

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

**Eightieth Session
April 29, 2019**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Heidi Swank at 4:03 p.m. on Monday, April 29, 2019, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/80th2019.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Alex Assefa
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Ozzie Fumo
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Sarah Peters
Assemblyman Greg Smith
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Howard Watts
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary
Alejandra Medina, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeff Dixon, Nevada State Director, State Affairs, Humane Society of the United States
Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League
Tiffany East, Member, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife
Larry Johnson, President, Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.
Tobi Tyler, Member, Executive Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Tyler Turnipseed, Chief Game Warden, Department of Wildlife
J.J. Goicoechea, State Veterinarian, State Department of Agriculture
Karen Boeger, Co-Chair/Secretary, Nevada Chapter, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers

Chair Swank:

[Roll was called. Rules and protocol of the Committee were reviewed.] I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 454.

Senate Bill 454: Revises provisions relating to the unlawful harassment of wildlife. (BDR 45-753)

Senator Melanie Scheible, Senate District No. 9:

Senate Bill 454 adds language to the existing *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) surrounding the Department of Wildlife to include harassment with manned or unmanned aircraft, also known as drones. You have had this discussion already when you passed Assembly Bill 83, which has been given to the Senate Committee on Natural Resources and will be in a work session next week. Assembly Bill 83 is a more comprehensive bill, affecting a number of different wildlife statutes. Senate Bill 454 addresses the same things that are included in A.B. 83, with one exception. There is one thing that S.B. 454 does that A.B. 83 does not do. Page 4, line 34 of S.B. 454 clarifies the definition of an "aircraft" as used in this section to include "any unmanned aerial vehicle, as defined in NRS 493.020, or any other device that is used for navigation of, or flight in, the air." In my reading of A.B. 83, that definition is not contained within the language. From a purely practical standpoint, we can either pass both of these bills and accomplish all the goals, or amend A.B. 83 in my committee and bring it back to you for consensus.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Some government agencies are starting to use more drones. I used to fly with a friend of mine—we would count deer herds by aircraft. We would have to get down into the canyons. The drones do not have problems getting low into the canyons. Would this bill keep them from using drones for research?

Senator Scheible:

No, but it would place some parameters on that research. If they are harassing wildlife or impeding their normal direction of travel in order to count them, that could become an issue. This bill does not prohibit the use of drones, just the harassment of wildlife with drones.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Many horse gathers are done by aircraft. Would this preclude all horse gathers by any kind of aircraft?

Senator Scheible:

I will point out that all the language in the bill where we have replaced "aircraft" with "manned or unmanned aircraft" is the same as A.B. 83. Moreover, I think this is a different area of the NRS because the sections that S.B. 454 changes already include aircrafts and helicopters. This is just expanding the definition to clarify that it includes drones.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Assembly Bill 83 did not say "mammal." That is why I am wondering.

Allan Amburn:

This bill is affecting game mammals. Game mammals do not include horses.

Chair Swank:

Seeing no further questions, I will open it up to those who are here to testify in support of S.B. 454.

Jeff Dixon, Nevada State Director, State Affairs, Humane Society of the United States:

We are in support of S.B. 454.

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:

We are also in support of the bill.

Tiffany East, Member, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife:

We are in support of S.B. 454.

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

We are also in support of this bill.

Tobi Tyler, Member, Executive Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

We are also in support of this bill. [A letter was also provided ([Exhibit C](#)).]

Chair Swank:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in neutral?

Tyler Turnipseed, Chief Game Warden, Department of Wildlife:

This bill deals with two things that are already covered under aircraft: hunting and harassing. Statutes already have that, but this is specific to game animals, not horses. This simply adds in some modernization with manned or unmanned.

Assemblywoman Titus:

This addresses manned and unmanned aerial aircraft. We are getting more and more technologically advanced with ground vehicles that are also unmanned. Is there any statute that prohibits someone from sending out an unmanned vehicle that could take photographs and harass animals?

Tyler Turnipseed:

I have not considered that before. I suppose there is a day in the not too distant future when we will be discussing unmanned terrestrial vehicles as well. My first thought is that they should already be covered under a motorized vehicle. Section 3 of S.B. 454 deals with NRS 503.010. Section 3, subsection 1 says, "it is unlawful to harass any game mammals or game birds with a manned or unmanned aircraft, helicopter or motor-driven vehicle." I would presume that motor-driven vehicle would include unmanned as well.

Assemblywoman Titus:

With that logic, we do not need this bill because if you are dealing with aircraft, it would not need to designate manned or unmanned aircraft.

Tyler Turnipseed:

We addressed that in the *Nevada Administrative Code* a few years ago in NAC 503.148, which says that it is illegal to scout for a big game hunt or locate big game mammals with an aircraft. We went through some debate as to whether that needs to be modernized to specify manned or unmanned. We erred on the side of adding that so that it is clear to everyone and there is no question that aircraft also included unmanned.

Assemblyman Assefa:

How do you enforce unmanned aircraft? If someone is flying an aircraft from a remote location, you will see the device harassing the animals, but how do you get to the person controlling the device?

Tyler Turnipseed:

There is a huge burden of proof. We get reports from hunters or hikers who say, I saw a drone flying around in a canyon. It is difficult to make the connection between the drone and a person on the ground. To my knowledge, we have not yet successfully made any unmanned aerial vehicle cases. We get reports, but we have not successfully prosecuted anyone—partly because of the burden of proof, and partly due to us being spread as thin as we are. It is difficult to respond to a report soon enough to actually see the drone flying. The person using the drone could be on the other side of a ridge, but is able to see what the drone is seeing. The person may not be visible from where the drone is.

Chair Swank:

Senator Scheible, do you have any closing remarks? [There were no closing remarks.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 454. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the importation into this State of certain live animals or parts of the carcass of certain animals. (BDR 45-206)

Tyler Turnipseed, Chief Game Warden, Department of Wildlife:

With Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint), we are trying to catch up to other states on erring on the side of caution when it comes to wildlife diseases that are hitting some other states hard, such as Colorado, Wisconsin, and other eastern states. This came about while talking with the State Department of Agriculture, trying to figure out how we could best prevent this, both from a wildlife and a livestock viewpoint.

Prior to being promoted to headquarters, I had a field patrol job in Winnemucca. I was there for about ten years. It was very common during the fall to get a call about a deer carcass or a big game carcass alongside the freeway, usually at a freeway exit, such as Button Point or Golconda. We would investigate and find a deer that had been butchered and the carcass dumped. We had no way of knowing whether that deer was killed five miles away or five states away. We started seeing this more and more, especially when California passed a law much like S.B. 85 (R1) that basically said that if you are going to take a big game mammal in another state, you cannot bring it back into California with a spine or any brain tissue. I think that contributed to some of our roadside carcass dumps as well. In talking to our staff veterinarian and the State Department of Agriculture, we realized that we may be behind the ball a little in trying to protect Nevada's wildlife population against diseases.

Some of the research about chronic wasting disease (CWD) shows just how scary it is. For instance, someone shoots a deer in Colorado that is infected with CWD. While travelling back home to California, the hunter realizes he will be in violation of California's law, so he stops and dumps out the butchered carcass alongside the freeway. He takes the meat, and leaves the spine or part of the head. Then a raven comes along, or the deer that migrate down off the Sonoma Range to the Humboldt River, and comes into contact with the carcass, and suddenly we have CWD in Nevada.

To summarize, the bill says that if you take a big game mammal in another state and you are bringing it back to Nevada, you need to butcher it first so that you are not bringing back the spinal column or any brain tissue on the skull. I hunt out of state, along with many other people. This is not a big deal as long as you take the quarters off of the spine, and the skull has to be skull-capped and cleaned so that it does not have any brain tissue left on it.

The bill also deals with the importing of live cervids. There is an elk ranching component that goes on around the West. It is currently illegal in Nevada, but it is one of the ways that diseases can spread.

That is it in a nutshell. If you are going to bring a big game mammal back from another state, you need to have taken those quarters off of the spine and the skull must be cleaned of any brain tissue.

J.J. Goicoechea, State Veterinarian, State Department of Agriculture:

We are behind the times in Nevada when it comes to CWD. As of January 2019, CWD is present in 24 states, the closest to us being Utah. It was first discovered in the 1960s in Colorado in farmed Cervidae at a research facility where they identified CWD. By 1981, it had spread into the wild in Colorado. Since that time, it is common throughout Wyoming, Colorado, Kansas, Nebraska, and just last week a reported case of an elk with CWD in Oklahoma, which was found in a captive elk in that state. As Chief Turnipseed alluded to, a portion of this bill addresses the captive farming of Cervidae. You will see in section 2, subsection 5, that we shall not knowingly bring into this state any live elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, moose, or alternative livestock, unless in accordance with a permit. Alternative livestock is defined as fallow deer or reindeer, which is in *Nevada Revised Statutes* Chapter 501. We must provide a permit for both the fallow deer and the reindeer if they are to be brought in the state. Currently, we have no legal fallow deer or reindeer facilities in Nevada. I do not see that changing because of disease risks such as this.

Once CWD is in the environment, it can stay, and that is a problem. Live animal contact nose-to-nose is an issue. You cannot tell if an animal has CWD until it has infected the environment and infected the entire population. We want to do everything we can to prevent that from entering the state of Nevada, because once we have it here, it will be very difficult to contain.

Chair Swank:

I am wondering about the word "knowingly." To my eye, it would not matter if you are knowingly doing this or not, we do not want you doing it.

Tyler Turnipseed:

The word "knowingly" is an amendment that came over from the Senate side. It was not in the original bill. The original bill talked about knowingly possess, but it did not say knowingly transport. There was some concern on the Senate side about whether people would be aware of this law. There was some discussion about knowingly—does it mean knowingly transport or knowingly violate the law. The way I read this, it is knowingly transport. If you are unknowingly transporting an elk in the back of your truck, that would be a bigger problem. Adding the word "knowingly" means that you are knowingly transporting an animal, regardless of its infected status.

Chair Swank:

Is this so that someone could not say, I was not aware of this law?

Tyler Turnipseed:

That is my opinion. Interestingly, in the rewrite of the bill, the Legislative Counsel's Digest talks about knowingly violating the law, whereas, the bill talks about knowingly transporting.

Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel:

The way I am reading this is that you have to knowingly bring into the state, or knowingly possess. It is not necessarily that you know of the law, but that you have an animal and you have brought it into the state, or that you possess that animal.

Chair Swank:

I do not understand how one would prove that someone did it knowingly.

Allan Amburn:

I think the concern in the other house was you might have been hunting near the border of California, for example, but you were not aware that you had crossed the state line. In that situation, you may not have known that you brought the animal into the state, because you were unaware that you were out of the state.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

How does this apply if you get a tag from another state, have a successful hunt, and you want to hire a taxidermist in Nevada? How do you get the animal here?

Tyler Turnipseed:

Many people hunt out of state, and we certainly would never want to get in the way of that. As long as you have caped the animal, then you can clean the skull, either by leaving it with a taxidermist in the state where you hunted and they would clean the skull, or you could clean the skull yourself. If you were going to mount it on the wall, you would skull cap it, which is cutting the antlers off across the top of the skull, then ensure that any brain tissue is cleaned out of the brain cavity. If you are doing a European mount, which includes the skull and antlers without the hide, you can wash out the brain cavity with a power wash or at a car wash, so that you are not bringing brain tissue into Nevada. Once you have the brain tissue out, the risk of transmitting CWD is much less, so you could bring the skull into Nevada.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I am thinking of a full-body mount. Is the spine part of the mount?

Tyler Turnipseed:

In a full-body mount, there are no internals of the animal in the mount. It is simply the antlers and the tanned hide, which is stretched over a Styrofoam form. There is no spine, no tissue, and nothing that could decompose. For a full-body mount, you skin the whole animal, separate it from any meat, bone, or tissue, and that is the only part that goes to the taxidermist.

Assemblyman Smith:

My concern is, if there is a group of hunters coming from California and travelling through Nevada, what is the Department of Wildlife's plan ahead of time to address those folks who are totally unaware of our law? How are they going to know, when coming back from Colorado, that they have to leave the spine and brain in Colorado before they can go into Nevada?

Tyler Turnipseed:

If I understand your question, basically it is how are we going to educate people that this law exists and try to avoid getting into trouble. We do this with other states on information sharing, where we will ask another state, such as Utah or Colorado, to share with us the name and address of any of your tag holders with a Nevada address. Then we can reach out to the hunter and advise them of the law.

Last year we had some voluntary check stations where you could have a sample taken of your deer or elk to check for CWD. We focused on the eastern border, assuming that CWD is going to be coming at us from the east. We tested more than 300 deer and elk. That test is a small piece of spinal cord from right behind the skull, and some glands and lymph nodes in the neck. We were able to reach out to 300-plus hunters in person. We did some of that at gas stations along Interstate 80. We have also partnered with the Department of Transportation and used the digital signs at border crossings.

Assemblyman Smith:

I am thinking logistically about California hunters in particular, not Nevada hunters. We know that most California hunters pass through Nevada. I am wondering if you will hit them with billboards going east, that say to plan on this new law when you are coming back. The same thing in Utah, saying check station ahead. I am very concerned about the first year. It is going to be tough.

Tyler Turnipseed:

I think it is a great idea to advertise it as people are going east. California—with such a huge population base—is a major source of out-of-state hunters for a lot of Rocky Mountain states and Midwestern states. It is pretty easy to predict their travel corridors. They will either be on Interstate 80, Interstate 50, or possibly Interstate 15. So we could have three digital billboards to catch them going east to educate them before they hunt so they can take care of the animal in the destination state.

As with any new law or regulation, we err on the side of discretion for the first year or two. We do not want to be jack-booted thugs going out and issuing a bunch of citations the first year of a new law or regulation. We will err on the side of warnings, rather than citations, the first year. That begs the question, what do we do with the animal? Once we test the animal to see if it is positive or negative, the State Department of Agriculture is gracious enough to provide us an incinerator where we incinerate carcasses that either have drugs on board or could be diseased.

Assemblyman Smith:

How quickly can you determine if the animal is infected?

J.J. Goicoechea:

It is a matter of days. It requires the sampling of the tissue and it must be sent off to look at histologically, or as a polymerase chain reaction, looking for those actual prions. I can see where this may be a problem and the animal may need to be confiscated by Department of

Wildlife or even by State Department of Agriculture enforcement officers. We could then either release the animal back to the hunter or incinerate it.

Assemblywoman Titus:

I just purchased a huge hunt for my husband to go on in Idaho this fall. We are relatively guaranteed to bring back an animal. It is a big deal and a big expense for us. For hunters who are going out of state and cannot bring the animal that they harvested back for a full-body mount is a concern. I had a lot of people reach out to me saying that our taxidermists are concerned. Is the testing offered in all other states, and do all other states have the same regulations? I need more details about the impact of this because it is going to have some impact. When we are out hunting, we quarter our animals and cape them out. If we are going to mount them, we do not take all the brain cavity out before we get them home.

Tyler Turnipseed:

I hunt out of state—many people do, and we do not want to interfere with that. Simply for ease of transport, we generally quarter the animal in the field. If the quarters are taken off of the spine, then you are good. The same thing with the head—you can skull-cap it and take the brain out, which usually falls out in one piece and leaves a clean cavity. If you are bringing back the whole skull that is not cut off, then you would need a power wash or car wash. It does get a little messy, but once that skull is washed off and cleaned, you can bring it home to your local taxidermist.

Assemblywoman Titus:

Are there any concerns about encouraging people to go to a car wash and spray washing the skull into the public water system?

Assemblywoman Peters:

Car washes are not public water systems. They have to treat their water on site.

Assemblywoman Titus:

Is that treatment enough to remove the CWD?

Assemblywoman Peters:

It never goes back into the water supply.

Assemblywoman Titus:

Back to my concerns of public washing of skulls in a car wash. You go to the local car wash and have brain product shooting all over everywhere.

Tyler Turnipseed:

I am sure that would generate some phone calls. I do not know how to address that. I went to Colorado last year with my brother and he was fortunate enough to take the buck of a lifetime. In that case, he wanted to mount it, so we skull-capped it in the field and did not bring back the whole skull. The European mount does complicate it a little because it is a

whole skull and it is not as easy to access the brain cavity. There are a couple of options: you can either boil it where you are, or you could leave it with a taxidermist in the destination state, and have him clean up the skull for you. The skull mount is a little tougher question because it is harder to access the full brain cavity through the spinal cord hole in the back of the skull.

Assemblywoman Titus:

I appreciate Assemblywoman Peters' comments because car wash water really does not get back into the water we drink, but it does go out. How many other states are trying to stop this at their borders? I agree with the concept. Everyone needs to be a participant in this. I am wondering where we are in the process and what other western states are doing this already. If this becomes nationwide, then all hunters will know this. I am worried about checkerboarding these regulations and not reaching out as a national priority in an effort to stop this disease.

J.J. Goicoechea:

There are currently 14 states and 5 provinces that ban the import of hunter-harvested cervid carcasses and certain parts of any state or province. There are 25 states that ban the import of carcasses and certain parts from states where CWD has been detected. Two states and one province have banned only from certain named areas within other states. Nine states and seven provinces have no particular ban in place. We are one of two states this year looking at statutes pertaining to CWD. The other state is Idaho.

Assemblywoman Titus:

If California is not recognizing this, and we have a ban, they have to cross through this state anyway. I appreciate that we want to be preemptive about this. We know it is coming, and we just want to delay it as much as possible and as long as possible. I appreciate your efforts.

Assemblyman Ellison:

How is this disease transmitted? Is it from an animal eating the infected animal? Is it airborne?

J.J. Goicoechea:

It is spread animal to animal, body secretions, and contamination of the environment. Our wildlife are curious creatures and as Mr. Turnipseed alluded to, if you have an offal pile on the side of the road, or some carcass parts, other animals will sniff and lick it. Should it be infected, the animal can be infected that way. The problem with this disease, it has a very long incubation period and sometimes you are not aware that the animal has it. We could be a decade with it in this state before we know we have it here. This disease is in the exact same family as bovine spongiform encephalopathy, which is mad cow disease, and Creutzfeldt-Jakob disease in humans.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I am thinking about the canine teeth in the elk and moose. That seems to be a big deal to the hunters.

Tyler Turnipseed:

Section 1, subsection 1, is everything you cannot bring into the state. Section 1, subsection 2, is everything that you can bring in, such as the meat, hide, clean skull plate, antlers, taxidermy mount, or upper canine teeth. When you shoot an elk, the evolutionary throwbacks to a canine, called ivories, is part of the trophy. That is one of the things that is exempt from this bill.

I have seen places where a captive cervid herd, elk farm or deer ranch, which had CWD. They take all the animals away, sterilize the whole place, and several years later there is still CWD in the soil. It is very hard to kill.

J.J. Goicoechea:

Once CWD is in the environment, it can be maintained for decades, even in our harsh environment.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

How prevalent is CWD in our state?

J.J. Goicoechea:

We do not have CWD in Nevada. That is why we are so focused in trying to do everything we can to keep it out. As Assemblywoman Titus said, it is coming at some point. I do not want it to be because of something I did not do as a state veterinarian and Mr. Turnipseed does not want it to be because of something he did not do. We are going to do everything we can to keep it out of this state.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

In looking for a workaround with the taxidermy issue, if someone is bringing an animal back for taxidermy purposes from an out-of-state hunt, they are not going to be dumping it at Button Point, or leaving the carcass anywhere else. If you pull them over because they have an animal, and their intent is to take it to a taxidermist, is there an exemption to taxidermy transport?

Tyler Turnipseed:

As the bill is written, there is no exemption. We probably need to do a better job of reaching out to taxidermists about animals coming in from out of state. We did quite a bit last year in terms of offering taxidermists a bit of a reward for any samples they provided us. For example, if you harvest an elk in Ely or Colorado and bring it to a taxidermist in Reno, we would take a sample from the taxidermist, and give the taxidermist a little reward for helping us. We could probably do more with what they are doing with their by-products. If they have a head that comes in, they skull cap it and have brain matter, which they are likely throwing in the trash, which then ends up in a landfill, which then ends up with a raven and

we have transmission potential. We need to reach out to taxidermists, independent of this bill, as to what they are doing with out-of-state wildlife parts. Beyond that, I am not sure of a good way to give them an exemption without providing them with a disposable incinerating option. If it is a mount, the hunter can certainly cut the antlers off. The tougher issue is a skull mount.

Chair Swank:

Are there any further questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone who would like to testify in support of S.B. 85 (R1)?

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

This is an incredibly insidious disease. It is practically 100 percent fatal. It has devastated deer populations in a number of the Midwest states. It is a minor inconvenience to out-of-state hunters to cape and bone their meat and not bring in either the head or the spinal cord portions of the animal. I hunt out of state and internationally, and it is a minor inconvenience. This is one issue where sportsmen need to step up to the plate and do whatever is necessary to prevent this disease from entering Nevada.

Kyle Davis, representing Nevada Conservation League:

We are here today in support of S.B. 85 (R1). I think the reasons for it have been well laid out. We need to take whatever steps we need to in order to protect our wildlife resources, and I think this is an important piece of that puzzle.

Tiffany East, Member, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife:

We are in full support of S.B. 85 (R1). It is imperative that we protect our wildlife community, whether it is moose, elk, deer, and other wildlife that inhabits our state.

Tobi Tyler, Member, Executive Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

The Toiyabe Chapter of the Sierra Club, representing 30,000 members and supporters in Nevada, supports S.B. 85 (R1) to prevent or at least slow down chronic wasting disease from spreading to Nevada. Numerous other states have implemented similar regulations to contain and limit the disease, so this is a timely and important bill. The elk, deer, and now moose in this state have enough to contend with considering climate change, drought, and wildfires. Limiting the spread of this terrible disease is very important for the overall health of the ecosystem. We are grateful to the sponsors for introducing this bill and look forward to its passage. [A letter was also provided ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Karen Boeger, Co-Chair/Secretary, Nevada Chapter, Backcountry Hunters and Anglers:

We are very much in support of this bill. We feel very lucky hearing that so far, this disease has not crept over our borders. I would like to echo Assemblywoman Titus' comment that it is not a matter of if, it is when. This is one step that we can take to try to at least slow that down, even if it is not a cure. Maybe in the future we will find something more significant that we can do, but in the meantime, I encourage you to support this bill.

Chair Swank:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of S.B. 85 (R1)? [There was no one.] Is there anyone else who would like to testify in opposition? [There was no one.] Is there anyone in neutral? [There was no one.] I will close the hearing on S.B. 85 (R1), and open up for public comment. Seeing no one, we are adjourned [at 4:52 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Davis
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a letter dated April 29, 2019, to Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining, signed by Tobi Tyler, Member, Executive Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, in support of Senate Bill 454.

[Exhibit D](#) is a letter dated April 29, 2019, to Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining, signed by Tobi Tyler, Member, Executive Committee, Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club, in support of Senate Bill 85 (1st Reprint).