

MINUTES OF MEETING - ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE - April 1, 1969

PRESENT: GETTO, YOUNG (R), HAFEN (B), BROOKMAN, CLOSE, DINI
HOWARD

ALSO PRESENT: GARRY STONE, BILL HICKS, ANCHOR

CHAIRMAN Getto opened meeting and called for discussion
on AB-718.

Mr. Garry Stone representing the Carson Water Subcon-
servancy Districts, addressed the committee (see copy of
Stone report attached.)

Mr. Young then asked what the difference was between sub-
district and district.

Answer: -- the legislature set up the district consis-
ting of Washoe, Storey, Churchill, Douglas and Ormsby
counties, and allowed 8 mills for taxation.

Now, it is 10 cents but only 4 cents is being used by
the subdistricts that the other 6 cents is not being
assessed.

Question: What becomes of the money?

Answer: It is used for purposes of construction.

Getto: I am still mixed up - why are you not assessing
the 6 cents.

Answer: We are the only agency having control of the
Carson River Subconservancy Districts and have not seen
the need of this.

Question: Are the subdistricts broken down in 160 acres

Page 2

or less?

Answer: No sir, they are not.

Mr. Anchor representing the Soil Conservation Committee was asked to remark on Mr. Stone's report and he said he agreed with it and that there was strong support in the community that he knew of absolutely no opposition. Both Mr. Anchor and Mr. Stone said that they had received a phone call from Mr. Fred Settlemyer suggesting an amendment to the bill covering legal fees.

Motion made by Howard To reconsider AB-718
Motion seconded by Young
Motion carried unanimously.

Motion made by Young to pass AB-718 as amended with "do pass" recommendation
Motion seconded by Howard
Motion carried unanimously
Chairman Getto said he would like to hear comment on SB-239, that it had been suggested amending out Livestock buyeers.

Assemblyman Close said he would like to have the bill based upon the business a man is doing, that he felt the government had no right to tell a man he can't do business because he can't afford the bond. He added he was reluctant to putting a man out of business. While some men could afford to put up this kind of bond others could not afford it and it seemed to discriminate between the big operators and the small ones.

Mr. Hicks then told the committee that he had heard of very little support for this legislation other than from Churchill County and for some reason they were supporting it.

Mr. Close was then asked if he would be agreeable to getting amendments prepared and he answered that he didn't feel that he was knowledgeable enough with all phases of what it should be.

Mr. Hicks then said that he did not feel that they wanted to legislate for every-body's problems.

Page 3

Assemblyman Brookman then remarked that the legislature had voted out a like issue in Pest Control.

Mr. Young observed that most of the cattlebuyers were already bonded with P.S. and that P. S. within a few hours could research this data. Mr. Close said he felt that most people are going to protect themselves against loss and the suggestion by Mr. Hicks was that as soon as the sale was made to have the check verified. Then it was mentioned that if a party contracted for a load of hay and this bill was passed it would make the little man selling one load of hay come up with a great big bond.

Mrs. Brookman then said that Mr. Hicks had suggested that livestock buyers be bonded higher and the thought was advanced that they did not want to be responsible for these people thru legislation.

On protecting the seller it was suggested that some means of giving title to the livestock along with the bill of sale might be effective.

Mr. Close said that they had this discussion two years ago and that by upping the bond from \$5000 to \$10,000 they were bound to put some people out of business. Mr. Howard added that perhaps some increase was needed in some areas as Nevada was becoming such a huge agricultural and industrial state but he felt that this bill was putting people out of business.

Assemblyman Brookman then suggested that the Legislative Council set up a committee for research and and this was opposed by the committee.

It was suggested that discussion be deferred to Thursdays meeting.

The committee then referred to AB-755 which says only that livestock must be researched within 24 hours. And it was brought out that this Bill was conflicting. In regard to this Mr. Hicks said it appeared that what was needed was a uniform code so that the money people could be responsible.

Mr. Close then stated he felt that this was putting the auctioneers in a bind if there was a lien on the livestock he had to pay off the lien and that he did not like this bill at all.

Mr. Hicks suggested that something should be worked out

Page 4

on the 5 - day clause that he did not feel that money should be held five days. Mr. Dini said this was hard on the auctioneer that he had to research the banks and loans on cattle that he felt you had two conflicting laws and he would like to have one or the other.

When Mr. Getto inquired how this was going to be put into law the answer was perhaps the suggestion that the buyer of stock sign an affidavit had merit.

The question was then presented as to just who would be responsible - there was nothing to stop a man from taking off with the money., and that it did not give much protection to the auction yard.

Mr. Young then said he thought it was too late in the session to have any work done on it now.

AB-755 - no action - still in committee.

Discussion was then requested on AB-728.

The committee was informed that the Dairy Commission was supposed to have made the remark that it cost them five additional inspectors, and there seemed to be a variety of opinions as to how this bill was written and on what if any amendment should be made.

Assemblyman Brookman then as suggested a compromise be reached on the divergence of opinions and asked Mr. Close what he would wish.

Mr. Close replied that this could conceivably be the source of a new industry for the state, but he added that he did not want "bottle on premises" included. Mr. Hicks then stated that he felt it was the only way that money could be made in this operation was to bottle on premises. But it was generally conceded that there were many possibilities as to how this action could be handled and each would have to be defined in the bill.

Motion made by Close for reconsideration of AB-728

Motion seconded by Brookman

Motion defeated 2 ayes 4 nays

AB-728 postponed indefinitely

Meeting adjourned

STATEMENT CONCERNING THE RE-INTRODUCTION OF AB 718

Garry Stone

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee.

My name is Garry Stone, I am Secretary-Manager of the Carson Water Subconservancy District.

I appeared before this committee on March 11, at which time I requested the introduction of a bill which would amend the Conservancy District Act, more specifically, Section 541,150, paragraph 4, which would allow conservancy subdistricts to levy and collect taxes for purposes of construction, operation and maintenance of works of subdistricts.

This committee did introduce such legislation, and the bill, AB-718 was printed and returned to the committee on March 19. Chairman Getto informed me on March 27 that AB-718 had been killed in committee on March 20.

Upon request, Chairman Getto graciously afforded me the opportunity to appear before you today to request the re-introduction of AB-718.

Realizing full well the work load carried by each of you, the late date of this request, and the already lengthy session you have endured, I would like to thank Chairman Getto and the members of this committee for the opportunity to once again appear and make this request.

I did not, during my last appearance, spend a great deal of time explaining the reasons for requesting this legislation, nor the significance of it to those who live within the subdistrict. I was under the impression at that time that a hearing would be conducted concerning AB-718.

Now, however, I believe that I must point out to you the need for such legislation, the benefits that it will provide for the residents of the Carson River watershed, and certain factors which should be considered by the committee in judging the merits of AB-718.

1. This legislation effects only one area of the state, for there is only one Conservancy Subdistrict. The main district within which
] the Subdistrict lies, is authorized by statute to expend tax monies for purposes of construction.

Stone report #2

2. AB-718 does not, I repeat, does not raise the tax rate established by statute. The rate of \$0.10 per \$100.00 assessed valuation is allowed under NRS 541.150, but only for purposes of organization and administration and for surveys and plans.

3. Many millions of dollars of Federal monies have been spent on the Carson River channel following floods in recent years. Much of this money could have been saved if maintenance work had been accomplished prior to heavy spring run-off. Under existing legislation, the subdistrict cannot do this work, and the Federal government cannot expend money until the damage is done.

4. Overwhelming local support for this legislation has been received from the Douglas County Commissioners, Carson Valley Chamber of Commerce Carson-Truckee Water Conservancy District, Soil Conservation District, Farm Bureau, Resource Action Council, and many local business men and taxpayers.

[5]-----

6. AB-718 would make it possible to construct a flood control project on the Carson River which would alleviate these floods, which become even more disastrous and costly as the area grows and more and more homes are constructed along the river. The danger to roads, bridges, farmland and homes becomes more critical as costs rise.

[5]--- The provisions of AB-718 become even more important this year due to the extremely heavy snow pack and the anticipated high spring flows of the river. The channel, from state line to Lahontan Reservoir is expected to suffer heavy damage which will have to be repaired.

7. If it became the desire of the constituents of the subdistrict to construct such a facility, the flood control and recreational benefits provided thereby become of significant importance, not only to the Carson area, but to the State of Nevada as well.

I do not want to give the impression to this committee that if AB-718 becomes

Stone report - #3

law, miracles will occur overnight, however, I do think it important that you realize the necessity of this legislation to the people who reside within the boundaries of the subconservancy district.

We are a subdistrict within the boundaries of the Carson-Truckee Water Conservancy District, which is allowed, by statute to do what this bill would permit the subdistrict to do. Ab-718 merely localizes this authority and makes it possible for the seven member Board of Directors of the subdistrict to expend tax dollars in a more realistic and beneficial manner.

I again would like to thank the members of this committee for their indulgence and for the opportunity to appear before you today. If there are any questions I would be happy to answer them for you.