

**MINUTES OF THE
SENATE COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION**

**Seventy-ninth Session
May 23, 2017**

The Senate Committee on Transportation was called to order by Chair Patricia Farley at 9:03 a.m. on Tuesday, May 23, 2017, in Room 2135 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. [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 Patricia Farley, Chair
Senator Kelvin Atkinson, Vice Chair
Senator Mark A. Manendo
Senator Don Gustavson
Senator Scott Hammond

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Edgar Flores, Assembly District No. 28

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Michelle Van Geel, Policy Analyst
Darcy Johnson, Counsel
Tammy Lubich, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

James R. Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Greg McKay, Chair, Nevada Off-Highway Vehicle Commission
Kyle J. Davis, Nevada Conservation League
Karen Boeger, Director, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.
Andy MacKay, Volunteer Director, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Jude Hurin, Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles

Senate Committee on Transportation
May 23, 2017
Page 2

Carlos Hernandez
Karla Rodriguez, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Bonnie McDaniel
Lynn Chapman, State Vice-President, Nevada Families Eagle Forum
Janine Hansen, State President, Nevada Families Eagle Forum
John Wagner, Carson City Vice-Chairman, Independent American Party
John Ridgeway

CHAIR FARLEY:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Bill (A.B.) 29.

ASSEMBLY BILL 29 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing off-highway vehicles. (BDR 18-220)

JAMES R. LAWRENCE (Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

CHAIR FARLEY:

Is the Legislative Counsel Bureau Legal Division satisfied with the language in section 8 including ancillary features of the proposed amendment ([Exhibit D](#))?

DARCY JOHNSON (Counsel):

Yes. Could you give us an example of what an ancillary feature might be?

MR. LAWRENCE:

An ancillary feature could be a trailhead or parking area. We did not want to confuse a parking area that is not technically a trail. However, when people are parking, loading, and unloading off-highway vehicles (OHV), there may be a need to protect some areas.

GREG MACKAY (Chair, Nevada Off-Highway Vehicle Commission):

We are in support of A.B. 29.

KYLE J. DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

We are in support of A.B. 29. Our organization had a part in putting together the original OHV program in 2009 during the 75th Session. We have taken part in the discussions and worked over the years to refine the OHV program into a well-functioning part of our State government. This program is crucial and it

makes sense to put it under the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for the ease of administration, and making sure it is an effectively functioning program, capturing all the OHVs that exist in our State.

KAREN BOEGER (Director, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.):

Three of our coalition board members were part of the original stakeholder group that Mr. Davis referred to. We were a motley crew that included OHV racers, dealers, sportsmen and conservationists. It took a lot of work to create the original legislation, and we had a lot of hopes, made some compromises, and have been watching how it has worked out over the past years. With the Commission not being under any umbrella, it has had difficulties. This is a needed step forward, and we retain some concerns that can be addressed through the regulatory process. We are in support of A.B. 29 in its amended form. With the support and expertise being given to the OHV Commission, we have high hopes of it getting better as time goes on.

ANDY MACKAY (Volunteer Director, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited):

I represent Nevada Bighorns Unlimited, which is one of the largest conservation organizations contained wholly in Nevada. With approximately 3,600 members who utilize OHVs to get around Nevada's landscape, we are in support of A.B. 29.

CHAIR FARLEY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 29 and open the hearing on A.B. 322.

ASSEMBLY BILL 322: Revises provisions governing driver authorization cards.
(BDR 43-955)

ASSEMBLYMAN EDGAR FLORES (Assembly District No. 28):

In 2013, on the Senate side in a bipartisan effort, the drivers authorization card (DAC) was introduced through S.B. No. 303 of the 77th Session. The DAC is for individuals who are not eligible to apply for a driver's license and was intended to ensure that every driver on the road is minimally competent to operate a vehicle. It was intended to create safety on our streets.

When we first implemented S.B. No. 303 of the 77th Session, we copied a model from the state of Utah. In copying that model, the DAC would be applied for and renewed based on the application date. In other words, if a DAC were applied for on January 1, then the renewal would be annually on the same day

it was originally applied for. This is different from a driver's license. A driver's license expires on the birth date of the driver, which spreads out the people going to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) to renew their licenses.

Because of the amount of individuals who quickly took advantage of the DAC program within the first couple of months, it has caused an issue today. The DAC holders are causing longer waiting lines at the DMV because they cannot apply for or renew online as driver's license holders can. Driver Authorization Card holders also do not have the benefit of going to off-site kiosks and are obligated to go to the DMV in person, causing a large inflow of individuals in the DMV. This consequence was caused by copying a model and not realizing how it would transpire.

Another issue is the renewal date of the DAC. A driver's license, starting in 2017, will be renewed every eight years. The intent of the DAC was to be sure individuals who are driving on our roads are minimally competent to operate a vehicle, and have insurance. I cannot find a logical explanation as to why the DAC has to be renewed every year as opposed to an individual who has a driver's license who renews every eight years. The renewal of the DAC should be exactly the same way as a driver's license is renewed. The renewal would be every eight years and on the date of the driver's birth as opposed to the date of issuance. This would resolve the issues at the DMV.

With that, I would like to pass the conversation over to the DMV to provide data on how many people have a DAC, what are the costs and the issues they have on how the DAC renewal process is currently working.

JUDE HURIN (Administrator, Management Services and Programs Division, Department of Motor Vehicles):

Assembly Bill 322 is trying to align the DAC, which is intended as a driving privilege and a credential card, with the driver's license renewals. Once a person receives the credential, they are susceptible to the same laws as anyone with a regular driver's license. If a person gets a DUI, has an insurance violation or accident, that person has the same penalties and consequences of a person with a driver's license. Assembly Bill 322 also intends to align the expiration date of the DAC with the anniversary date closest to the birthday of the individual, which is the same as a driver's license.

The DMV has approximately 36,000 DACs, and with permits, the number goes higher. At this point, the number of DACs that go through the DMV on an annual basis is steady. This is a burden to the DMV because DAC holders have to come in person and provide proof of residency in the State. There is no option for a DAC holder to use an alternate service or online feature. It would be a benefit to the DMV to allow the expiration date to go out to eight years aligning with our eight-year driver's license renewal.

Since 2014, the DMV has been transferring our driver's licenses to an eight-year expiration date and the process should be completed in the next six to seven months. The DAC would then align with the driver's license renewals. The only drivers that would be susceptible to a 4-year driver's license, would be anyone that is 65 years old or older.

CHAIR FARLEY:

Is the DAC for an individual who cannot prove their identity?

MR. HURIN:

The DAC was intended for individuals who do not have the proper credentials for a standard identification card. The DAC allows individuals alternate supporting documentation for their name and age, such as a foreign passport and other documents that are not standard proof of identification.

CHAIR FARLEY:

If an individual has a DAC, are they able to purchase insurance to drive a vehicle in the U.S.? I know that there is an issue commercially, but do not know if there is with a private policy.

MR. HURIN:

It was intended that the individuals who obtained a DAC would be allowed to purchase insurance, if they had a vehicle registered to them and registered at the DMV. The DMV has not had any issues brought to our attention of any negative impact and there has been no indication from the insurance industry that there are any issues.

CHAIR FARLEY:

Do you know, as of today, if there are any insurance companies willing to provide automobile insurance with just a DAC?

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

In working with individuals with DACs, I know they can and do get insurance. I do not want to speak incorrectly, and I believe this is the DMV's position, that an individual does not need to show proof of insurance to get a DAC. Just as an individual can get a driver's license without having insurance, it is also true for an individual with a DAC. In working with members of the community who do have DACs, I know when many of them purchase a vehicle, they apply for insurance, and are not being denied coverage.

CHAIR FARLEY:

You may want to look at the commercial side. I know I have run into incidents where an individual has a DAC and the insurance will not add them to a commercial policy. It would be good to solve that problem, in either this Committee or going forward.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Since this program began in 2013, how many DACs have been issued?

MR. HURIN:

At this point, I do not have the number since the implementation of the DAC. We average approximately 35,000 to 36,000 through the year. We do not have the number of DAC holders over that period because some holders have been suspended, revoked or have moved to another state. It fluctuates each year, but it has been steady at about 35,000 to 36,000.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

The requirements for getting a DAC are a little bit different. We started by copying Utah's program, but I see our requirements are not as strict as Utah. Whether the individuals are in the U.S. illegally or legally, there are different procedures used and different requirements. If you are an undocumented immigrant in the U.S., Utah requires a passport, social security card or something like that. How do our requirements differ from Utah?

MR. HURIN:

I am not very familiar with Utah and I agree they have stricter policies in place. We allow the individual some flexibility in some of the documents that can be submitted to the Department. A passport or a birth certificate issued from a foreign government; a consulate identification card; or any document issued by a foreign government that the DMV determines is substantially similar to a

consulate identification card is an acceptable document. Those are some of the exception documents that you would not find in standard driver's license documents that are submitted.

SENATOR GUSTASON:

I do believe Utah requires fingerprints. Do we require fingerprints?

MR. HURIN:

You are correct. The Nevada DMV does not require fingerprints.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

How will changing the DAC renewal date to every eight years affect the funding for the DMV, and is there a fiscal note on this? One of the reasons the DAC card was to be renewed annually was to help the financing, and keep better track of where the DAC holders are. Do you agree with this, and how much funding will be lost?

MR. HURIN:

Yes, there is a fiscal note that was submitted by the DMV showing that there would be a reduction in the revenue for fiscal year 2019. Fiscal year 2020 is when the full impact of the revenue loss will be realized. However, this bill would align everybody to an eight-year card and reduce the impact of people coming into the DMV offices. There would be 36,000 people coming in on an eight-year term rather than annually.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

There are two things I want to add to Mr. Hurin's comments. First, it is not the role of the DMV to track anyone. The role of the DMV is to ensure that individuals on the road are minimally competent to operate a vehicle. If an individual should have a DUI or show a disregard for our traffic laws, the DMV can always take that privilege away.

The DMV participates in a national database program where the DMV can double-check an individual's credentials. To your concern of tracking DAC holders, I do not think it was ever the intent of S.B. No. 303 of the 77th Session to create a tracking mechanism. The intent was to ensure that the people on the roads passed the test and knew how to operate a vehicle.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

Another issue for passing S.B. No. 303 of the 77th Session was to make sure that DAC holders who were driving had insurance. Do you have any records or numbers as to how many DAC holders have insurance or have lost their insurance, compared to people who just have a regular driver's license? Are there any differences between those numbers and those that are getting insurance, then dropping insurance right after they get their registration?

MR. HURIN:

I do not have any statistical data on that. We have a program in place that sends out notifications to comply by a certain date.

There may be individuals that do not have a vehicle and that is regardless of the credentials they hold. If an individual has a DAC, the likelihood of that individual of having a vehicle and registering with the DMV is probable.

CHAIR FARLEY:

In my experience, people who are here illegally do not go down and identify themselves to public agencies. In my business, there are a lot of people coming in on work permits to do construction or a specific trade and are here for only two years or so. They do not have the same type of identification, but they are here legally for a short period and we work with them to get their DACs so they can drive a work truck back and forth to the jobsite. There are other people working in other trades and it is important to know who is on our roads. Ninety percent to 100 percent of the people applying for a DAC are law abiding and not doing anything to jeopardize their status here.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

For the record, regarding your comment about commercial licensing, I would like to work with you in the future on that.

CARLOS HERNANDEZ:

I am in support of A.B. 322. I am a person who understands the situation clearly. I have close friends and family members who hold DACs and even though they are grateful for having the DACs, they are frustrated with the renewal process. It consumes a substantial amount of their time as well as those around them. Assembly Bill 322 ensures that the renewal process for a DAC is consistent with the current process of renewing a driver's license. As Assemblyman Flores previously stated, when the program was first created, you

had a substantial amount of individuals who took advantage of this opportunity to sign up for the DACs. As a consequence, every year the DMV receives a significant amount of individuals within a certain time frame who seek to renew their DACs. This causes a disruption to the already difficult process of renewing a driver's license or DAC. Assembly Bill 322 seeks to rectify the problem by ensuring that DAC holders are able to renew their cards based on their date of birth on an eight-year basis.

KARLA RODRIGUEZ (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

As a member of the Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada, I am in support of A.B. 322.

Nevadans that qualify for DACs already meet similar requirements to those that are required for the approval of a driver's license. It makes sense that the length of validity be the same. We are asking these individuals to renew and pay every year and that only makes it harder for them to acquire these driving privileges and identification cards. Therefore, I ask that you pass A.B. 322 so that Nevadans can have equal access to identification and driving privileges.

BONNIE MCDANIEL:

I am here representing 26 members of my family that are registered and have voted in Nevada for 6 decades. We are opposed to some of the language in A.B. 322 and do not want to see the renewal extended to eight years. It would be sufficient to extend the renewal to two to four years. We do not know how long DAC holders are going to be staying in Nevada and in Clark County. We are the No. 1 sanctuary city and county in the U.S. and we need to keep track of those who are undocumented. The State and the DMV are losing over \$1 million and it is also drawing more money from the taxpayers and causing us to pay out more for schools, welfare and Medicaid. We need to make sure we are not encouraging illegals to come to Nevada. We would like to see the amendment say that it would be only a two- to four-year renewal and not the eight-year renewal that you have.

LYNN CHAPMAN (State Vice-President, Nevada Families Eagle Forum):

Many foreign countries have laws that require you to get an international driving permit in order to drive a vehicle while you are overseas, but you are legally in the foreign country.

Illegal immigration costs the U.S. taxpayers \$113 billion a year at the federal, state and local level. The state and local governments absorb the bulk of the cost, \$84 billion. Education is one of the biggest costs, \$52 billion and all those costs come back to the state and local governments. I am referring to the money that is being spent already.

In 2013, Oregon enacted a law that provided driver's licenses for unauthorized immigrants. In 2014, the voters approved a ballot measure to suspend that law, 67 percent to 33 percent. The people started to understand the problems of a lot of people driving that should not. They do not have insurance. I know people who have been hit by people who have no insurance and many of them were illegals. Sorry, but that is what happens.

For the safety of our citizens, if you are going to have a DAC card, it should be kept at a one-year renewal instead of bringing it up to a four- to eight-year renewal. If you do that, it says to me, that they are the same as a citizen of the State and that is not true. It is not right and we oppose A.B. 322.

CHAIR FARLEY:

I have a quick question for you. I would rather know who is on the roads. Am I correct in stating, knowing who is on our roads is pretty important?

MS. CHAPMAN:

Yes.

CHAIR FARLEY:

If you are an illegal immigrant and you are here and doing mischief and not intending to be a good citizen, you are probably not going to register to vote and probably not going to the DMV and identify yourself.

Looking at this a little bit differently, it is the start of a process to identify and make sure people are qualified to be on the road. This way we know who are on the roads with our families. They are working, paying insurance and have at least some sort of identification. To me this is the right step towards bringing out the shadow citizens that are living in our State and identify who are here legally and being good citizens. We can then deal with the others in a different fashion.

Ms. CHAPMAN:

At one year, we would be able to keep a better eye on people rather than letting them go eight years and not know where they are and what they are doing. They may have a driver's license, move around the Country, and then come back, we do not know, but at one year, you are more likely to know where they are, who they are and what is going on.

JANINE HANSEN (State President, Nevada Families Eagle Forum):

With regard to your questions, we know who is on the roads now because we have the DAC for one year. They had to pass the test and identify themselves in order to qualify. We have that information right now without extending the renewal date.

Assembly Bill 322 is a safety issue. The majority of those obtaining DACs are illegals and there is no vetting. We do not know if some of them have committed crimes or have criminal records. It is your assumption that they do not commit crimes or have criminal records, but we do not know and have no information. If the Legislature changes the renewal time for the DAC from one year to eight years, those that are illegal are being treated just like citizens and encouraged to stay in our Country. According to the DMV in the Assembly Transportation Committee meeting, 75 percent of those taking the driver's test for a DAC failed, meaning there are 3 times as many illegals here than who have passed the test. The DAC makes Nevada essentially a sanctuary state. Nevada allows illegals to get a DAC with a passport or birth certificate from a foreign country, a consulate identification card issued by the government of Mexico, or other foreign countries, and are not here legally.

The issue that it creates lines at the DMV can be changed by using this bill to change the annual renewal date to the birth date. You do not have to extend the renewal to every eight years.

There is a fiscal note of over \$1 million on this bill with more cost to the taxpayers. This would be a loss of revenue because now they have to renew their DACs every year at a cost of \$24 each.

There is a huge cost to the taxpayers, in fact, the Federation for American Immigration Reform estimates that the annual physical burden on Nevada taxpayers, associated with illegal immigration is \$630 million. This equates to an annual cost of \$763 per native-born head of household in Nevada. In 2009,

the amount of taxes collected from the illegal population was about \$216 million, the net cost would remain \$414 million, and the average burden per native household would be about \$501; it could be more now.

We can answer the problem of who is on our roads by keeping the annual renewal. We can respond to the issue of so many lines in the DMV by allowing DAC holders to renew them on their birthdays. There is no reason to extend the renewal to eight years. This is a safety issue and we should be aware of who is in our Country, who are not citizens, and who are not here legally.

JOHN WAGNER (Carson City Vice-Chairman, Independent American Party):

We are opposed to A.B. 322. One of the problems is there are a lot of people who are here and may not be here very long. If you give them DACs that are good for eight years and they go somewhere else, what happens to those cards? They leave here and give their cards to other people who use the cards. They may get stopped by an officer and since they look alike, that is the end of it.

I think the renewal should be every year because a particular percentage of the population is transient and is not necessarily here for more than one year or maybe even two years. Yes, maybe it is an inconvenience, but as I understand it, they do not all expire on January 1. They expire on the renewal date when they were applied for. You can make it the DAC holder's birthday, which is fine, but I think one year is plenty for temporary licenses. If you get an international driver's license, for example, it is not good for eight years. One year is sufficient.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

Do you have an example of what a DAC looks like? Does it mirror a driver's license but says a driver authorization card? Do the individuals have to pass a driver's test and is a typical driver's license a four- to eight-year renewal?

MR. HURIN:

Yes, that is correct. There are a certain amount still in the four year phase and transitioning over to the eight-year phase. A lot have been moved to the eight-year renewal.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

When the original bill was brought before the Committee, there were the same arguments that the opposition made today. I find it offensive that everything we do is considered out of the norm and is allowing more illegals into this State or the Country. I do not see A.B. 322 as doing that.

I find it offensive that someone would say when you are done with the card you can just give it to somebody else because they all look alike. Mr. Wagner, that is offensive and disrespectful because not everybody looks alike. If you can pass a DAC to someone else tomorrow, you can do that with an identification card today. This is not a valid argument. People give their identification to others all the time to get into a club or a bar or whatever. Let us not make this an illegal issue, the loaning of identification cards exists today amongst all races, including yours. This is the same argument we hear every single time and I am trying to figure out what makes that argument any different today than yesterday.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

To the opposition, I say thank you for their safety concerns. First, the idea that an individual would get a DAC and give it to another individual does not make sense, because anybody can go to the DMV and apply for a DAC.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

What is the law today for a person surrendering his or her driver's license once they leave the State? You are supposed to surrender it, is that correct?

MR. HURIN:

That is correct; they usually surrender the license to the state in which they are currently residing.

SENATOR ATKINSON:

When I moved to Nevada, the DMV took my license before I could get a new identification card. Is this a state-to-state policy that exists today?

MR. HURIN:

Yes, you are correct.

ASSEMBLYMAN FLORES:

The other issue is whether one person is using another person's DAC or driver's license. That all-around issue is not addressed here. Under this model, and even if the law did not change, someone can currently give a driver's license or DAC to someone else.

With facial recognition technology, DMV would recognize if someone tried to use somebody else's identification. If an individual who has a DAC commits a crime, they are going to go through the same mechanism that any other individual would go through. The idea of criminals getting DACs does not happen. In Nevada, whether you have a driver's license or a DAC, it is not a right, it is a privilege and can be revoked at any time whenever an individual commits a crime. If an individual gets convicted of a traffic violation or multiple traffic violations, he or she is going to see a suspension or revocation of his or her license or DAC, regardless of whether there is a one-year or eight-year renewal.

The opposition mentioned when individuals get in car accidents, many times they do not have insurance. Whether they are renewing their DACs or driver's licenses every year or every eight years does not address the issue, because an individual is not forced to get insurance to get a DAC in the State.

The notion that we need to know who is on our roads is addressed whether we have a one-year or an eight-year DAC renewal. You still have to go to the DMV and give them all the identifying material to be put on the DAC. I understand the safety concerns, but there is no correlation between the one-year and eight-year renewal; the same information is there.

The other concern raised was how we are going to track the DAC holders. The DAC statute is not written to be a tracking mechanism and it is not the DMV's role to track whether someone is documented or undocumented. The DMV's role is to ensure individuals on our roads are minimally competent to drive a vehicle and to revoke that privilege if an individual continuously violates our State traffic laws.

Focusing specifically on the DAC, if we have 35,000 to 36,000 individuals who have to go into the DMV, it means that all of us are waiting longer. Even if we change it to renew on a date of birth every year, it still means there will be 35,000 to 36,000 individuals every year at the DMV creating longer wait times

and we still are not addressing the issue. The DMV is moving the driver's license renewals to every eight years and are not in the trend of going to a one-year renewal for a DAC. They are moving away from that model, because the preferred model is every eight years and is the best benefit for the DMV to operate.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

How many other states have gone from a four-year to an eight-year renewal? Utah has had this program for a lot longer than Nevada and they are still on a one-year renewal program.

MR. HURIN:

Oregon has moved to an eight-year card. I do not know if other states or jurisdictions have gone to an eight-year renewal, but we can obtain that information for you.

SENATOR GUSTAVSON:

I would like to have that information.

CHAIR FARLEY:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 322. Is there any public comment?

JOHN RIDGEWAY:

I am a long-term resident in Assemblyman Elliot Anderson's District No. 15 and Senate District No. 10.

I have three general comments, starting with audits. On one bill, they want to transfer money from one place to another and that is fine. On another bill, they want to collect 1 million names. Last Session, I asked Assemblyman Elliott Anderson if he would start getting some audits done and he brought up audits in the Assembly Committee on Judiciary and several other committees.

This Session in the Senate Committee on Judiciary, I asked Chair David Parks to do some audits. He said okay. At the end of these two bills today, and any bill, it says there is an effective date. It would be very easy to add the wording "shall audit." In our *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), it states, "may audit." We need to put in the NRS the working words that say "will and shall."

Senate Committee on Transportation
May 23, 2017
Page 16

I do not know if you have problems with [<http://nvleg.granicus.com>](http://nvleg.granicus.com), but with me as just a general person, we are not getting our money's worth.

There is one place we are getting our money's worth and that is at the Legislative Counsel Bureau in Las Vegas. I want you people up north to know that the staff here is totally terrific, all of them.

CHAIR FARLEY:

Seeing no further comment and there being no further business before this Committee, we are adjourned at 10:15 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Tammy Lubich,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Patricia Farley, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	1		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.B. 29	C	3	James R. Lawrence / Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Written Testimony
A.B. 29	D	1	James R. Lawrence / Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Proposed Amendment