

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

**Eighty-Second Session
February 15, 2023**

The Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Lesley E. Cohen at 4:02 p.m. on Wednesday, February 15, 2023, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4401 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/App/NELIS/REL/82nd2023.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Shannon Bilbray-Axelrod
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblywoman Venicia Considine
Assemblyman Rich DeLong
Assemblywoman Bea Duran
Assemblyman Bert Gurr
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Selena La Rue Hatch
Assemblyman Howard Watts
Assemblyman Toby Yurek

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None



STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Becky Peratt, Committee Policy Analyst
Erin Sturdivant, Committee Counsel
Connie Barlow, Committee Manager
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Kacey KC, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Alan Jenne, Director, Department of Wildlife
Rebecca L. Palmer, State Historic Preservation Officer, Administrator, Office of Historic Preservation, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Steve Walker, representing Storey County, Douglas County, and Lyon County

Chair Cohen:

[Roll was called, and Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will get started with our first presentation. I will ask the Division of Forestry State Forester Firewarden, Kacey KC to come forward. Please go ahead with your presentation whenever you are ready.

Kacey KC, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

Thank you for having me here today to provide a brief overview of the Division of Forestry (NDF), and all the fun work my staff gets to do that I used to get to do. Our mission is to protect and enhance Nevada's ecosystems and communities through natural resource stewardship and wildfire management [page 2, [Exhibit C](#)]. Our primary statutory authorities lie in the *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 472 and *Nevada Administrative Code* (NAC) Chapter 472, which is that of the State Forester Firewarden; NRS Chapter 527 and NAC Chapter 527, which is the protection of timbered lands, trees, and flora; and NRS Chapter 528 and NAC Chapter 528, which is forest practices and reforestation. We also have a shared statute with the Department of Corrections in our conservation camp program in NRS Chapter 209 that allows us to operate those programs jointly.

We run a lot of programs in NDF. I am not going to name them all or list them. We are called the Division of Forestry, but as you know, there are not a lot of forests in Nevada. We manage rangelands and watersheds and everything in between. We do manage an insect and disease program. We look at wildfire suppression and rehabilitation restoration. We have suppression assets, we have helicopters, we have engines, and we have crews. All of these people who work for me also manage natural resources on a daily basis.

We manage urban forests, all the trees that are within your city limits and outside your city limits, trying to make sure that we are reducing heat islands in our populated areas, along with hazardous fuel reduction. We run two state tree nurseries, one in the north and one in the south in Las Vegas, where we sell trees that we plant for conservation purposes.

We have a conservation education program. It is one of the smaller programs that we run, but it is one of the cooler ones, I think. We help educators learn how to teach kids how to get into the outside. We make tree cookies; the kids wear tree cookies, and it is very fun. We also manage, under NRS Chapter 527, the endangered plant species for the state.

Page 4 [\[Exhibit C\]](#) shows some of the accomplishments over this past year. We were able to treat nearly 7,000 acres, an increase of almost 3,000 acres from the previous year, which was kind of a big feat when you are short-staffed all over the state. We are fairly proud of those numbers. We sold 62,000 plant materials—seeds or seedlings—out of our state tree nurseries and our seed banks. We surveyed, together with our partners at Forest Service (USFS), 7.9 million acres of the state. We usually fly over our forests and woodlands every year to look at the trends in mortality from insect and disease. We did see an increase this year, which was not really surprising, of about 120,000 acres of more tree mortality due to the drought conditions. We are not facing these conditions right in this moment, but they will come back. We anticipated those increases in insect and disease outbreaks. What we do is, we fly it, we detect it, we map it, and we send troops out on the ground and try to make sure that we actually know what we are seeing in those infestations.

We increased our Firewise USA sites across the state by 22 communities that signed up with Firewise sites. These people are taking an active role in their community and making sure that their homes are as protected as they can be as we walk into what is probably going to be a pretty big fire season this year, unfortunately. Contrary to popular belief that fire seasons do not happen every year, they do happen every year. The big ones for us follow wet winters. That is because of the grass growth in the inner spaces. We are anticipating a little bit of a fire season. It will be slower in the upper elevations because it will take a little longer for snow to melt, but we are worried about the range this year. We were able to get some contracted aircraft last year as well as our own three helicopters. We had single-engine air tankers dropping retardant last year to combat the lack of crews that we had available for initial attack of fires. That worked out very well. Between our helicopters and the 500 plus fires we had last year, we dropped about 48,400 gallons of water or retardant on those fires.

Page 5 [\[Exhibit C\]](#) focuses on a couple of the really cool initiatives that NDF is doing in partnership with all of our state, federal, and local government partners. You might have heard of the Nevada Shared Stewardship Agreement, not the Shared Stewardship Recreation Agreement. This is the first one; this was the leader in this year's stewardship agreements. It is a wildfire agreement; it really was meant to be an agreement between the USFS and NDF so that we could tell our staff that we needed to work together on the ground. In Nevada the partnership does not work just between the USFS and NDF. This is because the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is a large landowner; Natural Resources Conservation Service works with private landowners; and a lot of state agencies, including the Department of

Wildlife; the State Department of Agriculture, the Division of State Parks, the Division of State Lands, and the State Historic Preservation Office all have parts and pieces that we all manage in resource management. Our shared stewardship agreement in the state of Nevada was the first of any agreement in the U.S. to expand beyond just the two-party partnership. The point of the agreement was to look at the risks across the state of Nevada for wildfire, pick those priority landscapes across the state, and attack those risks together, regardless of jurisdictional ownership. It really is the way we should have been working all of our lives. We have worked well together as partners, but this was really a direction for us to move in a different way. Since the agreement was signed in 2019, we have increased treatments across the state by 47 percent each year of the agreement. We are hoping to hit over 50 percent this year with an onslaught of money. We collectively agreed upon the map that you see before you [page 5, [Exhibit C](#)]. We had 13 landscapes to begin with and we consolidated 2, so 11 landscapes are our priorities. Those landscapes were picked by multiple different variables and issues. The two that are receiving federal funding to the tune of a gigantic number, \$57 million, are Elko, Spring Creek, Lamoille, and the Rubies; and the Sierra Front along Carson and up to Washoe County. We are very proud of this partnership. We asked our staff to work together at the ground level, define the priorities, and work together on projects. This resulted in the funding that, hopefully, will take these two large landscapes into maintenance mode over time and reduce the risk of wildfire as it comes through.

Page 6 shows the second program that you may be interested in, our Wildland Fire Protection Program. It is a voluntary program in which we work with counties that opt into the program. We fund their fire response over the mutual aid period, which is 24 hours. If they sign onto the agreement, they pay us a portion of funds into our account based on their fire risk and the cost to the state of their fire risk. We do more than just pay their fire bills; we actually work together to reduce their risk since we then own that risk. They tell us what projects are of most priority—they live in those areas, they work there every day, and they know the communities in which we work. Our firefighters reduce those risks every day while they are not fighting fire. It is a great program in which we work together. We are proud to say this year—it is a voluntary program as I said—but we have near full participation across the state. General Lyon County does not have a fire protection district, so it is kind of ours by the new ownership of the state park. Mount Charleston is the only district in Clark County that is out, and either Mineral County or Esmeralda County; one of them is in and one of them is out. We are very proud of getting everybody into the program, and hopefully they see the value in the services that we are providing. From the state's perspective, the value is that we are on the fire with our fire cost containment staff, making sure that everything that we are ordering and implementing on a fire is kept at a minimum before we go into a cost debate at the end of the fire when everything has already been done.

Page 7 shows the final program I will talk about today, Fire Adapted Nevada. Some of you may remember the Nevada Fire Safe Council. It was a 501(c)(3) that operated in conjunction with federal and state agencies along with local communities to help understand their risk and to take part in reducing that risk since they live in high-risk areas. The Fire Safe Council went away; nobody wanted to take it over. The university did take it over for a little while but did not have the capacity to run it the same way it was. We hired a Fire Adapted Nevada

coordinator in the Division of Forestry. He is an NDF employee with an interagency partnership, much like most of our partners programs. The point of that position is to help educate communities about where they live and the roles that they can take, and also to marry up industry and agencies to figure out how we can help them. If they are taking the actions necessary to protect their homes, then we can create the fuel breaks around it. The Forest Service or the BLM can treat their land behind that, and we have protected the community when a wildfire comes through. This is the program in which we have bolstered both our community wildfire protection plans. We have been updating those feverishly with counties and communities to increase the firewise communities. I am here for questions.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

We all hold our breath a little bit every fire season because Mount Charleston is so beautiful and right outside of Las Vegas. I used to say it would take two hours when I was growing up, and now I am literally 45 minutes away from Mount Charleston, which is at 7,000 feet elevation. Why are they not participating in the shared stewardship?

Kacey KC:

I do not know why they are not participating. We used to be an all-risk fire department somewhat like Cal Fire. We had an NRS statute that allowed counties to opt into an all-risk option, and we provided all-risk local government fire protection for those counties. Mount Charleston had opted in for many years. When the recession came, we gave those responsibilities back to the counties. My guess is there might have been some bad blood in the process. I was not here for the transfer. The other thought is Mount Charleston is largely federally owned around the outside. The Carpenter 1 Fire was under our jurisdiction. We ended up paying the state portion of the Carpenter 1 Fire. When we began the program, we called it "Kentucky windage." We thought, well I guess we will charge these people this much." It was kind of based on risk analysis, but it was also based somewhat on science. We were charged with making a scientifically based formula for the program. When we did that, we analyzed the risk to the communities. We had a map of the whole state at the time, and we had to put in the costs. For the cost of the Carpenter 1 Fire, we agreed to a ten-year cost. Once the ten years are up, those costs will fall off. My guess is they are waiting for year ten, and they have two more years. We were very close when Mount Charleston asked us last year. We also had talked to the county, and the county was supposed to be in—in full—but they asked us to parse them out by fire protection district. Two years ago, when we went through the last contracting cycle, we did break out the districts and got most of them in. I think we are close with Mount Charleston, but they could not find the funding. I am hoping this year, or maybe in two years.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

There are also other areas within Clark County. Do you have agreements with other areas in Clark County?

Kacey KC:

Yes, we have agreements with everyone else in Clark County. I should point out for the record that not having a Wildland Fire Protection Program agreement does not mean we do not respond; and it does not mean that we do not provide services—we do. When we worked on our NV Energy agreement, one of the first projects we implemented, because of snow up here in the north, was a fuel reduction project in the power lines along Mount Charleston. We still do work; we just bill for all of that work. We still respond as we would anywhere else in the state. That is not affected by this. We just bill them for that response.

Assemblywoman Considine:

I noticed your presentation says "urban forestry management," and I think you said "urban heat islands." What projects are you doing for those urban heat islands, and what projects are coming up?

Kasey KC:

We have an urban forestry program coordinator in the south. He used to be housed up here but is now down in our Las Vegas office. We also have a part-time urban forester in Elko County. A lot of the focus that they have been working on is primarily funded right now through Forest Service grants through state and private forestry. We have done a lot of mapping and looking at where the heat islands are and how the underserved populations are more adversely affected by the lack of trees in those areas. We have worked with a lot of the county and community tree workers to try to teach them how to do tree care work. We convert all of our flyers and trainings into Spanish and English so that we can make sure that the tree care workers understand and are trained to the same standards. We have lots of tree planting projects. Our nurseries grow plants and we put them in schools and areas that do not have trees. We are looking to greatly expand the program with the new funding that is coming down through the bipartisan infrastructure bill and the Inflation Reduction Act. We are hoping to expand to three full-time employees across the state, which would be one per region, and addressing those areas. I think you saw the newspaper articles. Las Vegas and Reno were the third- and eighth-fastest growing cities in the nation for a while, and thus it was getting hotter. We were having dieback of vegetation, and it is becoming harder to grow trees. We are hoping to focus on planting a whole lot more trees, particularly in the underserved populations, looking at some areas where we could also utilize those trees for food. Maybe with some stormwater catch basins or drains, we could take that water to help water those facilities and help Las Vegas not flood every time it rains.

That is a lot of ideas. This is a program that other states have done very well. Due to very limited funding on our side, it is not something we have had the opportunity to break into as much. We are very excited for the increase in funding.

Assemblyman Gurr:

I may have missed what the \$57 million was to Elko County. You probably said it, and it just went right by me until you said "\$57 million." What was it allocated for? Where did it come from? Where is it going?

Kacey KC:

The \$57 million is coming through the infrastructure bill through the National Forest System funding in the U.S. Forest Service. It is coming to the two shared stewardship landscapes. It is going to be split between Elko, Spring Creek, and Lamoille; and the Sierra Front, which engulfs a portion of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest's footprint into California from Douglas County up to Washoe County. We are very excited. It will be used to reduce the fuel load and hopefully take these large landscapes into maintenance mode, which means that we are no longer having to cut a whole lot of trees and brush out of the way. We are just maintaining a system that could run fire through it. Fire will still run through it, but it will be, hopefully, a lot lower and more manageable for firefighters as it comes in and less destructive to the communities. The focus is on communities and the areas directly around them.

Assemblywoman Brown-May:

I have one question relative to the fire retardant that you are using. You noted in your presentation that 48,400 gallons of water or retardant were dropped. Can you talk a little bit about what is in the retardant and how it affects the landscape?

Kacey KC:

That is out of my realm of knowledge here, but I can get that information to you. What I can tell you is our helicopters only drop water. We lift out of small lakes, streams, wherever we can get water, even swimming pools sometimes—whatever we find that has water in it. The single-engine air tankers do use retardant. Lately, most of that retardant has been made so that it is eco-friendly. I am sure there are things in it that are not great, but they are better than the fire moving through. I can get back to you on the exact ingredients and what retardant was used in the contract aircraft.

Chair Cohen:

Going back to all the rain we have had this season, you addressed the growth of grass and how that impacts fire. What about other things that impact the health of trees and plants, such as insects and wildlife? Can you give us an idea about that?

Kacey KC:

Typically, in our wet years, we get a lot of fine, flashy fuels, primarily bromegrass—north and south—that comes into the inner spaces. That is what carries fire a lot more quickly in the wet years. Remember that in higher elevations, we are going to have snow for a lot longer, and we are likely to have less fire impact early in the season. We are likely to have more impact down low. From an insect and disease standpoint, wet years usually inhibit their movement because they do not come out as early. It is the drought years, or the years in which we are highly impacted by fire. Any major disturbance rings a dinner bell for insects and disease to come into those trees. We saw that following the fires here along the front the last couple of years: the Tamarack and Caldor Fires. There was a huge increase in die-off in the areas that were directly adjacent. Some of that is due to heat stress on the trees that survive. Usually in the wet years, it just depends on the insect. Unfortunately, most of these insects are native to these ecosystems; some are introduced. If they are native, their

populations are on a cyclic cycle; they ebb and flow. We have not, in the state map, seen huge endemic versions that are of big concern, although this year we were seeing some dieback in the Tahoe Basin that was causing us a little bit more concern, somewhat like we had seen in 2008. We are hoping for a little less dieback. The trees get a lot less stressed when they have enough water to survive and feed themselves. That is what we typically see in wet years: a little less mortality from insect and disease, and a little more mortality from wildfire.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

To follow up on the conversation about a wet year: we are also thrilled we got moisture, but there is concern that we can have an increase in fires with the grasses. What mitigation-type things are you doing? Can you inform us of what you usually practice during wet years or even nonwet years?

Kacey KC:

As I talked about in the shared stewardship initiative, it is really a joint effort with all of our partners. We are constantly looking at the highest-priority, highest-risk areas. The last couple of years have been low-fire seasons for us, and the number has remained the same. The fires have not been as large. We had a lot more time to go out and mitigate that risk. We have created fuel breaks all across the state. We have picked and prioritized the areas that are most likely to affect how fire goes through. We worked with Senate Bill 508 of the 80th Session and our NV Energy agreement very closely on trying to reduce the risk under their power lines and expanding that out so that it actually could be a fuel break for fire moving in and out, not just for fires caused underneath the right-of-way. We have done a lot of work. Since the shared stewardship agreement was signed, all agencies—state, federal, and local government—have increased our treatments about 54 percent. It is visible when you drive to Elko. You can see the fuel breaks everywhere. We will continue to do that. One of the initiatives when I first became State Forester was ensuring that our staff are out somewhere every day. That is so our firefighters are not sitting in a station waiting for the bell to ring. They are out every day cutting brush and making sure that we are reducing risk in those high-priority landscapes.

Assemblyman DeLong:

In relation to the Sierra Front area, California is a huge risk as far as a potential source of wildfire migrating across the state line because their fuel management practices are not quite up to snuff. Is there anything you have been able to do to help mitigate the risk, if not before it comes over, at least after it comes over?

Kacey KC:

Yes. In the Tahoe Basin particularly, we have been participating in the Tahoe Fire and Fuels Team since its inception following the Angora Fire and the blue-ribbon commission. It was an interagency partnership, a model for the rest of the state on how we should be working together, picking priorities, and looking at those high-risk areas. When you saw the Caldor Fire coming into the Tahoe Basin, we were fairly certain it was imminently coming into Nevada. We were ahead of that cutting brush. This was the first time ever in my 20-year

career that we not only had every firefighter in existence out there—because when Tahoe is burning, everyone is coming—but we also had over 130 NV Energy crews from across the state plus our crews from all over the state camped out at an incident command post and actually cutting line on the Nevada side, from Stateline all the way up and over Kingsbury Grade down into Genoa. We cut a fuel break trying to protect the infrastructure and the communities where we thought the fire was going to go. That was the first for us. We are always doing fuel reduction as the fire is there too. Unfortunately, Tahoe is really the only place where we manage into and out of the state of California.

We did meet with Cal Fire last week and talked about putting one of our helicopters in the basin on a more permanent basis this summer, as hired by Cal Fire so it could go into California and into Nevada as needed. We may be working on that type of agreement. Last year we worked on a Cal Fire and NDF agreement that allows us to move not only our firefighting assets, but crews should they need our crews in the basin to do work because Cal Fire is largely not present in the basin anymore. They are a little farther up the road in Placerville. We will help them with that project work if they need it. We are setting ourselves up to help each other out. I also asked them to buy giant fans to blow the smoke back into their state, but I think they are still working on that technology.

Chair Cohen:

Seeing no other questions, we will move on to a presentation from the Department of Wildlife.

Alan Jenne, Director, Department of Wildlife:

Tony Wasley, who was our director for close to ten years, recently retired and I took over this position at the beginning of the new year. I am here to give you an overview of the Department of Wildlife (NDOW). I know many of you are familiar with NDOW, but I will give you a background overview. First and foremost is the page showing our leadership [page 2, [Exhibit D](#)]. There have been some recent changes, and I want to recognize the folks who are with me. First is Jordan Goshert, Deputy Director of Administrative Services, and Mike Scott, Deputy Director of Resource Management, newly appointed literally this week. We also have Alejandra Medina, Legislative Liaison, who has been double-tasking while our other legislative liaison is out on maternity leave.

Page 3 shows NDOW's mission which has been the same for years: To protect, conserve, manage, and restore wildlife and its habitat for the aesthetic, scientific, educational, recreational, and economic benefits of citizens of Nevada and the United States, and to promote the safety of persons using vessels on the waters of Nevada. We are out there and in consideration of ecosystem function and trying to keep wild things wild and wild places in healthy condition, but also dealing with boating. Our Conservation Education Division chief often jokes that we regulate fun. We have got great jobs. We have personnel who are spread across the state in the three different regions. There are 7 divisions; 329 employees, 9 of whom are wildlife commissioners, and approximately 50 seasonal staff. It is not a very big workforce for the size of the state. We are a very small agency, but we take great pride in the

amount of work that we get done, and the effectiveness and efficiency that we have. Our employees are very purposeful and passionate about the work that they do.

Page 5 [[Exhibit D](#)] shows that our statutory charge is rather broad. We do cover 900 wildlife species in the state of Nevada. Our game wardens are category I peace officers. This is in a state that is the seventh-largest in the nation with 85 percent federal land. Trying to manage wildlife in a state that is so large with public lands really increases the amount of work that we have to do in working with the federal land management agencies.

Our funding model is kind of unique to a state wildlife agency [page 6]. Over 95 percent of our budget comes from user-derived funds. Those are typically the state license and tag funds that account for 49 percent; the other 48 percent comes from the federal funds that we get. We have Pittman-Robertson [Wildlife Restoration Act] and Dingell-Johnson [Sport Fish Restoration Act], both of which are excise taxes. For Pittman-Robertson, it is derived from guns and ammunition. For Dingell-Johnson, it is derived from motorboat fuels, small engines, and fishing tackle—things typically associated with fishing. Only 2 percent of our budget comes from the State General Fund.

Page 7 gives you a quick walk through of our different divisions, starting with the Director's office. We included the numbers of what our fiscal year (FY) 2024 and FY 2025 budgets are, which you will see for each of these entities. We had it from our budget hearing, and I figured that we would give you that information as well. In the Director's office we have the Board of Wildlife Commissioners, which falls under the purview of the Director's office, as well as the county advisory boards (CABs); fiscal services, and centralized costs; human resources; and engineering and facilities.

The Board of Wildlife Commissioners operates under *Nevada Revised Statutes* 501.171 [page 8], which specifies where the nine gubernatorial appointed commissioners come from. One comes from conservation; one from farming; one from ranching; one from the general public; and five members who, during at least the last three of the four years immediately preceding the appointment, had a resident license to fish, hunt, or both in Nevada. *Nevada Revised Statutes* 501.181 establishes the role of the Commission which is establishing broad policy for the department and adopting regulations for wildlife management and boating safety.

Page 9 shows the public process. This is a good representation of how we are set up. The Commission receives recommendations from NDOW, along with comments from the CAB, which each county has. Some of you are more familiar than others with that process. Also, the general public has the opportunity, both at the CAB meetings and at the Commission meetings, to provide public input to help the Commission as they set policies and regulations. That helps us to manage the wildlife of Nevada.

Page 10 shows our Data and Technology Services Division, which has approximately 30.63 positions, because of a seasonal position. They cover licensing, hunting applications, customer service, geographic information systems, boating registration, and information

technology. Page 11 shows some of the highlights. We consider data and technology the cash register of NDOW. They collect about 85 percent of the Department's sportsman's revenues—the hunting and fishing licenses. In a seven-week period, when we open the big game application period, we generate over \$14 million dollars from all of the applications for big game. Over the year, the call center receives over 23,000 calls from the general public. As I mentioned, we have boating registration and titling in that division, and they do over 2,100 vessel inspections in a year. Again, this is a pretty small workforce doing a lot of good work.

The Conservation Education Division has 24 positions. We have hunter safety training, hunter and angler education, wildlife education, media and public relations, and urban wildlife. Highlights from Conservation and Education, this is where the general public most interacts with us. We go out to students; we go out to the general public; often you will see us at conservation trade shows. The Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation will generally have our educators out there. Overall, the Conservation Education Division is our point of the spear on education, information sharing, and communication on all things wildlife. One of the things that people often do not know is that hunter education is one of the few education services that is regulated and has to occur. Anybody born after January 1, 1960, has to have a hunter safety card. That is supported by 300 volunteers who are spread across the state and volunteer their time to teach kids hunter safety. It is a great program because it is an in-kind match, and volunteer hours come back and fund the grant that funds that entire education program. It is a great program that has been going for a very long time. As for recent accomplishments, in 2021 we revamped the NDOW.org website, making it mobile ready, and much more modern and advanced.

Page 14 [\[Exhibit D\]](#) shows the Urban Wildlife Program within the Conservation Education Division. This is the place where we try to deal with all of those urban wildlife conflicts. We receive a ton of calls; in 2022 we received 4,703 urban wildlife calls, mostly regarding black bears, waterfowl, baby birds, and coyotes. Staff spent approximately 7,300 hours and traveled over 43,000 miles, dealing with urban wildlife issues in 2022. We are so short-staffed in this program, and most of the time we are trying to educate the public to help them address the issue without our having to be involved so that we can manage that as efficiently as possible.

We have 54 positions in our Law Enforcement Division. Our Law Enforcement Division is one of the smallest across the nation. The density of wardens that we have is the scarcest across the United States as far as the number of square miles that are covered per warden. We are way understaffed. Again, these guys are very committed to their cause and do a very good job. Within law enforcement, we have wildlife enforcement, boating enforcement, public safety, boating education, dispatch services, and radio technology.

Page 16 shows highlights from NDOW law enforcement. As I mentioned before, game wardens are the smallest force of conservation officers per square mile in the United States. They enforce wildlife, boating, and public safety law everywhere in Nevada—110,000 square miles of territory. I believe there are approximately 40 wardens who are actually out

on the ground and are dispersed across that area; it is very thin coverage. Again, they are very committed. Often you will see those silver pickups at the weirdest times in the weirdest places. That is the advantage of the job they do. They are often flying the flag and deterring folks just from their presence out there. In 2022, wardens contacted 10,035 hunters, anglers, and trappers with 595 wildlife violations and 125 firearms violations. Wardens also contacted 1,504 boats and found 840 violations of statutes and regulations. Boating is one of those things that is not often tied to NDOW, but if you have ever been on Lake Mead or Lake Mojave on the fourth of July, you will appreciate that there is actually somebody out there to enforce boating regulations—it gets a little crazy. We also administer licensing of over 500 hunting and fishing guides. Many of you know us for the Operation Game Thief Program, which provides the opportunity for people to confidentially report wildlife violations.

Page 17 [\[Exhibit D\]](#) shows that Game Management Division has 35 positions. They take care of our big game survey and inventory, and seasons and harvest quotas. We do have a landowner conflict resolution program as well as wildlife health monitoring. We have a research piece in this division as well as air operations. We have two pilots and a dedicated mechanic to our air force program. We have two Bell 407 HP helicopters that we use for wildlife surveys, slinging the materials, hauling those materials into remote locations, and also for water hauls. For our wildlife health, we have a veterinarian, a biologist, and a wildlife technician who do surveillance of wildlife diseases across the state. If you are from the north, you are pretty aware of the black bear conflict. We have two biologists who are dedicated to solely responding to black bears and dealing with them. You can see the Karelian bear dogs on page 18. They are used to create aversive training. When we lay our hands on the bears, we are trying to make that a less than positive experience for them.

One of the things that we were asked to report on is our Nevada moose population. Moose have been recorded in the state going back to the 1950s, but in recent years we have seen their numbers increase. In 2023, based on aerial surveys, we documented 54 moose: 22 bulls, 21 cows, and 11 calves. We continue to see the population increase, and it is very positive to see the 11 calves. Our moose management goals are to maintain and improve their abundance, allow for their natural expansion, and encourage and identify recreational opportunities.

In the Fisheries Management Division, we have 46 positions [page 20]. We have sport fish production, which is where we deal with people who want to catch fish. To support that, we have our fish hatchery management program; native aquatics; aquatic health monitoring; and our aquatic invasive species. Highlights from fisheries include over 500 fishable waters in the state, with over 30 different game fish species. Additionally, we have 100 species of native fish and amphibians, 27 of those are federally listed. Nevada's urban fishery program continues to increase fishing opportunities. There are a number of ponds that we have been dealing with. There is one in Sparks called the Lennar Pond. We are dealing with the city of Sparks on that, trying to increase that opportunity. We are also working in cooperation with the mining industry and the city of Elko on the 12th Street pond to try to take a piece of ground that is adjacent to the river and develop that for an urban fishery so that the kids can just pedal down on their bicycles and go fishing. We have four fish hatcheries spread across

the state, three of them raise and rear trout for sport fishing. The one on Lake Mead rears native species to support the Colorado River Basin. There are some fish down there that are endemic, but in the world of endemic fish, there are megafauna—razorback suckers—which get to a pretty good size. It is a really neat program, and we have a nice visitor center there. I would encourage you to go out and see that site. Additionally, we have the aquatic invasive species program. We have quagga mussels in Lake Mead and the Colorado River system, and we are trying to make sure that they do not spread to the rest of the state or to our surrounding states. We conduct greater than 4,000 inspections on watercraft annually in Nevada. We are proud to say that we have not seen those quagga mussels expand beyond the Colorado River system.

Page 22 [[Exhibit D](#)] shows the Wildlife Diversity Division. We have 13 positions that deal with the Nevada Wildlife Action Plan, the nongame species management, threatened and endangered species, and members of the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program. Highlights from wildlife diversity include managing the nongame terrestrial species, including reptiles, mammals, and birds. They coordinate the development and implementation of the Nevada Wildlife Action Plan. In that plan, we have 267 of 900 different species that are actually designated a species of greatest conservation need. Those are things that could use our help. In that wildlife action plan, we have different ways that we have presented to try to help them and their habitats. As I mentioned, the Wildlife Diversity program represents us on the Lake Tahoe Environmental Improvement Program.

The Habitat Division has 39 positions. The division includes development project review, industrial development program, the habitat restoration and rehabilitation program, Nevada partners program, water development, and wildlife management areas. Highlights of the Habitat Division include being the point of contact for the National Environmental Policy Act dealing with the federal lands. We review over 500 projects annually. Additionally, we manage 88 industrial artificial ponds, which are ponds that have chemicals that may be harmful to wildlife. Across the state we have 1,700 water developments that are managed by the Habitat Division, including constructed watering facilities, known as guzzlers. We have 13 designated wildlife management areas totaling over 157,000 acres. As Ms. KC mentioned, we do participate in the shared stewardship program. We work with our federal land management agencies to try to rehabilitate our federal lands. In the last five years we restored over half a million acres. We have a very active program to try to assist and promote the rehabilitation of those programs on federal lands. Additionally, we have an energy review program where we have worked with more than 80 proposed energy projects to evaluate potential impacts, or to avoid and minimize those impacts, to wildlife.

Page 26 shows our very recent accomplishments. We have the creation of the HuntNV and FishNV apps. Those are places where you can go get information on fishing and hunting. We have implemented over 62,000 acres of rehabilitation efforts this last fall. We have had the establishment of the Carson Lake and Argenta Wildlife Management Areas in recent years. We have also had the deployment of body cameras on our game wardens. I mentioned the urban fishing ponds. Additionally, we have just recently finished the upgrade of our Comins Lake boating facilities in Ely. We put in a new concrete boat ramp

and handicap access; it is very nice. We created the Mule Deer Enhancement program in 2021, and since then we have sought the approval of and received for 37 different projects. As I mentioned the revision of the Nevada Wildlife Action Plan, we are waiting on final acceptance of that by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. We went through a tag and license simplification process. It made it much easier to participate in hunting and fishing. It did away with all the stamps, and it made it a much simpler process and reduced costs especially to our juniors and our seniors. Just recently we completed our five-year department strategic plan, and we will be handing that out to anybody who has not received it.

I want to end with the challenges that we see facing us. Not foreign to state agencies is our capacity, recruitment, and retention. We are sitting around 20 percent vacancy right now within the department. Despite the shuffling of chairs behind me, in the leadership team we have about 30 percent vacancy. It is a problem. We see employees leaving to go to federal agencies or other entities that pay better, and we have a tougher time recruiting. We look forward to the solutions that the Governor is considering and hope that this improves. It is a challenge with such a small workforce.

The other two things are much more nature-driven. Drought—luckily it looks like we are breaking the back on drought this year. Hopefully that is the trend carrying into the future. It is very tough when we see dry periods as long as we have seen. Associated with that, but often driven by other things, is habitat loss and conversion. Since 1986, we have seen a 55 percent loss or conversion of our sagebrush habitats in this state. When you contemplate that, those are some of the more productive lands where our wildlife lives. It is no wonder our wildlife populations are following those changes in our habitats. Thank you for your time and I stand for any questions.

Chair Cohen:

Before I get to questions, will you let members who are new on the Committee know what guzzlers are? You mentioned them, and it is not something that a lot of us deal with on a regular basis.

Alan Jenne:

Guzzlers are water collections. Basically, it is a metal roof that is designed to intercept the precipitation before it hits the ground. The water goes down into the gutter system and is collected and piped into a tank that is often underneath it. It stores the water and makes it available to wildlife. There is often a drinker on the big game units that are outside and available to wildlife. That is about a 3-foot by 3-foot drinker. Some of those units can be upwards of 18,000 gallons. When I say 18,000 gallons, they are designed to work down south in the Las Vegas where some years we might see only two inches of precipitation, but we can sustain hundreds of wildlife and all species with the guzzlers.

Assemblywoman Considine:

I have a question on law enforcement. One of the statistics is that game wardens contacted 1,504 boats and found 840 violations. Is that indicative of a lack of staffing because there

were 840 violations, more than half of the boats contacted? Or is it indicative of some boats just had a boatload of violations?

Alan Jenne:

Often when you look at those numbers, it is much like the Nevada Highway Patrol. The officer is sitting there and there are a lot of boats going around him. He does not contact every boat; he contacts the problem boats. That is a small number of the total number of boats. Some of those are merely educational contacts. The reason that percentage is so skewed is because they are dealing with problem boats that have attracted their attention.

Assemblyman Watts:

I know that among many other activities, there was some increased interest in sporting activities during the pandemic. I think we saw a lot of increases, not just in Nevada, but in general, in terms of fishing licenses, hunting licenses, and applications. Can you speak to any initial trends we are seeing? I know that, for example, big game applications have not opened for this year yet, but what are we seeing with those trends moving forward? Have we already seen it take a dip? Do we think that we are going to end up leveling off above where we were, or do you think we are going to see a lot of that interest that came up subside?

Alan Jenne:

Everybody saw it. As we saw COVID-19 hit, everybody wanted to go outdoors and enjoy themselves because they could not get together with their friends. We saw a blip. We are now starting to see that come down a little bit. In Nevada, we have seen a little bit different response. We have changed some of the regulations as far as applications on the big game species. While some of our licenses have actually gone down, we have seen an increased rate of participation in the number of applications that are submitted per person. We have also seen a greater interest since COVID-19 from our nonresidents. We do see greater participation there, but we do see a little bit of a downtick right now. We are curious to see what this year brings.

Assemblyman Watts:

You highlighted some of the overarching challenges that we are seeing, particularly when it comes to the sportsmen opportunity, which really depends on the health of the species and their overall numbers. At a high level, without getting into all the nitty gritty of the numbers, what are we seeing, especially with some of those big game species in terms of the health of the different populations?

Alan Jenne:

Because of the trend of what I think is 22 years of drought—and some of the most recent being very extreme—one of the biggest drivers in wildlife populations, especially in the driest state in the nation, is precipitation. We continue to see our populations follow that influence of drought. That not only affects the amount of feed on the landscape, but consider that often affects the recruitment rate as well. We may end up with animals going into winter that cannot carry a fetus because of their body condition, and we start to see the populations

dive. We are seeing every one of our populations, with the exception of mountain goats which is a very small population, and maybe moose, are all going down.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

You mentioned the populations are going down. Are the mountain lion populations going down?

Alan Jenne:

The mountain lion population is, as we see right now, mostly stable.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

In regard to Operation Game Thief, could you let the rest of the Committee members know who might not know, how that is funded? Maybe not now, but if you could get us some numbers on the issue of poaching and how big of a problem is that in Nevada. If you have some of those statistics on big game in particular, maybe you could share those with us offline.

Alan Jenne:

I will admit that I do not know the funding of Operation Game Thief. I do know the program is actually targeted so that citizens can call in or we have got a 411 app now where a caller can use his cell phone and report the violation through that site. I will give each and every one of you a response to Operation Game Thief and how it is funded, and also the number of cases that have come through the program.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

I noticed that during hunting season there is quite a presence of the Operation Game Thief. The big trailers are usually in area 6 or 7, some of the bigger big game hunting areas in the state. They seem to have a big presence there for either deterrence or checking. I have noticed them out there in some pretty remote spots, so you are being seen and hopefully that lends to helping in your efforts.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

I noticed a theme within your presentation but also within the Division of Forestry (NDF) and some of the other ones we have seen, which is habitat loss and conservation and all these challenges. I wonder how much you are working with other departments and divisions on those conservation efforts.

Alan Jenne:

It was great to follow Ms. KC because we are friends and also partners. We work a ton together. The shared stewardship is the spirit of that in the official mechanism, but we work together a lot. It is about trying to find the most effective and efficient ways to put that work on the ground. We work with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Forest Service, NDF, and all the other players to try to evaluate what we are doing. Oftentimes we work with BLM on certain instances where we have contracts as the state which are much more cost-effective, and we will take the lead on a particular portion of a project to save the dollars

so that we can stretch the acres. The BLM may come in and cover some other portion of that project because they have contracts, and they have the resources to do that work. We often look at those priority landscapes and we think, How are we most efficiently and most cost effectively going to get this done? We do a lot of work together.

Chair Cohen:

Do we have any other questions? Seeing none, thank you very much. With that, we will move on to our first bill hearing. Assembly Bill 46 makes various changes relating to historical markers. Please go ahead when you are ready. Committee, I will remind you that there is an amendment to this bill.

Assembly Bill 46: Makes various changes relating to historical markers. (BDR 33-240)

Rebecca L. Palmer, State Historic Preservation Officer, Administrator, Office of Historic Preservation, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

I am here today to present Assembly Bill 46 and to speak to the amendment proposed by my office [[Exhibit E](#)]. The amendment has been submitted to the Committee.

Put very simply, A.B. 46 is a bill that will, if enacted, reinvigorate the Nevada historical marker program by creating a cost-effective method of constructing and maintaining these roadside interpretive icons.

Assembly Bill 46, with the proposed amendment, reassigns the maintenance and construction responsibilities for Nevada's 274 historical markers from the Office of Historic Preservation to the Division of State Parks (NDSP). Pursuant to *Nevada Revised Statutes* 383.091, the office is responsible for establishing the qualifications and standards for the historical marker program as well as the historical research, designation, inventory, and updating of text for historical markers. These responsibilities fit well with our mission. However, the office does not have the staff, resources, or expertise to fulfill the maintenance or construction responsibilities of this program.

From 1977 to 2019, the office used revenue from multiple sources, including the Commission on Tourism and the Department of Transportation to hire contractors who were willing to undertake the construction and maintenance tasks for this marker program. While not a cost-effective approach, these contracts did ensure that the office could undertake a minimal level of maintenance and replacement. Since 2019, however, the office has been unsuccessful in locating any contractors willing to submit a proposal to continue the construction and maintenance program despite numerous attempts. It is highly unlikely that such parties will be any more willing in the future to submit proposals. Without the continued maintenance required for the program, markers have been damaged or even removed from Nevada's roadsides without feasible plans for their repair or replacement. This high-profile public interpretive program will continue to deteriorate unless a more cost-effective and collaborative approach for their maintenance is found.

Assembly Bill 46 serves as that cost-effective and collaborative approach needed to ensure the long-term preservation of the roadside historic interpretive program.

I will now review the bill along with the proposed changes in the amendment. Section 1 of the bill corrects what amounts to a historical oversight by removing the responsibility for the construction and maintenance of the markers from the office. The marker program was assigned to the newly created office in 1977 after it was transferred from NDSP. The construction and maintenance of any structure, including the markers, has never been within the capacity of the office as it does not have the facility, personnel, or equipment sufficient to complete the task. Section 1 also codifies the review process for new marker texts as it has evolved since 1977 when the office did not have a professional historian and the Nevada Historical Society served in that capacity. Section 1, subsection 2 and subsection 4 of the bill, as drafted, have been deleted by the proposed amendment [pages 1 and 2, [Exhibit E](#)]. Section 2 and section 3 of the bill as drafted have been deleted [pages 2 and 3]. The amendment adds a new section 2 [page 4] which assigns the installation, maintenance, and repair responsibilities to NDSP. This concludes my testimony, and I would be happy to answer any questions you might have.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I have had a chance to do just a little bit more research about where these markers are. I know that there are a few that are on school property and/or on other state or county properties. Does NDSP plan on working with the school districts and/or those other entities in the upkeep?

Rebecca Palmer:

We have 61 markers that are on lands either privately owned, owned by nonprofit entities, or owned by local governments. I do not have the figure of how many might be on school property, but I would be glad to find that information and provide it to the Chair for distribution.

Assemblywoman Anderson:

I just want to ensure that there continues to be a conversation with the school districts and/or the other county entities, whether it is NDSP, that they work together on the upkeep of these markers. I think what you bring forward is a very important element, especially the fact that you cannot seem to find anybody to do it and NDSP has volunteered to do so. I am not sure if somebody from NDSP could possibly discuss this as well, or if there are other ways that there have been partnerships in the past

Robert Mergell, Administrator, Division of State Parks, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources:

This bill, if passed, will allow the Division of State Parks to maintain the 274 historic markers located throughout the state. The division has maintenance personnel located around the state with the expertise needed to perform much of the maintenance required to maintain these historic markers in-house rather than contracting those services out. The division recognizes that it has been challenging to contract those services as the markers are

often located in remote locations. By taking over maintenance responsibilities for the historic marker program, NDSP will be able to add the locations to all of the historical markers to a mobile app currently being developed. The app will allow visitors to the state to pinpoint the location of each marker and read the historical information associated with those markers. The app will also have the functionality to allow the public to report problems they may see with the markers. This public reporting information will allow the division to receive real time information about the condition of the markers, which will help the division identify and prioritize maintenance needs.

Sharing the responsibility for the historic marker program and keeping the program within the department allows for each division to utilize their strengths, which ultimately provides a better service to the citizens of the state. Thank you for your time allowing me to add that testimony and I think more specifically to answer the Assemblywoman's questions. This will put the responsibility of maintaining, installing, and interpreting those markers onto the Division of State Parks, which is something that we know how to do.

Assemblyman DeLong:

I just want to make sure that the Division of State Parks testimony got into the record that they are supportive of this amendment. I think that has been addressed.

Assemblywoman Duran:

I appreciate the fact that the Division of State Parks is going to pick up the work of doing the maintaining of the historical markers. As you know, the concerns that I have are the funding. I spoke with Ms. Palmer yesterday concerning that. I understand that the funding is probably through donations and there is a little bit of money. Is the transfer of that money going to be directed to NDSP? Because of the fact that we know that there is a shortage of workers throughout the state, I am concerned that this will be included to help maintain a person to do this work.

Robert Mergell:

The current funding that comes from the Department of Transportation will come to NDSP, and any donations that entities or individuals might want to provide to help with that maintenance or installation of new markers, that type of thing, would come to NDSP. We do have a donation account that we can set up to take that money and make sure that it goes where it is supposed to.

Assemblywoman La Rue Hatch:

As a history teacher, this touches my heart. I appreciate trying to preserve this program. I have a question on the amendment [\[Exhibit E\]](#). On the second page, the new section 1, subsection 2, it says, "When the owner of private property consents to the placement by a nonprofit organization . . ." Then it goes on to say that the nonprofit organization will help maintain the marker. I would like some clarity between whether it is NDSP or the nonprofit organization who is maintaining that and when?

Rebecca Palmer:

The answer to the question is, that section addresses markers placed by nonprofit entities. It does not pertain to the Nevada historical marker program. That was inserted into law because of the concerns of nonprofit entities wanting to place markers on private property.

Chair Cohen:

I am really excited about the app because I cannot tell you how many times I have driven across the state and seen a marker and thought, When I get to wherever I am going, I am going to look up that marker, and I never do. Is there a way for you to work with the municipalities and other agencies to make sure that information about the app is out there? For instance, when the city of Las Vegas does their tourism information, maybe there is a link on their website.

Robert Mergell:

The short answer is yes. We are going to try to get the information associated with that app as widely distributed as we can because it is going to serve a lot of different functions for NDSP. This is going to make it more usable, more applicable statewide. We want to get to where it will read the marker for you as you drive past it. That is not on the immediate horizon, but down the road. That is where we are trying to take it.

Chair Cohen:

When I met with the director, he gave me some information about the condition of some of the markers. Can you give us some information about the condition of some of the markers right now?

Rebecca Palmer:

Some markers are in terrible condition. I wish I had a way to address the concerns of the public. This is a very popular program. We have individuals who make it a mission to visit these markers and they are very disappointed when a marker is in poor condition or nonexistent. We have not had an inventory since the last contractor left in 2019, but those records indicate at that time we had six missing markers. I suspect there are probably more now. This will be an opportunity to conduct an inspection of those markers so that there are eyes out there. The app will allow the public to report the condition of the marker in real time. It will be an opportunity that goes beyond what we do now, which is receive emails from members of the public saying that this one is gone, or this one was damaged, or whatever. We do not have an inventory of their condition at this point and have not since 2019.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Administrator Mergell, if this bill were to go through, I am assuming there would be a priority, a way of assessing which markers are in need to be addressed first. Has that assessment been done, or would that be part of the process?

Robert Mergell:

We have not done that yet. If markers have been identified as being missing, then those would become the priority, because again, you hate to have people show up to a historic site expecting to read a marker and have nothing to read. The missing markers would be the priority, obviously, and then we would make it a point to try to get out and physically see them as soon as we can and then come up with a list. Unreadable ones would be next in line. The other thing though is trying to get this app moving forward. If people showed up and had the app, they would at least know the text that was supposed to be on the marker while they are standing there. That is kind of our push right now. We cannot really do that until this bill passes because they are not my responsibility right now. The app that we are developing is definitely an NDSP app. It is going to cost the state a whole lot more if we have another entity. Right now, with the State Historic Preservation Office, it would cost the state tens of thousands of dollars more to add them as a user. We do not want to do that.

Assemblywoman Hansen:

Ms. Palmer, you shared an inspirational story about how these markers can have an effect for some individuals. For the record, will you share that story.

Rebecca Palmer:

I have been with the Division for 28 years, and I have seen a lot of people come in who just absolutely love these markers. The most compelling story I heard was a veteran who had recently returned from Afghanistan. His psychiatrist had recommended that he find an outlet for his negative energies. He discovered that if he got on his motorcycle, he could ride to every one of those markers. What he did, just to make sure everyone knew he was there, he took a selfie. He brought in a binder that was three inches thick full of all of the markers he had visited. It reminds me of why I am doing what I am doing. This obviously made him a more complete person and it saved a veteran who had served our country well.

Chair Cohen:

Thank you for sharing that story with us. I think that sounds like we have a movie in the making.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

Your story actually dovetails nicely with my question. I think we can begin with those photos and see which markers we need to address first. I love the idea of an app. I assume there will be an ability for people to upload a picture because we all have a different idea of when something is completely destroyed. It sounds like we already have it documented. We have a good place to start with this. Did he leave a copy, or did he take it with him?

Rebecca Palmer:

Unfortunately, I did not have the presence of mind to ask for a copy. I wish I had. I have his contact information, and I will be reaching out.

Assemblywoman Bilbray-Axelrod:

I think it would be a good place to start.

Chair Cohen:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, we will move on to support. Is there anyone for support of A.B. 46 in Carson City?

Steve Walker, representing Storey County, Douglas County, and Lyon County:

We are supportive of the amended version of the bill. We think it makes a lot of sense that one entity would be involved in maintenance of these markers instead of multiple ones. Again, we are in total support.

Chair Cohen:

Is there anyone else in support in Carson City? Seeing no one, and seeing no one in Las Vegas and no one in Elko, let us check the phones. Hearing no one, is there anyone in opposition in Carson City or Las Vegas? Seeing no one, is there anyone on the phones? Hearing no one, we are moving on to neutral. Is anyone in Carson City or Las Vegas in neutral? Seeing no one, is there anyone on the phones? Hearing no one, would the presenters like to make a closing statement? No? Okay, thank you very much for the presentation. It is very heartening to see state agencies working so well together. This will be a great program. With that, I will close the hearing on A.B. 46, and move on to public comment. [Public comment rules and protocol were reviewed. Public comment was heard.]

Chair Cohen:

I will close public comment. Before we adjourn, just a reminder that our next meeting will be in this room on Monday. Thank you all very much and have a good weekend. We are adjourned [at 5:35 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Davis
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Division of Forestry Overview," dated February 15, 2023, presented by Kacey KC, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

[Exhibit D](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "Nevada Department of Wildlife," presented by Alan Jenne, Director, Department of Wildlife.

[Exhibit E](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 46](#), presented by Rebecca L. Palmer, State Historic Preservation Officer, Administrator, Office of Historic Preservation, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.