

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

**Eighty-Third Session
May 27, 2025**

The Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Natha C. Anderson at 1:40 p.m. on Tuesday, May 27, 2025, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 2 of the Nevada Legislature Hearing Rooms, 7120 Amigo Street, Las Vegas, Nevada and to 123 High Technology Center, Great Basin College, 1500 College Parkway, Elko, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda [[Exhibit A](#)], the Attendance Roster [[Exhibit B](#)], and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/83rd2025.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblymember Natha C. Anderson, Chair
Assemblymember Selena La Rue Hatch, Vice Chair
Assemblymember Venicia Considine
Assemblymember Rich DeLong
Assemblymember Bert K. Gurr
Assemblymember Alexis M. Hansen
Assemblymember Jovan A. Jackson
Assemblymember Venise Karris
Assemblymember Heidi Kasama
Assemblymember Elaine H. Marzola
Assemblymember Howard Watts

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblymember Jovan A. Jackson (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Julie Pazina, Senate District No. 12
Senator Robin L. Titus, Senate District No. 17



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Becky Peratt, Committee Policy Analyst
Jeffrey Chronister, Committee Counsel
Cindy Glass, Committee Manager
Karen Cook, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT

Laurel Saito, Water Strategy Director, The Nature Conservancy, Nevada Chapter
Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Central Nevada Regional Water Authority; and
Humboldt River Basin Water Authority
Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League
Katie Hale, representing Environmental Defense Fund Action
Edwin James, General Manager, Carson Water Subconservancy District
Andrew Belanger, Director, Public Services, Las Vegas Valley Water District; and
Southern Nevada Water Authority
Jeffrey Rogan, Deputy District Attorney, Clark County
Bobby Ernalt, representing Walker Basin Conservancy
Nikki Bailey-Lundahl, Vice President, External Affairs, Nevada Mining Association
Jake Tibbetts, Manager, Natural Resources, Eureka County
James Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural
Resources
Taylor Avery, Manager, Political Affairs, Vegas Chamber
Austin Lemons, District Manager, Dayton Valley Conservation District
Rob Ghiglieri, Administrator, Commission on Mineral Resources, Division of
Minerals

Chair Anderson:

Good afternoon and welcome to the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources. [Roll was called.] I want to welcome everyone to this meeting, those in Carson City as well as anyone joining us in Las Vegas or listening online, and also Elko. Welcome to today's agenda.

We have three bill hearings and a work session at the end. [Committee rules and protocol were explained.] I will open the bill hearing on Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to water. (BDR 48-384)

Senator Julie Pazina, Senate District No. 12:

I thank you so much for the opportunity to present Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint), which establishes provisions relating to the conservation of groundwater. I will say this may seem a bit like Groundhog's Day for those of you after the Assembly Bill 104 hearing. Though this is just the water rights retirement portion, the similarities will be striking. With me today to present S.B. 36 (R2) is Laurel Saito with The Nature Conservancy, as well as Jeff Fontaine with the Central Nevada Regional Water Authority and the Humboldt River Basin Water Authority.

I had the pleasure of serving as chair of the Joint Interim Standing Committee on Natural Resources during the 2023-2024 Interim, following in Assemblymember Watts's footsteps, and serving alongside Vice Chair Anderson as well as Assemblymembers La Rue Hatch and DeLong. It was a wonderful opportunity to learn a lot more about some of the challenges we are having in the state and about how we can help our state, especially as the most arid in the nation when it comes to water scarcity, and that is why this bill came back.

Some of you may remember Senate Bill 176 of the 82nd Session with Senator Goicoechea for a water rights retirement program. That is where this bill was born. The Interim Committee learned about water rights retirement programs in other states as well as Nevada's voluntary water rights retirement pilot program during the interim. The pilot program received \$25 million from the State's American Rescue Plan Act funding, which was used to successfully retire over 20,000-acre feet of water rights from willing sellers. This program implemented by the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources granted funds to four entities: Central Nevada Regional Water Authority, Humboldt River Basin Water Authority, Walker Basin Conservancy, and Southern Nevada Water Authority. Based on various recommendations, the Interim Committee voted unanimously to carry the bill before you today. With that, I am going to hand it over to Ms. Saito and after that Mr. Fontaine to provide additional background.

Laurel Saito, Water Strategy Director, The Nature Conservancy, Nevada Chapter:

We really thank Senator Pazina, Chair Anderson, and the Interim Committee on Natural Resources for bringing forward Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint) on groundwater rights retirement, and recognizing the importance of water resources for the future of the health and well-being of the people and economies of our state.

We know overuse of groundwater in some places is depleting this precious resource and impacting other water users as well as our natural resources. These impacts can take years, decades, or even centuries to reverse and in some cases, they are irreversible. The Nature Conservancy supports enabling tools to resolve overuse of groundwater. This bill offers a tool to address these situations. As Senator Pazina said, this tool has been used in other states, like Kansas and Colorado, for years to address groundwater table declines affecting water users and ecosystems. As indicated on the attachment we submitted with our testimony [[Exhibit C](#)], we stand ready to help with implementing a voluntary groundwater rights

retirement program in Nevada by building on lessons learned from these existing programs and working with water managers and other stakeholders. We are also interested in considering ways to incentivize the retirement of groundwater rights to reduce impacts to groundwater dependent ecosystems. We urge your support of this important legislation.

Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Central Nevada Regional Water Authority; and Humboldt River Basin Water Authority:

Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint) is a standalone water rights retirement bill. Both S.B. 36 (R2) and A.B. 104 have taken different paths but now have the same water rights retirement language. We also want to thank Senator Pazina for her leadership on S.B. 36 (R2) and also Chair Anderson for moving A.B. 104 forward. Both the Senator and the Chair have worked very closely with a number of water stakeholders in our group on various amendments, and there were several amendments to get things linked together. We appreciate them very much.

As Senator Pazina indicated, Central Nevada Regional Water Authority (CNRWA) and Humboldt River Basin Water Authority (HRBWA) implemented a water rights retirement program in the interim. Between the two organizations, we retired over 17,000-acre feet of water in three groundwater basins where the groundwater levels are sharply declining. That includes Diamond Valley, which is the state's only designated Critical Management area. Chair Anderson, I know the Committee has heard almost all the provisions in S.B. 36 (R2) when you heard A.B.104. There were a few amendments made in the Senate that are now in Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint) the Committee may or may not wish to hear, or I could highlight various provisions of the bill, whatever the pleasure of the Committee.

Chair Anderson:

Just do a quick highlight. I think there are only two or three small highlights.

Jeff Fontaine:

There were only a couple of amendments made in the Senate and the first one appears in section 2, subsection 2(c) on the top of page 4. The exact application language "requests a change to or a reinstatement of . . ." is a change that was amended in the Senate, and it appears, I think, one or two other places in the bill. That was just to make sure we are talking about when these water rights are retired as far as a state engineer is concerned; that we are talking about the specific water rights that are retired and are no longer available for future appropriation.

The only other change I am aware of that was made in the Senate is changing—and it appears in various sections throughout the bill—the word "decreed." In the A.B 104 version in the Assembly, it was "vested" and it is now "decreed." That is a more formal process and classification used by the State Engineer, so that amendment was also made in the Senate. Those are the only two Senate amendments I am aware of.

Senator Pazina:

I would say that is just to make A.B.104 and S.B. 36 (R2) consistent. That is why those changes were made, as well as upon advice. I am also remiss because Assemblymember Gurr was also actively involved in this as well on the Interim Committee. We would be happy to take any questions.

Assemblymember Watts:

I think you just answered this. Since it was the end of your presentation, I will just confirm. Are all the provisions and language in this bill consistent with the language for this program within A.B.104?

Senator Pazina:

Yes, it is consistent. That was why those amendments were made that you did not hear with A.B. 104, because those amendments were made to A.B.104 later and are now consistent with S.B. 36 (R2).

Assemblymember DeLong:

I want to follow up on my colleague's question. The bill is consistent with A.B.104. Can you specify what is different in this bill from what is in A.B.104? Why do we need this bill since we already have A.B.104?

Senator Pazina:

Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint) is a standalone water rights retirement bill. Whereas A.B.104, you may recall, was more of an omnibus water bill. This is just the water rights retirement portion.

For those of you who were here last session, I mentioned S.B.176 of the 82nd Session earlier. This has been a very long road for Senator Goicoechea to get this water rights retirement program in motion and this bill was and is, we hope, the culmination of that. This is just the water rights retirement, not the rest of the water omnibus. We are just making sure the dream is realized, if you will.

Chair Anderson:

I know there are many people thinking we did not even need to have this hearing, which is very much a possibility. I know there are also many individuals who have worked on both bills. They had asked for both bills to have a hearing so everybody who worked on it would be able to get recognition.

We are going to move on to testimony. Is there anybody in Carson City who would like to offer testimony in support of Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint)?

Christi Cabrera-Georgeson, Deputy Director, Nevada Conservation League:

We are here in strong support. As you have heard, our water resources are precious and this is another important tool to conserving them.

Katie Hale, representing Environmental Defense Fund Action:

On behalf of Environmental Defense Fund Action, a public-interest organization working to secure clean, reliable water for all people, now and in the future, we are in support of S.B. 36 (R2) [[Exhibit D](#)]. This bill takes a meaningful step forward in addressing declining groundwater levels by establishing the Nevada Voluntary Water Rights Retirement Program, a tool that will help reduce water demand while building toward long-term water security for all Nevadans. Groundwater is vital to the well-being of Nevada's communities, economy, and ecosystems. Yet many of the state's groundwater systems are already showing signs of serious overuse and stress. By establishing a permanent program, S.B. 36 (R2) will allow the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to implement science-based criteria and monitoring mechanisms to maximize water savings and support a more resilient, sustainable water future for Nevada.

Edwin James, General Manager, Carson Water Subconservancy District:

We are in support of this bill; it is a tool that will help. It is not going to answer everything, but it is one more tool we need to deal with these water shortages as we move forward to meet the future demands of the communities and the state.

**Andrew Belanger, Director, Public Services, Las Vegas Valley Water District; and
Southern Nevada Water Authority:**

The Southern Nevada Water Authority is in support of S.B. 36 (R2). We want to thank Senator Pazina and members of the Joint Interim Standing Committee for the standalone bill. It really is a capstone of the long and illustrious career of Senator Goicoechea and the work he has done over many legislative sessions to protect Nevada's water resources and ensure areas that are overpumped get back into balance eventually. This is one more tool. We appreciate the bill and we urge your support.

Jeffrey Rogan, Deputy District Attorney, Clark County:

Clark County also supports S.B. 36 (R2) and thanks Senator Pazina for bringing it forward.

Bobby Ernalt representing Walker Basin Conservancy:

I just want to echo the sentiments of the previous speakers and we urge your full support.

Nikki Bailey-Lundahl, Vice President, External Affairs, Nevada Mining Association:

We are in support of this bill and all the work that has been done in this program.

Chair Anderson:

Seeing no one else in Carson City, is there anybody in Las Vegas or Elko? Seeing no one, is there anyone on the phone wishing to testify in support of S.B. 36 (R2)?

Jake Tibbitts, Manager, Natural Resources, Eureka County:

We are in support.

Chair Anderson:

We have no more callers for support. We will now move to opposition. [There was no one.] Is there anyone wishing to testify in neutral on the measure?

James Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and National Resources:

We appreciate working with the sponsor and other entities out there in making sure this language is appropriate. We can do some great things with it. They did a great job helping us during the interim last session, where we were actually able to acquire \$25 million worth of water rights and retire them. We appreciate the work.

Chair Anderson:

Is there anyone else in Carson City, Las Vegas, Elko, or on the phone wishing to testify in neutral? [There was no one.] Are there any closing remarks? [There were none.] I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint). I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 108.

Senate Bill 108: Revises provisions governing the Account for the Channel Clearance, Maintenance, Restoration, Surveying and Monumenting Program. (BDR 48-88)

Robin L. Titus, Senator, District No. 17:

Thank you for the opportunity to present Senate Bill 108. With me at the table is Edwin James, General Manager of the Carson Water Subconservancy District, to help me present this bill.

Senate Bill 108 revises provisions governing the Account for Channel Clearance, Maintenance, Restoration, Surveying and Monumenting Program. Under current law, the state maintains a fund to support projects for clearing, maintaining, restoring, and surveying navigable rivers. The State Engineer manages this fund and may request additional money from the contingency account if the balance falls below \$250,000 or is insufficient to issue grants. This bill will make two key changes: it raises a threshold for discretionary funding requests from the contingency account from \$250,000 to \$500,000; and clarifies only uncommitted funds are counted when determining the funds balance. These updates aim to ensure the timely availability of resources for critical waterway projects across the state. We have given, and submitted, to the Committee the legislative history on the Channel Clearance Maintenance Program, which starts back in 1973 when we first developed this [\[Exhibit E\]](#). At this point, I am going to turn the rest of the presentation over to Mr. James.

Edwin James, General Manager, Carson Water Subconservancy District:

I appreciate Senator Titus was so quick, otherwise I would have to stretch out my support for the other bill longer here. Today, I want to discuss why S.B. 108, which is commonly known as the clearing and snagging bill, is an important one to pass.

As you may know, the state of Nevada claims ownership to many of the riverbeds across the state. With ownership comes responsibility and ongoing maintenance. Over time, sediment can accumulate in river channels, reducing the capacity and increasing the risk of flooding, and also impacting bridges and other infrastructure. Additionally, fallen trees and other debris can pose safety hazards. The cleaning and maintaining of river channels are done mostly by local entities. On the Carson River it is the conservancy districts that perform most of this work on behalf of the state. Their only funds to do this are from State funds. These funds are not only critical for routine maintenance, but they can also be used to match with federal grants which enables larger scale projects.

Senate Bill 108 addresses two key issues in the channel clearing statute. One, it increases the funding cap of the channel clearing account from \$250,000 to \$500,000 and two, it allows the State Engineer to request additional funding from the state contingency account to replenish the channel clearing account, excluding committed funds. Both provisions are essential. Increasing the funding cap from \$250,000 to \$500,000 recognizes the rising cost of channel clearance and reflects the statewide scope of these projects. The current cap hampers progress by requiring the State Engineer to return to the Interim Finance Committee multiple times to seek additional approval to move clearing and snagging projects forward.

The second provision addresses a timing issue. Currently, if funds are committed for projects but not yet spent, often due to permit delays, the State Engineer does not request additional allocations from the contingency fund until the funds have been spent. This restriction prevents other projects from being funded even though there is a demonstrated need. The provisions in S.B. 108 clarifies the State Engineer can request additional funds when the balance in the account, not including the committed funds, drops below the funding cap. Senate Bill 108 helps prevent multiple-years delay for urgently needed clearing and snagging projects in the rivers. Carson Water Subconservancy District urges your support for S.B. 108.

Senate Titus:

With that, Madam Chair, we are happy to take any questions.

Assemblymember Watts:

Do you have any idea when this amount was last adjusted? You noted when this account was created. Obviously, we know the cost for doing pretty much everything increases over time, but I was wondering if you are aware of when this amount was last adjusted.

Edwin James:

I think it has always been \$250,000.

Senator Titus:

In the earliest record I have, it has not always been funded, and we did give you the sheet in 2016 [[Exhibit E](#)] when it was given \$200,000. In 2017 it was \$250,000, and that was the last adjustment.

Assemblymember Watts:

I think this is how you explained it during your presentation. I just want to make sure my understanding is clear. Essentially, it is at \$250,000. When somebody accesses those funds and it dips down, the State Engineer can go to the contingency account, but the account does not go above that amount. It has only been going back up to that \$250,000. The only caveat is if there is a project that might go completely outside of that, then it looks like the state can ask for some additional money in order to make sure the project can get done.

Senator Titus:

The key here is the maximum that would be allocated to the account is the \$500,000. The key about allowing for a request is frequently these things can take a long time; they go out to bid. Once the funds have been allocated, we cannot over appropriate what we have allocated. This [unintelligible] and I will use an example you are well aware of: Cave Lake, where they put in for the dam, and they have the bids, and it literally takes years to get that going, although the funds were committed. In the meantime, all these other folks cannot ask for any very much needed allocations of these funds. That is just wording allowance for them; then you have the matching federal things. Once those funds have been allocated, not necessarily used, then they can apply for federal funds when we are not waiting, but we cannot do more than the maximum we have already requested.

Assemblymember Watts:

Mr. James, have you done any recent surveys of the Carson River by raft?

Edwin James:

Yes, but not as many as I hoped this year. Mother Nature was not as pleasant with us in the runoff, but yes, I have been on most of the sections of the Carson River.

Chair Anderson:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we will move to testimony in support of S.B. 108 in Carson City.

Taylor Avery, Manager, Political Affairs, Vegas Chamber:

The Vegas Chamber is in support of S.B. 108. The changes in this bill will allow the State Engineer more flexibility and easier access to funding for projects. Maintaining the state's waterways and stability in Nevada's maintenance of water is critical for the future fiscal and general well-being of the state.

Austin Lemons, District Manager, Dayton Valley Conservation District:

We are in support of Senate Bill 108. It helps us keep the Carson River functioning correctly, protecting not only housing but agricultural land as well.

Chair Anderson:

Is there anyone else in Carson City? Seeing no one, is there anyone in Las Vegas, Elko, or on the phone wishing to testify in support of Senate Bill 108. [There was no one.] We will move to testimony in opposition to S.B. 108. [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony on S.B. 108.

James Settelmeyer, Director, State Department of Conservation and National Resources:

We are neutral on the bill, but completely understand costs have gone up just a little bit since 2017.

Chair Anderson:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in neutral on Senate Bill 108 in Carson City, Las Vegas, Elko, or on the phone? [There was no one.] Senator Titus, would you like to make any closing remarks?

Senator Titus:

I just want to acknowledge the time it took to hear this bill. I know we are all very busy and I appreciate your consideration.

Chair Anderson:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 108. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 464

Senate Bill 464: Enacts the Interstate Mining Compact. (BDR 46-1125)

Rob Ghiglieri, Administrator, Commission on Mineral Resources, Division of Minerals:

The Commission on Mineral Resources, Division of Minerals, advises and makes recommendations to the Governor, Mining Oversight, Accountability Commission, and the Legislature concerning the policy of the state related to minerals. The Division's mission is: To encourage and assist the responsible exploration for, and production of, minerals, oil, gas, and geothermal energy, which are economically beneficial to the state; provide for public safety by identifying ranking and securing dangerous conditions at mines that are no longer operating, or our beta mines program; and collecting and disseminating information on exploration production and related topics.

Every year we record the annual production of each registered mine throughout the state, including oil, gas, and geothermal. We permit all oil, gas, and geothermal dissolution or resource exploration drilling, and we operate the state's physical safety Abandoned Mine Lands Program. We also provide mineral education outreach and manage a small reclamation bond pool for mining and exploration projects.

As you all know, mining plays a big role in the state of Nevada. We consistently rank in the top five for investment fracking indexes of all mining jurisdictions in the world, and we have been first place ten times. We also consistently rank in the top three for nonfuel mineral production within the United States and were number one in 2024. Nevada has been the

largest gold producing state for over 30 years. Like I said, we are the leading producer of gold, but also Barrett lithium and a significant producer of silver, copper, molybdenum, gypsum, diatomite, and others. With all the industry focus and ongoing items in the nation, these just highlight the need to ensure Nevada has the ability to voice their opinion and role in the minerals industry in a compact commission like the Interstate Mining Compact Commission (IMCC).

This bill will make the state of Nevada a full member of the Interstate Mining Compact Commission [[Exhibit F](#)]. The governor will become Nevada's official commissioner within IMCC. The commissioners can appoint delegates to IMCC who serve on the state's behalf. The IMCC is a multistate governmental organization that supports the natural resources, related environmental protection, mine safety, and health interests of its member states. The IMCC provides the united voice for the states and Congress, administration, and federal agencies. Its consistent focus is on state management of natural resources, while maintaining a strong relationship with the federal government.

As a member, Nevada would be able to identify defining issues of concern with the Compact to address on behalf of the states, assist in the development of the position on the bills, rules, regulations, and other focus on the mining industry from the state's perspective as the primary regulators of the industry; participating in the development and execution of benchmarking and information sharing opportunities to enable states; and continue to perform at the highest level, and chairing the various roles of the committees in the Compact.

There is a fiscal note associated with this but it has been addressed in our approved budget with enhancement pending the passage of the legislation. For the foreseeable future, all membership dues will be paid by existing fee revenue on mining claims, and if there ever is a dedicated hard rock AML Fund, [Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation Fund], then we would be able to use those funds as well to fund this.

The main portion of the bill is section 2 and I will discuss some key articles within section 2. Article I of section 2 discusses the importance of mining's economic significance to the state while highlighting the importance of ensuring the effects of mining is evaluated to include soil, water, land, and other resources. Also, that all mining shall be conducted in accordance with sound conservation principles. Article III ensures each member state of the Compact has, or will, create a mining regulatory program and abandoned mine lands program to meet the intent of the Compact. Nevada already has multiple agencies which address mining regulations and abandoned mines and has been highlighted on a national level for its programs. This will not create any new requirements to Nevada's permitting agencies. The reason behind this is this Compact language that needs to be adopted by all states was written in the 1970s, when most states did not have regulatory agencies within the state.

Article IV, section 2 requires the Compact to study and collaborate between states and federal agencies on existing operation, processes, conservation, and restoration and make recommendations to the governmental administration dealing with the laws. Article V

discusses the members of the Commission, which is the governor of each state, and the rules, voting rules, and bylaws. In Article IX of the section, it is important to state nothing in this Compact shall be construed to limit, repeal, or supersede any other law of any party of the state.

Article X, section 3 of the bill authorizes the Governor to designate a representative as stated before. Article X, section 4 also provides the Compact and any policy of the Commission do not limit, repeal, or supersede any law of the state, and the state of Nevada is not liable for certain obligations or solvency of the Commission. Article X, section 5 of the bill provides the Governor, the Legislature, and the designated agent have the right to inspect the books of the accounts of the Commission. Article X, section 6 of the bill requires to file a copy of the bylaws of the Commission with the Division of Minerals. The Division of Minerals will make it available to the public. Article X, section 6 requires the Division Administrator to pay the annual membership dues of IMCC, or if authorized, from certain grants from the federal government. Again, each of these dues are based off U.S. Geological Survey reporting on metal production on an annual basis and as stated earlier, it will have no impact to the General Fund, to be paid by existing claim fees. With that, I am here, as well as Tom Clark, who is the executive director of IMCC, for any questions?

Chair Anderson:

Thank you for going through that so quickly. I know it was probably a little bit more in depth. Are there any questions?

Assemblymember DeLong:

Thank you for being here and getting through the Compact language so well. I do note it came out of the Senate 21 to 0, which was good to see. I just want to ask, did the Minerals Commission members vote to join the Compact in unanimity or were there any in opposition?

Rob Ghiglieri:

This was proposed by the Division and myself to the Commission on Mineral Resources, I believe a year ago, to pursue full membership. They all voted unanimously to move forward with that.

Assemblymember La Rue Hatch:

I really appreciate this is not going to have an impact on the General Fund, but it does cost public money. I wondered if you could summarize why it is worth this money being paid into this fund to join this Compact.

Rob Ghiglieri:

The funding for this is paid by fees that are paid by each individual mining claim. Every time somebody comes and stakes an unpatented mining claim on federal land in the state of Nevada, you have to pay the Bureau of Land Management and the county. Then \$10 of that is actually what funds the Division of Minerals. The majority of our budget comes from that.

The importance of this we have seen in two parts. We have seen an increased conversation over the last 15 years about domestic mineral production, and it has been seen on a much larger scale recently. The last administration, the Biden/Harris Administration, put out a report on Interagency Working Group on Mining Laws reform. They used the Interstate Mining Compact Commission as the only mechanism to actually reach out and communicate with state permitting agencies. The only other states they met with were the Western Governors Association and it was a 20-minute presentation with no questions or answers. Having that ability, when at that point in time, the Deputy Assistant [Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary] Steve Feldgus, was able to present and ask us questions. There were little comments like, We do not know what is produced on federal lands; I am going to raise my hand really quick; Yes, we do; Here is the data; Here is the information. Having that ability for a one-on-one connection with a higher level in Washington, D.C., where there is a lot of disconnect all the way down from the field office to the Washington, D.C., headquarters and being able to voice how Nevada has been able to successfully create a reclamation-cost estimator for each individual mine operation that is actually being used worldwide, the ability to find out what other states are doing, what Colorado has done for other regulations, or Montana, or others. To have that constant communication back and forth, we feel it is really important.

The second part is the AML. It was not until the bill, or bipartisan infrastructure law, that there was actually a federal hard rock AML created. It was created only a few years ago, and IMCC played a huge role in getting that passed and moved forward to where there is actually going to be—hopefully, there is money that needs to come from somewhere—the ability to have a significant amount of funding coming down to the states and to have that constant communication when IMCC was actually working with the U.S. Department of the Interior to help create that program and write the regulations of best benefit for the states.

Chair Anderson:

Any further questions? Seeing none, we will begin testimony in support of [S.B. 464](#).

Nikki Bailey-Lundahl, Vice President, External Affairs, Nevada Mining Association:

We are in support of this bill. We believe Nevada should have a seat at the table as we are talking about important issues that arise in the mining industry.

Chair Anderson:

Seeing no one else in Carson City, Las Vegas, or Elko, is there anyone on the phone wishing to testify in support of [Senate Bill 464](#)?

Jake Tibbitts, Manager, Natural Resources, Eureka County:

As many of you know, mining is very important to Eureka County and for the reasons articulated by Mr. Ghiglieri and Ms. Bailey-Lundahl and the duties of the Interstate Mining Commission, we believe our citizens and resources would benefit from the state's involvement in the Interstate Mining Compact.

[\[Exhibit G\]](#) and [\[Exhibit H\]](#), were submitted and will become part of the record.

Chair Anderson:

We have no additional callers for support. We will move to opposition testimony for S.B. 464. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, Elko, or on the phone wishing to provide opposition testimony? [There was no one.] We will move to neutral testimony. Is there anyone in Carson City, Las Vegas, Elko, or on the phone wishing to provide neutral testimony? [There was no one.] Mr. Ghiglieri, would you like to make any closing remarks?

Rob Ghiglieri:

I appreciate your time today. I know how limited it is, and thank you for the hearing.

Chair Anderson:

I will close the hearing on Senate Bill 464 and we will get started on some work sessions. Pursuant to Assembly Standing Rules, Speaker Yeager has approved work sessioning bills even though we just heard these bills and 24 hours has not yet passed. We will now go ahead and start our work session with Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint).

Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint): Revises provisions relating to water. (BDR 48-384)

Chair Anderson:

Members, are there any questions on Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint)? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 36 (2nd Reprint).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH MADE A MOTION TO DO
PASS SENATE BILL 36 (2ND REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYMEMBER WATTS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Members, are there any questions on the motion? [There were none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER JACKSON WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will ask Assemblymember La Rue Hatch to do the floor statement. The next bill on work session is Senate Bill 108.

Senate Bill 108: Revises provisions governing the Account for the Channel Clearance, Maintenance, Restoration, Surveying and Monumenting Program. (BDR 48-88)

Chair Anderson:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 108? Seeing none, I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 108.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER LA RUE HATCH MADE A MOTION TO DO
PASS SENATE BILL 108.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER HANSEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.].

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER JACKSON WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will ask Assemblymember Hansen to do the floor statement. The last bill on work session is Senate Bill 464.

Senate Bill 464: Enacts the Interstate Mining Compact. (BDR 46-1125)

Chair Anderson:

Are there any questions on Senate Bill 464? [There were none.] I will entertain a motion to do pass Senate Bill 464.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER MARZOLA MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 464.

ASSEMBLYMEMBER GURR SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? [There was none.]

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEMBER JACKSON WAS
ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will ask Assemblymember DeLong to do the floor statement. That concludes the work session.

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

We have arrived at the last item on our agenda, which is public comment. Is there anybody in Carson City, Las Vegas, Elko, or on the phone wishing to make public comment? [There was no one.]

I am 90 percent sure this will be our last meeting. Again, I want to thank everyone on the Committee. Our staff is incredible. There is no way we could do this without you. I want to make sure we recognize our legislative police, as well as our custodians and AVH [Audio Visuals and Hearings Unit] for everything they do for us. Thank you so much. This meeting is adjourned [at 2:23 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Karen Cook
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblymember Natha C. Anderson, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
S.B. 36 (R2)	C	Mauricia M.M. Baca, State Director, The Nature Conservancy, Nevada Chapter	Letter in support
S.B. 36 (R2)	D	Kevin Moran, Associate Vice President, Regional Affairs, Environmental Defense Fund Action	Letter in support
S.B. 108	E	Senator Robin L. Titus, Senate District No. 17	Document titled "Legislative History of the Channel Clearance, Maintenance Restoration, Surveying and Monumenting Program"
S.B. 464	F	Rob Ghiglieri, Administrator, Commission on Mineral Resources, Division of Minerals	Bill summary
S.B. 464	G	Corey Fisher, Public Land Policy Director, Trout Unlimited	Letter in support
S.B. 464	H	Thomas L. Clarke, Executive Director, Interstate Mining Compact Commission	Letter in support