

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

**Seventy-Eighth Session
April 9, 2015**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Don Gustavson at 1:45 p.m. on Thursday, April 9, 2015, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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 Don Gustavson, Chair
Senator Pete Goicoechea, Vice Chair
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Mark A. Manendo
Senator David Parks

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Tick Segerblom, Senatorial District No. 3

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst
Matthew Nichols, Counsel
Ellen Walls, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeffrey Jacobs, Director, Water Science and Technology Board, National Academy of Sciences
Susan Lynn, Great Basin Water Network
John Weisheit, Living Rivers
Jason King, P.E., State Engineer and Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Andy Belanger, Southern Nevada Water Authority
Jayne Harkins, P.E., Executive Director, Colorado River Commission of Nevada

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 9, 2015
Page 2

Beverlee McGrath, ASPCA; Best Friends Animal Society; Northern NV SPCA;
NV Political Action for Animals; Lake Tahoe Humane Society & SPCA; Pet
Network of Lake Tahoe; Wyle Animal Rescue; Fallon Animal Welfare;
Compassion Charity for Animals
Peter Krueger, Nevada Emission Testers Council

Senator Goicoechea:

We will open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 10.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 10: Requests the National Research Council of the
National Academy of Sciences to conduct an independent scientific and
economic analysis of the management of the Colorado River. (BDR R-70)

Senator Tick Segerblom (Senatorial District No. 3):

Senate Joint Resolution 10 requests the State ask the National Research
Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) to undertake a
review and analysis of the management of the Colorado River. We are
experiencing a tremendous drought. Nevada, especially southern Nevada,
depends on the Colorado River and its water flow. The last couple of years of
drought have been unpredicted by the U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau
of Reclamation (BOR) and current studies. We are asking for an independent
study that will either verify what the BOR has been reporting to our State, or
contradict what they say and lead us in a different direction. It will be helpful to
have an independent study conducted.

I have submitted a presentation ([Exhibit C](#)). Because of climate change, even
though we are in a drought cycle, there could be wet cycles in the future. There
are past study projections regarding the structures of the Colorado River and its
dams. In a wet period, Glen Canyon Dam is liable to collapse. If this dam
collapses as predicted by the BOR, it would take 24 hours for the water to
come downstream from Glen Canyon Dam, and for 10 days there would be
74 feet of water over Hoover Dam. This would be an obvious disaster. We want
the proposed independent study by the NAS to look at matters such as these.
For example, we want to find out if past projections are legitimate or if they are
understated. One professor at the University of Arizona said that when the BOR
did studies, their estimate of high water maximums was half of what the
historical high water has been through the Colorado River. I am not asking this
Committee to pay for the study; however, I am asking our State to request the
NAS perform an independent study of the Colorado River. This proposed study

is important, given the fact that the Colorado River is the lifeblood of southern Nevada.

Jeffrey Jacobs (Director, Water Science and Technology Board, National Academy of Sciences):

The NRC is the operating arm of the NAS and is located in Washington, D.C. I am the director of the Water Science and Technology Board (WSTB) at the NRC. Our organization dates back to 1863. In that year, the NAS was established by the U.S. Congress as an honorary body to honor the Nation's eminent scientists. It also established the NAS as an independent advisory body to provide reports to Congress by request. We are a nonprofit organization. All studies are conducted solely for the cost of the study performed. In 1916, the NAS responded to so many requests from Congress it became necessary to set up a full-time research arm, the NRC, which has approximately 1,000 employees in downtown Washington, D.C. There are a number of different units within the NRC, reporting on such as topics as engineering, political science, transportation and medicine, among other topics. Almost all of the work by the NAS is conducted by committees comprised of volunteer experts. We use extensive quality-control procedures, both at the front end, from the vetting of committee members, and at the back end of the study, when the reports are sent for external review. Throughout the study process, the reports are confidential and not released to the public until approved by the NAS.

The proposed study requested by S.J.R. 10 is one we could conduct. Our work is conducted through contracts, mainly with federal agencies such as the BOR. We also contract with various states. The scope of work used to guide our studies is designed in collaboration with our study sponsors. If we undertook the study of the Colorado River Basin that we are discussing today, we would design the study with the BOR—if they were to be the sponsor of this study. We are not a governmental or policy-making body. We have a relationship with the U.S. Congress under its congressional charter. We serve in an advisory capacity to the federal government. In the case of S.J.R. 10, I would assume the proposed study sponsor would be the BOR.

Senator Goicoechea:

The bill's sponsor has advised this Committee that this study would not have an associated cost. Clearly, the proposed study will have a significant cost. Assuming we study all of the Colorado River Basin states, meaning both the

upper and lower basin, we have an estimated cost of \$7 million or more for this study according to our Desert Research Institute. Who will pay for this study?

Mr. Jacobs:

The study would be overseen by the NRC. In this case, I would expect the sponsor to be the BOR. We can discuss this further, but someone would pay for the study. I have had preliminary discussions with people in Nevada and there may be a way to establish a contract whereby some monetary resources are provided by the BOR and also to have the contract for the proposed study made with the BOR.

Chair Gustavson:

Senator Segerblom, please restate what you mentioned about the structural problem with Glen Canyon Dam and the possibility of its failure. I see the presentation, [Exhibit C](#), is dated 1998.

Senator Segerblom:

The presentation, [Exhibit C](#), is from a BOR study completed in 1998. When the BOR first put through its Colorado River plan, they based it on a presumption of a certain amount of water being the high-water level for a 100-year flood. Since that time, it has been determined by experts the level the BOR used in the study was one-half the level of what the 100-year flood might be. We have not had the 100-year flood yet, but there are structural problems with Glen Canyon Dam. If the 100-year flood occurs, the Dam could become impaired. It would be a disaster if that happened.

I am requesting this Committee ask the U.S. Congress to fund an independent and economic analysis of the management of the Colorado River by the NRC to study these types of matters, as outlined in S.J.R. 10.

Senator Settlemeyer:

Since this study was conducted in 1998, I believe it was based on a concept of a certain freeboard level. In Clark County, we are way beyond that freeboard level.

Senator Segerblom:

That is the flip side of this situation. The upside is we have had dramatic changes with respect to our climate. The downside is we are way below the water level that experts thought we would be. The BOR is predicting a

9 percent under-average water flow for the next 50 years, but this prediction could be wrong. We lose 500,000 acre-feet of water from the Glen Canyon Dam due to surface water evaporation on Lake Powell. We could save that water. We need to study these types of matters independently.

Susan Lynn (Great Basin Water Network):

The Great Basin Water Network is in support of S.J.R. 10. Great Basin Water Network studies both ground and surface water. This is an opportunity for our State to take leadership in requesting a gap-analysis study on the Colorado River. There was a large study done in 2002 by the BOR which left out some information. There were science gaps and knowledge lacking about the gains and losses of water in Glen Canyon in this study. There are serious water losses in Glen Canyon, the area behind that canyon and within Lake Powell. Because southern Nevada is so dependent on water from the Colorado River, this proposed study could protect and quantify the amount of water that is or is not there, beyond what the BOR stated in their 2012 report. The connection between water coming into the Colorado River system and leaving the system is not well known. The NAS study could help determine this information in a better manner. The BOR ran out of time during their study, and they wanted to release the information they had accumulated. The Colorado River Compact (Act of December 21, 1928, ch. 42, 45 Stat. 1057) determines the water allocated to each state. This proposed study could establish rules for allocation of water in dry years.

John Weisheit (Living Rivers):

I live in Moab, Utah, next to the Colorado River. I have lived next to this river all my life. I have been a river guide for over 35 years. I have participated in public comment to the BOR, especially concerning interim guidelines of 2007 and the "Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study" of 2012. There are many components missing from these documents. I looked at the 2009 SECURE Water Act which compelled the states and the BOR to conduct the 2012 study. I noticed the study does not follow the directives of the SECURE Water Act. One of the directives is to assess flood situations and impacts on the Colorado River. Another directive was to look at groundwater and assess how these resources can be jointly used. The groundwater issue is eliminated from the 2012 BOR study. There are other incidental concerns with hydropower and recreation, and with the ecology and wildlife of the Colorado River. Many aspects of the 2012 BOR study are fine, but there is much information missing from the study. We need this information so our water supplies will be secure in

the future. The proposed independent study from the NAS could point out these matters. The proposed study by the NAS could confirm matters relating to the water and water system of the Colorado River.

Senator Goicoechea:

Are you in favor of a groundwater assessment?

Mr. Weisheit:

Yes, because surface and groundwater are disappearing.

Jason King, P.E. (State Engineer and Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

We are opposed to S.J.R. 10. In the resolution section of this legislation, it is our agency that is directed to consult with comparable agencies in the signatory states of the Colorado River Compact, the U.S. Department of Interior and the NRC regarding options for funding the requested study. Our agency, the Division of Water Resources (NDWR), has no authority concerning the management of the Colorado River. We are not the proper agency to be soliciting this kind of funding and coordinating with those parties mentioned.

Andy Belanger (Southern Nevada Water Authority):

We appreciate the efforts of the sponsor of this legislation with respect to a proposed study. We strongly favor looking at anything that can be innovative and would create solutions concerning issues of the Colorado River. In 2012, the BOR in conjunction with the Colorado River Basin States completed a basin-wide study of the Colorado River. This study looked at a number of different scenarios including models based on climate change for upcoming years. The study demonstrated significant gaps between supply and demand on the Colorado River. These issues are important to southern Nevada. We have worked hard to find solutions. We support efforts to solve water issues, but we are concerned that this proposed study does not achieve the main thing we are trying to accomplish. In 2012, the major municipalities in the lower basin on the Colorado River joined with Denver, Colorado, and the BOR to establish a pilot program designed to save a considerable amount of water and to move that water into Lake Mead, in order to increase the Lake's water level. This is important for southern Nevada. The Lake level drives how and where we can take out water. We are concerned S.J.R. 10 duplicates efforts already done by the BOR and will not add to the body of knowledge that we currently have. The solutions from this proposed study might be too long in coming. The solutions

we are creating now are a direct result of the 2012 study. We are currently in the design and construction of a low-lake pumping station. Those efforts are directly related to the Lake levels outlined in the 2012 study, and also related to the 24-month study the BOR issues. In the next 50 years, there are significant water-related challenges. The solutions will require innovation, creativity and collaboration. We are seeing the cooperation from the other states and the BOR. One could interpret that by requesting this proposed study we are implying the BOR is not doing the job as they should. The BOR has a laser-light focus on these efforts. We support the cooperation we are receiving from the BOR and other states.

Senator Goicoechea:

Did the 2012 BOR study address catastrophic dam failure?

Mr. Belanger:

The study looked at a number of different scenarios and resource options. I can investigate further on the issue of flooding. We would like to see more water in the Colorado River.

Jayne Harkins, P.E. (Executive Director, Colorado River Commission of Nevada):

We are the State agency that holds and protects the rights to ensure the Colorado River water under federal law and contracts. We represent Nevada in issues regarding the Colorado River with the other concerned states and countries. If S.J.R. 10 is to move forward, I would suggest in section 8 the Committee substitute the Colorado River Commission for the NDWR as the responsible entity to work with the other agencies listed. The NDWR does not have the statutory authority to work on Colorado River issues. The states have been working hard with the BOR to deal with drought conditions and to create ways to move water into reservoirs, to conserve water and release only what water is needed. The 2012 "Colorado River Basin Water Supply and Demand Study" did address impacts to hydropower, which was a concern for the Colorado River Commission, since we have hydropower under contract to us from Glen Canyon, Hoover, Davis and Parker Dams. We sell the hydropower energy into the State. We recognize from the Colorado River Compact through the Boulder Canyon Project Act (Act of December 21, 1928, ch. 42, 45 Stat. 1057), hydropower is a low priority. The storage and the conservation of water is always the priority when speaking of the water of the Colorado River. If necessary, hydropower customers know they need to look elsewhere for other

power resources. We are always looking for ways to continue the generation of hydropower at all dams, but we understand hydropower is a low priority.

I worked for the BOR for 27 years. The BOR conducts safety studies on every Colorado River dam. They look for dam failure and perform analyses. The BOR creates inundation maps. They study disaster response times. All of this information is provided to downstream communities so they can prepare disaster-response plans. They use the dam-failure scenarios to prioritize where money earmarked for dam safety is going to be spent. The broad perspective study this legislation is requesting is very expensive. The prospective study could be very useful, but it will take monetary resources away from the immediate needs we are faced with—how to deal with drought impact and how to keep water in reservoirs for those who need it for consumer and agricultural purposes.

Senator Goicoechea:

The hearing on S.J.R. 10 is closed. We will open the work session on S.B. 261.

SENATE BILL 261: Makes various changes relating to certain facilities that are engaged in scientific, medical or educational research. (BDR 50-56)

Alysa Keller (Policy Analyst):

I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit D](#)) for S.B. 261. An amendment by the bill's sponsor was proposed. After the hearing and after consultation with interested parties, the sponsor proposed a revised amendment, and a revised Proposed Amendment 6396 can be found in the work session document, [Exhibit D](#). There is a revised version of the Proposed Amendment 6396 ([Exhibit E](#)) delivered by the bill's sponsor as well. [Exhibit E](#) removes reference to a product testing facility; removes reference to destroying a dog or cat; provides that a research facility may offer a dog or cat for adoption through a program of the research facility; or may enter into an agreement with an animal shelter that performs the work of an animal rescue organization; clarifies that a facility is not required to offer a dog or cat for adoption if it manifests a behavioral or temperamental condition that poses risk to public health and safety; removes the 2-year limit on the amount of time research may be conducted on a dog or cat; provides that the facility is immune from civil liability relating to the adoption of a dog or cat; deletes reference to animal shelter, institution of higher education and product testing facility.

Senator Goicoechea:

In section 1, subsection 1, line 6 of the proposed amendment the word “if” is used; I would be more comfortable if we did not qualify that on the conditions of appropriateness of adoption. As I read section 1, subsection 2, a research facility is not required to offer any dog or cat up for adoption if it manifests behavioral or temperamental conditions. Does this mean the research facility has to offer up for adoption any dog or cat that does not meet these conditions? Does the research facility have discretion to adopt out the animal or not adopt out the animal?

Senator Manendo:

We worked to find compromise concerning this matter. There is total discretion by the research facility to decide if the dog or cat can be adopted, whether it is done in-house or through a rescue shelter.

Senator Goicoechea:

If the research facility has a very good, healthy dog, does this language state they must adopt out the animal?

Matthew Nichols (Counsel):

Section 1, subsection 1 of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#), states the research facility “shall,” before euthanizing the dog or cat, if the dog or cat is appropriate for adoption—offer it for adoption. There is leeway in determining if it is appropriate for adoption. If it is the best dog in the world as you described, the bill suggests that they would have to offer it for adoption.

Senator Goicoechea:

I am not comfortable with this language, as we are mandating that a research facility must render it for adoption by using the word “shall” in section 1, subsection 1 of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit E](#).

Senator Manendo:

In other states, research facilities adopt out dogs through in-house programs. That would be the first step. The research facility will do this adoption; it is just not going to arbitrarily destroy a dog or cat they have concluded tests on. Our State’s animal research facilities will work on an adoption program based on ones that other states have established and bring the program to Nevada. If there comes a point in time in which no one in the research facility wishes to adopt the animal in question, instead of destroying the animal the facility will

partner with a Nevada rescue shelter to find a forever-loving home for the animal.

Senator Goicoechea:

Would you have a problem with changing the word “shall” to “may” in section 1, subsection 1 of this bill? The research facility needs to have flexibility to determine whether the dog or cat can be adopted.

Beverlee McGrath (ASPCA; Best Friends Animal Society; Northern NV SPCA; NV Political Action for Animals; Lake Tahoe Humane Society & SPCA; Pet Network of Lake Tahoe; Wyle Animal Rescue; Fallon Animal Welfare; Compassion Charity for Animals):

Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (c) of [Exhibit E](#) states if the dog or cat exhibits behavior “otherwise not appropriate for adoption.” This gives a research facility complete license to make the determination if the animal can be adopted. The language is broad. It covers everything that could come to light that might prohibit the dog or cat to be offered for adoption.

Senator Parks:

Whether the word shall or may is used—section 1, subsection 2, paragraphs (a) and (b) gives whoever has a research dog or cat every out that could possibly exist to not adopt out the animal. I am happy with [Exhibit E](#) as presented.

Senator Goicoechea:

I would like the word “shall” replaced with “may” in section 1, subsection 1 of this bill.

Senator Manendo:

Yes, we can make this proposed change in [Exhibit E](#).

SENATOR PARKS MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED
S.B. 261 WITH PROPOSED AMENDMENT 6396.

SENATOR MANENDO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senator Goicoechea:

We will open the work session on S.B. 386.

SENATE BILL 386: Revises provisions relating to motor vehicles. (BDR 40-675)

Ms. Keller:

I will read from the work session document ([Exhibit F](#)) for S.B. 386. Proposed Amendment 9830 by the Legal Division is submitted in [Exhibit F](#), which deletes the requirement that the inspector look to see if the malfunction illumination light (MIL) is on and requires signs be posted conspicuously at authorized inspection stations informing customers a motor vehicle will not pass inspection if the MIL is on when the engine is running; and before performing the inspection, the emissions testing station must inform the customer the vehicle will not pass inspection if the MIL is on. A second amendment was proposed at the hearing by Peter Krueger, who represents the Nevada Emission Testers Council. A copy is found in [Exhibit F](#). I will read the language changes from the proposed amendment within [Exhibit F](#).

Senator Settlemeyer:

According to the hearing testimony on S.B. 386, there are times the motor vehicle does not fail the emissions test simply because the MIL is on. With reference to Proposed Amendment 9830 within [Exhibit F](#), section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (a), subparagraph 3, sub-subparagraph (I)—could there be a change of language such as, “Informs such persons that a motor vehicle will ‘most likely’ not pass the inspection ... ”?

Senator Manendo:

That proposed language is fine. I believe consumer notification is a winning situation.

Senator Goicoechea:

As I look at the proposed amendment in [Exhibit F](#), section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b), line 15, can the language be changed there as well? Line 15 states “the motor vehicle will not pass the inspection.” Can the word “will” be changed to “may?”

Senator Settlemeyer:

I would like to ask the bill’s sponsor, Senator Manendo, if he would be interested in those changes. As we have heard from testimony, motor vehicles

most likely end up failing the emissions test if the MIL is on. There are occasions, although rare, that vehicles will pass the test if the MIL is on. If the vehicle is older, it can pass the emissions test when the MIL is on. Perhaps instead of the word "may" we could use the words "most likely" in the proposed amendment within [Exhibit F](#), page 2 and line 15, which Senator Goicoechea previously referenced.

Senator Manendo:

I am fine with the language you have proposed.

Senator Goicoechea:

I will refer to the proposed amendment by Peter Krueger, representing the Nevada Emission Testers Council, in [Exhibit F](#). Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (c), subparagraph (3) is proposed to be added to S.B. 386. I ask for clarification. That addition states, "Authorized emissions stations shall have full access to emission analyzers for parts replacement, service and maintenance." I am concerned as to how much work can be performed by the owner of the emissions analyzer.

Peter Krueger (Nevada Emission Testers Council):

I represent the men and woman who are licensed by the State to perform emissions tests. There is one vendor in our State that supplies and services these emissions analyzers. All parts and service changes must be completed by this vendor. As explained in the hearing on S.B. 386, the emissions stations are upgrading from Microsoft Windows XP to Windows 7 operating system. The vendor is charging an inflated amount of money for this upgrade. The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) does not have a contract with this vendor. We would like the emission stations to be able to purchase their own parts for the emissions analyzer and have the DMV licensed technicians to service the analyzers in our State. This is a last-resort effort short of legal action for the owners of the emissions analyzers to be able to perform their own maintenance on the analyzers for a reduction of costs.

Senator Settelmeyer:

Who owns the emissions analyzers?

Mr. Krueger:

The owner of the emissions station has purchased the analyzer. He or she is asking in the proposed amendment, [Exhibit F](#), to be able to change a filter, for

example, or replace hoses that have come off. The station wishes to perform normal maintenance on the analyzers themselves, instead of having to call the vendor and getting overcharged. We would appreciate if the DMV would give the Nevada Emission Testers Council a list of the parts the owner could change out or work on.

Senator Settelmeyer:

In the hearing on S.B. 386, there was testimony which stated that some of the emissions analyzers are rented. I would like the proposed amendment to state in section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (c), subparagraph (3), "Authorized emissions stations shall have full access to emission analyzers 'that they own' for parts replacement, service and maintenance." You do not want to give someone legal authority to tamper with someone else's property.

Mr. Krueger:

I am fine with that proposed language. I am unaware of any leased emissions analyzers, but there could be some in our State.

Senator Goicoechea:

I recall testimony concerning S.B. 386 by an individual who had three or five of these emissions analyzers. His machines were covered by the vendor under a full-service contract. I would like to have a list created to show what types of repairs, services and maintenance would be allowed to be done by the emissions analyzer owners. Changing a filter or hose is a simple thing, but changing motherboards is a different matter. There should be a limit to what the owner can repair.

Mr. Krueger:

If the Committee would direct the DMV to work with our industry and the vendor to come up with the list, we would support this.

Senator Settelmeyer:

I brought up the question about ownership of the emissions analyzers for parts replacement services and maintenance. Could we add in the language of this bill, "Any damage done through that process is not under contract"? It would not void the entire contract with the vendor. If damage is done while the owner replaced a hose on the analyzer, for example, the motherboard is still under contract. If replacing the hose caused some other part to fail, that part would not be under contract any longer with the vendor.

Senator Goicoechea:

The issue is between the owner of the analyzer and the vendor who currently services the machines, regardless as to who owns the emissions analyzer. I am looking for limitations as to the scope and amount of work an owner can perform on the emissions analyzers. Perhaps we need to develop this list with the DMV. For example, as long as the owner does not get into the true emission testing side of the analyzer, routine maintenance should be allowed.

Mr. Krueger:

I would agree. There are emissions analyzers in our State which are under a purchased service warranty. I am not sure about the state of ownership of the analyzer when a service warranty exists. We would like to work with the DMV and vendor so all parties would be comfortable.

Senator Goicoechea:

We can work on a conceptual amendment. Simple maintenance and repair on the emissions analyzers should be allowed.

Mr. Krueger:

I will assist on the conceptual amendment language, if needed.

Senator Manendo:

We could move to amend and do pass S.B. 386 with the conceptual language that will be developed by Mr. Krueger, the DMV and the Legal Division.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 386 WITH AMENDMENT 1 BUT ADDING THE LANGUAGE "MOST LIKELY" IN TWO PLACES AS DISCUSSED AND ADDING AMENDMENT 2 WITH CONCEPTUAL LANGUAGE TO BE DEVELOPED AND REVIEWED LATER.

SENATOR PARKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Senator Goicoechea:

There was to be another bill in the work session, S.B. 438.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 9, 2015
Page 15

SENATE BILL 438: Provides for the development and implementation of a state emissions plan to reduce certain carbon-dioxide emissions. (BDR 40-992)

Senator Goicoechea:

We will not be working or voting on S.B. 438 in the work session today.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 9, 2015
Page 16

Senator Goicoechea:

There being no further business before the Committee, the meeting is adjourned at 2:46 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Ellen Walls,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Pete Goicoechea, Vice Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit		Witness or Agency	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
S.J.R. 10	C	8	Senator Tick Segerblom	Presentation
S.B. 261	D	15	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendment 6396
S.B. 261	E	3	Alysa Keller	Revised Proposed Amendment 6396
S.B. 386	F	9	Alysa Keller	Work Session Document with Proposed Amendment 9830