

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

**Seventy-Ninth Session
March 9, 2017**

The Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining was called to order by Chair Heidi Swank at 1:42 p.m. on Thursday, March 9, 2017, in Room 3138 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. The meeting was videoconferenced to Room 4406 of the Grant Sawyer State Office Building, 555 East Washington Avenue, Las Vegas, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits, are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/App/NELIS/REL/79th2017.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Sandra Jauregui
Assemblywoman Lisa Krasner
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Justin Watkins
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler
Assemblyman Steve Yeager

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

Assemblyman Chris Brooks (excused)

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

None

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst
Randy Stephenson, Committee Counsel
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary
Cheryl Williams, Committee Assistant



OTHERS PRESENT:

Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Jim French, County Commissioner, Humboldt County Board of Commissioners
Lorinda A. Wichman, Commissioner, Nye County Board of Commissioners
Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation
Steve K. Walker, representing Lyon County, Storey County, Douglas County, Carson City, and Eureka County
Sarah Adler, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Sylvia R. Lazos, Vice Chair, Latino Leadership Council; and Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now
Tom Baker, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada
Marc Johnson, President, University of Nevada, Reno
Constance Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education
Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance

Chair Swank:

[Roll was called and standard rules of the Committee were reviewed.] We will begin today's meeting with a hearing on Assembly Bill 16.

Assembly Bill 16: Revises provisions relating to agricultural extension programs. (BDR 49-440)

Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties:

Thank you, Madam Chair and members of the Committee for the opportunity to present Assembly Bill 16 to you today. With me are Humboldt County Commissioner Jim French and Nevada Association of Counties' (NACO) Deputy Director Dagny Stapleton.

Assembly Bill 16 proposes changes regarding the Cooperative Extension Program of the University of Nevada, Reno, including providing more support for this vital program as well as requiring a report of Cooperative Extension activities to the Legislature.

For those of you who may not be familiar with Cooperative Extension, it is a program that is central to the land-grant mission of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR), and is similar to cooperative extension programs in each state across the United States. Extension is the outreach arm of UNR. In their own words: "University of Nevada Cooperative Extension is the unit that puts university research to work—in your home, workplace or community. We're in every corner of Nevada, helping you learn parenting skills, conserve water in your garden and thrive economically."

Nevada's counties are a part of Extension in a big way, and in Nevada, counties have been partners with Extension for over 100 years. Cooperative Extension programming positively impacts communities in every county in this state, and in turn, counties send significant dollars to UNR and Extension offices in communities to support Extension programming.

Here are just a few examples of the programs that Extension provides: In Elko and Churchill Counties, where domestic violence prevention was identified as a high priority issue for residents, the Heart and Shield program has provided education on domestic violence response strategies for law enforcement; along with crisis education for children and families; and community education and support for victims. Outcomes of the program were measured and data was collected to find significant positive results and programming that could be shared as a model.

Cooperative Extension's Living with Fire program created outreach materials and protocols for working with communities statewide in the wildland-urban interface—those urban areas that are at high risk for wildfires and wildfire damage. Living with Fire is an award-winning program that has been emulated nationally.

Career Edge: Teens Taking Charge of Their Future! is a workforce readiness program for Clark County high school students focused on skill development for workplace and job success. After completing the program, participants believed that they were more likely to know the following: how to fill out a job application, how to dress appropriately for a job interview, what types of jobs or careers fit their personal interests, and that their school subjects had a direct effect on their future career choices and success.

The All 4 Kids: Healthy, Happy, Active, Fit program is an interdisciplinary approach to addressing childhood obesity in Clark County, developed by Cooperative Extension faculty from maternal/child nutrition, exercise physiology, and child development. Early findings show that the percentage of All 4 Kids children eating fresh fruit at least three times a week increased from 83 percent to nearly 92 percent, and children eating fresh vegetables three times a week jumped from 62 percent to 92 percent.

Family Storyteller is a six-week series of workshops, taught in both English and Spanish, which targets families at risk for low literacy. Outcomes were measured through assessing parent/child literacy and increases in language activities.

These are just a few of the programs provided by Cooperative Extension around the state. One additional Extension program that many are familiar with is 4-H. A program that is nearly a century old, 4-H provides youth leadership activities around the state. Statistics show that 4-H sets many young people on the path to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) careers. Though many people associate Extension with 4-H because of Extension's historic agricultural focus, the Nevada Cooperative Extension's mission was expanded in the late 1990s to ensure that, as our state became more urban, Extension was also serving the needs of urban Nevada. State law governing Extension was changed so that the mission of Extension became: "educational, research, outreach and service programs

pertaining to agriculture, community development, health and nutrition, horticulture, personal and family development, and natural resources in the rural and urban communities in the State of Nevada." This is in *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS) Chapter 549. Today the Clark County Extension office is the largest in the state.

As the programs we have touched on show, through its many activities across the state, Extension serves Nevadans in many ways and is truly the University system's outreach arm. Importantly, for many Nevadans, their first and only interaction with the University is through Cooperative Extension. In that way you can think of Extension as the University's ambassador as well as an arm that combines research with service and education.

Currently, of the approximately \$20 million budget for Extension, counties are the largest funder, providing 38 percent of the dollars compared to only 16 percent from the state. Though counties now pay a disproportionate cost for the University's Cooperative Extension Program, this has not always been the case. During the recession, Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) made funding cuts to Extension that equaled 70 percent, and while the University has restored many programs cut during the recession to 100 percent or more of prerecession funding, Extension has had the least funding restored of any remaining program at the University. Simultaneously, while NSHE was cutting Cooperative Extension funding, counties—though also undergoing significant shortfalls in revenue and making severe cuts to other services, including significant staff layoffs—maintained their funding levels for Extension. Today, all but one county continues to fund Cooperative Extension near or above prerecession levels.

Before we go into the details of A.B. 16, we want to make clear what our purpose is for this bill. Counties, as the majority funder of this program, believe that there has been a lack of priority placed on Extension as well as the vital mission that it serves. State funding for Extension was cut by 70 percent in 2011, resulting in a 57 percent cut to Extension staff. This has had a significant impact on the effectiveness of the program as well as its reach, despite the commitment that counties have and continue to make. Since that time, our members have asked us to work with University administration on a number of goals related to the program, the foremost of which has been the restoration of funds. Concerns about funding and requests for restoration, which were made to the University administration, began in 2015. They were further discussed at the Cooperative Extension board level throughout the second half of 2015 and officially expressed in writing and communicated again to the University in November 2015.

Nevada's counties have said that they find it increasingly difficult to explain to their residents the contribution of their tax dollars to a program that they see firsthand being diminished without equal investment from the institution in which the program has its home.

It is for these reasons that the Cooperative Extension Board voted unanimously to file this bill and ask for your help to address two things: one, that there be a guarantee of funding for

this program, and two, that a report regarding Extension activities and funding be submitted to the Legislature.

Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties:

I would like to quickly walk through some of what is proposed in A.B. 16 in more detail and would direct you to the proposed amendment that you have received ([Exhibit C](#)). Also, we would like to sincerely thank the Chair and Committee staff for working with us on this mock-up in preparation for today's hearing.

Section 1 requires annual reporting to the Legislature regarding the Cooperative Extension Program. We are proposing that the report include a summary of the Extension work and programming carried out each year; a breakdown of the total funds for the program by federal, state, and county dollars; and updates on the status of any cooperative agreements entered into between the Director of the Cooperative Extension Program and each county.

Sections 2 and 3 make changes to update NRS to reflect other changes that have been made in statute as well as at the university level. We believe the Legislative Counsel Bureau found that there is no longer a "Public Service Division of NSHE" and so made a change there, as well as the elimination of the word "agricultural" before "extension" to reflect the current name of the program at the university level.

Section 4 makes additional conforming changes throughout as well as eliminates subsection 6, which is language that appeared in the original draft and did not meet the intent of our original request. To alleviate any confusion, we have asked for subsection 6 to be removed entirely. Please note the important change in subsection 5. It is our intent that this language requires a basic level of state funding for extension work. The way that we propose to determine what that basic funding level should be is by requiring the University to match county dollars. Just a little background: the way that counties fund Extension is mostly through an optional one-cent property tax levy, though they do make contributions in other ways as well, including through staff, office space, and other in-kind assistance. What subsection 5 would require, is that the University also fund the Cooperative Extension Program at an amount equal to the total contributions made by counties from revenues from that one-cent property tax levy. We think the effect of the language in subsection 5 is to require NSHE to better support this program through funding.

We would refer you to the final section of the bill, section 14, which would provide an implementation date of July 1, 2018, so that this funding would not be required until the second year of the biennium.

The remaining sections of the bill, sections 5 through 13, only make conforming changes.

Jeff Fontaine:

Finally, we wanted to take a minute to address the mechanism that would determine the amount of funding required by NSHE. We understand that NSHE is concerned about the predictability of the funds that we have tied to their contribution. We would like to go over

a few statutory items that we believe are safeguards to ensure that the revenues would be limited, although we are happy to work with NSHE or the Committee if there are additional concerns.

We believe that tying the required amount that NSHE fund Extension by the property taxes is a prudent way to ensure that the amount that the University must commit each year would not be subject to unpredictable or dramatic increases. We would offer, as many of you know, that property taxes are already capped in two different ways: First, property tax revenues are limited through the 3 percent cap on owner-occupied residences and 8 percent caps on all other properties. Additionally, through NRS 354.59811, the amount of property tax revenue that a county can collect is limited to a 6 percent increase of the revenue collected in the prior year. This mechanism requires counties to adjust their tax rates so that revenue collected will be limited to a 6 percent annual increase. The result of these two separate caps, as well as other factors, is that, over the past five years, property taxes have risen only by an average of less than 1.8 percent per year. This ensures that the amount that the University would be required to pay under A.B. 16 could not become quickly inflated or unpredictable under either the current or any future property tax calculation.

We would also like to suggest one additional amendment to this bill, and that is to tie the University's required funding to a five-year rolling average of the collective one cent of county property tax revenue, as opposed to a single year. We think that this additional calculation will make the amount of this contribution even more predictable for the University.

Additionally, we thought it was important to note that every March, the Department of Taxation produces a projection of property tax revenues for each county for the following year so that the counties have that information to prepare their budgets. This information would be available to NSHE as well for planning purposes.

In closing, counties believe that they have continued to honor their commitment to funding Cooperative Extension and would respectfully urge the Committee to consider the additional support we are seeking through A.B. 16.

Assemblyman Ellison:

What happened with the consolidation issue? I think Elko County was concerned about last year's consolidation, putting the Extension into the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources. I would also like to talk to you about the one cent that the counties have already implemented trying to save these programs; they are so important.

Jeff Fontaine:

The consolidation of Cooperative Extension with the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources (CABNR) was approved by the Board of Regents, I believe, in September. I know the folks from UNR and President Johnson are here to speak to that. When that occurred, we worked very closely with the University and NSHE on that issue and tried to get as many of our comments and concerns about that consolidation addressed.

As far as the one-cent property tax is concerned, I believe Elko County is still levying that tax to support programs in their county. I know that all the other counties at this point continue to do that, with the exception of one county.

Assemblyman Ellison:

What about the Extension going to the College of Agriculture?

Jeff Fontaine:

That was the consolidation that I was referring to. Cooperative Extension was put into the CABNR.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Several years ago, when the cuts were made, Elko Extension went from three employees to one part-time employee. These people work closely with most of the people in 4-H. I think they lost most of their programs throughout the state, is that correct?

Jeff Fontaine:

I am not familiar with the specific cuts in services in Elko County, but there were cuts across the board, and I believe 4-H was part of the cuts in funding and services.

Assemblyman Watkins:

Have you had the opportunity to review the Clark County Commissioners' proposed amendment, submitted by Chris Giunchigliani and Marilyn Kirkpatrick, and what your position is on it ([Exhibit D](#)).

Jeff Fontaine:

We are familiar with the amendment and view it as a friendly amendment. Just to make clear, where the language of the bill refers to the University of Nevada, Reno, it would instead be replaced with "NSHE."

Jim French, County Commissioner, Humboldt County Board of Commissioners:

I have been involved with various segments of the consolidation program since its inception. Today I would like to address the on-the-ground impacts that Humboldt County has experienced since the 2011 reductions in funding, which approached 70 percent. Following that reduction, the NACO board asked me and three other county commissioners—Washoe County Commissioner Jeanne Herman, Eureka County Commissioner J.J. Goicoechea, and Clark County Commissioner Marilyn Kirkpatrick—to sit as a negotiating team with the University to attempt to work through some of the issues and concerns as they surrounded some of the core issues having to do with the consolidation as well as the funding and programming issues.

Although some compromises were achieved, the core concerns with program and funding were not agreed to by the University administration. The loss of core personnel and programs has reduced the services to my community to that of a shell. Many of the personnel and programs are simply nonexistent at this time. During that period of time, we

were experiencing the same kind of budget reductions as the state and many of the other counties were experiencing. We were looking for a lot of creative ways to keep the wheels on.

It was our priority in Humboldt County to maintain funding to Cooperative Extension, to the extent where we provided services, approximately 4,000 square feet of office and meeting space, two clerical personnel, and we funded a portion of the remaining Extension educator's salary. Since the time that we started that process, going back and looking at our budget, not only have we maintained that funding level, but we have actually seen that program increase by 24 percent. We have had to carry that as well. It has been increasingly difficult for us, as commissioners, to justify the program and the taxing structure as our budget tightens. The county has felt compelled to fill the budget and program gaps up to this point.

I would like to say that we feel that A.B. 16 would actually give us some relief relative to our programming and would allow us to maintain what we feel is a very vital program that comes out of our land-grant college system. The expectation in many rural counties is that Cooperative Extension would remain and have a robust program.

Lorinda A. Wichman, Commissioner, Nye County Board of Commissioners:

Nye County is the only county that chose not to participate. Through my testimony you will understand how the timeline took place. Tonopah, the county seat of Nye County, is the geographic center of Nye County and nearly the same for the state.

President Crowley was revered by Nye County for facilitating a growing program for the rural areas through the Cooperative Extension. In 2009, the Cooperative Extension office in Tonopah was a vibrant part of the community and served all of the outlying communities in Nye County. In Tonopah alone, \$135,900 a year was spent in supporting the activities and programs offered by a host of volunteers and two paid Cooperative Extension coordinators. An additional \$86,000 was spent to support programs in Pahrump, the largest community by population in Nye County, and only 45 minutes from Las Vegas.

In 2011, other than a request for an agreement to share the geographic information system with UNR through the Extension, there was no contact from the Cooperative Extension. However, the tax rate was approved and provided a total of \$212,261, of which \$130,023 went to Tonopah to provide area residents with services. In 2012 the Board of County Commissioners (BOCC) approved the budget presented by UNR and passed the resolution to fund the programs through the property taxes as the BOCC did each year. The University of Nevada, Reno was paid \$300,699 and \$134,438 was used in Tonopah.

At that time there were 24 programs available to the communities operated by volunteers under the supervision of one coordinator employed by UNR. The programs were self-funded through community donations and grants. They were an exciting and growing effort by everyone involved.

In the summer of 2012 the local community coordinator left UNR to tend to a new baby at home. Efforts began to fill her position and local educators were included in the selection process. Selection was made with the understanding the candidate would make Tonopah her home.

In April 2013, President Marc Johnson provided a presentation to the BOCC on the merger with the CABNR. Extensive questions were asked, as the decline in services was apparent to all. Assurances were made that services would return and be better than ever. The property tax resolution was again adopted which provided \$219,374 to UNR, and \$134,9310 was spent in Tonopah.

Within eight months of the new Cooperative Extension officer filling the position, 18 of the 24 programs in Tonopah were shut down and the volunteers were told to go home, that their programs did not fit the plans for the new model of Cooperative Extension. The Extension officer made her home in Pahrump and on occasion traveled to Tonopah. The new county extension officer was living in Pahrump and providing no services for the largest and most rural part of Nye County.

In August 2014, Dean Mark Walker provided an update to the BOCC, and again, many concerns over the lack of services and programs were expressed. Assurances were again made to the BOCC. The property tax resolution was adopted, providing \$285,777 to UNR and \$175,329 was attributed to Tonopah, with only a ghost of the former services available and one local coordinator remaining.

By the end of that same year, the remaining six programs along with their volunteers were eliminated. With no volunteers to supervise and no programs available to the community, the Tonopah coordinator left UNR's employment.

In August 2015, staff was directed to not bring forward the resolution to adopt the tax rate for Cooperative Extension. I simply could not justify a tax rate to my constituency when they would have to travel 240 miles or more to use the services provided by the Cooperative Extension office in Pahrump.

In September 2015, Dean Walker provided another update to the merger and again was given the concerns of the community over programs and the condition of the Cooperative Extension office in Tonopah. Assurances were once again provided to the BOCC, but I never saw any change so I never brought the resolution back for reconsideration.

The lingering tax collections provided UNR Cooperative Extension with \$169,293, and \$76,181 was attributed to services in Tonopah, with no coordinator and no programs operating.

In September 2016, the BOCC sent a letter to UNR leadership to express our concerns in Nye County and specifically the rural communities serviced by Tonopah's local office. Still no programs or coordinator in Tonopah but \$129,581 was claimed by UNR with \$1,423 attributed to Tonopah.

The 2016/2017 property tax bills were the first billing to express a zero-cent rate to support Cooperative Extension. Of the 18,159 square miles of Nye County, 17,259 square miles would love to participate in the vibrant and growing services provided to our youth and families by the Cooperative Extension office that existed prior to the changes that began in 2011. I would urge this Committee to pass A.B. 16 as a path to eventually make that possible.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

Can you tell us what some of the 18 of the 22 programs that were shut down were?

Lorinda Wichman:

One of our primary programs that was extremely vibrant was 4-H. There were other programs that provided lessons in cooking, gardening, and life preparedness skills. The most interesting part of this is that the community was so involved that none of the UNR dollars from the tax rate were used for those programs. They were all handled by volunteers and the community through donations and help.

Chair Swank:

I will open the hearing for testimony in support of A.B. 16.

Doug Busselman, Executive Vice President, Nevada Farm Bureau Federation:

Nevada Farm Bureau has been a longtime supporter of Cooperative Extension. Actually, our history goes back to 1919 with Cooperative Extension from our very beginning. We support the bill, particularly the enhanced transparency that is called for that results from the public reporting process that is outlined in section 1. We also support the increased financial support for Cooperative Extension and the linkage of this funding with county taxpayers and their contributions for the important beneficial programs associated with Cooperative Extension. We urge your support.

Steve K. Walker, representing Lyon County, Storey County, Douglas County, Carson City, and Eureka County:

The counties I represent run the gamut from the small, urban Carson City, to the very rural, Eureka County. They all support Cooperative Extension. Do I have a radon issue in my house? My trees are dying. What is the problem? My children want to raise rabbits, pigs, cattle, sheep, and chickens. Can 4-H provide this opportunity? Where do I get my domestic well water tested? What are the most adapted vegetables, trees, grasses, and shrubs in my area? Cooperative Extension provides highly educated employees with Ph.D.s and masters degrees to answer these questions without an economic incentive. Please support this bill.

Sarah Adler, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

For 14 years of my career, until January 20, 2017, I served as the Nevada State Director of the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Rural Development, an agency that works closely with Cooperative Extension throughout rural Nevada, including rural Clark and rural Washoe Counties. I am a huge fan of the exceptional individuals who populate Extension and the important work they do at the grassroots level in our state. I was also, for many years, a member of the Cooperative Extension Advisory Committee, when it existed. It was disbanded approximately three years ago, and although there was indication it would be reestablished, it has yet to be reestablished.

I wish to register my strong support for A.B. 16. It creates communication, accountability, and funding requirements that are essential to the health of communities and individuals throughout Nevada. Extension work is essential to that health at the community level.

As you have heard, Extension suffered disproportionate cuts to its budget through the recession years. A point I wish to make is that much of the funding that has been reestablished, as it has been indicated to me, has been put on campus, with appointments that are jointly funded by Extension and UNR. This misses the need in creating funding for the programs that Commissioner Wichman described.

I have great support for section 1, the reporting and accountability. I think, in addition, it should be clear what funding is spent at the local level versus at the University level. I think that improvement would be beneficial. This is important. I had one individual who had such a joint appointment tell me directly the work he did benefited his research and his lab on campus and had nothing to do with what went on at the county level. Regarding the merger with CABNR that was discussed earlier, the CABNR Faculty Senate representative said, Great, all of our grant requirements require outreach, and Extension can be our outreach. She meant for her on-campus research goals.

I also support section 4, subsection 5, the increased funding with the match by the state. Again, I think it is important that we are assured that a significant portion of the funding is spent at the county level, not at the campus level. There is a great benefit to the University in doing so: 4-H is the best feeder mechanism to the University system that we have in Nevada. Let us make these programs vibrant. [Also provided written testimony ([Exhibit E](#)).]

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I remember when we met in my office when the Advisory Committee was still intact. I know that former Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell had a very vocal part in that Advisory Committee. I found out after the session that the Advisory Committee had been disbanded, and I was discouraged by that. Was there a reason why the Committee was disbanded? Were you ever given a reason?

Sarah Adler:

I was requested to resign, and subsequent to that, the Committee was disbanded. That is all the information I have.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

There was no actual reason given?

Sarah Adler:

Not to me.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Thank you for all the work you did for Cooperative Extension for all those years.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Just about every county in the state is involved with this, correct?

Doug Busselman:

Cooperative Extension is a program that is offered in all states that I know of. It was built on a partnership that involved the land-grant universities, federal funding, as well as state funding, and local funding. It was created to be that kind of cooperative federalism. In 1919, when Farm Bureau first began as an organization, one of our original purposes was, through our county farm bureau organization's dues dollars, to support what eventually became Cooperative Extension, with agents coming out to extend the information from the land-grant universities to farmers in the field. I think in Nevada's history, there was a connection that required, in state law, a necessity that in order for a Cooperative Extension agent to be in place, they had to have a county farm bureau. That connection that we have had with the Extension goes back to when we were both just starting out.

Assemblyman Ellison:

Does that include all 17 counties in Nevada?

Doug Busselman:

I do not believe all of the counties, as was indicated, because of the connections with the funding that comes from the local level. I think they also have some that are consolidated. It covers the state, although it may not cover each of the counties.

Assemblywoman Titus:

Unfortunately the County Commissioner of Churchill County could not be here, and I would like to read into the record a letter that he sent to me:

Please accept the following comments submitted on behalf of Churchill County regarding A.B. 16, scheduled for hearing by the Assembly Committee on Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Mining, March 9, 2017.

During the 2011 Legislative Session, the Legislature took action that resulted in the University of Nevada's Cooperative Extension (UNCE) state general fund allocation being folded into the general UNR budget for the first time, thus allowing the University flexibility to reduce the overall level of funding for UNCE. The economic climate of our State coupled with the ability for

UNR Administrators to reduce funding, resulted in the Nevada System of Higher Education (NSHE) Board of Regents' decisions to drastically and disproportionately reduce UNCE's budget by 63%, although the overall budget cut to UNR was approximately 15%.

Churchill County supported the Governor's FY 14-15 efforts to return UNCE to its own line item in the budget and he provided a welcome \$500K per year addition to the budget, which only restored around 10% of the devastating cuts suffered by UNCE. These actions were taken to help ensure that funding intended for UNCE was provided and protected; albeit much damage had already been done.

Although all the counties in the state have felt the effects of the great recession and have had to make difficult budgetary decisions, we have treated UNCE and the services they provide to our communities as a priority by remaining committed to supporting and funding Cooperative Extension. Throughout the past fifteen years, the federal government and county partners have increased their support and financial commitment to UNCE, which is a reflection of the value and importance local communities place on the education and programs provided by UNCE. Actions taken by the University over this period have essentially shifted more of the financial support away from the state, thus resulting in counties now funding the largest portion of UNCE's total budget at 41%, while only 18% is being provided by the state; compared to FY 2009, when the state was providing 36%.

Churchill County supports AB 16 and any efforts to require the state to at least match county contributions to UNCE's budget. Additionally, due to recent actions taken by the Board of Regents to approve "administrative" consolidation of UNCE and CABNR, it is necessary to increase the accountability of NSHE and UNCE by requiring annual reporting to the Legislature regarding work that is carried out, the amounts of various funding used to carry out the functions of Cooperative Extension, and updates on the status of any agreements entered into between the Director of UNCE and a Board of County Commissioners.

AB 16 is a step in the right direction to ensure a more proportionate funding structure for UNCE, and provides protections to the counties who have remained committed to supporting Cooperative Extension and the services and programs they provide throughout Nevada.

The letter is signed by H. Pete Olsen, Chairman ([Exhibit F](#)).

Chair Swank:

I will now take testimony in support of A.B. 16 in Las Vegas.

Sylvia R. Lazos, Vice Chair, Latino Leadership Council; and Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now:

The Latino Leadership Council and Educate Nevada Now worked very closely with Commissioner Giunchigliani and Commissioner Kirkpatrick. For that reason we want to echo their testimony about the need for the amendment and the letter asking for the amendment, which is considered a friendly amendment ([Exhibit D](#)).

As part of the Latino Leadership Council, we were also bereft by budget cuts and how they impacted the Latino community in southern Nevada. There were many important programs—literacy, outreach to parents, development of ethnic curriculum—that totally fell by the wayside and have not recovered since the budget cuts. Extension can play a very important role in outreach to urban communities and particularly vulnerable communities. We have not seen a recovery of that since the budget cuts. As a faculty member, when I had the honor to serve at the University of Missouri-Columbia School of Law before I came to the wonderful William S. Boyd School of Law, University of Nevada, Las Vegas (UNLV), I saw the potential that Extension can create on a campus. Unlike the prior testimony that you have heard, we do not have joint appointments at UNLV between Extension. In fact, Extension is removed from the campus. The kinds of experiences that I had at Missouri, being able to work closely with Extension faculty so that my research could reach the community, are not opportunities that are being had here at UNLV.

The Latino Leadership Council spoke to the President of UNR, we spoke to Dean Mark Walker, we spoke to the Regents, and we have spoken to the local manager of Extension to try to ensure that local Extension becomes more active in our community. I believe that the changes in the law to create greater accountability are much needed so that we do not have community groups asking for accountability. It should be a more systemic thing. [Written testimony was also provided ([Exhibit G](#)).]

Finally, as part of the Latino Leadership Council testimony, I have attached a UNLV study, published in *The Lincy Institute Research Brief*, which discusses ways that we could structure Extension to better serve the community. I think it is an academic read, but still a good read and one that is motivating the request of Commissioners Giunchigliani and Kirkpatrick to take UNR out of the various sections and replace it with NSHE ([Exhibit H](#)).

Chair Swank:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support? Is there anyone in Las Vegas who would like to testify in opposition or neutral? Seeing no one, we will return to support in Carson City.

Tom Baker, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada:

For 12 years I had the privilege of serving as rural director for a man by the name of Richard Bryan when he was a United States Senator. For 11 years I served as chairman of the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension Advisory Committee until it was disbanded three years ago. I saw firsthand the work that Extension did in all of Nevada's counties. The Extension staff, located in each county, worked with county and city leadership to

enhance the quality of life and improve the economic base throughout Nevada by addressing locally identified needs and delivering over 100 programs. That is to all segments of our communities, from children up to senior citizens.

During the recent recession, Extension's budget was cut over 50 percent while the rest of the University system faced a 35 percent reduction. With the economic recovery in Nevada, most of the budget cuts have been addressed and made whole; Extension's has not.

I support A.B. 16. This legislation addresses the problems that Extension has faced in doing its work at the grassroots level in all of our counties.

Sarah Adler mentioned why section 1 is so important, and I think the University's report to the Legislature on outcomes and how the money is being spent is absolutely critical. I also agree with section 4, subsection 5, in which the state is required to match counties' contributions. Extension staff currently devotes an inordinate amount of time and effort to acquiring grants to augment their budget shortfall. This makes it necessary for the work done to match up with the grant priorities, rather than the needs in the local community.

Please, this is absolutely critical to not only rural but urban communities as well.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

We have heard a lot about the agriculture programs with Cooperative Extension. I understand there are many more programs. One community had a domestic violence program. Will you discuss some of the more diverse programs that you have seen over the years with Cooperative Extension?

Tom Baker:

Our largest program is in Clark County. Clark County is far from being a rural county, as well as the next largest being Washoe County and Carson City. I am sure Assemblyman Ellison can tell you the number of programs in the counties he represents. By far, as Mr. Fontaine said, all the county commissioners are very much in favor of supporting the programs within the counties. In fact, the Extension board was very much in opposition to the consolidation of the Extension back into the CABNR because Nevada is really the most urban state in the United States. We got crossways with the administration. We did that because the counties were opposed to it. There are reading programs for children, nutritional programs; you can go through the gamut of everything the Extension does. The 4-H is probably the best-known program; in fact, a gentleman by the name of Brian Sandoval is a graduate of the 4-H program. He came to talk to the Extension students and was very proud of being a part of the 4-H program. Most people think of 4-H, but Extension goes far beyond that and touches so many different people.

Chair Swank:

Is there anyone else who would like to testify in support of A.B. 16? Seeing no one, I will move to opposition.

Marc Johnson, President, University of Nevada, Reno:

I am going to start by saying some positive things about this bill. Throughout my presentation I would like to clarify some misconceptions that have been put forward today. Then I will state two points why we are in opposition.

First, this bill did a great job of cleaning up the language of a law that was written a long time ago. Indeed, this is the Cooperative Extension Program of the University of Nevada, Reno (UNR). University of Nevada, Reno is the land-grant institution that has operated in collaboration with the counties and with the USDA for many decades. We have verified this with the administrator of the National Institute of Food and Agriculture, the USDA branch that communicates with Extension, agricultural experiment stations, and teaching programs at land-grant universities. It has been verified that this is the institution recognized by USDA as the land-grant institution.

I also really appreciate everyone talking about the values of Extension here today. We agree with the values of Extension and, therefore, the value of these programs is not at issue. Actually, we are all friends when we get together and talk about anything but administrative organization and money. We all agree that these programs are quite valuable.

In terms of the reporting requirements, that is certainly not a problem for us because the Cooperative Extension does an annual report. We share it with our constituents and with our counties, and we are pleased to share it with the Legislature. We also report with the county commissioners every year as we are constructing budgets.

In terms of the consolidation, we did not consolidate the organization of Cooperative Extension into the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology, and Natural Resources (CABNR). We consolidated leadership so that the dean of the CABNR is the leader of the agricultural teaching program and also Cooperative Extension. Cooperative Extension maintains a separate budget; they maintain a separate state budget, and they maintain separate budgets within the University. There is no consolidation of budgeting, only the leadership has come together. The purpose of combining the leadership is that most of the states in the United States have consolidated the leadership of agricultural experiment stations, the college of agriculture, and cooperative extension because there is a long history of outreach to the communities to do applied research and, as stated earlier, extend that valuable research into the communities. That is where Extension got its name.

I will give you my background in Cooperative Extension. I took my first full-time cooperative extension role as a professor in 1978 at North Carolina State University. I was the Director of Cooperative Extension and the Director of the Agricultural Experiment Station and Dean of Agriculture at Kansas State University for 11 years. I later became Director of Cooperative Extension and Dean of Agricultural Sciences at Colorado State University from 2003 to 2008. So I do have a strong understanding on the implementation of cooperative extension programs.

It is cooperative because they are an investment by the federal government to do nationwide programs and nationwide grantsmanship to support programs for research and extension all the way to the county level, the cooperative partner being the land-grant university which represents the state. The state is responsible for hiring leadership and specialist individuals so that we can do applied research and put together some regional or statewide programs. These people require an investment as well. At the county level, the counties always put in funds as well to have a local program to support volunteers, the 4-H program, et cetera. For example, when we are talking about 4-H, we have the state 4-H specialist to coordinate with all the county Extension educators and 4-H volunteers to create a statewide 4-H program. There are similarities between counties and distinctions within counties. There are also some statewide programs so that we can have competitions statewide and a summer camp statewide for 4-H opportunities.

I have only two reasons why I have concerns with this bill. Both of them have to do with money, and that is really what this bill is about. First, there is the issue of section 4, subsection 5, which changes the language drastically. For years, the University has been permitted to contribute an amount up to the amount of one cent per hundred-dollar valuation. It was voluntary, and we have put money into the counties, up to the one cent per hundred-dollar valuation. This bill changes that completely. It is not voluntary, it is an amount equal to the one cent per hundred-dollar valuation. What that means for us is, basically, a mandatory increase of flow of funds into the county operations of about \$5 million a year, which is not a current requirement.

If we were to reallocate all of our funds, we would have no state specialists and no state 4-H leader. We would not be able to do our unique state-level responsibility by offering services, applied research, and coordination across the counties for that kind of support. If we were forced to put all of our money into the counties, there would not be that state support that we have been enjoying so far.

Let me turn now to the concern that I have most of all. Several speakers have said the University has restored most of the rest of the programs, but we have not restored Extension. That is just not true. I will proceed with a bit of language to tell you the approach we took to the catastrophic budget cutting from FY 2009 to FY 2013, the priorities we had, and where we are today with the budgets at UNR.

Between FY 2009 and FY 2013, UNR lost one-third of our state funding, \$75 million. To partially replace some of these funds, the Board of Regents has approved a series of registration fee increases of 47 percent. Our students are paying 47 percent higher fees today than they were in 2009, to only partially replace the budget cuts to the teaching operation. The University lost 600 state-funded positions, and over 50 tenure-track spots. It was so catastrophic, we had to set some goals. We set the goals to first of all support the core teaching and complementary research missions so that these students, who are paying 47 percent more, could have the faculty to teach their classes. Our second goal was to enable the students to pursue the degrees they were already pursuing and graduate with minimal

disruption. The third was to maintain the core infrastructure of our outreach bodies, such as Cooperative Extension and the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology.

We could not, in that period of time, do across-the-board cutting or we would have essentially destroyed everything. In the early rounds, we did many cuts, we closed some departments, we closed many programs, which means they got 100 percent budget reductions, and we have restored none of them. After such a catastrophic recession that we had, you do not go back and try to replace everything that you had ten years ago; you move on. Therefore, every nickel that has come to us has been spent in a strategic way to maintain the core missions of the institution.

Cooperative Extension and the Nevada Bureau of Mines and Geology were the last programs to have disproportionate cuts. This was after the 2011 Legislative Session. In the first year after that session, we understood the difficulty that this budget cut would present with Extension, so we gave them \$2 million in one-time funds for a year to give them time to write grants and seek alternative sources of revenue for their program. Unfortunately, that extra year did not result in much additional revenue.

I would like to make a very fundamental point. If this bill were to pass and we are supposed to, out of our own resources, come up with an additional \$5 million each year to go into Extension programs in counties, I am going to show you that we have no other money available to us from revenue growth except for that student enrollment-oriented source of revenue.

We have been growing rapidly at UNR. Our enrollment has really grown a lot. That has given us two of our three sources of new revenue: student fees, which we raised 47 percent; we have increased enrollment and higher fees. That is one of our main sources of revenue. The other main source of revenue is from the state funding formula, because as students finish more classes, we get caseload through the state funding formula. That is student-generated money. The third form of new revenue is what I would call self-generated funds through contracts, grants, and donor gifts to the University.

Since 2009, we have not asked for, we were not allowed to ask for, nor were we granted, any additional revenues beyond state funding formulas, except for this biennium, when UNR's School of Medicine was given an additional amount to develop a four-year medical school in Reno to complement the new medical school at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas. Other than that, none of our budgets, other than our teaching budget through caseload growth, have increased. Regarding the notion that UNR has restored many programs, we have not. We have been putting our money into hiring faculty, graduate teaching assistants, and student support so that our students can be successful in graduating. This has been the priority from the beginning, and it continues to be a priority, because we are developing the workforce and doing the kind of research that is supporting advanced manufacturing for the new Nevada.

This year we were given our first opportunity to really seek an enhancement. The enhancement we generated at UNR, which is in a budget request and supported by the

Governor's recommendation, is for an advanced manufacturing research initiative. The entire campus participated in putting this initiative together, including Cooperative Extension, because Cooperative Extension has the opportunity to teach advanced manufacturing, advanced technologies, and career opportunities.

Let me close by saying that if this bill were to pass and we are basically forced to spend one cent per one hundred dollars, it would cost us an additional \$5 million, which we have not gained in any other budget but our teaching budget. [Also provided written testimony, ([Exhibit I](#)).]

Assemblywoman Carlton:

It has been my understanding, Mr. Johnson, that the land-grant university that we keep talking about applies to both institutions, UNR and UNLV.

Marc Johnson:

I do not think it does.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

University of Nevada, Las Vegas has obtained grants based on being a land-grant institution. That has always been my understanding, so I think we will need to clarify that.

Marc Johnson:

We sought clarification when we started hearing that from the administrator at USDA who maintains the operating relationships with land-grant universities. His name is Dr. Sonny Ramaswamy ([Exhibit J](#)).

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I am not going to elaborate on the money too much, since this is not a money committee, but I cannot take my money hat off. When we talk about all the cuts from 2009 to 2013, it was not just the universities. Our state employees took cuts. At one moment in time we had problems with certain employees working for certain institutions not taking those cuts. Children took cuts. Autism took cuts. Public safety took cuts. Welfare took cuts. To step up and have a problem with those cuts in the past, I think everyone could come forward with that. We need to have a cut-and-paste paragraph for that when we have these conversations. I do remember these conversations, Mr. Johnson, in my conference room, about how important Cooperative Extension was and the impact it was going to have on Clark County. I do not think anyone up north heard us when we were serious about the impact to Clark County. I think it is time to have a very serious discussion about bringing this back to my constituents in Clark County.

We have also heard from county commissioners who are interested in it. Unfortunately, in 2013 and 2015 we could not do much, we were still strapped, and it is hard to make that argument when you are still asking children to take cuts in certain services; but we are coming out of it, and I think it is time to have this discussion. This may not be the actual way that we do it, but I think we all need to sit down and talk about how important this is for Clark County.

Chair Swank:

Thank you, President Johnson. Is there anyone else here in opposition?

Constance Brooks, Vice Chancellor, Government and Community Affairs, Nevada System of Higher Education:

We also take issue with section 4, subsection 5. We do understand the spirit of the intent to increase the state's share for Cooperative Extension, and we are in support of that. However, as President Johnson indicated and as is reflected in the fiscal note we submitted, we do see this as a loss to the overall funds for the University itself. The amendment that Mr. Fontaine offered with respect to how we could address that cost, I would be happy to discuss with him after the hearing. We have not had the opportunity to analyze that amendment and perhaps look into how that could be incorporated within this language. We would also like to thank NACO for the many meetings over the last couple of years, and the increased dialogue that we have had in order to address this very serious issue.

Chair Swank:

Is there anyone else in opposition to A.B. 16. Seeing no one, I will move to neutral on A.B. 16.

Kent M. Ervin, Legislative Liaison, Nevada Faculty Alliance:

Nevada Faculty Alliance is the statewide association of the NSHE faculty at all institutions, including Cooperative Extension faculty. Cooperative Extension is a great program with a distinguished history and tradition, now focused on modern community issues. It is part of our outreach and community engagement mission. Extension also helps for academic research in Nevada communities. Nevada Faculty Alliance would love to have funding for all NSHE programs restored to prerecession levels; there is no doubt about that. The reality, though, is that this bill seems to conflate funding from the University versus funding from the state. The Legislature, I believe, controls all the funding to the University budget, so if there is a way to provide the funds to do this reestablishment back to prior levels of Cooperative Extension by bringing new money in, that would be great.

The reality is that the Executive Budget does not fully fund the weighted student credit-hour formulas now, and does not fully fund the Regents' highest priority of faculty compensation. New sources of funds would have to be identified in order to increase other programs. Other statewide programs, such as the seismology laboratory, both north and south, are in the same boat of having no students' funds to grow, and having fixed or cut budgets since 2009. There are many orphan programs that have no way to grow. That will also need to be addressed in a more vocal way.

Chair Swank:

Is anyone else here in neutral? [There was no one.] Mr. Fontaine, would like to say a few closing remarks?

Jeff Fontaine:

I would like to thank you and the Committee for hearing our bill and all those who testified, including UNR and their opposition to this bill as well as NSHE. As President Johnson indicated, it really does come down to money. I guess I will make a couple of comments relative to that observation.

First, regarding the notion that UNR and NSHE would be tied to a one-cent property tax levy, or the revenue generated by that, the counties are tied to that, so it seems fair and reasonable that if we are going to be partners in this program, the university should be tied to that amount as well.

I was struck by President Johnson's comment that when you have to make cuts, you move on. That may be the case, but that is not what the counties did. The counties did not cut from the program; they did not take their penny out of the program and put it towards services they had to cut. Some of those services the counties are mandated to provide: public safety, social services, parks, libraries, and a whole host of services. They did not take that penny and pull it out of Cooperative Extension to pay for those services they were forced to cut. They kept it in the program and they continue to do so today, with the exception of one county. Regarding the priority of Cooperative Extension: you have heard all the testimony, and there is great support for the programs they provide and the services across the state, both urban and rural.

My view of things is that if it is a priority, then you fund it. That is all we are asking for in this bill; along with reporting, let us find a way that we can get more state funding into the program for Cooperative Extension. That is what the counties are doing. We need to make this a true partnership, one that we can continue for another 100 years. [Also provided a presentation of Cooperative Extension highlights ([Exhibit K](#)).]

Chair Swank:

With that, I will close the hearing on A.B. 16. We will now move into a work session. The first bill is Assembly Bill 33.

Assembly Bill 33: Abolishes certain boards, commissions and councils relating to natural resources. (BDR 46-312)

Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 33 abolishes certain boards, commissions, and councils relating to natural resources. It was sponsored by this Committee on behalf of the Office of the Governor, and heard on March 2, 2017. As you recall, the bill would eliminate certain boards and commissions, one of which is staffed by the Department of Taxation, Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission. The other four are within the purview of the Department of

Agriculture: the Garlic and Onion Growers' Advisory Board, the Alfalfa Seed Advisory Board, the Advisory Council for Organic Agricultural Products, and the State Dairy Commission. There were no amendments proposed at the hearing, but in response to concerns that were raised by Committee members, there has been an amendment proposed to retain the Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission. By retaining it, that would translate into an amendment to the bill that would take out the provision repealing the Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission such that that Commission would continue to exist ([Exhibit L](#)). I believe there are representatives here from the Departments of Taxation and Agriculture if members have questions of them.

Chair Swank:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 33.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 33.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblyman Yeager:

I would like to thank you for the amendment keeping the Mining Oversight and Accountability Commission. I was somewhat disturbed by the testimony that seemed to indicate the reason the Commission had not had a meeting was simply that seats had not been filled, not that there was not a desire to move forward with the work of that Commission. With that amendment, I am in full support of this bill.

Chair Swank:

We will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS WAS ABSENT
FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Cohen. I will now move on to Assembly Bill 50.

Assembly Bill 50: Revises provisions relating to the imposition of certain fees, civil penalties and administrative fines by the State Environmental Commission. (BDR 40-181)

Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst:

Assembly Bill 50 revises provisions relating to certain fees, civil penalties, and administrative fines from the State Environmental Commission. The bill is sponsored by this Committee on behalf of Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) within the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, heard in this Committee on

February 23, 2017. You will recall that this bill would increase the fines and civil penalties for violations related to community and public water systems. The cap on civil penalties that could be recovered by the Attorney General on behalf of NDEP would go from \$5,000 to \$25,000 per day. The cap on administrative fines imposed by NDEP is increased from \$2,500 to \$5,000 per day.

This bill would also authorize the State Environmental Commission to establish regulations for fees necessary to carry out the state's oversight of public water systems and for NDEP to fulfill its duties regarding review of tentative and final subdivision maps. There was an amendment proposed at the hearing by NDEP to clarify the administration of the fees. Their proposed amendment is attached ([Exhibit M](#)).

Chair Swank:

I will entertain a motion to amend and do pass A.B. 50.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN JAUREGUI MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
ASSEMBLY BILL 50.

ASSEMBLYMAN YEAGER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion?

Assemblywoman Titus:

I will be a no on this bill. I think it is a very dangerous precedent that we are allowing departments to increase fees by 500 percent when there was no documentation to support such a tremendous increase in these fees. I think it is a well-regulated industry already. I think the Clean Water Act and other government regulations have already set the path, and it is very clear. I think this is an incredible overreach.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

As a point of clarification, it was my understanding that this was a cap on fines. I believe we need to have strong fines to make people comply, especially when it comes to water. Am I correct, fees are different than fines and penalties? You have to do something wrong before it impacts you.

Susan E. Scholley:

That is correct. The fines are being increased. With respect to the \$5,000 to \$25,000, those have to be recovered in court, and the administrative fines go through the administrative process for fining for violations. There is authority for creating fees for review, but that is different than the \$5,000 and the \$25,000. The representatives from NDEP are here if you need more detail.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I just wanted to clarify that these numbers were actually associated with fines. I know we let a number of different agencies handle their own fees to a certain extent, and set them by regulation. The only ones that we actually statutorily deal with are the professional licensure boards, because we set a cap. I have no problems with making a fine a true hammer. If the fine is cheaper than the fix, people will just keep paying the fine. We have to make the fine impactful enough to protect the public.

Chair Swank:

We will now vote on A.B. 50.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN ELLISON, KRASNER, TITUS, AND WHEELER VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN BROOKS WAS ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Jauregui. I will close the work session and open public comment. Is there anyone who wishes to provide public comment? Seeing no one, this meeting is adjourned [at 3:08 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Davis
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Heidi Swank, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 16](#), dated March 7, 2017, provided by Dagny Stapleton, Deputy Director, Nevada Association of Counties.

[Exhibit D](#) is a proposed amendment to [Assembly Bill 16](#), dated March 8, 2017, submitted by Chris Giunchigliani and Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Clark County Commissioners.

[Exhibit E](#) is written testimony in support of [Assembly Bill 16](#), provided by Sarah Adler, Private Citizen, Carson City, Nevada.

[Exhibit F](#) is a letter in support of [Assembly Bill 16](#), dated March 9, 2017, to Assemblywoman Titus, written by H. Pete Olsen, Churchill County Commissioner, read into the record by Assemblywoman Titus.

[Exhibit G](#) is a letter dated March 9, 2017, in support of [Assembly Bill 16](#), provided by Sylvia R. Lazos, Vice Chair, Latino Leadership Council; and Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now; and Al Martinez, Chair, Latino Leadership Council.

[Exhibit H](#) is a December 2016 article from *The Lincy Institute Research Brief* titled "Comparing the Administration of University Cooperative Extensions in the United States: A Case Analysis," by Fatma Nasoz, Robert E. Gang, and William E. Brown Jr., provided by Sylvia R. Lazos, Vice Chair, Latino Leadership Council; and Policy Director, Educate Nevada Now .

[Exhibit I](#) is written testimony in opposition to [Assembly Bill 16](#), provided by Marc Johnson, President, University of Nevada, Reno.

[Exhibit J](#) is a letter written by Dr. Sonny Ramaswamy, Director, National Institute of Food and Agriculture, dated November 12, 2015, provided by and addressed to Marc Johnson, President, University of Nevada, Reno.

[Exhibit K](#) is a presentation of Cooperative Extension's 2016 Program Highlights, provided by Jeff Fontaine, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties.

[Exhibit L](#) is a Work Session Document for [Assembly Bill 33](#), dated March 9, 2017, presented by Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division. Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit M](#) is a Work Session Document for Assembly Bill 50, dated March 9, 2017, presented by Susan E. Scholley, Committee Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.