

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

**Seventy-Seventh Session  
April 11, 2013**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chairman Skip Daly at 12:42 p.m. on Thursday, April 11, 2013, in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, 401 S. Carson St., 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 [nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013](http://nelis.leg.state.nv.us/77th2013). 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 Skip Daly, Chairman  
Assemblyman Paul Aizley, Vice Chairman  
Assemblyman Paul Anderson  
Assemblyman Richard Carrillo  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblyman Ira Hansen  
Assemblyman James W. Healey  
Assemblyman Pete Livermore  
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

None



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst  
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel  
Cheryl Williams, Recording Secretary  
Steven Sisneros, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

None

**Chairman Daly:**

Today we have a work session on nine bills. All these bills were previously heard in the Committee. We took testimony from interested parties at that time, so during the work sessions, committees do not generally take testimony, although we sometimes call on specific people to respond to questions for clarification purposes. After we finish today's work session, we will take public comments; however, it is a particularly busy time in the Legislature, so we may end up limiting public comment accordingly.

We will begin with Assembly Bill 168. There is a mock-up amendment for this bill in the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

**Assembly Bill 168: Requires the membership of each county advisory board to manage wildlife to include one qualified member who represents the interests of the general public. (BDR 45-780)**

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the bill and proposed mock-up amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit C](#)).]

I am nonpartisan staff of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and, as such, I do not advocate for or against any legislation.

**Chairman Daly:**

At this point, I will take a motion to amend and do pass as amended in the mock-up on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) which has been agreed to by the bill's sponsor and the parties we worked on it with.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 168.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions, comments, or concerns from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I researched all the other boards to see how many of them required a member from the general public and almost all of them do, so I do not think there is really a problem with this. I would like to make sure the record reflects the fact that when you have counties like I represent such as Esmeralda County or Mineral County with very small population bases, trying to find someone to fit this requirement is not necessarily going to be easy. I want to make sure we have some flexibility, because in many cases these counties have difficulty getting anyone to serve on these boards. Again, I want to make sure the record reflects that there has to be a little bit of flexibility, for these smaller counties in particular. Other than that, I support the concept.

**Assemblyman Livermore:**

I am not going to support the motion as presented. I have appointed people to the wildlife board in Carson City. The bill speaks of ranching and farming. Is that remaining? I cannot tell you that the appointments I made to that wildlife board are any different from members of the general public. When you specifically speak to the general public, I think that can allow a challenge to someone we thought was qualified and recommended who someone later says was unqualified to serve in that position.

**Chairman Daly:**

Are there any other comments or questions?

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I cannot support this bill either because there is no definition of what represents the general public. My colleague from Sparks says it has been done on a lot of boards; well, in my opinion, that does not make it correct, so I am not going to support this either.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I am going to be voting no, but I want to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

**Chairman Daly:**

Are there any other comments from anyone on the Committee? I worked with the sponsor on this bill, and we went back and forth on some of these things. Some definitions wanted to say anyone who was even a member of some of these ranching or hunting organizations could not be the "general public." I said we could not go that far. When we took that language out, we went to the other side, and you cannot really define the general public without

cutting someone out, so there is a group of people to answer Mr. Livermore's concern. The hunters, trappers, anglers, ranchers, farmers—if it is a three-person board—can be two of any of those categories. If there is no farming or ranching person, it could be a hunter and a trapper or people who are recommended by those organizations. That is the way the language was before and the way I understood it. I am just giving an explanation for the record.

Concerning the definition of the general public, we started to try to define that. There was one iteration that wanted to define it as "not these people" even if you were just a member. When you cannot define it on one side, you cannot define it on the other, so it needs to be "general public." The county commission selects that person without recommendation from anyone else, so whoever applies for that position, the county commission is going to make their selection. I hope people apply.

Mr. Ellison is clearing up the record. He is going to vote yes but reserve his right to vote differently on the floor. Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There was no response.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN LIVERMORE AND  
WHEELER VOTED NO.)

I will give the floor statement to Mrs. Carlton.

Next is Assembly Bill 246.

**Assembly Bill 246: Prohibits the sale or transfer of ownership of a live animal at a swap meet. (BDR 50-747)**

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read an explanation of the bill and proposed amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

There is a mock-up amendment for this bill as well on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS) ([Exhibit D](#)). I know Assemblywoman Swank worked on this and I did as well, so I will accept a motion to amend and do pass with the amendment on NELIS.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 246.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

We had quite a bit of discussion in the Committee that this would exclude livestock events, livestock sales, and 4-H groups, et cetera. I just want to clarify for the record that this will exclude any kind of livestock.

**Chairman Daly:**

Our intent was not to affect any type of livestock show, livestock event, or livestock auction. If we have not clearly touched on that or if there is a concern that we have not exempted 4-H-type situations, we want to make sure that it does. Do you think we have covered it, Mr. Stephenson?

**Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel:**

Yes, there is a specific exclusion for livestock. You will see it in section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (a) where the language reads, "The provisions of this section do not: (a) Apply to any sale or transfer of ownership of any livestock." That definition pretty much includes what one would think are livestock which includes horses, cows, chickens, pigs, and so forth. That should also exclude sales that occur through a 4-H club. It does not matter how the sale occurs; it is just excluded from the provisions of this bill, so I think that should take care of it.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

If you are a kid who has a bunch of kittens and you are walking in front of the local supermarket, is that still perfectly legal to sell those kittens? I see Assemblywoman Swank nodding "yes," but I just wanted to double check that.

**Randy Stephenson:**

Yes. How the bill is set up now, the event you are talking about would have to come within the definition of swap meet. Section 1, subsection 3, paragraph (c) says "'Swap meet' means a flea market, open-air market or other organized event at which two or more persons offer merchandise for sale or exchange." I do not know if two kids walking in front of the store is an organized event.

**Assemblyman Carrillo:**

I will be voting yes on this and reserving my right to change on the floor.

**Chairman Daly:**

Are there any further comments or questions from the Committee? [There was no response.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will give the floor assignment to Assemblywoman Swank.

Now we will move to Assembly Bill 264.

**Assembly Bill 264:** Increases the penalty for certain crimes relating to estrays and feral livestock. (BDR 50-531)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit E](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

I will accept a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 264.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 264.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments from the Committee on this bill?

**Assemblywoman Cohen:**

I am going to vote to do pass A.B. 264, but I am going to reserve my right to change my vote on the floor. I think the gross misdemeanor is a big jump. I have spoken to some people in law enforcement who also work in the legal field who agree with that, so I would like to look into that a little more. Gross misdemeanor is a year. We are getting the public defenders involved at that point, and there is a fine of \$2,000. I think it is a very important bill, and I am very much for moving it forward and making this act criminal; however, the level of the criminality is what I am concerned with.

**Assemblyman Healey:**

I will be supporting the bill today, but based on Assemblywoman Cohen's comments, I would also like to reserve my right to change my vote.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I think the bill is good. If I had my way, the third or fourth offense would be a felony. When you bring these animals down out of the mountains, they are no longer wild; they become domesticated and end up getting killed. After telling these people they need to stop feeding these animals alongside the roads four or five times and they basically ignore you, I do not think this is strong enough.

**Chairman Daly:**

Any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There was no response.]

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

The floor assignment for this bill will go to Mr. Grady.

Now, Assembly Bill 310.

**Assembly Bill 310:** Revises provisions governing irrigation districts. (BDR 48-941)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the bill and proposed amendment from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

I will take a motion to amend and do pass with the mock-up amendment on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 310.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions or comments on the motion?

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

The amendment takes out everything but the limit on indebtedness from \$500,000 to \$1 million. All the language concerning the liability for the board members of these irrigation districts who are being held personally liable even though they are sitting on a state board has been removed in that amendment. To me, that removes the whole purpose of the bill. We are trying to correct a mistake from the past where these people were held personally liable even though they were serving on a state board. What is the reasoning behind the removal of the liability so these folks who are serving on these irrigation district boards can still be held personally liable for things that had nothing to do with their personal conduct?

**Chairman Daly:**

Any other comments from the Committee or questions? I spoke with Mr. Grady. I know he wants to have that part of it in the bill. I also spoke with

a number of people. The issue for me is a policy issue. If you just have this type of language about duty of loyalty, indemnification, and all of these things in one area but not for all the boards, it becomes a problem for people in like situations for a variety of positions where they might have the sovereign immunity of the state capped at \$75,000. Then other people will say that they do not have a duty of loyalty because the Legislature did not tell them to, and they do not have immunity because the Legislature did not give it to them. Unless it is broad and covers everything, it is a structural problem from a policy standpoint to do just one.

These people served on the board. The agency was a state agency held to the sovereign immunity but then there were additional claims made based on negligence of the people on the board. Founded or not, those people and their insurance had the opportunity to either go to court or to settle. They chose to settle, so the whole issue around water law, who owns the canal, and who is responsible for it is well settled and established. Those are the reasons for the amendment. Structurally, the policy that one board would have this language is not, in my view, going to work. That is why I brought the amendment. I have no problem going from \$500,000 to \$1 million, so I left it in.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

Mr. Stephenson pointed out that the language in this bill was all boilerplate; it had been applied to numerous other boards. I do not know if there are any other boards where you actually have personal liability when you are serving on a state board. I will be voting no on the amendment part. The original bill I would gladly support 100 percent, but I have to vote no with the amendment.

**Chairman Daly:**

From what I understand, the boilerplate language on that liability came from private boards and nonprofit boards. It does not apply anywhere else to any public boards.

**Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel:**

To clarify, Mr. Hansen, the statement actually was that this language comes from liability protection in language for members of private corporations—officers and directors of private corporations. We certainly were not looking into other public boards, commissions, or things like that. To respond to your question from last meeting, I did not find any other boards, state boards or similar boards, that have this sort of language attached to their duties or to the provisions creating the board.



**Assemblyman Hansen:**

In this case, the irrigation district canal broke, flooded Fernley, and these people were actually sitting on that irrigation board and have been sued personally as part of that board. If that same scenario occurred in Mason Valley at the Mason Valley Wildlife Management Agency, could the people who currently serve on the Board of Wildlife Commissioners, for example, be personally sued as well? It was my understanding that there was some limited liability for these people to protect them from that sort of stuff.

**Randy Stephenson:**

I do not think it would be fair to answer every situation with, "Yes, someone is going to be liable or not liable." The questions of liability are always dependent upon the specific facts. For many, many years, our Supreme Court has held that if you are the owner or operator of a canal, ditch, or reservoir, you are like any other owner of property. You are liable for negligent maintenance and negligent repair. I am thinking that is probably what happened in this case. Because of that case law, there was a certain amount of liability that was attached. As to the wildlife management area, the Department of Wildlife, or any other board or department, it is important to note that it does not mean that they are never going to be held personally liable either for some of their actions even if they have immunity up to a certain extent under *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 41. I am not saying that is, in fact, true, but there could be a set of circumstances somewhere along the line where they might be held personally liable for some act that would otherwise be subject to immunity. I do not have a crystal ball. I cannot say that these people will not be liable and that these other folks will be liable.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

I was not aware of the amendment, so I would like to withdraw my motion.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I thought the amendment was authorized by the maker of the bill. Apparently, he is not in favor of that, so I will also withdraw my second. If you want a motion, I will make one to accept the bill as is.

**Chairman Daly:**

I will not accept that motion. With the maker and seconder of the motion withdrawing their motions, I will ask for a new motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 310 with the amendment in NELIS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 310.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any other questions? I will make one comment to try to answer some of what Mr. Stephenson was saying to Mr. Hansen's questions. I believe it is presumed that if you are going to be on one of these boards, you have the duty of loyalty and you need to act in good faith and all of those things. None of the boards, in my view and understanding of the way things are, is going to protect you from negligence in that duty if there is an issue. Again, I think I stated why I have an issue on the policy basis of just having this in the irrigation districts.

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

That is a huge issue. My understanding has been that if you serve on the county commission or you are appointed to a board, there is a very limited liability, if any. There are thousands of people around the state who are serving on these boards. If our interpretation and understanding is correct, now they all could be sued personally over something they had absolutely nothing to do with other than happening to serve on one of these boards. I think I understand where you are going with this, but this is an issue we are going to have to address. My understanding is, if you serve on a county commission or whatever, the county will pick up the responsibility of defending you if you are sued personally and that your own personal assets are not typically held as collateral in one of these types of situations. I like the one part of the bill that is left, but I am going to have to vote no on the bill with the amendment.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ANDERSON, ELLISON,  
HANSEN, LIVERMORE, AND WHEELER VOTED NO.)

Assembly Bill 345 is next.

**Assembly Bill 345:** Revises provisions governing the management of certain wildlife. (BDR 45-273)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a bill description and proposed amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit G](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

Assembly Bill 345 has an amendment worked on by Mr. Bobzien and as many people as he could talk to. I will accept a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 345 with the amendment in the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 345.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I drafted a letter regarding A.B. 345, section 2, subsection 1, paragraph (b) at line 3. I asked that the word "excessive" be excluded. The maker of the bill wanted to leave that word in. I also commented on lines 29, 30, and 31 in subsection 3, paragraph (c) which amends the population location of each species of predator wildlife. There is no way that could ever be determined. To me, that is irrelevant. With these sections in the bill, I will be voting no.

**Assemblyman Livermore:**

I am going to be voting no on this bill regardless of the amendments. If you want to create a new fund to study the scientific data, that is one issue; but you are taking money from an existing fund. As a hunting license holder, I paid \$3 just to apply for my deer tag. I know my deer tag will have a \$3 predator fee added to it. To misrepresent that my \$3 payment was for predator eradication or control and change it to a scientific study, I feel I was compromised in my decision to buy that tag. I would support an effort by the Department of Wildlife to ask permission to create a new funding source or new fund to study this issue. I just cannot support a measure that is taking the money I paid for a service that I believe is important to me as a hunter and to change the focus of that.

**Chairman Daly:**

Are there any other comments or concerns from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

Along the same lines as Assemblyman Livermore, I am going to vote no on this bill. When the sportsmen voted on this fee years back, they supported it, and this is micromanaging this fund. This fund was set up for specific things, and I think it is being intentionally diluted in such a way that it removes the original intent of the \$3 predator control fee. While I certainly support the scientific side of this and agree completely that all predator programs should be carefully controlled, I think the verbiage in this bill is such that it is actually designed to undermine the very concept of predator control. I believe that it absolutely is a slap in the face of all the people who voted and polled and worked so hard to get this thing in place only ten years ago, or less. It actually goes contrary to the intent of the people who put it in place, so I am going to have to vote no on it. While I do certainly support the scientific sides of it, I believe it is a classic example of micromanaging from the top down.

These things should have been left up to the Wildlife Commission in conjunction with the federal animal damage control people.

**Chairman Daly:**

Are there any other questions, concerns, or comments from the Committee? Seeing none, I will make one comment. I support the science side of this as well. Like many things, there are two groups of science that have two different ways. From what I understand, we have had blanket predator control rather than specific areas where it can be targeted to do the most good, for instance, you would do intensive predator control in an area where you were going to introduce elk or bighorn sheep. So there is a divergence; this allows for both.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ANDERSON, ELLISON, HANSEN, LIVERMORE, AND WHEELER VOTED NO.)

Moving on to Assembly Bill 346.

**Assembly Bill 346:** Revises provisions governing mining reclamation. (BDR 46-1035)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the bill and proposed amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit H](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

At this time I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 346 with the amendment in the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 346.

ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

We have a note for a change that was agreed to by the sponsor of the bill, but it happened at the last second, so Mr. Stephenson has a comment about it.

**Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel:**

As the Chair pointed out, at the last minute, working with Mr. Bobzien and some of the other people involved, section 4 of the mock-up ([Exhibit H](#)) with the proposed amendments to recreational use statute, should be deleted from the mock-up. Because it happened so quickly, it was easier to stay with the document rather than try to change it. The mock-up you would be voting on and the amend and do pass motion would not include section 4.

**Chairman Daly:**

If the maker and seconder of the motion are still okay with that, we will go from there. It is my understanding that the liability issue is covered in the body of the bill and did not need to be covered in *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 41 as well.

Are you still okay, Mr. Wheeler and Mr. Aizley? [Both gentlemen indicated that they were satisfied.]

**Randy Stephenson:**

We do not need a reference to the existing recreational use statute. Section 3, subsections 4 and 5 of the bill provide what the sponsors want for the limitation of liability for property owners, lessees, operators, and employees. The liability that is actually put into subsections 4 and 5 is stricter than what is in the recreational use statute.

**Chairman Daly:**

It is my understanding, Mr. Hansen, that Barrick Gold of North America/Utah testified in support of the bill and this has been agreed to by the parties.

Are there any further questions or comments from the Committee? Seeing none, the motion is to amend and do pass A.B. 346 with the mock-up except for section 4, which is being deleted.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Assembly Bill 396 is next.

**Assembly Bill 396:** Revises provisions relating to the waters of this State.  
(BDR 48-763)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the bill and proposed amendments from the work session document ([Exhibit I](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

I know Mr. Bobzien has been working on this right up to the last minute. I have been bothering him to get us some language on various issues. There is an appropriation, so this bill will be going to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, but we do want to try to get it to a point where people can still keep working on it. At this time, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass with the amendment in the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System (NELIS).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SWANK MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 396.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I liked the original version of this bill much better. I think we are giving way too much ground on bodies of water up to the high-water mark that should legitimately be used by the public. While I respect Assemblyman Bobzien's attempt to bend over backward, I think some of these folks, particularly at Lake Tahoe, essentially want to keep the public off what should legitimately be the public's right to use a beach that is below the high-water mark. I am going to vote for it with the amendments, but I want the record to reflect that I think there are some people in the state who think that, because they own land that is adjacent to public land, they have the right to block people from accessing what is legitimately public. That includes rivers and other areas. I gave an example earlier of a bunch of Boy Scouts going down the Humboldt River. Some fellow stretched a barbed wire fence across the Humboldt River. We have to put a stop to that kind of stuff. I will support this, but I liked the original version better.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

What my colleague from Sparks forgets to tell you is that this bill also allows you to trespass. I am not going to vote for any bill that allows you to trespass, so I will be voting no.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

As I look at the amendments, they kind of spook me. I do not like the rights. If someone did cross an area and got hurt, the person who owns the private property could be held liable. That is my biggest concern. As far as using the waterways and beaches, I do not have a problem with that, but I still think we are leaving people in private areas to be held accountable.

**Chairman Daly:**

Are there any other questions or comments from the Committee? [There was no response.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON AND WHEELER  
VOTED NO.)

The next bill is Assembly Bill 487.

**Assembly Bill 487**: Makes various changes relating to recycling. (BDR 40-120)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the bill from the work session document ([Exhibit J](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

This bill had no amendments, so at this time I will accept a motion to do pass Assembly Bill 487.

ASSEMBLYMAN LIVERMORE MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 487.

ASSEMBLYMAN CARRILLO SECONDED THE MOTION.

Are there any questions from the Committee?

**Assemblyman Hansen:**

I am going to vote no on this because I think this is something that should be left up to the marketplace. I think we are trying to force things that the free market takes care of on its own. I am especially concerned that, over time, it will have an effect on the smaller counties I represent. I know it is currently not mandatory, but it is clearly drifting in that direction and is a real concern. While these things work okay in Clark and Washoe Counties to a certain point, I am not so certain for the smaller counties. Again, I think this is something that the marketplace should take care of.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

Ditto.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN HANSEN AND WHEELER  
VOTED NO.)

**Chairman Daly:**

The last bill on our work session today is Assembly Joint Resolution 7.

**Assembly Joint Resolution 7**: Urges recognition of the importance of mid-20th century architecture in Nevada. (BDR R-609)

**Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst:**

[Ms. Welden read a description of the resolution from the work session document ([Exhibit K](#)).]

**Chairman Daly:**

I will accept a motion to do pass Assembly Joint Resolution 7.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEALEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

At this time, we are going to recess until the call of the Chair. The floor statement for A.J.R. 7 will go to Dr. Swank. Mr. Bobzien will get the floor statements for all his bills. Mr. Ohrenschall will get the floor statement for the recycling bill.

Is there any public comment? Seeing none, we are recessed to the call of the Chair [at 1:36 p.m.].

[This meeting was reconvened at 11:50 a.m., Friday, April 12, 2013, behind the bar of the Assembly.]

I am calling this meeting back to order to address Assembly Bill 310. We have proposed amendment 7987 to the bill ([Exhibit L](#)). I have spoken to the bill's sponsor, Mr. Grady, who is supportive of this amendment which brings back part of section 2 of the bill that would allow irrigation districts to buy certain forms of insurance.

First, we will need a motion to reconsider our previous action to amend and do pass A.B. 310.

ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY MOVED TO RECONSIDER THE PREVIOUS  
ACTION TAKEN BY THE COMMITTEE TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 310.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Now, we need a new motion to amend and do pass A.B. 310 with proposed amendment 7987.



ASSEMBLYMAN AIZLEY MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS  
ASSEMBLY BILL 310 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 7987.

ASSEMBLYMAN HEALEY SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Thank you, Committee. We are adjourned [at 11:55 a.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Cheryl Williams  
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Terry Horgan  
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblyman Skip Daly, Chairman

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

## **EXHIBITS**

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

**Date:** April 11, 2013

**Time of Meeting:** 12:42 p.m.

<b>Bill</b>	<b>Exhibit</b>	<b>Witness / Agency</b>	<b>Description</b>
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
A.B. 168	C	Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst	Bill description and proposed amendment
A.B. 246	D	Amelie Welden	Bill description and proposed amendments
A.B. 264	E	Amelie Welden	Bill description
A.B. 310	F	Amelie Welden	Bill description and proposed amendment
A.B. 345	G	Amelie Welden	Bill description and proposed amendments
A.B. 346	H	Amelie Welden	Bill description and proposed amendments
A.B. 396	I	Amelie Welden	Bill description and proposed amendments
A.B. 487	J	Amelie Welden	Bill description
A.J.R. 7	K	Amelie Welden	Description of the resolution
A.B. 310	L	Amelie Welden	Proposed amendment 7987