

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session  
May 16, 2017**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Heidi Swank at 2:26 p.m. on Tuesday, May 16, 2017, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4404B of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada, and to Room 203, Carl A. Diekhans Center for Industrial Technology, Great Basin College, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at [www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017](http://www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017).

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair  
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chair  
Assemblyman Chris Brooks  
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton  
Assemblyman John Ellison  
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui  
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner  
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus  
Assemblyman Justin Watkins  
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler  
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

**COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:**

None

**GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:**

Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7



**STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst  
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel  
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary  
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Patrick Donnelly, Nevada Wildlife Advocate, Center for Biological Diversity  
Caron Tayloe, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Fred Voltz, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Margaret Martini, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada  
Heather E. Carpenter, Western Regional Director, The Humane Society of the  
United States  
Annoula Wylderich, District Leader Volunteer, The Humane Society of the  
United States  
Jana Wright, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada  
Joel Blakeslee, representing Nevada Trappers Association; and Southern Nevada  
Coalition for Wildlife  
Larry Johnson, President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.  
Mitch Bailey, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Jonathan Lesperance, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada  
Mel Belding, Private Citizen, Washoe County, Nevada  
Bob Brunner, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada  
Rachel Buzzetti, Secretary, Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association  
Rich Sandoz, Private Citizen, Spring Creek, Nevada  
Donna Cox, Commissioner, Nye County Board of Commissioners  
John Bosta, President, Private Well Owners Cooperative of Nye County  
Kenny Bent, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada  
Dave Caudle, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada  
Ed Goedhart, Private Citizen, Amargosa and Pahrump, Nevada  
Dwight Lilly, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada  
Herman Lewis, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada  
Vicki Hafen Scott, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada  
Kyle J. Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League  
Shaaron Netherton, Executive Director, Friends of Nevada Wilderness  
Meghan Wolf, Store Manager, Patagonia, Reno, Nevada  
Andy MacKay, Director, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited  
John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party  
Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Committee for Full Statehood

**Chair Swank:**

[Roll was called and standard rules of the Committee were reviewed.] We are going to be rolling all of the bills on the work session to Thursday, May 18, 2017. [The following bills were not considered:]

**Senate Bill 194 (1st Reprint): Prohibits the sale of products derived from or containing certain animal species under certain circumstances. (BDR 52-664)**

**Senate Bill 270 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to water. (BDR 48-359)**

**Senate Bill 371 (1st Reprint): Establishes provisions governing the care of an animal which has been impounded. (BDR 14-153)**

We will start with Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint).

**Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the trapping or taking of certain animals. (BDR 45-107)**

**Senator David R. Parks, Senate District No. 7:**

I am here to present Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint) for your consideration. This bill provides much-needed commonsense and humane revisions to the statutes regarding trapping in our state. In response to testimony on the Senate side, the bill was amended to address a variety of concerns and represents what I believe is a reasonable compromise. Also, I have a couple of additional but simple amendments to present as part of the hearing today.

In summary, S.B. 364 (R1), in its first reprint, does the following: It excludes certain traps, such as mousetraps and other pest traps, cage and box-type traps, and live beaver traps from the definition of trap as used in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Title 45.

Section 2 replaces the term "wildlife" with "animal" in the definition of trapping.

Section 3 requires the Department of Wildlife (NDOW) to develop standard language for signage used by every state agency that manages public lands where trapping may occur and designates locations where the signs must be posted.

Section 5 was amended in the Senate and now requires any trap, snare, or similar device to either be registered with NDOW or have the name and address of the owner of the trap stamped on it or attached with a metal tag. The amendment in the Senate also changes the registration fee from \$10 per person to \$5 per trap. Section 5 deletes provisions which declare that information in possession of NDOW concerning the registration of a trap is regarded as confidential.

Section 6 allows someone to remove or disturb a trap when the trap creates an immediate risk of physical injury or death to any person or animal with them, such as a pet or a horse, or when necessary to release a person or accompanying animal caught in the trap.

Section 7, as amended in the Senate, requires a trapper to visit his traps at least once every 96 hours to remove any animal caught in the trap and prohibits the Board of Wildlife Commissioners from adopting regulations regarding frequency of the trap visitation. Based on input I received over the past few weeks, I am asking this Committee to delete section 7 from the bill in its entirety, thereby leaving NRS 503.570 as it exists today, with a visitation for 96 hours and authority for the Board of Wildlife Commissioners to adopt regulations on trap visitations.

Section 8.5 was also added in the Senate amendment and locked in the existing regulations of trap visitation. Consistent with my proposed amendment to take out section 7, I would also ask the Committee to remove section 8.5 to fully restore the status quo on regulating trap visitation.

I urge you to support S.B. 364 (R1) as amended and to take out sections 7 and 8.5, so we preserve some flexibility in the interim on trap visitations while we continue to work on this issue. In closing, this bill is not a prohibition against trapping, but simply provides important commonsense safeguards, so that traps can be identified and people will be warned that traps may be nearby, so they can protect themselves, their children, and their pets. While I realize some would like this bill to be more prescriptive, it is my hope that this version with the additional changes is a reasonable compromise and will move us forward.

[Assemblywoman Cohen assumed the Chair.]

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I see that the mock-up of your amendment has not been prepared yet. I think we will have the other presenters give their presentation before we take questions.

**Patrick Donnelly, Nevada Wildlife Advocate, Center for Biological Diversity:**

I will briefly walk you through the key points of this legislation and illustrate how they address gaps in our current regulatory structure for trapping.

Trapping is a lightly regulated practice in Nevada. A hunting tag or a fishing license comes with a very specific set of rules to protect the safety of the public, the welfare of wildlife, and the sportsmanship of the hunt. By contrast, there are relatively few regulations with trapping in Nevada, and thus there are impacts to the safety and well-being of the public and domestic animals, unless there is a potential impact to health and human safety. This legislation will institute simple, commonsense regulations on trapping to bring management of this activity into the realities of the twenty-first century.

I would like to point out what this bill does not do. This bill does not ban trapping. It does not impose limits on trapped animals. In its current amended form, it does not reduce trap check intervals. Please bear this in mind during today's hearing; the bill has been greatly changed from its original form and reflects a compromise that has enjoyed strong bipartisan support throughout the legislative process.

The first important provision of this bill is to institute a system of trap registration or identification. Existing rules lack a critical component of regulation, which is accountability. Currently, you simply need to get a license, but there is no registration of individual traps. If a game warden were to encounter a trap in the field which was placed within the confines of the regulations, there would be no way to know whom to hold accountable for that trap.

Senate Bill 364 (R1) thus requires trappers to either register each trap with NDOW at a cost of \$5 per trap or to affix a tag or engrave their name and address on each trap, so that a game warden would be able to identify whose trap it is. This simple provision of trap registration or identification will provide an element of accountability into trapping regulations.

The second important provision of this bill is signage. Currently, there is no way for users of public land to know if there are traps set in the area in which they recreate. I am sure there are endless stories from public land users whose pets have been caught in leg-hold traps. People's dogs have been badly injured or died in these traps. Such senseless suffering probably could have been averted with simple signage warning public land users that trapping is occurring in the area.

The bill instructs the Department of Wildlife to develop standard signage in places where trapping may occur and to work with federal land management agencies to ensure that such signs are posted at trailheads, kiosks, and other public access locations.

The final important provision of this bill is the ability to release traps. Existing state law prohibits the removal or disturbance of any trap, snare, or similar device if it is being deployed in a legal manner. You can envision a situation where a trap deployed in a legal manner trapped a domestic animal, such as a dog; it is actually illegal to disturb that trap to release your dog. This is sort of a quirk in current law that this legislation will resolve. This will allow for the removal or disturbance of a trap only in the case that it presented an immediate threat to health, human safety, or the safety of domestic animals.

In summary, S.B. 364 (R1) provides reasonable, commonsense regulations on trapping which would correct current omissions in the regulatory structure. These commonsense regulations would create a safer, more accountable environment for all Nevadans. I thank you for the opportunity to present this bill. [Written testimony was also provided ([Exhibit C](#)).]

**Caron Tayloe, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I want to thank Chair Swank, the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining, and all who worked so diligently on S.B. 364 (R1). We believe that taking visitation out is a good solution to the concerns that have been identified by several parties.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

Thank you, Senator Parks, for listening to the folks who are concerned about the visitation times and working with the Department of Wildlife to let them set the regulations. I appreciate that. I am curious about the change of registration fees. Currently, it is \$10 per registration, or trapper, and it is going change dramatically to \$5 per trap. I am wondering about the purpose of that and where those fees are going.

**Patrick Donnelly:**

Currently, there is no trap registration. There is no requirement to register traps. What is being proposed is a \$5-per-trap registration fee, or the option to affix your name and address to the trap. The \$10 flat fee was in an earlier version of the bill.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

Where does that \$5 fee go?

**Caron Tayloe:**

It is my understanding that it would go to the Department of Wildlife.

**Vice Chair Cohen:**

I will now move on to support.

**Fred Voltz, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

One of the reasons S.B. 364 (R1) is such an important piece of legislation is that last year the Board of Wildlife Commissioners completely eliminated its trapping committee, which should have been looking at these issues on a regular basis. Unfortunately, the committee had not done a real good job in dealing with the issues. I believe that the legislation needs to be further amended to reflect a universal 24-hour visitation interval, even though I understand that in coming up with a compromise, that has not been a starting issue.

Trapper convenience and success are not sufficient justifications, and the existing statute does indicate a duty to protect wildlife, not just exploit it. Regarding the Senate hearing on S.B. 364 (R1), the Nevada Trappers Association made claims of disease, assault, and heightened trapping in and around urban areas as justifications for continuing their activities with few limitations. They also claim that their heritage should trump all other considerations. Ultimately, trappers assume the risk of liability and damage their activities inflict upon public property and upon other people and their companion animals who are recreating in Nevada's wild areas. The fact that the trappers consistently try to ignore their responsibilities toward the public's wildlife and the over 2.9 million Nevadans needs to be changed.

**Margaret Martini, Private Citizen, Incline Village, Nevada:**

I am sure that if this meeting were at a different time, this room would be filled with families; families concerned for the welfare of their hiking excursions, and their walking path excursions with their children and family pets. I am pretty involved with the Washoe County School District's system, and I speak with a lot of parents. I have also had discussions with

my own family and friends about this. I am in full support of S.B. 364 (R1). This body has the opportunity to assure a safer environment for the public when they are enjoying the Nevada outdoors with family and pets.

This bill also gives you the opportunity to create a sensible system of accountability to our Nevada wildlife. This accountability exists for other sportsmen and should not exclude trappers. Everyone needs accountability, especially when living beings' lives and welfare are involved with the outcome of supporting this bill. Our desire is to focus on best methods and practices that will address and correct some of the deficiencies that currently exist. In supporting this bill, you will be supporting best management practices for the safety of the citizens and the wildlife of Nevada.

**Heather E. Carpenter, Western Regional Director, The Humane Society of the United States:**

On behalf of our Nevada-based supporters, I urge you to support S.B. 364 (R1). I encourage you to please review our full testimony, submitted as an exhibit to this bill ([Exhibit D](#)).

Nevada is far behind other states in its trapping laws, which leaves wildlife and the public vulnerable to injury and suffering. Senate Bill 364 (R1) proposes limited, commonsense updates to Nevada's trapping laws. These changes are necessary to reduce animal suffering, to protect unintended victims, and to provide accountability to citizens who have a public interest in healthy wild animal populations and a personal concern for the safety of their companion animals.

This bill would require traps to have information identifying the person using them. This is a basic standard of any state-regulated trapping program. Without proper identification, it may be very difficult to properly enforce other trapping laws and regulations.

The bill will also result in more signs warning of traps on public lands. Signs warning about traps would protect humans and their family pets recreating on public lands by alerting them to the presence of traps in the vicinity.

Trapping is not supported by sound science and is not an effective method for managing wildlife populations or addressing wildlife conflicts. In fact, it can actually stimulate population increases of some animals as they compensate for population reductions. Trapping also does not help control the spread of diseases. Leading health organizations have found no evidence that trapping reduces the incidence of rabies, and in some cases, trapping may actually make these problems worse.

Nevada's voting public wholeheartedly supports trapping reform. A survey of Nevada voters in January of this year found that 68 percent support requiring traps to display information identifying the trap owner, and 80 percent support requiring warning flags or signs for traps.

We urge you to support S.B. 364 (R1) to protect family pets, wild animals, and public safety.

**Annoula Wylderich, District Leader Volunteer, The Humane Society of the United States:**

I would like to thank Senator Parks and Chair Swank for bringing this bill forward, and all those who are in support of it.

The previous speakers have done a good job of outlining the good points in support of this bill, so I will keep my comments short. Many of us are outdoor enthusiasts who enjoy hiking and other forms of outside recreation with our families and often our pets. So, it is natural to expect a safe environment free from potential harm, whenever possible. In this case, it is possible with the right measures in place. As Senator Parks emphasized, this bill does not prohibit trapping, but we do need to have a better system of accountability just as we do for other types of sportsmen activities. After all, this impacts other sportsmen, the public, and our wildlife. I support S.B. 364 (R1), and I urge you to do so as well.

[Assemblywoman Swank reassumed the Chair.]

**Chair Swank:**

We have about one minute left for those in support.

**Jana Wright, Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:**

Ditto to everything everyone has said in support of S.B. 364 (R1).

**Chair Swank:**

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? Seeing no one, I will move on to opposition.

**Joel Blakeslee, representing Nevada Trappers Association; and Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife:**

I have not seen the amendments, and I will need to look at them before I comment on the bill. If the visitation requirement is taken out of it, that addresses one of our major concerns. The thing that most people will talk about today is the confidentiality of our information. The registration of the traps offers two choices. You can either register with the Department of Wildlife, or you can put your name and address on the traps. In either case, our confidentiality is coerced. The unfortunate thing that came out on Facebook a couple of weeks ago has created a firestorm as far as confidentiality. The trappers have said they do not want people knowing where they live after seeing something like that. I think that is a fair point. Think about this; this is a cultural war. Would you do this to any other group of people? Would you pass a bill that allowed their information to be made public, especially when it is a controversial issue like this?

We do have trap registration now. Trapping is highly regulated. As for human and health concerns, the average traps that we use on land have a five-inch diameter, which means it has a 2.5-inch vertical leap. I do not see that as being a safety hazard for people. I will submit my other comments in writing when I have seen the amendment. [([Exhibit E](#)) and ([Exhibit F](#))] were also provided but not discussed.]



**Larry Johnson, President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.:**

My main concern with this is lack of confidentiality of trappers' information. A similarity exists, I think, with innocent citizens who have reported bear incidents. Since that data was public information, those individuals who simply reported that a bear was breaking into their house or into their cars have been harassed and received death threats, to the point where NDOW has introduced Senate Bill 75, which provides confidentiality for those individuals stepping forward. Without that same confidentiality provided to lawful trappers, we have no choice but to oppose this bill as written.

**Mitch Bailey, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

I know you are going to tell me to speak to the bill, but I am speaking to the confidentiality issue associated with trapping that also applies to other hunts in this state. When my daughter was 15 years old, she was fortunate enough to be one of the first people in the state to draw a bear tag. If anyone remembers the controversy around that hunt, every warden in this state was on duty on the opening day for fear of candlelight vigils, altercations between hunters, people blocking access, et cetera. We decided we would stay as far away from the action as possible and hiked up to the top of the Sierras. We did not have any luck and decided we would go to a more public area.

My daughter was successful in harvesting a bear. She was very excited about it. We followed all the protocol, and we had no interaction with anyone. She came home; she was joyful about her accomplishment, being the first woman in the state to harvest a bear. Sure enough, a picture of her and her bear was given to the Department of Wildlife. They enjoyed looking at it, and then gave it to the *Reno Gazette-Journal*. They put it on the front page of the paper, and the attacks started. They not only started with letters to the editor, but it got violent on Facebook. They located her and humiliated her on Facebook. I cannot repeat the things they said about her or what they were going to do to her. There are enough people who hate trappers that we hardly need our information in the hands of those who hate us.

**Jonathan Lesperance, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:**

I would like to reiterate, obviously, the concerns that confidentiality has raised. The proponents of the bill have said that it has to do with accountability. I see it as very much about accountability to keep that information confidential. Otherwise, we invite vigilante justice. I do not think that is something that any of us want to entertain. I spend a large amount of my free time in the mountains with my dogs. I have never had an issue of coming across a trap and altercations with my dogs. I think that point is largely overstated. To that end, I think public education can help. The Nevada Sporting Dog Alliance will be hosting seminars this summer on how to release canines from traps.

**Mel Belding, Private Citizen, Washoe County, Nevada:**

I appreciate this time you have granted us to address this issue. My concerns are also for confidentiality. As mentioned by Mr. Johnson, NDOW has that very bill going to vote on the floor. I briefly took some time this morning and looked at some old posts on TrailSafe Nevada and other sites. It is a common practice to read threats towards people who take up bear hunting, deer hunting, or trapping. It is an unfortunate thing, but it does happen. I ask you to do the same thing. It will not take ten minutes to find several of those threats.

As far as someone wanting to see the equipment that I use when I am hunting, whether it be a rifle, a truck, a backpack, or a trap, whatever the case might be, I do not have a problem turning that over to law enforcement and having them look at it. To disable a trap, it just takes a stick going across the jaws. That is all that has to be done. That trap does not have to be removed from the ground; it does not have to be pulled. One simple stick will take care of that trap. I would not have a problem with putting my name and address on my traps if no one would disturb the traps, and I certainly would not have a problem with law enforcement having the ability to check my traps. I think we are asking for trouble for the general public to have that information.

**Bob Brunner, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada:**

This bill has a quite a few good ideas in it, but it has a lot of unintended consequences that go with it. I would ask that this bill not go any further.

**Rachel Buzzetti, Secretary, Nevada Outfitters and Guides Association:**

We are in opposition to this bill. The amendments are questionable regarding the consequences of the bill. I spend a lot of time going on trails in the outdoors, and I have never seen a trap along a trail. I would hope that people are trapping along those trails because if I saw a mountain lion while walking with my kids and my pets, I would hope someone was trapping and hunting them. Trapping is heavily regulated, and confidentiality is a huge concern to our members.

**Rich Sandoz, Private Citizen, Spring Creek, Nevada:**

I currently have a Nevada trap identification number. I have a numbered tag on every one of my traps. I paid \$10 for those years ago. This has been around a long time. Section 6, subsection 3 would allow people to remove my traps. I think if you are going to allow them to remove my traps, they should have some sort of obligation as well. That would be to return the traps to NDOW along with a form with their name and address on it, so I would be able to get my trap back. There should also be penalties for failure to comply with that. I have all kinds of penalties if I do not comply.

There are a lot of regulations for trappers. I think that NDOW should also be required to notify the trapper if, for some reason, someone is looking at his trap or his information to obtain the trapper's address. I think if someone is going to remove a trap, just disarm it, because it could be lethal to pets, but it will not do any damage to people walking by.

If there was a conibear trap, which is a steel trap on the ground, trappers would spring it, so it would not hurt someone's child. Most trappers are going to do that, but there might be some idiot trapper who would not. To wrap up, I think that if people are bringing traps into NDOW, there should be a record of that along with an identification form.

**Chair Swank:**

We are going to close the testimony in opposition. Assemblyman Watkins has a question for Mr. Blakeslee.

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

I understand the fear of retribution of trappers and putting identifying information on their traps, but I think that is a major societal problem. You should go to Facebook and read what is said about politicians. All of my information is public. Anyone can picket in front of my house. Anyone can threaten me on Facebook for being a public official. I am a lawyer; people do not like lawyers. That information is public. My office information is public. Heck, my signature is a public record once I became an attorney. What is so different about the confidentiality of a trapper than the problems all of us face in this society with crazy people out there on social media saying crazy things? Why is this different?

**Joel Blakeslee:**

I will answer that by referencing the firebombing that occurred at the Rocky Mountain Fireworks and Fur Co. in Caldwell, Idaho, in 2011; and the attempted firebombing at Montgomery Furs in Ogden, Utah, in 1997. A friend of mine had his truck burned down in his driveway in central Utah. I can go on and on. I am not aware of an assemblyman ever having that type of recognition.

**Assemblyman Watkins:**

We have had politicians shot and killed. Gabby Giffords was shot. We have politicians of all sorts. I appreciate and I understand that there is a real risk, and I would hope that most people would register their traps in order to avoid this. We, as politicians, do not have another avenue. I cannot make my home address private. Lawyers and public defenders and prosecutors are threatened and attacked daily when they go into their office. Yes, I understand confidentiality and the need for it. We all want our privacy. I have a hard time seeing how this one instance is so different than what the rest of us face on a daily basis. I guess we will have to agree to disagree on this. Do you have another issue, other than confidentiality, with the amendment?

**Joel Blakeslee:**

I do not understand the amendment. I have not had a chance to review it. As far as the confidentiality and the registration, why not just be confidential? Instead of having two citizens having a confrontation, it can go through law enforcement.

**Assemblyman Wheeler:**

My question for you is, did you campaign to become a public official and put your name out there, or are you a private citizen who expects privacy?

**Joel Blakeslee:**

I am a private citizen. I have been president of the Nevada Trappers Association for 28 years; I guess you could say that I ran for office at one time.

**Chair Swank:**

If there is anyone else who has not been able to speak, please mail in your written testimony. With that, we will go to neutral. Seeing no one, Senator Parks, do you have any closing remarks?

**Senator Parks:**

Thirty-eight states require trappers to register their traps. I am certainly happy to leave the registration fee of \$10 for each registrant in effect. As long as there is some form of a registration number and a number on each of the traps, that could be kept confidential and the only people who would have access to it would be NDOW.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

The name on the trap is like a big target out there. If we could have a number that goes back to the authorities, I think if we could take the name off of the traps and replace it with a number. Putting the names out there for the public is my biggest concern.

**Caron Tayloe:**

If they want to pay the fee and register their traps with NDOW, they will not have to put their name and address on the traps. If they do not want to do that and they do not want the money to go to NDOW, then they have to put their name and address on the traps.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

If they had a number stamped on the traps, that should be sufficient. They currently do that, do they not?

**Caron Tayloe:**

I have been out in the wilderness many times; the traps I have seen do not have numbers or registration on them.

**Chair Swank:**

Maybe you can address those questions offline. With that, we are going to close the hearing on S.B. 364 (R1). [Letters in support were received but not heard include ([Exhibit G](#)) and ([Exhibit H](#)). Letters in opposition received but not heard include ([Exhibit I](#)), ([Exhibit J](#)), ([Exhibit K](#)), and ([Exhibit L](#)). All exhibits will become part of the record.]

I will now open the hearing on Senate Bill 21.

**Senate Bill 21: Abolishes the Nye County Water District. (BDR S-478)**

**Donna Cox, Commissioner, Nye County Board of Commissioners:**

I brought this bill forward. Nye County was only given the opportunity to choose one bill draft request. We had plenty of wishes for others, but in the final realm of things, after speaking with the people and speaking at the Board of Commissioners meetings, it ended up that we voted on this particular bill draft request to move forward. It became Senate Bill 21, which is to eliminate the Nye County Water District. It is specifically for Nye County. I would like to address a few of the issues that the people have brought forward.

One of the main reasons for doing this is because the Water District was created to import water. There is no longer a need to import water to Nye County. At one time we were growing, and Thomas Buco thought that we were going to need the water because they were looking at a population of 450,000 people. In order to accommodate that many people, it would take an importation of water. That has not happened, and I do not believe it is ever going to happen. We are never going to become a city. In the words of Commissioner Andrew "Butch" Borasky, this was just a pipe dream. The Water District has become obsolete for the reasons of which it was created. We no longer have the need to import water.

The Water District has ongoing expenses and budget increases, which northern Nye County is paying also and reaping no benefit for their money. The Water District was created to oversee Pahrump and the Amargosa Valley only. The need to support the Water District is no longer justified as we are now members of the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority—for which we pay a membership fee every year—that encompasses eight different counties and was put together to protect all the counties from anyone taking their water. I have been told that was another reason for putting together the Water District. We would still have that protection, even if we eliminate the Water District. We would be protected under the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority. We have three people attending all of the meetings of the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority.

We have support, not only those here today, but from other people as well. I received a statement from the Nye County Republican Central Committee (NCRCC), recommending that we support S.B. 21, which abolishes the Nye County Water District. The statement reads, "This week the Nye County Board of Commissioners voted to support this Senate bill. Please contact your Senators and let them know you support this bill and the Nye County Commissioners." This is from the Chairman of the NCRCC. He wrote that he received a press release today that Senator Goicoechea and Assemblyman Oscarson also support this bill. The press release says:

Carson City - Senator Pete Goicoechea and Assemblyman James Oscarson released the following statement about SB 21, which seeks to abolish the Nye County Water District.

This bill was brought to the Legislature by the Nye County Commissioners. They introduced it and they support it. We believe that this is a decision best made by local government and those closest to the issues. Any indications otherwise are simply untrue. We both believe in local control of the water resources, but we will defer to the County Commission as to specific actions they wish to take. This is, after all, not a state issue but an issue of local government.

Unfortunately, Commissioner Borasky could not make it here today. I have the comments that he made when I brought this bill forward at the County Commissioners meeting. He is one of the County Commissioners who was there originally when the Water District was put into place. I would like to paraphrase what he said at that meeting in support of the bill draft request that we wrote. He said that it is not a reality; it is not accomplishing the act for which we thought it would. We are spinning our wheels and not going anywhere. The rest of the county is supported by the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority. I was sold a bill of goods that were not real, just smoke and mirrors. Importing water was a pipe dream that would cost so much that it is not even worth thinking about. It is just not working, and I cannot support the Water District or northern Nye County paying for a water district with fees and not receiving anything back. The Water District has not accomplished what it was set up for and cannot do the financial changes that are beyond its control. Nye County is no longer financially able to sustain this Water District.

I would like you to hear what the other people have to say who have come here to testify. I am not here to represent the board. I am a county commissioner, and I did bring this bill forward, so I am basically representing S.B. 21, not all of the board members.

**Chair Swank:**

We have about 20 minutes for testimony. I will give ten minutes to support and ten minutes for opposition. We will start with support.

**John Bosta, President, Private Well Owners Cooperative of Nye County:**

Yesterday, at the water board meeting, Commissioner Dan Schinhofen apologized for telling people that the water plan had been adopted by the commissioners. He apologized because on January 19, 2017, he made a motion, which had two prongs. One was to take part of the groundwater management plan back to the Water District, and second, to pass forward eight items to the State Engineer. Most of those items that were passed on to the State Engineer have become bills before the Legislature.

I think the thing that is important is yesterday at 5 p.m., I was informed that the two dissenting commissioners who voted against the bill were lobbying people in the Assembly, saying that the Water District is supporting the domestic well owners, and that is an absolute untruth. They have not supported the domestic well owners. They have lobbied against the domestic well owners; they have sent forward bills reducing our water from 2 acre-feet to 0.5 acre-feet and put meters on our wells. They have used the Office of the State Engineer. It is very important that you take a look at the truth. I think that the

Water District is going to be used to move forward the privatization of the utility companies. They would also be involved in any water that goes towards Yucca Mountain. Please vote in favor of this bill.

**Kenny Bent, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada:**

I am a retired general engineering contractor. I have spent most of my life building wastewater treatment plants and mining projects. I have been tracking the water issues in Basin 162 for quite a while. I was also a member of the groundwater management planning board, and I can tell you first-hand that the board was basically hijacked, so everything was going in the direction of basic utility and developer interest.

I was also told last night that there was lobbying taking place in Carson City, and the Water District was created to protect the well owners. I apologize, but at the last minute, I sent you a petition with about 300 signatures on it of well owners who are in support of S.B. 21 ([Exhibit M](#)).

Most of the people who have been paying attention realize what this Water District is being used for now: an unelected, unaccountable board that is largely representing the utility and developer interests and not the interests of the county per se or the community. It is somewhat of a financial black hole that keeps on taking and not necessarily giving. From a physical standpoint, this was another consideration of why the County wanted to move forward with S.B. 21. In the past, the commissioners attempted to not approve the appointments on the board to stop it from moving forward. The District Attorney told them they could not do that. There again, that is another reason why S.B. 21 came forward. This is something the County needs, and I hope you will keep this bill moving forward.

**Dave Caudle, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada:**

I am a retired quality assurance manager. I also live in Nye County. I am here to urge you to bring S.B. 21 before the Legislature and support its passage. I have also been told that there has been lobbying to kill this bill. It does not protect the domestic well owners. People pushing that story are lying to you folks. In fact, passing S.B. 21 will protect the domestic well owners. The Nye County Water District Act, *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 542, provides extremely broad powers, but none of those powers are aimed at protecting domestic wells.

However, in S.B. 21, section 8, subsection 1, paragraph (o), subparagraph (1) allows a point of diversion in one basin and point of use in another basin within Nye County. My understanding is that this language was included to enable the Water District to supply water to Yucca Mountain. Former Democratic Senator Richard Bryan stated in an interview on KNPR that he resigned as Governor specifically so he could run for the U.S. Senate and combat the dumping of nuclear waste in Nevada. It appears that the current Governor and most of the legislators are against Yucca Mountain. Eliminating this Water District would turn off the tap. Again, I urge you to bring S.B. 21 forward and pass it.

**Ed Goedhart, Private Citizen, Amargosa and Pahrump, Nevada:**

I guess I should share some of the blame for the necessity of this bill. In 2007, I was a freshman Assemblyman, and I helped author and sponsor Senate Bill 222 of the 74th Session. At that point in time, we had a completely different picture of what that Water District or what that act would do. I am here to urge you to move S.B. 21 and kill the Water District.

Tom Buqo was looking at Nye County, negotiating with Yucca Mountain and also with the Nevada National Security Site (NNSS). The NNSS contaminated 1.6 trillion gallons of water underneath the test site, and now it is emanating out. We are looking at getting some sort of quid pro quo mitigation and compensation for that contaminated water. That Water District would enable us to import water from somewhere else and move water around Nye County. That was all sold to us because the County was going to explode. Since 2007, many things have changed. Looking at the latest State Demographer report, it predicts that by the year 2034, which is almost 17 years from now, Nye County will actually have a net loss of 570 residents.

Also, that board was hijacked by a lot of the folks who spun off Yucca Mountain. The Yucca Mountain Project actually provided the founding money that was handed to the County to form the Water District. People who are now with the Water District are very close to the Yucca Mountain project. Yucca Mountain would love to have a water district they could tap into, which could provide them with the water they need for construction and for the ongoing operation. I am a staunch opponent of Yucca Mountain and have been for the last 20 years. In fact, Nevada is using me as the grounds for Nevada standing and fighting Yucca Mountain. I urge you to pass S.B. 21.

**Dwight Lilly, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada:**

I am on the Board of Directors of the Pahrump Well Owners Cooperative. For the last several years, we have attempted to work with the Water District in solving water issues in southern Nye County. It became very clear that this was not going to be accomplished through this Water District. Although the Water District was supposed to do one thing, it has gone in a completely different direction: a pro-Yucca Mountain direction. The only county commissioners opposing this legislation are people who are highly in support of Yucca Mountain and supplying water to that site. This is a community issue. We live in Nye County; Yucca Mountain is in Nye County. We do not want Yucca Mountain and the radiation that comes with it. It affects the southern portion of the state. I urge you to approve S.B. 21.

**Herman Lewis, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada:**

I would just like to point out to the Assembly that this Water District was founded with \$169,000 from a Department of Energy federal grant. If you follow the money, you will see that is how the Water District was founded. Oscar Wichman, Commissioner Wichman's husband, confirmed yesterday, after I pressed him and Dave Hall three times, that the



Water District was founded with federal money from the Nuclear Waste Repository Project Office. If you follow the money, you will see that this is going to end up back at Yucca Mountain unless you approve to abolish this Water District. Please support S.B. 21.

**Chair Swank:**

We are going to close testimony in support of S.B. 21. If you did not get a chance to voice your support, please submit your testimony. I will move to those in opposition to S.B. 21.

**Vicki Hafen Scott, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada:**

I was involved with the original formation of the Nye County Water District. I went to all of the meetings and came before the Legislature. I can tell you that I do not have any memory nor do I believe that it is accurate to represent that this Water District was formed to transfer water to Yucca Mountain. That was never brought up in any of the discussions that I was ever involved in, nor have I seen it come up in any of the meetings for the Water District. The importation of water was not the main reason for the Water District; it was one of the reasons that were given to form the Water District, but there are a number of reasons why Nye County needs that Water District. There are many water issues in Nye County and in Pahrump.

Those of you who are familiar with water issues in Nevada probably realize that some of the larger issues are in the Pahrump Valley, with the balancing of the basins—the pull and tug between domestic well owners and appropriated water rights. There are a number of solutions that can help Nye County and the Pahrump area that only a body like the Nye County Water District can supply. There has been a lot of progress made with this board. It was disappointing in the beginning at how slow and dysfunctional it was, but I think they have made some very good progress in the last few years. That includes bringing forward some groundwater management plans, studying the basin in terms of where there is an overconcentration of domestic wells, and trying to come up with some solutions. For example, 420 domestic wells in one square mile is a problem. You cannot put that many straws in one small area and think there is enough water for everyone. The Water District is the method to find a solution to the problems, and it should not be abolished. [Written testimony was also provided ([Exhibit N](#)).]

**Chair Swank:**

Is there anyone else in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who wants to speak in neutral? [There was no one.] I would like to make a comment on this bill. This is my third session, and this is probably one of the more interesting build-ups to a bill that I have seen. I have been contacted by many people who are in opposition to this bill but are unwilling to put their names and faces out there. That makes me very concerned about this bill. I was hoping to make that comment earlier, but I did not in an effort to make sure we had as many people testify as possible. Having listened to many parties on this bill over the last two weeks, I have concerns. I think that Nye County has many overappropriated basins. I am going to be giving this a lot of thought as we go forward. I want to make sure that everyone knows there are a lot of folks in opposition to this bill, but who did not feel comfortable testifying.

**Assemblywoman Titus:**

I am curious about alternatives. There was a lot of mention about domestic water users in this district. It has been my experience in water districts that there is also irrigation and agriculture. I am wondering if this affects them. How much irrigated, pasture, or agricultural land in production do you have? Will that be affected by abolishing this, or is this just going to affect domestic water users? Also, does the County have a strong water plan ordinance to take over some of these functions?

**Donna Cox:**

What we intend to do is do away with the Water District and put it back under the power and authority of the Nye County Board of Commissioners. We do have a planning department that is doing those things right now: looking at options and taking care of business at hand. We will deal with each item as it comes about. At one time we were all farmland, and now we have a lot of developers, like Ms. Hafen Scott and her father. There are many people who are subdividing their lots into little tiny lots. They need to bring water to those lots. All of that can be dealt with through the Board of County Commissioners. We do not have to have another individual board to do that.

We have a very educated person whom we have hired who works with the Planning Commission as the head of the Planning Department. His name is Darrell Lacy. I can quote from what he said about his education and his background: "I was a general manager of the Water District for eight years. I am an engineering attorney, and I am pretty passionate about water issues. That is one of the reasons why I was doing that for the last eight years." I think that water issues are one of the most important things you have to deal with as elected officials. We have plenty of well-educated people to carry on where this District would leave off.

**Assemblyman Ellison:**

I just received a statement from Senator Goicoechea that I would like to read into the record. It says, "I am getting mixed statements. The Nye County Commissioners voted twice to abolish the Nye County Water District and brought S.B. 21 as their own county bill draft to do that."

I also had several calls last night, but my phone died, and I could not call anyone back. I want a letter from every one of the county commissioners who are in support prior to voting on this bill. The problem is, I am getting conflicting stories. I would like to see those letters, if someone could send a letter with all the county commissioners on it, I would appreciate it.

**Chair Swank:**

Commissioner Cox, please briefly wrap it up.

**Donna Cox:**

There is a petition that has been provided to you ([Exhibit M](#)). There were over 300 signatures collected on that petition within a five-hour period. You can imagine how many signatures we could have gotten if we had a lot of time to send it around. This is a dangerous and powerful district, and they have the ultimate control. They have extreme power to incur debt, issue bonds, acquire land, import water, spend vast amounts of money and collect taxes to do so. They can adopt fees, adopt ordinances, pass resolutions, hire attorneys, and increase their budget. This District is becoming the monster that I said it was years ago. Their budget is climbing continuously; they have gone from a zero budget to over \$600,000. This is all on the backs of the taxpayers. They have actually raised taxes in order to keep this board going. We do not know how far they will go with it. They have tremendous powers. Those powers should lie in the hands of elected officials, not appointed officials. When an elected official screws up, you can vote him out. With an appointed official, you have to go through two processes. There is big tax involved in keeping the Water District, which is not feasible. Their budget is over \$600,000 now, and we need to get rid of the District as it stands and put it back in the hands of the county commissioners where it was before the Water District was created. I would like to ask that you please keep S.B. 21 moving forward. We would appreciate it.

**Chair Swank:**

Thank you for presenting this bill. We appreciate having you there. With that I will close the hearing on S.B. 21. [Also provided were letters in opposition to S.B. 21, ([Exhibit O](#)), ([Exhibit P](#)), and ([Exhibit Q](#)).]

Senator Cancela will not be here to present Senate Joint Resolution 12, but she has the very abled Mr. Davis in her stead. I will open the hearing on S.J.R. 12.

**Senate Joint Resolution 12: Rescinds Senate Joint Resolution No. 1 of the 78th Session of the Nevada Legislature. (BDR R-999)**

**Kyle J. Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League:**

Senator Cancela asked me to come and present Senate Joint Resolution 12 for your consideration. I know that you have very little time left, so I will be as brief as possible. Quite simply, S.J.R. 12 is fairly straightforward. It rescinds the passage of Senate Joint Resolution 1 of the 78th Session. For those who are not aware, S.J.R. 1 of the 78th Session was a resolution that passed in 2015, which called for the transfer of public lands that are managed by the federal government, the vast majority of them in our state, in two phases. The first phase included roughly 7.2 million acres from various categories of land. The second phase included, upon request of the local government, basically any other land administered by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, or the Department of the Interior, with some caveats excluding certain types of lands.

Certainly, this is not a new issue that has been brought up, either in Nevada or in the West. This is an issue that came up at various times in past decades. It seems to be coming back around today, and we certainly see some of these movements happening in other states. The simple fact is, as we see it, the state of Nevada is not equipped to manage large tracts of public lands, and there will be significant negative consequences that would come from that.

We certainly acknowledge that there are problems that come sometimes when dealing with land management. Land management is not an easy thing to do, especially as it relates to the BLM. The BLM often faces competing priorities in terms of how they manage their lands for multiple uses. This is not an easy thing. I think the question you have to ask is whether the state can be in a better position to do it. Quite frankly, from a financial perspective, this is just not the case.

The state is not equipped to manage these lands. They do not have the funding to do so. When you take into account the cost of wildfire suppression, the cost of wild horse management, and just the simple costs that go into day-to-day management of these lands, our state simply does not have the budget to do this. The report that was prepared as a backing report for S.J.R. 1 of the 78th Session acknowledged that the BLM actually loses money every year managing our public lands in Nevada. That is excluding a number of these costs.

We feel that the issues that may come up from time to time as it relates to public lands, whether they are isolated cases where some tracts may make sense to be offered for sale or protections need to be made, can be dealt with through existing processes, through county lands bills or other types of lands bills that go through Congress. That has been a very successful model in our state for many years. That is a more proactive way of doing this. I think that has been acknowledged in recent months. We have seen on the national level where there was a bill introduced by Congressman Jason Chaffetz of Utah to direct the sale of over 3 million acres of public lands. He withdrew that bill a week later. Only yesterday, we heard from Congressman Mark Amodei, who sponsored a bill in the last Congress loosely based upon the findings of S.J.R. 1 of the 78th Session. He said that is not something he is pursuing this Congress, that there is not a lot of support for the vast transfer of public lands.

We feel that it is appropriate, given where we are now and given the understanding of the danger that would come from a large-scale transfer of public lands and the likelihood that those would be sold in order to balance our budget, that it is appropriate for this Legislature, this session, to pass S.J.R. 12, rescinding that action so that we can work in a more proactive fashion with our members of Congress to deal with public land challenges as they arise.

**Chair Swank:**

We will now hear from those in support of S.J.R. 12.

**Shaaron Netherton, Executive Director, Friends of Nevada Wilderness:**

Thank you, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of S.J.R. 12 on behalf of our 9,000 supporters and volunteers across the state. Our organization has long been a champion of America's public lands. I would like to take the opportunity to publicly thank Congressman Amodei for stating that he would not be reintroducing his version of S.J.R. 1 of the 78th Session again. I think he held a lot of meetings across the state, and it became apparent that this was not popular and that Nevadans love their public lands; they do not want them transferred, sold, or used primarily for economic generation. Nevadans treasure public lands for recreation, wildlife habitat, and quality of life. I think it is very important that we recognize that in Nevada. Polls across the West show that whether you are Democrat, Republican, or Independent, there is little support for transfer of public lands. I hope that you will support rescinding S.J.R. 1 of the 78th Session and support S.J.R. 12, and show strong support for keeping public lands in public hands.

The main point I would like to make is that public lands are not a partisan issue, although somehow it has become one in the past. I think that, across the state, people of all stripes, whether Democrat, Republican, or Independent, truly do value our public lands and want to keep them in public hands. As Mr. Davis said, there are better, more productive ways using the county-by-county bill process that our delegation has been working on for many years. Friends of Nevada Wilderness has been involved in working with the county commissioners and other stakeholders across the state. We want to continue to do that. We recognize there are problems that need to be resolved. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify. [Written testimony was also provided ([Exhibit R](#)).]

**Meghan Wolf, Store Manager, Patagonia, Reno, Nevada:**

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of S.J.R. 12. On behalf of Patagonia as a business and me as a concerned citizen, we wholly support the protection of public lands. They are important to our business and to my family and me, who love to hike, fish, and camp on Nevada's beautiful public lands.

Our business relies on access to public lands for our customers and our employees to recreate and spend time with their families. More than 20 years ago, Patagonia moved our service center to Reno. One of the major reasons we chose Reno was its proximity to the outstanding public lands. Many of our 500 employees like to get out and recreate on public lands.

Patagonia's service center opened with 120 employees and about \$120 million in revenue. Today, there are over 500 employees and almost \$800 million in revenue. We love and are proud members of the Nevada business community.

There are also economic benefits that the protection of public lands provides. I have said this in previous testimony; this statistic speaks to the market opportunity that the outdoor industry is. From 2008 to 2011 during the recession, the outdoor industry grew 5 percent every year.

I believe this state needs and benefits from a diversified economy. In Nevada, there have been recent findings from the Outdoor Industry Association about the outdoor industry generating almost \$15 billion in consumer spending in this state and 148,000 direct jobs.

During the same time that Patagonia experienced such growth and success, Nevada also became a national leader in the protection of public lands. I would like you to seize this opportunity. That is why I moved here 12 years ago and why the company established its service center here 20 years ago. Nevada has a real public lands opportunity.

**Andy MacKay, Director, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited:**

I am here in the capacity of Director for Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, but I think more important, I am here as a proud fourth-generation native Nevadan. With respect to this proposal, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited completely supports it. Not to belabor any of the specific points made by Mr. Davis, but it is important to note that a big portion of this is simply economics. When you look at the wildfires that raged across this state in recent years, quite frankly, the state just does not have the resources to manage that. That being said, I think brevity is the soul of wit in this instance, so I will close there.

**Chair Swank:**

Is there anyone else in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in opposition?

**John Wagner, State Chairman, Independent American Party:**

I have a copy of the proclamation that was done by President Abraham Lincoln. It was done on October 31, 1864. It says, ". . . the admission of such state into the Union on an equal footing with the original states." It has that in there a second time, ". . . State of Nevada is admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original states." To me, that means Nevada lands belong to Nevada, not to the federal government to seize power on it. I think, if I may use the buzzword people have been using, it is common sense that Nevada can probably do a better job of managing our lands than the federal government can with the bureaucrats sitting back in Washington, D.C. I definitely think that now is the time that we should start doing this. The other people seem to think that just because we, as a state, take over the land, that locks everyone else out of the land. That is not true, it is still public lands. Who is in charge of the public lands? Is it the federal government, someone back in Washington, D.C.? In fact, someone out in the hall suggested it is Donald Trump. I do not think that is the case, but I think our people are just as competent and more so than I think the people in Washington, D.C., are.

**Janine Hansen, representing Nevada Committee for Full Statehood:**

We, of course, are not a full state. We control a smaller portion of our state than any other state. States east of Colorado have full control of their states, except for 4 percent. Nevada legislators are just as capable of supervising and controlling our land as any legislature anywhere else. The public lands in Nevada are not public lands. They are controlled by unelected, unaccountable, inaccessible, arrogant bureaucrats who do not care what local people say. I will give you an example. In Elko County, the County Commission went over the projected road closures, roads that have been opened for over 100 years. Almost all of

their suggestions were completely rejected without any concern by BLM and the U.S. Forest Service. They do not care what people in the rural counties think. There is blatant disregard for public input. They ask for it, and then it is totally and completely disregarded.

Another problem is their miserable mismanagement in protecting Nevada's lands from fires. They are very incompetent at this. I have had fires very close to my own home in the last few years. We are very concerned about this issue, and we do not feel they are doing a very good job at all. Another issue is that, of course, they stifle economic development. I talked to a county commissioner in Lincoln County who said they have been trying to get a mine going there for over ten years. That was several years ago; it still is not in operation because of their red tape designed to destroy the economy in the rural counties. Lincoln County has only 1 percent of their land that is private. They have no tax base. They cannot take care of their own people adequately because they need to have land in order to grow their tax base. Senate Joint Resolution 12 represents the continued oppression of the rural Nevada counties and a disregard for the well-being of the people in the rural counties. This would be a boon for them so they could have jobs.

**Chair Swank:**

Is there anyone else in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] With that, I will close the hearing on S.J.R. 12. [([Exhibit S](#)) in support of S.J.R. 12 was also provided but not heard.] I will open the meeting for public comment. Seeing no one, we are adjourned [at 3:53 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

---

Nancy Davis  
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

---

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair

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

## EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

[Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster.

[Exhibit C](#) is written testimony in support of Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), dated May 15, 2017, and presented by Patrick Donnelly, Nevada Wildlife Advocate, Center for Biological Diversity.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter to Assembly Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining Committee, dated May 11, 2017, by The Humane Society of the United States in support of Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), provided by Heather E. Carpenter, Western Regional Director, The Humane Society of the United States.

[Exhibit E](#) is a letter to the Assembly Natural Resource Committee Members in opposition to Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint) provided by Joel Blakeslee, representing Nevada Trappers Association; and Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife.

[Exhibit F](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Senate Bill 364 2017 Legislature," provided by Joel Blakeslee, representing Nevada Trappers Association; and Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife.

[Exhibit G](#) is a written statement in support of Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint) provided by Bonnie Matton, Private Citizen, Dayton, Nevada.

[Exhibit H](#) is written testimony in support of Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), dated March 15, 2017, provided by Janette Dean, Environmental Policy and Human Rights Advocate.

[Exhibit I](#) is a letter to Assemblywoman Swank, dated May 14, 2017, in opposition to Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), written by John Sullivan, Vice President, NV Trappers Association.

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter addressed to Chairwoman Swank, dated May 17, 2017, in opposition to Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), written by Donald A. Molde, Private Citizen, Reno, Nevada.

[Exhibit K](#) is a letter dated May 16, 2017 to Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair, and Assemblywoman Leslie E. Cohen, Vice Chair, in opposition to Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), provided by the National Pest Management Association.

[Exhibit L](#) is a letter to the Assembly Natural Resources Committee Members in opposition to Senate Bill 364 (1st Reprint), written by Mike Reese, President, Southern Nevada Coalition for Wildlife.



[Exhibit M](#) is a copy of a petition signed by those in support of [Senate Bill 21](#), provided by Kenny Bent, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada.

[Exhibit N](#) is a letter and supporting document to Chairwoman Swank, dated May 17, 2017, in opposition to [Senate Bill 21](#), provided by Vicki Hafen Scott, Private Citizen, Pahrump, Nevada.

[Exhibit O](#) is a letter to Honorable Assemblymen and Assemblywomen, dated May 11, 2017, in opposition to [Senate Bill 21](#), written by Emma Velador, Private Citizen, Amargosa, Nevada.

[Exhibit P](#) is prepared testimony in opposition to [Senate Bill 21](#), dated May 16, 2017, provided by Daniel Schinhofen, Commissioner, Nye County Board of Commissioners.

[Exhibit Q](#) is a letter to Committee Chairman Swank, dated May 16, 2017, in opposition to [Senate Bill 21](#), written by Lorinda Wichman, Commissioner, Nye County Board of Commissioners.

[Exhibit R](#) is written testimony, dated May 15, 2017, in support of [Senate Joint Resolution 12](#) provided by Shaaron Netherton, Executive Director, Friends of Nevada Wilderness.

[Exhibit S](#) is the introductory statement for [Senate Joint Resolution 12](#) provided by Senator Yvanna Cancela, Senate District No. 10.