

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

**Seventy-ninth Session
March 30, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Yvanna D. Cancela at 1:06 p.m. on Thursday, March 30, 2017, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412E of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada and to Room 102, McMullen Hall, Great Basin College, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, 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 Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair
Senator Mark A. Manendo, Vice Chair
Senator Julia Ratti
Senator James A. Settelmeyer
Senator Pete Goicoechea

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Moises Denis, Senatorial District No. 2
Senator Patricia Farley, Senatorial District No. 8
Senator Ben Kieckhefer, Senatorial District No. 16

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysa Keller, Policy Analyst
Erin Roohan, Counsel
Gayle Farley, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Forest Schafer, Forester, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District
James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Mike Baughman, Executive Director, Humboldt River Basin Water Authority
Omar Saucedo, Southern Nevada Water Authority

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 30, 2017
Page 2

Steve Walker, Eureka County

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

Susan Joseph-Taylor, Deputy Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources

David Rigdon, Taggart & Taggart, Ltd.

Mike Draper, Western Elite; A Track-Out Solution; Lunas Construction; Green
Solutions Recycling; Nevada Recycling and Salvage; Rubbish Runners,
Full Circle Soils & Compost

Chase Whittemore, Western Elite; A Track-Out Solution; Lunas Construction;
Green Solutions Recycling; Nevada Recycling and Salvage; Rubbish
Runners; Full Circle Soils & Compost

Ray Bacon, Nevada Manufacturers Association

Tom Morley, Laborers Union Local 872

Warren Hardy, SA Recycling

Cody Witt, Full Circle Soils & Compost

Norberto Madrigal, Lunas Construction

Anne Macquarie, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club

Vinny Spotleson, Nevada Conservation League

Jim Gibson, President, Western Elite

Kam Brian, Chief Operating Officer, Par 3 Landscape

Danielle Basson, Co-founder, Simple Environmental Services Group

Gary Basson, Owner/Operator, Next Generation Recycling

Vince Collet, Simple Environmental Services Group

Misty Grimmer, Waste Management

Greg Martinelli, Waste Management of Nevada

Fran Almaraz, Teamsters Local 631; Teamsters Local 986

Sean Higgins, Republic Services

Bob Coyle, Republic Services

Ronald Flenoy, Teamsters Local 631

Samuel Bronson, Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services

Jeremy Greenwell, Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services

R. Wayne Haas, Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services

Paul Caywood, Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services

Jerry Neal, Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services

Vincent W. Washington, Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services

Tommy Blitsch, Chief Executive Officer, Teamsters Local 631

Brian McAnallen, City of Las Vegas

Lisa Foster, Boulder City

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 30, 2017
Page 3

Susan Fischer, C&S Waste Solutions of Nevada, Inc.
John Shea, Chief Executive Officer, C&S Solutions of Nevada, Inc.
Greg Lovato, Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State
Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Michael Harwell, Assistant Manager, Department of Business Licenses,
Clark County

CHAIR CANCELA:

Senator Kieckhefer will introduce our first bill Senate Bill (S.B.) 499.

SENATE BILL 499: Revises provisions relating to forestry. (BDR 47-492)

SENATOR BEN KIECKHEFER (Senatorial District No. 16):

Senate Bill 499 bill was requested by the Tahoe Oversight Committee, which reviewed the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and Marlette Lake Water System during the 2015-2016 Interim. I chaired that Committee and they voted unanimously to request a bill draft request to clarify the intent of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 528.053. This statute applies to a timber owner, or its agent conducting logging operations near bodies of water.

This bill is intended to allow residential and commercial landowners, who are not conducting an actual logging operation, to create defensible space on their properties without obtaining a variance. In order to obtain a variance, property owners are required to get authorization from a committee comprised of the State Forester Firewarden, the Division of Forestry, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, the Director of Department of Wildlife and the State Engineer. An issue was brought before the Oversight Committee on May 26, 2016 by residents of the Lake Tahoe Basin with regard to creating defensible space around and near their properties. This was later explained further by Forest Schafer, Forester, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District; John Pickett, Forester, Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District; and John Christopherson, Resource Management Program Manager of the Division of Forestry.

As I understand it, the Division of Forestry did not previously consider such activities to fall within the purview of this statute. This led to residents becoming upset when they were creating defensible space. However, as the bill was originally drafted, it may not quite accomplish what we are trying to achieve in terms of the allowance for defensible space without having to obtain

this additional permit. Mr. Schafer has a proposed amendment ([Exhibit C](#)) to clarify that intent and ensure the bill falls in line with the intent of the Tahoe Oversight Committee.

FOREST SCHAFFER (Forester, North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District):
Nevada Revised Statute 528.053 provides that property owners be required to obtain permits when they are moving trees within 200 feet within a water body. The North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District and Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District are charged with protecting life, safety and property within the Lake Tahoe Basin. We provide assistance, education, and outreach to homeowners to demonstrate processes to teach them how to create defensible space around their properties in the areas around the structure and where the vegetation is modified. This provides a safe working area for firefighters to protect that structure and increases the likelihood of it to survive on its own without the assistance of firefighters. This proposal that was brought to the Oversight Committee to clearly define logging operations and specify that NRS 528, also known as the Nevada Forest Practice Act of 1955, applies specifically to logging operations. This refers to commercial harvest of timber on forested land. The current draft of the bill provides provisions for homeowners to implement the creation of defensible space, related to wildfire hazard conditions that are required under the *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) 477.

We support the bill with the proposed amendment, [Exhibit C](#), which allows the removal of vegetation and trees, not specifically related to wildfire, in a residential urban environment within 200 feet of a water body. For example, the dangers of felling hazards or interference with power lines. The amendment, [Exhibit C](#), provides a clear definition of a timber owner as being someone who owns a stand of trees, or land capable of growing a stand of trees, that is not specifically devoted to other non-forestry related uses. What this provides is the capability for an owner of lots that are within residential or urban areas, whether they are developed or not, the ability to create defensible space. This is to protect structures or remove any felling hazards that may occur without the need for a variance.

JAMES R. LAWRENCE (Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):
We are fine with the amended language.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Mr. Schafer, have the people who worked with the Nevada Fire Safe Council been paid by the federal government? It has been approximately six to eight years since this first became an issue.

MR. SCHAFER:

There are still outstanding accounts due to contractors, local governments and agencies that completed the work for the Nevada Fire Safe Council. Throughout the years 2000 to 2011, the Nevada Fire Safe Council facilitated fire safety work within the Lake Tahoe Basin and throughout the State. This was funded through federal grants. The federal government ceased payments in 2011. This is still entangled in bankruptcy litigation, and to date there have been no payments made to those contractors who completed the work.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

To update the Committee, one of our local fire departments is owed several hundreds of thousands of dollars. Thank you for the great work you have done.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 499.

SENATOR RATTI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 499 and open the hearing on S.B. 270.

SENATE BILL 270: Revises provisions relating to water. (BDR 48-359)

SENATOR PETE GOICOECHEA (Senatorial District No. 19):

As the Chair of the Legislative Commission's Subcommittee to Study Water, I will be introducing S.B. 270. This bill establishes a deadline of December 31, 2027, as the date to file a water rights claim on a vested proof of appropriation.

Section 1, subsection 2, paragraph (a), of the bill provides that this date will be published annually for four consecutive weeks for ten years in four or more

newspapers that are circulated throughout the State. All claimants who have submitted proofs pursuant to this bill will be noticed. I prefer that the language state "in a paper of local circulation." We need to notify those people in smaller communities in newspapers like the Lincoln County Record, The Eureka Sentinel, and the Elko Daily Free Press. These people are going to have vested water rights claims.

I think the language is straightforward; however, I anticipate that before we get to the year 2027, someone will push that deadline out. We need to get this process started now. We have to find out how much water we have on the books before we can ever begin adjudicating or settling the water rights claims that have been established. Vested rights claims go back to when we became a State, before we had a State Engineer's Office. There are pre-statutory claims, which will be submitted with proof, existing water rights claims, stock water claims and irrigation claims. There are many vested claims that have to be established through a chain of title.

MIKE BAUGHMAN (Executive Director, Humboldt River Basin Water Authority):

We support the bill. Thirty-four basins encompass the Humboldt River Region and we probably have over 1,000 existing claims for vested rights filed with the State Engineer's Office. Twenty-four of our 34 basins are currently over-appropriated. Several of those are over-pumped and are candidates to be designated as critical groundwater management areas. These would necessitate a process to identify and resolve conflicts. We also have significant conflicts between the groundwater and the surface water in our area. These claims must be identified, filed before the State Engineer, and resolved in some manner as we go forward. We need to have this information to make sound decisions on how to distribute our water. I would encourage this Committee to pass this bill. I hope you will consider the suggestions from the people of Eureka County as well as the Division of Water Resources. They both have suggestions and we share their concerns.

OMAR SAUCEDO (Southern Nevada Water Authority):

We do not support this bill. We question whether it is constitutional. Vested water claims are pre-statutory water rights and property rights. Extinguishing those rights based on an arbitrary date could be considered a taking. In addition, there is a potential issue with federal reserved rights. Section 1, subsection 1 references a "vested water right" not a "reserved water right." The federal government could simply say this bill only limits the vested water rights

claimants from filing after 2027, but it does not limit their ability to file reserved water right claims. Vested claims and reserved claims are different. This language will not save the State Engineer time in adjudicating federal claims because he will still need to adjudicate reserved water right claims.

We believe the most effective way to accomplish the goals and policies set forth in the bill is to provide the State Engineer more staff. The real issue in accounting for vested rights is not caused by the claimants. It is caused by the lack of staff in the State Engineer's Office to process adjudications. If everyone in the State filed their claims by this deadline, it could still be decades before the State Engineer did an adjudication, leaving the State no closer to its goal of improved accounting.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

When you refer to federal reserve rights, are you talking about the Reserved Rights Doctrine?

MR. SAUCEDO:

Yes, I am referring to the McCarran Amendment.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Are you basing this on the idea that some rights existed regardless of what the State says? For instance, tribal lands, fisheries, habitats and things of that nature?

MR. SAUCEDO:

Yes, that is correct.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

The real issue is public water reserves that are filed today by the federal government in some areas. Those waters were supposedly set aside to allow people that were coming across the Country to have access to water for their teams and animals. I think this is what you referring to. Technically, when you get into any other arena such as a federal park, those water rights are usually applied and are adjudicated in the process. I have some concern about new filings for public water reserves. In defense of this bill, I think if we do not start this process and get this data together somewhere, adjudication will not happen for 50 years from now. None of us can afford to wait 50 years until a water basin is adjudicated because there will not be anything left to adjudicate.

STEVE WALKER (Eureka County):

I am speaking on behalf of Eureka County. I am interested in some points that are in Jake Tibbitts' letter of support ([Exhibit D](#)). The first point is in section 1, requiring notification in newspapers statewide. Existing law, NRS 533.110, calls for notification in all papers that the State Engineer publishes in statewide. Since your notification is for statewide adjudication, we would recommend that change. Another issue is the noticing requirements again in NRS 531.110 should be maintained throughout the bill and in all of the sections.

We would also like to add language regarding claims after 2027 that are based on new information, to be included into the process. These are three proposed amendments that I would like to discuss with the bill sponsor to see if we could include these in the mock-up.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

It is probably going to take some time to define what would be allowable after the process has closed when determining new information. I think this part of the language that would have to be defined more clearly. What would you consider as new evidence?

MR. WALKER:

I suggest that new evidence could be found in advanced studies and research on the basin, groundwater models developed, or further measurement on surface flows with a longer term to show changes that did not exist when the proof was filed. There could also be a more advanced technical study of the basin published to suggest that the perennial yield of the basin is less or is more. I would be happy with two out of three.

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

We are testifying as neutral on the bill. Most of my written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)) is in support, and perhaps repetitive of what Senator Goicoechea stated. Current law allows claims of vested rights to be filed any time before and during an adjudication of a particular source. We have approximately 11,000 vested claims filed in our office to date. We believe it is important to get all claims of pre-statutory vested water rights on file in order to know what all of the actual claims are on any particular water source.

Finally, I want to be perfectly clear that what is being proposed here is the filing of the vested claims by 2027, not the adjudication of all 256 basins and unknown amounts of spring and creek sources throughout the State.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Then your recommendation on the bill would be to put section 1 of the amendment in place and leave the rest in existing statute. I am fine with that. I was intrigued with your remark that a Public Water Reserve (PWR) 107 claim would be outside of this. All federal agencies, for example, the U.S. Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management are post-statutory.

MR. KING:

Senator Goicoechea, in my mind it would be cleaner to put a sunset date in there. I have listened to other testimony today and we support better noticing during the next ten years, whether it is through all of the newspapers in the State or other means. When you pointed out my testimony about the PWR 107s and the other reserved rights, my understanding is that those rights will only materialize if we initiate a McCarran Amendment adjudication on a specific source. Otherwise, I do not think the PWR 107 claimants will feel compelled to meet that 2027 deadline.

SUSAN JOSEPH-TAYLOR (Deputy Administrator, Division of Water Resources, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I would like to provide the definition of reserved rights:

Reserved rights are implied when the federal government reserves land from the public domain for a public purpose thereby impliedly reserve then unappropriated water to fulfill the primary purpose of that reservation.

That is an interesting point Senator Goicoechea. Regarding the PWR 107 claims, I believe their priority date was 1926, but the federal government has been asserting vested rights claims in place of those in many adjudications, which are being litigated as in the Owyhee adjudication. Indian tribes are asserting those water rights that are appurtenant to their lands as opposed to the history of Nevada that they ran with the cattlemen. We have had much more than water reserve claims. We have had tribal, in-stream flow, firefighting and administrative site claims. I am not sure if I have done a fish and wildlife claim. They are broad, so it is not just the PWR 107 claims.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 30, 2017
Page 10

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Have you had any vested right claims come out of basin 162? They have the same claim, that they are pre-statutory.

MS. JOSEPH-TAYLOR:

We have not initiated an adjudication in Pahrump. I would have to look at our records to see if there are any vested or reserved rights claims on file.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I think you know where I am coming from. The claim is, and there is a case pending, that those were select lands and therefore are reserved.

MS. JOSEPH-TAYLOR:

I do not agree with that at all Senator Goicoechea. They are not asserting a reserved right claim.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In that case, would it be appropriate for them to file a vested claim before December 31, 2027?

MR. KING:

Are you specially asking about the PWR 107s or any vested claims?

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Any vested claims in basin 162.

MR. KING:

I could almost guarantee we have vested claims of water rights in Pahrump.

MS. JOSEPH-TAYLOR:

I think I know where you are going Senator Goicoechea, and they would have had to put that water to beneficial use prior to the priority date on the source they are claiming, and perfect that right. If there is no well drilled, there is no vested water right claim.

SENATOR RATTI:

What were you talking about the conflict with S.B. 51 and what was your recommendation?

SENATE BILL 51: Makes various changes relating to the adjudication of vested water rights. (BDR 48-180)

MS. JOSEPH-TAYLOR:

We have proposed several significant changes with the adjudication statutes in S.B. 51. I think it would be much cleaner if we only did the call for proofs in this bill and reconciled the two bills later. It is my suggestion that we leave section 3 because we are going to continue to adjudicate and as I had mentioned to Senator Goicoechea, I think there are some conflicts with other sections of the statute. I would propose that we only do the call for proofs in S.B. 270 and reconcile the other two if S.B. 51 is passed.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Mr. King, does your office have the resources necessary to process claims as they come in? I know it is a ten-year window, but I would be interested to hear about the logistics and how you would prepare for this.

MR. KING:

I believe we can. We received 5 new adjudication positions in 2013 and now have roughly 7.5 employees to do adjudications. I imagine that as we get toward the end of 2027 there will be a mad rush, so they may take longer to process. In terms of actually filing those as they come in, I believe our staffing level is okay. Obviously, once you get into the adjudication process, it takes a tremendous amount of time and you do what you can with the staff you have.

DAVID RIGDON (Taggart & Taggart, Ltd.):

We are neutral on this bill. We greatly appreciate the intent behind this bill. We share Southern Nevada Water Authority's concern with regard to meeting the deadline. The abandonment of the right conflicts with NRS 533.085, subsection 1, which states:

Nothing contained in this chapter shall impair the vested right of any person to the use of water, nor shall the right of any person to take and use water be impaired or affected by any of the provisions of this chapter where appropriations have been initiated in accordance with law prior to March 22, 1913.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Things do not happen in this world unless there is a deadline. I have a feeling this section might be amended in the future in order to find a solution for those exceptional cases. What are your thoughts?

MR. RIGDON:

I agree and I have thought about this many times. How can you have some type of a deadline without having a penalty, especially when that law does not allow us to impair those pre-statutory vested rights? It seems to be a fundamental conflict.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I concur with the suggestion to amend section 1 of the bill to say that it will be advertised in every paper of local circulation, which is the normal procedure for the State Engineer. As for Senator Settelmeyer's comments, if this bill is passed, I think these issues would have to be addressed in the 2027 Session.

I agree that there needs to be a mechanism to address those vested claims that may be amended or litigated if something was missed when the original proof was filed. If a vested water right holder could prove that new information was uncovered, the claim could be re-established, no matter what this language says.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 270 WITH ONLY CHANGES IN SECTION 1.

ERIN ROOHAN (Counsel):

Most of the other changes in the bill are just conforming changes based on the changes made in section 1. The amendment is not making substantive changes to statute, so much as it is changing other statutes to reflect the changes made in section 1.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Could we have Mr. King come forward to confirm that type of a concept? It does seem that there are some differences.

MS. JOSEPH-TAYLOR:

Ms. Roohan, I do not agree because section 3, subsection 2, paragraph (b), is being eliminated. We still need that in statute and eliminating that conflicts with

NRS 533.110, NRS 533.125 and NRS 533.130. This still has us going out, noticing and calling for proofs. That is my concern, not the "except as provided" in subsection 1.

MS. ROOHAN:

The motion is to remove the language " ... except as otherwise provided." In section 3, if the intent is to continue to allow the State Engineer's Office to accept proofs of claims after the 2027 deadline, that language could remain. The 2027 deadline to submit proofs is what that change in section 3 is based on. It does not take effect until 2028, at which point, all the claims would have to have been submitted, and the State Engineer would no longer be going out, noticing and calling for proofs. It depends on what the intent is.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I will rephrase my intent. I will withdraw my previous motion.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS AS AMENDED S.B. 270 ONLY PERTAINING TO THE CONCEPT OF THE DEADLINE OUTLINED IN SECTION 1 AND ALL OTHER CHANGES NECESSARY TO AFFECT THAT DEADLINE.

SENATOR RATTI:

Does that keep in the noticing statewide?

CHAIR CANCELA:

I believe Senator Settelmeyer will have to amend his motion to include the language that Eureka County brought forward. This means ensuring that notices are circulated in statewide papers as is the current practice by the State Engineer's Office.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I withdraw my motion and amend it that way.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS S.B. 270 AS AMENDED ONLY PERTAINING TO THE CONCEPT OF THE DEADLINE OUTLINED IN SECTION 1, WITH THE NEWSPAPER NOTIFICATION LANGUAGE FROM EUREKA COUNTY AND ALL OTHER CHANGES NECESSARY TO AFFECT THAT DEADLINE.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 270 and now hear S.B. 315 with Senator Farley's introduction of the bill.

SENATE BILL 315: Revises provisions relating to waste disposal. (BDR 40-989)

SENATOR PATRICIA FARLEY (Senatorial District No. 8):

I will present this bill sponsored by Senator Denis and myself regarding the waste and recycling industry and its effects on the people, environment, and economy of our State. I have submitted my written testimony ([Exhibit F](#)). We will be working from the Proposed Amendment 3245 ([Exhibit G](#)) to the bill.

SENATOR MOISES DENIS (Senatorial District No. 2):

This is an important issue in our State. In the past two Sessions, I brought forth bills that would increase recycling in the State, however they did not get very far. Senator Farley was on the committee that heard the last bill during the 78th Legislative Session in 2015 and started asking a lot of questions. She started researching the issue and realized that there was a problem. Recycling is on a decline in Nevada and we have statistics that attest to this. Our landfill in Clark County, which was a 250-year landfill was increased to a 417-year landfill to be able to do more.

This does not show me that we have an interest in recycling; it shows me we have an interest in filling landfills. Once again, we are here to talk about how we can increase recycling in our State. This would also create significantly needed jobs by salvaging those materials that are recyclable. There are many different industries across the Country that are successfully doing this.

I would now like to walk you through the bill with Proposed Amendment 3245 [Exhibit G](#). Section 2 and section 3 define commercial recyclable materials and franchisee provisions.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Section 2 of the bill with Proposed Amendment, 3245 [Exhibit G](#), by Senator Farley has not changed at all.

SENATOR DENIS:

Evidently, my comments were not updated in the amendment [Exhibit G](#). Section 4 states that the State Environmental Commission will study agreements for the collection and disposal of solid waste, make recommendations to municipalities regarding provisions that would likely increase recycling, and make sub grants and donations to administer the provisions of the bill.

Section 5 lists the information that must be submitted monthly by franchisees to the Commission including the total cost per ton of the franchisee for collecting, hauling and disposing of commercial and demolition waste. This includes all charges for the disposal of this waste. Within five days of receiving this information, the Commission will calculate and post the effective monthly disposal rates for each franchisee. For the following month, the franchisee may not charge any competitor a rate to dispose of waste at the franchisee's disposal site that exceeds the effective monthly disposal rate. The effective monthly disposal rate means the lowest rate for disposal of construction and demolition waste at the franchisee's disposal site that has been advertised or submitted as a bid.

Section 6 creates the Nevada Council on Recycling and Materials Management and provides for its membership. The Council will study issues relating to disposal of solid waste, including waste diversion, waste management plans, recycling and composting. The Council will also provide recommendations to the Governor, the Nevada State Legislature, the Commission, State agencies and municipalities.

Section 7 provides the Legislative declaration that limiting competition and disposal of commercial recyclable material does not facilitate efficient services or promote the general welfare of the inhabitants of this State.

Section 9 provides that a governing body may not enter into an agreement that gives an exclusive right to collect, transport and dispose of commercial recyclable materials generated within the municipality.

Section 13 requires that each county with a population of 100,000 or more, for example, Clark County and Washoe County, must divert at least 25 percent of its solid waste from a landfill to a recycling or composting facility.

Finally, section 15 provides that the Commission must adopt regulations with the goal of recycling at least 35 percent of the total solid waste generated.

I mentioned earlier how important this is. I think as we move forward, we need to remember that recycling is an important matter that can bring jobs and is good for the environment and our communities. I urge you to support this bill.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I have heard other versions of this bill in the past and I appreciate the changes that have been made. They seem to be much better than the previous versions. What is the current waste diversion rate in those counties that have a population over 100,000?

SENATOR FARLEY:

There is a goal of a 25 percent rate, which has been hit 3 times in the last 20 years. With the way the contracts stand now, the locals, counties and cities are having a difficult time getting accurate information on how much recycling is actually occurring today.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Was the 25 percent diversion rate that was hit, was it only in Clark County, or was it hit in Washoe County as well?

SENATOR FARLEY:

This was statewide. I am not sure I understand your question.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

The bill is specifically stating that counties with populations that exceed 100,000 will have a rate of 25 percent. You are saying that Clark County has been able to achieve that 25 percent. Has Washoe County had the ability to do that? What is the rate currently and is that goal attainable?

SENATOR FARLEY:

My understanding is no, it has not been hit. There have been hearings at the local levels and requests that have been made by local officials for data to verify

what their recycling rate is. However, they are unable to get this information because it is couched behind a confidentiality provision within the contract. We are seeking to change that by adding a mandate.

SENATOR DENIS:

This is why that particular provision was placed in the bill. Regulations will be put in place to ensure that information is being reported on a regular basis.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Is the bill effective this year, or will the counties have a year to get to that goal?

SENATOR FARLEY:

My understanding is that Republic Services is about to open up a new recycling center and will testify that they should hit 35 percent off the bat. Therefore, 25 percent should not be a problem.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I appreciate that, but again, I am trying to make sure that Washoe County can make its goal if it passes.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Washoe County is at 31 percent today.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

This says a goal; it is not a drop dead number.

SENATOR FARLEY:

Yes, currently it is a goal but it would be a mandate of 25 percent. In 2023, it will move to 35 percent.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

In section 15, subsection 2, the bill says, "The regulations adopted pursuant to subsection 1 must be adopted with a goal of recycling at least 35 percent"

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

I am reading section 13, subsection 1, " ... shall maintain a waste diversion rate of at least at 25 percent."

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I see a conflict in the bill. One section is a goal and one section is a mandate.

CHAIR CANCELA:

In section 6 where you talk about the Council. As it is written right now, they are all Governor-appointed positions. Would you be open to changing the decision-making so that the Legislature has a voice as to whether it is a minority or majority leader who is appointed to the Council?

SENATOR FARLEY:

Yes, we have had several conversations with different people that would like to see how the Council is put together. Perhaps structured a little differently and less political.

MIKE DRAPER (Western Elite; A-Trak Out Solutions; Lunas Construction; Nevada Recycling and Salvage; Green Solutions Recycling; Rubbish Runners; Full Circle Compost):

I want to be clear as we go into further discussion about this bill that we are not talking about how one company is good or how one company is bad. This discussion is about antiquated and archaic policy that has not been discussed since 1991 and is long overdue. The statute governing waste was written in the mid-1950s. The majority of that statute was created to protect our residents from disease and the plague. In 1991, the Legislature established a recycling goal of 25 percent. Because that was only a goal, and not a mandate, there was no accountability or enforcement. In fact, the Legislature established a funding mechanism for this recycling program. For every tire sold in the State, a \$1 surcharge would go to educate and promote recycling. Because this is a goal and not a mandate, that money has been disbursed across the Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and other budgets. That goal of 25 percent has only been hit 3 times in 25 years.

We really want to establish an official mandate that is reasonable and below the national average. In recent years, municipalities in northern and southern Nevada have implemented single-stream recycling programs into their local franchise agreements. The true nature of this archaic policy has become obvious and undeniable and to the detriment of our residents, our businesses and the environment. Nevada is in an extremely unique position because our two main franchisees in the State, Waste Management in northern Nevada, and Republic Services in southern Nevada also own their landfills. This creates an

alarming potential for artificial market manipulation and endangering existing businesses in this industry. I want to make no mistake that these small businesses that are in the audience, and others that are watching in Las Vegas, are not here looking for a competitive advantage or more than their fair share. In fact, what they are doing today is fighting for their very livelihood. We are a State that prides itself on bucking the trend and going our own way and being one of the most business-friendly states in the Country. However, when it comes to waste and recycling we are one of the most, if not, the most franchised state in the Country. This has limited opportunity, innovation, business and job growth. It is time we do something about this, and establish a much more sensible and relevant framework for moving forward.

CHASE WHITEMORE (Western Elite; A Track-Out Solutions; Lunas Construction; Nevada Recycling and Salvage; Green Solutions Recycling; Rubbish Runners; Full Circle Compost):

We have already discussed the reasons we are bringing this bill forward. I will begin on section 4 and Slide 4 of my presentation ([Exhibit H](#)).

Section 4 gives authority to the State Environmental Commission to study franchise agreements and provide third party disinterested recommendations to counties and cities. At the present time, when someone enters into a franchise agreement with the city or county for waste and recycling services they are competing with only two companies; Republic Services in southern Nevada, and Waste Management in northern Nevada. The idea is for the Commission to provide its recommendations to local governments in a simple advisory capacity. Counties would continue to have complete autonomy to do what they want but at least there is another entity at the table that may have new ideas. It is also of interest that the typical franchise agreements in Nevada are extremely long.

SENATOR RATTI:

Mr. Whittemore, you keep referring to counties. Do you mean any entity that enters into a franchise agreement?

MR. WHITEMORE:

Yes, any municipality, city or county. Oftentimes, the franchise agreements are 12 years to 20 years long, whereas most of the franchise agreements that Republic Services has in other areas are between 1-year to 5-years agreements. There is obviously a disconnect between State and local government with the franchisees.

Section 4 of the bill requires the Commission to outline reporting requirements. I will go through Slide 5 of [Exhibit H](#), which illustrates a typical rate breakdown. In southern Nevada, Republic Services will offer to place a dumpster box on a jobsite for \$280. To collect and transport that material to the landfill, the cost is typically advertised at the landfill as \$37. They have a dumpster box that they put out for bid at \$280 and that is to collect, transport and dispose of up to 10 tons. Their competitors are operating under the advertised rate of \$37 per ton. This demonstrates that companies other than Republic Services cannot compete under the current system. Slide 5 of [Exhibit H](#) shows examples of how the Commission reporting requirements would actually work. If you look at the cost, they would require actual cost data and unbundle that service.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I understand the process that you are laying out. I would like some clarification on how the data is transmitted from entity to entity. In your example, the data is reported to the Commission. The Commission then forwards the data to all entities within the field and sets the pricing. Is this the intent?

MR. WHITEMORE:

In this example, we have used Republic Services. Republic Services would report its actual cost data and the bids that it submits to the Commission. If you look at section 5, subsection 1, paragraph (a) of the bill you have the total cost of the franchisee for collecting, hauling and disposing of construction and demolition waste for the calendar quarter. They would submit these figures to the Commission and then they would submit what their charges, rates and bids were for that calendar quarter. Based on the data submitted to the Commission, the Commission would subtract b from a in the bill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

I understand that. Who is responsible to enforce this and who is transmitting that number to the different entities in the field?

MR. WHITEMORE:

Once the Commission comes up with the calculation it would publish that effective rate. The existing construction and demolition waste haulers would be charged that rate at the landfill.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Would they be charged by the municipality or county they have a contract with?

MR. WHITTEMORE:

No. Apex is the landfill, which is owned by an affiliate of Republic Services. That affiliate would then be required to charge construction and demolition haulers that effective rate.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

That works great in Clark County where you have one landfill. What happens in northern Nevada if you have a municipality that chooses to go a different route? This calculation would not work for them.

MR. WHITTEMORE:

The way the bill is written, the franchisee is defined so you would have to be a franchisee, which Waste Management in the north would be, and then you would have to own a landfill. How we want to write this is that there are only two franchisees that would fall under this reporting requirement category.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Even though there may be other options in the northern part of the State?

MR. DRAPER:

Senator Goicoechea, the point is when you are the major franchisee and you also own the landfill, there is significant opportunity for the market conditions to change based on that and you could control the entire market. The idea is if you happen to be the major franchisee, but you do not own the landfill, you are still subject to whatever that landfill owner is charging you. In this State, there are only two companies where this would apply.

MR. WHITTEMORE:

The effects of section 4 of this bill are outlined on Slide 6 of [Exhibit H](#).

SENATOR RATTI:

I am looking at section 5 of Proposed Amendment 3245, [Exhibit G](#). It appears that you are focused on construction and demolition waste. There is garbage and there is trash, and then there is the material between. Is the other trash included in this bill?

MR. WHITTEMORE:

No, the construction and demolition material is not subject to the franchise agreement in Clark County or Washoe County. It is an open market. This is why

there is such a disconnect. Republic Services is bidding against all of these competitors, but they are subsidizing that area of their business because they own the landfill and are the residential franchisee.

SENATOR RATTI:

I understand that, but in some of the franchisee markets commercial waste is not included in the franchise, which would include all of those other trash types. Will this bill help them?

MR. WHITEMORE:

No, this provision is specifically for the construction and demolition waste market.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

This goal is two-pronged. We are trying to increase competition and increase recycling. By reporting to the Commission to gain this data is to ensure we are hitting these required goals. In that respect, maybe we need everyone to file these reports, whether they are franchisees or not so that we have all the actual data. This could be added to the information we have to see if we are achieving these goals.

MR. WHITEMORE:

There are two issues. One is the 25 percent goal that all the counties are to report to the NDEP. This is based on self-reporting from the franchisees, small haulers and the materials recovery facilities (MRF). That issue is separate and apart from the current issue of the construction and demolition market that is being manipulated.

We are trying to add a new reporting requirement to level the playing field for the construction and demolition market. The reporting requirements for the recycling mandate and goal would still be reported by the counties. By requiring a mandate of 25 percent, the hope is that the counties will have something to go back to the people who are self-reporting and say, give us the numbers of what you are actually recycling. That goes to single-stream recycling, which residents are paying a couple of extra dollars for whether they are recycling or not. We have spoken to certain county commissioners that said since they entered into single-stream, they have had a difficult time collecting data to determine if materials that go into recycling bins are actually being recycled.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Right, and it comes down to making sure that the parties have the information to know that we are actually achieving that. I just want to make sure that all individuals that would be hauling waste, whether it is residential or commercial, would give someone that data.

MR. DRAPER:

Senator Settelmeyer, all of that data is currently being reported because we do have that 25 percent goal and the NDEP cannot require counties to report the data. There are many counties that do, but some do not. The NDEP does not have the ability to enforce, it is a goal. In an audit, they just take your word for it. The same goes for the most part with the local and county governments. When this becomes a mandate, you have the ability to enforce it. Then all the counties will have to report that data and then there is the mechanism to go back and enforce it. We do not know if residents are recycling or not with single-stream recycling. If the reports show that the recycling data is not at 25 percent, the residents are not recycling. If this is what is happening, we should not be offering single-stream recycling. If we are implementing it, let us show that recycling materials are really being recycled and not being dumped in the landfill.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Would the reporting be done by all entities?

MR. DRAPER:

Yes, that is correct.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Is the intent to make this data accessible to the public or would it just stay with the Commission?

MR. WHITEMORE:

The construction and demolition data that was submitted by the franchisee would be confidential other than the actual calculated rate. Everything else will remain confidential, as it should be.

I will continue with my presentation to section 6, which is on Slide 7 of [Exhibit H](#). There has never been a coalition before this and the State has been lacking in this area so we feel that creating a working group of stakeholders will

help drive future policy discussions. The mandate would only apply to Washoe and Clark Counties which is described in sections 13 through 15 on Slide 8 of [Exhibit H](#). Washoe County is currently at 31 percent and the latest data we have from NDEP for Clark County is 17 percent; however, they have reached 25 percent in the past.

SENATOR RATTI:

When you say this would apply only to Washoe County and Clark County, do you mean it would apply to all jurisdictions within these counties that have franchise agreements?

MR. WHITEMORE:

As the statute reads now, NRS 444A only applies to counties. The counties are not obligated to report their data. The Southern Nevada Health District (SNHD) is responsible for Clark County's data and the Washoe County Health District is responsible for Washoe County's data. They only rely on the self-reporting. It is only countywide data and as they collect it, they report it. What this would do is create a mandate that would be for the counties. Washoe County would be required to provide a recycling diversion rate of 25 percent or more and the effective date would be 2023. Right now, they are at 31 percent so Washoe County is already hitting that mandate. What Proposed Amendment 3245, [Exhibit G](#), does is to clarify that when you enter into a single-stream recycling system, all materials that are put into the recycling bin are recycled.

SENATOR RATTI:

You are saying that one of the goals is to make sure that the commercial market is open to innovation and other providers is to increase recycling. If you are not measuring the recycling for the market that you are trying to open up, where is the accountability?

MR. WHITEMORE:

The mandate is different than the goal. The 25 percent goal would remain the same, which covers everything. All residential and commercial would have a goal of 35 percent. The mandate would only be for residential.

MR. DRAPER:

In Washoe County and Clark County almost all the municipalities have implemented single-stream recycling for residential customers. We anticipate that at least 25 percent of what is being collected is recyclable materials.

When you open up the commercial market, you would presume, since we have only two major landfill owners in the State, that companies that were looking for other uses for that waste would come in and begin to compete. They would not be taking the waste to the landfill. They would be coming in to compost the food waste and make things out of the recycled materials. I heard a story where someone was taking garbage and building doghouses out of it. You would begin to see that type of innovation. This is why we did not feel like a mandate was needed on the commercial side. The single-stream system on the residential side ensures that our residents are recycling where there is a demand for it.

SENATOR RATTI:

We are using the term recycling but actually I think what we want to measure is diversion from the landfill. If it is being turned into compost or a doghouse, then it is being diverted from the landfill. I think it is important to measure that across the system, not just in the residential setting. That is, if it really is the premise for the argument for why you want to take commercial out of the franchise.

MR. DRAPER:

We would be happy to work on ways to do that. I know there are some unintended consequences with some areas of the commercial side that are more difficult than others. I think everyone would be happy to figure out how to make that apply across the board.

SENATOR RATTI:

I think if the commodity markets change and it becomes more expensive to recycle, and there is no mandate to divert from the landfill, people will start going back to the landfill because it is a profit-driven system.

MR. WHITEMORE:

Commercial recycling is open in all franchise agreements except the City of Reno's franchise agreement with Waste Management. There are technicalities in the agreement that are very difficult to get around so commercial recycling is regulated by the franchise agreement. This bill would establish that commercial recycling is not to be included in any franchise agreement.

Commercial businesses that generate a large amount of recyclable materials have the most incentive to sort and separate their materials, for example, paper and cardboard. Many commercial businesses use many tons of paper or

cardboard per year and they want to sell that material. They have customers who care deeply about the environment, which is why many commercial businesses like to recycle.

This amounts to a compelling incentive for large commercial businesses to recycle. In some instances, franchisees have locked businesses out of doing that. The State must intervene. We have one client in the north that specifically puts out bins for source separator recyclables. Since their waste numbers fell they wanted to downsize their bins from Waste Management. Waste Management would not do this and told this business they had to stay at the same rate they were paying. This is a real problem. They can either spend the money to use the bin at that current size or they can contract with one of my clients and recycle that material. The hope and intent of this bill is to clear this up and say that commercial recycling is not to be franchised. If you are a business and you want to contract with a recycling company to source separate your material, you could.

The proposed amendment goes one step further and would open up the commercial waste market entirely. Currently, it is franchised on an exclusive basis and when you look at other cities with open markets, for instance, Houston, Philadelphia, Atlanta, Orlando, Los Angeles, New York, Chicago, Washington D.C.; some of these cities operate in a hybrid system. The cities and counties say, we are not going to enter into an exclusive franchise agreement but we will enter into non-exclusive agreements. This would allow multiple waste haulers to be able to enter into these agreements relating to different zones, services and areas.

Many cities have open, competitive markets as seen on Slide 11 of [Exhibit H](#). There are markets that are unionized with union jobs and the vision and intent of this bill would be the same. Right now there may be less trucks on the road which means fewer jobs. Cost and service is very important for businesses, as seen on Slide 12 of [Exhibit H](#).

There is a company called Rubicon Global that contracts with 7-Eleven, Walmart and Dollar General. What these companies do when they enter into an agreement with Rubicon Global is they look for the best waste hauler company that has those corporate diversion rates. A large company may have a corporate diversion rate of 50 percent recycling and currently there is only one franchisee

that it could contract with. If there were multiple franchisees, they could do that service a little cheaper and ensure that they hit that recycling goal.

When you talk about opening up the commercial waste market, oftentimes you will hear that residential rates will increase. If you look at a market, such as St. George, Utah, they have a franchisee for residential but their commercial is open. They have lower rates in residential waste than in Las Vegas. There are examples like that all over the Country where the residential rates did not increase simply because the commercial market was opened. This would offer many people an opportunity to compete for a contract with the effort of keeping current residential rates.

CHAIR CANCELA:

Am I correct in saying this bill does not open up residential contracts?

MR. WHITTEMORE:

Correct. This bill does not touch residential waste or residential recycling. This bill would say to the cities and counties that you cannot enter into exclusive franchise agreements, but they would still have plenty of options to enter into non-exclusive franchise agreements.

RAY BACON (Nevada Manufacturers Association):

There are technology solutions out there that may solve this problem completely and eliminate the need for this bill. Fulcrum Bioenergy has a contract with the United States Department of Agriculture and companies. They have a site in the Tahoe Reno Industrial Center (TRIC) in Senator Settelmeyer's district and they believe they can take trash from any landfill and turn it into jet fuel. They have small scale demonstration projects that have proven the technology stage of the game, but have yet to develop them to scale. There is another company in the TRIC called Aqua Metals, Inc. They have defined a new process that cleans up lead acid batteries. The only facility they have right now is in the TRIC. They believe there will be 40 facilities in the Country and 100 around the world at some point in time. Johnson Controls, which is one of the major industrial developers and makers of batteries, just bought a large amount of stock of the company. The last one I will mention is Trex, which is an operation that recycles plastic bags. Plastic bags are used to run about 96 percent of the plant that makes Trex decking with recycled material. Therefore, we have major things that are already happening in the State with regard to recycling.

TOM MORLEY (Laborers Union Local 872):

We believe that there is a responsibility in the construction industry to recycle. We have collaborated with several contractors that were mentioned earlier. There are many good union employers as well as Republic Services.

WARREN HARDY (SA Recycling):

SA Recycling supports S.B. 315. We are particularly fond of the new definitions in the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#), that clarifies significantly what solid waste is and what it is not. There is an understanding that recyclable materials that are harvested are not solid waste and for that reason we support the bill.

CODY WITT (Full Circle Soils & Compost):

I help my dad run Full Circle Soils & Compost right here in Carson City, Nevada and we support this bill. We operate about 3.9 miles from here. Over the last 20 years we have recycled over 1 million cubic yards of organic materials and have kept them out of the landfill. We primarily compost organic waste, which are items that are from local forests, commercial projects and food waste. The way the legislation is written, food waste is not considered a recyclable material. Over the years, the Environmental Protection Agency estimates 35 percent to 45 percent of all garbage could actually be sent to composting rather than go to the landfill. As an example, all of the lawn clippings that will be clipped here at the Legislature are probably going to go to the landfill. The landfill is 6.9 miles away. I am 3.9 miles away and my price is exactly the same.

I have a couple of stories I would like to bring up. One story is about Walmart, a company that is not known as being the most environmentally friendly company. They actually have a corporate standard that if there is a compost site within 50 miles they have to compost. The Douglas County and Topsy Lane Walmarts come to my site. To my knowledge, the Carson City Walmart compost goes to the landfill. The reason for that is based on the franchise agreement. Because the franchise owner of Carson City can choose where they can take the material, even though Walmart would like it to go somewhere else like my business, it goes to the landfill.

The next story is that we started the first food waste composting route with Waste Management in Reno. We got up to eight garbage trucks a week with food waste coming to us from the Atlantis, the Peppermill, Walmart and Costco. One day it just stopped coming to us. We were never told why. However, our

program has stayed in place and we are able to continue to accept materials and compost and recycle them. Based on the current regulation, only the franchised waste hauler can pick up food waste. We know this food waste can be turned into compost and put back in our environment as well as help create jobs. The food waste that is being picked up by the franchised waste hauler in Reno is going into the landfill instead.

I am asking for your support on the mandate of a 25 percent diversion rate, because this is the only way to get organizations to do the right thing. You cannot recommend something; you have to make it a mandate which will get more people involved. The University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) does this every day. We recycle all of its green waste and we make it into awesome Nevada-made compost that goes right back to UNR. They have cut their chemical fertilizer usage, their pesticide usage and their water usage in half.

SENATOR MANENDO:
How did you get the business from UNR?

MR. WITT:
The way that green waste is currently defined, it can be hauled by anyone. That is not held within the term of garbage, refuse or trash; however, it is written in the NRS. Green waste is pulled out; however, there are other items that can be composted that are within that definition of garbage that is under the franchise agreement, for example, food waste. It is just semantics of how things are defined. There are a lot of creative ways to get around that through determining which things are, or are not, commodities. That is how we get UNR's green waste. We do not take any of their food waste because no one can haul it other than the one franchise waste hauler. We could take all of their food waste too, but I can only take green waste at the current time because that is open.

SENATOR MANENDO:
Why do you not get the green waste from here?

MR. WITT:
Technically, I am not a hauler, but I can work with any of the haulers in this area. Whoever is the legislative green waste landscaper can come to my site. That is my job as a business to reach out to those people.

SENATOR MANENDO:

They have to bring the waste to you?

MR. WITT:

Yes, I am just a receiver and I do not care who hauls to me. The more haulers and compost sites, the better.

SENATOR MANENDO:

When you say it is the same price, does that mean the same price minus the cost to haul it to you? I am using Costco as an example.

MR. WITT:

Yes, and the price of the Carson City landfill is the lowest priced landfill I have ever seen. It is only \$12 a ton for green waste and it is \$25 a ton in Reno. My company charges \$7 per cubic yard, which comes out to \$24 per ton for the organic waste, which is the same price at the landfill. That is the accepting weight rate.

NORBERTO MADRIGAL (Lunas Construction):

I think this is a bill of opportunity and we support it. My company, Lunas Construction, has been in business for 29 years. We haul approximately 400 tons of waste every day. If I were to haul this waste straight to the landfill, it would take approximately five drivers in one day. However, we are doing something a little different. We recycle that waste. We have approximately 200 employees that dedicate their day to picking up waste, processing it, and hauling whatever residual waste there is left to the landfill. Whatever is left over, as far as commodities, go to different recyclers. For example, metal, cardboard, plastic, concrete, rebar, carpet, etc. We ask you to support this bill. I would also like to mention commercial recycling. Casinos are recycling on their docks with a rate of 30 to 50 percent. We can easily help them to increase their recycling by taking those materials off to a MRF, which is what we have.

ANNE MACQUARIE (Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club):

The Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter, supports S.B. 315 in the context of our policy for reducing waste, which is based on the principle of zero waste. Zero waste is a designed principle and planning approach for the environmental management of resources. Its aim is to prevent waste by design rather than by managing waste after the fact. The Sierra Club's zero waste policy addresses not only the quantity of waste we generate, but also its toxicity, its contribution to climate

change, and the important links between waste reduction and corporate responsibility. We have several principles that we talk about while implementing this goal. These principles, transparency and accountability, have been addressed in this bill. We believe waste program development and operations should be open and provide opportunity for the input for all stakeholders. Industry should be accountable to both government and consumers for environmental outcomes.

We strongly support section 6, which is setting up the Nevada Council on Recycling and Materials Management. In section 6, subsection 10, paragraph (a) of the proposed amendment, [Exhibit G](#), we would like to see the language "to study the zero waste policy," added to the bill. We feel this would be a more comprehensive way to address the issue of waste in general.

VINNY SPOTLESON (Nevada Conservation League):

The Nevada Conservation League supports S.B. 315. We support recycling goals becoming mandatory because that increased accountability will lead to a big increase in recycling statewide. We also support the goal of 25 percent statewide and we applaud the goal of 35 percent recycling within certain municipalities. Resource extraction comes at an enormous cost to our environment. Recycling plastic, paper, and construction waste and reusing those materials allows for more of our public lands to be used for outdoor recreation and wildlife.

JIM GIBSON (President, Western Elite):

I am here with Bob Ellis of R&S. The element of competition is important to everyone and to small businessmen. We express our support and we urge your support of this bill.

KAM BRIAN (Chief Operating Officer, Par 3 Landscape):

We are one of the largest landscape contractors in southern Nevada and support this bill. We operated in recycling, construction, and demolition waste as Par 3 Recycling for about 15 years. We invested millions of dollars in a MRF, dumpsters and trucks to develop a waste hauling and recycling business in Las Vegas. We generated an immense amount of green waste and were diverting about 100,000 cubic yards of material every year from the landfill to compost. We were a competitor and a customer of Republic Services. We were taking our excess waste to the landfill and that worked well until a couple of years into the recession. Republic Services got very aggressive in their dumpster

and landfill pricing. With the price pressure going downward on the dumpsters on the retail end of things, and the commercial market landfill increase, our costs at the landfill went up 400 percent in approximately 3 years. At that point, we were very vulnerable in the market. Our competitor controlled our destiny and we were at the mercy of the landfill price. We made the difficult decision to sell what was once one of our most profitable divisions. We could control our costs but we could not control the landfill costs. The current state of the law and the franchise agreements affected us to the point that we were forced out of the business. We could no longer divert the amount of green waste that we had controlled when we handled our own waste stream. This is resulting in far more green waste that could be diverted in our landfills. We want to see healthy competition. For these reasons, we support the S.B. 315.

DANIELLE BASSON (Co-founder, Simple Environmental Services Group):

Simple Environmental Services Group (Simple ESG) is a small family-owned local business that was founded in 2008. We currently employ over 50 Nevada residents, manage waste and recycling for over 350 commercial properties, and have 700 active accounts with a franchisee. We emphasize recycling efforts and have successfully increased our client's recycling rates at an average of approximately 30 percent to 45 percent. In the last 24 months, Simple ESG has lost approximately \$500,000 in contracted annual revenue due to the franchisee's direct interference and misuse of its privileges awarded through the exclusive franchise agreement. These examples include placing 278 of our clients' properties on service interruption for four days without cause, blocking our Website access and account information for almost seven weeks, purposely providing false and misleading information to our customers regarding franchise services while withholding information from our team, and actively pursuing contracted clients to cancel our services. Simple ESG and other local businesses have filed numerous complaints with all four municipalities asking for assistance and most have not received a response. Instead, the city is now considering a third extension of its exclusive franchise agreement, even though the clear majority of residents of southern Nevada very publicly oppose it. Several Nevada businesses have already been forced to close because of these exclusive franchise agreements resulting in hundreds of jobs lost. Meanwhile, the franchisee in southern Nevada recently terminated and moved hundreds of jobs out of our State. We ask the State to help us to put a stop to this by approving S.B. 315.

GARY BASSON (Owner/Operator, Next Generation Recycling):

I support this bill for a couple of reasons. Primarily, I think that increasing recycling is a good thing for the environment and what we are all looking for is some greater oversight. We are faced with the precarious situation where as a resident, I am contributing and funding a recycling facility that the franchisee recently built. I am a commercial recycler and I am competing with the facility that I funded. The commercial recycling process is blended into the residential recycling process. There is no delineation. From a competitive standpoint, I am funding a facility myself whereas, the franchisees are using funds from the residential process to fund the commercial facility.

VINCE COLLET (Simple Environmental Services Group):

I was in the same situation as Kam Brian. Due to the prices that the franchisee started charging my company, we were unable to sustain our competitive edge or process. We had 25 employees and had to close our business. I am in support of S.B. 315.

MISTY GRIMMER (Waste Management):

Senator Goicoechea, in response to your question about the other landfills, one of the circumstances in northern Nevada is that there are other landfills in this area. The way this bill is written right now, the price regulation would only apply to Waste Management's landfill.

I would also like to comment about the goal of 25 percent or 35 percent recycling. It is a fantastic goal and Waste Management meets that goal at 31 percent. There has to be a product for the market of the recyclables. It is one thing for all of us that are residents to put our recyclables into single-stream and feel good about it, but once it gets to the facility they have to find a buyer. This is not always easy to do.

GREG MARTINELLI (Waste Management of Nevada):

From our perspective, there does not seem to be a need for the State Environmental Commission to be involved in establishing disposal rates for construction and demolition in northern Nevada. Each franchise in Washoe County, Reno, and Sparks has elected not to make construction and demolition part of that franchise. It is an open competitive environment. There are also three landfills in northern Nevada. The Lockwood Regional Landfill, the Carson City Landfill and the Russell Pass Landfill outside of Fallon. The way the bill is written, the Commission would be involved in setting the rates for

construction and demolition volumes going into the Lockwood Regional Landfill, but not the other facilities. The reason for that is that Waste Management, Inc., owns Reno Disposal Co., who operates the collection franchises in Washoe County. Waste Management, Inc. also owns Refuse, Inc., which are the Lockwood Regional Landfill and the transfer stations. The competitive bidding process in northern Nevada works. A State-mandated price control seems to be counter intuitive to the desire for an open and competitive marketplace. The cities and counties know what works best in their communities and they should be the ones making the decisions on whom and what they franchise in their communities.

I want to move into the franchise part of the bill. I do not want to go into each individual item and try to rebut everything that was said. Anyone that says by taking the commercial portion out of a franchise agreement is not going to impact residential rates does not understand how the process works.

The commercial subsidy in the City of Reno is significant. Last year, the City of Sparks elected to make its residential service standalone although there is a subsidy for paying for the free city services. Washoe County has very little commercial business and this is reflected in the rates. The City of Reno might pay \$17 per month for the service and in the county it would be \$23 a month; in Sparks, it may be \$19 per month. There is a significant impact. Over the years, in my work with government, the politicians are very cognizant of the impact that this has on their ratepayers. There are 135,000 residential consumers in Washoe County and 8,000 businesses. There is a real drive to make sure those people are not impacted.

We believe it is bad for residents because the rates will increase. It is bad for municipalities because of the significant franchise fees they earn. This is also bad for the environment because there would be more trucks on the road with fewer recycling programs and less recycling education. No matter how you cut it, there are only so many tons of waste. More trucks on the road will have an impact on the carbon footprint.

This bill will adversely impact union jobs throughout Nevada and will remove choice from municipalities to design their franchise systems for managing their solid waste and recycling services. This bill will eliminate coordinated routing logistics and service efficiencies, commercial subsidy of residential rates, and the subsidy for free city services. This bill will reduce recycling and

sustainability programs and the incentive to reduce waste generation. Finally, this bill will eliminate financial incentives for private industry to invest in recycling and processing facilities.

There are significant consequences in disfranchising the commercial side. Some of the benefits of keeping the commercial business are that it subsidizes the rates to result in lower costs to the residential ratepayer. The impact of disfranchising would require the residential services to stand on their own. Municipalities would pay for city services in addition to losing franchise agreements resulting in a budget shortfall.

Waste Management, Inc. has a contract with Fulcrum Bioenergy that Mr. Bacon mentioned earlier. They will be receiving solid waste from Washoe County, which will be going into their facility located in Storey County. They will be creating a feedstock to go into their biorefinery at the TRIC. We have an arrangement set up with the regulator, which is the Washoe County Health District (WCHD) to provide them with the data so that those percentages are being shown as being recycled out of northern Nevada.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

Mr. Martinelli, you mentioned that there are three different places to take materials. If they are going to the other landfills, how do we get that data? Do they have to report to the other landfills that are not in the area, or do they report to WCHD?

MR. MARTINELLI:

If you operate a collection company in Washoe County you are required to have a permit from the WCHD. One of the conditions of the permit is that you provide them a reporting of your volume data on an annual basis. All of that information is currently being collected, which is how we got to the number of 31 percent.

FRAN ALMARAZ (Teamsters Local 631, Teamster Local 986):

I oppose S.B. 315 and I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).

SEAN HIGGINS (Republic Services):

Republic Services is the largest recycling company in the State and we are in favor of recycling. Approximately one-half of Clark County is single-stream and we recycle at 25 percent.

This bill is not about recycling. This bill is about trying to create an anti-competitive market. This is almost a manufactured hysteria by two or three companies and their public relations firm to try to bring down Waste Management and Republic Services and change the way we do business today.

I want to walk through the amended version of the bill, [Exhibit G](#), to clarify certain points because it is important that the Committee reads and understands what is in it. Section 3 talks about a franchisee, which is a new definition. These definitions become important later when you look at this. Residential solid waste is generated from a building that serves primarily as a residence for one or more natural persons. This definition in this bill would include multifamily dwellings, which are currently collected and charged at a different rate than a single-family residence. Certain residents would be subject to different and potentially higher rates if this bill were to pass. We would welcome the study required in Section 4 of the bill.

Section 5 requires a franchisee to submit specific information including cost per ton for collection, hauling and disposal of construction and demolition waste. However, cost is not defined in the bill. Do we amortize all of our random costs? Is it the cost of the landfill or equipment? What is the cost that we are required to submit? As we look at this section, we also have to look to sections 7, 18 and 19 and then look at section 3 again. This definition of franchisee is limited. If this bill were to pass, a franchisee would be a person who collected residential waste only. Consequently, what we are requiring under section 5 is a residential waste franchisee to report construction and demolition waste. This part has no bearing on the other part. In addition, this section does not require us to charge a lower rate to the public as the proponents would have you think. This only applies to other haulers and they would be the only ones who could do this.

With regard to the definition in section 5, subsection 6, I think this is a misinterpretation of language. What this section is actually saying is that if you take the difference in what it costs, for example, it costs someone \$15 with Republic and what we bid, we will say it was \$30. This bill says the effective rate would be \$15 for the next quarter. I am sure that is not the intent here.

What the Committee has not heard is that construction and demolition waste is a complex issue. Republic Services has two different types of construction and

demolition operations. One operation drives to the location and drops the dumpster off then workers pick it up and take it to the landfill. The other operation is where customers bring their own waste and dispose of it at our landfill.

During the 78th Legislative Session in 2015 and during the 2015 Interim, there was suggestion and innuendo that we manipulate the price. However, the proponents of this bill including the sponsors, have yet to show me one piece of evidence where this has occurred. There was a job that we completed and we were accused of bidding different rates to different companies to haul away waste. I provided those bids myself and they were all identical, but I was still told that was incorrect. As far as I can see, no one has provided this Committee or Republic Services evidence that we are providing rates that are unfair and noncompetitive. Mr. Whittemore had a quote of \$280 for a 10-ton box. We offer a 30-yard box, which normally holds approximately 4.5 to 5 tons for \$280. If you do the calculation, that is more than the current gate fee of \$37 per ton. In addition, this bill would not allow us to provide volume discounts. All that is doing is setting up a noncompetitive market.

Finally, with regard to section 5, this bill is simply unconstitutional. The language in this bill violates the contract clause. This would require Republic Services to amend its agreement with the county, which states that Republic Services would have the sole right to set and collect tipping fees for disposal of solid waste.

If commercial waste is removed from the franchise agreement, Clark County residential prices will increase. I provided a rate sheet from the City of Phoenix ([Exhibit J](#)). The City of Phoenix is approximately the same size in population as Clark County, but only franchises residential waste. Its current monthly fee is \$26.80; Clark County's fee is \$14.00. Mr. Whittemore identified that many cities recycle differently; however, the cities he mentioned are the seven largest metropolitan areas in the Country. There are many cities close to our size, for example, Anaheim, Boise, Huntington Beach, and Arlington, Texas that operate franchise agreements exactly as we do. I would like to move to section 13, subsection 5.

SENATOR RATTI:

I have to leave to chair another meeting, but I want to get a concern of mine on the record. There have been discussions regarding this issue and definitions.

The City of Sparks franchises commercial garbage, but not commercial trash for recycling. Many of the conversations today have been about waste or solid waste. I want to make sure this is on the record that we spend time being careful about the definitions. They really do have some meaning at the local level.

MR. HIGGINS:

Senator Ratti is correct. Clark County does not franchise commercial recycling either. The current franchise agreements in Clark County and in Washoe County work as they are expected to. The construction and demolition waste and commercial recycling is an open market. If Republic Services were manipulating the price, then why would we not have all the business? No one that I have talked to in the past two years has ever brought me a bid or a single example in writing where we either bid two different things or undercut someone. We have an example showing the economic impact this would have on our State ([Exhibit K](#)).

BOB COYLE (Republic Services):

Several of our employees are here to express their feelings about this bill. They have just completed their routes and have been up since 3:00 a.m. or 4:00 a.m.

RONALD FLENOY (Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services):

As a member of this community, who happens to be a Local No. 631 Teamster Union member and an employee of Republic Services, I am proud and thankful to have worked for your cities and counties for the last 15 years. This bill would negatively affect the livelihoods of thousands of sanitation workers and their families. Republic Services has built a working relationship with the City of Las Vegas for decades. As a member of this community, I respectfully ask that you oppose S.B. 315.

SAMUEL BRONSON (Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services):

As a resident of this State, I am here to oppose S.B. 315 because of the long-term relationship Republic Services has with the City and various counties. My family and I enjoy many benefits including a fair wage, a stable way of life, health care and a pension to secure our future. With the implementation of S.B. 315, not only my family, but also the families of over 1,000 union brothers and sisters will no longer have this stability going into the future.

JEREMY GREENWELL (Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services):

I am an employee of Republic Services and a Teamster member for 11 years. I oppose S.B. 315, because it potentially means that I may be put out of work. If the market was to open up to other companies that do not pay union wages, pensions or benefits, I will be laid off. That means that the house I just bought could go into foreclosure. What am I supposed to do? This work needs to stay with Republic Services. They take care of their employees and they will take care of Las Vegas and Clark County.

R. WAYNE HAAG (Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services):

I have been employed by Republic Services for 13 years. My brothers and the company that I work for are all opposed to S.B. 315. This is not a recycling bill. We provided written testimony [Exhibit I](#) from the Teamsters Union, Local No. 631, in opposition to this bill.

PAUL CAYWOOD (Teamsters Local No. 631; Republic Services):

I am a proud Teamster and employee of Republic Services. I do not believe this bill will create jobs. I think it will hurt jobs. I also believe it will increase traffic, which is a problem here. I do not know if people understand what four commercial trucks going down their street every other day will do.

JERRY NEAL (Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services):

I have been a member of the Teamsters Union, Local No. 631 and an employee of Republic Services for 27 years. This bill is not good. It will take everything away that I have worked for. This is a lot to take away from someone. I do not think that other companies will pay for our pensions, health and welfare. There are many people dealing with affordable health care, which is expensive. This bill is unfair and I oppose it.

VINCENT W. WASHINGTON (Teamsters Local 631; Republic Services):

I oppose this bill. I have worked at this company for 11 years and the idea that another company is going to come in and want to hire me is an illusion. As another employee stated, the benefits of working for this company are unmatched. In addition, no one wants to have four or five commercial vehicles coming down their street at the same time. As Mr. Coyle said earlier, we have all been up all night and are tired.

TOMMY BLITSCH (Chief Executive Officer, Teamsters Local 631):

This is a very complex and confusing bill. To think that any of the individuals that have spoken are against recycling is not true. On behalf of the 1,000 members of Teamsters Local No. 631, we oppose this bill. Teamsters Local No. 986, and Teamsters from southern Nevada, in addition to Local No. 533 in Reno, also oppose this bill. This bill is about two companies, Republic Services and Waste Management as well as the Teamsters Union.

We are afraid that if this bill passes it could affect our members' insurance, wages, jobs, retirement and retiree benefits. The members of Republic Services are very concerned about this bill and others that may be coming forward. We ask you to support us and dismiss this bill.

MR. COYLE:

This bill takes recycling backwards. Section 13, subsection 1, states, "Each county whose population that is 100,000 or more shall maintain a waste diversion rate of at least 25 percent." However, subsection 3 changes the definition of what "waste diversion rate" is and commercial or construction waste is no longer included. This coalition of small recyclers and small waste transporters who proposed this bill have taken themselves off the hook by trying to put Waste Management and Republic Services squarely in the target area by saying that all of the waste diversion has to be residential. This is a sneak attack, in my opinion. Because they were the ones that proposed the bill, they have taken commercial and construction waste recycling out of the equation and now it is only residential. I think that Mr. Martinelli and I can agree that we can get to 25 percent residential diversion, but what about the rest of the industry? They are trying to pull the wool over everybody's eyes by dropping commercial and construction waste out of the recycling.

BRIAN MCANALLEN (City of Las Vegas):

The City of Las Vegas opposes the amended version of S.B. 315 primarily because of section 9. This bill strips the local government's ability to enter into exclusive franchise agreements for commercial recyclable materials and commercial solid waste. Currently, we would not consider entering into an exclusive agreement for commercial recycled materials. However, we would like to reserve that right for the future so that we may be able to determine which delivery service options are best for our community. We feel this bill is too limiting and ties our hands in providing what is needed for our community.

In the fall of 2015 and through 2016, the City of Las Vegas drafted an update to the solid waste and single-stream recycling ordinance. We have negotiated a franchise agreement with Republic Services. This item will be on the Las Vegas City Council agenda on April 5, 2017.

LISA FOSTER (Boulder City):

Boulder City is in a unique situation and would like to be exempted from this bill. Boulder City's population is 20,000. They have their own landfill and they only process approximately 20,000 tons per year.

SUSAN FISCHER (C&S Waste Solutions of Nevada, Inc.):

We are supportive of the intent of the bill; however, there are some parts in the amendment we have concerns with. We have met with one of the bill sponsors and the proponents who are amenable to working with us. Section 3, subsection 1, where it describes the franchisee, "A person who owns or operates, ... " we would like that changed to "owns and operates." Mr. Shea's company operates the landfill in Nye County but the landfill is owned by Nye County. His franchise agreement is with them.

JOHN SHEA (Chief Executive Officer, C&S Waste Solutions of Nevada, Inc.):

We are the franchise hauler and landfill operator in Nye County. We employ over 80 Nevadans and we have been operating in that jurisdiction for over 20 years. We are family owned and operated. I am a fourth generation operator in this industry with roots in one of the most progressive recycling companies in the Country today. That is who we are and this is a philosophy we live by. For example, we implemented some of the first sustainable recycling programs in rural Nevada over a decade ago and those are thriving today. In 2005, we assumed operation of the Nye County landfill with a scheduled closure date of 2009. Today, that landfill still has over 20 years of life because of a progressive diversion program that we implemented with the support of the Nye County Board of County Commissioners. Currently, we are in negotiations and discussions with Nye County to expand those programs hoping to achieve a 50 percent diversion rate.

I would like to commend the sponsors of this bill for having the foresight to address recycling in this Session. We are very much in support of the idea of forming a Council to evaluate diversion opportunities.

Section 3 of this bill would force Nye County to go to the Commission to set rates. Nye County sets the rates by ordinance and we operate on behalf of the County. We also have concerns about section 7 with the exclusion of the commercial waste stream. We understand the goal of this legislation is to target Republic Services and Waste Management. The fast pace that we are moving this forward is in regard to the pending vote in the City of Las Vegas. As written, there is collateral damage in this bill and it affects us and small operators like us. We built our entire career around a model to service the specific needs of the communities in which we operate and this has been done with the legislation and regulation that is currently in place. We have built an entire business and business model around that and the proposed changes as set forth in this bill and the amendment puts our entire company at risk.

We are ready to be part of this process, but if we are going to do this, we should do it right and not lose sight of everyone impacted by the decisions you make.

GREG LOVATO (Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I am here to provide neutral testimony on S.B. 315 on behalf of the NDEP. My written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)) will briefly review the proposed legislation and specifically how NDEP interprets its duties related to franchise agreement recommendations.

MICHAEL HARWELL (Assistant Manager, Department of Business Licenses, Clark County):

I just received the proposed amendment for S.B. 315 and have not had time to review it. I am glad to see that the commercial recycling material definition has been removed. Our position is neutral, but we do have concerns. One of them is the 25 percent diversion rate. If we want to be sure that everything possible is being diverted out of the landfill, it should refer to all solid waste, not only residential solid waste. In addition, the construction and demolition waste that is being diverted and the recycling numbers that are being reported to NDEP by the SNHD, should be voluntary, not mandatory. If we are looking for a mandatory 25 percent diversion rate, this reporting should be required of all companies that recycle. There should be a mechanism to penalize those that do not report and we should be able to verify or test to ensure those numbers are accurate and not duplicative. For example, a construction and demolition hauler could recycle ten tons of material and send part of that to a metal recycler.

These materials need to be measured and held to an accurate number. If those numbers are being duplicated, then that is just inflating the number. The other part is, we talk a lot about recycling and construction and demolition waste, but this amendment changes the competitiveness to include all solid waste. I will remain neutral right now, but we do have concerns about opening up all commercial solid waste to competition.

SENATOR FARLEY:

I have a couple of counter points to make. To begin with, this was referenced to by Mr. Higgins as a hysterical response. I want to make sure that the Committee knows that this week we delivered 7,000 signatures of people in opposition to the contract that is being proposed on April 5, 2017 to the members of the Las Vegas City Council.

I feel bad that the employees of Republic Services are involved at this stage. In my heart and in my mind, this does not erase jobs and is not going to impact someone's family. If anything, we are going to put more people to work. When I found out that the Teamsters Union had that opinion, I immediately went to the person I know at the Legislature who has the most union experience. That person is Danny Thompson. It is not my intent to take anyone's job, and if I were heading down that road, I would quickly turn around. For everyone that came up and testified today, that is not my intent. I understand why Republic Services is sharing information with you the way they are. I want to tell you that I am collaborating with the side of labor to ensure that we are not only protecting your jobs, but we are providing more jobs in our State. I want to make sure this is very clear. Bob Coyle made a comment in his testimony, and he phrased it as a sneaky attack. I would like to play his testimony back for the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Legal Counsel to weigh in. Mr. Coyle was talking about new language in the bill and I do not know if it was just a mischaracterization or potentially intentional or unintentional on his part.

Finally, when you quote Phoenix to an Arizona girl, you had better hope the Arizona girl does not have friends in waste management and garbage in the city. Phoenix is a very different city. It is almost twice as large and more spread out than Las Vegas. There are multiple dumps and it costs much more for these services. Phoenix is not a good example, and neither is St. George, which is smaller. We used Los Angeles because of the closer proximity to Nevada. We looked at other cities that did not experience increased prices or labor being impacted and they have flourished. In addition, you heard Mr. Bacon testify,

there are companies that are finding things to do with garbage. Someone also testified that they were spending quite a bit of money marketing a recycling program. I think we need to look at the bigger picture. Senator Denis and I wrote a letter this week asking the City of Las Vegas to join in this conversation. It is a public policy conversation and I think that we have raised some valid points and concerns. This is not only about the companies that testified today, but the 7,000 signatures that were delivered this week that say this is a valid issue and deserves some discussion.

The remainder of this page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 30, 2017
Page 45

CHAIR CANCELA:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 315, and adjourn the meeting at 3:51 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Gayle Farley,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	11		Attendance Roster
S.B. 499	C	2	Senator Ben Kieckhefer	Tahoe Douglas Fire Protection District / North Lake Tahoe Fire Protection District Proposed Amendment
S.B. 270	D	2	Steve Walker / Eureka County	Jake Tibbitts Letter of Support
S.B. 270	E	2	Jason King / Division of Water Resources	Written Testimony
S.B. 315	F	3	Senator Patricia Farley	Written Testimony
S.B. 315	G	14	Senator Patricia Farley	Proposed Amendment 3245
S.B. 315	H	12	Chase Whittemore / Western Elite / A Track-Out Solutions / Lunas Construction / Green Solutions Recycling / Nevada Recycling and Salvage / Rubbish Runners / Full Circle Soils & Compost	Presentation
S.B. 315	I	1	Fran Almaraz / Teamsters Local 631, and Teamsters Local 986	Written Testimony
S.B. 315	J	1	Sean Higgins / Republic Services	Phoenix Public Works Solid Waste Collection Fees
S.B. 315	K	1	Sean Higgins / Republic Services	Nevada Economic Impact Fact Sheet
S.B. 315	L	2	Greg Lovato / Division of Environmental Protection	Written Testimony