are trying to recruit more people to shoot them. Do those not seem like cross-purposes? Why are we doing this?

Ken Mayer:

In every wildlife population, there are ebbs and flows in the numbers. One of the goals of wildlife management is to take the peaks and the valleys and eliminate big extremes in one direction or the other. Within every population, there are a certain number of animals you can take through sport harvest without negatively impacting the total population. Our job is to survey and determine the number of animals that can be safely harvested while maintaining our conservation goals for that animal resource. You can actually harvest does and still increase the total herd size. A lot of sportsmen want to hunt and fish, and funds collected from their licenses and tags are used to finance our wildlife

conservation efforts. It is called the North American Model of Wildlife Conservation. It is used on an international level and based on the concept that wildlife belongs to the people, and through survey work, the wildlife agencies manage the animals in a conservation mode. It allows people to hunt and fish while, at the same time, we are conserving the animal population.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any more questions?

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I did not realize there was such a strong impact on our economy from boating-related recreation. How are the figures on page 6 reflected in those shown on page 15?

Patrick Cates, Deputy Director, Administrative Services, Department of Wildlife:

The pie chart on page 6 shows the overall economic impact to our state. It does not directly relate to the revenues the state collects. On page 15, the figures represent our operating budgets, which are a combination of funding from sportsmen's fees and federal grants. The pie chart on page 16 shows those funds.

Ken Mayer:

On page 6, these figures are not the DOW's. If you look at the citation below the pie chart on page 6, it indicates these figures were compiled by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service in 2006. Nationally, those totals are updated every five years, and an update will be done this year.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Can you tell me about boating demographics?

Ken Mayer:

Since Lake Mead and the Colorado River system have the majority of the state's water, it is where you find the majority of the state's boaters. The vessels run the gamut from jet skis to motorized boats of all sizes. Patrick, can you give us the average fee boaters pay? Most of the boats using those waters are in the midsize range from 14 feet to 20 feet in length.

Patrick Cates:

I do not remember the average, but it ranges from \$15 to \$100 depending on boat size. Most people are paying \$25 to \$35 to register their boats.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Are the boaters coming from Nevada or from surrounding states?

Ken Mayer:

The largest source of revenue comes from Nevada residents.

Patrick Cates:

It is a dilemma for us to see so many boats on Lake Mead that are not registered in Nevada. We are still out there providing boating enforcement and safety, but only Nevada boaters are paying to support these services.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

I understand the DOW has to weigh in on green energy projects to comply with NEPA. Since it puts a strain on your department's resources, I wanted to suggest you enter into a cooperative agreement with the BLM. I am aware of some companies paying the BLM an additional amount to cover their overhead and staff time to complete the NEPA process for them. Using the BLM services speeds up the process and moves the project forward faster. A lot of these companies hire environmental consultants to prepare the projects because their objective is energy development and sales, not conservation. With the current format, the proposed projects are so analyzed, debated, and scrutinized that there has not been a single megawatt of Concentrated Solar Power developed on public lands in the last four years. There are a lot of projects that people have filed on land to develop these green energy projects, but very few have come to fruition.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

The consultants who are doing the EIS work for the companies are getting their data from you. Therefore, the DOW is still in the mix. Is that correct?

Ken Mayer:

That is correct

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Livermore:

You distributed a handout called the 2010 Annual Report ([Exhibit F](#)) prepared by your Law Enforcement Division. How do you equate the number of officers to the amount of wildlife and boating violations? Are the numbers increasing?

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

We have 33 field officers. The number of violations is affected by certain factors. It is difficult to say scientifically how many violations there are. The pie charts on page 14 and 15 simply show the number of violations we encounter. If the officers are spending a lot of time focused on a certain problem—for example, dealing with problem bears on the Sierra Front—then they are not spending time in the field patrolling for violations. Therefore, we would detect fewer violations because our officers are tied up with another project. The violation figures vary from year to year. There are not a consistent number of hours focused on any one problem. Fishing without a license is our most common wildlife violation, and no life jacket is the most common boating violation.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Where is the revenue from violation fines shown in this handout?
[See [Exhibit E.](#)]

Rob Buonomici:

By state law, the revenue goes to the state's Distributive School Account. Bail forfeiture funds go to the courts. The DOW does not see any revenue from criminal violations.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Do you know how much the total amount would be?

Rob Buonomici:

I can get those figures for you.

Chair Carlton:

Since all our questions are answered, I am opening the hearing on Assembly Bill 19.

Assembly Bill 19: Revises provisions governing the issuance of certain fishing licenses and permits. (BDR 45-471)

We will have the Department of Wildlife (DOW) present our first bill of the session.

Richard L. Haskins II, Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife:

This is a "feel good" bill that is broken into two parts. The first part addresses changes in the definition of eligibility for a Nevada special fishing permit. The second part is the creation of the interstate boundary waters nonresident fishing

license. [Mr. Haskins read the bill's summary, and he submitted prepared testimony ([Exhibit G](#)).]. Ms. Hullinger, our Program Officer III, is also here with me. She is the "go-to" lady on the details. She will explain the history of this special fishing license.

Maureen Hullinger, Program Officer III, License Office Supervisor, Administrative Services, Department of Wildlife:

Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) 502.077 authorizes Nevada's special fishing permit, and it allows a license to be issued for public or private nonprofit groups to take up to 15 persons into the field for fishing. Back in the 2003 Session, there was a language change made to the law. The change eliminated some language, and it made the license more restrictive on the types of groups it applied to. The effect of that new language was to eliminate groups, such as Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, youth, school, and church groups. Currently, the only school group permits allowed are for disadvantaged or at-risk children. We are requesting a broadening of the scope of eligible youth groups by incorporating the language in section 1 of this bill. [Ms. Hullinger read section 1 of the bill.]

Chair Carlton:

What is the cost?

Maureen Hullinger:

The permit is \$25, and we can issue 2 permits per organization.

Chair Carlton:

Is that for the whole group?

Maureen Hullinger:

Yes, up to a group maximum of 30 persons. It is an annual license.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Aizley:

Is this truly an annual license, which means it would be good for one year from the date of purchase?

Maureen Hullinger:

It is an annual license in terms of our license year, which is March 1 through February.

Assemblyman Aizley:

That is not an annual license.

Maureen Hullinger:

Our license year for annual licenses begins March 1. That is also true for our hunting and fishing licenses. They are valid through the following February.

Assemblyman Aizley:

That is unlike a driver's license or a car license.

Maureen Hullinger:

Correct. Unlike.

Assemblyman Livermore:

With an annual fishing license, the licensee is also required to purchase a trout stamp. Would these groups be required to purchase a trout stamp? How is that handled?

Maureen Hullinger:

It is just the license. They are not required to have a trout stamp.

Assemblyman Livermore:

How is that equal and fair to everybody?

Maureen Hullinger:

With this particular license, the intent is to get people into the field. The stamp would have to be for each person unless the language was changed to allow the stamp to apply to the whole permit for the whole group. The trout stamp language currently reads "per person." We may have to amend the trout stamp language to make it work.

Assemblyman Livermore:

I do not disagree with the intent of the program. I believe it is a good investment to give future license holders an opportunity to learn how to fish. However, I think you should teach them the whole program, which includes the license and the stamp.

Chair Carlton:

Mr. Livermore, would you explain what you mean?

Assemblyman Livermore:

When a license is purchased, it is for fishing. If you choose to fish for trout, you must also purchase a trout stamp. I think you should teach the whole procedure.

Chair Carlton:

Do we require children to buy trout stamps if they get a fishing license?

Maureen Hullinger:

If they meet the age requirement for the annual license, and they plan on fishing in trout waters, they will need the trout stamp.

Chair Carlton:

And what is the age requirement?

Maureen Hullinger:

It is a minimum age of 12.

Chair Carlton:

Therefore, any child under 12 would not have to buy a trout stamp. If a group of children over 12 . . .

Assemblyman Livermore:

They have to be accompanied by an adult. They cannot go fishing on their own without an adult who has a current fishing license.

Chair Carlton:

That is something I think we can address.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I want to compliment the department for the online point-of-sale operation you have for getting stamps. If I understand this program and its operation, you are purchasing a fishing license for 15 children. The group license is an umbrella for the 15 children. Is that correct?

Maureen Hullinger:

Yes, that is correct.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

To resolve the trout stamp issue, we would need to develop a master trout stamp that would cover the entire group. The fee for that could be added to the license cost, or would you require each of the 15 children to get a trout stamp? I am trying to think of the mechanics of the situation.

Maureen Hullinger:

Language could be developed. The purchase of one stamp for all of the licenses might be feasible. It is simply a matter of how you want to write the language.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I want to make sure that the permits are easily available, so obtaining them does not impact getting the children out on the water fishing.

Chair Carlton:

Just to clarify, they currently do not have to get the trout stamp. This program is already in effect for certain groups. We are just expanding the number of groups that could apply for the permit.

Maureen Hullinger:

Correct.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Ellison:

Can you estimate the number of groups who may participate in the program?

Maureen Hullinger:

Currently, we issue about 45 permits annually. Fifteen children are included per permit. The groups could have more than one permit in a particular group if the size is over 15. However, some groups would be smaller than 15.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I like the plan. My only concern is more fish may have to be transferred in to accommodate the group size.

Richard Haskins:

In my experience as a former fishery biologist, the impact on the resource from these groups would be minimal.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Are you going to consider a license exemption for disabled veterans?

Maureen Hullinger:

Servicemen who have a 50 percent service-connected disability are eligible for a free disabled veteran's license.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Could you provide me with a copy of that?

Patrick Cates, Deputy Director, Administrative Services, Department of Wildlife:

I would like to add that we do have a list of low-cost or no-cost licenses under statute for people who are exempted, disabled, Native American, and others. That program costs us about \$500,000 a year in revenue we do not collect. We do try to help people.

Chair Carlton:

Are there further questions? [There were none.] We will move on to the next section of the bill, which requires "an annual license to fish solely in the reciprocal waters of the Colorado River, Lake Mead, Lake Mohave, Lake Tahoe and Topaz Lake." [See A.B. 19, section 2, subsection 4.]

Richard Haskins:

This section of the bill amends *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 502.240. Prior to 2004, we used to require a Colorado River fishing license for nonresidents who came to Nevada and just wanted to fish in that area. The license was issued at a reduced price, so the purchaser would not have to buy the full fee nonresident fishing license. We stopped issuing those licenses on the theory that if they wanted to fish in Nevada that much they should purchase a full fee nonresident fishing license. What we discovered is Arizona has a similar program that they have maintained. Therefore, we are losing the revenue from those people who used to buy our Colorado River fishing license. They are now buying the Arizona permit.

The purpose of this amendment is to reinstitute the program with a fee structure that will be more competitive than Arizona's. We will be able to market our license. Part of the funding coming from the Dingell-Johnson Sport Fish Restoration Act is based on a state's total license sales. This amendment will be a marketing tool and a revenue generator for us. It will give us additional credit to secure federal grants. It will put nonresident licenses on price parity with resident fishing licenses. It was suggested we make it for boundary waters, not just for the Colorado River. The permit would be for all bistate waters including Lake Tahoe and Topaz Lake since California shares management of those with us. With a less expensive license available in Nevada, we hope to increase our sales. It is a positive move to encourage tourism in Nevada.

Chair Carlton:

How will our price compare with those in Arizona and California?

Richard Haskins:

Our license will be \$29. Currently for Arizona, a regular nonresident fishing license is \$48.75.

Chair Carlton:

So is \$29 enough?

Richard Haskins:

Yes, I think so because we get the credit for the federal aid. Currently, our license is more expensive than Arizona's, so some money is better than no money.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Aizley:

What is the total cost of a license to fish anywhere in Nevada including the trout stamp and the Colorado River?

Richard Haskins:

For a nonresident license?

Assemblyman Aizley:

No, resident.

Richard Haskins:

Our basic fee schedule . . .

Maureen Hullinger:

The total would be \$42.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Including the Colorado River?

Maureen Hullinger:

Yes. Arizona requires a \$3 additional stamp for access to the Colorado River system. Nevada does not have the additional stamp.

Assemblyman Aizley:

For \$42, a Nevada resident fishes anywhere in the state.

Maureen Hullinger:

Yes.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Anderson:

I have a question about something in the existing statute. What is an annual master guide's license?

Chair Carlton:

We do not want to do guides right now.

Maureen Hullinger:

It is a license that allows a person to guide people in the field for hunting or fishing activities.

Chair Carlton:

Are there further questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 19?

Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League:

We are in support of this legislation. Both steps are good to provide the department with increased revenues to help maintain our fisheries. Also, it will get more people involved in the sport of fishing, and they may become new conservation advocates.

Chair Carlton:

Are there others in support? [There were none.] Is there anyone in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who is neutral? [There was no one.] I am

closing the hearing on A.B. 19. We will hold on to this bill to give the Committee time to evaluate the trout stamp issue. Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

This meeting is adjourned [at 2:51 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Judith Coolbaugh
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

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

Date: February 24, 2011

Time of Meeting: 1:31 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.C.R. 3	C	Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton	Work Session Document
	D	Ken Mayer	PowerPoint Presentation
	E	Ken Mayer	Wildlife Diversity Report
	F	Rob Buonamici	2010 Annual Report
A.B. 19	G	Richard Haskins	Testimony