

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

**Seventy-sixth Session
February 23, 2011**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Mark A. Manendo at 3:36 p.m. on Wednesday, February 23, 2011, 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 Mark A. Manendo, Chair
Senator David R. Parks, Vice Chair
Senator John J. Lee
Senator Dean A. Rhoads
Senator Michael Roberson

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Charity Fowler, Counsel
Michelle Van Geel, Policy Analyst
Sandra Hudgens, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ken Mayer, Acting Director, Department of Wildlife
Harry Mortenson, Ex-Assemblyman
Joseph C. Strolin, Acting Executive Director, Agency for Nuclear Projects
Colleen Cripps, Ph.D., Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Randi Thompson, Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy

CHAIR MANENDO:

Ken Mayer will present an overview of the Department of Wildlife.

KEN MAYER (Acting Director, Department of Wildlife):

The Department of Wildlife (DOW) has an overview of our responsibilities ([Exhibit C](#)). The mission of DOW is:

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.

Pages 3 and 4 show the history of DOW from the first State Fish Commissioner in 1877 to 2003, when we became a cabinet-level Department.

We are the driest state in the nation, but we are the 11th biologically diverse state in the nation ([Exhibit D](#)). Nevada has over 892 different species of wildlife, page 5, [Exhibit C](#).

Page 6 of [Exhibit C](#) shows the economic impact of wildlife- and boating-related recreation to Nevada, bringing in \$2 billion a year.

The Department has a nine-member Board of Wildlife Commissioners (Board) appointed by the Governor for staggered three-year terms. There are 17 county advisory boards appointed by the county commissioners, with a Board director and commission secretary appointed by the Governor. There are 243 full-time employees in 7 program divisions. Page 8 shows the Department structure. The fiscal section is in the Director's Office for more control. Page 9 shows the budget reductions required after the 26th Special Session. A graph on the next page shows appropriations from tourism and the General Fund. We are funded primarily by sportsmen because money from native-wildlife management is limited.

General Fund reductions curtailing certain programs are shown on page 11, [Exhibit C](#). The federal government's match on funds increased from a 50/50 match to a 65/35 match, which helped.

CHAIR MANENDO:

Are we using federal dollars? Are we retaining all the possible dollars? Where do we need to improve?

MR. MAYER:

We are not leaving any federal dollars on the table. We do not know what will happen in the future. The dollars from the Pittman-Robertson Act are an excise tax on sporting equipment. During the change of administration, people were

buying handguns and bullets. We saw an increase in the federal excise tax that came to the states. We chose not to build programs with those dollars, because it normalizes over time. We have not hired people, but we have done one-shot things. We are now using all federal dollars that are available.

CHAIR MANENDO:
How will reductions impact our State?

MR. MAYER:
With the available \$500,000, we can continue doing our native-wildlife programs, provide surveys for endangered species and survey those species we do not know a lot about. We want to facilitate green energy in Nevada on public land. Our public-land partners look to us to provide the State's input relative to species. It is critical to maintain our native wildlife by collecting data on those species. Pikas are found in the 9,000 to 10,000-foot elevations. Our folks have found pikas in places where they thought pika could never exist. Further General Fund cuts will affect these programs. The federal government would have to decide what is important and what is not important. Sometimes, there are negative effects from developments in the State. We still need to provide public service for general-wildlife management and the General Fund dollars are crucial. We may see negative effects if we are cut further.

Page 12 shows DOW priorities. When I came, the budget was a mess, and no one understood it. We now allow every division to have its own budget. This makes it easier to see where the dollars go in and go out. We are focusing on improving ways to deal with the General Fund loss by looking for other private dollars or other ways to match the federal funds. Our volunteer programs are important because we can convert the hours into dollars, which can then be matched with federal dollars. There is a list of other priorities on page 13. The deer resource across the West has been in decline. Sage grouse is listed as threatened, but since it is precluded, it does not have the protection of the Endangered Species Act. The Nevada Partners for Conservation and Development program has state and federal agencies working together to decide what the priorities are, where the dollars are, how to pool them and what the human and financial resources are so we can make real progress.

CHAIR MANENDO:
Will you please go into more detail on the sage grouse restoration? Help me understand what you are doing and if there is anything we can do.

MR. MAYER:

We have a data-collection process when we survey sage grouse. During hunting season, we get demographic information. In the Partners program, we are doing pinon and juniper tree removal to promote sagebrush. If we do not have sagebrush, we do not have sage grouse. To work on private land, the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) has a \$20-million program this year and had a \$25 million program last year. Between NRCS and DOW, we are going to have two cost-share positions. This year, NRCS dedicated \$5 million to Nevada for easements. An easement is when NRCS negotiates an easement price with a private landowner to protect a meadow in perpetuity by paying the landowner a fee for an easement. The landowner can then use the land as he sees fit and pay taxes on it, but he will have to protect those meadow complexes that are essential to sage grouse. I serve as the national chairman overseeing all the federal and state agencies across the West on sage grouse restoration and funding. On an annual basis, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will review the status of the bird and make a decision whether to move it up in priority.

CHAIR MANENDO:

Is the sage grouse listed as a threatened species?

MR. MAYER:

Yes, the bird is listed as threatened but precluded. Precluded means it meets the criteria for being a threatened species, but, they are ranked by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and given a listing priority number (LPN). The LPN goes from 1 to 12. The sage grouse are an LPN of eight. That means there are a number of species in line before the sage grouse are listed. They are being reviewed annually. If the conditions have worsened in Wyoming, which has the largest number of sage grouse, it might be decided to reevaluate them. Nevada has about 30 percent to 35 percent of the sage grouse in the world. If Wyoming sage grouse conditions worsen, the LPN may decrease to four or three. We have an opportunity with a public-private partnership to keep the sage grouse from being fully listed.

Page 14, [Exhibit C](#), shows the DOW budget split-plan overview. Page 15 is the budget summary. In fiscal year (FY) 2012, we estimate a budget of about \$36 million, which includes the purchase of equipment. In FY 2013, we estimate a budget of almost \$36 million.

There is a pie chart on page 16, to show how DOW is funded. The General Fund portion is small compared to the rest of the pie, but it is an important part of the budget.

Page 18 shows the functions and kinds of activities in the director's office. Page 19 shows accomplishments, such as adding a deputy director to focus on fiscal matters and supervision in administrative services. Some of the challenges are also listed on page 19. The director's office budget is listed on page 20.

Page 22 shows the nine board commissioners appointed by the Governor.

Major functions of the Operations Division are licensing, operations and sales. The functions and activities are listed on page 25. A private company operates the draw for deer tags and provides a secure environment for the draw.

Accomplishments and challenges are listed on page 26. The DOW has two pilots and two Bell Jet Rangers and a Cessna. Both pilots are licensed to fly both helicopters as well as fixed-winged airplanes. They are both Federal Aviation Administration certified mechanics able to work on their own planes.

Page 27 shows the DOW budget operations. Five million dollars funds the Department. There are 9 positions for administrative support, and there are 28 office positions. Licenses are sold in all 28 area offices. The State Land Agent position, shown on page 29, is planned to go to the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (SDCNR). We will work closely with them on the purchase of our lands. The dollars used to purchase lands with bond funds are being used up. The next page shows how the regional offices are distributed.

The Conservation Education Division is responsible for programs listed on page 32. We have one of the best volunteer programs in the western United States. Many states come to us to see how we organize and maintain. We do not have the money to do general-wildlife education for the public, as we did.

Some of the accomplishments and challenges to the Conservation Education Division are listed on page 33. Assembly Bill No. 246 of the 75th Session was the apprentice hunting license. There were 150 apprentice licenses sold this year, and 5 of them were nonresident. We need to follow up to see how many of those apprentice hunters actually bought a hunting license and took up

hunting. The Nevada "Conserve Wildlife" license plate will bring in revenue for the Department: this will go towards general-wildlife education for the public. The Department is trying to turn around the money loss due to the decrease in the number of hunting and fishing licenses.

The Conservation Education budget is about \$2 million a year, shown on page 34. We are on television and very active in the media. Page 35 shows the positions involved in Conservation Education. The Conservation Education program is divided between headquarters staff and regional staff.

The enforcement officers are Category I, with the same training as Nevada Highway Patrol Troopers ([Exhibit E](#)). Law enforcement functions and activities begin on page 37, [Exhibit C](#). Law enforcement accomplishments and challenges are listed on page 39. Trophy antlers can be worth thousands of dollars which is an enforcement concern across the nation. If we have a human public-safety issue with nuisance wildlife, we are going to respond regardless of the expense. Bears are our biggest problem. The budget for law enforcement is about \$7.5 million a year as shown on page 40. There are 41 sworn officers and 12 civilian positions, including our own dispatcher. We have a contract with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to dispatch for them. Page 42 shows the organizational chart for the Law Enforcement Headquarters. Some game wardens under the chief game warden are boat wardens who may change jobs occasionally.

The Game Management Division starts on page 44, followed by functions and activities. The accomplishments and challenges are listed on page 45. We are proud of the fact that we have put in place the first wildlife crossing for mule deer over U.S. Highway 93. We had 3,600 deer use the crossing, eliminating collisions and deadly consequences. This crossing was a cooperative project with Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT) and DOW. Remote cameras allow us to see the deer.

This year, we cleared 4,300 acres of pinion and juniper trees that had taken over meadows and sagebrush. We have an active radio call-in program that allows us to monitor over 7,000 male sage grouse. The males strut during the reproductive process to attract the females. They are very sensitive to disturbance, so we want to direct development away from those areas during reproduction time. We do a lot of wildlife-survey work from helicopter. We have a wildlife veterinarian who is working on a wildlife-disease program. We do not

have regulatory authority, but we can provide information. We would like to front-load that information at the beginning of construction projects so developers can select areas that do not have negative environmental effects. This would enable them to save money by not having to quit production due to disturbing endangered species. Page 47 shows monies spent on game management. Page 48 shows 29 positions. Game and habitat offices used to be together. We separated them to focus on habitat. They work together closely but are split in two divisions. The Game Management chart is shown on page 49. Headquarters' staffs include mule deer specialists, predator management, a waterfowl specialist and a supervising biologist in each office.

Page 50 starts the Fisheries Management Division functions and activities. We planted 1,732,437 trout last year. Other accomplishments and challenges are listed on page 52. My emphasis is on urban ponds that allow fishing opportunities for children and families. Fish hatcheries are closing and there is a decline in fishing licenses. The fisheries management expenditures are found on page 53. They are close to the \$7-million level. Page 55 shows a chart of headquarter staff specialists and regional programs with supervising biologists and field staff. There is a hatchery-rearing station with fish culturists that supervise the hatcheries statewide, shown on page 56.

Page 57 starts the Wildlife Diversity Program that has the "Nevada's Wildlife Action Plan" and other functions listed. Accomplishments and challenges are found on page 59. Our "Nevada's Wildlife Action Plan" has been recognized nationally as one of the finest and has been used as an example. We are active in monitoring and implementing conservation actions for endangered species and other species of conservation priority. We completed 80 different geographical information system (GIS) data analysis projects.

CHAIR MANENDO:

How do you gather that GIS data?

MR. MAYER:

The GIS data come from a variety of sources. We take map-based information, or maybe some of our own studies, or studies from other agencies for which we have confirmed the accuracy. We have it digitized and place a layer in our GIS. People also come to us with sightings.

CHAIR MANENDO:

Are you able to obtain all the data you need?

MR. MAYER:

People know that we are there and are coming to us. I feel confident we have a handle on the reliable data that is available. We link with other agencies that have their GIS layers, especially the federal side. Do you have something specific in mind?

CHAIR MANENDO:

Do you have the funding necessary to do what you need to do?

MR. MAYER:

Right now we do have the funding to do what we need to do. Further cuts will affect programs like the GIS. Page 60 shows \$2 million a year for the Diversity Program with 16 positions. We have three of those positions at headquarters and the rest are in the regions.

The Habitat Division functions and activities start on page 63. Mining companies pay a fee to support some positions with DOW because we do a lot of environmental work for them. We have 150,000 acres in a wildlife-management area complex scattered around the state for habitat restoration. We are active in rebuilding guzzlers and making sure wildlife have water. The biggest challenge is to keep pace reviewing impact on wildlife. The habitat program is about \$4.7 million a year as shown on page 66. The 32 statewide positions are shown on page 67. Most of the staff are located throughout the three regions. The Habitat Division Wildlife Management Area is shown on page 69.

CHAIR MANENDO:

If energy project directors ask, do you have the ability to respond properly regarding data?

MR. MAYER:

Yes, they do ask, and we are maxed out. We are going to triage some of it by working on the biggest and the most important ones. If they keep stacking up, it will delay the time when we can provide the information. I am not sure what that means to the federal side of the permitting process. We are going to need some help. We do not have the staff to provide it.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 2011
Page 9

CHAIR MANENDO:

It sounds as if you need help. We need to write a letter to our federal delegation. Is that something we can do?

MR. MAYER:

If we put our heads together, maybe there is something we can do.

CHAIR MANENDO:

Maybe you can work with our staff.

SENATOR LEE:

How does the State receive money from the Dingell-Johnson Act (Federal Aid in Sport Fish Restoration), and why do they get it?

MR. MAYER:

Dingell-Johnson is the fishery side of it. There is an excise tax on the fishing equipment that people buy, like the excise tax on hunting equipment. The money flows into the federal government from those tax sources. Then it is rolled back to the states and apportioned in accordance with the size of the state's hunting and fishing numbers available.

CHAIR MANENDO:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 119.

SENATE BILL 119: Revises provisions governing the Agency for Nuclear Projects. (BDR 40-249)

SENATOR DAVID R. PARKS (CLARK County Senatorial District No. 7):

We have three bills recommended from the Legislative Committee on High-Level Radioactive Waste (LCHLRW). Former Assemblyman Harry Mortenson was the chair of the LCHLRW and will speak on recommendations in S.B. 119.

HARRY MORTENSON (Ex-Assemblyman):

My comments apply to S.B. 119, S.B. 120 and S.B. 121. These three bills were passed unanimously by the LCHLRW. My impetus as chairman at that time was to assure that the Agency for Nuclear Projects (Agency), the Committee and the Commission on Nuclear Projects (Commission) would not go away, because it looked like the Nuclear Waste Repository (Yucca Mountain) was comatose. Yucca Mountain is not dead. The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) made the

decision not to support their application to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission for a license. Several states have challenged the DOE on that issue, saying DOE could not do that. If those states win their suit, Yucca Mountain will be back with a vengeance. That is one reason not to diminish the three entities on nuclear and radioactive waste.

[SENATE BILL 120](#): Revises provisions governing the Committee on High-Level Radioactive Waste. (BDR 40-248)

[SENATE BILL 121](#): Revises provisions governing the Commission on Nuclear Projects. (BDR 40-250)

There are problems with the nuclear age in our State. These problems should be monitored and investigated, and that is what these three entities do.

I would like to read something from the Legal Division that was created on my behalf.

Whereas, the Armed Forces of the United States have conducted military exercises in multiple geographic regions of Nevada using ammunition, weaponry and other military equipment that were composed, in part, by depleted uranium, a high-density radioactive material ... much of which remains as radioactive debris in the Nevada landscape I am condensing this, by the way.

Whereas, the [Nevada] Test Site was established by the federal government in 1950, and from 1951 until 1992, the federal government conducted 100 nuclear tests and 828 underground nuclear tests, which resulted in 1,021 nuclear devices. Each detonation of a nuclear device at the Test Site produced nuclear fallout consisting of hundreds of different radioactive isotopes and left behind vast quantities of radioactive material, waste debris, including millions of curies of uranium, thorium, iodine, cobalt, tritium, plutonium and other radionuclides. Therefore, the detonation of nuclear devices in the atmosphere caused millions of curies of radioisotopes to be dispersed over a large geographical area of Nevada. Approximately one-third of the underground nuclear tests were conducted directly in aquifers and other underground tests were conducted above the water table.

Whereas, the United States Department of Energy has estimated that nuclear testing has left behind more than 300 million curies of radionuclides, making the Test Site one of the most radioactive contaminated places in the United States. Since 1961, Area 5 and Area 3 within the test site have been primary storage and disposal sites for the federal government for low-level and mixed-radioactive waste. Mixed means hazardous waste and radioactive waste.

Therefore, the Test Site continues to be used for activities of nuclear-weapons testing, including, without limitation, hazardous chemical spills. ... Whereas, the aforementioned activities of the federal government have had a deleterious effect on the environment of this State and have resulted in contamination on surface and subsurface groundwater and aquifers of a large geographic area ...

I just read part of Senate Concurrent Resolution 2.

SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION 2: Directs certain state agencies to investigate whether the State could potentially receive compensation from the Federal Government for environmental contamination in Nevada as a result of certain military exercises, nuclear weapons testing and other activities conducted by the Federal Government in Nevada, (BDR R-247)

My point is that there are an awful lot of things that need to be looked at. Depleted uranium is a particularly egregious material. There is one report that lists the disability rate of veterans that were exposed to depleted uranium. In World War I, only 5 percent of the soldiers were permanently and medically disabled. In Vietnam it was 10 percent. But in the first Gulf War, which had considerable exposure to depleted uranium, it's over 50 percent. There were more than 500,000 soldiers there and more than 300,000 are permanently disabled and this is attributed by many people to depleted uranium contamination. ... I was looking into this for a very short time and have very little knowledge of it, but it's very interesting, some of the things that I've come up with.

The Sierra Army Depot has been destroying vast amounts of material, and it is feared that depleted uranium and chemical substances contaminate the Paiute Tribe at Pyramid Lake. This is off of the [Nevada] Test Site. We have areas [where] two nuclear detonations took place off of the Test Site. Are they contamination problems at this point, or have they been carefully monitored? These are things that I believe the continuing committee, which will be renamed the Radioactive and Hazardous Waste Committee, should continue to look into ... So, that was my impetus in trying to maintain these three entities that do study this kind of material.

The three bills cover the three entities. The LCHLRW decided to change its name to increase its purview on what it can investigate. In addition to high-level radioactive waste, it would be able to look at all types of radioactive waste in the State. It would also be able to look at hazardous waste. It might only look at hazardous waste if there were a tremendous problem, like the PEPCON explosion. I have assured the new head of the Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, that her territory is not being invaded, but the Commission can be available as a tool for her. She would be consulted if a problem with hazardous waste were discovered. We introduced S.B. 120 to address that. Senate Bill 119 and S.B. 121 increase the purview of the Agency for Nuclear Projects Agency. Last Session, Executive Director Breslow testified it could be possible for the federal government to pay penalties for the contamination that has occurred in this State.

JOSEPH C. STROLIN (Acting Executive Director, Agency for Nuclear Projects):
The Agency is not looking to expand its role or territory. The bill codifies what the Agency has been doing. The existing statute is broad enough to allow us to do what is encompassed in the new language. It is more specific than the materials we can cover. We have been working on low-level waste transportation with the Nevada Test Site issues, including contamination. There is a conflict between S.B. 119 and S.B. 121. In S.B. 119, section 2 continues the definition of radioactive waste that currently exists for the Commission. Senate Bill 121 changes that definition in the Commission statute. You do not need section 2 of S.B. 119 if you enact the changes in S.B. 121. Other than the problem with section 2 in S.B. 119, we take no position on the bill. We support S.B. 119 because it supports the work the Agency has been doing the last number of years.

COLLEEN CRIPPS, Ph.D. (Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

The Division of Environmental Protection (DEP) is neutral on S.B. 120, ([Exhibit F](#)). The bill changes the name of the Committee on High-Level Nuclear Waste, to the Committee on Radioactive Waste and Hazardous Waste. Based on the discussions at the Nuclear Waste Committee's last meeting, I understood there was an interest in expanding the Committee's purview from high-level radioactive waste to include low-level radioactive waste. The bill does that, but it also adds the definition of hazardous waste from *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 459. This definition includes all industrial chemicals that are specifically listed by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) as hazardous waste as well as those considered radioactive, corrosive, ignitable or toxic. As drafted, this bill will bring all the State's hazardous waste generation treatment, storage disposal and recycling and transportation under the purview of the Committee. Hazardous waste was being included because of an interest in having a committee available to deal with catastrophic events such as the Henderson, Nevada PEPCON explosion that occurred in 1988. The ability to deal with similar events in the future was already considered by the Legislature in the aftermath of the PEPCON explosion. As part of the legislation adopted in 1991, requiring the regulation of highly-hazardous substances, the Legislature also required, in NRS 459.3864, the Governor to appoint a committee to oversee the management of risks when there is an accident that poses a significant danger to public health and safety. That Committee, the Committee to Oversee the Management of Risks is charged with performing a comprehensive review of the degree of compliance at the facility where the accident occurred, the adequacy of existing laws, regulations and standards and the adequacy of emergency-response efforts. It must also publish a final report, including its review and recommendations. The DEP has successfully regulated these types of facilities for two decades, including working with the Legislature to amend the statute in 1999 to add explosives and manufacturing to the list of regulated industries. This process is working, and with amendments to the current law, DEP has been able to address new concerns with industries that were not originally included in the legislation.

Senate Bill 120, section 1, subsection 1, proposes to change the name of the Committee. Section 2, subsection 8 would not require DEP to prepare and provide semiannual written reports on hazardous waste to the Committee. We would be happy to work with any committee established by the Legislature, but

it is important for me to know what the fiscal and resource impacts will be on my agency.

SENATOR PARKS:

Have you or members of your agency thought of a revised name for your committee if you delete the hazardous materials?

MS. CRIPPS:

Our suggestion would be to delete "hazardous waste" and the definition of hazardous waste in that bill.

MR. MORTENSON:

The LCHLRW is regulatory. The Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining is a policy group and will never tell the LCHLRW what they should look at unless there is a change in the law. The chair of the LCHLRW has complete authority to look at hazardous waste and the LCHLRW can ignore all hazardous materials.

The LCHLRW can come to the Legislature to get attention anytime they feel there are problems in the *Nevada Revised Statutes*.

RANDI THOMPSON (Nevadans 4 Carbon Free Energy):

I have been actively lobbying on behalf of Yucca Mountain since the mid-1980s. I support S.B. 119. I want to see the Agency get more latitude and to take this opportunity to look at the economic aspects of a reprocessing and recycling center at Yucca Mountain. I have an article showing a \$4.8 billion project being built in South Carolina to reprocess spent fuel from nuclear disarmaments ([Exhibit G](#)). We have the technology in America to reprocess spent fuel and can use the money. We have never looked at the advantages that Yucca Mountain can provide our state. I do not mean to use Yucca Mountain as a spent fuel waste dump. This Committee has the ability to look at long-term applications of spent-fuel reprocessing. I would like to amend the bill to add under section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (g), a report to the Legislature on emerging technologies that can reprocess spent fuel and the economic benefits to the State from hosting a reprocessing facility using Yucca Mountain as an interim-storage facility. The group I represent are businessmen from Las Vegas and Reno, none of whom will benefit from building a site like this. All of us will benefit from the potential \$3 billion this site can bring in annually, purchasing and processing the spent fuel. I would like to get a

conversation going on this concept in Nevada. New Mexico, Washington, South Carolina and Texas are waiting to see what is going to happen to the Yucca Mountain Repository. The price of uranium goes down as more power plants are built. The cost of reprocessing becomes economically viable. Nevada could lead the nation and create billions at the same time. Nevada could create a trust fund by doing this for Nevadans, while doing a good thing for our country.

MR. STROLIN:

There are serious problems amending section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (g) to incorporate reprocessing spent fuel at Yucca Mountain. We have looked at reprocessing spent fuel waste at Yucca Mountain through geotechnical, environmental characteristics, economics of reprocessing and waste importation into this State. Extensive research over the last 20 years proves no basis to expect financial reward for Nevada. The risks for bringing spent fuel into the State to reprocess are greater than the risks associated with the high-level waste repository at Yucca Mountain.

CHAIR MANENDO:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 119, S.B. 120 and S.B. 121.

SENATOR RHOADS:

Secretary of the U.S. Department of the Interior, Ken Salazar, came out with a new classification for public lands called "Wild lands." This regulation could hurt Nevada users on public lands if it is not monitored in such a way to continue that use.

SENATOR RHOADS MOVED TO PROPOSE A BDR ON WILD LANDS.

SENATOR LEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

Nevada does not recycle small beverage containers. To increase recycling rates there are container deposit laws. The deposit is charged at the time of the sale, and the deposit is returned if the container is returned.

SENATOR LEE MOVED TO PROPOSE A BDR ON SMALL BEVERAGE CONTAINER DEPOSIT.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR MANENDO:

Senate Bill No. 137 of the 75th Session dealt with recycling in apartment complexes requiring at least one recyclable container on the property. The bill was changed requiring only new buildings to have a recyclable container. Since no new building is occurring, we need to revisit this legislation if we are going to be serious about recycling. People in apartment complexes have no bins and have nowhere to go to recycle. We need to make it accessible.

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO PROPOSE A BDR ON RECYCLING CONTAINERS FOR APARTMENT COMPLEXES.

SENATOR LEE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
February 23, 2011
Page 17

CHAIR MANENDO:

There being no further business, the meeting of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources is adjourned at 5:07 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Sandra Hudgens,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Mark A. Manendo, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Natural Resources

Date: February 23, 2011
p.m.

Time of Meeting: 3:36

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Ken Mayer	NDOW Overview
	D	Ken Mayer	Wildlife Diversity
	E	Ken Mayer	Division of Law Enforcement
	F	Colleen Cripps	Testimony
	G	Randi Thompson	News Article