

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

**Eighty-First Session
May 10, 2021**

The Committee on Natural Resources was called to order by Chair Howard Watts at 4:03 p.m. on Monday, May 10, 2021, Online and in Room 3143 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/App/NELIS/REL/81st2021.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair
Assemblywoman Lesley E. Cohen, Vice Chair
Assemblywoman Natha C. Anderson
Assemblywoman Annie Black
Assemblywoman Tracy Brown-May
Assemblywoman Maggie Carlton
Assemblyman John Ellison
Assemblywoman Cecelia González
Assemblywoman Alexis Hansen
Assemblywoman Susie Martinez
Assemblywoman Robin L. Titus
Assemblyman Jim Wheeler

COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senate District No. 17
Senator Fabian Donate, Senate District No. 10

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst
Allan Amburn, Committee Counsel
Devon Kajatt, Committee Manager
Nancy Davis, Committee Secretary
Trinity Thom, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 1143



OTHERS PRESENT:

Lewis Souder, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada
Tiffany East, Chair, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife
Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada
Ashanti Lewis, Advocacy Manager, Three Square Food Bank
Sarah Sanchez, Director, Carson Valley Community Food Closet

Chair Watts:

[Roll was taken. Committee rules and protocol were reviewed.] We will begin our hearings with Senate Bill 125 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 125 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions related to falconry. (BDR 45-158)

Senator James A. Settelmeyer, Senate District No. 17:

Senate Bill 125 (1st Reprint) is a long-standing issue; I have a few falconers who hunt on my ranch on occasion—it is fascinating for me to work with them on issues. In one session we had a situation where all the falconers had to get rid of their birds because the Department of Wildlife (NDOW) did not have the proper paperwork done in time. Luckily, at that time, then-Assembly Speaker Marilyn Kirkpatrick reached out and gave us an emergency legislative-called meeting during session so the falconers would not have to get rid of their birds.

It is fascinating to watch the falconers do rehabilitation; the work they have done when birds are unfortunately injured is phenomenal. One of the things these falconers run across, on a rare occasion, is an injured golden eagle. Under *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS), they are not allowed to rehabilitate golden eagles. This bill seeks to allow that. We are not trying to allow the taking of eggs or anything of that nature. The Department of Wildlife had some concerns with the language of the bill during the hearing in the Senate Committee on Natural Resources. The Department provided an amendment to ensure their issues and concerns were dealt with. The individuals whom I have worked with on this bill had no problem with the amendment. It is fascinating to me the degree that they are willing to give up their own freedoms in order to care for these birds. When the falconers enter into these agreements, they allow the federal government to come onto their property at any time in order to ensure these animals are being taken care of. That is a step further than I would be willing to go. The bill seeks to incorporate NDOW's concerns. Also, some of the members of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources were worried about the idea of potentially taking animals out of the wild in the state of Nevada. This will enable them to do rehabilitation on these animals, but not take them from the wild. I am not a falconer, but I have experts here who can answer your questions better than I.

Chair Watts:

Mr. Souder, do you have any remarks before we open up for questions?

Lewis Souder, Private Citizen, Gardnerville, Nevada:

I am here to promote good conservation in getting this bill passed. We had many letters of support when we presented this bill to the Senate Committee on Natural Resources. Everyone says this is good conservation. We are here to help. Some of the concerns were that we were going to be taking eagles out of wild Nevada; we are not trying to do that.

Chair Watts:

Members, are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Titus:

In the first three sections of the bill, it references the bald eagle and the golden eagle. Section 3, subsection 3, is specifically related to golden eagles. I know there are bald eagles in this state; I have seen them on my own property and on yours, Senator Settlemeyer. Is there a different set of regulations for bald eagles?

Senator Settlemeyer:

Federal law does not allow you to have bald eagles. I believe that is why the language is that way.

Lewis Souder:

Senator Settlemeyer is correct. [unintelligible.] We are trying to work with the eagles that need rehabilitation. There is also concern about trapping healthy eagles in Nevada. We are not trying to do that. There is a federally regulated lottery in which eagles are taken out of depredation zones—there are currently depredation zones in Utah and Wyoming. I believe for the whole country there are six tags available to falconers. This involves meeting with a federal trapper, going to a depredation zone, identifying an eagle that is preying upon livestock, and putting the eagle in the hands of a licensed falconer. Not just any falconer can get these tags; this is going to be a master falconer with an eagle endorsement. This is very strict on a federal level, and no bald eagles will be involved.

Chair Watts:

It seems that bald eagles are out of the question, and we are only dealing with golden eagles within the provisions of this bill.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I was shocked in looking at section 1, which references trophy big game mammals. Is that possible? No one uses these birds to hunt big game mammals, correct?

Senator Settlemeyer:

That is existing law in NRS 501.3855, which does not apply to the concept of falconry; it is just the section of law that it is tucked into. More specifically, NRS 503.610 references eagles. No, eagles are not utilized to take down big game mammals.

Assemblyman Ellison:

I thought maybe this was another section that was deleted a long time ago.

Chair Watts:

Section 1, subsection 1, paragraph (b), notes the addition of NRS 503.610, and states, "unlawfully kills or possesses a big game mammal, moose, bobcat, swan or eagle" I believe the reference to that other section is because of these adjustments that are being made further in the bill.

Senator Settelmeyer:

I appreciate that response. This is indicating that these individuals be exempt since it would be lawful for them to possess these eagles.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will open up for anyone wishing to offer testimony in support of S.B. 125 (R1).

Tiffany East, Chair, Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife:

The Board of Wildlife Commissioners, Department of Wildlife, supports S.B. 125 (R1) and we thank Senator Settelmeyer for bringing this forward. As Nevada is one of only three states that does not have a rehabilitation program in place, we feel it is important to allow for possession of the golden eagle for the rehabilitation of these amazing birds. We encourage your support of S.B. 125 (R1).

Chair Watts:

Is there anyone else wishing to testify in support? Hearing no one, is there anyone in opposition? Hearing no one, is there anyone in neutral? Hearing no one, are there any closing remarks? Seeing none, thank you for your informative bill presentation. With that, I will close the hearing on S.B. 125 (R1) and open the work session. We will begin with Senate Bill 43 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 43 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation. (BDR 35-344)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

As Legislative Counsel Bureau staff, I can neither support nor oppose any proposal that comes before the Legislature. Senate Bill 43 (1st Reprint) was heard in this Committee on May 3, 2021 [[Exhibit C](#)]. This bill expands the membership of the Advisory Board on Outdoor Recreation in the Division of Outdoor Recreation of the State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources by adding one voting member and two nonvoting members. The voting member is to be appointed by the Governor from a list of nominees submitted by the Board of Directors of the Nevada Association of Counties. The two nonvoting members must be representatives of the United States Department of the Interior and the United States Department of Agriculture, respectively.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions? Hearing none, I will accept a motion to do pass S.B. 43 (R1).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON MADE A MOTION TO DO PASS
SENATE BILL 43 (1ST REPRINT).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GONZÁLEZ SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Hearing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Martinez. Next is Senate Bill 98.

Senate Bill 98: Makes various changes to provisions relating to the Carson Water Subconservancy District. (BDR S-579)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 98 was heard in this Committee on April 26, 2021 [[Exhibit D](#)]. This bill expands the boundary of the Carson Water Subconservancy District to include the portions of Storey County that are within the Carson River hydrologic basin. The measure expands the membership of the Board of Directors of the Carson Water Subconservancy District from 11 to 13 members by including two residents of Storey County appointed by the Board of County Commissioners of Storey County. The measure excludes the portion of Storey County within the District from the taxable property on which the Board of Directors is authorized to levy a certain tax. Instead, the Board of County Commissioners of Storey County must pay to the District from the County's general fund an amount equal to what would have been generated by such a tax on the portion of Storey County that is within the Carson River hydrologic basin.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions?

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Typically, the counties do not pay these taxes. Is this making an exception to Storey County to pay the taxes that are levied on this in order to get the work done? Property owners would typically pay these taxes, correct?

Senator James A. Settlemeyer, Senate District No. 17:

The issue that we ran into in Storey County is that only a very small portion of the county is within the Carson Water Subconservancy District. That assessment is approximately \$8,000. Rather than trying to bill the minute number of property owners in that portion of Storey County, the County felt it was in the best interest on a more regional planning basis to make one check, rather than making it more difficult through the tax assessment process.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

In essence, all members of Storey County will now be paying for this, is that correct?

Senator Settlemeyer:

That is correct.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to do pass S.B. 98.

ASSEMBLYMAN WHEELER MOVED TO DO PASS SENATE BILL 98.

ASSEMBLYMAN ELLISON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblyman Wheeler. The last item on our work session today is Senate Bill 404.

Senate Bill 404: Revises provisions governing cannabis. (BDR 51-1086)

Jann Stinnesbeck, Committee Policy Analyst:

Senate Bill 404 was heard in this Committee on April 28, 2021 [[Exhibit E](#)]. This bill authorizes the State Sealer of Consumer Equitability, Division of Consumer Equitability, State Department of Agriculture, to adopt and enforce regulations relating to cannabis weighing and measuring equipment. The State Sealer of Consumer Equitability must ensure through inspection and testing that such equipment is suitable for its intended use, is properly installed and accurate, and is so maintained by its owner or user. It is prohibited for a person to have an incorrect weight or measure in his or her possession in a cannabis establishment and for a person to sell or offer to sell an incorrect weight or measure for use in a cannabis establishment. The State Sealer of Consumer Equitability may establish an annual license fee for all cannabis weighing and measuring equipment.

The Assembly Committee on Natural Resources proposed an amendment, which makes the following changes: Exempts non-commercial cannabis weighing and measuring equipment from the inspection and testing requirements; and requires independent testing laboratories to conform with certain standards. The amendment is attached to the work session document [pages 2 through 8, [Exhibit E](#)].

Chair Watts:

The amendment was agreed to between the State Department of Agriculture and other industry stakeholders. Are there any questions? Seeing none, I will accept a motion to amend and do pass S.B. 404.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN COHEN MOVED TO AMEND AND DO PASS
SENATE BILL 404.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN CARLTON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Is there any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, we will vote.

THE MOTION PASSED. (ASSEMBLYMEN BLACK, ELLISON,
HANSEN, TITUS, AND WHEELER VOTED NO.)

I will assign the floor statement to Assemblywoman Cohen. That concludes our work session. We will be in recess [at 4:23 p.m.]. We will come back to order [at 4:29 p.m.]. I will open the hearing on Senate Bill 370 (1st Reprint).

Senate Bill 370 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions relating to food policy. (BDR 50-824)

Senator Fabian Donate, Senate District No. 10:

As the chair of the Senate Committee on Natural Resources, it is my pleasure to introduce Senate Bill 370 (1st Reprint), which was requested by the committee. This bill comes at a timely period as we continue to respond to the public health crisis and find innovative ways to recover from this economic downturn.

The intent of S.B. 370 (R1) is to help supplement food security opportunities in Nevada. This bill authorizes the State Department of Agriculture (NDA) to purchase nutritious foods grown, raised, produced, or processed in Nevada for the purpose of distribution to food-insecure individuals experiencing hunger. This bill provides an economic stimulus and helps our local farming industry. Food banks will work with the State Department of Agriculture to make this locally procured food available to those who are most in need.

Today we have Three Square Food Bank and the Food Bank of Northern Nevada to provide an explanation of how the current public health crisis has impacted food insecurity rates in Nevada and the decline in federal nutrition assistance programs, such as The Emergency Food Assistance Program (TEFAP).

Three Square Food Bank is southern Nevada's only food bank, serving 4 counties, and the Food Bank of Northern Nevada serves the remaining 13 counties. Both food banks are members of the Feeding America network, the nation's largest hunger relief organization, consisting of 200 food banks across the country. I will now turn the presentation over to Shane Piccinini.

Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada:

I have a presentation to walk you through the bill and show you what it does [[Exhibit F](#)]. It is important to note that we have amended the bill. As written, the bill was amending an existing program within the NDA. We wanted to create a new program which we cleverly call the Home Means Nevada Agriculture Food Purchase Program. I would like to refresh

your memory that in Nevada there are about 388,000 people who are struggling with hunger and food insecurity. Among those people are approximately 134,000 children. One in eight adults struggle with hunger; one in five children struggle with hunger. The part that breaks my heart the most is that Nevada is tied in fourth place with Louisiana as one of the most food insecure states at about 20 percent; these numbers are pandemic numbers. In 2019, Nevada was ranked twentieth at 12.8 percent; we have lost a lot of ground. Equally as tragic, Nevada is tied in first place with Louisiana with the highest child food insecurity rate at 32.3 percent. In 2019, Nevada was in ninth place at 19.5 percent [page 2, [Exhibit F](#)]. From 2000 to 2019, between the two food banks, Nevada has put in a lot of work trying to improve our food insecurity numbers.

Page 3 shows what S.B. 370 (R1) will do. It will build a process to help Nevada become a more food secure state. It creates economic opportunities for Nevada agricultural products. The partnership with the two food banks leverages a statewide distribution network ensuring that every community in need is reached. The NDA and the food banks have expertise in distributing federal commodities programs such as TEFAP and Farmers to Families Food Box Program (FFFBP), which the Trump Administration created in response to the pandemic that was allowing agriculture to directly ship food boxes to the Feeding America's 200 food banks. As a sidenote, states with emergency food assistance programs similar to the one we are asking to create in Nevada include Massachusetts, New York, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Washington, New Jersey, Texas, and California among others.

Page 4 shows that S.B. 370 (R1) represents an economic opportunity to support agriculture in Nevada. I want to bring this point home—we really do want to support Nevada agriculture. Nevada agriculture had an economic output of almost \$5 billion in 2020. That includes ranching and farming, which accounted for \$787.8 million. Food and beverage manufacturing accounted for \$3.925 billion. There are a lot of products produced in Nevada. Not only sheep, cattle, lamb, and hogs, there are also dairy products, cereal, flour, beverages, grains, fruits, and vegetables. Nevada is actually a fairly agriculturally diverse state considering that we are such an arid state.

In closing, Nevada received food from the federal government valued at approximately \$47 million through TEFAP, the Commodity Supplemental Food Program, and the FFFBP. Of that \$47 million, very little was sourced from the state of Nevada. That, in a nutshell, is what S.B. 370 (R1) would do. Ashanti Lewis of the Three Square Food Bank and I are happy to take any questions you may have.

Chair Watts:

Are there any questions from the Committee?

Assemblyman Wheeler:

Section 1.7, subsection 2, says, "The Director may solicit and accept any gift, grant or donation for the Program." I see nothing about creating this in the State General Fund. I see nothing about the State General Fund and I see no fiscal note. Is there a general fund to set

this up? My follow-up to that is, would this bill offset any current purchases from out of state?

Senator Donate:

With regard to the first question, I would need clarification from your legal counsel. I would defer your second question to our presenters.

Shane Piccinini:

Regarding the General Fund, we deliberately left that open as it says that we would be willing to accept gifts, grants, or donations. We wanted to leave every revenue opportunity open for future directors of NDA. Realistically, this is probably a question that would be best answered by NDA. I can tell you that when we were discussing this with NDA, we wanted to leave it open to any opportunity that the Department would have to be able to purchase food for the Program. The answer to your second question regarding offsetting any purchases coming into the state is no. All of this would be additional food that would be brought in, in addition to the federal commodities programs that the Department is already managing.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

In interest of full disclosure, I am the Executive Director of United Labor Agency of Nevada; we consider Three Square to be an excellent partner. We have truly enjoyed working with them, and to be quite blunt, they saved our butt last summer because we could not keep our food pantry full. They were there when we needed them to be. Assemblyman Wheeler, this does not create an expenditure; it does not reduce the revenue; it is not a budget implementation. There is no real fiscal handle on it. This is just creating a new account, which will come back to the Legislature in the future when we review accounts. There is nothing there that we can touch right now because this is step one in the process until they show up and ask for money, which I am beginning to get a hint that might happen in the near future.

As this Program moves forward, these foods will be purchased and then given to the two food banks. How are we going to get food to southern Nevada? We do not grow much down there. How will it be divided between the Northern Nevada Food Bank and Three Square in Clark County, which is the most populous county in the state?

Shane Piccinini:

This is where the great relationship between Three Square, the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, and the State Department of Agriculture comes in. From the very beginning, all of us had an agreement that we would distribute the food wherever the need is. After having had many conversations with NDA, we would, through the regulatory process as this Program is created, figure out ways to ensure that it is equitable for not just southern Nevada and northern Nevada, the two most populous counties, but to also ensure that the rural counties, which also have high need, especially in the tribal areas, benefit from this. To be realistic, I would imagine in the beginning this Program is going to be fairly small. There is not a lot of money right now for these purchases. We are trying to establish a process that

would ensure that Nevada-grown products are making it out the door to the people who really need it. Also we are trying to help Nevada agriculture create a new market within Nevada. I do not know if this is particularly helpful, but this is stuff that we would work out as we implement the Program. We are committing to the fact that this is going to be an equitable distribution.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

I do appreciate that. I hope, as you look through section 1.7, subsection 3, paragraphs (a) and (b), when you are looking at operating the Program and purchasing, transporting, and distributing—there is a lot that goes into nutritious foods and many food pantries are associated with Three Square and the Northern Nevada Food Bank. So, if this helps with the tree of the dispersion of food, that would be very helpful, too, because whatever happens to Three Square impacts all the different food pantries and other access points. As you are looking at that portion of the bill, that would be very helpful. I see that this would be sent from the food bank to the pantries with no cost to the pantries. Would there be a cost to the food bank, or would this be purchased by the state, given to the food banks, and then passed through to the food pantries and other dispersion points?

Shane Piccinini:

That is exactly right. The products would be purchased by the State Department of Agriculture and we would be a pass-through to the partner agencies. The Food Bank of Northern Nevada has approximately 145 partner agencies. Our intention is to distribute whatever the product is that we obtain through the Program to as many partner agencies as the supply will allow.

Ashanti Lewis, Advocacy Manager, Three Square Food Bank:

Three Square Food Bank has approximately 170 partner agencies.

Assemblywoman Carlton:

Full disclosure, I am fully supportive of this, but I have to tell you that during the crisis, we had food brought in from California to us. You are limiting this to just purchasing food in Nevada. I understand what you are trying to do, and I applaud it because we would like to do that. However, this could limit you in the future if there was another supply chain break like what we witnessed last summer in which we could not get supplies. Thank goodness a semitruck came in from California with avocados, lettuce, pineapples, et cetera. I am not sure if there is any way you could build something in, but I would hate to see you limit yourself if we ever get put in a position again where you might possibly have dollars, have spent as much as you can in Nevada, have money left, and need to bring in other products from another state. I am not sure if you have had this conversation, but I wanted to put it out there simply because we never thought we would see the distribution chain break so badly that we had to ask for food from another state to feed Nevadans.

Shane Piccinini:

That is a good point; TEFAP and many other products that we brought into the state through coronavirus relief programs were sourced from other states. The supply chain was broken

across the country, as you may recall, from late March into late May or early June 2020. This is a conversation that is definitely worth having. We wanted to create this Program to ensure that there was a market for Nevada-grown products and Nevada-produced products. As far as how we would fix the supply chain, that is a much larger conversation we would want to have in the interim to figure out other solutions for that. That is a big problem that hopefully we will never face again, but that is not one we were trying to solve with this Program.

Assemblywoman González:

My concern is also about how the food will be distributed. The bill says the food bank will do the distributing; however, in the presentation it shows that the distributing would be done by Three Square and the Food Bank of Northern Nevada. Will this go to any food bank, or are we putting into statute that the products will only go to both the Food Bank of Northern Nevada and Three Square?

Shane Piccinini:

The State Department of Agriculture would make products available to the two food banks; there is a vigorous process around that. We chose to do it this way because we already have experience in running a program similar to this, which is TEFAP. From the two food banks, the products would be distributed to our partner agencies across the entire state. We felt this is the most equitable way to ensure tribal, rural, and larger urban communities would all be able to access the products. Because we have the infrastructure already in place, this was a way to ensure that the products would go to the furthest reaches of Nevada, from as far north as Duck Valley Indian Reservation and as far south as Pioche.

Assembly González:

With the way the distribution is done, are there any areas that are left out? Are there any agencies that are not partners and would be left out of this process?

Shane Piccinini:

As long as the entity is a registered partner with Three Square or the Food Bank of Northern Nevada, they would not be left out. I do not know how many community-based food pantries there are in Nevada, because I do not think there has been a census of those. As far as the community reach is concerned, between the two food banks, we have every county covered, either through a partner agency or through our own mobile distributions. We can guarantee that every county would be covered.

Chair Watts:

I appreciate the clarification you provided that when the statutory language discusses food banks located in the state, essentially the two food banks are the Food Bank of Northern Nevada and Three Square. Between the two they provide coverage to all counties. Will you briefly discuss your partnerships with other agencies and the difference between the food banks and the food pantries and how the food goes through the chain and gets to the folks in need?

Shane Piccinini:

A food bank is a very specific type of classification for a food relief program; it is more like a logistics company. In 2020, the Food Bank of Northern Nevada handled just over 20 million pounds of food, and Three Square handled almost 89 million pounds of food. We have a logistics program for that to ensure that food is distributed to our clients either by one of our direct programs, such as our mobile pantry program—which is primarily for fresh produce—or through our partner agencies. Think of this as a giant logistics company with a fleet of tractor-trailers that sends food out all over the state. I do not know if this is clarifying it, but a food bank really is more of a logistics and food distribution company than it is a direct service agency.

Ashanti Lewis:

Mr. Piccinini summed it up nicely. You can think of us as a warehouse. Our agency partners order through us and we distribute to those partners. We do not see clients at Three Square. If someone is in need, he would go to a partner such as Catholic Charities of Southern Nevada, a local church, or a school that has a food pantry which is provided food by us. A food bank is a distribution facility through the Feed America network.

Chair Watts:

Thank you for that clarification. I think that is helpful for members who are not familiar with the food bank and partner model.

Assemblywoman Cohen:

I am wondering about the Director's job in finding the food. Once the Program is up and running, is the Director going to reach out to the Nevada Farm Bureau Federation, the Nevada Cattlemen's Association, et cetera, and advise them of the Program? Mr. Piccinini is nodding his head yes. Will there be an opportunity for producers to contact the Director? Again, I am getting a yes. This will work both ways, getting the word out and being available for the producer to contact the Department, correct?

Shane Piccinini:

That is exactly right. We want the Department of Agriculture to manage the contract because they know where almost everything is produced, grown, raised, or processed. Also, because the NDA already has those relationships, whatever the product is, the NDA is in a better position to be able to negotiate the price. We wanted to do it this way so that the two food banks were not working against each other.

Chair Watts:

Are there any other questions? Seeing none, I will move to those wishing to provide testimony in support of S.B. 370 (R1).

Sarah Sanchez, Director, Carson Valley Community Food Closet:

The Carson Valley Community Food Closet has been serving residents of Douglas County since 1989. Each month we provide an average of 700 people with supplemental food. Over the course of a year, that is more than 230,000 meals provided to people in need. The food

we distribute comes from a variety of sources, but our biggest contributor is the Food Bank of Northern Nevada. Thanks to our partnership with the Food Bank, the Food Closet is the distributor of the emergency food assistance food program, which gives us access to fresh fruits and vegetables each week for our recipients. While we glean from local grocers, the produce we receive is typically at the end of its nutritional value and usability. Occasionally local gardeners and small farmers will make donations of fruits and vegetables, but nowhere on the scale of what is needed to give our clients nutritional items with each visit. These fruits and vegetables we receive from the food bank will go a long way to help offset the high-sodium and high-sugar products we often receive. As a small rural food pantry, this connection is invaluable to us. The fresh new products that the Food Bank is able to procure and mobilize is something we could never do on our own. Senate Bill 370 (1st Reprint) would have a tremendous impact on helping our residents maintain access to nutrient-dense foods with the added benefit to the agricultural community—this bill is a win-win for residents of northern Nevada.

Chair Watts:

I will hear the next caller in support. Hearing no one, I will move to testimony in opposition. Hearing no one, is there anyone wishing to offer testimony in neutral? Hearing no one, are there any closing remarks?

Senator Donate:

I would like to thank my colleagues from Three Square and the Food Bank of Northern Nevada. I think we learned from the pandemic the differences we have across the state and what happens when our systems do not work together. We need a broader look at how we respond to epidemiological surveillance, or even food distribution. I urge your support and thank you for hearing this bill.

Chair Watts:

I will close the hearing on S.B. 370 (R1), which brings us to the last item on our agenda, which is public comment. Is there anyone wishing to provide public comment? Hearing no one, our next meeting will be May 12, 2021, at 4 p.m. This meeting is adjourned [at 5:02 p.m.].

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Nancy Davis
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblyman Howard Watts, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

[Exhibit A](#) is the Agenda.

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

[Exhibit C](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 43 \(1st Reprint\)](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit D](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 98](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit E](#) is the Work Session Document for [Senate Bill 404](#), presented by Jann Stinnesbeck, Policy Analyst, Research Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau.

[Exhibit F](#) is a copy of a PowerPoint presentation titled "SB 370: Home Means Nevada Agriculture Food Purchase Program," submitted and presented by Shane Piccinini, Government Relations, Food Bank of Northern Nevada.