

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

**Seventy-Sixth Session
March 1, 2011**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Maggie Carlton at 1:32 p.m. on Tuesday, March 1, 2011, in Room 3161 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, 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
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amelie Welden, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Judith Coolbaugh, Committee Secretary
Sherwood Howard, Committee Assistant

OTHERS PRESENT:

Jim R. Barbee, Acting Director, State Department of Agriculture
Lon Beal, Administrator, Division of Measurement Standards, State Department of Agriculture
Mark Jensen, Director, Division of Resource Protection, State Department of Agriculture
Anette Rink, DVM, Ph.D., Laboratory Supervisor, Animal Disease and Food Safety Laboratory, Division of Animal Industry, State Department of Agriculture
JoAnn Mothershead, Administrator, Elko Office, Division of Livestock Identification, State Department of Agriculture
Dawn Rafferty, Administrator, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture
Steve Marty, Agriculturist IV, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture
Jeff B. Knight, Entomologist, Insect Survey and Identification, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture
Charles W. Moses, Environmental Scientist IV, Environmental Compliance Branch, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture
Dean Baker, representing Baker Ranches, Inc.

Chair Carlton:

[Roll was called.] We will start with our introduction and overview of the Nevada Department of Agriculture (NDOA). We will go through the different portions of it and save our questions for the end.

Jim R. Barbee, Acting Director, State Department of Agriculture:

My portion will be very brief ([Exhibit C](#)), and we will have each of our division administrators come up and go through their specific programs.

The mission of the NDOA is to encourage advancement and protection of agriculture and related industries. We strive to ensure the economic environmental viability of Nevada's agriculture by promoting economic stability, food safety and security for all citizens, protect access to water, work

effectively with other regulatory agencies, and ensure equitability of the agriculture, petroleum, and commercial marketplaces.

[Continued to read from prepared testimony.]

I would like to turn it over to Lon Beal, the Division Administrator for our Measurement Standards section.

Chair Carlton:

If I could stop you on that last slide (slide 6), it is very difficult to read. If you could go over it, that would be appreciated.

Jim Barbee:

To the far left is the Division of Animal Industry, which would include veterinary services. The next one to the right is the Administrative Division, which would include the director, administrative assistant, accounting positions, and administrative services positions. The next one over is the Division of Measurement Standards, and they would be leaving and going to the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV). The one to the right of the yellow is the Division of Livestock Identification. That will be followed by the Division of Resource Protection Wildlife Services, and that program will be presented. To the far right is the Division of Plant Industry, which is our largest division by both budget and staff. I can get you a better copy if you need it.

Chair Carlton:

Thank you, I appreciate that. Can you tell me how many of those positions are currently vacant?

Jim Barbee:

I believe we only have two vacant positions. One of those is in Measurement Standards, and one is in veterinary services.

Lon Beal, Administrator, Division of Measurement Standards, State Department of Agriculture:

I want to begin with the Bureau of Weights and Measures, Budget 4551. The powers and duties of the Bureau of Weights and Measures are mandated in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapters 581, 582, and 590. The department director is the State Sealer of the Bureau of Weights and Measures. The State Sealer is charged with licensing and certification of commercial weighing and measuring devices. The Bureau of Weights and Measures inspectors conduct annual inspections of all weighing and measuring devices in the State of Nevada. Inspections follow the intent of NRS Chapter 581, and the guidelines published by the National Institute of Standards Technology (NIST).

These standards, along with subsequent revisions, are the reference implementation for NRS Chapter 581.

The Bureau's inspectors conduct yearly device inspections for fuel dispensers to check volumetric accuracy. The inspectors collect samples of motor fuels for analysis by the Department's Bureau of Petroleum Technology. They determine whether or not the motor fuels are in compliance with the standards published by the American Society for Testing Materials (ASTM) International. The inspection of the advertising and labeling of motor fuel dispensers, storage tanks, and the quality of fuels is covered in the Nevada Liquefied Petroleum Gas Act and cited in NRS Chapter 590.

The Bureau regulates registered service agents (RSA). Registered service agents install new measuring devices and repair and calibrate scales that are determined by Bureau inspectors to be out of specification. The RSA can conditionally return a previously failed device with notification to the Bureau. The inspectors recheck the device at the earliest opportunity.

The Bureau also regulates public weighmasters. Public weighmasters certify weight information for a fee and require a license as specified by the Bureau. The Bureau inspectors inspect public weighmasters' scales and audit their weigh tickets for compliance.

The Bureau maintains a metrology lab, which houses the state of Nevada standards for mass, length, and volume. The metrology lab is recognized by, and directly traceable to the NIST. The Sparks metrology lab is currently awaiting notification and accreditation by the National Voluntary Laboratory Accreditation Program (NVLAP). This accreditation propels the Sparks metrology lab to the status of an international entity and will make the lab a magnet for businesses and government entities from surrounding states that are in need of services of a fully accredited metrology laboratory.

The state metrologist certifies the fuel standards used by Weights and Measures inspectors and RSAs. The Bureau of Weights and Measures is tasked with inspecting packaged goods to determine the stated amounts, sizes, and pricing are correct. Additionally, the Bureau tests point-of-sale scanners to ensure the prices scanned at the register match posted or advertised prices.

The NIST is part of the U.S. Department of Commerce, and its organization includes the Division of Measurement Standards. The NIST develop standards and systems for efficient operation of commerce between the states. Weights and measures standards-based systems deal primarily with the commercial use of scale and metering systems, typically found at grocery stores

and service stations. They also develop standards for the packaging and labeling of goods offered for sale as well as for price verification. Nevada is a member of the Western Weights and Measures Association and has voting privileges on subjects such as tolerances and specifications, testing procedures, and other protocol as part of the NIST operating handbooks.

The Bureau of Weights and Measures is a neutral third-party in the commercial transactions between buyer and seller that involve weight and measurements. The Bureau ensures each party is represented fairly in buying and selling of goods and services. Most commodities are either weighed or measured at some point, and this process affects the consumer every day. The Bureau responds to complaints and takes necessary actions to correct any improper or misrepresented activities. Many of the devices that are tested by the Bureau are supplied with security systems, which are sealed by the inspectors at the time of inspection to ensure there is no fraud due to improper adjustment of the device between annual inspections. Package inspections by the Bureau ensure the public receives the correct amount of product as stated on the label and the price charged as advertised. Fuel dispensers are tested for correct tolerances and labeling. Samples of the fuel are analyzed to determine if the gasoline or diesel product meets the specifications for that grade.

The Bureau provides services to Nevada Department of Transportation (NDOT). Inspectors inspect and test the trucks and hopper scales used by various contractors in the upgrading and construction of roads throughout the state. The public weighmaster certification program provides the mechanism for reciprocity between states by meeting interstate commerce requirements for the weighing of large commercial transport vehicles. The Bureau certifies the weighmasters and their scales, and it audits issued weigh tickets. The inspectors travel throughout the state at least once in each yearly testing cycle.

This concludes the section on the Bureau of Weights and Measures.

Chair Carlton:

If the Committee members have questions, we will go ahead and ask them now.

Assemblyman Aizley:

How long has the Bureau been in the Department of Agriculture?

Lon Beal:

During the 1990s, they were in the Department of Business and Industry. I am not quite sure when they went to NDOA. They bounced back and forth a couple of times. Prior to Business and Industry, I think they were under NDOA.

Jim Barbee:

When they were under Business and Industry, that is when NDOA was a division. They have been with NDOA since the early 1950s.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Are there personnel now in Weights and Measures that do jobs that overlap with NDOA? My understanding is that they are not physically moving the Las Vegas and Sparks Weights and Measures offices from where they are now. Is staff being shared by NDOA as well?

Jim Barbee:

The move would reflect on the same staff, facilities, and building. It would be transferred to the DMV. Their responsibilities are relative to petroleum, grocery, certifying livestock scales on ranches, et cetera. They have multitudes of responsibilities of a commercial nature.

Assemblyman Aizley:

I do not see any fiscal savings by the move. Is there something that will be saved?

Jim Barbee:

It is my understanding that it is more of an efficiency that will be gained in terms of performance, and not necessarily a financial savings.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Has there actually been a study done to see if there will be improvements in efficiency? It is a big mystery as to why they are pulling Weights and Measures out of NDOA and putting them under the DMV. Where did this decision come from?

Jim Barbee:

It is my understanding that the efficiencies would be in auditing and field inspectors, since they would be under the same division. Therefore, they could do the inspections and auditing at the same time, on site. In terms of a study, I am not aware of one.

Chair Carlton:

I think this bill will end up in the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means. Are there any other questions?

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

Mr. Beal, you were talking about how you were awaiting accreditation. Could you repeat that? I did not understand exactly what that was. It was under the package quality control and price verification slide.

Lon Beal:

I will repeat that. The Bureau maintains metrology labs. We have two: one in Sparks and one in Las Vegas. The Las Vegas lab is essentially a satellite lab. The Sparks lab is fully equipped. We are currently NIST recognized and traceable. We are going through NVLAP, and it is through the International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 17025 standard. We have met the ISO standards, and we have been assured the accreditation will happen any day now. Essentially, that makes us an international entity and traceable to the international standards directly.

Chair Carlton:

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

You were talking about the price verifications for the scanners in the retail stores. How often are they checked?

Lon Beal:

Currently, we check them on demand and based on complaints. Technically, we would like to do them each and every time we go in to check grocery scales or scales in any other retail-type place. We currently do not have a fee structure in place for that. If we have slack time, if the weather changes, or we do not want someone out on the road with big equipment, then we will do those checks. They are not necessarily scheduled.

Chair Carlton:

You check them, but it is not part of the fee schedule for the other things you do for them?

Lon Beal:

I have been the administrator now for about 2 1/2 years, and this precedes me. The statute was added in the 2003 Legislative Session to do the package checks and price verifications. After the legislation was passed, apparently nobody pursued anything further than that, so they never set the fee schedules. I would like to approach that.

Chair Carlton:

I think we should.

Lon Beal:

It caught me by surprise too. I was told it was an unfunded mandate. I thought the Legislature does not do unfunded mandates.

Chair Carlton:

We will not go there. I do remember this because there was a conversation about the coffee can issue. There was a debate over a 16-ounce coffee can and a 13-ounce coffee can and how they were the same price. People were getting ripped off by about 2 1/2 ounces of coffee, and they were up in arms. That was the pricing schedule, and that led into the discussion of scanners. Let us figure out a way for you to recover the cost for that. You have the authority to do that, so let us get that implemented. I believe that was the intent.

Lon Beal:

I agree.

I will continue with the Bureau of Petroleum Technology, Budget 4537. I will try to keep this short because I know we are consuming time here.

The Bureau receives its authority through Chapter 590 of the NRS, which mandates that the State Board of Agriculture adopt standards concerning fuel and to test fuel sampled from retail outlets.

[Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit D](#)).]

Mark Jensen, Director, Division of Resource Protection, State Department of Agriculture:

The Division of Resource Protection is a cooperative program. Chapter 567 of NRS allows for the NDOA to enter into agreements with the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) for the control of predatory animals, crop destroying birds, and rodents within the state of Nevada.

[Continued to read from prepared testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Assemblyman Livermore:

You talked about the complement of people. Did I hear you right when you said you have seven field wildlife specialists?

Mark Jensen:

That is correct. Within our organization, we have seven state employees, and the state designation for those seven employees is Field Assistant II. The rest of the employees are federal employees. It is a combination of federal

employees and state employees who cooperatively form the Nevada Wildlife Services.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Do they duplicate any of the Department of Wildlife (NDOW) functions? What is their role?

Mark Jensen:

Their role is to provide assistance to the public and the ranchers when they have problems with wildlife. Those people live and work throughout rural Nevada providing those services to the public. We do not duplicate any functions the Department of Wildlife has or what the federal entity is doing. It is a collaboration of both state and federal entities.

Assemblyman Livermore:

I am still a little confused. I do see duplication with two agencies dealing with the same product and people. We listened to NDOW last week. I am confused as to what role you are responsible for and what they are responsible for. It seems like it might be a great place for consolidation, elimination, and reduction of staff people.

Mark Jensen:

Granted NDOW is responsible for managing wildlife, but they do not have any personnel; for example, government trappers in the field respond to these kinds of complaints. We do that, and we work very closely with NDOW on those issues.

Chair Carlton:

If I remember correctly, a lot of the money that goes into NDOW comes from fishing and hunting licenses, and they are very restricted in what they can do. I do not believe they would have an opportunity to do some of these things. This department picks up where the others leave off and actually have state employees do these jobs. Am I correct?

Mark Jensen:

That is correct. Our mission is to protect agriculture.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Are you a recipient of fishing and hunting license fees? Do your funds come through a process from the USDA down to you?

Mark Jensen:

It is a little complicated. I have a federal appropriation, and I also have a state appropriation for my seven state employees. We also work closely with NDOW to do projects, for example, the sage grouse. The NDOW is responsible for the management of sage grouse, and they are concerned about them, so some dollars come to this program on the federal side to manage ravens that are depredating sage grouse nests. This is some money that comes from NDOW to do specific projects.

Chair Carlton:

I will have staff sit down and go over this in more detail if we have more questions.

Assemblyman Hansen:

The NDOW will contract with you to do some of the field work, correct?

Mark Jensen:

That is correct. They come to us because we have the expertise, infrastructure, and equipment necessary to do this work. In effect, they will contract with us to this work.

Assemblyman Hansen:

I know you do raven controls. Is there any evidence that these projects have actually increased sage grouse production?

Mark Jensen:

We do not do the research, but there is research out there showing that high concentrations of ravens can limit nest success. The removal of those ravens can enhance the nesting success. That has mostly been done by the United States Geological Survey (USGS) and other research entities.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I think it is a pretty unique working relationship NDOA and NDOW have on this along with Wildlife Services at the federal level. For those of us who have the stomach for it, I would highly encourage you to get on the wildlife newsletter email list. There are some entertaining stories of how predators are dealt with across the state.

Mark Jensen:

With that, I will introduce Dr. Anette Rink with the next presentation.

Anette Rink, DVM, Ph.D., Laboratory Supervisor, Animal Disease and Food Safety Laboratory, Division of Animal Industry, State Department of Agriculture:

The Division of Animal Industry has a total of eight full-time employees, and we currently have two laboratories: one in Sparks and one in Elko. In fiscal year (FY) 2012, our staff will be reduced to seven full-time employees, which will result in the closure of the Elko laboratory because the senior veterinary diagnostician position in Elko is slated for elimination.

The Division of Animal Industry provides a series of services to the state. We run the diagnostic laboratory services. We also provide animal traceability, which is important for trade facilitation. We do disease surveillance, eradication, and control for zoonotic diseases and foreign and endemic diseases. To give you a couple of examples, the diseases that have been eradicated from Nevada over the last couple of decades are bovine tuberculosis (TB), brucellosis, and pseudorabies in swine. We also have an outreach in continuing education of our program, and we provide factsheets and information brochures for veterinarians and the public. We also go out and give presentations, if requested, on a variety of issues pertaining to animal diseases and zoonotic diseases. We work with the industry to implement and develop regulation changes when necessary and requested, and we also have a responsibility in ensuring animal welfare in the state.

We consider ourselves to be an integral part of the One Health Initiative, which is based on the fact that around 70 percent of all infectious diseases, vector-borne or directly transmissible, are actually of zoonotic origin. In a state like Nevada, it is important to remember that international tourism harbors a huge risk of introduction of zoonotic diseases. It is important to maintain the ability to do surveillance and detection for eradication of new diseases as they are introduced into the state, as well as do ongoing surveillance for already existing diseases in the state. We do West Nile virus, St. Louis encephalitis, and Western equine encephalitis surveillance as a statewide program. These are just a couple of zoonotic diseases that are currently endemic and have a public health concern. I think many times the perception is that an animal disease lab is primarily focused on animals and animal diseases only, but there is actually a huge potential for transmission of infectious diseases between animals and humans. In the lab, we routinely work with diseases like tularemia, bird flu, brucellosis, plague, mad cow disease, rabies, tuberculosis (TB), West Nile, and anthrax. In case you are wondering what these beautiful pictures represent ([Exhibit C](#), slide 33), the top photo is a lesion that was caused by rabbit fever or tularemia. The center picture is a positive rabies brain, and the lesion at the bottom is a so-called anthrax canker or cutaneous anthrax lesion.

To give you an overview of the variety of the different functions we perform, we have listed a couple of the performance measures here. The first figure you see behind the description is actually what we were doing in FY 2010, and what we had projected. In 2010, our actual activity was below the projected activity, which was an average of the previous three years. For some of the activities, we exceeded our own projections. We are involved in accreditation of new veterinarians who are either recent graduates or moving to Nevada from outside the state. We monitor animal health certificates, both coming in and going out of the state. We review applications for the use of veterinary biologics and conduct training and outreach. We assist NDOW when requested in wildlife health investigation, which is important to do because we are concerned about disease transmission at the wildlife/livestock interface, and we have a regulatory trichomoniasis disease control program, which is sexually transmitted disease of cattle. That is one of the programs implemented in 2007 that we are active in and provide the majority of laboratory testing for.

We do epidemiologic investigations, conduct emergency preparedness activities, and we are Emergency Support Function (ESF) #11. We do all of the arbovirus testing for the state with the exception of human origin samples, but we do the testing for wildlife, poultry, livestock, and mosquito samples, and they are tested in the animal disease lab. When there was sufficient funding for avian influenza testing, we conducted that testing for the state of Nevada, and we continue to conduct rabies testing. The number of samples submitted to the lab annually ranges anywhere from 30,000 to 38,000. Because some of these activities we have described are lab-based, while others are field-based, Nevada is in a unique position because we are a very tiny Division of Animal Industry and smaller than any other state. All of the diagnostician positions actually have a second function, which is a field veterinary medical officer. Other states around us have a dichotomy. They have a Department of Agriculture field service where veterinary medical officers go out into the field and do field work, and then there is a diagnostic lab where diagnosticians are entirely lab-based. In this state, that is not possible because of the small number of people involved and the diversity of functions we need to fulfill.

This is an extract of our submission as part of the Priorities of Government (POG). To show you a couple of the populations we serve, the smallest populations I have listed here are the private practice veterinarians, and we currently have about 820 of them licensed in Nevada. We obviously do work together with them. At the top of the list, endemic livestock diseases are listed, and those are the families living on livestock operations who would be directly affected by livestock disease. Our rabies surveillance and testing program reaches 2.5 million out of the approximately 2.6 million people in this state. Our public health risk mediation program, through arbovirus testing,

reaches around 1.9 million. The emergency preparedness for companion animals covers approximately 2.1 million pets. In northern and southern Nevada, there are 109,000 households and 168,000 households respectively. Because of our involvement in disease surveillance both in livestock and in cooperation with NDOW, we also serve 63,000 sportsmen in this state.

Assemblyman Anderson:

On slide 33, the disease slide, do we have any of those presently in Nevada? I know we probably have rabies here.

Anette Rink:

We do. We have tularemia and rabbit fever, which is endemic in this state. We have West Nile virus and anthrax. Anthrax is actually a disease that is probably never going to be eradicated in this state because of our unique soil conditions. Anthrax spores can survive for centuries in our soil. We constantly monitor for brucellosis because even though, theoretically, the United States is free from brucellosis in the livestock herd, there is a constant risk of reinfection of the livestock, in particular the cattle population in the greater Yellowstone area. We are currently bovine TB free, but we do have ongoing testing, and that is required because we do have the problem in cattle. The cattle TB we are finding in the United States is unfortunately not only mycobacterial novus, which is the cattle TB, but there is a significant number of cattle that have human TB, which can also be transmitted back to humans. We have a multitude of the diseases in our state.

Chair Carlton:

I am trying to figure out how private practice veterinarians fit into this scheme. How do they fit into what you do?

Anette Rink:

We serve private practitioners. They submit samples to our lab. The state veterinarian, as the state animal health official, is the state representative to national certification bodies for veterinarians. The accreditation for a veterinarian goes through the state veterinarian.

Chair Carlton:

Thank you. I just wanted to make sure I had that, and it now makes sense.

Assemblywoman Pierce:

What is emergency planning for pet-owner households in Las Vegas?

Anette Rink:

I do not know if you remember some of the issues that arose after Hurricane Katrina and several other gulf state hurricanes. Many people are very attached to their pets, and before there was any ability for people to be evacuated and take their pets, thousands of people opted to stay behind with their pets because they did not want to abandon their pets. Clark County, Washoe County, and several other counties also have emergency preparedness measures planned, and we have exercised this several times through the state emergency system. It is how we would go about evacuating animals with their owners in case of an earthquake, flood, or any other natural or manmade disaster. The compliance of people expected to evacuate is better than it has been in many other disasters.

Chair Carlton:

I believe that was Senator Titus' bill from her last session.

Assemblyman Ellison:

How do you quarantine if you do have an animal that is infected with something? Do you quarantine them here in Carson City? Do you quarantine rabid animals?

Anette Rink:

We do not quarantine a rabid animal. The rabies testing is actually based on dead animals only. By the time someone has observed or declared that to be an issue, euthanasia of these animals has happened outside of the laboratory. We just conduct laboratory testing. About a third of all rabies tests we conduct in the lab are associated with potentially exposed humans. The current treatment for humans is fairly costly, so it is important to get test results to that person very early, so they do not incur about \$3,000 in costs to go through complete post-exposure prophylaxis. We have not had domestic rabies in this state for almost 30 years. We are endemic for bat rabies. We find bat rabies every year between 6 and 18 times in most of the counties. In case there was a positive rabid animal, or if you had a rabid bat that flew into a house with several cats or dogs in it, we actually work with animal control agencies or the sheriff's department in those counties that do not have an animal control agency. They implement either in-home quarantine, or they must be quarantined under the jurisdiction and authority of a private veterinarian, or they must be put down for testing.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Do they do the same thing for parvo? Do they try to keep the animals separated from the other groups?

Anette Rink:

Correct.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We had problems with cattle. We had a group come in who had brought some cattle in from California, and by the time we got there, we found out they were infected and got into our cows. We tried to separate them as quickly as we could, but we were too late.

Anette Rink:

They were infected with rabies?

Assemblyman Ellison:

No, I cannot remember what disease it was. It was several years back, but I know it was not rabies.

Anette Rink:

Cattle rabies in California is not that uncommon because they have a much larger rabies problem than we have in this state. The implementation of quarantine will depend on the species, the housekeeping method of that species, and what kind of infectious disease is involved.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Once the veterinarian got out there, we had to shoot some of the calves, but the cattle were fine.

Anette Rink:

Not every disease is a quarantinable disease by state regulation. Sometimes it is a management approach to limit economic damage.

Assemblyman Goedhart:

Do you also have any dealings with hantavirus or bubonic plague within the state of Nevada?

Anette Rink:

We are not equipped to deal with hantavirus because it would require a biosafety level 3 facility, and we are a biosafety level 2 facility. Biosafety level 2 facilities deal with disease agents and pathogenicity that allows confinement under a biosafety cabinet. You would need to have the "moon suit" type of outfit to do hantavirus without risking fatal infection of the diagnostician. We do not do hantavirus.

We do deal with the plague though. We diagnose several cases of plague, and that is one of the reasons you find closed camping grounds around the state. The camping grounds will be closed if we find a plague infected marmot or ground squirrel. Those are agents that can be safely handled by the appropriate people at a biosafety level 2 facility, for which we are certified.

I would like to introduce the next speaker. She is the administrator for the Division of Livestock Identification.

JoAnn Mothershead, Administrator, Elko Office, Division of Livestock Identification, State Department of Agriculture:

We are responsible for protecting the livestock industry from theft or loss of livestock, introduction of diseased animals, and unfair business practices. As you can see ([Exhibit F](#)), the brand on this cow has been altered. It originally was a 7 lazy S combined. It was altered to an arrow lazy 8 combined. There were 200 animals involved in this theft.

We are mandated by statute to maintain the records for the Nevada brands. We currently have about 4,400 brands on record. They are re-recorded every four years, and a brand book is published. In between the publishing of the brand book, we publish annual supplements during the interim. Re-recording will start for us in July 2011. Legislative statutes for brand recording began in 1923.

Nevada Revised Statutes Chapter 565 deals with the inspection of brands and mandates inspections. We currently have 80 deputy inspectors scattered throughout the state. Last year, they inspected 320,000-plus head of cattle in the state, with approximately 60,000 inspected in the two sale yards in Fallon. We inspected 13,000 horses, and many of those were BLM horses. We issue a lifetime horse permit, and this allows them to travel in the western states without getting a brand inspection every time they move out of the district or state. We perform enforcement activities and have five Peace Officers' Standards and Training Commission (P.O.S.T.) certified inspectors. They work with other allied agencies in theft investigations.

Chapter 575 of NRS deals with assessments and collection of the special Livestock Inspection Tax. Last year, we sent out 5,864 livestock assessment forms. Many were issued for our operation as well as the wool growers for predatory animal control, disease control, and other activities related to Nevada's sheep industry.

Chapter 573 of NRS deals with the public sales of livestock, and Chapter 576 of NRS deals with livestock and farm products, dealers, agents, and sale yards.

[Continued to read from PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit F](#)).]

Because of the economic downturn, I think there are many more horses out there, and people are turning horses loose.

Chair Carlton:

Could you clarify VRE?

JoAnn Mothershead:

It means Virginia Range estray horses.

Chapter 574 of NRS deals with cruelty to animals. This mare was found around the Austin area, and her brand was cut out. There was a reward posted. We had several leads, but they all turned out to be dead ends. No one would step forward with any information. She was adopted out and currently resides in California.

Assemblyman Ellison:

A long time ago, when I lived with my brother and my dad at our ranch, we had some calls from people we sold animals to, and they were checking brand numbers. Do they still do that after they go to auction? I thought it was amazing that they could track the brand back that far. We had changed our brand.

JoAnn Mothershead:

We are mandated to keep the records for 10 years. If it is within those 10 years, we have it on file and can check.

Assemblyman Ellison:

We always used the tattoo versus the brand on our horses.

Chair Carlton:

Out of curiosity, you mentioned the horses being turned out, and that is something that has come up two or three different times. When that happens, and you get a hold of them, how often are you able to track back where they may have come from? Is it difficult?

JoAnn Mothershead:

Very seldom. We do put a notice in the legal section of the newspaper in the area the horse was found. Usually, if a person has turned out their horses, they are not going to admit to it, and oftentimes the neighbors do not care because it is not out of their pocket to feed the horse. In the month of January, we had 11 abandoned horses to deal with.

Chair Carlton:

In these tough times, people are doing that, and it is going to need to be addressed sooner rather than later.

JoAnn Mothershead:

I would like to introduce Dawn Rafferty with the Division of Plant Industry.

Dawn Rafferty, Administrator, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture:

As Mr. Barbee indicated earlier, this division is the largest in NDOA with 26 full-time employees, 8 budget accounts, and 11 programs. As you can imagine, we have a wide diversity of activities and a wide diversity of statutory mandates and funding sources. With this much detail, I do have program managers available with me today should you have any detailed questions.

[Read from PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit C](#)).]

We also curate the state arthropod reference collection and conduct educational programs throughout Nevada. We manage federal survey and control cooperative agreements and personnel with USDA Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey. The Mormon cricket and grasshopper survey is a big part of that.

[Continued to read from PowerPoint presentation.]

The Nevada Organic Advisory Council conducts research, promotional, and educational activities related to improving organic agricultural production and certification in Nevada. We certify approximately 58 producers at this point for organic certification.

As you can see, we have a lot of different funding in the Noxious Weeds Program from the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) money and USDA money. We work with volunteer groups and do a lot of education and outreach programs, but the activities in this program are for the prevention, control, and eradication of plant species that are detrimental to Nevada's natural resources, agricultural industry, and recreation.

[Continued to read from PowerPoint presentation.]

This year we have given out 352 certifications for export of agriculture products.

[Continued to read from PowerPoint presentation.]

The Environmental Compliance Program and the Pesticide Safety Program are run with Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) funds. They do certification training to ensure pesticide applicators are competent and knowledgeable about state and federal regulations. We also dispose of pesticides. We have programs for that. We conduct inspections to determine if pesticides are applied safely and in compliance with state and federal laws. Surface and groundwater samples are collected annually to be monitored for pesticide contamination.

The Specialty Crop Block Grant Program is from the USDA Agricultural Marketing Service where we take money through the Department and give it back out to local producers of niche products. Currently, we are at about \$200,000 and expect that to increase based on increasing production of specialty crops by agriculture producers.

Assemblyman Livermore:

When you were talking about green food quality, are you the Department that manages and certifies organic products sold in a market?

Dawn Rafferty:

Yes. We are not in the market, but the organic producers in Nevada are.

Assemblyman Livermore:

They evidently must acquire a license or some form of identification from you. Do you perform an inspection or manage production? People pay extra money for organic foods.

Dawn Rafferty:

If I could ask Steve Marty come up. He runs that program, and he could more adequately answer that question.

Steve Marty, Agriculturist IV, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture:

To address your question, certified producers and handlers, which are processors of organic agricultural products, are required by federal law under the USDA National Organic Program to be certified by an accredited entity. The NDOA is an accredited entity; therefore, we can provide this certification service, whereby every facet of that operation is condensed in an organic system plan. We have purview of, or we approve, products going into that system and farming techniques used in that system, and we are also conducting at least one annual inspection at each of those entities to verify the practices listed in the plan are those being used.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Most summers you can find farmers' markets, and you can find a big section of organic produce. Is that reliable information? How does a consumer know what they are truly buying?

Steve Marty:

The consumer should demand to see the organic certificate, which is a document issued to each of these producers and/or handlers. They can have confidence those products are, in fact, organic if they are listed on that producer's organic certificate.

Assemblywoman Bustamante Adams:

This has to do with your export certification. Out of the examples listed, how many of those are exported outside of the United States?

Dawn Rafferty:

All of those.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I am familiar with the Mormon crickets. We have had our battles over the years. Are bees in your area of expertise? I did not see them on here, but it seemed to me the bee population is down. Is that correct?

Dawn Rafferty:

I would like to bring up Jeff Knight.

Jeff B. Knight, Entomologist, Insect Survey and Identification, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture:

Currently, the regulation of bees is essentially with the Africanized bee quarantine in southern Nevada. We will, by request, go in and test bee colonies for diseases, but we do a very limited amount of that. As far as how we deal with colony class disorder, we have very limited involvement in that system.

Chair Carlton:

Since Assembly Bill 35 deals with pest control, you had said the fines go to the school district. I vaguely remember that debate years ago. Could you tell me what amount of fines have been forwarded to the school district?

Dawn Rafferty:

I would like to have Charles Moses come up and answer that question.

Charles W. Moses, Environmental Scientist IV, Environmental Compliance Branch, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture:

I work with our Environmental Compliance Branch in the pesticide safety program. I did bring that information with me. Essentially, we have been collecting fines for school districts, and we accumulate these fines as a result of penalties for enforcement actions we take against pest control companies and individuals who issue pesticides. We have this broken down by committee. Since the program started in FY 2000, we have given Clark County \$124,000 from these fines. Every monetary fine we collect goes to the county where the violation occurred. We have given Washoe County \$23,429 and Lincoln County was given \$500. I do not have the total of all the different counties, but that gives you an idea of how much we have collected and forwarded to the counties.

We encourage the counties to use the money for Integrated Pest Management programs (IPM) for the schools. We want them to use the money to help control pests and develop programs that do not utilize pesticides in every case. The IPM program is a preventative program that relies on an array of different tools to control pests in school districts. It is not a nonchemical pesticide program, but it is looking at the different methods available and using the money to do things like cleaning schools, training staff, and excluding pests. Putting up shelving in food service areas to keep food off the floor, getting door sweeps in classrooms, and getting containers for teachers to put food in so pests do not become a problem in the classrooms are examples of remediation that we would like to see the money used for.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Are you familiar with IPM? If you are, could you explain it to me? Is it limited to indoors, or does it apply to the outdoors as well?

Charles Moses:

I would like to refer you to a newsletter you should have all received ([Exhibit G](#)). There is one page on integrated pest management, and it goes into depth about the discussion. It is not just the pest control approach for controlling pests indoors, but it can be used in urban and agricultural sites and nonagricultural sites. It relies on preventative means to control pests. The problem we have had in the past is people who control pests like to rely on chemicals because they are easy to use. The way IPM works is by asking people to identify pests they are trying to control and determine if the pest is a problem we need to control. In many cases, not all pests need to be controlled. In schools, when we have public health pests, sometimes the only way to control that particular pest is with the use of pesticides. In most cases, we can develop methods and put plans into effect, so we can deal with pests we know we will have a

problem with ahead of time. That way, we do not always have to rely on using chemicals.

We have been working mainly with the Clark County and Washoe County School Districts. We have been putting together programs to encourage them to develop a pilot program and pick a school with a pest problem. Then, they can tell us what the major pest is, and our staff will develop these programs for them. Ask us to help you with that, and we will give you some ideas on how to control your particular pest problem. In Clark County, rats were a big issue a couple of years ago, and we helped the county put together programs to prevent roof rat problems. What needed to be done in that case was to exclude pests from coming into the building. They would control these rodents inside the building, and then the rats would find a way in. It was a problem that could never be handled.

Assemblyman Aizley:

Is there any consideration given to the effect that some of the pesticides have on children or people who might have weaker immune systems in assisted living facilities?

Charles Moses:

Yes, all pesticide products must be registered by the EPA and by our agency. We do not ask these companies that register products here in our state to submit data. Before they can submit to the state for registration, the EPA requires these companies send in data to show these pesticides are safe to use in the environment in the sites they are intended to be used and that they actually work. When you buy a pesticide and use it according to label directions, it is going to work against the pests you are trying to control. For any pesticide registered to use in Nevada, there is data showing that if you follow label directions and use the pesticide safely, it is not going to cause a health effect.

Chair Carlton:

We need to move to the bill. I will open the hearing on Assembly Bill 35.

Assembly Bill 35: Revises provisions governing the custom application of pesticides. (BDR 49-453)

Charles W. Moses, Environmental Scientist IV, Environmental Compliance Branch, Division of Plant Industry, State Department of Agriculture:

I would like to give you a brief overview of the statute changes we are proposing with A.B. 35 and answer any questions you may have related to the bill.

In general, we are proposing three changes to *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 555, which regulates the custom for higher application of pesticides in the state. You saw the slide ([Exhibit C](#)) dealing with pest control operators who apply pesticides for hire. In most cases, all pesticide applicators are regulated by our agency.

The first change deals with the insurance requirement we are trying to amend in our statute. The way the requirement is currently written states the company that applies pesticides for hire must have a minimum of \$10,000 bodily injury coverage and \$10,000 property damage coverage to give it a license to apply pesticides for hire in the state. This does not include aerial applicators. Their insurance requirements are much higher. In our experience, for many types of problems we have, whether it is an environmental issue or human health issue, these minimums are too low to cover anything. When you buy automobile insurance, they always try to get you to take the higher amount of coverage, and it is for good reason. For example, we had a pesticide drift incident and some mature trees died. It took \$130,000 of the pest control operator's, and homeowner's insurance money to replace these trees. The pest control operator's insurance did not cover that amount. For human health effect, we have investigated cases where people were involved with pesticide drift and ended up in the hospital.

Chair Carlton:

You are saying pesticide drift. Could you explain what you mean by that?

Charles Moses:

Pesticide drift occurs when the applicator makes an application, and the pesticide droplets move off the target site. In most cases, even under the best conditions where there is little or no wind speed involved, you will still get some pesticide moving off-site. Small droplets are created when you are spraying pesticide, and they will move off-site. Most of the time it does not cause damage or make anyone sick if it comes in contact with vegetation or a person.

In most cases, our experience has been that these amounts are not enough to cover this kind of damage. We have done surveys with our pest control companies and talked to them and worked through our State Board of Agriculture, which has industry representatives, and most companies carry much more than this. Most carry \$1 million, and the lowest we could find that established companies had was \$100,000 for property damage or bodily injury insurance. Occasionally, we will get a person who comes and wants to post a bond for the \$10,000 or a certificate of deposit (CD), and we cannot deny them because it is in the statute they can do this.

In our second change, we are changing the requirement for each business location, since some pest control businesses have multiple business locations in the state, to have a primary principal at each location. This particular rule was set up years ago, and I was around when that happened. It was set up to make sure the staff working at these business locations are adequately supervised by somebody who is knowledgeable, trained, and competent about pesticide applications. With the invention of new communication devices such as cell phones, internet, and email, a primary principal at each location is no longer required. We consider the primary principal like the quarterback of the company. It could be the owner, but it is the person responsible for all of the activities. Most of these things can be directed from other locations. It is not required they actually be at that business location.

What has resulted from setting up this particular regulation was it became a hindrance for business expansion. It is a hindrance for companies to come in here from other states because they cannot get a primary principal to be the person running that particular pest control business at that location. Anyone who wants to start a pesticide business in Nevada must have two years of pest control experience in order to obtain the pesticide license. These primary principals are hard to find, and in many cases, a company cannot find a primary principal to run its outlet here. If they have one person, he is going to be at another location. Our experience is that we are not having problems with supervision where a group of individuals who are doing pest control are not being adequately supervised by their principals or bosses.

This is a problem because we have a requirement that if a company loses their primary principal at a particular business location, they have 30 days to find a replacement, or we must close that business down. We want to change that, so they do not have to wait these 30 days. As an aside, we have another requirement where primary principals must have fingerprints submitted to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI). The FBI will inform us if these individuals are involved in a felony or not. This takes 45-60 days each time we submit these. The 30-day requirement is not enough. If we took this primary principal requirement out of the statute, it would give these people plenty of time to get their primary principal established if they lose one.

Chair Carlton:

Would this primary principal be allowed to be located outside of the state?

Charles Moses:

Yes. The primary principal would be allowed to be located out of the state. We have another definition of a principal operator. This person can substitute for the primary principal who can run the operation from another location in the

state. That individual has all the training, except for the two years experience, that a person needs to run the activities at the business.

The last changes we are proposing are housekeeping items that will clarify definitions we have in our statute. An example is "performing pest control for hire." There is a lot of discussion and a need to clarify what we mean when we talk to people about performing pest control for hire. Another change is "landscape areas," which clarifies the definition for pest control in areas of xeriscape. We talked about landscaping and residential lawns in how the statute was written before, and we are changing that to "landscape areas" to encompass all those areas where pest control might take place.

There are a few changes in this bill you may have seen, and some are Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) suggestions. Anytime we want to make a statute or regulation change, LCB looks at them and comes up with a definition that might be better than what we have. They might give another suggestion that we might include. We want to clarify what some of these terms are for people.

Chair Carlton:

On page 4, section 8, you have who will pay the fee to the director, and the fee is established by regulation. Can you give me an idea of what the fees are now? In a lot of our other areas, we have parameters of fees that "shall not exceed" an amount, so if you ever want to go back in and go over that amount, you would need to come back to the Legislature and have the discussion on why that fee would need to be raised. Why are we going to do these by regulation?

Charles Moses:

In section 8, it talks about fees we collect. In regulation, these fees are outlined. We set those fees based on what we know people charge in the different states, especially in the west for people who want to establish pest control companies and take examinations. Currently, the examination fee is \$25 per exam. Most people have a general test and a test in at least one particular category. It could be industrial, institutional, ornamental and turf, or agricultural. If they do not pass the tests, they must wait 10 days, and they have to pay the fees again to retake the test. Then, there are business license fees, which start at \$350 per business. They must pay a fee for each individual who is licensed by that business as well. If you have a company that has a lot of individuals, each person must pay a fee of \$35. We have about 400 businesses now licensed in the state.

Chair Carlton:

What is the purpose for not putting them in statute?

Charles Moses:

From my experience, when you have to make a change, it is easier to do that in the regulation because there may be reasons why you have to change it again in the future. I do not know the history of when this statute was set up. I know for a fact almost all of our regulations are set up that way. The fees are usually established in the regulations, and we change them when we need to.

Chair Carlton:

What I was proposing is in some other areas they have a cap up to \$200 and over the next 10 years. If you ever end up bumping up against the cap, you must come back and change it. That creates the discussion on why these numbers have gone up. It gives people an opportunity to ask why they have to pay more. That is the policy and debate part of the regulation and having it in statute.

Assemblyman Ellison:

The way I read this bill, it is strictly for commercial operators. This will not fall under private or agriculture, correct?

Charles Moses:

Yes, that is correct.

Assemblyman Ellison:

The Chair spoke about section 8 where it says, "An agent, operator, primary principal or principal shall pay to the Director a fee." Is that the way it has always been? Are you just following along the same line where "operators, pilots or agents" is taken out and replacing it with the new language? Have the fees been collected and gone into that division?

Charles Moses:

That is correct. The terms "operators, pilots or agents" were used initially, but we took the opportunity to change it so it is consistent with how we define these applicators now as "agent, operator, primary principal or principal." A pilot was the same as primary principal.

Assemblyman Ellison:

It seemed like you had a problem with bonding. It seems like you need more for a small business, and that is the only way they can operate. If they are running \$300,000 limits on "one person, not less than \$300,000 for bodily injury to or death," either insurance or bonding is the only way they will be able to do that.

Charles Moses:

That is correct. Please note that these are for the aerial applicators when it speaks to \$100,000 or \$300,000 limits. Anybody who is not an aerial applicator can get a bond or CD for \$10,000.

Assemblyman Livermore:

I am trying to get my head around this "primary principal." There are many companies in these national franchises. Would that be recognized as a primary principal?

Charles Moses:

That is correct. These companies that are franchised generally have more than one branch. If they wanted to have four branches here in Nevada, they could have one primary principal.

Assemblyman Livermore:

I see many ads on television, and they seem to be a national company that sells a national franchise. Would that be a primary principal?

Charles Moses:

Correct, that would be.

Assemblyman Livermore:

Occasionally, I have a guy who mows my lawn. If I ask him to get rid of the aphids on my rose bushes, would he need to have a license?

Charles Moses:

He needs to have a license in the proper category. If he is doing lawn work, that falls under our ornamental and turf category, but that does not necessarily allow him to make applications inside a residence. We have a separate category for that. That individual who is doing pest control for you needs to have a license in the correct category.

Assemblyman Livermore:

He needs a license, and to pay the \$350 fee, just to spray the roses outside my garden to get rid of the aphids? Could you imagine what it would cost me to have him do that?

Charles Moses:

He is not doing pesticide work and applying pesticides for hire. There are some people, like landscapers, who are exempt. In our regulations, we have specific information that says a person is exempt in these following circumstances: they do not use power equipment to apply pesticides; they do not advertise that

they apply pesticides for hire; or if they do less than \$20,000 of pesticide work and are licensed to do an overall landscaping job. These are things that will allow a person not to get a license from our department.

Assemblyman Livermore:

What responsibility do I have, as the purchaser, to make sure the person who does that work on my property is licensed? Is there a penalty to me?

Charles Moses:

There is no penalty to you. You can always call the Department of Agriculture (NDOA) to find out if a company is licensed. We also keep that information online. You can find out if the company is licensed and has the proper category by visiting our website. Of course, any of our staff can direct questions to us, and we can answer them that way as well.

Chair Carlton:

Under section 8 where it says "agent, operator, primary principal or principal," are any of these people going to be paying a fee that previously did not pay a fee? Or, are we just changing terminology?

Charles Moses:

We are just changing terminology. There is no change in the fee that will be charged to any of these individuals.

Chair Carlton:

All of these categories were paying fees before?

Charles Moses:

Correct.

Chair Carlton:

I just wanted to be sure we got that right. Are there any other questions? [There were none.] Is there anyone here in opposition to the bill? [There was no one.] Is there anyone here who is neutral on the bill? [There was no one.]

There are probably a few clarifications we will need to make, and we will schedule this bill for a work session.

I do have Mr. Baker signed in to speak under public comment.

Dean Baker, representing Baker Ranches, Inc.:

As far as the petroleum part of the presentation goes, our ranch is in a remote location. For the last 50 years, I had to have the scale for the livestock working

and certified in order to sell livestock. We also sell hay and grain and ready-mix concrete, and that scale needs to be certified and done by the same people. We also have a service station, and the same people certify that. They have been very nice to work with. In all of those years, there have only been short periods of time when we have not been certified. The NDOA is very important to the ranch for brand inspection. In order to have livestock chipped, we must be certified with the state that it is healthy, and we do that with a local veterinarian who sends it into the state.

Since I was very young, I have applied pesticides because we were raising alfalfa. My father was one of the first agricultural operators in the state of Utah. I have spent a lifetime with pesticides, and I very much appreciate the education and control that has come in to make us more careful. I support the NDOA, and it would not be practical to send the Bureau of Weights and Measures and Petroleum Technology to someplace else. They are combined, and the facilities are in the NDOA buildings in Las Vegas, Sparks, and Elko.

Chair Carlton:

Thank you for your comments. If you would like, I will make sure you are put on a list, so you can help follow the Weights and Measures issue as it works its way through Assembly Committee on Ways & Means because that is where many of the decisions will be made.

Dean Baker:

I would appreciate that.

Assemblyman Hansen:

Did the NDOA board actually vote on whether or not to keep Weights and Measures?

Dean Baker:

Yes, the State Board of Agriculture would like to keep it there because to take Weights and Measures and Petroleum out of our department would mean a complete restructuring of the department. We will work hard to get it more effective and productive. The Board feels that way, and I am sure our new head of the department feels that way as well. I think it is simpler for the state and less expensive to keep it where it is.

Chair Carlton:

We probably need some clarification. Mr. Baker, who are you speaking on behalf of today? I was under the impression you were speaking for yourself.

Dean Baker:

I was speaking for Baker Ranches, Inc., but I am on the State Board of Agriculture. That question was familiar in feeling of the whole board. I do not know of any member of the board who thinks it ought to be done.

Chair Carlton:

We must be careful when we put opinions on the record reflecting a board if there has not been official action, or if there has not been a letter sent. We just do not want to put something in the record that is not 100 percent accurate. You have the feeling for members of the board, and you know them and spend time with them. I am not questioning your feelings about that, but when you get into these types of issues with a board, you need to be very careful who represents what the board is feeling without the official "blessing" of the board to represent that.

Dean Baker:

I am not very knowledgeable.

Chair Carlton:

We always want a good record. Someone in the future will read it to figure out what we were talking about.

Dean Baker:

Next week, we have a board meeting. We cannot legally put it on the agenda, but we will try to discuss it.

Jim R. Barbee, Acting Director, State Department of Agriculture:

It is an action item on the next agenda. I do not believe the Board has taken a vote on that.

Chair Carlton:

As soon as they do, I am sure we will get the appropriate documentation from them.

We will close the hearing on A.B. 35.

The meeting is adjourned [at 3:13 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Judith Coolbaugh
Recording Secretary

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Julie Kellen
Transcribing Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

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

Date: March 1, 2011

Time of Meeting: 1:32 p.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Attendance Roster
	C	Jim R. Barbee	PowerPoint presentation
	D	Lon Beal	Bureau of Petroleum Technology, Budget 4537
	E	Mark Jensen	PowerPoint presentation
	F	JoAnn Mothershead	PowerPoint presentation
	G	Charles Moses	Plant Industry Division Newsletter