

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

**Eightieth Session
April 30, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 30, 2019, in Room 2144 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4412 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. [Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda. [Exhibit B](#) is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair
Senator Chris Brooks, Vice Chair
Senator Dallas Harris
Senator Pete Goicoechea
Senator Ira Hansen

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24
Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Assembly District No. 16

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alysa Keller, Committee Policy Analyst
Erin Sturdivant, Committee Counsel
Christine Miner, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim Lawrence, Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Tobi Tyler, Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter
Kyle Davis, Nevada Conservation League; Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife
Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau
Tyson K. Falk, Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition
Tiffany East, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 30, 2019
Page 2

Ernie Adler, Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe
Daniel Pierrott, Nevada Bighorns Unlimited
Rob Bastien
Christine Saunders, Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada
Alex Tanchek, Nevada Cattlemen's Association
Kirk Kuznicki, Friends of Nevada Wilderness
Kirk Peterson
Patrick Bruce
Captain Evan Morrison, Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Fallon
Rob Rule, Community Planning and Liaison Officer, Naval Air Station Fallon
Captain Russell Jones, United States Naval Aviation Warfighting Development Center
Clarence Southard, Vice President of Military Affairs, Navy League of the United States
Mitchel Roach, United Veterans Legislative Council
Jennifer L. Carr, Deputy Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Joelle Gutman, Washoe County Health District
Robert Tekniepe, Department of Air Quality, Clark County, Nevada
Richard Karpel, Executive Director, Nevada Press Association

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will open the hearing on Assembly Joint Resolution (A.J.R.) 3.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 3: Expresses support for the Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan and the Nevada Conservation Credit System and urges the United States Bureau of Land Management to require compensatory mitigation to offset anthropogenic disturbances in accordance with the Nevada Conservation Credit System. (BDR R-511)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN HEIDI SWANK (Assembly District No. 16):

Assembly Joint Resolution 3 is a result of many thoughtful discussions in the Legislative Committee on Public Lands during the 2017-2018 Interim. Nevada is home to the greater sage grouse, a large ground-dwelling bird that lives in sagebrush habitat that is prevalent to our landscape. However, years of drought conditions, wildfire habitat fragmentation, invasive weeds and continued development have put the sagebrush habitat under threat. Due to concerns about the population of the greater sage grouse and its habitat, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service initiated a formal species status review in 2004.

For Nevada, the potential listing of the greater sage grouse as threatened or endangered would greatly impact the management of lands. It would limit backcountry tourism and other industries such as ranching, mining and renewable energy development.

Nevada has worked with a variety of stakeholders and has developed a robust program to protect the greater sage grouse known as the Nevada Conservation Credit System, a scientifically-based mitigation system.

The majority of the greater sage-grouse habitat is located on lands managed by the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and as such, most of the permitted disturbances to habitat occur with permits issued by the BLM. Last summer, the national office of the BLM issued an instructional memorandum to its staff saying they cannot require compensatory mitigation for disturbances on BLM managed lands unless the mitigation is a State requirement.

JIM LAWRENCE (Deputy Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

The State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources supports S.J.R. 3. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit C](#)).

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Why are the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) or the U.S. Forest Service not included in the Resolution?

MR. LAWRENCE:

This is a specific challenge associated with the BLM. The instructional memorandum from the Department of the Interior was released last summer. It indicated the BLM, as a multiple-use agency, has no authority to require mitigation. The USDA Forest Service, which in Nevada oversees the Humboldt Toiyabe National Forest, does not have the restrictions of the BLM. The challenge is not coming from the Forest Service when doing projects to evaluate and utilize the Nevada Conservation Credit System (CCS). The Resolution is in response to the instructional memorandum from the Department of the Interior.

SENATOR HANSEN:

What are anthropogenic disturbances?

MR. LAWRENCE:

The Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan specifically identifies anthropogenic disturbances. They are human-caused activities that require a permit. The Conservation Plan excludes ranching or grazing activities or improved infrastructure related to those activities. It does not include activities for blading out a road for a fire. It includes the permanent disturbances on the landscape requiring National Environmental Policy Act permits, such as transmission lines, pipelines, mining activities and similar types of activities.

TOBI TYLER (Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter):

The Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter supports A.J.R. 3. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).

KYLE DAVIS (Nevada Conservation League):

The Nevada Conservation League supports A.J.R. 3. Nevada has a great record in terms of involving all parties and creating a conservation plan for sage grouse that includes the CCS. If the system is utilized, it can provide far better conservation outcomes than what used to be under traditional compensatory mitigation under the BLM. The BLM is not officially requiring compensatory mitigation, but are saying it will defer to states. That is why the Nevada program is so important.

DOUG BUSSELMAN (Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau):

The Nevada Farm Bureau has concerns with A.J.R. 3, not because it is opposed to the Resolution. I tried to get on the record at the State Assembly hearing, but the concerns of the Bureau were viewed as critical and testifying in neutral was not allowed.

The Farm Bureau supports the Nevada Greater Sage-grouse Conservation Plan and knows it is a good plan. Not enough of the Nevada Conservation Plan has been implemented in the BLM planning. There is still potential for the U.S. Forest Service as it moves forward with its amended plan. It may include more of the Nevada Conservation Plan, but that is to be determined.

The Farm Bureau is concerned that there are not enough of the ideas and thinking of the Nevada Conservation Plan going into the federal land management plans. There are things in the federal plans that are different from what the Nevada Conservation Plan calls for.

The Farm Bureau supports the recently adopted CCS. The permits are currently temporary. These will eventually move to permanent regulations. Improvements in the program will allow private landowners participating in the CCS to be given conservation agreements with assurance protections. Should the greater sage grouse be put on the endangered species list, the private landowners should be protected from their voluntary involvement and engagement in the CCS. The Farm Bureau has been consistent in its belief that this needs to be accomplished, but it has not been. This is a concern.

If in the future, greater sage grouse are listed as endangered species, there needs to be protections for Nevada to have some influence over that decision beyond the population and other factors. Serious things are happening with the State habitats. Millions of acres of sage grouse habitat are burning on an annual basis. There must be more aggressive work done to manage fuel loads; more needs to be done to protect the habitats from conservation activities.

The Bureau is not opposed to A.J.R. 3, or the Nevada Conservation Plan or the CCS; it just wants more and better in the plans.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Are you proposing to amend the resolution? There are things we need to see happen.

MR. BUSSELMAN:

The Farm Bureau does not have a formal proposal for amending the Resolution. I have seen ideas proposed as possible amendments to include encouragement for the federal agencies to do more, but these are not the proposals of the Farm Bureau and it cannot bring them forward.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

I have seen some proposals. Given what the resolution is and does, it is well worded and sends the message to our delegation in Congress that we support it. Your sentiments are on the record as we move forward.

MR. BUSSELMAN:

These are the sentiments of the Farm Bureau. It knows a lot of solid thinking and work went into the development of the Nevada Conservation Plan. Federal agencies worked side-by-side in developing their plans. The agencies' plans are not the same as the Nevada Plan. This is where the concerns of the Farm

Bureau lie. The U.S. Forest Service will come forward with its plan. The BLM has given assurance as it goes forward with its adoption of the CCS to follow closely the regulations and requirements Nevada is pushing for on how this program should be implemented. The same assurance does not come from the Forest Service because it does not need the State mitigation plan to do what it is going to do on its own. If the Forest Service considers its system better, it may not be in sync with the Nevada mitigation plan.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

We are supporting Nevada's Conservation Plan and that is where we will be.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Would you encourage the members of this Committee to vote for or against the resolution?

MR. BUSSELMAN:

I would encourage you to vote in favor of A.J.R. 3.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will close the hearing on A.J.R. 3 and open the hearing on A.J.R. 7.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 7: Expresses the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to the proposed expansion of the Fallon Range Training Complex. (BDR R-1099)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SARAH PETERS (Assembly District No. 24):

I will present A.J.R. 7. This is not an anti-military resolution. It is in response to the draft environmental impact study that removes public land from public use. This is about standing up for the interests of our constituents.

The military training complex in Fallon was established in northern Nevada in the 1940s. It spans more than 230,000 acres of land located approximately 65 miles east of Reno. In November 2018, the U.S. Department of the Navy released the Fallon Range Training Complex Modernization Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). The EIS presented three proposed alternatives for the expansion of the training complex located at the Naval Air Station (NAS) Fallon. The proposal preferred by the Navy would require more than 600,000 additional acres of land spread across Churchill, Lyon, Mineral, Nye and Pershing Counties

to be allocated to the Navy for the expansion of training sites. Those lands would no longer be available for public or private use by citizens.

The adoption of this expansion proposal would result in numerous negative environmental and economic consequences to public lands and the surrounding communities. It would take away parts of the Fallon National Wildlife Refuge, eliminate public access to recreational areas, restrict exploration of mineral and mining development, reduce livestock and grazing areas and close or reduce at least one State route.

The passing of S.J.R. 7 will express the opposition of the members of Nevada's 80th Legislative Session to the expansion of the training complex as proposed in the draft EIS.

Our legacy is what we leave to our children and future generations. The amount of land we have in Nevada is a huge part of our story. Each of us has a memory from access to public lands across the State, and this area is no different. It is significant for its natural resources for the population of Nevada. It is important to stand up for our constituents and their interests in how these areas are managed and processed by the federal government.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

I have two letters in support of A.J.R. 7 from organizations unable to attend this hearing: the Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition ([Exhibit E](#)) and the Center for Biological Diversity ([Exhibit F](#)).

MS. TYLER:

I will read from my written testimony in support of A.J.R. 7 ([Exhibit G](#)).

KYLE DAVIS (Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife):

The Nevada Conservation League and the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife support A.J.R. 7. The closing of access to public lands and the impacts on wildlife habitat have been detailed in previous testimony. It is not just the access to public lands, it is the investment in the public lands that have been made by sportsmen and sportswomen. Conservation partners and the Department of Wildlife have invested in water development projects and have spent significant amounts of money to improve the habitat for the wildlife species. Blocking access blocks recreation and the ability to maintain and improve habitat. It is an issue that touches areas for recreation, habitat and loss

of economic opportunity and geothermal potential for alternative energy. A large portion of land is detailed to be inaccessible. We encourage the U.S. Navy to return to the drawing board with the interested stakeholders to find a solution that does not make the impacts as stated.

SENATOR HANSEN:

When U.S. Congressman Mark Amodei spoke recently, he hinted strongly that this expansion by the Navy is going to happen. Have you considered a possible amendment to A.J.R. 7? The lands are federal lands owned by all the people of the U.S., not just Nevada. There are 330 million Americans and 3.3 million Nevadans. That is a 100 to 1 ratio claiming equal rights to tell Nevada how it can or cannot use public lands. As a Legislature, would it be better to negotiate for a quid pro quo?

MR. DAVIS:

The concern that created A.J.R. 7 is with what has been proposed to date and what is being proposed in the EIS. Is there a potential to reach some agreement so access to important parts of public lands can be preserved, wildlife habitat can be protected and access maintaining these projects remain available? It is possible, and we should continue to have the discussions. The passing of A.J.R. 7 is not closing the door to future alternative solutions. The Resolution states what has been proposed to date by the EIS has unacceptable impacts, and Nevada cannot support it. It does not close the door to continued conversations to reach mutually beneficial solutions.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I am a cosponsor on the southern Nevada Resolution regarding the U.S. Air Force expansion. I am more sensitive to A.J.R. 7 because I have a son in the U.S. Navy, a daughter-in-law in the U.S. Marine Corp and a son-in-law in the U.S. Air Force. When military representatives claim the need in order to train, Nevada is one of the few areas left in the continental U.S. where the land masses are still available. Since Nevada has not asserted sovereignty over the lands, the U.S. Congress can dump nuclear waste at Yucca Mountain or expand Naval bombing ranges in the north and the Air Force ranges in the south. The reality is the lands do not belong to Nevada. I prefer this not to happen but wonder if we are shooting ourselves in the foot by not trying to cooperate with a quid pro quo in order to satisfy both parties and for Nevada to get something in exchange.

TYSON K. FALK (Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition):

The Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition supports A.J.R. 7. The Department of the Interior publishes a list of critical minerals needed for national security and national defense for computers, missile and related technologies. Much of this list occurs almost exclusively in Nevada.

While the discussion exists about increasing the military land mass for national security interests, there is much mineral activity in the proposed expansion area. The minerals are there, but there is no commercial use for them. Lithium is a good example. There has always been enough lithium supply to make the things lithium is used for. With the introduction of lithium ion batteries, lithium is a hugely strategic critical mineral.

There are ways to comingle with the military for the space in terms of mining activities. There are not many power lines or concerns from a national security standpoint for exploration and pre-mining activities. There are opportunities and avenues to be explored. The Coalition is opposed to the draft EIS.

The diversity of interests expressing opposition to the EIS proposal includes mining, environmental and renewable energy.

TIFFANY EAST (Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife):

The Board of Wildlife Commissioners supports and agrees with much of the supporting testimony for A.J.R. 7. The proposed expansion of the training complex at NAS Fallon will result in wildlife mortality including our precious bighorn sheep. The Department of Wildlife and its conservation partners have invested significant time and resources improving wildlife in the proposed expansion area. It will have adverse effects should the expansion move forward. The Board's support of A.J.R. 7 does not diminish its respect, appreciation and service of the military. The Board's support is a reflection of its concerns about the potential impacts on Nevada's wildlife and its habitat. The cumulative effects of the proposed expansions in northern and southern Nevada will have severe impacts on the wildlife in the Desert National Wildlife Refuge and the Fallon Wildlife Refuge.

ERNIE ADLER (Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe):

The Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe supports A.J.R. 7. The land of concern used to belong to Native Americans. The proposed EIS takes access of the land away from Native peoples. The Tribe is opposed to the EIS. The amount of land to be

dedicated to this range will be greater than the size of the state of Rhode Island. It is a substantial area. The Tribe is not opposed to the military, but the EIS is excessive in terms of its impact on Nevada.

DANIEL PIERROTT (Nevada Bighorns Unlimited):

The Nevada Bighorns Unlimited supports A.J.R. 7. It also supports the military and the State conservation efforts.

ROB BASTIEN:

I support A.J.R. 7. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit H](#)).

CHRISTINE SAUNDERS (Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada):

The Progressive Leadership Alliance of Nevada supports A.J.R. 7 and the supporting testimony.

ALEX TANCHEK (Nevada Cattlemen's Association):

The Nevada Cattlemen's Association supports A.J.R. 7.

KIRK KUZNICKI (Friends of Nevada Wilderness):

The Friends of Nevada Wilderness supports A.J.R. 7. It agrees with the supporting testimony of the Nevada Conservation League, the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, the Sierra Club and other conservation partners.

KIRK PETERSON:

I support A.J.R. 7. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit I](#)).

PATRICK BRUCE:

We see things through our own filters. When I listened to the speech by Congressman Mark Amodei, I did not get the impression the expansion of military lands in Nevada was guaranteed to happen, and Nevada should get something out of it. The Congressman said it is something that, as it stands, each opposing group could get something out of what is happening with the expansion. It is not an all-or-nothing proposal. People support the military as I do. There are opportunities with this project for some consensus and some give and take. I support A.J.R. 7.

CAPTAIN EVAN MORRISON (Commanding Officer, Naval Air Station Fallon):

The NAS Fallon opposes A.J.R. 7. One of the objectives of the modernization project has been to inform and educate. The U.S. Navy has conducted over

250 informational and key leader engagements since the summer of 2016. It has completed over 60 informational briefs to decision makers and stakeholders. Four of my colleagues and I made ourselves available today to all Legislators and staff early this morning in this building. This single engagement is insufficient. I extend an invitation to the Committee and its colleagues in coordinating additional dialogue. During this process, we have been as transparent as possible, and this effort must continue.

My job as Commanding Officer is to provide functional training ranges and facilities for our aviation and Special Forces, so they are successful in combat. I take this responsibility seriously. The Navy is attempting to maximize its technological advantages, bridge the technology in warfighting capability and prepare operators to train as they will fight and improve the lethality through a more capable force.

As you know, many nations do not share our values and beliefs in liberty and freedom. When our Country is confronted, we need to be confident that our sons, daughters, brothers and sisters possess the critical skills for using the available tools to succeed and survive combat against adversaries who threaten U.S. security interests. This modernization effort will provide that opportunity.

The Navy is a Nevada community member. We live and work among Nevadans. Maintaining strong positive relationships is critical to the Navy as well as Nevada. The 2015 NAS Fallon Environmental Impact Statement calculated the Base's economic impact to Nevada at over \$515 million annually. As the Navy and the Department of Defense modernize and reconstitute warfighting capabilities, Nevada can continue to be a beneficiary of that economic activity.

The NAS Fallon has value to the U.S. Navy and Nevada. We are a team. As a team, we need to train and support our aviators and Special Forces in meeting global threats to protect our liberty from those nations who wish to take it away. We must provide our fighting forces the chance to perfect their combat skills for meeting threats. We recognize that we are a member of the community and want to work with all stakeholders to ensure the resources valued by Nevadans are appropriately considered as we continue studying the Fallon Range Training Complex modernization initiative. A country worth defending is a country worth protecting. This includes using natural resources in a responsible manner.

SENATOR HANSEN:

I was on the tour of Churchill County, and it made it clear the Navy contribution is one-third of the County's economy. Thank you for that. My son, who is in the Navy, will get his Navy Seal trident pin here in September. Special Forces are important to me.

Nevada has the most owned and controlled land by the federal government in the Nation, at 86 percent. Are there any other states in the Continental U.S. where this expansion could possibly be placed? The concern for native Nevadans is the constant military expansions in the State, like nuclear test sites and desert ranges, because there are no other states that have this land-type available. It seems Nevada will continue to see this into the indefinite future. Has the Navy looked at other places that could feasibly be used for this type of training?

CAPTAIN MORRISON:

There is no other place in this Country where the Navy can conduct this amount and type of training with the infrastructure in place. It was said there would be 600,000 acres cutoff to the public. In the draft EIS, 325,000 acres will still be available to the public.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

If there is nowhere in the U.S. for this type of testing, does that mean that there is no reason the Navy would leave the base in Fallon to go elsewhere?

CAPTAIN MORRISON:

If there was another viable place to conduct the training, the Navy would more than likely leave the base.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Is there another viable place to do this?

CAPTAIN MORRISON:

There is no viable place at this time.

SENATOR HANSEN:

When I was running my trap line in Edwards Creek, near Smith Creek, the Navy was doing an exercise well outside the boundaries of its normal location. There were helicopters flying about, and a navy man was standing in a field. I was

mystified when a smoke grenade was popped, and a helicopter came and picked up the man. It was well outside the boundaries of this proposed expansion. How much land do you use in Nevada beyond what is specific to your base?

CAPTAIN MORRISON

Are you referring to the Dixie Valley area?

SENATOR HANSEN:

I was east of Dixie Valley, near the Desatoya Mountains, and there is a main canyon which is Edwards Creek. At the top, it drops down to Smith Creek and Smith Creek Valley. It was by the Smith Creek Valley side. What amount of territory do you typically use? This is not part of the base on the Dixie Valley side as the eastern boundary.

CAPTAIN MORRISON:

The boundary of the Fallon Range training complex extends 120 miles east and 80 miles north. The modernization specifically refers to the actual bombing ranges of Bravo 16, 17, 19 and 20. The Dixie Valley training area is where a lot of our non-harmful, non-kinetic helicopter-type combat search and rescue training takes place.

SENATOR HANSEN:

As a Nevadan, I agree with the issues in favor of Nevada. As an American, I recognize these are federal lands and not Nevada lands at all. Americans have an equal say in how the lands are used. It is a big concern to me; my "Sagebrush rebel concerns" have been squelched.

ROB RULE (Community Planning and Liaison Officer, Naval Air Station Fallon):

The NAS Fallon supports all of northern Nevada for search and rescue needs. It provides support for lost hunters and off-road riders. The training you witnessed could be similar to search and rescue training.

CAPTAIN RUSSELL JONES (United States Naval Aviation Warfighting Development Center):

The area you describe is within the boundaries of the entire Fallon Range training complex, though not contained within a specific bombing range. We train for search and rescue operations in the entire area of the Range. That is likely what you witnessed. It is contained within the airspace and the ground space of the training complex.

SENATOR BROOKS:

I agree that NAS Fallon is a valuable member of the community, a valuable part of the Navy and instrumental in keeping us safe. We acknowledge and recognize that.

The federal government, specifically the Department of Defense, controls millions of acres between the Nellis Air Force range, the Nevada National Security Site (N2S2), NAS Fallon and everything in between. It seems readiness and what is needed to achieve readiness, is subjective. If these millions of acres are not enough to do what needs to be done for training and readiness, how are a few hundred thousand more acres going to be enough? At what point is there enough? Looking at the history of expansion of military lands in Nevada, it seems the appetite for expansion will never be satisfied.

What is being done to utilize the millions of acres of land at Nellis, N2S2, NAS Fallon and other test sites? Is there any coordination for the use of the lands?

CAPTAIN JONES:

There is an amount of commercial airspace and jetways separating the Nellis range from the Fallon range. The ability to expand or bridge those areas is limited. There are chunks of airspace allowing travel between the two ranges. It will never be something we could view from surface to 50,000 feet, and it is never something we could do on the ground. That keeps the two from working together on a consistent basis.

The NAS Fallon is scheduled at 130 percent of its capacity, so it turns away fleet customers on a regular basis. Hours of operations are limited. It is not a 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year organization. It operates 12 hours a day and 5 days a week. That is expanded as necessary, but is not a regular occurrence. I know the Nellis range is overscheduled and turns away customers for training and testing activities. This prevents sharing and combining range space. All the training requests received cannot be met.

Is enough, enough? The original bombing ranges were built during the 1940s. They were developed at a time when propeller-driven aircraft and dropped dumb bombs using iron sights were used. Warfare has modernized with more standoff weaponry. In order to "train like we fight," it requires an expanded area for dropping some of the weapons required to train and deploy if called upon in

defense of the Nation. The proposed bombing range expansions will allow the drop of only a fraction of available weapons. The other weapons require much more land than the Navy could ever hope to ask for in Nevada. The Navy strives to be a good steward and partner and limits its requests to what has been provided.

CAPTAIN MORRISON:

One of the intricacies of the Fallon range compared to Tonopah or China Lake is the instrumentation to record all of the training events. Twenty-four hours are spent planning a mission and 3 hours briefing it for a 45-minute flight. An additional three to four hours are spent debriefing the mission, and the mission is replayed in a big auditorium with multiple screens. That is a piece to the puzzle that is different from the other ranges.

SENATOR GOICOCHEA:

Where are we at in the draft EIS and the alternative proposals.

MR. RULE:

The draft EIS was released in winter; comments closed on February 14, 2019. We are in the process of collecting the comments and figuring out the pathways for what can be done and what cannot be done in terms of mitigations. The process lasts several months. The final EIS should be released in the next 12 months. The Secretary of the Navy will then sign the document 30 to 60 days after.

CLARENCE SOUTHARD (Vice President of Military Affairs, Navy League of the United States):

The Navy League of the U.S. supports the maritime services, the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard and U.S. Flag Merchant Marines. I do not hear national security being considered in A.J.R. 7. The military service organizations need to be provided with adequate facilities to perform trainings. I understand the need for recreation, off-road recreation and livestock grazing. It takes 23 acres to feed a cow. It is important to provide the military personnel with the training necessary to protect this Country.

Before sending the resolution to Congress, consider the importance of national security.

MITCHEL ROACH (United Veterans Legislative Council):

The general consensus of the Veterans is half support and half do not support A.J.R. 7. The Council will leave this up to your best judgement.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PETERS:

Nevada has put together an alternative plan that works for Nevada. It is not considered in the draft EIS. Nevada has attempted to be a player at the table to negotiate and find common ground for the expansion. Sending A.J.R. 7 is another step to ensure our voices are heard. We need alternatives that work for Nevadans.

My husband is a marine combat veteran. He trained at Bridgeport in the Mountain Warfare Training Center. It was paramount for where he served three tours in Iraq. I understand the importance of training. This is not about the importance of training; this is about ensuring our public lands work for Nevadans and are used in the most effective ways.

The draft EIS is a long document containing varying impacts. It is important to get an understanding on the impact the expansion will have on Nevada. Summary documents are available. The Navy reached out to me prior to the initial hearing of the bill and came to the table to discuss this with the Legislature.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will close the hearing on S.J.R. 7 and open the hearing on A.B. 1.

ASSEMBLY BILL 1 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions governing the adoption of certain regulations by the State Environmental Commission or a local air pollution control board. (BDR 40-360)

JENNIFER L. CARR (Deputy Administrator, Division of Environmental Protection, Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

I will introduce A.B. 1 and a minor conceptual amendment ([Exhibit J](#)). I will read from my written statement ([Exhibit K](#)).

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We had a question about the germaneness of the new conceptual amendment, [Exhibit J](#). I am not sure we will be able to consider it. We will follow up before the work session on A.B. 1.

JOELLE GUTMAN (Washoe County Health District):

The Air Quality Management Division of the Washoe County Health District supports A.B. 1 as amended. We appreciate the consideration of the local agency requirements for public notice. As a result of A.B. 1, the Health District will start the development of a new list service for the email system to aid with communicating information on District programs and policies. It has been the experience of the District that social media and electronic communications have become significantly more effective than publishing in the newspaper.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

The bill with the original amendment is A.B. 1 (1st Reprint). This is the bill we are reviewing at this hearing. The new proposed amendment, [Exhibit J](#), with the repeal of section 8 is still to be considered.

ROBERT TEKNIEPE (Department of Air Quality, Clark County, Nevada):

The Department of Air Quality, Clark County, Nevada supports A.B. 1. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit L](#)).

RICHARD KARPEL (Executive Director, Nevada Press Association):

The Nevada Press Association opposes A.B. 1. I will read from my written testimony ([Exhibit M](#)).

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will close the hearing on A.B. 1 and open the hearing on A.J.R. 8.

ASSEMBLY JOINT RESOLUTION 8: Expresses the opposition of the Nevada Legislature to the elimination of the Nevada State Office of the Bureau of Land Management. (BDR R-506)

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Seeing no one to present A.J.R. 8, we will not hear it today and move it to a later date.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
April 30, 2019
Page 18

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

With no more business to conduct, we will adjourn at 5:31 p.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Christine Miner,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Melanie Scheible, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBIT SUMMARY				
Bill	Exhibit / # of pages		Witness / Entity	Description
	A	2		Agenda
	B	4		Attendance Roster
A.J.R. 3	C	4	Jim Lawrence / State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Written Testimony
A.J.R. 3	D	1	Tobi Tyler / Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter	Written Testimony
A.J.R. 7	E	3	Nevada Mineral Exploration Coalition	Letter of Support
A.J.R. 7	F	2	Center for Biological Diversity	Letter of Support
A.J.R. 7	G	1	Tobi Tyler / Sierra Club, Toiyabe Chapter	Written Testimony
A.J.R. 7	H	1	Rob Bastien	Written Testimony
A.J.R. 7	I	1	Kirk Peterson	Written Testimony
A.B. 1	J	5	Jennifer Carr / Division of Environmental Protection / Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Proposed Amendment
A.B. 1	K	3	Jennifer Carr / Division of Environmental Protection / Department of Conservation and Natural Resources	Written Testimony
A.B. 1	L	1	Robert Tekniepe / Department of Air Quality, Clark County, Nevada	Written Testimony
A.B. 1	M	2	Richard Karpel / Nevada Press Association	Written Testimony