

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES**

**Eighty-First Session
April 9, 2021**

The Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 1:25 p.m. on Friday, April 9, 2021, Online. 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/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Annie Black
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Mendy Elliott, representing Nevada Humane Society
Jennifer Ott, Director, State Department of Agriculture

Chair Watts:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will begin our work session with Assembly Bill 102.

Assembly Bill 102: Revises requirements for the issuance of certain annual permits for entering, camping and boating in state parks and recreational areas. (BDR 35-877)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

As Legislative Counsel Bureau staff, I cannot advocate for or against any measure that comes before the Committee.

Assembly Bill 102 was heard in Committee on March 10, 2021 [[Exhibit C](#)]. This bill removes the requirement for the Division of State Parks of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to impose an administrative fee on annual state park permits for Nevada disabled veterans who can receive such a permit free of charge.

There is one amendment proposed by Assemblywoman Krasner that would make the following changes: It removes the 10 percent service-connected disability minimum requirement; and reverts the Division's authority to charge the administrative fee. There is email correspondence [[Exhibit D](#)] from Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, addressing the question of a fiscal note, which can be found on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 102.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 102.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Krasner with Assemblywoman Hansen as backup. I will move to the next bill on our work session, which is Assembly Bill 146.

Assembly Bill 146: Revises provisions relating to water. (BDR 40-123)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 146 was heard in Committee on March 17, 2021 [[Exhibit E](#)]. The bill requires the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (DCNR) to establish a program regulating water pollution resulting from diffuse sources. The bill revises requirements for regulations adopted and notices provided by the State Environmental Commission in the Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) of DCNR relating to water pollution. The bill revises various requirements for permits to discharge a pollutant or inject fluids through a well. The bill requires such permits to file a bond or other surety and the Commission to adopt corresponding regulations. The bill requires the Commission to adopt regulations for controlling the infiltration of contaminants into underground water resulting from contaminated fluids or soil if the underground water supplies a public water system. The Commission is also required to consider any disproportionate impacts on marginalized or historically oppressed communities when adopting such regulations. Lastly, the bill requires the Director of DCNR to consult or notify Indian tribes of certain actions relating to water pollution.

Assemblywoman Peters proposed an amendment, which makes the following changes:

- Removes the requirement to establish a program to reduce, control, and mitigate water pollution from diffuse sources. Instead authorizes DCNR, in addition to any controls prescribed by the Commission, to develop plans, recommendations, and policies consistent with any federal requirements for diffuse sources to manage, control, and mitigate water pollution resulting from diffuse sources. Provides that such plans, recommendations, and policies may include various areas of focus;
- Removes the requirement for an applicant for a general or individual permit regarding discharges or injection of fluids through a well to file a bond or other surety with DCNR and removes DCNR's requirement to adopt regulation relating to this bond;
- Provides that the Legislature declares that the people of this state have a right to clean water and that it is the policy of this state to mitigate any degradation of the waters of this state;
- Authorizes the Commission to manage certain septic systems and clarifies that septic systems are not prohibited from being used;
- Provides that no permit may be issued which authorizes any discharge or injection of fluids through a well into any waters in the state which would result in substantial degradation of biological, cultural, or wildlife resources;
- Removes the requirement that any permit issued by DCNR ensures that the discharge or injection does not disproportionately impact historically oppressed or marginalized communities;

- Removes the numerical water quality criteria for major categories of diffuse sources identified by DCNR;
- Removes the requirement for the Commission to prescribe controls for diffuse sources;
- Removes the requirement that DCNR establish a continuing planning process that includes procedures for addressing the major categories of water pollution from diffuse sources;
- Replaces the term "historically oppressed or marginalized communities" with "historically underserved communities"; and
- Removes the changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 445A.490 that were proposed to be made in section 7 of the bill.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

I know the sponsor was going to work with NDEP because there were concerns regarding federal funding. I cannot see if that has been addressed.

Assemblywoman Sarah Peters, Assembly District No. 24:

I have been working extensively with all stakeholders on this amendment. As you can see, it is quite vast and has met everyone's needs and concerns. We have gotten to the point with NDEP where they are confident that the current language will not inhibit their ability to get those federal funds, because the obligation to develop a program regarding nonpoint source pollution was removed.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 146.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 146.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I wanted to let Assemblywoman Peters know that I appreciate the work she has done with the bill's stakeholders. My district has a lot of water needs and issues, but we are not there yet. I am going to be a no on this.

Chair Watts:

Is there any additional discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON, HANSEN, AND WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Peters with Assemblywoman Anderson as backup. We will move on to the work session for Assembly Bill 170.

Assembly Bill 170: Revises provisions governing animals. (BDR 14-762)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 170 was heard in Committee on March 8, 2021 [[Exhibit F](#)]. The bill requires that a notice of the right of a person lawfully arrested for certain crimes involving animals to request a hearing also be provided to a person who is lawfully issued a citation for such violations. The bill also clarifies that a hearing involving such crimes be held in a court of competent jurisdiction and imposes a preponderance of evidence standard of proof in such cases. In certain circumstances where the ownership of an impounded animal has been transferred to an animal rescue organization, animal shelter, or person, this bill provides that the new owner may sell the animal at auction, humanely destroy the animal, or continue caring for the animal, as the new owner sees fit. Lastly, the bill clarifies that the State Department of Agriculture is responsible for creating and maintaining a notice concerning the impoundment of an animal owned or possessed by a person who is arrested and detained.

There have been several amendments proposed for this bill, coming from the Nevada Humane Society, Boulder City, the State Department of Agriculture, and a representative for Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck. The majority of the amendments are attached to the work session document [[Exhibit F](#)]. I will give a summary of the amendments to the bill.

The Nevada Human Society proposed two amendments, which make the following changes: Authorizes certain animal control officers to perform certain functions to enforce certain ordinances and to enforce laws prohibiting cruelty to animals as set forth in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) 202.487 and NRS Chapter 574; and removes the preponderance of evidence standard of proof in animal cruelty cases.

Boulder City proposed an amendment, which makes the following change: Provides that hearings are to be held pursuant to NRS 574.203 for misdemeanors in violation of the ordinances of their respective cities.

The State Department of Agriculture proposed an amendment, which makes the following change: Removes the requirement that the State Department of Agriculture maintain a written notice concerning impounded animals. Instead requires the local detention facility to post and maintain the written notice provided by the State Department of Agriculture.

Lastly, Francisco Morales with Brownstein Hyatt Farber Schreck proposed an amendment which makes the following change: Provides for a clear and convincing evidence standard and reverts language concerning issuing a citation and providing a hearing in a court of competent jurisdiction.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I am looking at the amendment, and section 2, subsection 6 [page 4, [Exhibit F](#)] gives the definition of an animal control officer. Would this allow someone working for a nonprofit shelter to actually be designated an animal control officer?

Chair Watts:

My recollection is that there are certain areas that contract with nonprofits to provide certain services. This is clarifying that the nonprofit already has the ability to essentially act as animal control. This amendment would allow them to issue specific citations.

Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel:

It does provide employees of the animal shelter to carry out these tasks, but in order to do so, the employee has to be designated and authorized by the city or county.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I want to clarify that as well; this was an issue for me when the hearing was held, along with process issues. I know there has been work done, so I want to clarify that I understand these policing powers, so to speak; I think Carson City does it this way. This is only when the animal shelter is contracted and only with the approval of the city government, is that correct?

Mendy Elliott, representing Nevada Humane Society:

That is correct. Carson City contracts with the Nevada Humane Society, and Humane Society representatives serve as the animal control officers on behalf of the city.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

How long has that contract been in existence?

Mendy Elliott:

I believe the contract has been in place for at least four years.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I have decided to vote yes, but was originally a no. I would like to clarify that Carson City is different from a lot of the communities; I am assuming that many of the counties have animal control and this is more of an outlier for which you give a nonprofit this kind of policing authority. Is this a rare exception?

Chair Watts:

That is correct. I know that in southern Nevada, local governments have animal control entities. I do not think we have a comprehensive list available at this time, but in the major urban areas, animal control would continue to be handled by local governments. This bill is not changing that. It is providing the option for Carson City, for example, to take the route they have taken.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Do some of the nonprofits, such as the Humane Society, use volunteers in these positions, who would not be trained to act as animal control officers?

Mendy Elliott:

The staff representing the Carson City Animal Services through the Nevada Humane Society are all paid staff. There are no volunteers working in this capacity; they are all trained professionals.

Assemblyman Wheeler:

What about any other counties?

Mendy Elliott:

I cannot answer for the other counties. I just know that the Nevada Humane Society is the animal control for Carson City. Part of the reason that this request is in place is because in current law, our staff, while serving on behalf of Carson City, has to take a sheriff off of the streets to meet the animal control officer in order to issue a citation. It was deemed this would be a better use of the sheriff's time to serve the people in a better way. Our animal control officers are trained, and this is very specific for any type of animal issue.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 170.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 170.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I have not been involved in this issue, but I do remember this from last session. This is one of those issues where there are no perfect answers. We may not get to where we need to be to have all of those concerns addressed 100 percent for everyone, considering that we are dealing with limitations for the counties, rights of owners, and welfare for the animals. I appreciate the work that has been done, and I do not want the perfect to be the enemy of the

good. I want to thank Assemblywoman Martinez and everyone who has clearly been working very hard on this.

Chair Watts:

Is there any additional discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON, AND
WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Martinez. We will now move on to Assembly Bill 209.

Assembly Bill 209: Prohibits the removal or disabling of the claws of a cat under certain circumstances. (BDR 50-211)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 209 was heard in Committee on March 31, 2021, [[Exhibit G](#)]. This bill prohibits a person from removing or disabling the claws of a cat, except if necessary to address the physical medical condition of the cat. The bill specifically prohibits a person from removing or disabling the claws of a cat for cosmetic, aesthetic, or convenience reasons in keeping or handling the cat. The bill requires a licensed veterinarian who determines that the removal or disabling of the claws of a cat is necessary to address the physical medical condition of the cat to prepare and file a written statement with the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners and to provide the statement before performing the procedure or, in the case of an emergency, not later than five days after performing the procedure. Lastly, the bill imposes civil penalties and provides that a licensed veterinarian who violates any provisions of this bill is subject to disciplinary action by the Board.

The Assembly Committee on Natural Resources proposed an amendment, which removes the requirement of a licensed veterinarian to provide a written statement to the Nevada State Board of Veterinary Medical Examiners along with the corresponding civil penalties. This amendment is in conceptual form. I believe there has been correspondence on the issue of fiscal note from the Board, but it is not available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System at this time.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 209.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 209.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

My cats are not declawed, but I am going to be a no. I would prefer a different route. I think education works great with spaying and neutering. I think education would work here also. I think many people are becoming more and more aware. I am not a fan of the ban, but I appreciate the work and the opportunity for all of us to get more educated on this issue.

Chair Watts:

Is there any other discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYWOMAN HANSEN VOTED NO.
ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Martinez. We will move on to Assembly Bill 356.

**Assembly Bill 356: Makes various changes relating to the conservation of water.
(BDR 48-1090)**

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 356 was heard in Committee on April 5, 2021 [[Exhibit H](#)]. This bill creates the voluntary Program for the Conservation of Water and the Account for Purchasing and Retiring Water Rights. The bill authorizes the State Engineer to purchase and retire certain water rights with money from the Account.

Assemblyman Watts proposed an amendment that is attached to this work session document [[Exhibit H](#)], and the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) proposed a conceptual amendment, which makes the following changes:

- Removes the provisions concerning the voluntary Program for the Conservation of Water and the Account for Purchasing and Retiring Water Rights;
- Prohibits, with certain exceptions, the waters of the Colorado River that are distributed by the SNWA from being used to irrigate nonfunctional turf on any property that is not zoned for the exclusive use of a single-family residence on and after January 1, 2027;
- Requires the Board of Directors of the SNWA to define nonfunctional and functional turf for the purpose of this prohibition and promulgate these definitions through the service rules of its member agencies; and to develop a plan to identify and facilitate the removal of existing nonfunctional turf on property that is not zoned for the exclusive use of a single-family residence by December 31, 2026;

- Authorizes the Board of Directors to approve an extension or waiver for these provisions; and
- Creates the Nonfunctional Turf Removal Advisory Committee to provide recommendations to the Board of Directors regarding turf removal.

It is my understanding that there is an additional amendment that is not part of this work session document; however, it is available on the Nevada Electronic Legislative Information System [[Exhibit I](#)]. The amendment is proposed by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources and is in addition to the mock-up that is attached to the work session document. This amendment seeks to require the Legislative Committee on Public Lands to conduct a study during the 2021-2022 Interim concerning water conservation in this state. This proposed amendment seeks to require the Legislative Committee on Public Lands to submit a report to the Director of the Legislative Counsel Bureau on or before February 1, 2023, to transmittal to the 82nd Session of the Nevada Legislature.

Chair Watts:

The original language of Assembly Bill 356 is being removed under the proposed amendment. We have worked up some language in alignment with the concept that was brought forward by SNWA to address the removal of nonfunctional turf in southern Nevada, which would save 12 billion gallons of water a year over the next five years. In addition, as noted during the hearing, while we may have different ideas, we agree it is important that we have discussions on conservation programs and policies. The additional amendment would keep that discussion going and have the Legislature lead it through directing the Public Lands Committee to address this as one of the issues during the next interim.

Are there any questions from the members?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I want to clarify that essentially everything is gone from the original bill except for sections 36 through 42. Now, instead of being the original bill that we discussed at the hearing, it is just sections 36 through 42, dealing with SNWA and its distribution of water, prohibiting it from being used for nonfunctional turf. Is the two-thirds vote requirement also gone?

Chair Watts:

The entire Program for the Conservation of Water is removed under the proposed amendments. That also removes the two-thirds vote requirement from the bill. Are there any other questions from members? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 356.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN ANDERSON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 356.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I just want to make sure that the proposed Nonfunctional Turf Removal Advisory Committee is cognizant of multifamily dwellings. I know there is a difference between parks, apartments, and greenbelts. I think for some families living in multifamily dwellings, those greenbelt areas may be more functional than for people who live in single houses. I hope that due consideration is paid to those families in multifamily dwellings.

Chair Watts:

I believe the language specifically addresses nonfunctional turf that is not residential, which includes both single family and multifamily areas. In addition, the committee that is proposed would include all stakeholders that are affected to determine exactly what uses are functional and not, and to allow the use of areas that actually serve a function other than ornamental.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Thank you. My point is that sometimes that turf appears to be just ornamental, yet it is actually more than that for the people who live there. I just want to put that out there for consideration as this bill moves forward.

Chair Watts:

There will be a full hearing for this in the Senate, and assuming it is passed into law, the proposed committee will further dig into those issues in a public and open process. Is there any other discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON, AND
WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement. The next item on our work session is Assembly Bill 399.

Assembly Bill 399: Revises provisions governing the production and sale of eggs and egg products. (BDR 51-559)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 399 was heard in Committee on April 7, 2021 [[Exhibit J](#)]. This bill requires that eggs sold, offered for sale, or transported for the purpose of selling within this state be produced in a cage-free housing system. The bill requires a farm owner or operator to go through a cage-free certification process through the State Department of Agriculture (NDA). The bill prohibits a business owner or operator from selling, offering or exposing for sale, or transporting for sale eggs that the business owner or operator knows or should have known were not produced in a cage-free housing system.

Jeff Dixon with The Humane Society of the United States proposed an amendment that makes the following changes:

- Provides that the Legislature declares that the regulation of egg production on farms and the sale of eggs and egg products furthers the health and welfare of consumers, promotes food safety, and advances animal welfare;
- Defines "cage-free housing system" to mean an enclosure in which hens are free to roam unrestricted;
- Provides that NDA may use a government or private inspection or process verification provider;
- Removes the new fee authority, which removes the two-thirds requirement; and
- Changes the effective date for having only cage-free eggs to January 1, 2024.

Chair Watts:

This is the same amendment that was presented during the hearing, except for the change of the effective date, which addresses the concerns that were brought up by the Retail Association of Nevada, the Nevada Restaurant Association, the Vegas Chamber, among others. Are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Section 17, subsection 1, states that it is illegal to sell eggs in the state of Nevada without a certificate [page 6, [Exhibit J](#)]. We know there are small egg ventures in Nevada, and we do have farms with a couple hundred chickens or so, whose eggs are sold to individuals within the community. If it is illegal to sell eggs without a certificate, and if this bill passes and we set regulations and start developing the certification process, are we going to be assured that these small farms are not going to be charged for certification? Also, the next section deals with inspections. I am not seeing how those small farms in Nevada will be exempt from being certified and inspected. Will they have to pay for those certifications and inspections?

Chair Watts:

I would like to ask Director Ott to respond to your question. I think the broader point you are getting to is whether this expands the existing regulatory footprint of the State Department of Agriculture over egg production. In other words, is there anyone producing eggs who does not have to go through a certification or inspection process within the Department, but would were this bill to be enacted?

Jennifer Ott, Director, State Department of Agriculture:

Egg producers in the state are currently captured under our producer certification program. If you are producing and selling eggs in the state, you are currently captured under that program. You are receiving the inspections and you pay the nominal certificate fee. This bill does not expand that. The only change that we would have under this bill is when we come

out to the farm to look at the operation and confirm the information on the application, we would also be looking at the hen housing at the same time.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

In looking at the amendment, section 17, subsection 4, states, "The Department may use a government or private inspection or process verification provider to ensure compliance . . ." [page 7]. If these small farms have to be inspected, will there be a fee passed on to the egg producers in Nevada if this goes into law and then in regulation? Is the NDA going to absorb those costs and not pass them on to the egg producers in Nevada?

Jennifer Ott:

The outside inspection was a result of a conversation with The Humane Society regarding if the Department could not accomplish those inspections. We have requested to have any outside inspectors approved by the NDA so that would not happen. There is no additional fee in this bill, whether it be from NDA or outside inspectors.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass Assembly Bill 399.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 399.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Black:

I am going to vote no but reserve my right to change my vote on the floor.

Chair Watts:

Is there any other discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON,
HANSEN, AND WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYWOMAN TITUS
WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will take the floor statement. That brings us to the last item on our agenda, which is public comment. Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment? Hearing no one, at this time we are going to recess until the call of the Chair [at 2:17 p.m.].

[The meeting was adjourned on the floor of the Assembly at 5:22 p.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Davis
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 102](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is a copy of an email dated March 17, 2021, submitted by Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, referencing the fiscal note for [Assembly Bill 102](#).

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 146](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 170](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit G](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 209](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit H](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 356](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit I](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 356](#), dated April 9, 2021, submitted and presented by Assemblyman Howard Watts, Assembly District No. 15.

[Exhibit J](#) is the Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 399](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.