

ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MINUTES  
MARCH 25, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Hickey, Vice-Chairman Price,  
Messrs. Coulter, Jeffrey, Getto and Howard

MEMBERS ABSENT: Dr. Robinson, (excused)

GUESTS: Tom Ballow, State Department of Agriculture  
Fred Warren, State Department of Agriculture  
H. E. Gallaway, State Department of Agriculture  
J. E. Edmundson, State Division of Health  
John O. Olsen, Associated Nevada Dairymen, Inc.

A quorum being present, Chairman Hickey called the meeting to order. The purpose of the hearing was to hear testimony on SB 87, 109 and 115 and to take action on various bills which have been previously heard.

SB 109, revises definition of "restricted use pesticide" to include pesticides classified as "restricted use" under federal law.

Harry Gallaway of the State Department of Agriculture, testified that this bill was one of the three pesticide bills that the department had sponsored this session. It should have come to the Assembly side with the other two but this did not happen. This is enabling legislation to bring Nevada into compliance with the federal act.

This bill amends NRS 586 which deals with the restrictions and sales of pesticides. It inserts definition of "certified applicator". It also requires that distributors of "restricted use pesticides" will have to register and maintain records on who they sell these to and in what amounts. This is the means for enforcement of the act.

Mr. Gallaway stated that they preferred this approach to that which makes it a law for distributors to sell "restricted use pesticides" to someone without a license.

SB 87, Authorizes State Sealer of Weights and Measures to adopt emergency specifications for gasoline and clarifying provisions on motor oils subject to Society of Automotive Engineers specifications; exempting certain oils from labeling requirements; and providing other matters properly relating thereto.

Mr. Gallaway, Agriculture Department, that this act would amend the Nevada Petroleum Act. He stated that the problem has arisen since the energy crisis when the federal government was discussing lowering the standards for grading of gasoline. There was a great deal of discussion about the federal law.

This act will enable the State Sealer of Weights and Measures to adopt emergency regulations for grading requirements. This

MARCH 28, 1975

Page 2

bill would also remove the requirements for SAE number of pre-diluted motor oils used in 2-cycle engines. The present law states that if used as motor oil must bear an SAE number. This is meaningless in the pre-diluted motor oils as it cannot be checked.

Mr. Price<sup>asked</sup> if there something that should replace this language. Mr. Gallaway stated there wasn't but went on to say that some of the pre-diluted motor oil and motor oil intended for dilution have additives in them. They should not be used in crank cases. However, the department is not sure of this but should it be true, this should be on the label. This needs to be worked out with the industry and they will probably bring something up in two years regarding this.

Mr. Howard asked if this emergency testing was relative to the amounts of lead in gasoline. Mr. Gallaway stated that it was not, it referred only to the distillation range of gasolines. It also has to do with the sulfur content of the gasoline. It cannot contain more than .25% of 1%.

Mr. Gallaway also stated that these emergency regulations could only be adopted upon the recommendations of the American Society of Testing Materials.

Mr. Hickey asked what they did with used oil. Mr. Gallaway stated that this is gathered and taken back and cleaned up and marketed as used re-refined motor oil.

SB 115, repeals provision relating to study of poisonous plant. Mr. Gallaway stated that this short bill repeals the provisions of law relative to halogeton glomeratus. This was enacted in the early 50's enabling the Department of Agriculture to accept a grant from the Richfield Oil Co. to study this plant. Other parts of this act have been amended leaving this a meaningless part of the law. This would clean up the law.

Mr. Getto asked if the Department had given up on this plant. Mr. Gallaway stated that they still are conducting a small amount of study on this plant but this section of the law has no bearing on that.

As there was no further discussion on these bills, Chairman Hickey called on Mr. Jeffrey to present his proposed amendment to AB 29, which abolishes the Dairy Commission. Mr. Jeffrey stated that he was proposing to amend this bill by removing the Administrator-Secretary of the Dairy Commission from the classified service to the unclassified service, thus making the position answerable to the Commission itself. He would be appointed by the Commission with the approval of the Governor. He also proposed that the Administrator-Secretary could be removed by a 3/4 vote of the Commission. And finally, Mr. Jeffrey

ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MINUTES  
MARCH 28, 1975  
Page 3

proposed that the Commission members term of offices being on the staggered basis. All members would be appointed as of July 1 of this year, 2 for 1 year; 2 for 2 years; 2 for 3 years; and 2 for 4 years. Thereafter they would each be appointed for 4 years.

Mr. Jeffrey then moved that the committee adopt this amendment for committee introduction on the floor. Mr. Howard seconded the motion. The vote was 5 ayes, 1 not voting (Mr. Getto) because of the conflict of interest; and 1 absent (Dr. Robinson).

Mr. Hickey again called upon Mr. Jeffrey to report to the committee what he was able to find in his research on the Brand Division of the Department of Agriculture. Mr. Jeffrey stated that basically they had discovered that most of the money collected for livestock inspection division were spent on brand inspections.

He then turned it over to Mr. Getto who called upon Earl Oliver, Legislative Auditor, to go over the report presented herewith. (Exhibit I). Mr. Getto explained that he requested Mr. Oliver as the state fiscal analyst to go into the brand inspection program. However, Mr. Getto said that he was only able to obtain the expenses of salaries which as far as Mr. Getto was concerned did not go deep enough into the division.

Mr. Oliver began by stating that they had done this at the request of Mr. Getto. It was not a true audit but only a gathering of information which may be of some value to this committee. Mr. Oliver then went through each part of the attached Exhibit I.

With Schedule 5 of this report, Mr. Ballow of the State Department of Agriculture presented a copy of the schedule with the various items broken down further than in the original report. Schedule 5 is attached to this record as Exhibit II.

Mr. Hickey asked Mr. Ballow what the cattle population of the state was and how many of those are inspected. Mr. Ballow state there are approximately 600,000 stock cattle in the State of which about 437,000 were inspected last year.

Mr. Hickey asked if there was any breakdown of the cost of the vehicles assigned to the inspectors. Mr. Oliver stated there wasn't. He stated that since the program had changed so much over the last few years it was very difficult to show any real comparisons.

Mr. Hickey then asked if Mr. Oliver's division had any recommendations on the procedures used by the brand division. Mr. Oliver stated

that when they performed an audit several years ago (1968) they did have some recommendations. He then read the recommendations of his office which are:

" Nine separate funds were created by the Legislature to account for the special programs of the Department. In addition, two budget accounts have been created administratively to account for General Fund appropriations in support of specific livestock programs.

These funds may have been created in order to provide a method of separating the costs of certain programs. However, it cannot be proven that individually the several funds and accounts are fairly matching costs with individual programs activities. Nor can it be demonstrated that the variety of special taxes, fees, and sales designated by law to be deposited into the special funds are financing the activities or meeting the costs of the programs under each special fund.

We recommend that the Legislature review the various special funds and programs administered by the Department of Agriculture with the objective of combining the several special revenue funds in order that the activities of such funds, and a comparison of program costs may be made to the fees, licenses and special taxes imposed."

Mr. Oliver stated that these recommendations have never been complied with. Part of the problem has been that the law is very specific. Mr. Oliver stated that he wouldn't want to manage this extremely restrictive requirement that they have for these funds. You would have to really cut corners or something somewhere. He cited several situations and stated that they were probably financing some programs with other programs. He stated that he would suggest an overall study and review of all financing in the department.

He further stated that he did intend to do an audit of the Department in the very near future and after which he would have further comments and recommendations.

Mr. Ballow then stated that he would like to say for the record that he has asked for audits and would very much like to have an audit performed. When he first came to work for the Department he requested an audit and it was denied. Then he contacted the Federal Agriculture Department and they performed an audit at no expense to the state. He realizes that this audit cannot be officially recognized. This audit brought about about 18-20 recommendations. They have tried to incorporate some of these to the best of their ability. He stated that his

## ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MINUTES

MARCH 28, 1975

Page 5

Department did not even have an accountant or an auditor in it. They have attempted to solve this but have not been able to get the personnel. To Mr. Hickey's question on the amount of money handled by the Department, Mr. Ballow stated that they handled about \$1,300,000 a fiscal year.

Mr. Getto stated that his request for this investigation had not been a "witch hunt" but rather to find out exactly where the money is going. Brand inspection is using most of the livestock inspection funds which was created as an emergency fund to be used to help in the event of an outbreak of disease.

He further stated that he felt there could be more cooperation between the brand inspectors and the sheriffs and highway patrol.

Mr. Ballow stated that they are entering into an agreement with the highway patrol for this very thing and that some county sheriffs are becoming more cooperative.

Mr. Howard asked if they had requested an accountant to which Mr. Ballow stated that they had in SB 111 but that this had been amended out of the bill as the committee decided it was not that necessary.

Mr. Howard further stated that he did not feel that with the outlying areas being so large that funding through fees is ever going to offset the amounts needed. He felt that they should perhaps put pressure on the powers that be to subsidize this department and get it the money it really needs. We subsidize every other law enforcement agency why not this one. The people involved can only do so much. He further asked if the State Board of Agriculture supported his position. Mr. Ballow stated that they did. The board has been willing to do anything they felt necessary to get the job done.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that he felt that they were talking about two areas. Benefit to the industry and therefore the industry should help pay but yet for the good and welfare of the general public. He stated from that position he felt that the state should help subsidize the costs of the program.

Mr. Price then brought up the situation of a farmer or rancher who lived on the border and had pasture in both states. Did he have to pay head tax everytime he moved his cattle from one pasture to another across the state line. Mr. Ballow stated that they have never bothered these people as long as this was all one ranch and not broken up with other pastures in between.

## ASSEMBLY AGRICULTURE COMMITTEE MINUTES

MARCH 25, 1975

Page 6

Mr. Warren of the State Department of Agriculture, stated that most ranchers welcome a brand inspection. He further stated that it was quite costly to the department when they have to inspect brands for a sale of only a few cattle.

Mr. Price asked if something could not be done so that in the case of small sales the farmer could bring the cattle to a central point. Mr. Warren stated that they have considered this. They do the best possible job but yet no answer is perfect.

Mr. Oliver stated that at the present time the funds available in this program were in extreme danger of being exhausted. He also stated that until the department has the staff with the right expertise they are always just going to be getting by and their system of accounting is going to be determined by people outside the department.

Mr. Ballow stated they were going to work very closely with Mr. Oliver's audit team and come up with something that can be initiated.

Mr. Getto asked Mr. Ballow if he would be able to provide him with further information on the breakdown on the rest of the cost of the brand inspection program. Mr. Ballow stated that he would and that inflation has hit his department at the same time that the economy of the industry has gone the other way.

Mr. Hickey thank Mr. Ballow and Mr. Oliver for their cooperation and stated that the committee would begin taking action on some of the other bills that have been heard.

AB 47, provides for alfalfa seed research and promotional projects. Mr. Howard moved "do pass" and Mr. Getto seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Howard and Mr. Getto were asked to handle it on the floor.

AB 80, makes various changes in provisions concerning milk and milk products. Mr. Price moved "do pass" and Mr. Getto seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Jeffrey was asked to handle it on the floor.

AB 137, establishes new period for rerecording brands and marks. Mr. Getto stated that he felt there should be something in the bill that the fees would be adjusted downward to coincide with the time. Mr. Warren stated that they do have this under consideration and that State Board of Agriculture has the authority to do this so there was no need for a fiscal note or to have this in the bill.

Mr. Getto moved "do pass" and Mr. Howard seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous. Mr. Coulter was requested to handle this on the floor.

AB 138, prohibits sale of adulterated or misbranded feed for livestock. Mr. Howard moved "do pass" and Mr. Getto seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Price was assigned to handle this on the floor.

AB 139, requires notification to State Sealer of Weights and Measures when any weight measure, instrument, or device is purchased, installed or placed in use.

Mr. Getto stated that he questioned the necessity of this bill especially for the farmer who had his own scales for his own use. Mr. Price stated that it was aimed mostly at the commercial end of the business especially for example gas stations etc.

Mr. Price moved "do pass" and Mr. Jeffrey seconded. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Howard was assigned to speak on the floor.

AB 213, makes certain changes in provisions relating to registration and distribution of fertilizers. Mr. Getto moved "do pass" and Mr. Jeffrey seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Jeffrey was asked to handle it on the floor.

AB 288, requires State Board of Agriculture to appoint representative to National Livestock and Meat Board. Mr. Getto moved "do pass as amended" and Mr. Howard seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Young will be asked to handle this on the floor.

SB 87, Authorizes the State Sealer of Weights and Measures to adopt emergency specifications for gasoline and clarifies provision on type of motor oil subject to S.A.E. specifications. Mr. Howard moved "do pass" and Mr. Price seconded the motion. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Getto was asked to handle it on the floor.

SB 109, revises definition of "restricted use pesticides" to include pesticides classified as "restricted use" under federal law. Mr. Howard moved "do pass" and Mr. Jeffrey seconded. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Mr. Coulter was asked to handle it on the floor.

SB 115, Repeals provision relating to study on poisonous plants. Mr. Price moved "do pass" and Mr. Howard seconded it. The vote was unanimous (Dr. Robinson absent). Chairman Hickey will handle it on the floor.

MARCH 25, 1975

Page 8

AB 80 was then again brought up as an amendment had been inadvertently omitted. The amendment was distributed for the committee's consideration. A copy is attached to these minutes as Exhibit III. This amendment would remove the Administrator-Secretary of the Dairy Commission from the classified service and place him in the unclassified service.

Mr. Jeffrey stated that he felt that this amendment did not do enough and felt that his suggested amendment would be better to handle the situation.

Mr. Howard stated that he felt that this amendment did not belong with AB 80 but should be with AB 29. He therefore moved the committee "indefinitely postpone" this amendment and leave AB 80 as is. Mr. Jeffrey seconded the motion. The motion carried with Mr. Getto not voting and Dr. Robinson absent.

Mr. Price stated that he would like to move that the committee introduce a resolution recommending that an interim study be made of the dairy industry and commission in this state. He stated that he felt a great many problems had been brought to light by these hearings which have not been settled and that an in-depth study was really called for.

The committee agreed and asked him to get a resolution drawn up for them to see and consider.

Mr. Hickey then stated that he would like to see something done by this committee to look into the situation in Southern Nevada of advertising of meat.

Mr. Getto stated that he would not be in favor of any type of legislation that would regulate anything in grocery stores. Truth in advertising would be alright but not anything that specifically regulated meat.

As there was no further business to conduct, Chairman Hickey adjourned the meeting.

Respectfully submitted,

SANDRA GAGNIER,  
Assembly Attache



ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

244

Tuesday,  
Date... March 25, 1975 Time 8:00 a.m. Room 240

Bills or Resolutions  
to be considered

Subject

Counsel  
requested\*

- | Bills or Resolutions to be considered | Subject  | Counsel requested* |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------|
| SB 109                                | Revises definition of "restricted use pesticides" to include pesticides classified as "restricted use pesticides" under federal law.   |                    |
| SB 87                                 | Authorizes State Sealer of Weights and Measures to adopt emergency specifications for gasoline and clarifies provision on types of motor oil subject to S.A.E. specifications. |                    |
| SB 115                                | Repeals provision relating to study of poisonous plant.  |                    |

COMMITTEE WILL TAKE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING BILLS:

AB 47	AB 139
AB 80	AB 213
AB 137	AB 288
AB 138	

STATE OF NEVADA  
LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL BUREAU

LEGISLATIVE BUILDING  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701



*EXHIBIT 1*  
LEGISLATIVE COMMISSION  
LAWRENCE E. JACOBSEN, Assemblyman, Chairman

INTERIM FINANCE COMMITTEE

FLOYD R. LAMB, Senator, Chairman

253

ARTHUR J. PALMER, Director

PERRY P. BURNETT, Legislative Counsel  
EARL T. OLIVER, Legislative Auditor  
ARTHUR J. PALMER, Research Director

March 12, 1975

The Honorable Virgil M. Getto  
Assemblyman  
C/O Nevada Legislature

Dear Assemblyman Getto:

In response to your request of March 4, 1975, we are submitting to you the following comments and schedules concerning the Livestock Inspection Program of the Department of Agriculture.

Under the system of Brand Inspection in effect prior to September 1972, the part-time Brand Inspectors were non-state employees operating under a contract basis. There were about 115 of these employees. They would charge 10¢ per head inspection fee for cattle and would keep the money as their salary. The full-time state employed Brand Inspectors would also charge 10¢ per head inspection fee, and their money would be turned in to the State Treasury to the credit of the Livestock Inspection Fund.

In September 1972, the cattle brand inspection fee was raised to 20¢ per head in order to utilize state employees as part-time Brand Inspectors and to add a theft inspector to the staff. This change was apparently the result of a series of meetings held with ranchers and livestock people in an effort to determine ways of improving the Brand Inspection Program.

The cattle brand inspection fee was increased to 30¢ per head in August 1974. The Department of Agriculture said that this fee increase was necessary due to increased costs being experienced by them.

There currently are positions authorized for eight full-time brand inspectors and 68 part-time Deputy Brand Inspectors. As of February 28, 1975, 61 of the Deputy Brand Inspector positions were filled. The full-time Brand Inspectors each have a state-owned vehicle. The part-time Deputy Brand Inspectors use their own vehicles, receive a mileage reimbursement, and are paid on an hourly basis through the state. All Brand Inspection fees collected are turned in to the state for credit to the Livestock Inspection Fund.

Information on the following schedules was obtained from Department of Agriculture records and was not verified by us.

Schedule 1 shows the receipts and disbursements of the Livestock Inspection Fund for the six year period ended June 30, 1974.

The Honorable Virgil M. Getto, Assemblyman  
March 12, 1975  
Page 2.

Revenue from cattle and horse Brand Inspections is shown in Schedule 2. We were only able to obtain this information for the fiscal years ended June 30, 1972, 1973 and 1974. Schedule 3 shows the number of cattle inspected, the revenue received from cattle inspections, the number of brand inspections and the cattle and horses inspected by fee inspectors. Schedule 4 shows the number of horse inspections and the revenue received from horse inspections.

Schedule 5 shows the Livestock Inspection Fund receipts for the six year period ended June 30, 1974. Schedule 6 shows the personnel expenditures for the same period.

In our audit report of the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1968, we made the following comments and recommendations:

"FINANCING THE DEPARTMENT'S PROGRAMS

Nine separate funds were created by the Legislature to account for the special programs of the Department. In addition, two budget accounts have been created administratively to account for General Fund appropriations in support of specific livestock programs.

These funds may have been created in order to provide a method of separating the costs of certain programs. However, It cannot be proven that individually the several funds and accounts are fairly matching costs with individual program activities. Nor can it be demonstrated that the variety of special taxes, fees, and sales designated by law to be deposited into the special funds are financing the activities or meeting the costs of the programs under each special fund.

RECOMMENDATION

We recommend that the Legislature review the various special funds and programs administered by the Department of Agriculture with the objective of combining the several special revenue funds in order that the accounting for the programs may be matched with the activities of such funds, and a comparison of program costs may be made to the fees, licenses, and special taxes imposed."

Our review of the Livestock Inspection Fund transactions indicated that this recommendation has never been complied with. The Department of Agriculture still appears to have an unworkable and highly restrictive separation of moneys.

The Honorable Virgil M. Getto, Assemblyman  
March 12, 1975  
Page 3.

If you should have any further questions regarding the information contained herein, we will be available to discuss it with you at your convenience.

Respectfully,

EARL T. OLIVER, C.P.A.  
LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

By Robert O. Dimmick  
Robert O. Dimmick  
Deputy Legislative Auditor

ETO:ROD:ja

cc: Tom Ballow

Attachments (6)

LEGISLATOR'S REQUEST NO. 6  
LIVESTOCK INSPECTION FUND RECEIPTS AND DISBURSEMENTS  
SIX YEAR PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 1974

SCHEDULE 1

	Fiscal Year Ended June 30					
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Balance Forward	\$115,476.79	\$ 66,116.41	\$ 49,464.46 <sup>(1)</sup>	\$ 68,238.22	\$ 48,321.10	\$ 1,497.84
Receipts	<u>139,899.63</u>	<u>146,355.26</u>	<u>198,949.18</u>	<u>177,256.56</u>	<u>248,935.76</u>	<u>335,254.52</u>
Total Available	\$255,376.42	\$212,471.67	\$248,413.64	\$245,494.78	\$297,256.86	\$336,752.36
Disbursements	<u>189,260.01</u>	<u>163,007.21</u>	<u>180,175.42</u>	<u>197,173.68</u>	<u>295,759.02</u>	<u>323,085.43</u>
Balance Forward	<u>\$ 66,116.41</u>	<u>\$ 49,464.46</u>	<u>\$ 68,238.22</u>	<u>\$ 48,321.10</u>	<u>\$ 1,497.84</u>	<u>\$ 13,666.93</u>

Note:

(1) Balance as of January 1, 1972 was \$70,835.78.

Point - That brand inspection costs are last year - 323,085.45 - the actual money collected - from ranches toward brand inspections - is 95,094.48

LEGISLATOR'S REQUEST NO. 6  
 REVENUE FROM CATTLE AND HORSE BRAND INSPECTIONS  
THREE YEAR PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 1974

SCHEDULE 2

	Fiscal Year Ended June 30		
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Cattle Inspections	\$13,341.80	\$76,786.80	\$85,502.00
Horse Inspections	<u>304.20</u>	<u>7,318.00</u>	<u>9,592.00</u>
Total	<u>\$13,646.00</u>	<u>\$84,104.80</u>	<u>\$95,094.00</u>

LEGISLATOR'S REQUEST NO. 6  
 HEAD OF CATTLE INSPECTED AND INSPECTION REVENUE  
SIX YEAR PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 1974

SCHEDULE 3

	Fiscal Year Ended June 30					
	<u>1969</u>	<u>1970</u>	<u>1971</u>	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Number Head cattle Inspected by State Brand Inspectors:						
@ .20	--	--	--	--	380,028	427,510
@ .10	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>133,418</u>	<u>7,812</u>	<u>--</u>
Total Head of Cattle In- spected	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>133,418</u>	<u>387,840</u>	<u>427,510</u>
Revenue received from State Brand Inspec- tions	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>\$ 13,341.80</u>	<u>\$ 76,786.80</u>	<u>\$ 85,502.00</u>
Number of Brand Inspections <i>Temp</i>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>N/A(1)</u>	<u>17,800</u>	<u>21,400</u>	<u>21,700</u>
Cattle and Horses Inspected by fee Inspectors <i>no income to state</i>	<u>312,241</u>	<u>450,940</u>	<u>438,500</u>	<u>450,000(2)</u>	<u>--</u>	<u>--</u>

Note:

- (1) N/A - not available
- (2) Estimated

LEGISLATOR'S REQUEST NO. 6  
 SCHEDULE OF HORSES INSPECTED AND INSPECTION REVENUE  
THREE YEAR PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 1974

SCHEDULE 4

	Fiscal Year Ended June 30		
	<u>1972</u>	<u>1973</u>	<u>1974</u>
Number of Horses Inspected:			
@ \$1.00	--	7,318	9,592
@ \$ .25	<u>1,217</u>	--	--
Total Horses Inspected	<u>1,217</u>	<u>7,318</u>	<u>9,592</u>
Revenue received from Horse Inspections	<u>\$ 304.20</u>	<u>\$ 7,318.00</u>	<u>\$ 9,592.00</u>



LEGISLATOR'S REQUEST NO.6  
LIVESTOCK INSPECTION FUND RECEIPTS  
SIX YEAR PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 1974

SCHEDULE 5

Description	Fiscal Year Ended June 30					
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Livestock Head Tax	\$113,594.95	\$120,389.37	\$137,030.52	\$144,594.85	\$145,305.02	\$196,411.55
Miscellaneous Fees	--	--	123.00	174.50	130.62	254.60
Brand Recording Fees	--	--	37,353.00	3,366.50	3,745.00	6,625.00
Brand Transfer Fees	--	--	1,175.00	420.00	435.00	1,595.00
Brand Inspection Fees	--	<i>Schedule 2</i>	13,502.75	<u>13,646.24</u>	<u>84,104.75</u>	<u>95,094.48</u>
Dealers License Fees	--	--	6,475.00	5,710.00	6,450.00	7,740.00
Sales Yard Fees	--	--	100.00	100.00	200.00	300.00
Brand Book and Supply Sales	--	--	167.00	2,198.45	512.50	474.50
Stray Sales	--	--	836.68	1,550.58	1,431.23	1,954.80
Stray Administration Charges	--	--	917.40	647.74	1,670.54	593.95
Rural Rehab. Admin. Charges	--	--	<i>Feed Money</i>	4,847.70	4,951.10	24,210.64
Sales-Miscellaneous Holdovers	--	--	1,268.83	--	--	--
Special Fees	25,081.08	23,791.20	--	--	--	--
Sales not in General Fund	888.30	1,349.65	--	--	--	--
Refunds and Reimbursements	335.30	825.04	--	--	--	--
<b>Total</b>	<u>\$139,899.63</u>	<u>\$146,355.26</u>	<u>\$198,949.18</u>	<u>\$177,256.56</u>	<u>\$248,935.76</u>	<u>\$335,254.52</u>

LEGISLATOR'S REQUEST NO. 6  
 PERSONNEL EXPENDITURES  
SIX YEAR PERIOD ENDED JUNE 30, 1974

## SCHEDULE 6

Item	Fiscal Year Ended June 30					
	1969	1970	1971	1972	1973	1974
Salaries	\$103,602.79	\$111,639.13	\$120,971.78	\$126,202.30	\$177,636.23	\$209,944.55
N.I.C.	730.28	647.76	660.76	942.77	1,315.53	3,430.46
Retirement	5,991.26	6,414.25	7,182.73	7,411.15	8,666.55	11,060.62
Personnel Assessment	660.00	762.00	873.17	880.39	1,131.95	1,349.46
Group Insurance	1,221.22	1,127.28	1,332.24	2,442.86	3,347.83	3,599.59
Retirement Admin.	--	--	--	--	81.88	130.24
Controllers Assessment	--	--	--	178.36	477.13	796.25
Total	<u>\$112,205.55</u>	<u>\$120,590.42</u>	<u>\$131,020.68</u>	<u>\$138,057.83</u>	<u>\$192,657.10</u>	<u>\$230,311.17</u>



Adopted   
 Lost   
 Date:  
 Initial:  
 Concurred in   
 Not concurred in   
 Date:  
 Initial:

Adopted   
 Lost   
 Date:  
 Initial:  
 Concurred in   
 Not concurred in   
 Date:  
 Initial:

Amendments to Assembly / Senate

Bill / Joint Resolution No. 30 (BDR 51-143)

Proposed by Assemblyman Mann 263

*Exhibit II*

Amendment N<sup>o</sup> 7946



Amend the bill as a whole by adding a new section designated as section 4, following section 3, to read as follows:

"Sec. 4. NRS 534.455 is hereby amended to read as follows:

534.455 1. The commission, with the approval of the governor, may arrange and classify its work and may appoint such assistants, deputies, agents, experts and other employees as are necessary for the administration of NRS 534.325 to 534.690, inclusive . . . , prescribe their duties and fix their



Amendment No. 7946 to Assembly Bill No. 30 (BDR 51-143) Page 2

salaries] Except as provided in subsection 3, the duties and salaries of such persons shall be established in accordance with classifications made by the state department of personnel.

2. All assistants, deputies, agents, experts and other employees shall be subject to the provisions of chapter 284 of NRS.

3. The secretary of the commission shall be in the unclassified service and his duties and salary shall be determined by the commission with the approval of the governor."

Amend the title by deleting line 1 and inserting:

"AN ACT relating to the regulation of milk and milk products; providing that the secretary of the state dairy commission shall be in the unclassified service of the state; providing that milk and milk products."

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE  
Tuesday,  
Date April 1, 1975 Time 8:00 a.m. Room 240

<u>Bills or Resolutions to be considered</u>	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Counsel requested*</u>
AB 323	Deletes exemption of certain vendors from licensing requirements for traveling vendors.	
AB 401	Makes various amendments to statutes on meat and poultry inspection.	
SB 23	Prohibits use of term "honey" in label or brand name of product unless honey is ingredient in such product.	

*Cancel  
Reschedule 4-8-75*

\*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.