

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS
AND
SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
SUBCOMMITTEES ON PUBLIC SAFETY, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND
TRANSPORTATION**

**Eightieth Session
March 22, 2019**

The joint meeting of the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means and Senate Committee on Finance Subcommittees on Public Safety, Natural Resources, and Transportation was called to order by Chair Dina Neal at 8:02 a.m. on Friday, March 22, 2019, in Room 2134 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.

ASSEMBLY SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Chair
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Al Kramer
Assemblywoman Daniele Monroe-Moreno
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus

SENATE SUBCOMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Yvanna D. Cancela
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator David R. Parks

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Cindy Jones, Assembly Fiscal Analyst
Mark Krmpotic, Senate Fiscal Analyst
Kimbra Ellsworth, Program Analyst
Colby Nichols, Program Analyst
Nancy Morris, Committee Secretary
Lisa McAlister, Committee Assistant

After staff called roll, Chair Neal covered the Subcommittees' housekeeping rules and stated that public comment would be held at the end of the meeting. The first budget to be covered was budget account 4162, State Parks.



INFRASTRUCTURE
CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCES
DCNR - STATE PARKS (101-4162)
BUDGET PAGE DCNR-34

Chair Neal requested that the presenters skip the mission statement and go straight to the financial details. Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), began with page 3 of his presentation titled, "Division of State Parks Budget Account 4162," dated March 22, 2019 ([Exhibit C](#)). The revenue sources for the Division came from five sources, with the State General Fund being the largest at 43 percent, followed by user fees at 29 percent, and other/transfers in at 22 percent. The total revenue was about \$19 million per year, or \$38 million for the biennium. On page 4 of his presentation were the Division's expenditures, the largest of which was personnel costs at 68 percent. Operating and maintenance made up most of the rest of the expenditures. The reserve in the budget reflected user fees collected during a calendar year and rolled over on a fiscal year basis. The revenues and expenditures combined to run the 27 parks with 123 permanent employees and 145 seasonal employees. The parks were divided into three geographical regions plus Lake Tahoe, which was run directly from the Division office and not through one of the regions. The visitation to the park system had been increasing and reached a record high 3.69 million visitors in 2018. The growing visitor base and increasing overall size of the park system brought new challenges in ensuring facilities satisfied park visitors.

Having completed his overview, Mr. Mergell moved on to the decision units included in The Executive Budget, which started on page 6 of [Exhibit C](#). Decision unit Enhancement (E) 225 supported the provision of state email accounts for all permanent employees in the Division, instead of having an assortment of different email domains. The second enhancement, E-350, recommended an additional deputy administrator position. The current deputy administrator was also the part-time regional manager for Lake Tahoe, and because of the Division's employee headcount and number of parks, a second deputy administrator was needed. A cartographic graphics technician 4 was also recommended in The Executive Budget in decision unit E-351. Basically a Geographic Information System (GIS) position, additional support was needed because often areas would need to be mapped, and the Division would have to rely on a different division to provide the service for State Parks because there was no mapping ability within the Division. A historic preservation officer was recommended in decision unit E-352 because neither the Division nor the Office of Historic Preservation could do cultural clearances, often required by grants. The park planner position resulting from the 2017 Legislative Session needed to travel to the state's parks to work on strategic plans. Travel to support the park planner was reflected in E-353. The Division's safety specialist recommendations to purchase personal protection items to meet Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) requirements were funded in E-354. The last enhancement on page 6 reclassified an administrative assistant 3 to an

administrative assistant 4. This reclassification was needed to address the growth of the Division and the increased responsibilities for this position.

Moving on to page 7 in his presentation ([Exhibit C](#)), Mr. Mergell explained that E-364 recommended a commissioned park ranger for Walker River State Recreation Area. This position was approved in the 2017 Legislative Session, but there had been no immediate need for this role because the park was new. In contrast, Washoe Lake State Park had only one commissioned officer and needed more staff to run a year-round campground situated between two metropolitan areas. For public and employee safety, the Division moved the position from Walker River to Washoe Lake. Walker River had since opened, and there was again need for a park ranger. A park ranger technician at Wild Horse State Recreation Area was recommended in E-365 because the addition of cabins in this park after the 2017 Legislative Session meant the park could no longer be run by the one-person staff. Decision unit E-366 recommended a commissioned park ranger for Sand Harbor Lake Tahoe Nevada State Park. Staff at this busy park was already struggling to keep up with the number of visitors during the busy summer months and the addition of a multiuse trail from Incline Village would bring more visitors and expand the area that would need to be patrolled. The next two enhancements discussed by Mr. Mergell were for permanent park aids at Spring Valley and Spring Mountain Ranch State Parks. Park visitation had expanded from seasonal use to become year-round attractions, and year-round staff was needed to provide basic services. The park aid positions were new and were neither high-paying nor technical. The next enhancement was E-378 which addressed out-of-state travel for staff training. The agency had found that traveling to parks in other states to learn from their experiences and bring the knowledge back to Nevada was of great benefit. The last decision unit on page 7 of [Exhibit C](#) was E-379, which recommended travel for an annual park supervisors meeting. The annual meeting would ensure consistency in training and policy enforcement throughout the state, which was difficult to accomplish without travel because the large geographic area of the state made personal interaction challenging.

Mr. Mergell then moved to page 8 of his presentation ([Exhibit C](#)), and the first recommendation was E-384, which provided travel for all levels of state park employees to gather at a biennial event to share what they had learned, build a team atmosphere, and ensure consistency across the state. The purchase of supplies for the Ice Age Fossils State Park visitor center was recommended in E-385. The center was still being built, and supplies would be necessary to operate the visitor center once complete. The purchase of OSHA safety items and supplies for Walker River and Ice Age Fossils was recommended in E-386. Decision unit E-387 recommended advertising costs for Ice Age Fossils to make the public aware of the park and its programs once the visitor center was completed. Fuel and vehicle supplies for Ice Age Fossils and Walker River were recommended in decision units E-388 and E-391, and E-392 recommended funding for grounds maintenance at the Ice Age Fossils State Park and snow removal at Van Sickle Bi-State Park. On page 9 of [Exhibit C](#), Mr. Mergell explained that E-395 recommended funding for maintenance of the agency's website. Many of the Division's computers were in need of replacement because Microsoft

would no longer be supporting the operating system, and E-710 recommended replacement of those computers. The positions added by the agency from prior legislative sessions and the recommended additions in this budget required more physical space for staff, and E-733 recommended additional rent in the Richard H. Bryan Building for the additions. Decision unit E-800 recommended increased funding for the cost allocation with the Department of Public Safety.

Page 10 of Mr. Mergell's presentation covered recommended one-shot and supplemental appropriations. The first three recommendations funded continued development of the Ice Age Fossils State Park. He cautioned that because the park had started from a big vacant lot, it required more money to complete the facilities. The one-shots funded parking lot paving, phase two buildout to provide storage for maintenance equipment, and statewide installation of self-pay systems where practical. The Governor recommended one-shot funding for the replacement of vehicles. Funding was also recommended to purchase a beach cleaner for Sand Harbor. The Agency would secure matching funds through grant sources for the machine's purchase when the recommended amount was approved. Finally, the Governor recommended a supplemental appropriation to fund the Division's terminal leave payout for FY 2019.

Having concluded his presentation, Mr. Mergell paused for questions from the Subcommittees.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno expressed her gratitude that progress was being made at Ice Age Fossils State Park, because it was so close to her home. She asked which of the Division's responsibilities were not being met with the existing management structure that necessitated the addition of a new deputy administrator as recommended in decision unit E-350.

Mr. Mergell explained that the current organization of the Division included a chief of planning and development, although the function of that area had solely been development until the recent addition of a planner. The planning, development, and grants were all interlaced and reported to Mr. Mergell. His desire was to have those units work more collaboratively and move the grants program management under the planning and development area to strengthen the relationship and better manage project timelines. Communication would be improved with one person in charge of these connected areas.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno asked what the separation of duties was between the division administrator and the parks regional managers. She continued by asking why the deputy administrator needed to oversee the planning and development when there was a chief of planning and development who would be overseeing development.

Mr. Mergell clarified that the chief would oversee development. The new deputy administrator would oversee the heads of the planning, development, and grant functions.

The existing deputy administrator handled personnel matters, oversaw the law enforcement and training specialist, and had many small tasks, but much of the existing deputy's time was consumed with being the regional manager for the Lake Tahoe area. All of the regional managers reported directly to Mr. Mergell, and he wanted to shift that reporting responsibility to a deputy administrator. He envisioned one deputy administrator over the operations area and one deputy over the planning, development, and grants areas to provide a clear separation of responsibilities.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno asked how the Explore Your Nevada Initiative had affected the Division's workload and park visitation.

Mr. Mergell reiterated that park visitation was at an all-time high at the end of 2018. More park visitors meant more work for park staff to maintain the parks. Some parks were already operating at capacity, and more people could not physically fit into popular parks like Sand Harbor or Valley of Fire State Park during peak times. He mentioned that the Division was pursuing an online reservation system, which would provide visibility and reduce the amount of visitors seeking access to a park that was already full. This system was not included in the presentation because the Division did not have a budget item for this initiative. The increasing quantity of visitors would continue to drive the need for park staff, maintenance, and supplies. He speculated that he would be back in future legislative sessions requesting more park aids because the need for year-round staff to keep parks clean would grow.

Assemblywoman Jauregui returned to decision unit E-351 and asked whether a full-time graphics technician would still be needed once Ice Age Fossils State Park and Walker River were fully operational. She countered that if there was not ongoing need, perhaps a contract position would be a better solution.

Mr. Mergell explained that even before the two new parks were started, the Division was routinely borrowing GIS staff from the Division of State Lands. Knowledge of infrastructure features such as water shut-off valves was purely institutional and not documented on any State Parks maps, which would create problems when knowledgeable staff left the agency. The person hired as graphics technician would be tasked with creating a knowledge base of maps and would be busy for a long time. Mr. Mergell offered that this position would be available as a resource to other divisions within DCNR, but would be housed within State Parks because of the awaiting workload.

Assemblywoman Jauregui shifted to E-352 and the new historic preservation officer. She understood the need to comply with federal regulations and asked how often a cultural resource compliance need arose and whether it necessitated a full-time position. She again asked whether it could be a contract position to address the need.

Mr. Mergell stated that this was a continuing need because the Federal Highway Administration's Recreational Trails Program (RTP) was administered by the Division, and

almost all of the RTP projects required some amount of clearance. The Department of Transportation (NDOT) had provided the necessary clearances in the past, but had stopped doing so.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked when NDOT stopped performing clearances and why they stopped.

Mr. Mergell explained that the change had happened during the current biennium. He suspected it was because NDOT was overwhelmed with its own projects and did not have the resources to help other departments.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked why the new position would not start until FY 2021 when NDOT had already stopped providing assistance.

Mr. Mergell stated that a person in the grants program in the Division was doing the clearances because that person was qualified to do the clearances, but this was not part of the job description. The delayed start for the new position was purely fiscal-related.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the move of a ranger position from Walker River to Washoe Lake after the last legislative session meant that there was no park ranger at Walker River.

Mr. Mergell explained that was not the case. Several rangers were at Walker River, and the position that moved to Washoe Lake would have been the fourth ranger at Walker River, slated to be in the Flying M Ranch area. The designated area had not been heavily trafficked and had not needed a ranger, but more people in the park meant there would be more in the Flying M Ranch area and a ranger was needed.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether the position recommended in E-364 was a move of the ranger currently at Washoe Lake to Walker River or whether it was an additional position to be able to staff Walker River.

Mr. Mergell clarified it was an additional position. The transferred ranger was still needed at Washoe Lake, and the recommendation was for an additional ranger at Walker River.

Assemblywoman Titus moved to the topic of the new east shore bike trail that was expected to bring more traffic to Sand Harbor from Incline Village and asked whether more staff would be recommended because of the increased visitation.

Mr. Mergell reiterated that was the reason an additional ranger was recommended in E-366. It was still unknown how much more traffic would come to the park because of the bike trail, but it was expected to increase, and more staff was needed for the areas around Memorial Point and Hidden Beach.

Assemblywoman Titus expressed her concern that more traffic control was needed in the Sand Harbor area. She then asked what the status was of repairing the Nine Mile Ranch building at Walker River after it was damaged by an earthquake. She reminded Mr. Mergell that he had promised last session, when the park was authorized, that the building would be restored through a grant process, and she had not seen any updates on the project.

Mr. Mergell explained that the Division had expected the damage to cost around \$500,000 to repair. State Public Works Division (SPWD), Department of Administration, had evaluated the building and estimated the damage to be much worse. Once a detailed report was available from SPWD, the Office of Historic Preservation requested a second opinion, because SPWD's recommendation required the building be completely dismantled, a foundation built, and then the building reconstructed. The Office of Historic Preservation wanted to keep the historic nature of the building intact and was awaiting the results of an expert's evaluation of a less intrusive way to repair the building. The amount needed to repair the building was estimated to be between \$500,000 and \$1.5 million. Some funding sources were available from the sesquicentennial license plate sales, Land and Water Conservation Funds (LWCF), and also Question 1 (Q1) [a 2002 ballot question approved by the voters] funds that could be used for the building's repair, and the Division was waiting to determine the best fix for the structure.

Assemblywoman Titus appreciated the update and was pleased to hear the project had not been abandoned and funds were still available.

Senator Parks asked how the Division determined when it was necessary to add staff at the state parks.

Mr. Mergell stated that all parks could use more staff, and the Division actually wanted more staff than what was included in The Executive Budget. The management team prioritized the list by considering where the biggest public and employee safety problems existed, along with where workloads were preventing staff from being able to complete standard work. The two park aids recommended were a small portion of the Division's needs, and more would be requested in future legislative sessions.

Senator Parks asked what the anticipated effect would be on park visitation and staff workloads as a result of adding new cabins at Wild Horse State Recreation Area.

Mr. Mergell explained that Wild Horse was not the most heavily trafficked park and had a staff of one with some seasonal help. It was expected that the cabins would draw more visitors year round because they could stay overnight. The ability to stay warm while on an ice fishing trip would draw even more visitors in the winter. The increase in facilities and correlated increase in visitors would increase the workload of park staff. The recommended park technician would ensure someone was always available to move snow and prepare

cabins. It was anticipated this new position would be fully consumed with managing the park's cabin program, and the additional seasonal help would still be needed.

Senator Goicoechea asked what effect the fires near Wild Horse had on the park and its facilities. Mr. Mergell was pleased to report that the fire went around the area and the park property was not affected.

Chair Neal asked whether the Division anticipated needing staff for southern Nevada parks in addition to the park aids recommended in E-370 and E-371.

Mr. Mergell reiterated that more staff would always be needed at the parks. He was considering ways to use existing seasonal funding to convert some seasonal positions to year-round positions and would complete the related forms and process to make the change if it was feasible.

Chair Neal asked what additional benefits were realized from the biennial State Park Academy.

Mr. Mergell stated that each academy had a theme and the 2020 academy's focus would be technology. The online reservation system, receiving input from each park, and understanding how the new system would affect the parks would be significant parts of the meeting. Participants from outside the Division, such as the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), U.S. Department of the Interior, and the U.S. Forest Service, United States Department of Agriculture, were invited so that Division staff could learn from others' experience. The meetings were usually held near a local state park, and attendees would experience the local park's interpretive program and acquire knowledge for use at their home parks. He summarized that a lot of good resulted from the meetings.

Chair Neal asked when the 8 new park master plans and updates to the 19 existing master plans would be completed.

Mr. Mergell explained that before individual park strategic plans could be reviewed, an overall direction for the agency had to be established, which was realized only when a planner was added after last session. The Division now had a strategic plan and individual park plans could be started. Some of the existing park strategic plans were too old to still be relevant and would also need to be rewritten. New versions needed to reflect current trends and be broad enough to provide direction, but not so specific that they would become quickly irrelevant again.

Chair Neal again asked what the timeline was to complete the plans, given the realization that existing plans were outdated and did not consider the future.

Mr. Mergell responded that the goal was to complete five to six plans per year, with each plan having a five- to six-year lifespan. With 27 parks, it was anticipated this pace would keep the Division on track with current plans and updates.

Assemblywoman Titus stated her support for the electronic fee stations and the convenience provided because of changing lifestyles. She questioned the lack of maintenance funds for the new machines in the budget. She suspected maintenance would be required beyond the scope of what park staff could complete.

Mr. Mergell explained that ongoing credit card processing fees were included in The Executive Budget, and required maintenance would be covered in individual parks' maintenance accounts. The machines that had been installed at Sand Harbor had not required much maintenance. If machines did break, the user fee overage was specifically intended to fund required repairs.

Assemblywoman Titus clarified that this initiative was merely an expansion of a successful program, with which Mr. Mergell agreed.

Seeing no further questions from the Subcommittees, Chair Neal moved on to the next budget account.

INFRASTRUCTURE
CONSERVATION & NATURAL RESOURCES
DCNR - STATE LANDS (101-4173)
BUDGET PAGE DCNR-107

Charles Donohue, Administrator, Division of State Lands, and State Land Registrar, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR), began with his presentation titled, "Nevada Division of State Lands Budget Presentation Budget Account 4173," dated March 22, 2019 ([Exhibit D](#)). Page 3 of his presentation highlighted the programs and activities performed by the Division. The agency provided services to other state agencies when state land needs arose. The Division secured and disposed of lands for other state agencies and also authorized the occupancy and use of state lands. The state's land records were maintained by the Division, some going back almost to statehood. The agency also was involved in resource protection programs, including coordinating environmental improvements at Lake Tahoe, Question 1 (Q1) [a 2002 ballot question approved by the voters] and grant conservation programs, and had a member on the sagebrush ecosystem technical team. The final service area covered by Mr. Donohue was land-use planning services to state agencies, including the coordination of state agencies' comments on federal actions throughout the state. Moving to page 4 of [Exhibit D](#), Mr. Donohue explained that all of these programs were provided by 19 full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions, many of whom were housed in the State Lands office. The Division's unique land management system had a spatial as well as database component, and the engineering technician and business analyst

provided mapping services, often to sister agencies within the Department. Page 4 of his presentation included a breakdown of the 19 FTEs and the total biennium budget for the Division, which was \$4,216,178.

Mr. Donohue shifted to the funding sources for the Division's budget account and explained that as depicted on pages 5 and 6 of [Exhibit D](#), the Division was primarily funded through State General Funds, with a smaller portion of funding coming from transfers in from Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) mitigation fees, general obligation bonds, U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) federal grants, and a portion of the Lake Tahoe license plate fees. The FY 2020 budget recommended \$1,656,473 in General Funds and \$416,790 in non-General Funds. The FY 2021 budget recommended \$1,707,080 in General Funds and \$435,835 in non-General Funds.

Page 7 of Mr. Donohue's presentation ([Exhibit D](#)) started the overview of the decision units for budget account 4173. Enhancement (E) 225 and E-226 were changes to the funding sources for operating costs associated with the Nevada Tahoe Resource Team (NTRT) program manager and administrative assistant. Because the interest from general obligation funds that had been used for NTRT positions was slowly running out, position costs had been transferred to other funding sources during the 2015 and 2017 biennia. However, for the upcoming biennium, the positions' salary and fringe costs would be funded by bond interest. The next two enhancements, E-227 and E-229, changed funding sources for programs that were funded through Question 1 bond interest. The last two Question 1 positions were eliminated in the 2017 Legislative Session, but some operating costs had remained, and with no more interest from Question 1 bonds, the rent and Attorney General cost allocations were being transferred to other funding sources. Continuing to page 8 of [Exhibit D](#), E-231 recommended funding for the Division's website security certificate. Base funding levels remained unchanged, but vendors for professional development had changed, and E-232 corrected the budgeting. Maintenance for the Division's website was recommended by E-241. Scheduled replacement for seven of the Division's computers, primarily funded through General Funds, was recommended in E-710. The last enhancement unit presented by Mr. Donohue was E-733, a \$20,634 reduction in Richard H. Bryan Building rent for the Division. A proposed reconfiguration of the fifth floor of the building would reduce the Division's square footage.

Assemblywoman Monroe-Moreno asked whether the agency anticipated having sufficient bond interest earnings from upcoming bond sales to support the program's operating costs beyond the 2019-2021 biennium.

Mr. Donohue stated that a successful sale of bonds as a result of [Assembly Bill \(A.B.\) 220](#) would provide Environmental Improvement Program project funding. He hoped the Division would receive enough money from the proposed \$8 million to fund projects, as well as NTRT staff.

Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Senate Committee on Finance
Subcommittees on Public Safety, Natural Resources, and Transportation
March 22, 2019
Page 11

Chair Neal thanked Mr. Donohue for his presentation and stated the Subcommittees did not have additional questions, and Fiscal staff would contact him with any follow up. She moved on to the next series of budget accounts for the Department of Wildlife.

**INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - DIRECTOR'S OFFICE (101-4460)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-6**

**INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - OPERATIONS (101-4461)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-13**

**INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - LAW ENFORCEMENT (101-4463)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-26**

**INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - GAME MANAGEMENT (101-4464)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-31**

**INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - FISHERIES MANAGEMENT (101-4465)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-37**

**INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - DIVERSITY DIVISION (101-4466)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-43**

Chair Neal asked the Department of Wildlife to start with page 4 of its presentation so the entire budget could be heard during the meeting.

Tony Wasley, Director, Department of Wildlife (NDOW), started with page 4 of his presentation titled, "Nevada Department of Wildlife FY 2020-2021 [2019-2021 biennium] Biennial Budget," dated March 12, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)), which provided a high-level overview of the funding and sources for the Department. Only 3 percent of the Department's funding came from State General Funds. Sportsmen Revenue contributed 45 percent of the funding through license and tag sales. Federal funds generated from the sale of guns, ammunition,

and fishing equipment contributed 49 percent and were provided to the state with certification of the number of hunters and anglers in the field. Page 5 of his presentation illustrated the funding flow for the Department, with 49 percent from federal grants, 30 percent from unrestricted Sportsmen Revenue, 12 percent from restricted Sportsmen Revenue, and 2 percent from boating fees. The Executive Budget included several recommendations to replace Sportsmen Revenue with State General Funds.

Moving on to page 6 of [Exhibit E](#), Mr. Wasley explained that each of the eight executive budget accounts had some small adjustment, with the exception of Law Enforcement, budget account 4463. The chart on page 7 of his presentation depicted the eight budget accounts with their related funding sources and expenditure categories. Mr. Wasley then skipped to page 24 of his presentation, which provided a high-level view of the Department's major initiatives. Three initiatives were in the conservation administration area: one each in the director's office, wildlife diversity division, and habitat division. Three initiatives were in the deferred maintenance category: one each in fish hatcheries, wildlife management areas, and office facilities. A proposed modernization of the data and technology in the Operations Division was a zero-cost major initiative. The remaining major initiatives were the urban wildlife program, the addition of an outdoor connection coordinator position, and a classified position change.

The first major initiative discussed by Mr. Wasley was decision unit Enhancement (E) 280 from budget account (BA) 4460, detailed on page 25 of his presentation ([Exhibit E](#)). This decision unit replaced \$70,039 per year in Sportsmen Revenue with \$70,039 per year in General Fund appropriations. The Division had an increasing demand for public record requests and other activities unrelated to sportsmen, and the recommended change would more closely align the funding source with the broad population that benefitted from the activity.

The next initiative Mr. Wasley presented was decision unit E-287 from budget account (BA) 4466, which was the Diversity Division. The change in funding for this decision unit was similar to that in E-280 and funded activities that affected a broad constituent base with funds gathered from a broad base. This enhancement recommended replacement of \$149,837 in Sportsmen Revenue each year of the biennium with the corresponding amount from State General Funds. The funds would go to statewide songbird monitoring, owl surveys, assessment of abandoned mines for use by wildlife, and other activities for the 92 percent of species in the state not pursued by sportsmen or sportswomen. Some recent, nonpursuit-related wildlife activities that used the Department's resources included handling bats at the Lawlor Events Center and burrowing owls in pipes on a construction site. The money was also used to collect federal aid match, usually at a 3:1 ratio. By using the Sportsmen Revenue to fulfill the statutory charge, the Department was able to leverage the funds.

Chair Neal stopped Mr. Wasley from proceeding to the next initiative to allow the members of the Subcommittees to ask questions about budget account (BA) 4460 and BA 4466. She then asked how the Division determined the amount of time spent on public record requests and what type of requests it received to justify the recommended change to the funding model.

Mr. Wasley stated that many of the administrative duties within the director's office pertained to conservation-related activities for species not classified as game animals, such as wetland conservation. There was often indirect benefit to species pursued by sportsmen and sportswomen from these activities, but the intent of the broadly benefiting initiatives was not aimed at pursued wildlife. The \$70,039 per year was a small percentage of the administrative costs associated with these broad-reaching activities. He continued that the types of public record requests received often pertained to urban wildlife, which was again tied to broad community benefits and not limited to sportsmen. A specific example cited was requests for records pertaining to bears, unrelated to a bear hunt, which included how many bears the Division handled, the outcomes, and necropsy reports.

Chair Neal restated her question about how much time the Department spent on the public record requests categorized by the Department as having societal benefits.

Jack Robb, Deputy Director, NDOW, also the public records officer in the Department, explained that occasionally the requests exceeded 50 percent of his time. Bear management in the Tahoe Basin was a polarizing and emotional issue with some residents in favor of controlling the population, while others felt the bears should be left alone. One request he received required him to produce 1,720 emails and three other individuals to also produce their emails. Because the records existed, the Department was required to provide them regardless of how time-consuming the process was.

Chair Neal then asked what role the Department's two public information officers played in fulfilling public records requests. Mr. Wasley explained that the public information officers managed press releases and social media. The public information officers disseminated agency information and messages and were not involved in public records requests.

Assemblywoman Titus expressed her gratitude as a sportswoman that the money paid for tags and licenses was used by the Department to address more than just hunting and fishing and provided conservation efforts. She asked how the prioritization of the deferred maintenance projects in E-730 of BA 4460 was determined.

Mr. Wasley stated that it was largely a case of triage. With the fish hatcheries, water quality and delivery were important to maintain. On-site employee housing facilities were most often older and located in isolated rural areas. They were susceptible to animal intrusions and upkeep was expensive. Mr. Wasley was willing to share the long list of projects, a very

small percentage of which were \$10,000 or over, that fell into the area of preventative maintenance.

Assemblywoman Titus asked whether projects deferred from prior sessions ended up costing more to complete because they were delayed.

Mr. Wasley confirmed this was a concern of the Department. He explained that maintenance was the responsibility of Mr. Robb and invited him to provide more detail.

Mr. Robb explained that one of the items on the list was \$26,000 for a new boiler for the NDOW office in Elko. Two winters ago the boiler had broken, which caused heat exchangers to freeze, which led to further problems. The prioritized list of projects was intended to prevent this type of increasing future expense.

Assemblywoman Titus encouraged the Department to be proactive when considering maintenance projects to reduce subsequent repair costs. She then asked how the Department determined to completely fund deferred maintenance of fish hatcheries and NDOW office facilities with General Fund appropriations. She felt it would be appropriate to continue to use Sportsmen Revenue to fund these activities because sportsmen benefitted from these facilities.

Mr. Robb stated that the Mason Valley Hatchery was open to the public, and many Mason Valley Wildlife Management Area visitors were neither hunters nor fishermen. Recreation activities such as wildlife viewing and bird watching were enjoyed by the general public at Mason Valley.

Assemblywoman Titus sought clarity that the fish hatchery maintenance would be completely funded through General Funds.

Mr. Robb clarified that it would be shared between General Funds and Sportsmen Revenue. Regular continuing maintenance was funded through Sportsmen Revenue, and the General Funds would supplement that through decision unit E-730 based on percentage of use in the affected areas.

Chair Neal advised that she had a question about the recommended reorganization, but would continue with BA 4466 and questions related to the shift in funding from Sportsmen Revenue to State General Funds. She asked which activities were supported with the federal Wildlife Restoration Diversity grant.

Mr. Wasley explained that page 26 of his presentation ([Exhibit E](#)) included decision unit E-287 for budget account 4466. The federal aid for wildlife and sport fish restoration was a grant that combined federal excise taxes from the sale of guns and ammunition and fishing equipment. The Department's current budget generated \$11.9 million annually from wildlife

and \$5.4 million annually from sport fishing grants, with specific expenditures allowed under each. Grant agreements were approved by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, and the Department had to write very specific, detailed grants that were parsed out by division and tied with each budget category. Some of the wildlife diversity research projects mentioned by Mr. Wasley included raptor nesting, owls, and reptiles, which all had to be described in detail in grant proposals and approved before funds were disbursed from the federal government. The grant funds were matched by state funds, usually at a 3:1 ratio.

Chair Neal explained the reason for her questions was to understand the rationale for matching the grant with General Fund appropriations instead of Sportsmen Revenue.

Mr. Wasley explained that the income came from certified hunters and anglers. The numbers of both in the field determined the amount the state was eligible for. The revenue from tag and license sales was used as a match to get the federal dollars. Of the 895 species the Department statutorily managed, 8 percent were pursued recreationally. This meant that 5 percent of the population was paying 95 percent of the budget to pursue 8 percent of the species, leaving 92 percent of the species under addressed. The budget for wildlife diversity was the smallest in NDOW, as depicted on page 7 of his presentation ([Exhibit E](#)), further supporting that this was a narrowly funded budget with a broad statutory charge. Using a portion of the Sportsmen Revenue to get the federal aid match came with some political risk in trying to align the fund usage with its origin and intent.

Chair Neal asked why the Department sought to change the funding source, because the Department had been receiving federal grant funds for many years.

Mr. Wasley stated that the federal money was dependent on the sale of guns and ammunition, which was affected by the country's political climate. Recent decreases in the sale of guns and ammunition had reduced the amount of available federal funds. Exacerbating the problem with fewer available funds was the need to fund cost-of-living adjustments and merit increases. This meant a larger portion of an already shrinking funding source was being used on personnel matters. Along with that, there was an increased demand on resources from the Habitat Division. The Department had a specific responsibility within the National Environmental Policy Act to provide comment on any project that occurred on federal land or with federal funds, relative to the effects or potential effects on wildlife. In the prior year, the Habitat Division had commented on nearly 600 projects occurring on federal land. Some of the comments were specific to the 8 percent of the pursued species, but the majority were toward the 895 species that occurred commonly throughout the state. The benefit and the nexus was far broader than sportsmen and sportswomen. It was a funding model that had historically been relied on, where a disproportionately small number of citizens paid a disproportionately large amount. Some states had laws that prohibited the use of tag and license fees for anything other than the 8 percent of the species that were pursued.

Chair Neal asked whether the use of General Funds would allow NDOW to leverage additional federal funds for wildlife diversity activities.

Mr. Wasley stated that while that was the intent, the amount of federal funds available was finite because it was driven by the federal excise tax collected on sales. Sportsmen Revenue could potentially be freed up, which could be used as a match for federal dollars. The Department had historically been creative in ways to find the match and get the maximum federal money available.

Chair Neal noted the federal grant was awarded annually and asked what amount NDOW expected to use for the state's matching requirement in the wildlife diversity program for each year of the upcoming biennium.

Mr. Wasley stated that would depend on the amount of federal dollars available. The federal wildlife grant was determined and approved by Congress. The amount approved would determine the amount of match required. The grants were typically under \$1 million, so it was expected NDOW would need \$200,000 to \$250,000.

Chair Neal asked Mr. Wasley to return to budget account 4461 to address the reorganization in the budget instead of proceeding to budget account 4467.

Tony Wasley, Director, Department of Wildlife (NDOW), explained that the reorganization effort was a zero-cost recommendation, with the objective of creating an efficient and responsive agency. The Department had various information technology (IT) areas in different divisions, including Geographic Information System (GIS) within the Operations Division, Global Positioning Satellite (GPS) and collar databases in the Wildlife Diversity Division, and customer data in the Game Division. The multitude of IT areas had created redundancies across budget accounts. To reduce the redundancies, NDOW was combining data and technology services from separate divisions into a single Data and Technology Services Division to maximize the knowledge and expertise, combined with the necessary tools.

Senator Parks moved to the transfer of six engineering and fiscal administration staff and associated costs and budgets. He asked why the roles were being centralized in the Director's Office.

Mr. Wasley explained that the Department had 261.63 full-time employees with experience similar to that found in the private sector, including engineers, information technology, customer service, and biologists. Redundancies in expertise and software had been created in the way that NDOW managed data, and the recommended change would consolidate the expertise to provide efficiencies. Information technology and GIS would be together, along with GPS collar monitoring and customer data information, and could benefit all divisions.

Senator Parks asked whether NDOW had an estimate of potential fiscal savings as a result of the centralization.

Mr. Wasley responded that had not been considered, but expected there to be efficiencies in communication and the elimination of some redundancies.

Chair Neal then asked for an update on the Department's license simplification efforts and how the simplification measures had been received by sportsmen and license-issuing merchants.

Mr. Wasley explained page 40 of his presentation titled, "Nevada Department of Wildlife FY 2020-2021 [2019-2021 biennium] Biennial Budget," dated March 12, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)), illustrated the streamlining of the licenses. License options were simplified from 28 options to 8, state stamps were no longer required, and combination options were available only for nonresident, senior, and junior license holders. The Department was required by *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) to issue a request for proposal (RFP) for a license vendor and to have a third party outside vendor administer the big game tag draw. A new vendor was selected and NDOW had seen a 40 percent increase in fishing license sales and a 28 percent increase in hunting license sales versus the prior year. The Department had realized almost \$1.4 million year-to-date in savings, plus a revenue increase of more than \$2 million, for a total of \$3.4 million improvement to the bottom line. The significant increase in the number of licenses sold meant the state would be eligible for a greater portion of the federal excise tax dollars available. He cautioned the Subcommittees that the \$3.4 million net gain could not replace the recommendation for General Funds, because the use was restricted by NRS to fund the administration of the draw. The rollout of the program was a significant undertaking, completed the prior year. The Department had been able to work with its vendor to add in features at no additional cost to the state. The big game tag draw, the third of the fiscal year, was currently open. Mr. Wasley acknowledged Mr. Jack Robb, Deputy Director, NDOW, for his role in executing the new system and invited him to provide more detail.

Mr. Robb stated that much of the \$2 million revenue increase was from sales of the Silver State Tag, and the use of funds from those sales was very restricted. The Department had devoted itself to ensure the simultaneous rollout of a new vendor and license structure was successful. The vendor selected was chosen because it was willing to partner with NDOW and the feeling was reciprocated. Other portions of NDOW employees' jobs might have suffered along the way to make sure that the sportsmen and citizens of Nevada were taken care of. He acknowledged that beating customer expectations, as the Department had done, was key to delighting its customers and staying in business.

Assemblywoman Titus observed the new system was much improved over prior systems. Not only had she experienced the improvement filling out her application, but complaints she had heard in prior years had dissipated, and she had received no complaints about the new system. She asked whether NDOW felt all customers and merchants had a similar reaction.

Mr. Wasley stated that NDOW had heard some initial frustration because of the change. In addition to standard problems that come with IT projects of this magnitude, the Department discovered the structure of its data added a complication. The desired outcome was to have all data tied to one owner, whether boat, fishing, or hunting licenses, combined. The Department's multiple sets of data were not structured in a way to allow easy migration, which caused extra work. Mr. Wasley stated that the project rollout was more successful than any other states that had tried to institute a similar change.

Assemblywoman Titus thanked Mr. Wasley and concurred that the new system was much improved and the rollout was successful. She then asked what the expected benefits were from centralizing NDOW's technology staff.

Mr. Wasley stated that the GIS system, which analyzed much of NDOW's data, resided in BA 4466, the Diversity Division. The information technology (IT) staff, which was an IT professional and two additional staff, was in BA 4461, Operations. Databases specific to the GPS tracking of thousands of collars was in BA 4464, Game Management. As the data management and analysis needs increased, housing the capabilities and data sets together facilitated communication, improved efficiencies, and removed redundancies. The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) required that NDOW provide information on animals that lived or resided in an area considered for a project on federal land. With the current information structure, data would have to be pulled from each database in each division to construct a complete picture to fulfill the statutory charge. Housing the information together meant databases could be built in a similar manner, and a few clicks of a mouse could populate a complete list of all the species that inhabited an area. Housing the data together in a similar format, using the same personnel, the same software, and eliminating some of the redundancies both in needs of technology and needs of software, would improve the Department's ability to address the needs of industry and fulfill its statutory charge.

Assemblywoman Titus said she understood the recommendation allowed the data to be housed virtually and to be accessible to all staff throughout the state. Mr. Wasley confirmed her understanding was correct.

Chair Neal instructed Mr. Wasley to present budget accounts 4462, Conservation Education, and then 4467, Habitat, even though 4467 had been touched on in the discussions of other budget accounts. The Subcommittees did not have major concerns on the remaining budget accounts: 4463, Law Enforcement; 4464, Game Management; and 4465, Fisheries Management.

INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - CONSERVATION EDUCATION (101-4462)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-22

Tony Wasley, Director, Department of Wildlife (NDOW), referred to page 32 of his presentation titled, "Nevada Department of Wildlife FY 2020-2021 [2019-2021 biennium] Biennial Budget," dated March 12, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)). There had been growing demand around the state relative to the Department's roles and actions in addressing some of the urban wildlife concerns, primarily coyotes around Reno/Sparks and Las Vegas. Two conservation educators, one each in Las Vegas and Reno, were converted from seasonal to full-time in fiscal year (FY) 2018, and Sportsmen Revenue was used to cover the difference in costs. Decision unit Enhancement (E) 350 provided these positions would be fully funded from State General Funds. Urban wildlife conflicts had been increasing, and the positions had helped improve outreach efforts and public safety. On page 33 of his presentation, two heat maps depicted coyote calls in the Las Vegas area as well as the Reno/Sparks area. All calls were documented, and 41 percent of calls had come from Clark County, 39 percent from Washoe County, and 20 percent from the remainder of the state. The outreach performed by the coordinators included newsletters and presentations to the public in a variety of settings, as illustrated on page 35 of [Exhibit E](#). Targeted outreach was performed using the heat maps, including public service announcements on television and outreach through homeowners' association (HOA) newsletters. He concluded that these positions currently existed, and the decision unit recommended a change in funding source.

Referring to decision unit E-275, Chair Neal asked what need existed to justify adding a new conservation educator position and what benefit was expected from the addition.

Mr. Wasley explained that 34 percent of society identified as mutualists, and mutualists often anthropomorphized animals, giving them human personas and viewing them as an extended part of their network. This was in contrast to NDOW staff, where only 8 percent identified as mutualists. This disconnect between the agency and society meant there was much work to be done to educate the population on the relevancy of conservation and the Department's work. This new position would help NDOW understand how the public viewed the agency, as well as help the public understand the goods and services in regard to clean air, clean water, and ecological goods and services provided by the Department. In addition, this position would help garner public support for bills and initiatives. Many had been introduced or were in existence, and NDOW lacked the capacity to reach the public to improve understanding and support for the benefits of conservation. The Department wished to see support for such initiatives and campaigns as Recovering America's Wildlife Act, Wild Harvest Initiative, National Conservation Outreach Plan ("Making It Last" campaign), and the Alliance for America's Fish and Wildlife.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked whether any of the existing 15 conservation educators could cover the duties just listed.

Mr. Wasley acknowledged that connecting with people and connecting people to conservation drove the recommendation for this position. Current staff could provide some of the needed duties but not all, and not without sacrificing other duties and programs. The Department did not have anyone assigned to the R3 initiative, which was the recruitment, retention, and reactivation of individuals. This applied to not only hunters and anglers, who could provide revenue and affect certification numbers, but also to the general public. The only way to direct resources to address increasing demands was to add a position dedicated to connecting people with conservation.

Assemblywoman Jauregui asked what the rationale was to use General Fund dollars to fully fund this position.

Mr. Wasley explained that this position was focused on engaging nontraditional constituents more than had been done in the past. Many people gave very little thought to conservation and were largely unaware of it. The Department engaged through school programs at varying ages but lacked other outreach to elevate the value of conservation. Traditional customers of NDOW already connected with natural resources and were willing to fund conservation, but this position would focus on gaining a broader awareness and acceptance among those who did not connect with and were not funding conservation.

Returning to the discussion on decision unit E-350, Assemblywoman Jauregui asked what the rationale was for funding the two conservation educator positions entirely with General Fund appropriations.

Mr. Wasley stated that the two conservation educator positions that functioned as urban wildlife coordinators answered hundreds of phone calls to provide assistance to the public. The positions were originally seasonal and funded from General Funds, but growing public expectation and demand necessitated the conversion of these positions to full time. The conversion was offset with Sportsmen Revenue, and E-350 replaced the Sportsmen Revenue with General Funds.

Senator Goicoechea asked Mr. Wasley to describe the process for remedying urban wildlife conflicts.

Mr. Wasley explained that NDOW maintained a contract with Wildlife Services, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Wildlife Services provided predator control for the livestock industry, as well as airport safety and other conflicts. When a conflict arose, NDOW would call Wildlife Services to help remove or relocate wildlife. One example cited by Mr. Wasley was an emboldened coyote on USA Parkway that bit a worker's boot because the coyote was used to being fed. Wardens

from NDOW talked to individuals in the area before contacting Wildlife Services to strategically remove the animal.

Assemblywoman Titus expressed her appreciation for the contract with Wildlife Services and asked whether having more staff would cause the public to be more dependent on NDOW to resolve less serious conflicts, such as skunks, resulting in more calls to NDOW.

Mr. Wasley agreed that was a significant challenge. Because of the Department's small staff, the focus was on empowering the public to help themselves instead of relying on NDOW. The Department could spend a significant amount of time, energy, and resources addressing urban wildlife issues, but other responsibilities would fall through the cracks, such as commenting on public land-use projects. Instead, NDOW tried to meet public expectations without simultaneously increasing public expectations. Tools and knowledge were provided, and NDOW tried to mobilize only when public safety was at risk. Local animal control and rehabilitation facilities were used so the Department could fulfill its broader statutory charge for the other animals in the wild.

Chair Neal directed Mr. Wasley to move on to budget account 4467 and cover areas not already discussed.

INFRASTRUCTURE
DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE
WILDLIFE - HABITAT (101-4467)
BUDGET PAGE WILDLIFE-49

Tony Wasley, Director, Department of Wildlife (NDOW), referred to page 27 of his presentation titled, "Nevada Department of Wildlife FY 2020-2021 [2019-2021 biennium] Biennial Budget," dated March 12, 2019 ([Exhibit E](#)) and stated that budget account (BA) 4467 was the Habitat Division. He reiterated that the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) was a federal act that required an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement from NDOW for any project that used federal funds or was on federal land. The policy required the evaluation of potential project effects and addressed mitigation, avoidance, minimization, and design feature changes. In addition, this Division conducted in-depth technical review for many projects. Mr. Wasley returned to the technology consolidation effort and explained that when the Division was performing the in-depth technical review as required by NEPA, the Division had to consider the direct effects that would occur within the footprint of the project, as well as indirect effects that would occur outside of the project area. To complete the analysis, the Division would have to gather information from multiple areas within the Department, and putting all of the information in one place along with GIS would simplify that process and allow the Department to create a complete picture of the species within the area.

Mr. Wasley referenced the Spring Valley wind farm and the project assessment that included the effect the proposed turbines would have on the millions of bats living in a cave nearby. Industry sought a way to ameliorate the effects to the bats. The agreed solution was an infrared detection system so when bats left the cave, turbine speed was automatically cut, significantly minimizing the effect on the bats. The number of projects requiring NDOW's input had been increasing, driving up the demands and expectations because often the assessment was the rate-limiting step for projects. This was another Division that provided broader benefits to others, not just sportsmen, and The Executive Budget recommended shifting funding for this Division from Sportsmen Revenue to State General Funds.

Regarding the example of the wind farm, Chair Neal asked whether it was industry or NDOW that suggested the solution to minimize the effect on local species.

Mr. Wasley explained that once industry approached the land management agency with a proposal, an environmental analysis would be performed. The analysis could be either an environmental assessment or a more in-depth environmental impact statement. As a cooperating agency, NDOW provided comment. In the bat and wind turbine example cited, Mr. Wasley stated that the Division would provide input, such as "there is a bat cave, a hibernacula and maternity roost that has up to 2 million bats, and this windfarm with 66 turbines could create a source of mortality and could impact these species." This input would start a discussion between the land management partner, industry, the Department, and other nongovernmental organizations that had an interest in bats and ways to mitigate potential negative effects were brainstormed.

Chair Neal asked whether this was a cooperative agreement or a mandate by NEPA for the Department to work on mitigating solutions.

Mr. Wasley clarified that NEPA's requirement for NDOW ended with analysis. Decisions by industry did not have to be based on available science, but it had to be considered.

Chair Neal asked what costs were involved from other NDOW divisions for performing work under NEPA.

Mr. Wasley stated that comments were provided at the ecosystem level for all species, regardless of game species or not. Because more resources were available, the Department had more thorough data on game species than others, such as pika or pygmy rabbits.

Chair Neal redirected Mr. Wasley and stated that it appeared other Wildlife Division budgets were being intermingled and asked what those costs were.

Mr. Wasley introduced Alan Jenne, Administrator of Habitat, NDOW, to provide detail.

Mr. Jenne stated that experts from various divisions assisted when providing comment to NEPA and the information did not all reside in one database. The divisions' end-use coded to budget account 4467. The specific resource advisor composed the comment associated with the NEPA process.

Chair Neal clarified she was still trying to get to a dollar figure for the cost associated with the NEPA activity, either in the Habitat Division's budget account or elsewhere within NDOW.

Mr. Wasley explained that the end-use coding piece was used by other divisions to code their time to technical review because federal aid grants were species-specific. He admitted that did not provide the detail Chair Neal was seeking and said that the Department would have to gather the requested data by looking at the amount end-use coded to technical review in each of the divisions. However, even that would not provide the exact detail, because federal aid grants covered the management of a suite of species.

Chair Neal moved on to ask why it was recommended to use General Fund appropriations to fund the Division's NEPA and environmental reviews instead of Sportsmen Revenue.

Mr. Wasley reiterated that Sportsmen Revenue was generated from only 8 percent of the 895 commonly occurring species in the state. All of the 895 species and citizens of Nevada benefitted from providing input to NEPA.

Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
Senate Committee on Finance
Subcommittees on Public Safety, Natural Resources, and Transportation
March 22, 2019
Page 24

Seeing no further questions from the Subcommittees, Chair Neal opened the meeting for public comment.

Seeing no public comment, Chair Neal closed public comment and adjourned the meeting at 10:25 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Morris
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Dina Neal, Chair

DATE: _____

Senator David R. Parks, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Division of State Parks Budget Account 4162," dated March 22, 2019, presented by Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR).

[Exhibit D](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Division of State Lands Budget Presentation Budget Account 4173," dated March 22, 2019, presented by Charles Donohue, Administrator, Division of State Lands, and State Land Registrar, DCNR.

[Exhibit E](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Department of Wildlife FY 2020-2021 [2019-2021 biennium] Biennial Budget," dated March 12, 2019, presented by Tony Wasley, Director, Department of Wildlife.