

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, AGRICULTURE, AND
MINING**

**Seventy-Sixth Session
March 3, 2011**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 1:30 p.m. on Thursday, March 3, 2011, in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, 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/76th2011/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair
Assemblyman Joseph M. Hogan, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Paul Aizley
Assemblyman Elliot T. Anderson
Assemblyman David P. Bobzien
Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblyman Ed A. Goedhart
Assemblyman Ira Hansen
Assemblyman Kelly Kite
Assemblyman Pete Livermore
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Judith Coolbaugh, Committee Secretary
Sherwood Howard, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Alan R. Coyner, Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral Resources
Tim Crowley, representing the Nevada Mining Association
Richard L. Haskins II, Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife
Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden, Division of Law Enforcement, Department of Wildlife
Paul R. Dixon, Ph.D., Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada
Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League
Tom Smith, representing the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.
Joseph Johnson, representing the Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club
Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Gilbert A. Yanuck, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Esther Valle Rojas, representing the Southern Nevada Water Authority

Chair Carlton:

[There was no roll call. The Chair reminded Committee members, witnesses, and members of the audience of Committee rules and protocol.] We are going to start this hearing with an overview of mining in Nevada.

Alan R. Coyner, Administrator, Division of Minerals, Commission on Mineral Resources:

It was a challenge to cut this PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit C](#)) down to 15 minutes because there is so much going on within the industry, especially in the geothermal area.

Chair Carlton:

We will expand your 15 minute time frame when we take questions.

Alan Coyner:

[Mr. Coyner read this statement from slide 1 of the PowerPoint.] "The mission of the Division of Minerals is to administer programs and activities to promote, advance, and protect mining and the development and production of petroleum and geothermal resources in Nevada." In part, we view ourselves as an economic development agency. We remove roadblocks by helping people and organizations get their permits and bonds for economic development projects, especially in rural Nevada. [Mr. Coyner continued to read the prepared testimony on the slides. Some supplemental information and dialogue has been included where it is appropriate.]

Slide 2 describes who we are; slide 3, what we do. Mr. John Snow, our Commissioner for geothermal resources, is also here and is available to answer any questions. The Commission on Mineral Resources has unanimously voted to oppose our proposed consolidation into the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources for a number of reasons including policy matters and operational consistency. Most importantly, no cost savings will be generated by the merger. In fact, there will be a cost to consolidate the two agencies. We receive no State General Fund money because all our revenue comes from fees charged to the mineral industry, and it has been that way since 1983. About 80 percent of our revenue comes from mining claim fees.

Slide 4 highlights our abandoned mines program, and it is where we spend most of our time and effort. The abandoned mines are the historical legacy of our original miners and prospectors, who were very industrious. There are probably about 200,000 mine openings throughout the state that need to be secured, and we are charged with finding the responsible owner/party and having them secure the site. If it is an "orphan" site, which is one found on public lands, we do the remediation. Slide 5 describes our summer intern program, and we also work with Eagle Scouts doing abandoned mine securing projects. Bats are a protected species, and they inhabit old mine shafts. We provide bat gates to allow unlimited ingress and egress for the bats. Also, we have completed 740 mine backfill projects since 2000.

We are currently responding to an abandoned mine accident in Jersey Valley, Pershing County. The mine opening is very close to the Jersey Valley geothermal plant. An individual has fallen into the shaft, and rescue teams are at the site. It is both a tragic and saddening accident which validates the need for our education and public awareness campaign. We work hard to communicate to the public the dangers associated with abandoned mines through our "Stay Out And Stay Alive!" program. I have included some of our educational materials ([Exhibit D](#)) in the package you received. Besides doing the

physical work of securing these abandoned sites, we need to get the message out. We conduct classroom awareness programs. We are especially active in the Virginia City schools because of the number of underground openings in the town's confined area. Accidents have happened there. Slide 11 shows teachers on a field trip at one of the Earth Science and Geology workshops that we offer.

Slides 12 and 13 list the three most recommended books and reports on minerals and mining in Nevada. They provide us with an information resource for our annual update on production and exploration activity in Nevada. The line graph on Slide 14 shows the total value of all mineral and energy production in Nevada by year. In 2009, the total gross value was \$5.8 billion, which was down from \$6.4 billion in 2008. With the exception of sand and gravel, the location of major mines, oil fields, and geothermal plants is shown on the map on Slide 15. As the map shows, the mineral industry is dominated by northern Nevada. Slide 16's line graph indicates that Nevada's petroleum industry is in a lull. The "glory days" of Nevada petroleum were in the 1980s at a place called Grant Canyon in Railroad Valley, Nye County. We consider ourselves a "frontier state" because we still have a lot of potential petroleum fields. However, Nevada is geologically a very difficult place to explore for new oil deposits. Some of the geological formations, that give the state gold deposits and hot water, are not ones where petroleum deposits can be found. We have very little natural gas.

Slides 18 through 25 show the location of our potential geothermal sources, energy production and producers, the number of power production wells, and Bureau of Land Management (BLM) geothermal leases. We have a lot of hot water in Nevada, and we are rapidly developing the geothermal power industry. The wells cost \$3 million to \$7 million each to drill. The Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology and the Great Basin Center for Geothermal Energy are doing invaluable scientific work to support the industry.

Slides 26 through 28 are about gold production. The current gold "boom" in Nevada is extensive and long-lived. The total ounces we produce far outweigh the amount of gold recovered by the 49ers or by the miners in the Yukon gold rush. However, we are currently in a declining production phase, which concerns us in terms of future prospects. Since we set the one-year world gold production record in 1998, we have had a 40 percent decline in gold production. The average price for an ounce of gold in 2010 was \$1,225. Gold production in the United States is now on par with South Africa, Australia, and Peru. As the line graph shows, China is the number one gold producer in the world. We now compete with the Chinese in mineral commodity sales.

Slide 29 details our silver production, although Alaska is now the number one producer. Currently, silver has an average price of \$35 an ounce. We are seeing more interest in silver exploration, but currently we have only one producer, the Coeur d'Alene Mines Corporation's Rochester Mine in Pershing County. Most of our silver is recovered as a gold mining by-product.

The chart on slide 30 shows mining financial assurance figures. All mining operators in Nevada have to post mining reclamation bonds. We are now holding \$1.6 billion worth of financial assurance instruments. We need to dispel the myth that mining companies come in, mine the gold, and leave us with a huge environmental clean-up problem. That is not the case. The money has been put in place to do the reclamation. Slides 31 and 32 show the drastic decline in active mining claims when the BLM instituted their mining claim fee in 1993-1994. Although the price of gold has been accelerating, we do not see a corresponding increase in mining claims. In fact, claims have declined in the last four years. Eighty percent of the Division's revenue comes from mining claim fees. On slide 32, the bar graph indicates that the notice of intent to hold fee instituted last February has increased the negative impact on mining claim filings. The map on slide 33 indicates the state is a major natural resource producer with significant mineral and energy resources. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions?

Assemblyman Anderson:

I wanted to compliment you on your presentation.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Is the mining exploration being hampered by government-imposed restrictions?

Alan Coyner:

The companies operating here tend to be large and multinational. There are a lot of Canadian companies, but in all cases the companies look at their opportunities on a worldwide basis. The price of gold in Malaysia is the same price as it is in Elko, Nevada. We do not set the price. We are in a competitive environment where regulations, fees, land-holding costs, business climate, available trained employees, infrastructure, and political stability all affect corporations' decisions when they attempt to determine if it is cost-effective to open new mining claims.

Also, over 3 million acres of Nevada are designated as wilderness areas. I was recently asked about Nevada's rare earth potential. We may have deposits,

but some of those are locked up in current wilderness areas. Land-use planning decisions are very critical as the mining industry moves forward.

Assemblyman Ellison:

A lot of people do not know that the gold being mined is microscopic and recovery is difficult. Can you comment on that?

Alan Coyner:

We have miners working in these large mines who never see any gold. It is a huge capital investment to process and recover these infinitesimal flecks of gold. However, these mines provide jobs and economic development in rural Nevada where we need it the most. It takes an extensive amount of work and investment in time to get the gold out of the ground.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

On the slide showing geothermal leases, you spoke about the success in moving the paperwork forward for these leases. Can you talk a little bit more about the collaborative efforts that have helped move those leases forward?

Alan Coyner:

The BLM has done a very good job of getting the leases out so companies can get on the ground and begin exploring. However, the permitting process is somewhat broken. The Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) document for completing the first plant at Salt Wells was huge. Permit timelines are critical because we are losing thousands of jobs and millions of dollars in delays. The BLM is part of the problem because there are certain constraints they have to live with. The possibility of environmental lawsuits is also part of the problem. The state agencies are doing all they can to move the process forward. It is a key issue for us in Nevada. The gold and geothermal resources are there, but we have to get people to invest the development money and get the projects online.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Senator Rhoads and I have introduced a bill to speed up the process. It is currently taking eight years to get through the permitting process. In the past, it only took two years on average. This is affecting all mineral exploration and development. Is that correct?

Alan Coyner:

I have difficulty understanding why we still have a hunting season for the sage grouse when it is such a huge environmental issue that slows down the permitting process. Permitting times vary, but certainly eight years is unacceptable. For example, the permitting process for Newmont Mining

Corporation's recent Emigrant Springs' project took five years to complete. There were a lot of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) issues involved in that project which were probably unnecessary. We need to continue to focus on speeding up the process. The Governor was with Secretary of the Interior Salazar last week discussing permitting process timelines.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

Even with the rising price of gold, the overall production of gold has dropped by 40 percent. Is that because when prices are higher, the companies tend to mine the less dense ore bodies, or is it because there are fewer ore sources?

Alan Coyner:

You are correct. When prices are higher, companies mine lower grade ore, which means there is less gold per ton of rock. Using lower grade ore does not create as many ounces, but overall it is more profitable. Also, we are moving more toward underground mines. They produce a lower volume of ore because not as much ore can be physically mined, and it costs more to get the ore out. Even though the recoverable volume of ore is a significant factor, profitability is still the driver in mining decisions. We need a profitable industry because it creates the revenue stream necessary to continue exploration for new ore bodies. Nevada produces 5 million ounces a year, and that is a nonrenewable resource for the state. Lower grade ore, more underground mining, and permitting delays are the three factors responsible for the drop in total volume. Permitting delays are probably the number one culprit explaining why volume is decreasing while gold prices are increasing.

Assemblyman Munford:

What is Nevada's position on recovering rare earth metals, like lithium?

Alan Coyner:

We do have rare earth deposits in Nevada. They are actually fairly ubiquitous, but finding enough of them in one place is the trick. The world's largest rare earth deposit is at the Mountain Pass facility in California. If the Von Schmidt boundary line between Nevada and California had been a little farther to the west that deposit would have been in Nevada. It is located just south of Jean.

Assemblyman Munford:

Is that Molycorp Minerals?

Alan Coyner:

Yes, it is Molycorp Minerals. The Chinese currently control nearly 95 percent of the rare earth supply in the world. The minerals are critical to the renewable energy industry.

Assemblyman Munford:

Batteries . . .

Alan Coyner:

Batteries for electric cars . . . There is a current interest in government circles to determine if the United States can produce more rare earth minerals and find the location of those deposits. Unfortunately, Nevada is not a focus for rare earth mineral deposits because the type of geology found here is different from the type of geology where rare earths are found. Other states may edge us out in the race to find them, but that does not mean we do not have them. We have not really looked for them. There is a difference between lithium and rare earths. Lithium is a light metal, but it is not truly a rare earth mineral. We do have a developing lithium industry in Nevada. We are currently the only producer of lithium in the United States at our Silver Peak mine. It is a brine extraction process. Water is pumped out of the ground and deposited in huge evaporation ponds. We are well-positioned to take advantage of increasing lithium demand. We are not as well-positioned for mining other rare earths or specialty metals.

Assemblyman Munford:

There is a market for them. Is that correct?

Alan Coyner:

Yes, a huge market that is growing. I recently toured the Mountain Pass mine and all of their support comes from Las Vegas, including all their infrastructure and services. Therefore, it is still economically advantageous for us even though the deposit is not in Nevada.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.]

Tim Crowley, representing the Nevada Mining Association:

I have distributed my PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit E](#)). [Mr. Crowley read from the prepared testimony. Some supplemental information and dialogue have been included for clarity.] Nevada has over 40 operating mining companies, and they mine the minerals shown on slide 2. Gold does represent 88 percent of our commodities in terms of value. In addition to the operating mine companies, we do have a wide variety of mining vendors. In total, 160 vendor companies belong to the Nevada Mining Association. There are also many individuals working in the mining industry that have specialized occupations such as: assayers, auctioneers, environmental consultants, metallurgists, and engineers. All of these companies and individuals contribute to our economy.

Our Association is united in dealing with industry issues including environmental stewardship and safety. Slide 5 shows a reclamation project in Bald Mountain. We have an active and robust committee that works with the state's Division of Environmental Protection. Environmental protection issues are not stagnant; the issues are alive and in continuous flux. Mine closures, air quality problems, and permitting delays are some of the issues in which we are actively involved. We do seek state mining permits, and the state has been quite good at doing their required scrutiny while still moving our projects forward. We do need faster processing of permits on the federal side.

Slide 4 shows a photograph of a recent conference we had at the Peppermill Resort Casino. It was the Joint Western Regional Mine Safety and Health Conference. Our federal regulators are the Mine Safety and Health Administration (MSHA). They are equivalent to the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, but the MSHA specifically addresses the mining industry. We have an active working relationship with the MSHA, and we are always striving to create a safer working environment. Safety is the most important part of our mission.

We are working to inform Nevadans about the mining business and, next to prostitution, we are the oldest industry in Nevada. We have been here since the founding of the state, and the state has grown up around us. Therefore, we need to reintroduce ourselves. We want to be as transparent as possible to this Legislature and the public. To promote and enhance communication, we have a website, conduct tours, and do social networking on Facebook and Twitter.

We are putting Nevadans to work by spending billions for developing and expanding existing operations, and by bringing new operations online. Some of the most recent gold mines that have been built or expanded include: Allied Nevada Gold Corporation's Hycroft mine, which is north of Winnemucca, and Barrick Gold Corporation's Cortez Hills Gold Mine in Crescent Valley. The Newmont Mining Corporation owns three mines which are: the Phoenix project, south of Battle Mountain; the Long Canyon project in Elko County; and the Emigrant Springs in the Carlin Trend. In addition, Kinross Gold Corporation and Barrick Gold Corporation share equal partnership in the Round Mountain and Gold Hill mines near Tonopah. Other new mining operations opening up are: General Moly Corporation's Mount Hope molybdenum mine, near Eureka; Western Lithium USA Corporation's lithium mine in Kings Valley, north of Winnemucca; and Nevada Copper Corporation's Pumpkin Hollow copper mine, southeast of Yerington. There are also numerous geothermal facilities being developed throughout the state.

Slides 7 and 8 detail the mining industry's tax contributions to the state. As the price of gold increases—which is the gold line on the first line graph—so do our Net Proceeds of Minerals Tax revenues (NPOMT), which are the industry-specific property taxes that mine companies pay. Yesterday, the mining companies made their 2011 NPOMT prepayment. We have just looked at Barrick's and Newmont's returns and their taxes amounted to over \$140 million. That amount surpasses the NPOMT budget projections by a significant amount. The mining industry represents 3 percent of Nevada's total economy. Although that is not a large portion, our total taxes in 2009 were \$200 million. The figure includes all of the taxes that every business pays which are: sales, use, property, and payroll taxes. Mining pays an additional \$100 million in NPOMT.

Our contributions to the state come in many forms including charitable giving. Annually, we give approximately \$4 million in donations to charitable and community organizations. For example, Newmont Mining Corporation recently gave \$300,000 to Great Basin College, and yesterday, Barrick Gold Corporation gave \$75,000 to the Storey County Youth and Community Resource Center.

Our total tax contribution, on a per employee basis, surpasses all average contributions by \$12,000. The mining industry pays over \$18,000 per employee, whereas all other industries average about \$5,500. It is an important distinction to make because, if you were to measure our impact and need for state services, we cover that amount plus some with our employee tax contributions. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Chair Carlton:

I am sure there will be questions, but we will stick to the policy part of your presentation since other committees will be handling the tax part.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I want to thank the mining industry for the fantastic job it does in supporting community activities and events. The rural communities I represent are very positive about the mining industry. Have you done a study to show how much potential revenue Nevada has lost because of endless delays in the permitting process?

Tim Crowley:

We have not done that analysis. We lose time and materials and the opportunity to put people to work. Currently, we are gathering data to measure the number of jobs in the queue which will come online with pending expansions and new mine operations. We are probably going to grow by about 1,000 jobs.

Assemblyman Hansen:

In the part of the world I represent, mining is number one. You guys are great.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

Has the Mount Hope mine been permitted? What stage is it at in the process?

Tim Crowley:

The General Moly Corporation, which owns the operation, is continuing to work with the town of Eureka, Eureka County, and the federal government to get through their permitting process. They are not there yet. However, there is no question that eventually they will be fully permitted, and the anticipated date is the end of this year. Their work force will grow from the current 20 employees to about 450 employees.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

There is a saying about farming and mining. If you do not grow it, you have to mine it.

Assemblyman Anderson:

Is there anything that this Committee or the Legislature can do to speed up geothermal development within the state?

Tim Crowley:

The permitting process a lithium or molybdenum mine goes through is the exact same process all mines have to complete, which is the federal NEPA process, and they have to prepare an EIS. The mining company maps out the entire life of the mine and the costs it will take to close that mine and do the reclamation work. A cash bond has to be posted upfront to cover the cost of the mine closure. The NEPA process vets the project. There has been an increasing impetus to get the geothermal projects online, and we do know that the permits can be granted with some alacrity. However, that same alacrity is not always applied to mineral permits.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Can you go back to the slide showing the tours? Where is the tour photo taken?

Tim Crowley:

If I remember correctly, this photo was taken at the Cortez Hills Gold Mine.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Okay.

Tim Crowley:

The Barrick Gold Corporation's operation in Crescent Valley is the newest gold mine to come online.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

There are some lessons to be learned about how the mining industry interacts with the state in terms of permitting and permitting fees. How would you describe the mining industry's current working relationship with the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW)? I am asking because there is a great opportunity for your association's geothermal members to work with their colleagues in the mining industry to address some of the permitting challenges and to make sure we develop good EISes.

Tim Crowley:

There is no question mining impacts the environment, and the mining industry goes to great lengths to return the lands to acceptable condition. It is required by law, and the land will be available again for public use when we finish the reclamation process. We work with NDOW to restore less-than-ideal habitat for a number of reasons, which are unrelated to mining. It is an opportunity for us to do some mitigation. For example, the comprehensive watershed restoration of Maggie Creek has returned it to a pristine state. It is now being recognized as one of the future best trout fisheries in the state. The Trout Unlimited organization has paid tribute to the work the mining industry did to put that riparian area back into a pristine state. We do make a robust and positive effort to mitigate the impact of mining activities on the land, and we return the land to an environmentally healthy and safe state.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Do the mining corporations pay a water impoundment fee to NDOW?

Tim Crowley:

I do not know if we pay a water impoundment fee. We do pay wildlife fees, and I would be happy to provide you with details of the fee structure.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

That is fine. Does the Mining Association have a specific policy on sage grouse hunting?

Tim Crowley:

We do recognize the sage grouse concerns are focused on a habitat issue, not on bird numbers, and the hunting season is based on bird populations. The current issue is habitat, and we are very aware of the need for environmental conservation.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Thank you for the great presentation. How many employees does the Cortez Hills Gold Mine have for the new construction?

Tim Crowley:

Cortez has just over 1,000 employees, and they are considering an increase. They will probably add another 100 to 200 employees, but they are almost at full employment.

Assemblyman Ellison:

How many employees are at the regular Barrick site?

Tim Crowley:

I do not know. In all of mining, there are about 12,000 employees.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Are these all high paying jobs? The companies take good care of their employees and provide them with many benefits including profit sharing. I want to thank the mining industry for its commitment and support of local communities. Even when the price of gold was down, the mining industry was still there for the communities.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions? [There were none.] For those of you who have not had the opportunity to take a mine tour, above or below ground, it is a very interesting experience, and it is one I recommend.

I am opening the hearing on Assembly Bill 167.

Assembly Bill 167: Enacts provisions for the protection of the waters of this State from aquatic invasive species. (BDR 45-847)

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams, Clark County Assembly District No. 42:

Thank you for the opportunity to present A.B. 167. I will begin by summarizing the bill and then I have my invited technical experts to provide you some background on the intent of this legislation. [Ms. Bustamante Adams read her testimony from prepared text ([Exhibit F](#)). A letter of support for A.B. 167 from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency was requested for inclusion in the record ([Exhibit G](#)).

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions? [There were none.]

Richard L. Haskins II, Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife:

I would like to thank Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams for her introduction, and she has stated the problem very well. In your packet of information, you will find an Aquatic Invasive Species (AIS) Fact Sheet ([Exhibit H](#)). I will be referring to it on occasion, and it contains some statistics on the costs being incurred on a nationwide and local level to eradicate AIS. [Mr. Haskins read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit I](#)). Some supplemental dialogue and information has been included for clarity.] New Zealand mudsnails are now found in the Colorado River system, and in Salmon Falls Creek, in northern Elko County. It is not a matter of trying to eradicate just one particular species.

The focus of this bill is on boats and boat conveyances because they are an infestation pathway for several of these species, such as quagga and zebra mussels. [Mr. Haskins continued to read from prepared testimony.] California has had a considerable problem with golden algae, and now it has also shown up in Lake Mead. When you get a golden algae bloom, it produces toxins. Rock snot—or didymo—is a diatom that forms a mat on the bottom of streams and rivers and chokes out all other aquatic plants. Our Lake Mead Hatchery is closed because of quagga mussels. It costs over \$1 million annually for the Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) to have divers keep the intake towers scrubbed clean of quagga mussels. The Bureau of Reclamation has problems at the Hoover Dam power plant because of the infestation of quagga mussels plugging the penstocks and the water intakes used for cooling.

This bill also deals with injurious wildlife. At Comins Lake in eastern Nevada, our highly successful rainbow trout fishery, which attracted anglers to fish for the trophy trout in the lake, is nonexistent today because of the illegal introduction of northern pike. We are a little late in finding solutions because we do not have an AIS plan. We are working to resolve that issue. I brought two physical examples—a pleasure boat propeller and an athletic shoe—to show the extent of the quagga mussel infestation in Lake Mead. [Photographs of these exhibits have been included in these minutes. The propeller is shown in ([Exhibit J](#)) and the athletic shoe in ([Exhibit K](#)).] We participate with the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (WAFWA) and the Colorado River Fish and Wildlife Council. The WAFWA prepared a resolution ([Exhibit L](#)) on AIS. It outlines a series of recommendations that states need to do to address the problem of AIS. Along those lines, we have recreated the position of Aquatic Nuisance Species Coordinator, Karen Vargas. Without being prompted, she recognized the need to establish a state Aquatic Nuisance Species or Invasive Species Committee and she is in the process of setting up an executive committee to initiate that process. We are also attempting to establish a state Aquatic Nuisance Species Plan. Ms. Vargas will be our appointed representative to the Western Regional Panel. Regarding the recommendation to establish

an early detection rapid response plan, we are now monitoring some water around the state. In particular, we are monitoring waters that may have been infected by our movement of fish from the Lake Mead Hatchery prior to recognizing that there were quagga mussels there. I believe the Bureau of Reclamation is monitoring on Lake Lahontan and Rye Patch Reservoir. There is certainly monitoring going on up at Lake Tahoe. That is an important element here. You need to know where the threats are and then be able to react to them. That is the idea of a rapid response plan. Once aquatic or invasive species are there, it is really tough to get rid of them. If you can isolate them and avoid them being a new source for introduction somewhere else, that is half the battle.

This bill seeks to establish the authority to implement these programs and plans. Mr. Buonamici will cover the mechanics of the bill. Given the administration's position on taxes and fees, we are willing, as a collective group, to work with the bill's sponsors on the fee schedule included in the bill.

Rob Buonamici, Chief Game Warden, Division of Law Enforcement, Department of Wildlife:

I will go through the bill and review the technical details in the bill's language. "This bill addresses a substantial deficiency in existing law for the criminal and civil punishment for the crime of introduction of injurious aquatic wildlife." [Mr. Buonamici continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit M](#)). Some supplemental information and dialogue has been included where it is appropriate.] Punishment for knowingly and intentionally introducing an aquatic invasive species or "injurious aquatic species" to a body of water is a category E felony. Provision for a civil penalty "of at least \$25,000 but not more than \$250,000" is also included in the bill. The massive destruction of the public's property by intentionally releasing any AIS into a body of water warrants a criminal felony penalty, not a lesser gross misdemeanor or misdemeanor offense.

Our rationale behind this is that intentional release of Pike, quagga mussels, or other species into Lake Tahoe or other areas is a destruction of public property. The people of the state own the land and waterways. These are not private lakes or bodies of water. The Department of Wildlife spends a tremendous amount of the public's money investing in the state's fisheries, wildlife programs, and so forth. We look at it as a property value issue, whether public or private. If someone goes down to a new car dealership and pours sugar into the gas tanks or if they go throw two pike into Comins Reservoir, there would be no visible signs of damage. However, if you start the vehicles, the motors would be irreparable. If the value of the property is greater than \$5,000, it would be considered a category C felony. Similarly, once the two pike

introduced into Comins Reservoir proliferate, there would be potentially hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage. That is the thought process behind it. The civil penalty fine will fund restoration efforts to return the property to its original state. [Mr. Buonamici continued to read from prepared testimony.]

Chair Carlton:

Let us stop there and deal with this issue before we get into the boating section of the bill. I would like you to go back and explain more fully section 2, subsection 8, paragraph (b), so we clearly understand those terms.

Rob Buonamici:

That part of the bill states that it includes, without limitation, predation, parasitism, interbreeding, or the transmission of disease. If NDOW determines, for example, that pike are a predator on rainbow trout and bass, this mechanism would allow us to go to the Board of Wildlife Commissioners and justify why pike should be considered an injurious aquatic species. Aquatic invasive species may carry parasites that could infect other native species, or they may interbreed with native species and create a nonnative hybrid. We would also be concerned if the AIS transmit diseases to native species. The section is designed to set standards and provide a justification for declaring a species injurious. We cannot just pick on any species.

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other questions?

Assemblyman Bobzien:

In section 2, subsection 5, the language states: "A person who knowingly or intentionally introduces, causes to be introduced or attempts to introduce an aquatic invasive species" What happens if a person forgets to decontaminate his wading boots? I may be an angler with bad habits, but I am not subject to penalties. But if I am caught at the edge of the lake with a bucket of pike, then I am captured by this. Is that the distinction?

Rob Buonamici:

Correct. Two issues come into play here. For a felony, we are required to prove intent.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Which is always a tricky thing to do.

Rob Buonamici:

If someone forgets to thoroughly decontaminate his boat and misses a spot, we cannot charge them with a felony. This law is designed to punish the person who intentionally contaminates a water body.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Knowing that the standard for determining an "intentional" action is a high test, I emphatically support the felony provision. This is a serious situation. In Portola, California, the entire tourism economy collapsed because someone intentionally introduced an AIS into Lake Davis. The strongest part of the bill, and probably the most important, is designating the crime as a category E felony.

Chair Carlton:

I respectfully disagree with you.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

Is the wildlife account in the State General Fund overseen by NDOW or the Board of Wildlife Commissioners?

Rob Buonamici:

It is overseen by NDOW.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Is it true that most AIS introductions are casual occurrences? For example with the northern pike, is it possible they were minnows in a bucket that an angler was using? Once these AIS are in place is there a way to actually eradicate them?

Rob Buonamici:

It is true that AIS found in a body of water could have been an accidental and unintentional release. We are not saying that does not happen or could not happen. This bill only applies to people who intentionally and knowingly release an AIS into a body of water. The odds of a game warden being there at that moment in time to observe an intentional release of AIS into a body of water are slim to none. A thorough investigation would ensue. After the investigation, the district attorney in that jurisdiction would review the facts and make sure the intent was there before issuing any arrest warrant. Will this law prevent the unintentional release of AIS? It may with the felony provision included in statute because it elevates people's educational awareness. People will be extra careful when they clean and dry their boats.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Are there actually any cases of people being caught intentionally releasing AIS?
Are most introductions of AIS accidental?

Rob Buonamici:

Nevada and other states have caught people knowingly introducing an AIS into a body of water. For example, some boaters have been told they cannot launch their boats because they are infected. They are given directions and instructed to remove AIS from their boats, but they do not go through AIS removal process and attempt to launch their contaminated boats.

Richard Haskins:

I would like to elaborate. Mr. Buonamici covered the portion of the bill that speaks to the mussel infestation, but it is a broad spectrum problem. The northern pike in Comins Lake were intentionally released there.

Assemblyman Anderson:

Are you saying the northern pike used to be in Comins Lake, and they are a nonnative species? Is that correct?

Richard Haskins:

The northern pike were originally stocked in Comins Lake in the 1970s. The only fish native to the Steptoe Basin, where Comins Lake is located, is the relict dace. At that time, it was a large irrigation reservoir used by the 3-C Ranch, and the northern pike were brought in to control the Utah chub. They did a very good job. The Utah chub went from 96 percent of the gill net catch one year to 4 percent the next. A 400-acre reservoir is not suitable for maintaining a large predator like the northern pike with a forage fish. In the 1980s, the northern pike were removed from the reservoir with the intention of establishing a rainbow trout and largemouth bass fishery. That is what existed for a number of years until the northern pike were reintroduced. They are not native to the system.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Currently, we have poaching laws and other laws that protect wildlife and protect the public's property. Have you physically caught a person willfully introducing AIS into Nevada waters?

Rob Buonamici:

No, we have not caught anybody in Nevada intentionally releasing AIS.

Assemblyman Livermore:

You are asking anglers and boaters to pay a fee, although you have no strong evidence supporting the intentional release of AIS. I am concerned about what we are creating. After we cover boating inspections, I reserve my right to ask questions and to find out how you plan on policing the problem.

Chair Carlton:

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams used a strong term—"ecoterrorism"—in her opening statement. I would like her to explain the use of that word for the record. Then we will cover the next part of the bill.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I used that term to describe the release of northern pike into Comins Lake. It brought about a drastic change in that body of water.

Chair Carlton:

Gentlemen, please proceed.

Rob Buonamici:

In section 3, Chapter 488 of the *Nevada Revised Statutes*, provisions are addressed. [Mr. Buonamici read section 4 of the bill.]

Chair Carlton:

You said, "Leave an impaired body of water in this State or any other state" I assume you are referring to the bodies of water within our state that have multiple state boundaries. Do you have jurisdiction in another state?

Rob Buonamici:

That is correct. The bill's language would make it unlawful for someone to knowingly take a boat from a body of water in California and bring it to a body of water in Nevada, which has an inspection program, without having the boat inspected and decontaminated if necessary. We do have jurisdiction on the entire body of Lake Tahoe as well as Lake Mead, Lake Mohave, and the Colorado River system. We also have concurrent jurisdiction with Arizona, which gives us the right to take enforcement action up to five miles into Arizona. Arizona has authority to take enforcement action up to 25 miles into Nevada.

Richard Haskins:

I cannot think of any state around us that does not have a program where they identify impaired waters. They may use different mechanisms and agencies, and they also have restrictions over boats going in and out of those waters. Any boater from another state would know what they were dealing with.

Our monitoring program is used to determine the bodies of water in Nevada that are impaired. This bill would give the Board of Wildlife Commissioners the authority to proclaim which bodies of water in Nevada are impaired based upon our monitoring surveys.

Chair Carlton:

And that would be a felony also?

Rob Buonamici:

That would not be a felony arrest in the event we catch them before they launch. It could potentially be a felony arrest if a boater refused to comply and launched his boat. The district attorney would review the factual circumstances surrounding the case. If the intent, above and beyond any reasonable doubt, was proven to be there, there would be a felony arrest.

Chair Carlton:

The bill's language says that they left one impaired body of water, possibly in another state. We are adding the standard of knowingly.

Rob Buonamici:

. . . and launched . . .

Assemblyman Livermore:

Where do I get my boat inspection done? If I am going to fish in Topaz Lake, the only boat inspection center is in Reno, and they do not open until 8 a.m. Would this bill limit people's freedom to use the fishing license they paid for if they cannot find a convenient boat inspection location?

Rob Buonamici:

There is a term used in the legal world called a "reasonable test." We have to be reasonable in our law enforcement. I think you are concerned that you may be put in jeopardy of a felony arrest, but applying the "reasonable test" rule would be a defense for the boat owner. If we were concerned about Topaz Lake, we would have an inspection station there to address any problems.

Assemblyman Livermore:

You used to have boat registration in Carson City, but now you have to go to Reno or get it online.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Lake Mead has quagga mussels. Do you assume that every boat leaving Lake Mead has to be checked before entering another body of water?

Rob Buonamici:

There are a couple of parameters to consider. Those boats that are docked at Lake Mead for extended periods of time will be infected with quagga mussels. The temperature, on a particular day, is taken into consideration when evaluating whether or not day users require a boat inspection. For day users' boats, hot summer temperatures might take care of some AIS, as long as there is no water in the bilge, within a 24-hour period.

Assemblyman Aizley:

How do people know what the requirements are?

Rob Buonamici:

At this point, we have not done a good job of educating the public because we do not have a formal program in place. We have done the best we can and tried to get the word out. Can we do better? Yes, we can. That is why we are requesting this piece of legislation.

Richard Haskins:

When boaters come in and moor their boats or use the docks for an extended period of time at Lake Mead National Recreation Area, they sign a lease agreement which notifies them their boats must be cleaned when they are removed from the water. The bill is not designed for day users. Within a few days after day use, the quagga mussels die. Boats that remain there for extended periods of time are the ones that need attention and are dangerous to the environment.

Chair Carlton:

We need to move forward. If you can summarize the additional sections, then we will address the fee schedule.

Rob Buonamici:

Section 4, subsection 2, requires boat owners to stop at a mandatory inspection station and decontaminate their boats. Section 4, subsection 3, says a peace officer may stop and inspect a vessel or conveyance for the presence of AIS. This section clarifies the authority to make these stops. Currently, we do not have that authority unless we have probable cause that indicates a boat is a carrier of prohibited AIS.

Section 4, subsection 4 provides authority to require a person to decontaminate his or her vessel. Section 4, subsection 5 gives an officer the authority to quarantine or impound a vessel if the boat owner refuses to comply. Section 5 states that if a peace officer orders a vessel or conveyance to be impounded or quarantined, it must be for a reasonable amount of time. The time periods

would differ between northern and southern Nevada and depend on seasonal temperature variations.

Chair Carlton:

Do you charge an impoundment fee for a vessel or conveyance vehicle?

Rob Buonamici:

Correct. That fee is covered in section 5, subsection 2.

Chair Carlton:

How much is the fee?

Rob Buonamici:

I do not know the figure.

Chair Carlton:

If it is anything like a car in a tow yard, it is a lot of money.

Rob Buonamici:

Section 5, subsection 3 states NDOW may suspend the certificate of number or validation decal if someone refuses to comply. The suspension is similar to suspending a motor vehicle registration. Section 6 states a person must pay a fee for an AIS decal that is required to be attached to a vessel. However, displaying the decal does not insure that the boat is decontaminated or free of AIS. The purchase of the decal will pay for the cost of the program. Section 6, subsection 4 states the Board of Wildlife Commissioners will establish, by regulation, a reasonable annual fee for the decal.

Section 7 covers the definition of terms and mirrors those terms used for wildlife. The term "decontaminate" is defined in section 7, subsection 5. I would be happy to answer any questions.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

Mr. Haskins, I want to go back to the beginning of your presentation when you conveyed a message of position from the Governor. Could you restate that?

Richard Haskins:

Yes, I can. I am paraphrasing the communication I received. Given the current administration's position on taxes and fees, we are willing as a collective group to work with the sponsors of the bill on the fee section.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

To complete that paraphrase, and assuming no one is here from the Governor's office today, the administration is supportive of the bill except for the fee section.

Richard Haskins:

That is correct.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

That is encouraging. In effect, they are saying this: We understand the severity of the issue; we know there is a problem; and we want to see the problem addressed, but we have a problem with charging a fee. Is that what I am hearing from the administration? What do you mean by saying we will work with the sponsors of the bill on the fee section? Do you mean there will not be a fee, or you will try and find another way to fund the program? I realize I am putting you on the spot, and you are just conveying the message you received from the administration. If you do not have the availability of a fee, is it even worth discussing this bill? If you cannot fund it, we have no program. Is that right?

Richard Haskins:

Yes, I think there is a program here even without charging a fee. We need the authority in statute to do things right now, with or without a fee. We do have some other funding structures, but right now we need the enforcement ability. As part of the AIS plan, we will flush out a lot of the details. There is considerable question and concern about inspection programs. At this point, we do not know what the nature of those programs will be. We have a diversity of waters spread throughout this state, so we need to take a different approach than other states that have fixed inspection stations at their major bodies of water.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I know this issue well. I appreciate how good you are with the money you have available, and how well you develop creative funding solutions. The money for the fee would be used for what purpose—inspection, outreach, or education?

Richard Haskins:

I believe it will cover all of those items.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

When I hear the words "other funding streams," I hear what I pay on a combination license with stamps every year to support hunting and fishing will be used for a boat program. We need to keep the funding streams

specifically connected to their source. I want to make sure the people causing the problem are contributing to the cleanup of it. If no funding is generated by the program itself, then I wonder why we are going to keep talking about this bill.

Richard Haskins:

We believe the bill has value without a fee structure. An inspection program is administered by the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency, but their law enforcement officers have to seek civil remedy for violations. They issue a summons and have to take the person to court. If the person is found guilty, he pays a fine. Criminal law is not part of their law enforcement structure for violations. They need a bill, like this, to enforce their inspection program.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I encourage you to reconnect with the sponsors of the bill and have this discussion with them. If law enforcement authority has value exclusive of the fees, then this bill may be viable. I continue to be concerned about the pressures put on your agency to find creative funding solutions.

Chair Carlton:

We have covered the bill, and I do not have anyone wishing to speak in opposition to the bill. There are some bill supporters who would like to speak.

Paul R. Dixon, Ph.D., Private Citizen, Las Vegas, Nevada:

I chair the Clark County Advisory Board to Manage Wildlife, and I am an active hunter and avid sportsman. I am here today to comment on this bill as an individual. Mr. Haskins and Mr. Buonamici have already covered many of the items I wanted to address. In my opinion, this bill is needed to control major problems we currently have and will experience in the future if it is not enacted. [Mr. Dixon continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit N](#)). Some supplemental dialogue has been included where it is appropriate.]

I would like to mention that the Comins Lake restoration project will involve draining the lake in order to clean it up. In the process of draining, an arsenic problem was discovered along part of the shoreline. As long as aquatic mud was sitting on top of the old mine dump area, which is the source of the arsenic, there was no problem. Once the lake was drained and dried out, the arsenic became a problem, and it will have to be addressed before the lake can be returned to its original state. [Mr. Michael McBeath, a Commissioner on the Board of Wildlife Commissioners, asked me to submit his support statement ([Exhibit O](#)), and a copy has been distributed to you. Dr. Dixon continued to read from prepared testimony.]

Chair Carlton:

Are there any other people in support?

Kyle Davis, representing the Nevada Conservation League:

We are in strong support of this bill. It is a very important program that needs to be in place to control the state's AIS. It is a serious problem. If we do not have the ability to have a program in place to manage AIS, the problem will worsen. The problems the mussels are creating in Lake Mead will start to be a problem in other waters of this state. It is an expensive problem that is harmful to our state's economy, to tourism, and to the environment.

We need to work in partnership with the states surrounding us. Many states around us do have programs in place. Nevada needs a program so we can deal with AIS. It is not just a state problem; it is also a regional and national problem. If we were able to have a fee to cover the program costs, federal matching funds would be available to us. The fee would give us a lot of opportunities to get more funds that we could put into on-the-ground conservation work.

Going back to the felony discussion, there was a question about whether or not the state had actually caught somebody intentionally depositing AIS into our waters. The fact that we have not caught anyone proves a high standard of proof of intent is required for someone to be arrested and charged with the commission of a felony crime.

It is important to recognize that programs do cost money, and the services of the state cost money. It is appropriate to charge a fee to cover the program's costs. If we do not have a fee, we may end up spending a lot more in the long run. We are in a severe budget crisis, and other funds are not available. The Nevada Department of Wildlife has very little of the State General Fund available to it. What funds it has are severely stressed, so there is no extra money there that could be used. If you take funds from other NDOW programs, then those monies are not being used for their intended purpose. I will answer any questions.

Chair Carlton:

There are no questions, so we will hear the next speaker.

Tom Smith, representing the Coalition for Nevada's Wildlife, Inc.:

We do support this bill especially the educational portion. All the people using the state's waters need to understand the seriousness of the AIS problem. We need to educate the public on what is happening. I also represent other groups including the Northern California/Nevada Council Federation of

Fly Fishers, Trout Unlimited, and the Truckee River Fly Fishers. I have been involved in the fishing community in Nevada for over 25 years.

This bill may not go far enough as it only addresses lakes, impoundments, and reservoirs. The streams that enter these waters can also be infected with AIS. The most common vehicle for spreading that infection is felt-soled waders. The Trout Unlimited organization would like to see felt-soled waders outlawed in the United States by the end of 2011. Alaska has prohibited them in their entire state effective January 1, 2012. Vermont and Maryland have also outlawed felt-soled waders. Nevada needs to look at that issue and possibly amend this bill to include the prohibition of felt-soled waders. This is how several of the invasive species have been brought into our state. Didymo or rock snot is a very pretty, almost fluorescent green plant that chokes off other native aquatic plants and invertebrates. Whirling disease and viral hemorrhagic septicemia, where the fish actually bleed to death internally and externally, can be transmitted between water sources on felt-soled waders. These infections have caused as much as 90 percent of the cases of mortality in some impoundments

The bill is very important, and Nevada needs to communicate to the public the dangerousness of AIS. Felt-soled waders should also be addressed. [Mr. Smith showed the Committee an alternative choice to felt-soled waders. They were rubber and chain waders. Photographs of the physical exhibit have been included in these minutes ([Exhibit P](#)).]

Chair Carlton:

We will hear from the next witness in support of this bill.

Joseph Johnson, representing the Toiyabe Chapter, Sierra Club:

We support this bill and user fees. The bill is a reasonable means to establish a framework for education, and it will act as a deterrent for the unintended introduction of AIS. The threat and potential problems have been identified. We support this bill.

Leo M. Drozdoff, P.E., Director, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

It is a pleasure to appear before you today to offer my department's comments on A.B. 167. The protection of the waters of Nevada from aquatic invasive species is very important to many divisions within DCNR including Environmental Protection, State Lands and its Tahoe EIP program, State Parks and others. [Mr. Drozdoff continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit Q](#)).]

Chair Carlton:

Are there any questions? [There were none.] We will hear from our next witness in support of this bill.

Gilbert A. Yanuck, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

I ask for your favorable vote on A.B. 167. The Nevada Department of Wildlife needs the Authority to implement a comprehensive education, inspection and enforcement program to enable it to fully protect the State of Nevada from Aquatic Invasive Species. [Mr. Yanuck continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit R](#)).]

Esther Valle Rojas, representing the Southern Nevada Water Authority:

The Southern Nevada Water Authority (SNWA) is in support of A.B. 167. I would like to verify information that was previously presented. The SNWA has spent about \$4 million on maintenance and cleaning of intakes, and another \$5 million has been spent on chemical treatments. In addition, the SNWA had to budget about \$24 million to install some titanium lining on the third intake which is under construction. I submitted some photographs ([Exhibit S](#)) showing before and after pictures of the quagga mussels on the intake screens and divers cleaning them off.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Once the quagga mussels become established in a water body is there any way to eradicate them permanently?

Esther Valle Rojas:

There is an ongoing evaluation monitoring system, but it has not had any success to date. Some of the millions being spent on the problem are used to determine a way to mitigate the problem of the quagga mussels. Currently, there is no way to completely eliminate them from the water.

Chair Carlton:

I do not see anyone else signed in to speak today, but if there is anyone else who would like to put something on the record, now is the time. [There was no one.]

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

I just want to say I love this Committee. I have learned about pesticides, quagga mussels . . .

Chair Carlton:

With that, I will close the hearing on A.B. 167. I thank everyone for being here today to address this important issue. Is there any public comment? [There was none.]

This meeting is adjourned [at 3:46 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Judith Coolbaugh
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining

Date: March 3, 2011

Time of Meeting: 1:30 p.m.

Bill	Ex hi bit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Alan Coyner	PowerPoint Presentation
	D	Alan Coyner	Educational Materials
	E	Tim Crowley	PowerPoint Presentation
A.B. 167	F	Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams	Testimony
A.B. 167	G	Assemblywoman Irene Bustamante Adams	Letter of Support from the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
A.B. 167	H	Richard Haskins	AIS Fact Sheet
A.B. 167	I	Richard Haskins	Testimony
A.B. 167	J	Richard Haskins	Photographs of Propeller
A.B. 167	K	Richard Haskins	Photographs of Athletic Shoe
A.B. 167	L	Richard Haskins	Resolution from WAFWA
A.B. 167	M	Rob Buonamici	Testimony
A.B. 167	N	Paul R. Dixon	Testimony
A.B. 167	O	Paul R. Dixon	Letter of Support from Michael McBeath
A.B. 167	P	Tom Smith	Photographs of Waders
A.B. 167	Q	Leo Drozdoff	Testimony
A.B. 167	R	Gilbert A. Yanuck	Testimony
A.B. 167	S	Esther Valle Rojas	Photographs of Intake Screens