

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

**Eightieth Session
March 7, 2019**

The Senate Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Melanie Scheible at 4:00 p.m. on Thursday, March 7, 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:

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senatorial District No. 17

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

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

OTHERS PRESENT:

Ernest C. Schank, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District
Rusty D. Jardine, General Manager, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District
Gordon Depaoli, Walker River Irrigation District
Steve Walker, Eureka County
Alex Tanchek, Nevada Cattlemen's Association
Zach Rhodes
Patrick Donnelly, Center for Biological Diversity
Cheva Gabor, U.S. Forest Service

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will open the hearing on Senate Bill (S.B.) 232.

SENATE BILL 232: Revises certain provisions related to irrigation districts.
(BDR 48-644)

SENATOR JAMES A. SETTELMAYER (Senatorial District No. 17):

I will present S.B. 232. Under current law, it is impossible for irrigation districts to designate voting rights to someone who is a beneficiary of a trust. Many trusts are formed as a way to protect assets from taxation or liability. Irrigation districts struggle to find members to serve on the districts because the law lacks clarity on who can serve on the irrigation district to represent a property. The bill seeks to allow a trustee, holding title to a property, to designate voting rights for an irrigation district to a beneficiary of the trust.

ERNEST C. SCHANK (Truckee-Carson Irrigation District):

I retired from the Board of Directors of the Truckee-Carson Irrigation District (TCID) after 24 years. I will highlight some points from my written testimony supporting S.B. 232, ([Exhibit C](#)).

Family trusts have become popular in recent years because they allow farms to be passed from generation to generation. This eliminates estate transfer problems. It gives older generations the opportunity to set guidelines for younger generations.

Beneficiaries of trusts are often active in the operation of a farm, but have no voting rights nor can they run for office in an irrigation district. Good talent is lost by this lack of rights. Senate Bill 232 proposes to amend *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 539 by putting family trusts on equal footing with other forms of land ownership. It allows beneficiaries of a trust the authority to sign petitions, vote and do the things electors are allowed to do according to statute.

A few years ago, a member of the Board of Directors of TCID passed away. A new director needed to be assigned to serve until the next biennial election. A farmer in his mid-thirties was asked to fill the position. Because he was a beneficiary of a family trust, he held no voting rights and was ineligible to serve.

When I decided not to run again for the Board of TCID, my son wanted to run for the seat, but as a beneficiary of our family trust, he could not. His solution

was to buy a small neighboring water-righted property in order to run for office. That is not a viable option for most people.

A large pool of young talent could become involved in the governance of an irrigation district should S.B. 232 become law.

SENATOR HARRIS:

Is there a risk of the opposite happening if voting rights are allowed to trustees not living on the property?

MR. SCHANK:

Many trustees do not reside on their land.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

A trustee and owner of a property in an irrigation district has voting rights regardless of whether this person lives on the property. In Douglas County, I work with an irrigation district having 127 members. Forty-nine of those members live out-of-state. Any owner or primary trustee has voting rights in the district. The bill seeks to allow for situations when a trustee, not living on the land and not involved in the day-to-day management of the land, wishes to designate a beneficiary of the trust the right to intercede on the trustee's behalf. It is important for active participants of the land, who understand the day-to-day operations, be participants in the decisions of the irrigation district. Irrigation districts work well if the government stays removed and neighbors are allowed to work with one another. There should be no opposite effect to this proposal because current statute allows the trustee voting rights.

SENATOR HARRIS:

It was my understanding the bill was to allow the holder of a trust to be able to vote. I now realize the beneficiary of a trust does not have the right, and the bill proposes to correct this. Is there a concern if the beneficiary of a trust does not want voting rights?

MR. SCHANK:

Although it could happen, it is not a concern.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

The language of the bill states that if there is more than one trustee, the trustees must designate one of their number as the person to carry out the duties as allowed in NRS.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

If a person owns over 20 acres of land, is this person entitled to 2 votes?

MR. SCHANK:

An owner of 10 acres is entitled to 1 vote. Each additional 10 acres, up to and including 200 acres allows an additional vote. Every additional 100 acres over 200 allows an additional vote. There is a formula in the law.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Will S.B. 232 allow for the appointment of more than one trustee on the ballot because this person owns over 200 acres?

MR. SCHANK:

The law is clear that one trustee has to designate the other. The bill does not change any of the voting numbers.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Can an interest owning over 200 acres have up to 3 votes?

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

This is addressed in the bill. A trustee can only designate one beneficiary. It is not a split-vote situation.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

If a district issues a separate ballot for each vote, how will that work with the designated trustee? Page 4, line 17, of the bill states "The district shall issue a separate ballot for each vote ...". How would that work with the designated trustee?

MR. SCHANK:

Each interest is assigned a certain number of votes, and ballots are issued accordingly.

RUSTY D. JARDINE (General Manager, Truckee-Carson Irrigation District):
Truckee-Carson Irrigation District supports S.B. 232. I have submitted written testimony ([Exhibit D](#)). There are 2,500 water users in the Newlands Project, a federal reclamation project which TCID is responsible to operate and maintain.

As the manager of TCID, I must ensure TCID properly designates who holds the right to vote in elections on behalf of a property. Senate Bill 232 will assist TCID in performing this duty. Sons and grandsons are often the ones seeing to the operations of a farm and performing the daily operations. This bill will allow them the authority to vote and sign petitions and do the other things accorded electors of an irrigation district.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

There appear to be many men on the boards. Are the boards attempting to recruit women to the boards?

MR. JARDINE:

I have an office staff of women and encourage women to become members of a board. In 2008, the Fernley flood occurred. The concern over liability created a lack of participation in the governance of TCID. Everyone and anyone who is an elector is invited to participate in the irrigation district.

SENATOR SETTELMAYER:

If the bill passes, my brother-in-law and I have agreed to gladly allow my niece and my two daughters to attend the meetings, rather than us.

GORDON DEPAOLI (Walker River Irrigation District):

The Walker River Irrigation District (WRID) of Smith and Mason Valleys supports S.B. 232 for the reasons expressed by Mr. Schank and Mr. Jardine. For many years, the chairwoman of WRID was Beverly Landolt. There are no women on the WRID Board at this time.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

We will close the hearing on S.B. 232 and open the hearing on Senate Joint Resolution (S.J.R.) 1.

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 1: Urges Congress to require the Bureau of Land Management and the United States Forest Service to include cheatgrass in certain forage estimates. (BDR R-257)

SENATOR IRA HANSEN (Senatorial District No. 14):

In the last year, Nevada has spent over \$100 million fighting unnecessary fires. There are 9 million acres in Nevada invaded by cheatgrass, an invasive species.

I will speak from my visual presentation ([Exhibit E](#) contains copyrighted material. Original is available upon request of the Research Library.) The picture on page 2 from 1995 is indicative of the landscape in Nevada. It shows high desert with typical sage brush and rabbit brush communities. The yellow colored vegetation in between the shrubs is highly flammable cheatgrass. The photo on page 3 shows a fire on a mountainous sage area. Fire is a natural occurrence, and in the Great Basin, fire intervals were once every 100 to 200 years. Once cheatgrass became prevalent, the fire occurrences are every decade or less.

The photo on page 4 shows a cheatgrass community of dead brush that can easily burn. There will never be a return to the native habitat, depicted on page 2, without aggressive action.

In 1939, there were 5 members of the Civilian Conservation Corps killed in a range fire in Nevada. It was the first time cheatgrass became a significant issue. Cheatgrass was first documented in Nevada in the 1890s. Cheatgrass has been here for almost 120 years. Cheatgrass is also known as bronco grass.

In the 1940s, the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR) began to study cheatgrass. Page 5 is a picture from 1941 showing cattle grazing on cheatgrass. From the studies, recommendations were made in 1942 on this new rangeland grass. It was not considered a bad thing. I will read from page 6, one recommendation made from the studies: "In northern and central Nevada, it has become a permanent source of feed for many important range areas and must be recognized as an integral part of our grazing resources." Other recommendations from page 7 state "It creates a serious fire menace when it is fully mature and dry," and "It will necessarily have to be recognized as the forage plant which at the present furnishes a large portion of all the feed for livestock on the spring-fall ranges of northern and central Nevada."

I have checked with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) over the past decade to see if it has used cheatgrass in its forage calculations. I will quote from a memo I wrote on February 27, 2019, pictured on page 8 of [Exhibit E](#):

BLM and USFS land managers have stated that early season cheatgrass grazing is not factored into grazing permit applications... . In Nevada, BLM does not have a standard for annual grasslands, so they do not currently manage for annual grasses...

To this day, the federal land management agencies do not include cheatgrass in their calculations for how much forage is available for livestock grazing. This is a problem.

The Great Basin Wildfire Forum of 2007 took place at UNR. It published a booklet in 2008 to document its solutions. The cover of the booklet titled *Great Basin Wildfire Forum, The Search For Solutions* is pictured on page 9. I will read a quote by Dr. J. Wayne Burkhardt, a professor emeritus of range management at UNR, from this document:

For the past 40 years, the management strategy, at least on public lands, has been to reduce or modify livestock grazing on these annual grasses, presumably to allow the re-establishment of native bunchgrasses. This has proven to be disastrous. Preadapted annual grasses can out-compete native bunchgrasses for early spring moisture on arid range sites. Reductions in grazing on these rangelands have not promoted the establishment of native flora, but rather have allowed flammable fuel build-up and increased fire frequency, intensity and spread. These unnatural fires remove the sagebrush overstory, prevent shrub re-establishment and create the conditions for the establishment of monotypic annual grasslands on what should be a shrub/grassland vegetation community.

This problem has been occurring in Nevada for 52 years, and it is getting worse. A recommendation sheet from the booklet, shown on page 10, on fire prevention and fuels management reads "Recognize cheatgrass as a major forage species on the rangelands of the Great Basin and develop grazing management systems that optimize the use of this resource while reducing uncontrollable wildfires." The Forum took place 12 years ago, after 7 years of the most severe wildfires ever experienced in Nevada. Cheatgrass and wildfire is spoken of today as something new and strategies are being developed, yet this has been discussed for more than 50 years.

Carson City has problems with fires in the area of C-Hill. Carson started a fire management program. The program allowed sheep to graze on a certain portion of the land with an exclosure pasture separated from the grazing area. Sheep were not allowed to graze in the exclosure pasture. The Parks, Recreation and Open Space Department, the Citizen Advisory Committee and the Carson City Board of Supervisors are of the opinion that this is a valuable program, especially at the negligible cost.

It is ironic that ranchers used to pay for the privilege of grazing; Nevada is now subsidizing them to prevent fires. The results of the program are shown on a graph on page 12. A quote of the summary says:

After completing line point intercept transects both inside and outside the grazing exclosures, on varying slope aspects, we found that there was a higher cover of litter and vegetation inside the exclosure when compared to conditions outside the exclosure. This is consistent with our hypothesis that targeted grazing in these areas would reduce fine fuels and vegetative cover, thus reducing potential fire risk. Additionally, we found that plant diversity was higher outside of exclosures than inside, indicated by the increased presence of annual forbs and perennial grasses in grazed areas.

Up until 1979, the Department of Wildlife issued an annual report reflecting the cheatgrass crop. This crop was considered valuable because the chukar population thrived on it. When I was a teenager hunting chukar, I did not succeed in catching one, but a friend got a couple of them. He said the secret to finding the birds is to find cheatgrass, their favorite food.

Nevada has become nothing but cheatgrass. It is an alien plant and it would be good to get rid of it. It is not going away, though, it is expanding. There is consensus among some that ranching and grazing caused the cheatgrass infestation. This is true in some disturbed grazed areas, where cheatgrass will more easily establish. The reality is, there are areas in Nevada that have never been grazed and are now predominantly cheatgrass. An example is Anaho Island in Pyramid Lake. It has never been grazed and it is a cheatgrass community where many native plant communities are scarce.

Some claim Nevada was originally grasslands, and when livestock grazing was introduced, it destroyed the grasslands which allowed the shrub communities to

grow. On page 14 is an article about John Muir. He spent three years in Nevada hiking to the top of mountains to measure elevations. He wrote his observations about the flora of Nevada. He described the plant communities. John Muir and other early explorers described Nevada as an ocean of sagebrush, with piñon-juniper on the central Nevada ranges, as it is today. Originally, Nevada was predominantly a shrub community, not grassland. It did not come about due to overgrazing by the livestock industry.

A report done by Sereno Watson is shown on page 15. He was part of the King Survey, also known as the Fortieth Parallel Survey, which took place from 1867 to 1872. He was a professional botanist and reported in detail the plant communities in Nevada. His report showed Nevada with primarily shrub communities. This is important to know, because some say the elimination of livestock grazing will allow Nevada to return to grassland communities. There is no historical data to back up this theory.

One of the reasons for the expansion of cheatgrass is carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide, a greenhouse gas, provides for the expansion of plant production. The overall plant communities have expanded due to the increase of carbon dioxide.

The picture on page 16 was taken in 1869 by Timothy O'Sullivan, with the King Survey, of the top of the Ruby Mountains. In 2013, the U.S. Forest Service (USFS) took a picture at the same location on the same day of the month as the original picture. The photo on page 17 shows how the plant community changed through the years. The photo shows a fire-free zone because there are no contiguous fuels. The changes are natural, not caused by grazing or fires. In theory, if the changes were due to grazing, there should be reductions in plant communities and the overall amount of foliage. The 2013 photo shows more vegetation.

Page 18 shows a photo from 1869 of a canyon with the Ruby Lake marshes in the background. The photo from 2013, page 19, of the same canyon shows a dramatic increase in foliage. Photos on pages 20 and 21 show the same phenomenon with the first from 1869 and the second from 2013. The latter photos show remarkable expansions in biomass. The plants are responding to the dramatic increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, which is plant food. This is also true for cheatgrass.

The BLM and USFS have been restricted in dealing with the cheatgrass issue. It is difficult to manage the events of cheatgrass. With the current wet conditions, cheatgrass will be prolific this year. It is the opposite in drought years. Cheatgrass is an annual and comes from seed stock.

The federal government controls 87 percent of Nevada lands. The bulk of the areas experiencing huge wildfires are managed by BLM and USFS. These agencies do not include annual grasses in their forage methodologies.

There was a dramatic cutback in cattle grazing in the 1970s and 1980s. There was a term "cattle free in '93" when Bruce Babbitt was U.S. Secretary of the Interior. There was a push in the U.S. to remove all livestock grazing from the public domain. There were dramatic cutbacks.

When considering the history of range fires in Nevada, it should be noted that the first million-acre fire was in 1999. Over 1.6 million acres burned that year. Yearly fires have burned 11 million acres in Nevada since then. Fires are preventable. Even if Nevada subsidized livestock grazing, it would be less expensive to spend \$5 million in prevention, than \$100 million fighting fires. It would prevent the incredible destruction of native habitat destroyed by fires.

Nevada has no ability to force federal land managers to take action. Senate Joint Resolution 1 proposes to urge the federal government to assist the State by requiring the non-native cheatgrass be included in the forage calculations of BLM and USFS. Nevada has experienced millions of acres of wildland fires. There have been many studies and recycling of ideas, yet, no action has been taken. A fire must have three components: a heat source, fuel and oxygen. Eliminating one of the components stops a fire. If Nevada can cut back on the amount of cheatgrass on the range, it will allow the return of the conditions of the 1970s and 1980s, when more livestock grazed.

SENATOR BROOKS:

What are the scientific or policy reasons stated for not including non-native or cheatgrass in the forage calculations?

SENATOR HANSEN:

In the 1960s and through the 1980s, the theory was if there were good grazing practices, cheatgrass would naturally go away and perennial grasses in certain circumstances would compete with cheatgrass. It did not work. Governments

do not make changes easily. The ability of BLM and USFS to make necessary changes is a challenge. By the time it is realized there will be a good crop of annual cheatgrass, it may take six to nine months of approvals from Washington, D.C. before things can be accomplished to graze the cheatgrass. The federal entities must be directed to take action.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Would you support the reduction of carbon emissions to reduce the growth of cheatgrass?

SENATOR HANSEN:

No, I would not support that. The increase in carbon dioxide is a positive. The U.S. is experiencing a net expansion of domestic food and forest production. All plant life in the world is increasing due to more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The amount of forage available for our livestock industry is an improvement and should be taken advantage of.

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Would the reduction of carbon dioxide contribute to the reduction in cheatgrass?

SENATOR HANSEN:

Yes, it could. Cheatgrass contains a lot of protein and is a valuable forage plant which should be seen as a net benefit. Considering it livestock feed, not just fuel, allows our livestock producers to increase the amount of sheep and cattle on the range. This would benefit everyone. Carbon dioxide is a gas and a plant food. We breathe in oxygen and breathe out carbon dioxide. Ninety-eight percent of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is created by nature. Man's contribution is very small.

STEVE WALKER (Eureka County):

Eureka County supports S.J.R 1. This is an important issue and Nevada should take advantage of the cheatgrass forage. It is more than just about the forage; better water distribution is needed to use the grasses. The entire range management issue needs attention. Technically, a typo in the bill is on page 1, line 17, scientific nomenclature, *bromus tectorum*, should be capitalized; it is a genus.

ALEX TANCHEK (Nevada Cattlemen's Association):

Nevada Cattlemen's Association supports S.J.R. 1. To manage rangelands effectively, management must adapt to current conditions. Cheatgrass has shifted millions of acres of native rangelands to annual grasslands. Although it is often seen as a weed, livestock effectively convert cheatgrass to healthy protein for the American public to consume while simultaneously reducing fine fire fuels. By declaring cheatgrass a forage, producers can work with BLM and USFS to manage their allotments for an upward trend in ecological condition while remaining economically productive and sustainable.

ZACH RHODES:

I am a Nevada born and raised horseman and cattleman. I have seen the effects of cheatgrass on rangeland when it is properly managed. The Perry Fire last year burned rangeland in Palomino Valley. I graze 80 and 100 head of cattle on private land there. Due to cheatgrass, the fire took off rapidly spreading on both sides of the range. I graze my cows in a canyon along with the Paiute Tribe. The fire went around the entire canyon due to cattle grazing.

The house of a friend of mine, where I do branding and castrating and pasture my cows, was saved from the fire due to grazing. Her neighbor declined allowing our cows to graze on her property, which had overgrowth of cheatgrass. Unfortunately, her house burned down.

I have seen the results of cattle grazing near Big Canyon Ranch. The Tule Fire burned near there, and the top of the range where cattle are run did not burn. Areas where cattle did not graze burned. Last spring native grasses had started to grow in the areas near the Ranch where cattle are run. I support S.J.R. 1.

PATRICK DONNELLY (Center for Biological Diversity):

The Center for Biological Diversity opposes S.J.R. 1. This appears to be a piecemeal approach to a much larger problem of fire and cheatgrass invasion. Historically, livestock grazing has been a major driver of the establishment and persistence of cheatgrass and other invasive weeds on public lands.

I can point to a bundle of studies showing no correlations between livestock grazing and reduced fire intervals. One of the main drivers of fire is climate change and drought. In the Martin Fire of 2018, much of the sagebrush in low and poor condition burned because of the Aroga moth. It breeds on sagebrush and causes defoliation. Its degradation encouraged burning and was secondary

to climate change and drought. This does not mean cheatgrass is not a driver of fires.

There are other efforts taking place this Legislative Session to address fire issues. The Legislative Committee on Public Lands heard a bill requesting the Legislative Commission appoint a committee to conduct an interim study concerning wildfires. Addressing the suitability of using grazing as a tool to address cheatgrass should be dealt with in the broader context on how to control Nevada fires. The proposal in S.J.R. 1 is just one small facet of a larger issue.

CHEVA GABOR (U.S. Forest Service):

I will give information on how USFS uses targeted grazing. There are two options available today for using livestock to reduce fine fuels. One is hazardous fuels reduction contracts and the other is issuing grazing permits. The project Senator Hansen described in Carson City is a hazardous fuels reduction contract USFS has with the Borda Land & Sheep Company. The Carson City Parks, Recreation and Open Space Department is a partner. The project is called the West Carson Fuels Project and includes 500 acres. A second similar project is called the Arrowhawk Fuels Reduction Project on the west side of Reno in the Mount Rose corridor. Sheep graze 1,000 acres.

The USFS has annual monitoring data to 2007, which demonstrates the effectiveness of hazardous fuels reduction contracts in reducing fine fuel loads. Fuel management staff from the Carson Ranger District say this is one of the most effective fuel reduction tools they have. We have contract activities in both project areas. In the spring, we will expand those to the fall and USFS is interested in expanding the use of this tool. Its use will be analyzed through the National Environmental Policy Act on a project-by-project basis or as part of a programmatic analysis.

The second option using livestock is through grazing permits. The language in S.J.R. 1 appears to encourage the federal agencies to work through the grazing permittees for using their livestock to achieve fuels reduction. For USFS, available forage is not something it recalculates on a regular basis, nor on an annual basis. The wording in S.J.R. 1 may not achieve the impact as intended. The authors might consider broadening its language to achieve that impact.

Permanent livestock can graze cheatgrass. The dilemma is the on-and-off date provision. The permit terms and conditions mean livestock are generally not on the USFS ranges during the spring and fall, the key windows to target annual grasses. The rangers have some flexibility with the dates, but only two weeks on either side. If rangers see fine fuel load, they have some flexibility for the permittee. A longer time period requires a National Environmental Policy Act analysis to change permit terms and conditions.

There are USFS projects underway to allow analyses of changes in the permit terms and conditions, such as the Santa Rosa Rangeland Management Project. This is designed to analyze grazing on 12 allotments in the Santa Rosa Ranger District in Humboldt County. A Statewide discussion on outcome-based grazing is related to this. It means looking at conditions on the ground instead of established on-and-off dates. If that flexibility could be built in, it might be complementary to this discussion.

Some funding has been made available to USFS for the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest to expand the use of targeted grazing. There is a meeting next week to begin developing a plan on how to use the funding to build on the use of this tool in the future. Invitees are UNR, University of Nevada Cooperative Extension, State Department of Agriculture, Nevada Cattlemen's Association and BLM. Some permittees of livestock grazing permits may be interested.

SENATOR GOICOECHEA:

Nevada is coming out of a high precipitation spring and, we will see dry matter in September. There could be close to a ton of dry matter per acre in cheatgrass prone areas. How can this be addressed in 45 days? Livestock needs to be on these ranges to reduce the impact of the grasses. This is a problem. It would be unfortunate to wait on this, then determine a year from now something should have been done earlier to address this issue.

MS. GABOR:

We need to develop tools for flexibility in using grazing permits, and I agree, we do not have it right now.

SENATOR HANSEN:

From Ms. Gabor's testimony, the problem is clear. There are 45 days for the agencies to make a quick change as the fuel load is building up. Cheatgrass is also a valuable resource. I am asking the State and the Legislative Body to send

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 7, 2019
Page 15

a non-binding resolution for the federal government to do something. Nevada is in a big mess and this issue has been studied for 50 years. Nevada has 11 million burned acres, 9 million acres of which is a monoculture of cheatgrass. Something needs to be done. This resolution will allow the federal agencies in Nevada the flexibility level they need, but do not have now under federal law.

Remainder of page intentionally left blank; signature page to follow.

Senate Committee on Natural Resources
March 7, 2019
Page 16

CHAIR SCHEIBLE:

Having no further business, we will adjourn at 4:58 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	1		Agenda
	B	2		Attendance Roster
S.B. 232	C	2	Ernest C. Schank / Truckee-Carson Irrigation District	Written Testimony
S.B. 232	D	2	Rusty D. Jardine / Truckee-Carson Irrigation District	Written Testimony
S.J.R. 1	E	21	Senator Ira Hansen	Visual Presentation