

# Nevada Farm Bureau Policies For 2022

The following policy positions were adopted by voting delegates at the 2021 Nevada Farm Bureau Annual Meeting in Fallon on November 19, 2021.

## General Agriculture

### **Agriculture Definition: 100**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the following definition of Agriculture: If it were just food and fiber, it would be indispensable; but agriculture is more than that. It's both the promise of sustenance for a hungry world and a source of enjoyment in a demanding world. It is education and entertainment. It is land use and landscape. It is natural sustainability and national security. It is a confluence of biology, chemistry, physics, genetics, engineering, meteorology, biotechnology, economics, finance, marketing, packaging, distribution, sales, and sociology. Essentially, agriculture is life.

### **Agricultural Exhibits: 101**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a gathering of agricultural producers to showcase agriculture in the State of Nevada. Such gathering may be in the form of a fair that invites all areas of the state to participate.

### **Agricultural Labor Committee: 102**

Farm Bureau recommends the formation of a committee, who are familiar with agricultural labor needs and programs, to discuss with the Nevada Farm Bureau and the Nevada State Department of Labor, issues regarding labor needs and regulations relating to production agriculture. This includes H2-A guest worker programs, minimum wages, overtime regulations, difficulties in finding year-round workers and other labor issues related to production agriculture.

### **Agricultural Promotion: 103**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports funding of pro-agricultural programs. Such activities as Jr. Livestock shows, fairs, farmers' markets and harvest festivals all represent good, pro-agricultural activities.

### **Agricultural Sustainability: 104**

We encourage the creation and funding of programs designed to improve the profitability and sustainability of agricultural operations and that enhance rural agricultural economic diversification.

### **Animal Rights: 105**

We are opposed to the granting of any public funds by any level of government for use in preparing, promoting and/or distributing non-traditional concepts of diet, animal rights, or anthropomorphism (the act of ascribing human emotions to other animals). We are opposed to the teaching and public funding of such concepts.

### **Conservation: 106**

We support conservation practices which fit in the operational plans of agricultural producers. We encourage Farm Bureau members to engage with their local conservation districts to promote sound conservation.

**Fuel Storage Tanks:** **107**  
 We oppose any mandatory regulations or fees with the registration or monitoring of fuel storage tanks for farm use.  
 No limit should be imposed on the number of fuel storage tanks per farm and ranch;  
 Double wall tanks may be permitted in place of diking around tanks;  
 Exempt farm fuel (diesel and gasoline) tanks up to 22,000 gallons from environmental regulatory mandates; and  
 All farmers regardless of their on-farm fuel storage capacity should be allowed to complete and self-certify a spill control plan.  
 We believe state, county or municipality rules for fuel storage tanks should not be more restrictive than federal rules.

**Horses:** **108**  
 We support the use of horses for food and by-products.

**Nevada Winery Operations:** **109**  
 We support amendments to state law to allow licensed wineries to be able to obtain a liquor license and be allowed to serve other alcoholic beverages at their winery by the glass.

**Pesticide Applicators:** **110**  
 We support a system for general reciprocity agreements for licensed pesticide applicators with neighboring and other states in the Western region.

**Risk Management:** **111**  
 Farm Bureau recommends development of Risk Management tools, covering areas of need for Nevada agricultural operations.

### **Agriculture Research**

**Agricultural Research:** **112**  
 The Nevada Farm Bureau Federation supports the use of the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Stations as a research and teaching laboratories of critical importance to the future of Nevada’s agricultural industry.  
 We believe that the Experiment Station system should be maintained under the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources. We oppose the conversion of any Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station properties to urban use.  
 We believe that the Nevada Agricultural Experiment Station should engage in more applied research as opposed to basic research with input from Nevada farmers and ranchers.  
 The UNR College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Resources, Cooperative Extension, Nevada Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service and other agencies of the USDA should conduct and/or continue research on water resources, usages, water studies, pipeline projects, water shortages, etc. and provide educational materials that agricultural producers can readily use, including, but not limited to educational classes on water rights, rangeland resources, etc.

**Economic Research:****113**

Government agencies should recognize that personal income of a small business does not reflect the real economic impact on a community. We believe that it is important to work towards ascertaining the full economic impact (including multiplier effect) of small business, including farms and ranches, and specialty farms, on the community, and the state of Nevada as a whole.

Farm Bureau encourages county commissioners to adopt land use plans that will protect their county's customs, culture and economic stability. We also urge counties to make an economic study of their counties' resources.

County Farm Bureaus are encouraged to become members of local economic development agencies.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports local communities in their request for environmental, economic and social impact studies addressing the cumulative impacts on the entire community by Federal Government regulation and legislative actions.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the Economic Assessment project that Extension and the University of Nevada, Reno are doing to assist in the development of an economic database to assist with National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements for economic analysis.

**Extension – Research:****114**

We maintain that agricultural funding for agricultural research, Cooperative Extension and the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources should be maximized. Educational programs relating to Nevada agricultural needs should not be diluted.

We support the efforts of Cooperative Extension to gain additional funding from the Legislature to establish/maintain a core of experts to cover key areas facing Nevada agriculture: agronomy/forage production, alternative crops and traditional agricultural enterprises, rangeland management, noxious weed control, apiculture, and water management. We urge additional research on control measures for pests on private and federally-managed lands.

Cooperative Extension should enhance its liaison between researchers and producers. This includes bringing not only new knowledge from the researcher/specialists to the producer but also identifying needs of producers to help guide new research. Extension should play a role in educating the non-agricultural community regarding the issues facing people in agriculture today.

Local Extension personnel's role needs to be strengthened in developing and carrying out applied research for the benefit of production agriculture.

We recommend a cooperative working relationship between the federal government; Cooperative Extension; the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources; and the Agricultural Research Service.

**Food waste:****115**

We support research to develop ways to reduce the waste of food and support the beneficial use of food scraps.

## **Main Station Farm And All Other Agricultural Properties**

### **Owned By the Nevada System of Higher Education: 116**

Nevada Farm Bureau strongly urges the Board of Regents of the Nevada System of Higher Education System (NSHE) to retain all NSHE agricultural properties to meet the needs of production agriculture research and education.

Farm Bureau opposes selling all or any part of the Main Station Farm or any other agricultural properties for development or exchange for uses not consistent with above purposes.

Nevada Farm Bureau insists that all funds acquired from the sale or lease of Agricultural Research assets be used to establish endowments to pay for hiring researchers and to carry out research that matters to Nevada agriculture.

### **Use of Animals in Research: 117**

We feel that the humane use of animals in various kinds of research projects is necessary for the health and welfare of humanity and animal life.

## **Commodities**

### **Agricultural Industry: 118**

All forms of agricultural production are important to Nevada. We believe that organic farming, vineyards, wine and table grapes, specialty crops, and nursery production, including sod, nursery stock, etc., should be considered as part of the overall agricultural sector in Nevada with equal consideration in taxation policies, land use, etc.

In recognition of a growing hemp industry, Nevada Farm Bureau supports the formation of an advisory committee to develop policy to guide Nevada Farm Bureau.

### **Apiaries and Beekeeping: 119**

We support beekeepers and apiary groups being included in the primary stakeholder group in developing and updating the Managed Pollinator Plan for Nevada.

We support the Nevada Department of Agriculture in maintaining a website for the voluntary registration of apiary locations for access by pesticide applicators as part of Nevada's Pollinator Protection Plan.

### **Animal Identification: 120**

Each segment of the livestock industry has its own unique needs and level of management requirements. We support a variety of animal identification systems be used in tracking livestock as long as the system is market driven with an array of alternative methods available for the choice to be determined by the producer.

Nevada authorities, involved with interstate livestock movement need to be proactive in negotiating favorable arrangements with states where Nevada livestock are shipped, providing for interstate shipment to these states through a program, which is efficient and affordable.

As part of considerations of Nevada's Brand program, supplemental methods of livestock identification should be used in brand inspections and in connection with proof of ownership methods. Brands should be allowed as a tracking method under the National Animal Identification System, at the same time identification methods for NAIS should be considered as a method for proving ownership under the Nevada Brands program.

## **Animal Identification – Goats and Sheep:**

**121**

We support the farm herd, range, dairy and other sectors of the goat and sheep industry in their proposed methods for distinct individual animal identification. Each sector of the goat and sheep industry has its own unique needs and level of management requirements.

We support a variety of identification systems to be used in tracking goats and sheep as long as any system adopted is voluntary and determined by the producer.

Goat and sheep identification is to the benefit of the operator and may include, but not be limited to, individual animal tattoos, scrapie tags, ear tags, ear marks and/or other means of recognition as selected by the owner of the goat or sheep.

## **Animal Identification – Head Tax:**

**122**

We support the proposed increase in the state's livestock head tax, which secures sufficient funding. In our support for the proposal, we urge that specific changes seek proportional adjustments that are weighted such that stock cattle, dairy cattle, horses, donkeys and mules receive a higher rate of head tax assessment than hogs/pigs, sheep and goats. We further offer our recommendation that legislative changes include definitions for hogs/pigs, sheep and goats that take into account age levels for animals, which are charged the annual tax.

We support significant changes to the expenses associated with this program to help stabilize the account.

## **Animal Medication and Health:**

**123**

We recognize the need for and wish to assure availability of animal health products and feed additives in livestock, farmed fish, and poultry feeds.

We support:

1. The use of standard symbols for all drugs and withdrawal times.
2. Legislation that would continue the policy of allowing veterinarians to prescribe drugs needed for proper animal health on an extra-label use basis.
3. The United States Food and Drug Administration (USFDA) using research data of foreign countries as a basis for clearing animal health medications for use within the state of Nevada as well as the United States.
4. The USFDA designating sheep, goats, and farmed fish as minor use species so that research data utilized to clear animal health products in other farmed animals can be applied to them.
5. Faster drug approval from the USFDA on medications for the poultry industry.
6. We oppose the banning of animal medication without adequate proof of danger to humans and/or animals.

## **Beef Checkoff:**

**124**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the following modifications to the Beef Checkoff Program:

1. Revise the beef referendum process to provide producers at regular time intervals to petition for a referendum on continuing the Beef Checkoff Program. Ten percent of producers nationwide signing the petition at USDA designated local sites will trigger the USDA to conduct a vote within a year.
2. Establish a similar process to provide beef producers the opportunity to petition for a referendum on increasing the Beef Checkoff. Ten percent of producers nationwide signing the petition at USDA designated local sites will trigger the USDA to conduct a vote to increase the Checkoff rate.
3. Any reference to the charter date of an established national non-profit industry governed organization should be eliminated.

**Beef Checkoff – Supplemental Program:**

**125**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes the United States Secretary of Agriculture creating a supplemental beef promotion program.

**Biotechnology:**

**126**

Nevada Farm Bureau working with Higher Education should facilitate and sponsor education regarding genetic engineering, both pro and con, to its members as well as the general public. We continue to support the following:

1. Continued research and development of biotechnology and genetically modified organisms (GMO) while protecting the markets we currently have for non-GMO products. We oppose any act or legislation that would destroy the above by any individual and/or group.
2. Extend to farmers the legal immunity from civil liability for nonconsensual and/or unintentional cross-pollination between GMO and non-GMO products. We oppose any legislation that would be introduced that would potentially provide legal precedent.

**Board of Agriculture:**

**127**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the Nevada Department of Agriculture as a department level entity. Department status recognizes the importance of agricultural production and it provides quality service to state farmers and ranchers.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports that the Nevada Board of Agriculture be maintained as a policy-setting entity.

The Board of Agriculture should be responsible for the final approval of all regulations which fit into the regulatory scope of the Nevada Department of Agriculture, including brand regulations.

The Board of Agriculture should also maintain strong connection with Nevada agricultural organizations, providing Nevada agricultural producers with the opportunity to give input and influence into services or programs which are needed to benefit farmers and ranchers.

**Board of Agriculture-Composition:**

**128**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports composition of the Board of Agriculture, representing Nevada’s production Agriculture. We believe a majority of the Board members must be active agricultural producers. Nevada Farm Bureau requests input on all board appointments.

**Brands:**

**129**

We encourage an annual publication of the Nevada Brand Inspection Division financial report with results made available which explains the income and costs associated with the operations of this program.

**Brand Inspector Appointments:**

**130**

Farm Bureau believes that when authorities are appointing brand inspectors, they should be qualified.

We encourage the Department of Agriculture to provide proper training for appointed brand inspectors.

Appointing authorities should consider the preferences of livestock producers in the area to be affected. Such a system will help to ensure continued cooperation between personnel of the state Department of Agriculture and farmers and ranchers in specific areas.

The Department of Agriculture should be more proactive in recruiting livestock brand inspectors in order to achieve better distribution, located throughout the state.

**Dairy Marketing:****131**

We support the audit function carried out by the Nevada Department of Agriculture at the producer-processor levels.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports efforts to secure local dairy processing facilities in Nevada.

**Department of Ag/Seed Certification:****132**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the full enforcement of the Federal Seed Trade Act in the State of Nevada with appropriate funding and staffing to carry out the necessary seed sampling and enforcement. We understand that the sampling includes continuation of seed certification of seed growers and seed companies. We also believe that appropriate actions, in accordance with the Federal Memorandum, should be carried out for seed coming in from other states.

**Disease Control:****133**

We support the operation of an effective Trichomoniasis program through regulation by the Nevada Department of Agriculture and dissemination of informational education.

Nevada Farm Bureau favors mandatory brucellosis vaccination of all female breeding cattle in the state.

We urge the Nevada Department of Agriculture to notify in writing all large animal veterinarians and owners of property adjoining livestock operations where outbreaks of scabies, brucellosis, bluetongue and other quarantinable diseases have been detected.

We favor the addition of elk, moose and bison into a disease control program, operating under the Nevada Department of Agriculture.

Nevada Farm Bureau will work with the State Veterinarian on livestock health testing issues that affect Nevada livestock operators on inter-state movement.

Livestock producers need to be kept informed of current information/research findings regarding bovine Spongiform Encephalopathy (BSE) and other economically-significant diseases.

**Export Promotion:****134**

Nevada Farm Bureau will be involved in promoting exports of all farming commodities, including, but not limited to, livestock, hay and dairy products.

We support the approval and timely implementation of international trade agreements that provide fair and balance trade for United States businesses.

**Health Certificates:****135**

Nevada Farm Bureau is concerned with the relative difficulty in acquiring the necessary health permits to transport livestock into or out of the state of Nevada.

Nevada Farm Bureau requests the Department of Agriculture to coordinate with Nevada Farm Bureau in outreach efforts to educate producers on how health permits may be obtained.

**Livestock Liability:****136**

Property owners should not be held liable for accidents incurred by persons voluntarily engaged in equine or other livestock activity.

We also support NRS 568.355 and NRS 568.360 as currently written in 2014, identifying Nevada as an open range state.

**Livestock Theft Prevention:** **137**

To prevent livestock rustling, Farm Bureau recommends:

1. That the county sheriff, Highway Patrol and personnel of the state Department of Agriculture work together for better enforcement.
2. That the enforcement agencies use road blocks more frequently.
3. Support and expansion of the “Range Alert” observation program that has been developed by the Nevada Cattlemen.
4. That ranchers should carefully account for their livestock and promptly report losses to the appropriate agencies.

**Marketing – Labeling and Regulations:** **138**

Agricultural products are available on many levels of processing. The current trend is away from highly processed goods towards more natural forms of agricultural products from local sources. High levels of regulations prevent direct marketing between producer and consumer.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports direct marketing between producer and consumer with disclosure of the inspection level to which the commodities have been subjected. Nevada Farm Bureau adamantly opposes increased restrictive regulation that requires federal inspection for any agricultural products sold directly between consumer and producer (private treaty sale).

**Minimally Processed Cottage Foods:** **139**

We support minimally processed food production (i.e. dehydrated, dried, freeze dried, etc.) being able to be sold to consumers under a program, operated by the Nevada Department of Agriculture, which includes a producer’s certification system.

**National Poultry Improvement Plan:** **140**

We support Nevada’s participation in the National Poultry Improvement Plan, and the creation of a low-cost poultry inspection program that would allow producers to become NPIP certified.

**Nevada Meat Inspection Program:** **141**

We propose that Nevada have a state meat certification program with necessary inspections and a functional Nevada Department of Agriculture program which allows for state inspected meats to be sold through in-state commercial channels.

We also support a program that will allow a meat processor to operate with a custom-kill facility or a mobile facility.

Nevada needs to pursue increased opportunities for expanding United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) inspection.

**Organic Farming:** **142**

We support the Nevada Department of Agriculture reinstating and administrating the state organic program.

## **Seizure of Livestock:**

**143**

We support the local sheriff as the responsible supervisory authority on orders of seizure by a federal agency. The local authorities will over-see all orders of seizure and have a court order provided to this local authority to implement the action.

We support a change to federal livestock regulations to require a court order prior to impoundment.

Nevada NRS 565.100 outlines that it is unlawful to transfer ownership by “Sale or otherwise” without a brand inspection clearance certificate within brand inspection districts. The agent of the Federal Government must get a brand inspection from the state in order to remove livestock from a brand inspection district or to sell any of the animals.

In dealing with brand inspection procedures for cases where livestock have been impounded, we believe the following steps should be carried out:

1. Prior to a call for brand inspection of livestock to be impounded by any claims or alleged claimant, a review should be conducted by a local court and this material should be presented to the brand inspector before any transportation is approved (this should be required regardless of district brand boundaries within the state of Nevada);
2. any such livestock be impounded within the state of Nevada and should remain here until clearance is approved for their release by satisfaction of the case;
3. and, local law enforcement must be present to maintain order.
4. In the case of impounding cattle, we believe that the private property owner should be protected from excessive fines such as impoundment costs that are higher than actual, unless a court action calls for this type of action.

## **Urban Agriculture:**

**144**

We support incentivizing and reducing the cost of urban and indoor agriculture with the exception of marijuana, by supporting rate reductions, and rebates for power and water.

We support creation of temporary and permanent urban agricultural zoning, to incentivize the use of vacant land for agricultural use.

## **Veterinary Medicine:**

**145**

We believe that farmers and ranchers should be able to perform animal husbandry activities on their own livestock, obtain necessary veterinary supplies or utilize another person for necessary treatment and animal care.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports an amendment to the Nevada Revised Statutes allowing for the creation of another level of veterinary certification and licensing such as a veterinary technician. This position would be capable of making health inspections and issuing health certificates in underserved areas of the state and would work under the direction of the State Board of Veterinarian Medicine.

We believe that the State of Nevada should provide a program for telemedicine for livestock care with trained technicians working under the protocols to assess and treat livestock under the guidance of a veterinarian. Because veterinary care can be limited and difficult to access in rural Nevada, Nevada Farm Bureau should work with the states of Nevada and surrounding states to allow certified vet techs or veterinary assistants to provide routine veterinary care, such as Bangs vaccinations, under the supervision of a veterinarian, including out of state veterinarians in counties adjacent to rural Nevada counties.

## **Education General**

### **Education – General:**

**146**

We support an education system which will:

1. Support Nutrition/Consumer Science /Home finance as a required curriculum. These classes could meet the Science, Math and Humanities standards necessary to pass to the next grade or graduate;
2. Provide for education about career opportunities in agriculture;
3. Create partnerships with business, including agricultural business;
4. Support science and humanity credits for agriculture science classes;
5. Teach students basic nutrition utilizing a balanced approach emphasizing food safety from market to plate;
6. Offer and encourage the expansion of career and technical education in all school districts;
7. Focus on a thorough understanding of basic economics, free enterprise systems and the United States and Nevada constitutions;
8. Allow for individual flexibility in achieving education goals;
9. Instill students with attributes of self-esteem, responsibility and discipline;
10. Ensure a mastery of competencies;
11. Provide that the costs for background checks for volunteers be paid by the ordering authority;
12. Provide textbooks or the digital equivalent for students to use in or outside the classroom

### **FFA:**

**147**

We support:

1. Continuation of agricultural education programs with emphasis placed on the recruitment and training of qualified agricultural instructors.
2. Efforts by county Farm Bureaus working closely with their local school districts to establish and ensure the maintenance, improvement and continuation of agricultural education programs and FFA. High school agricultural education and the FFA are vital programs for development of the talent and leadership needed in farming and agricultural service industries.
3. Efforts by county Farm Bureaus to work with their school districts to implement an updated agricultural education curriculum to meet the needs of today's agriculture. The curriculum should include agricultural science courses or other classes that would meet the criteria needed to receive credit for a college prep course.
4. The inclusion of agricultural projects in school science fairs.
5. Efforts to create renewed interest in the agricultural education model that includes three equal parts – classroom instruction, Supervised Agricultural Experiences and leadership development through the FFA.
6. The increase of funding of agricultural education and FFA via state and federal career and technical education funding.
7. The increase funding of programming and services provided by state level agricultural education and FFA as a part of career and technical education.

### **Separation Of Schools From County School Districts:**

**148**

We support amending Nevada Revised Statute to allow the creation of community school districts, for communities who feel underserved-by their current county school district.

## **K-12 Education**

### **Agricultural Literacy:**

**149**

The Nevada Farm Bureau supports active Agricultural Literacy programs in K-12 schools throughout all school districts within Nevada. It is essential that we enhance and improve student understanding of basic agriculture and its vital role in the production of our Nation's food and fiber supply, as well as the importance of agriculture in our local, state and national economy. We support special emphasis being placed on Nevada agriculture, including education of the value of multiple uses of our federally-managed lands. In this regard we also support both in and out of classroom activities.

We support and encourage teacher training workshops to enable our state's teachers to both become more familiar with the importance of agriculture and more effectively teach about that importance. We encourage special emphasis be placed in teacher workshops concerning the multiple use of federally-managed lands.

We support autonomy for Agricultural Literacy programs within the National Institute of Food and Agriculture at the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

### **Agricultural Literacy Sustainability:**

**150**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports working with other involved partners on Agricultural Literacy programs to develop a working strategy and organizational structure to assist in enhancing and sustaining a statewide, long-term Agricultural Literacy program.

### **Charter Schools:**

**151**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a statewide internet charter school system. This will allow rural schools and home schools throughout the state to access a charter school.

### **Education:**

**152**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports local control of our school districts including the determination of curriculum. Education proficiency exams would be based on whether a student demonstrates that they have learned the required information.

### **School Attendance:**

**153**

We continue to encourage local school districts to allow adequate time for students, with passing grades, to participate in extracurricular "academic enrichment" structured programs such as FFA and 4-H. Furthermore, we urge that the school districts adopt a policy stating that participation in these types of "academic enrichment" programs not be considered as absences.

### **Student Financial Credit System:**

**154**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a financial credit system for K-12 where state funds follow the individual students to pay for their education in an accredited program to offer more options for school choice.

Since a student might attend a public supported school in a district other than where he/she resides, the school districts should enter an inter-local agreement, requiring each district to pay for its own students.

**Textbooks: 155**

Nevada Farm Bureau believes that the first priority in the selection of textbooks should be the accuracy of the contained information. The Farm Bureau supports strong review of all textbooks for accuracy of contained information by parents, teachers and administrators. We also believe that textbook selection should be a product of local input.

**Teaching Credentials: 156**

All schools should require uniform teaching credentials, administrative credentials and allow for provisional credentials for technical education.

**Higher Education**

**College of Ag, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR): 157**

We strongly urge the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR) to work with the Nevada Farm Bureau to assess current statewide undergraduate educational needs in agriculture. Additionally, we urge CABNR to work with the Nevada Farm Bureau to assess the current statewide agriculture research needs of the industry.

**CABNR/Cooperative Extension: 158**

We support the necessity of budget integrity for Cooperative Extension and the Agricultural Experiment Station system to avoid inappropriate expenditure allocations from these budgets to fund CABNR financial requirements.

We support a statewide Cooperative Extension program operating under the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources (CABNR).

We also believe that Extension specialists should be stationed in the field, as opposed to being required to be based on campus and removed from day-to-day contact with constituents. Arrangements developed for finalized consolidation need to take into account appropriate evaluation systems to deal with improved incentives for applied research/development projects. To promote the values of outreach programing, we believe that the faculty who are involved with outreach should retain Cooperative Extension as their academic home. This will recognize that there are differences in the University criteria and allow for proper rewards and encouragement for those who engage in educational outreach and research programs aligned with needs of customers and communities who Cooperative Extension serve.

**CABNR/Land Grant College Responsibilities: 159**

We strongly support the National Land Grant College system, established under the Morrill Acts of 1862 and 1890, which reflected a growing demand for agricultural and technical education at colleges across the Nation. The Hatch Act, enacted in 1887, provides funding to each state to establish agricultural experiment stations in connection with the state's land-grant institution. The needs which prompted enactment of these two laws, clearly remain to this day. We strongly encourage the University of Nevada System, the University of Nevada, Reno and the College of Agriculture, Biotechnology and Natural Resources to recommit their efforts to conform with requirements as set forth in the statutes/regulations for National Land Grant Colleges.

Nevada Farm Bureau will establish a committee to assess alternatives for agriculture education, Cooperative Extension programs and research. The emphasis of this strategic planning process needs to be focused on assessing what we need, what we want and how to go about getting it.

**CABNR/Reciprocal Programs:****160**

We recommend that the University of Nevada System develop more extensive reciprocal programs with other universities and colleges, including community colleges for agricultural studies, such as those through the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education (WICHE).

**Community Colleges:****161**

We support the educational opportunities provided by Nevada's community colleges. To fulfill these opportunities, it is vital that instructors be hired and schedules be offered which meet the needs of the residents of a community. For students who are seeking to use community colleges, to meet obligations for classes in order to transfer to other colleges and University programs, it is critical that required classes be offered at the community colleges in a coordinated system.

**Great Basin College:****162**

We encourage Great Basin College in Elko to find creative solutions for re-establishing a curriculum granting an Associate of Arts degree, an Associate of Science degree, and an Associate of Applied Science degree in agriculture.

We further encourage Great Basin College to re-establish a Bachelor's degree program in agriculture. Agriculture education is currently limited in Nevada due to the fact that the University of Nevada only offers agriculture degrees in certain technical areas with little emphasis on practical, production related education. The establishment of an agricultural curriculum at Great Basin College offers excellent opportunities for advanced agriculture education to Nevada's students. We strongly urge the University of Nevada System Board Of Regents to lend full support to Great Basin College and other community colleges that offer agricultural courses and engage in budgeting and planning for facilities to be used by courses in the agriculture programs.

Nevada Farm Bureau urges the Nevada Department of Agriculture, NSHE Board of Regents and Cooperative Extension to consider a joint venture in planning and budgeting for the construction of a hands-on facility/building/center at Great Basin College for use especially by the Agriculture program for more "hands-on" educational opportunities to better serve the needs of rural Nevada college students, Department of Agriculture educational services and Cooperative Extension agricultural activities and symposia, etc.

**Millennium Scholarships:****163**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a change in the Millennium Scholarship Program to extend benefits of the scholarship to Nevada resident students who are committed to studying agriculture but have to go to another state for this type of program.

## Extension

### 4-H

164

We support a state-wide program that is committed to success through:

1. Setting up a state leaders council with both adult and youth leaders to administer funds of the 4-H Foundation and to act as an advisory board to the state 4-H program;
2. Providing the opportunity for our youth and adults to participate in state and national trips, scholarship programs and leadership training, etc.;
3. Sharing information between counties (newsletter, web page, calendar, etc.);
4. Providing an atmosphere which encourages understanding, respect and a rapport among our youth, adults and staff among counties and between state and counties;
5. Recognizing the validity of “traditional 4-H” as well as other interest and “school enrichment” activities; (“Traditional 4-H is broadly defined as encouraging learning, responsibility, development of life skills and interaction with other youth and adults. 4-Hers work toward known achievable objectives.”)
6. Recognizing that the real strength of 4-H is older youth working with new or younger 4-H members; (This is the foundation of leadership and community service.)
7. Encouraging youth and adults to make friends and have fun.
8. Each county’s adult and youth leaders council should have input into their program on a regular basis. Programs developed by staff, youth leaders and volunteer leaders should have objectives and responsibilities clearly delineated.

### 4-H Camp:

165

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the efforts of the University of Nevada Cooperative Extension to secure funding, both private and public, for improvements at the Nevada State 4-H Camp, including a Learning Center.

Nevada Farm Bureau also supports the establishment of an additional Nevada State 4-H camp to serve the larger populations of 4-H members in Southern and Eastern Nevada, and encourages the establishment of a stronger agricultural and natural history theme at the camp with the goal of instilling in 4-H youth a much greater appreciation of the natural and cultivated bounties of this great state.

### Extension/Local Working Relationships:

166

An effective working relationship between cooperative extension and counties depends on equal responsibility with all partners sharing a role in establishing direction and review of progress. We believe all aspects of cooperative extension, including hiring, payment and tenure review of extension personnel should involve county commissioners. We encourage county commissioners to request and form local citizen advisory committees.

Further, to maintain and enhance 4-H programs, Cooperative Extension should continue policies of mutual respect between administrators, staff and volunteers.

## Government

*Nevada Farm Bureau believes that government on all levels has outgrown its original bounds delineated by the constitution. We urge all elected officials to limit the role of government to basic needs, and not continue to be invasive in every aspect of local and national economies and the personal choices of the people they serve.*

### **Affected Interests:**

**167**

When drafting regulations, government agencies must consider all entities which have economic interests which will be affected by the implementation of the regulation, taking into consideration private property rights, local people, multiple use of the land and local economies. When federal agencies plan to make land use plan changes, they need to notify all land owners in the affected area by mail.

### **Board Appointments:**

**168**

We believe that it is in a community's and the state's best interests that qualified and knowledgeable people, representing varied interests, be appointed to boards, committees and commissions, and that governing bodies should make every effort to make appointments according to these criteria.

Agricultural production interests should have input to the appointment of the Board of Agriculture.

We believe that Farm Bureau should be consulted when agricultural and/or natural resource related appointments are made.

### **Budgeting And Spending:**

**169**

We support reform of Nevada's budget process, implementing a zero-based budget process where all state budgets are constructed from zero with line-item justification required for all elements of the proposed spending amounts.

We support a limit on state spending using a formula where spending does not exceed state-wide cost-of-living and population increases.

We strongly recommend that Nevada state and county governments be fiscally responsible.

### **Assessor Training:**

**170**

Nevada Farm Bureau recommends that newly elected county assessors and staff continue to be provided the necessary background training by the Nevada Tax Commission so that they may competently carry out the functions of their office and obey NRS 361.227, following all applicable market prices.

Though we do not recommend that county assessors be required to be certifiable as professional appraisers, we also recognize the need for equitable and competent property assessment procedures.

### **Department of Agriculture:**

**171**

To encourage the development of local nurseries, we ask the Department of Agriculture implement a tiered, licensing fees based on gross income.

Nevada Farm Bureau requests the Nevada Governor and Nevada Legislature to provide adequate general fund monies to the Nevada Department of Agriculture for increased inspections of incoming agricultural products, from out of state sources, in order to protect the general public from economic impact of importing invasive species and diseases.

## **Department of Motor Vehicles**

**172**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports moving the Nevada Department of Motor Vehicles and commercial licensing into the private sector.

## **Financial Disclosure:**

**173**

While we recognize the need to know information about the interests of persons serving in a public capacity, we are opposed to any requirements on the part of any government entity at any level that its volunteer boards, commission and/or committee members disclose personal and business financial information or reveal the resources thereof.

## **Financing:**

**174**

We believe that no government entity should be allowed to make unfunded mandates on lower levels of government or jurisdiction.

## **Fundraising:**

**175**

The state of Nevada, with the Attorney General's office and the Nevada Board of Agriculture should have legal means to require groups raising funds in Nevada to use factual and not misleading information in their fundraising when agriculture is affected.

## **Federal Government Agencies:**

**176**

Federal government agencies and their employees should follow adopted legislative authority without creation of their own missions or bureaucratic edicts, which have no foundation in the intent of law.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the ability of federal agencies to make local/regional decisions, based on local input.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports improved Congressional review/oversight of Executive Orders, federal agencies and IRS litigation, court cases and court appeals.

Private citizens' judicial relief from abusive agencies is destroyed by the agencies' unlimited funding for repeated and expensive litigation, as well as the practice of charging as single action under multiple regulations in order to circumvent double jeopardy protection.

We oppose government agencies or individual employees harassing or intimidating friends, family or business associates of parties to any dispute in order to force capitulation or submission.

We favor local control and oppose any national police force. All state and federal agency personnel must go through elected county sheriffs for law enforcement problems unless the sheriff is the target of the investigation.

Federal land and resource agencies should be prohibited from exercising police powers within a state and should not have their own police enforcement agents.

## **Government Agencies – Department of Labor Actions:**

**177**

We are concerned over the manner in which the U.S. Department of Labor is pursuing an anti-agricultural agenda and tactics that include issuing orders, which prevent the sale of perishable commodities without due process regarding allegations of adhering to labor regulations. Federal regulators from any government agency should be required to carry out their responsibilities in a manner, which recognizes citizens' rights and entitlement to proper due process and legal protections.

**Limits Of Government Emergency Powers: 178**

Religious practices are fundamental rights and should remain available during times of trial and pandemic. Precautions should be taken, but our rights to worship when, where and the number of participants should not be limited by government.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports limiting the length of time the Governor of Nevada can enact emergency powers. Extension of time must be sought from two-thirds legislative approval.

We are opposed to federal restrictions and mandates, put forth through Executive Orders or federal agency regulations.

**Local Government: 179**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the concept of all subdivisions of State government adhering to the laws that govern existing cities and counties.

Nevada Farm Bureau rejects the concept of “Innovation Zones” or creation of new subdivisions of State government that remove authority and tax base from existing counties.

**State Government Agencies: 180**

We support the accountability of State government agencies and their employees for their actions under Nevada Revised Statutes, Chapters 197 and 199. We support systemic reforms to achieve this end. We support punitive action, recognizing existing statutory constraints – 2017, against both agencies and individuals who abuse their powers.

State agencies and their employees must recognize the U.S. Constitution, state laws and local ordinances, and must act within those boundaries.

**In Lieu of Tax Payments: 181**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports legislation requiring federally-managed lands to be deeded to counties to make up for shortages in Payment In Lieu of Tax payments.

Nevada Farm Bureau shall pursue the forming of a fair formula for dispersing Payment In Lieu of Tax dollars in order for Western States to receive their fair share.

**Medical Marijuana: 182**

We support use of valid medical marijuana within the state.

We support county primacy of regulating the production and sale of marijuana.

We further call attention to the recognition of federal laws involving the cultivation, harvesting, production and sale within the United States.

**Regulations: 183**

Farm Bureau supports a reduction in government regulations to allow agricultural producers to focus on their business and operate efficiently without undue government interference, particularly but not limited to EPA regulations, and encourages the EPA to adopt a “Do No Harm” policy to producers.

Nevada Farm Bureau Federation opposes enactment of Local or State CAFO (Confined Animal Feeding Operations) regulations that are more restrictive than federal EPA regulations.

Farm Bureau believes that any time regulations are written for the implementation of a new law the legislators should review and approve those regulations to make sure that they do not exceed the intent of the law.

**“Right-to-Work” Law: 184**

We support Nevada’s “right-to-work” law and oppose any attempt by federal or state legislation to subvert it.

**Sovereign Immunity:**

**185**

Farm Bureau opposes sovereign immunity being used by government and government officials to avoid prosecution for illegal and unethical activities.

Because no one should be above the law, we call for the criminal prosecution of any governmental employees who abuse their power, lie, destroy or tamper with evidence including email, or threaten subordinates or any parties to legal or financial disputes, to the fullest extent of the law.

**Voting Process:**

**186**

We support every legal vote.

We support the enhancement of solicited “absentee ballot” laws to include hardship of “in person” voting such as health or distance to the polls.

We support changes to state election laws to not allow the random, unsolicited mail distribution of ballots or the harvesting of those ballots.

We believe insuring election integrity is essential. We encourage the Secretary of State provide educational information to report on the outcomes of local audit results as well as areas of deficiencies which should be addressed with proposed changes.

**Welfare:**

**187**

We oppose public policies which allow aliens who are illegally in the United States to collect social welfare payments.

We also strongly believe that welfare assistance programs should be controlled by state and county authorities, and that they should not be “federalized.”

**Land Use/Property Rights**

**Agricultural Practices – Right-To-Farm:**

**188**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports adoption of local right-to-farm ordinances designed to encourage agriculture and protect the existing rights of farmers and ranchers. We should be able to produce without unreasonable restrictions, regulations or undue liability and nuisance suits when carrying out normal production practices. We believe the Nevada Board of Agriculture should continue to serve a role in helping to make sure proper farming practices are being used.

Productive and/or potentially productive agricultural lands should be identified in all county general plans and all properties within one mile should be notified upon purchase that agricultural practices include dust, noise, odor, spraying and machinery operation at all hours and seasons.

We encourage cooperation between farmers/ranchers and the non-agricultural public in resolving conflicts that occur over agricultural practices like burning or that involve concerns of dust, odors, etc. Necessary agricultural practices should be considered in weighing agricultural/urban disputes.

We urge every county, through its duly elected board of commissioners, to develop and implement an ordinance(s) similar to the position that other Nevada counties have taken to protect agriculture.

**Agricultural Preservation:**

**189**

We support establishment of a program to purchase or transfer development rights on agricultural lands and irrigation water rights to preserve agriculture while at the same time permitting current owners a return on their investment.

**Condemnation Of Private Property: 190**

Farm Bureau opposes condemnation or use of eminent domain of private property for access to federal lands.

Nevada Farm Bureau is opposed to the taking of private property including water rights for the benefit of a private business for “Public Purposes”. We oppose the taking of property to benefit a private business entity.

**Consolidate Checkerboard Lands: 191**

Nevada Farm Bureau encourages the consolidation of checkerboard land to make it more reasonable for the public lands and private land owners to manage and develop the land as they wish.

**Easements: 192**

For easements to be granted, there must be a written description or an indication on the survey maps that there is a new or additional easement.

**Elected Officials Private Property Responsibilities: 193**

Nevada Farm Bureau recommends that all elected officials seek means to continue/protect all private property rights within their jurisdiction.

With the increased pressure from the federal government and local governments to encroach on private property rights, we request that the Attorney General’s office, of the state of Nevada, vigorously defend the property rights of the state of Nevada and its citizens from the federal government and local governments.

**Federal Lands Conversion to Private Property: 194**

We favor retention and strengthening of the principles of the Desert Entry Act and Carey Act to provide for the disposal of federal lands into private ownership.

Nevada Farm Bureau should monitor Federal Lands Resource Management Plan amendments to promote suitable lands for agriculture to be classified for disposal.

We support a streamlined environmental assessment system. Nevada Farm Bureau will send letters in support to encourage state and federal officials to improve policies for improved opportunities for use of the laws for disposal of federal lands for agricultural use.

**Federal Land Transfers: 195**

The State of Nevada should acquire federally managed lands.

When lands removed from federal control are determined to be available for sale to private ownership, adjoining landowners with a pertinent right attached to the land, if they meet the bid levels, should be provided with the right of first refusal for purchase.

Under FLPMA, federal land use management plans must be consistent to local land use and water plans. We believe that lands which continue to be managed by federal agencies should continue in this manner and lands acquired by the State of Nevada should also be operated in a like fashion.

**Fence Out State: 196**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the Nevada Revised Statutes as a fence out state. We encourage federal agencies to follow the Nevada statute to eliminate further burden on livestock permittees.

**Government Acquisition:**

**197**

We are opposed to the increased state and federal government ownership of land and water rights through acquisition of private property.

When government agencies acquire private lands, they should be required to return comparable lands to private ownership. There shall be no net loss of tax base of the county affected.

We believe the percentage of Nevada land in private property should be substantially increased to establish vigorous local economies and that counties should not be subject to loss of tax base when tribes acquire property under Trust Status.

Tribes should be required to meet the same standards, and pay all the same fees and taxes applicable to other developers.

We are opposed to the perpetual federal funding for purchases of private land, converting it to public purposes.

In the case of overallocated water basins, Nevada Farm Bureau supports the purchase and compensation of water rights for retirement of those water rights.

**Government Actions Impacting Private Property:**

**198**

With the strong foundation of many laws and our U.S. Constitution requiring full due process of law before federal or state agencies can take possession of private property, we believe that it is important for local governments and other levels of government as well to enforce laws which require due process and the right of a grand jury judgment before any private property can be seized or civil rights violated.

We believe that all federal agencies should honor private property rights and that no agency should be able to take private property without due process.

**National Monuments:**

**199**

Because of the abuse of the 1906 Antiquities Act, which destroys the multiple use concept, we support the repeal of the 1906 Antiquities Act, and/or revocation of presidential authority to set aside more than 640 acres without the approval of the affected counties, and of Congress.

**Natural Resource Surveys:**

**200**

No state or federal agency (or their representatives) should be permitted to do stream surveys or carry out other activities on private lands without the permission of the private landowner.

**Property Tax Mitigation Requirements:**

**201**

We support mitigation plans to be developed and accepted by County Commissioners when private property is removed from local property tax rolls and acquired by non-property tax paying entities.

**Trespass Laws:**

**202**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports legislation allowing trespass prosecution on improved sites (i.e. hay fields, irrigated crops, yards, irrigated pasture, vineyards, etc.) regardless of whether or not such sites are posted.

Changes should be made to NRS 207 to make it simpler and more easily understood for notification of trespass.

We seek increased criminal prosecution for trespass, increasing penalties to gross misdemeanor levels.

**Trespass Laws – Jurisdiction Over Sovereign State Lands: 203**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the approved Jurisdictional Determination (dated December 30, 2014) by the Army Corps of Engineers that changes the classification of Segment 8 (Carson Desert 16050203) to the status of a non-navigable waterway. With this change, the adjacent land owners are now under the rights outlined in NRS 503.240, pertaining to trespass, hunting and fishing without the private property owners’ permission.

We also desire clarification by the Nevada Division of State Lands, owner of the riverbed, as to what is meant by “Ordinary High Water Mark,” “Normal High Water Mark” and per NAC 322.080 what is the “Mean High Water Mark Line.” Are these synonymous with the United States Geologic Survey (USGS) stream flow data?

We also support the education of involved entities (Sheriffs, District Attorneys, the Nevada Department of Wildlife, Nevada Division of State Lands, landowners and public users) as to the reclassification and the ramifications.

**Zoning: 204**

County Farm Bureaus should continue to be active in the process of promoting private property rights as they relate to local zoning issues.

**Miscellaneous**

**Agricultural Overtime Requirements: 205**

Because of the impact of weather as well as the seasonal and intensive nature of the agricultural industry, agricultural labor should remain exempt from the state’s overtime requirements (law and regulations).

**Daylight Saving Time: 206**

We support Pacific Daylight Time year round.

**Defense – Impacts of Military Reservations: 207**

Expansion of training areas, which close or limit multiple use of federal lands need to be clearly justified with considerations given to public input and transparent reasoning given to alternative options. Plans must also take in account and provide the ability for continuation of necessary emergency services and wildlife management activities.

We propose that farmers and ranchers be properly compensated by the military branches or the federal government for any adverse economic impacts, short and long term, of new and existing military activities, reservations or restricted areas.

In cases where grazing allotment closure is required, compensation to grazing allotment owners should be required and should take into account the value of the feed provided for that allotment (within the seasonal context of how that allotment fits into the ranch’s operations); the value of the water rights on the allotment (with the full value of the lost or change in status of the water right); the value of any and all range improvements and the consequences of the economic conditions for the ranching operation by the loss of the component provided by the grazing allotment. Compensated water rights should be retired.

This speaks to the long-term economic viability and sustainability of the entire agricultural operation.

**Farm Bureau – Policy Implementation:****208**

Nevada Farm Bureau will seek out, cooperate and work in conjunction with other groups to accomplish our policy goals. County Farm Bureaus are encouraged to present policy positions to their County Commissions annually.

**Farm Bureau – Political Action/Education:****209**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the political action efforts of Nevadans For Families and Agriculture. Their purpose is to involve Farm Bureau members in the political process to the fullest extent possible. This approach is to further the pursuit of our overall goal of accomplishing Nevada Farm Bureau policy objectives.

**Fire Arms - Right to Bear Arms:****210**

We support the right of the people of Nevada to retain the right to keep and bear arms including open carry and prohibit the registration of fire arms and ammunition. We oppose gun-free zones.

**Health Care:****211**

Nevada Farm Bureau believes that one of the primary goals of health insurance reform should be to reduce costs. We oppose the Health Insurance Tax (HIT) or any movement that encourages a socialized style of health care.

Concepts for further Health Insurance Reform should:

- Provide for the ability to shop and purchase health insurance coverage from out-of-state companies without state-based required policy provisions;
- Allow persons to purchase catastrophic insurance with high deductibles;
- Make self-contributions to Health Savings Accounts (HSAs) pre-taxed or fully deductible;
- Limit public funding to “Planned Parenthood” to only those which provide community wellness clinics such as vaccinations or health care for children; (Planned Parenthood facilities which receive public funding for these services should be closely monitored and operations which exceed these types of services, using public funding, should be required to reimburse the public funds they received.)
- Encourage creative ideas to be explored which require all citizens to have an investment in their own and their family’s health care with options for service providers which redirect those seeking non-urgent medical care away from emergency services;
- Explore reform options for litigation which discourages frivolous lawsuits by requiring lawyers and their clients who lose cases to cover court costs;
- Maintain the “Prudent Layperson Law” as written. (It is designed to protect U.S. Citizens from having to pay out of pocket expenses for Emergency Department visits.)
- Encourage education of Farm Bureau members and their friends and family on how the “Prudent Layperson Law” protects them to prevent the legislature from modifying the “Prudent Layperson Law”;
- Allow for any groups of citizens to join together for the purpose of offering a group association policy; and,
- Eliminate special health care entitlements for lawmakers and their staffs.

**Law Enforcement:****212**

Enforcement of any codes by federal agencies must be limited to their primary responsibility. Nevada Farm Bureau believes that Nevada and its counties have sufficient law enforcement personnel and courts systems to enforce any and all laws and regulations. We oppose federal intrusion into law enforcement activities in the state. We urge the Nevada Legislature to take an active role in protecting Nevada's citizens from Federal law enforcement or being called before federal courts for minor infringements. Jurisdictional issues must be clarified and adhered to.

**Liability - Limitations, Malpractice, Other Aspects:****213**

We recommend that the state legislature set a limit on the size of damage awards in medical malpractice lawsuits. We further recommend that the Nevada Legislature take note of the following suggestions when considering legislation regulating liability actions:

That each defendant in a liability case should only be held liable to the extent that he or she is responsible. The so-called "deep pockets" philosophy should not be acceptable.

That, in personal injury judgments, allowances should be made for monthly installment payment of disability damages. There should be no requirement for lump payment.

That, in liability cases, a reasonable cap should be placed on the amount of damages awarded for pain and suffering.

**Media – Public Relations:****214**

We encourage the various media to present all points of view. Public relations efforts as well as other methods may be needed to require the media to balance the message.

Nevada Farm Bureau believes it is necessary to obtain public notice of the work that is done in agriculture and agricultural research, and to further make known the activities of the Nevada Farm Bureau.

With that in mind, we feel it is necessary to seek publicity on radio and television, and in the press, about such activities in order to improve our relations with the public and improve the public image of our industry.

**Nevada Heritage Foundation:****215**

We support the Nevada Heritage Foundation.

**Penal System - Capital Punishment:****216**

We support capital punishment as a sentence for capital crimes and urge that it be enforced in a timely manner.

**Unmanned Aircraft Systems: 217**

We support:

1. The use of unmanned aircraft systems (UASs) for commercial purposes (i.e., agriculture, forestry, and other natural resource use);
2. Requiring the operator of the UAS to gain the consent of the landowner and or operator, if the UAS will be surveying or gathering data about the landowner’s property below navigable airspace; and
3. The regulation of UASs as recreational aircraft.

We oppose:

1. A federal agency using UASs for the purpose of regulatory enforcement, litigation and as a sole source for natural resource inventories used in planning efforts;
2. UASs surveying and gathering data without the consent of the landowner and or operator below navigable airspace; and
3. FAA regulations of UASs as fixed-winged aircraft.

**Youth Groups - Junior Livestock Show Board: 218**

We urge that there be continued support of the Nevada Junior Livestock Show Board with increased emphasis on commodity group representation. The board discharges a necessary function for all youth interested in livestock husbandry.

**Youth Programs: 219**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports all youth programs connected with agricultural preservation and husbandry.

**Natural Resources/Environment**

**Action Plan On Federally-Managed Lands: 220**

Nevada Farm Bureau should work together with other livestock production or advocacy groups and other impacted groups to coordinate strategy on Nevada federally managed land issues, and private property rights with an emphasis on enhancing rangeland conditions, including development and maintenance of stockwater by ranchers.

**Agricultural Contributions to Wildlife: 221**

Nevada Farm Bureau will promote and publicize benefits to wildlife from production agriculture.

Nevada Farm Bureau recognizes the intrinsic value of grazing and use of wet meadows and native grasslands to maintain habitat quality. We support the use of leases or private contracts for use of Federal and State Wildlife Management Areas with consideration given to previous or prior users.

**Agricultural Practices – Dust: 222**

We support the continued process of including the Nevada Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service and the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection Citizen Advisory Committee in working to resolve agricultural dust related problems. The advisory committee should continue to include farmer/rancher producers as part of the representatives from the agricultural sector. Ag. Producers should be allowed to continue to mitigate dust complaints through the use of best management practices as opposed to regulatory controls.

**Agricultural Waste:****223**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports an option for on-site non-hazardous solid waste disposal for ranchers' daily operational waste.

**Air Quality Controls:****224**

Air quality particulate standards should be based on attainable, scientifically sound studies with an exemption for normal agricultural practices. We encourage Farm Bureau's participation in any public policy development affecting agricultural practices including burning for field sanitation.

We encourage cooperation between farmers/ranchers and the non-agricultural public in resolving conflicts that occur over agricultural practices like burning or that involve concerns of dust, odors, etc. Necessary agricultural practices should be considered in weighing agricultural/urban disputes.

**Air Quality/Vehicle Inspections:****225**

We oppose any farm or ranch equipment or vehicles being subject to air quality regulations and/or smog control inspections in rural counties.

Nevada Farm Bureau believes that there should be a requirement that all emission/opacity standards be provided on a county-by-county basis with registration materials for all new and renewal vehicle registrations, notifying vehicle owners the standards they must meet before vehicles are registered.

We also believe that recognition should be made for the differences between rural and urban areas of the state and that vehicles or farm equipment operated in rural areas should not be subject to the same emission/opacity standards as urban areas. This approach could take the form of developing appropriate standards for agricultural/rural areas.

Should a Nevada vehicle, for which all of the owner's county of residence licensing requirements have been met, be cited for non-compliance in a different county, we propose:

1. That a reasonable time be given for necessary engine repairs.
2. Those fees be waved on proof of correction and compliance, within the required time, with regulations of the county where the citation was issued.

**Bear Management:****226**

We believe that the Department of Wildlife should continue current programs which remove nuisance bears in a timely manner when they damage private property or pose a public safety concern. We support a hunting season for bears as a management tool with the opportunity to use dogs for hunting.

**Big Horn Sheep:****227**

Farm Bureau opposes any removal of livestock from open range for the protection of Big Horn Sheep.

**BLM Resource Advisory Committees:****228**

Nevada Farm Bureau should continue to provide the representatives on the Resource Advisory Councils with the resources and information necessary to make sound decisions.

**Chronic Wasting Disease in Wildlife:****229**

Nevada Farm Bureau will:

1. Advocate the banning of alternative livestock susceptible to Chronic Wasting Disease;
2. Support the ban of winter feeding of elk as outlined in the Nevada State Elk Species Management Plan;
3. Advocate making permanent the ban of interstate importation of any wildlife susceptible to Chronic Wasting Disease; and
4. Advocate Nevada Department of Wildlife be required to fully investigate occurrences and inform the public.

**Common Raven:****230**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the effort to declare the common raven a nuisance and threat to the health, safety and welfare of the people and wildlife of Nevada and supports the removal of the raven from its protected status.

**Coordinated Planning:****231**

Nevada Farm Bureau favors the concept of coordinated resource management planning at both state and local levels.

**County Resource Plans:****232**

It is essential for state and local governments to have a good working knowledge of their powers and responsibilities in regard to Natural Resource plans in their respective jurisdictions. To this end, Nevada Farm Bureau encourages all state legislators, county commissioners, county sheriffs and anyone who has need to work with Federal agencies attend training in the form of workshops, conferences or other means (such as those provided by the group American Land Stewards).

Nevada Farm Bureau strongly urges each county and the Nevada Legislature to establish appropriate advisory boards to develop natural resource strategies necessary for county Boards of Commissioners and the State of Nevada to protect the Custom, Culture, Environment and Economy of their county and state.

**Elk Management Plans:****233**

The current process for Elk planning in the State of Nevada is a mostly internal process carried out by the Department of Wildlife. Nevada Farm Bureau requests changes to the currently adopted process to allow for a more open forum, and broader public input into elk management plans. No increases in the existing elk populations can be tolerated until there is a documented increase in the forage available, better overall rangeland health, and all suspended livestock permits have been restored to their original capacity.

## **Endangered Species:**

**234**

We encourage county Farm Bureaus to be involved in conservation habitat planning.

We encourage county commissioners to be active in promoting and supporting development of local planning processes.

Nevada Farm Bureau members are encouraged to minimize adverse impacts to private property rights by seeking resource capable, species beneficial actions, developed and monitored, using credible real science in developing local habitat conservation plans.

Because the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout is a hatchery produced fish and it appears that these populations can and are introduced into Nevada's waters at will, Nevada Farm Bureau supports efforts to de-list the Lahontan Cutthroat Trout as a Threatened Species.

Any listing of any species, animal or plant, as Threatened, Endangered or BLM sensitive species will undoubtedly affect the Custom, Culture and Economy of the impacted area, as well as cause a financial impact to one extent or another to local landowners. This must be treated as a "Takings" and dealt with through the appropriate court system so that just compensation can be obtained for impacted parties.

*(Reference is also made to American Farm Bureau Federation Policy on Endangered and Threatened Species)*

## **Environment – Regulatory Standards:**

**235**

We support the use of sound science that protects our air, land/soils, water and climate.

We recommend that all the state's regulations comply with realistic and viable standards, which with proper planning, will permit resource development and optimize conservation of the environment. We favor incentive based approaches, which provide positive economic incentives to accomplish desired objectives.

We support environmental issues that affect Nevada agriculture being monitored closely by the Nevada Department of Agriculture to help protect agriculture from unreasonable and unworkable regulations.

## **Estray/Feral Horses:**

**236**

Nevada Farm Bureau should work with the Nevada Board of Agriculture to remove feral animals (i.e. horses), under the responsibilities of the Nevada Department of Agriculture. Feral animal populations should not negatively impact the condition of private property or rangelands.

## **Fire – Fuels Management:**

**237**

Federal agency land use policies over the past 40-plus years have steadily reduced numbers of domestic grazing animals permitted on the range, thereby allowing natural fuels to become overgrown and burden the landscape. The results are seen in devastating, uncontrollable wildfires, incinerating everything in their path, burning thousands of animals alive including threatened and Endangered Species while devastating habitat. Increasing numbers of grazing livestock would reduce the range fuel load vegetation as well as producing food necessary for our nation and the world. We support the innovative, positive message of promoting the protection of our land and natural resources by increasing numbers of domestic grazing animals which will decrease fuel loads and help reduce catastrophic wild land and range fires.

It is proven largely ineffective to exclusively use native species for rehab work. We support the inclusion of fire-resistant crested wheat grass seed and forage Kochia and other beneficial species in all possible local, state, regional and federal reseeding projects where it is adapted.

Livestock grazing has been shown to be a valuable tool, especially after wildfires. We urge that the moratorium after burns be removed and appropriate grazing to be used for rehabilitation.

We support the removal of dead and dying trees from our forest as a tool for fuel reduction. We also support a requirement that every grazing and logging permit issued should include a dangerous fuels reduction plan and insure that every plan has mandatory triggers which federal land managers may not deviate from or contest. Mandatory triggers should be implemented when fuel loads exceed ten percent over normal maximum or when a livestock grazing permit owner has utilized less than 90 percent of allowable forage with normally permitted numbers during a regular grazing season.

Limit or eliminate National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) reviews in areas where activity such as grazing or logging are already permitted. Categorize dangerous fuel reduction activity and development under emergency and public safety rather than general grazing or logging, thus eliminating most legal challenges to this necessary activity.

## **Fire Control – Federally-Managed Lands Agency Policy:**

**238**

We support mutual aid agreements between counties and all government agencies.

With the Governor agreeing to form an interstate working group addressing wildfires, we believe Nevada Farm Bureau, representing the agricultural producer's perspective in fire planning, response and rehabilitation, should make every effort possible to participate in that working group.

We believe that fire program funding should be committed in greater proportion to prevention of wildfire through fuels management, pre-suppression and rehabilitation than that allocated for fighting the fires.

We believe that, working with others interested in addressing immediate fire attack, a comprehensive plan be developed organizing and training a force of "Emergency Fire Technicians" to be certified as "red card" First Responders, able to attack fires immediately and otherwise respond to such emergencies.

1. We believe that any First Responder's group should have ready and at their disposal all manner of suppression and firefighting equipment for immediate fire attack.
2. We support development of a communication network for reporting fire discovery, equipment and First Responders addressing fires, which includes local fire districts, county sheriffs and First Responders so that fires may be attacked without interference.
3. Working in concert with the interstate Governors group, the United States Secretary of Agriculture and others, we support any highly specialized communications equipment, training and upgrades/updates required by the FCC for firefighting situations being made available to First Responders at the least possible cost.

We support a survey including anyone affected by wildfires since the 1980's to ascertain if accounts of federal employee threats, including hefty fines, imprisonment, or both, and/or grazing permit revocation have any basis.

1. Surveys should include the approximate year, number of incidents, penalties threatened, etc.
2. Verified reports should be provided to the Governor requesting legislative resolution, and also the multi-state working group for consideration.
3. We support the use of controlled and managed burning during fall and winter months to remove massive fuels buildup of non-grazeable vegetation such as sagebrush, Juniper, Piñon Pine, willows, etc.

### **Fire Control – Local Fire Districts:**

**239**

We direct County Commissioners to work cooperatively with state and federal agencies, other public firefighting agencies and private property owners (ranchers) to set up a local fire management plan.

The County Commissioners need to provide for local control of firefighting efforts within the county. Local volunteer fire departments need to be recognized as having authority and incentive to put out fires that originate in or invade the area.

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) should treat catastrophic fires on a par with other natural resource disasters and should provide emergency assistance and access to low interest loans for ranchers. We encourage county Farm Bureaus to review local FEMA fire plans to determine the status of local conditions.

### **Fire – Loss:**

**240**

Because smoke inhalation will bring about dust pneumonia weeks after a fire, the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) should amend its current policy of limiting claims to those livestock deaths occurring when the fire is put out and the grazing permit owners are allowed back into the area. Animals terminally affected may be discovered and diminished values will be compensated at the difference between the damaged value and full useable value.

USDA Farm Services must recognize the need for immediate action where livestock are concerned and allow costs-sharing for emergency rebuilds of infrastructure that ranchers do on their own before official approval.

Federal agency officials should either provide assistance in documenting lost animals, fences and other structures or accept anecdotal testimony from locals.

### **Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites:**

**241**

Nevada Farm Bureau encourages hazardous waste disposal to be locally accessible.

### **Land Use Mitigation:**

**242**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports renewable energy programs that are cost-effective. Renewable energy projects on federally-managed lands diminish other uses of the land, as well as create possible conflicts with sensitive plants and animals. We oppose diminishing one land use as mitigation for the impacts of another use.

## **Livestock Grazing on Irrigation District Lands:**

**243**

Many irrigation districts established grazing facilities as part of their creation. Nevada Farm Bureau supports the continuation of livestock grazing on historically grazed property within an irrigation district. Users should be able to graze with assurance of long term leases with preference to current users.

Lands acquired by the state of Nevada and falling under the management of the Nevada Department of Wildlife should be managed in cooperation with those persons grazing livestock and other multiple user interests involved in the area prior to the land coming under state control. Continuation of grazing at or near historic levels should be part of the management system used on such lands.

## **Livestock Grazing Preference on Federally-Managed Lands:**

**244**

We support restoration of all suspended Animal Unit Months (AUMs) on all grazing permits nationwide. This includes permanently suspended AUMs. Federal agencies should be required to give specific, proven science-based reasons for any AUM which would not be eligible for this action and the agency should be required to prove that their action is the best overall interest of the resource.

We support the restructuring of every grazing permit so that grazing is allowable 12 months each year, giving both ranchers and land managers an effective tool to reduce fuel loads in real-time.

We support the establishment of a local arbitration board, made up of agency personnel and local livestock permit owners, to take a rancher's appeal before in instances when there has been a rejection of proposed "out of season" turn-outs.

We recognize the inherent property attributes of range rights held by permittees and/or grazing allotment owners of federally-managed lands including, but not limited to, private water rights. We support extending the term of each grazing permit from 10 to 20 years, thus allowing ranchers the surety to finance necessary range improvements and additional livestock over more realistic and sustainable repayment periods.

Any loss of property rights as a result of a loss of a grazing allotment or a portion thereof should be considered as a taking.

Federal agencies should be required to allow livestock permit owners to develop and maintain water resources on their permits, where the permit owner already owns water rights or where a new water development is in the best interest of the overall range and state law allows the water development. We further support lifting of restrictions on the use of supplemental minerals and attractants, water hauling and other measures which would better disperse livestock grazing and make better use of the range resources.

## **Livestock Trespass Suits:**

**245**

We suggest that the land management agencies provide arrangements whereby difficult-to-control drifting of livestock from one range grazing allotment to another can be accommodated without the necessity of imposing penalties on livestock owners for unintentional livestock trespass. We suggest that the agencies and users design a system to better accommodate the movement of livestock in relation to forage availability. This might require a change in regulations, and if so, such change is recommended. The permittee or leasee must be allowed to use forage for which he holds a permit or lease, and must not be fined for innocent trespass due to livestock "drift." Federal Land Management agencies should conform to state fencing laws. Owners of trespassing livestock must show proof of a permit and/or lease in order to qualify for "innocent trespass due to livestock drift."

**National Conservation Areas: 246**

Nevada Farm Bureau is opposed to the expansion or designation of National Conservation Areas, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern or other special designations within the boundaries of the state of Nevada. We propose that the state of Nevada, directed by the Governor’s office, prioritize a coordinated approach to maintain multiple use of federally-managed lands to preserve economic, recreational and other opportunities. We believe this determined state policy must be included in the decision process for any proposed change of land use designation by the federal government.

**Nuisance Wildlife: 247**

Nevada Farm Bureau will engage in discussions with the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and others to address control of nuisance deer, rodents, etc., in our small communities around the state. The discussion needs to include health issues, damage to landscape and ornamental plants, and potential for dangerous human-wildlife interactions.

**OHV Use: 248**

It is the policy of the Nevada Farm Bureau to participate to the extent possible with the various user groups in recommending laws and regulations that are fair and workable without causing undo harm to on farm and/or ranch use of OHVs.

**Planning For Federally-Managed Lands: 249**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the use of the federally-managed lands utilizing a multiple use concept. Full consideration should be given to employing scientific range management methods which consider range land trend data, use patterns, plant numbers, plant health and other applicable indicators such as precipitation. Utilization standards or other individual criteria should not be the sole determining factor for management decisions.

Livestock should be used as a management tool as part of rehabilitation and restoration programs.

Federal lands officials should not be allowed to reduce AUM numbers without consulting with permittees and/or grazing allotment owners, (and the county commissioners of the county or counties wherein said permittees and/or grazing allotment owners operate). Reductions must be justified, based on an allotment evaluation that shall be carried out prior to the reduction of an allotment on the basis of no less than three years or no more than 10 years. This evaluation shall include the involvement of a qualified, independent range scientist and the county Board of Commissioners. There should be justified reasons for reductions. Transfer of ownership is not justification for reduction. In the event that there is a reduction in AUMs, NEPA will apply.

Under FLPMA, federal land use management plans must be consistent to local land use and water plans.

**Pinyon/Juniper Control: 250**

We are in support of rangeland restoration activities which address the serious problems of pinyon-juniper expansion.

Nevada Farm Bureau urges an aggressive approach to Pinyon/Juniper control and effective management in Nevada and throughout the intermountain West. We further support economic development opportunities using Pinyon/Juniper resources including a more open wood cutting policy on federal lands and a program which offers cut-your-own Christmas trees at no cost in these areas.

## **Rangeland Restoration:**

**251**

We believe permittees and/or grazing allotment owners on federally-managed lands should be encouraged to improve range conditions through cooperative contracts with the appropriate agencies. Permittees and/or grazing allotment owners should be provided security of investment. We support the permittee's and/or the grazing allotment owner's right to water development on public lands in accordance with Nevada water law without being required to sacrifice any part of their water rights to the federal government. We support adequate federal funding for an expanded cooperative range improvement program.

Farm Bureau also supports the establishment of federal and state Rangeland Restoration Funds, offering matching fund grants to implement on the ground projects to restore or rehabilitate rangelands.

Federal agencies on federally-managed land are financially responsible for noxious weeds.

## **Riparian Areas:**

**252**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports good management of agricultural and public uses of riparian areas. Proper grazing management, well designed roads and reasonable recreation use of riparian zones are important. While we believe these and other uses of riparian areas need to be properly managed, we also believe that traditional agricultural uses such as livestock grazing can be compatible with healthy riparian systems.

We strongly encourage the early involvement of all affected permittees and other affected parties to address riparian management challenges. These methods can include, but are not limited to, season of use grazing, planned grazing systems, alternative water sources, development of alternative forage, etc., which will provide long-term, less disruptive solutions to these improvement problems; and that fencing should only be used, where needed, as a last resort measure to encourage riparian improvement, or where exclusion fencing proves to be the most economically efficient means to meet multiple use management objectives.

Farm Bureau recognizes that livestock grazing impact is critical to healthy ecosystems, plant diversity, insect production and wildlife habitat.

## **Sage-Grouse:**

**253**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes the listing of Sage-Grouse under the Endangered Species Act.

We support local Sage-Grouse conservation programs, which work to enhance sagebrush communities. We further maintain the need for incentive-oriented programs to involve private property owners in conservation efforts while providing for protections of property rights.

In addition any encroachment on permittees' and/or grazing allotment owners' AUMs shall be considered as a takings.

We support NDOW limits on Sage-Grouse hunting or season closures where applicable, especially in light of concerns related to a possible ESA listing.

We support appropriate management activities to address site-specific problems.

We believe that local management plans by county governments should be weighed as viable alternatives for Sage-Grouse Management. We recognize the potential management of livestock for contribution to the intrinsic values for thriving habitats for Sage-Grouse and livestock. We also recognize the inherent value of diverse economic basis and the access to resources necessary for different economic entities to survive.

We ask that the Governor and state legislature take all necessary measures to insure that wildlife and habitat management within the state be solidified as a local and state function, not a federal function.

**Sage-Grouse –**

**2014 Nevada Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan: 254**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the facets of the adopted state of Nevada’s Greater Sage-Grouse Conservation Plan. We encourage the Nevada Sagebrush Ecosystem Council to continue to work for sound management of Sage Grouse habitat.

Because the Sage Grouse is being used as a pretext to limit or eliminate mining, grazing, farming and other economic activities in Nevada and throughout the West, Farm Bureau members and local officials should learn about the Nevada Conservation Credit System. Farm Bureau members should become involved with Sage Grouse local area working groups to prevent or minimize draconian “conservation” measures.

**Science-Based Resource Management: 255**

Farm Bureau believes that all regulations and guidelines for state or federal agency action must be supported by proven, fact-based science subjected to external peer review. Agricultural producers also need to improve their knowledge and education in ecological sciences so they can get involved in the discussion and preparation of public awareness.

**Wetlands: 256**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a voluntary, incentive-based approach to maintenance of wetlands and wildlife habitat on private property.

**Wilderness: 257**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes implied or expressed reservation of water or water rights for Wilderness areas. Therefore, we shall work towards keeping designated Wilderness areas and Lands with Wilderness Characteristics or other special designations to a minimum, and State water rights sovereign.

We seek Wilderness Study Areas, not suited as Wilderness to be returned to multiple use. Any Wilderness proposal should consider the views of the residents in the affected locality and State, therefore we believe hearings concerning Wilderness legislation should be held in affected communities of the State.

We believe our State should implement law allowing the county or counties containing any proposed Wilderness area to accept or veto such proposal by the county commission.

Nevada Farm Bureau will follow adopted county Farm Bureau policy pertaining to wilderness designations in their county.

We believe existing NRS (Chapter 405) provides opportunities to retain open roads and thereby preventing much of the wilderness designations under road-less requirements.

**Wild Horses & Burros: 258**

We are opposed to legislative proposals that will change the 1971 Wild Horse and Burro Act.

We direct Nevada Farm Bureau to continue to be involved with developing and implementing solutions regarding wild horse and burro management.

The Appropriate Management Level (AML) within Horse Management Areas should be established on a unit by unit level.

It is essential that the number of wild horses and burros be kept at or below AML on a statewide level and in each Herd Management Area.

We strongly encourage that the State of Nevada and federal land management agencies fence primary and secondary highways without hindering public access where Wild Horse collisions are a public safety issue.

**Wild Horses & Burros – Advocacy For Proper Management: 259**

Nevada Farm Bureau should work with other groups and organizations in coordinating an informational presentation which gives elected officials and other interested persons an overview of the current ‘wild’ horse and burro situation with an emphasis on the consequences of the long term implications of currently proposed legislation and management policies.

**Wild Horses & Burros – Forage: 260**

In the event that horse and/or burro levels are allowed to exceed the appropriate AML, resulting in destruction of native forage values, horses must be removed before any livestock reductions are enforced. If range condition has deteriorated because of wild horse and/or burro abuse to a point where livestock reduction must occur, then the affected permittees and/or grazing allotment owners must be compensated for their loss. Furthermore, County Commission Boards within affected counties must be informed and in agreement with whatever actions occur.

Farm Bureau encourages and supports action by the state of Nevada, including but not limited to legal relief, in instances when wild horses and burros are above AML.

**Wild Horses & Burros – Relocation: 261**

The Wild Horse and Burro Act of 1971 strictly forbids the Secretary of Interior from relocating captured ‘wild’ horses into different herd management areas.

**Wild Horses & Burros – Sanctuary: 262**

It does not appear that there is any demonstrated ability to manage large numbers of horses, exceeding Appropriate Management Level (AML) numbers in a majority of Herd Management Areas (HMA), on open federally-managed rangeland without negatively impacting the objectives of approved grazing standards and guidelines, i.e. grazing rotation, riparian utilization, integrity of perimeter fences, actual use, conforming to land use plans and displacement of wildlife.

Therefore, Nevada Farm Bureau opposes conversion of domestic livestock AUMs to Wild Horse and Burro Use. We also oppose the formation of Wild Horse and Burro sanctuaries on federally-managed lands in Nevada as these would only be a stop-gap measure, which don’t address the long-term problem of Wild Horse populations that double every four to five years.

Our specific points of concern, regarding the proposed eco-sanctuary include:

1. The idea of the public paying a private organization to graze public horses on public land is inconsistent with logic.
2. The development of regulations and guidelines to monitor the range and neighboring wild horse herds under such a different set of conditions will be costly and time consuming for an already burdened government agency.
3. Prior applications for changes in allotment use by other individuals and groups concerning the Great Basin Desert have been pushed aside while this newer request is being given priority attention. We do not support the idea that money and name recognition may buy attention from government agencies.
4. Monitoring the truthfulness of ideas being taught by the proposed “eco-tourism” sanctuary would be a government burden likely ignored in light of more pressing duties. This would allow another avenue for untruths to be taught and paid for by the people of the United States.

We recognize the right of private property owners to engage in enterprises on their private lands as long as there is no negative impact to the adjacent property owners.

**Wild Horses & Burros - Water:**

**263**

During periods of drought or other events that result in restricted range livestock water, the vested water rights of permittees and/or grazing allotment owners must be protected from being dominated or impacted by extensive horse use. The federal management agency must take steps to insure the protection of the permittee and/or grazing allotment owners’ vested water right, by removing horses or temporarily supplying alternative sources of water by such techniques as hauling water. When actions of this nature are required, the County Commission Boards within affected counties must be informed and in agreement with whatever actions occur.

**Wildlands Project:**

**264**

The “Wildlands Project” is a proposal to eliminate all human industry – all mining, grazing, recreation, hunting and fishing – from 60 percent of the United States. We oppose the concept of the “Wildlands Project.”

**Wildlife – Landowner Compensation Tag Program:**

**265**

We support the Nevada Department of Wildlife’s (NDOW) landowner compensation tag program. Depredation should be available for any viable crops. Viable crops represent any agricultural commodity produced.

We support the removal of the current legislative cap on the number of available deer and antelope landowner compensation tags.

We also recognize the value in it for making the State and landowners partners in the stewardship of wildlife. We support separating the antelope and mule deer into independently managed and regulated programs.

The landowner compensation tag program must continue to be convenient to participants to schedule counts.

**Wildlife Management:**

**266**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the implementation of the state elk management plan with development of local management plans. We believe that the emphasis of wildlife management should be on improving and developing habitat, which benefits all multiple-users.

We believe that in elk management plans, wild horse and burro populations and plans need to be considered.

Nevada Farm Bureau recognizes and appreciates the intrinsic aesthetic and recreational value of Nevada’s wildlife. Agriculture in Nevada provides valuable water and habitat resources for wildlife. Nevada’s wildlife populations and diversity are dependent, to a large degree, on production agriculture, cultivated fields and improved water sources. Sportsmen in Nevada have the best of both worlds with extensive federally-managed lands providing easy access to hunt on and scattered, diverse cultivated crops and water sources to support wildlife.

Any damage by wildlife to private property should be fully compensated.

**Wolves:**

**267**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes any establishment of wolves in Nevada.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the development of appropriate plans to deal with the immediate removal of wolves should they come into the state.

## **Pest & Weed Control**

### **Agricultural Chemicals:**

**268**

Farm Bureau supports maintaining control of the agricultural chemical program in the Nevada Department of Agriculture. We further support the Department of Agriculture playing a lead role in coordinating use of agricultural chemicals, licensing of applicators and control of activities with other agencies (U.S. Fish & Wildlife, Public Land Management Agencies, Etc).

We support the Nevada Department of Agriculture's program to collect and dispose of agricultural chemicals and urge the continuation of the program.

### **Agricultural Chemicals – Education:**

**269**

We encourage the use of educational programs like Agriculture in the Classroom or other local, state or national programs which show the positive benefits of the use of agricultural chemicals and the practices of producers to use the chemicals within regulatory standards and to demonstrate these benefits.

### **Agricultural Chemical Registration:**

**270**

Nevada Farm Bureau is directed to work with the Nevada Department of Agriculture in getting necessary agricultural chemicals placed under Section 24-C and Section 18 of FIFRA. This program provides the opportunity for addressing agricultural chemical local/special circumstance needs.

### **Cheatgrass Management:**

**271**

As the ecologic, environmental and economic costs of cheatgrass dominated rangelands becomes better known, the Nevada Farm Bureau urges an aggressive approach to cheatgrass control and effective management in Nevada and throughout the intermountain West. Due to the magnitude of this weed issue, we urge the development of a coordinated cheatgrass control and rangeland revegetation, restoration and rehabilitation, involving all levels of government, including federal, state and county governments.

As part of a coordinated cheatgrass control program, Nevada Farm Bureau urges flexibility for season of use in the land use management plan and/or grazing permits by both the BLM and the USFS to allow producers to turn livestock out on rangeland allotments early enough in the season to graze off the cheatgrass prior to seed setting/production. This practice should be considered as a treatment which serves as a tool to control cheatgrass infestations. This will reduce competition and allow beneficial grass species the opportunity to revegetate leading to range improvement.

These treatment periods of cheatgrass management, using grazing as a control should not be charged against a permittee's AUM's nor should the permittee be penalized for participating in the program.

### **Insect Control:**

**272**

The Nevada Farm Bureau supports efforts of the Department of Agriculture and other involved agencies to control the Mormon Cricket, Grasshopper and Cutworm and other insect pests infestations in the state of Nevada. Farm Bureau supports aerial application of pesticides deemed safe to accomplish these objectives. The Nevada Farm Bureau actively supports Congressional appropriated and department designated funding in support of these activities.

**Noxious Weed Control:****273**

Nevada Farm Bureau will work with the Nevada Board of Agriculture and the Department of Agriculture to develop, fund and implement a plan of using state weed abatement laws (NRS 555) to require weeds to be controlled. We do not support the proposed action to create an intermediate fine process.

There must be cooperation and consultation between all appropriate local, state and federal agencies regarding noxious weed control measures on all lands, regardless of ownership or management.

We believe that effective weed eradication programs will include actions that are based on identifying weed locations, appropriate treatment/control measures and follow-up monitoring to determine continued strategies. We believe that up to date research findings and studies should be readily available to ranchers and farmers in printed materials. We also believe that a state weed map system should be established and maintained under state control.

Any new State funding that becomes available for noxious weed control must be so directed that it goes through the established programs of noxious weed control existing within the Nevada Department of Agriculture.

Nevada Farm Bureau urges University of Nevada College of Agriculture, Biotechnology & Natural Resources and the College of Extension to conduct ongoing research and studies and provide timely, usable printed materials that will assist in ever better methods of weed control and eradication.

**Pesticide Application:****274**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes government agencies from imposing a fine on pesticide applicators or property owners applying their own pesticide when said pesticide drifts onto other property unless there is proven damage to the affected property.

**Rodent Control:****275**

We strongly encourage continued efforts to improve rodent control using whatever methods will work.

We support increased activity of the Nevada Rodent and Predator Control Committee in order to do more to address rodent and predator problems.

We encourage the University System and the Nevada Department of Agriculture and other appropriate agencies to conduct research on new methods for gopher and ground squirrel control and testing effectiveness of current methods of control.

**Predator Control – Programs:****276**

In order to maintain a balance between predators and wildlife/livestock, Nevada Farm Bureau should seek and support predator control.

In order to save state funds whenever possible, nongovernmental hunters should be used to control predator numbers.

USDA/APHIS/Wildlife Services should be responsible for developing Environmental Impact Statements for predator control programs on federal lands.

We ask that a more effective program be implemented for adequate predator control.

We encourage USDA and all Nevada State Grazing Boards to continue funding predator control programs.

**Predator Control - Trap Bans:****277**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes passage of any laws or regulations banning the use of leg-hold traps in predator control work.

We are also opposed to laws or regulations interfering with using traps for protecting private property from predators or other agricultural pests.

**Public Utilities/Energy****Electrical Power:****278**

When dealing with electrical rate proposals, we will work to make certain that the percentage of increase for agricultural electrical rates does not exceed the percentage of increases of other rate payers.

**Energy Development:****279**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports local energy development with benefits of any assessments retained by local jurisdictions. Any energy production should require that energy be in part available to local interests. We request local education on current laws and programs relating to energy production.

Nevada Farm Bureau encourages new alternative energy source development with innovative financing, low-interest loans and or tax incentives.

We support current laws regarding county control and benefits of geothermal generation.

Because of water use associated with many types of alternative energy, we believe that full disclosure of water use be made public early in the planning phases.

**Energy Production:****280**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports energy independence including traditional energy sources.

We oppose shutting down coal and large hydro-electric power plants. We support all energy production including coal and large hydro-electric with an emphasis on the most cost-effective. We oppose the Nevada State Energy Portfolio. Energy production should be market-based, not based on government subsidies or mandates.

We support including hydro-electric power generation as a renewable energy.

**Fuel:****281**

Farm Bureau encourages the exploration of domestic oil and natural gas supplies and the construction of additional refinery capacities.

**Government Loans For Power Conversions:****282**

We urge the federal government to make low-interest loans available through the Department of Agriculture to assist individual farmers and ranchers faced with prohibitive and unpredictable costs for generating energy. These loans would be for the purpose of developing more cost effective and fuel-efficient energy sources in order to carry out agricultural operations. The loan monies should be made available for the development of any and all alternative energy sources and the installation of electrical transmission lines.

We urge that any necessary environmental reviews for said projects be fast-tracked due to the immediate need for affordable energy by many of our state's farmers and ranchers.

**Net Metering/Local-Generation: 283**

Farm Bureau supports local-generation of electricity as a viable option for agricultural producers as long as net metering levels, are provided for by state law. We encourage amendment of state law to raise the current levels and help facilitate local generation. We also support changes to state net-metering laws which allow for implementation of the program with sites not located together.

Any electric utility or co-op, operating in the state of Nevada, shall buy back any electricity produced by wind, solar or hydro, agricultural waste and geothermal from its members or customers, within the state of Nevada.

**Rural Electrification: 284**

Farm Bureau encourages development of electrical power service in areas of the state presently without such service.

**Telecommunications Service: 285**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the deployment of advanced telecommunications services in rural areas. Extension of these services should be a priority.

Reliable cellular telephone service especially in rural areas of the state is a matter of Public Health and Safety for both rural residents and the increasing number of visitors. Additionally, we encourage continued development and extension of high-speed internet access to rural areas. Some means should be made available to potential customers, which allow comparison of connection costs, service rates and system capabilities for cellular phones and high-speed /wireless internet.

**Taxes**

**Agricultural Property Taxation: 286**

Any property that is an integral part of a whole farming operation should fit under the agricultural use property tax law.

**Business Profit Tax: 287**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes the adoption of a tax on business profits.

**Commerce Tax: 288**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the repeal of the Commerce Tax.

**Farm Machinery Taxes: 289**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the exemption from sales and use taxation on the purchase of those pieces of equipment used directly in production of food and fiber.

**Gross Income Business Tax: 290**

We oppose any changes to the current gross revenue tax that lowers the threshold for taxes due or the increase in the percentage of that tax that is assessed.

We also seek an exemption from any gross revenue or commerce tax for all of agricultural industries.

**Health Savings Account: 291**

The amount that an employer contributes to an employee’s Health Savings Account should be a deductible line item on the Modified Business Tax Return.

**New Taxes: 292**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports being involved in discussions for new taxes and fees that generate additional revenue for government.

**Tax Voting Requirement: 293**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the constitutional requirement for a two-thirds legislative majority for increases to taxes and fees.

**Transportation**

**Farm-Based Truckers: 294**

Farm Bureau supports continuing the current license fees on farm-based truckers.

**Fencing Roadways: 295**

We request that the appropriate Nevada and federal departments and agencies fence remaining unfenced paved highways in order to protect human lives as well as livestock and wildlife. When fencing traditional grazing ranges, provisions need to be made to allow for access to water or movement of livestock.

We believe that highway rights-of-way fencing should be located on legal rights-of-way and maintained by the Department of Transportation who retain liability and maintenance responsibility.

The lack of fencing in some areas is a hazard to motorists as cattle move on to the road. Another danger is from the wild or stray horses wandering on to the roadway. We request that the state of Nevada and/or BLM to complete this fencing at once.

**Motor Carriers: 296**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports legislation to reduce motor carrier fees to ease the financial hardships to Nevada truckers.

**Road Closures: 297**

Any road, street, highway, etc., built with city, county, state or federal monies shall not be closed to the public, except military bases.

Consideration should be given ranchers and farmers who need access roads, even though such roads are not funded by public money, when such roads are designated for closure. Those ranchers and farmers affected should be part of the planning process when such roads are labeled for closure with written notification required.

**Road and Highway Funding: 298**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports road maintenance taxes that bring equity to all types of fuels/energy used on our highways.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports funding of all roads and highways in a manner that considers the amount of actual wear and tear on them.

## **Roadway Rights-of-Way Acquisition:**

**299**

Nevada Farm Bureau recommends that when state and federal government agencies acquire rights-of-way for road construction, that the design of the road be made to consider safe movement of livestock and machinery and to minimize the impact on the property owner and on existing water righted lands.

## **Water General Policies**

### **Agriculture & Other Water Uses:**

**300**

Established agricultural water rights should be considered a priority and not be lost or diminished because of other uses which do not have a priority property right in this first-in-time-first-in-right state.

### **Appropriation Of Water:**

**301**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the strict application of the Prior Appropriation Doctrine (as opposed to riparian doctrine) for administration of Nevada's water.

Farm Bureau believes that the sole authority for the appropriation, distribution and use of water or the change in place or manner of use of water is and should be state law or applicable court decrees.

We support the prior appropriation of rights described in applicable decrees and permits.

### **Cloud Seeding:**

**302**

The Nevada Farm Bureau recognizes the benefits of and encourages all local, regional and state government entities to actively participate in sound and scientific weather modification (cloud seeding) programs designed to improve annual snow pack and increased water supply.

### **Complete Adjudication and Inventory Of Water Basins:**

**303**

Every basin needs a base-line inventory of springs and streams and natural sub-irrigated meadows. This study should be accomplished by money set aside over time by the Nevada Legislature and done with a peer reviewed process. The study's timing should be based on priority of risk. Each basin should go through the adjudication process and a baseline inventory be established before an out of basin transfer occurs. A decrease of a baseline level should be viewed as a taking.

### **Designated Basins:**

**304**

Nevada Farm Bureau believes that agricultural water rights are a benefit for the environment is a public benefit and fulfills a valuable public purpose. There is no justifiable purpose to designate a groundwater basin with restrictions or non-preferred status for agricultural irrigation.

We support the process that the state law spells out for designation of groundwater basins, with each basin being treated individually with separate hearings and separate actions.

When determining basin designations for water allocations, the designation Order should be clearly explained with details of the criteria used to offer the proposed Order.

In a designated basin where the state engineer decides to levy an assessment, we believe that a local hearing must be held prior to the assessment to provide an explanation of what fees will be levied. Additionally, an annual report must be provided to the water right owners who have paid assessment fees to explain how their fees have been used.

**Domestic Wells: 305**

When a property has a domestic well that the casing has deteriorated and a new well needs to be drilled and the old well must be abandoned and sealed according to Nevada Law and this has been complied with, the replacement well should hold the same original well's date and usage.

**Domestic Wells and Connection To Existing Water Rights: 306**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports legislation that would allow for coordination between a county's right to parcel land with an implied underground water right and the Nevada State Engineer's statutory obligation to manage and protect the State's water resources as well as other existing water rights.

**Farm Bureau Water Committee: 307**

Farm Bureau realizes the importance of surface and underground water supplies to agricultural production in Nevada. We recommend the continuation of the statewide committee of Farm Bureau members from each county to discuss water-related issues. This group would also communicate with the Nevada Farm Bureau, the State Engineer and be available for working with the Nevada Legislature on as needed basis to insure the needs of production agriculture are prioritized in the legislative and administrative processes.

**Federal Water Rights: 308**

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes any federal funds to purchase water rights.

Nevada Farm Bureau opposes any wildlife water rights being granted to any federal land management agency, which doesn't have "ownership" or control over Nevada's wildlife.

No water rights should be granted to federal land management agencies for Wild Horses and Burros.

**Leasing of Water: 309**

We believe that agricultural entities should be allowed to temporarily lease their water for other uses without jeopardizing ownership of their water rights.

**Mine Dewatering: 310**

Farm Bureau believes that the state water engineer should monitor and record all effects of mine dewatering and make reports regarding the same for each affected area. Reports should be made public. The object of this is to protect and conserve the natural resource (water) and the rights of all property and water right owners.

**Mitigation of Water Right Conflicts: 311**

We strongly oppose any and all attempts to create regulations, temporary or otherwise, that are designed to mitigate any form of water dispute. We strongly support the right of the State Engineer to continue to oversee the management of Nevada's water law as defined in NRS 533. However, we do not support any attempt by the State Engineer or any other body, political or otherwise, that would intend to by-pass state law by mitigating a water dispute(s) by creating a temporary, or permanent regulation to accomplish such a goal.

We strongly support locally developed mitigation discussions by stakeholders to resolve any form of water dispute. We are not opposed to involving the State Engineer in any such discussions as an ad hoc participant, but the solution to such problems must come from the impacted stakeholders. If the parties agree to make an agreement, the agreement must be ratified by a Nevada state court and become a decree. (Note: a decree is exempt from Nevada Water Law and cannot be used to change water law.)

## **Nevada Water Banking Program:**

**312**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a water banking system as long as it does not diminish the water right owner's water right or is used as a tool to diminish the water right owner's water right or the water right of another.

As Nevada considers the authorization and establishment of a water bank system for agricultural water rights, we maintain that these critical principles be covered:

- Prior to any formal adoption of a Nevada water bank system, local, public, in-person meetings need to be held in every local area to discuss the framework of how this proposed system would be operated, including the specific purpose for how this banking system will address area water needs. These meetings need to be provided as opportunities by water right owners to learn the possible benefits that the banking system will offer and provide water right owners to give input to the Nevada Division of Water Resources. Based on this input from water right owners throughout Nevada, the Nevada Division of Water Resources will be able to adequately present a fully-vetted proposal to the Nevada Legislature as a bill draft.
- Proposed legislative bills need to specifically identify where and under what conditions a water bank can be authorized and operate. The authorization of a water bank should also be provided first as a pilot project for a specific area and be subject to a continuation after a defined timeframe, possibly 10 years.
- All water rights enrolled in a water bank system must be maintained by the water right owner, who voluntarily participates under clearly defined terms that include the regular return of enrolled water to the agricultural property which has been temporarily idled.
- Water rights involved in a water bank system need to be verified as not causing any negative impact to any other water right owner and the water associated with the water bank will be subject to eligibility for a temporary transfer of use based on not negatively affecting other water right owners.
- No local water bank may operate with water rights that are being conjunctively managed. Surface water rights enrolled with a water bank that is operating a surface water right bank may only lease water to another surface water right user. Groundwater rights enrolled with a water bank that is operating a groundwater right bank may only lease water to another groundwater right user. The different sources of water must remain separated and not mixed.
- Local water right banks must remain local in nature and cannot be used as a tool to facilitate transfer of water outside of a basin or adjudicated river system.

## **Nevada Water Buyout/Retirement Program:**

**313**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports a water right buyout/retirement program as a means to solve over-appropriation as long as it does not significantly diminish another property owners property rights.

## **Nevada Water Conservation Program:**

**314**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports appropriate management of agricultural irrigation water and conservation measures which provide for proper management of water resources which maintain the long-term ability of a water basin to not exceed perennial yield levels. Agricultural irrigation water use should not exceed the duties associated with a water right.

Attention needs to be directed at addressing over-appropriated groundwater basins with solutions oriented to bringing water rights and water being pumped into balance with perennial yields. Ongoing monitoring reports need to be shared with water right owners in the groundwater basin to assist in a better understanding of the conditions and status of the groundwater basin.

Conservation and irrigation efficiency by an agricultural water right owner is already addressed without government involvement because of the costs and economic self-interest of the water right owner who has significant investments associated with the infrastructure and operations of applying irrigation water for beneficial use.

## **Range Livestock Water:**

**315**

Nevada Farm Bureau encourages actions to expand the private development and ownership of stockwater on federally-managed lands.

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the premise that all federally-managed ranges in Nevada were historically fully adjudicated.

We oppose the federal ownership or control of water on all grazing allotments.

If during the intervening years the original carrying capacities have been reduced by agency action, this cannot be construed as resulting in historically certificated waters becoming available for any other use, or available for any agency filing. If in fact agency filing were to successfully occur, this loss of water must be considered as a "Takings".

## **Treatment of Water Permits:**

**316**

Temporary permits were set to be for one year, so that the water could be used while the State Engineers Office issued the final. To comply with the intent of the law temporary permits need to have a time limit on them.

We urge that the Nevada State Engineer and his staff make every effort to expedite processing of agricultural water use permit applications. The State Legislature should authorize funding for staff and systems to get the job done in a timely manner.

We ask that all municipal applicants or permit holders be held to the same standard as other entities.

## **Treatment of Water Rights:**

**317**

The right to use water is a property right which should not be taken away from an owner without due process of law and just compensation at the highest valued use. Any government attempt to diminish the availability of water to serve these water rights constitutes a takings and should require just compensation. We support the present system of appropriation of water rights through state law and oppose any federal reserve right, domination or preemption of state water resource distribution formulas.

## **Snow Survey and Water Information:**

**318**

Realizing the paramount importance of water supplies to Nevada agriculture, Nevada Farm Bureau encourages the continuance of snow surveys and accurate reporting of reservoir storage amounts. Farm Bureau also urges the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) and the state engineer's office to make readily available any water survey reports applying to Nevada.

**State Control:****319**

Water in Nevada belongs to the state of Nevada and its citizens. Water in Nevada is put to beneficial use for all aspects of the state and its citizens. We support the complete sovereignty of Nevada over its water. There must be no additional federal involvement in any water used for any form of agriculture. In regard to delivery systems that cross state lines we will only support the involvement of the affected states.

**Storm Water Management:****320**

We strongly encourage all entities involved in determining storm water management plans to involve landowners prior to adoption.

We support requiring any entity allowing or causing the deterioration of water drainage systems that adversely affect any agricultural landowners to be liable for the correction of the drainage systems.

We urge changes that would require municipalities and developments to control storm water runoff to reduce the serious flooding and financial losses the water can cause to agricultural operations.

Farmland should be exempt from storm water management assessment given its permeable surface.

**Water Measurement:****321**

Nevada Farm Bureau urges establishment of a dispute resolution system regarding disagreements between water right owners and water delivery personnel over water measurements. Such a program should include delineation of standards and specifications for water measurement methods and instruments, and allow for independent review of such water measurements.

We believe in sound water management. Sound water management requires timely data collection, information access and distribution to water right owners. Training should be provided to assist with entry of water data.

**Water Planning:****322**

Nevada Farm Bureau encourages county governments to develop water plans.

In anticipation of continued population growth across the Western states, Nevada Farm Bureau encourages open source planning efforts, focused on meeting future demands through innovative infrastructure to import water from distant sources, including from desalination facilities.

**Water Quality:****323**

We are concerned that agricultural lands are not receiving the same level of attention/protection from pollution of ground/surface water by point and non-point polluters.

We urge counties to develop water quality plans, locally, to address identified problems of water quality standards, and implement corrective actions.

The Nevada Farm Bureau supports the state of Nevada in establishing a short general permit process in accordance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit that simplifies acquiring said permit for the use and application of aquatic weed killer in irrigation ditches, drains and canals.

The Nevada Farm Bureau fully recognizes and supports Nevada Revised Statutes (NRS) # 445A.425[3] and 445A.520[2] in establishing water quality standards “shall recognize the historic irrigation practices in the respective river basins of this state, the economy thereof and their effects.” To the extent that water quality standards are intended to define conditions necessary to support and protect fish and to provide for recreation, they must be reasonably, scientifically and economically attainable.

## **Water Quality Treatment:**

**324**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports state and federal funding to municipalities desiring to treat drinking water.

## **Policies For Conjunctive Water Issues**

### **Conjunctive Water Management:**

**325**

We are very concerned over the lack of legislative direction and absence of specific parameters in regard to how “Conjunctive Management” is going to be carried out. We urge a full public discussion of what conjunctive management of water resources means and how combining separate sections of state law will be implemented. Long and established separations for surface and groundwater rights cannot be quickly combined without a complete vetting of how issues and impacts will be worked through. Top down edicts by the State Engineer’s office, without local, public engagement of those being affected is not acceptable.

Statutory parameters need to be established to guide regulatory actions in how the State Engineer will implement and operate conjunctive management activities.

Regulatory activity related to carrying out conjunctive management needs to be based on established scientific documentation that the water relating to the conjunctive management of specific groundwater and surface water are connected, as well as an established understand to the degree one water right is relating to others.

The interaction of water from various sources involves many different elements include the timeframes and the degree to which connections take place. State policy on the use of conjunctive management needs to be based on site specific circumstances, which recognizes the variety of elements that exist at a specific site. Not all areas have the same connection and interaction throughout a system and this warrants consideration in implementing active management that has consequences to different water rights.

In responding to State Engineer actions where conjunctive management actions could have an impact on different water right owners, senior water right owners need to have their rights duly recognized as they wish to have the water associated with their rights dealt with. They should be able to receive water which meets their water rights instead of being required to accept financial or other compensation through mitigation measures that they do not voluntarily agree to.

### **Humboldt River Management Modeling:**

**326**

Modeling being developed by the U.S. Geological Service (USGS) and the Desert Research Institute (DRI) for the Humboldt River system requires validation and the findings related to the research need to be presented in an understandable fashion. The “conjunctive” management which will come as the result of this modeling must have a basis in factual information that the general public can effectively deliberate for soundness. Along with the findings of the Humboldt River Basin Capture Analysis, we believe that an overall river basin economic perspective needs to be factored into river and groundwater basin management actions for the Humboldt River system.

This process should apply to all other rivers in the state of Nevada.

## **Policies For Groundwater Issues**

### **Basin Management: 327**

We oppose the combining of established water basins and believe that management of individual basins lead to more precise stewardship of the water resources.

A change in the State Engineer's attempts to management of a water basin should only be considered after a broad consensus of the stakeholders in that basin has been reached.

### **Forfeiture of Ground Water Rights: 328**

We believe that the state water engineer's office should not forfeit a ground water right under the five-year use requirement when the water is not being put to beneficial use because of challenges outside and beyond the control of the affected right holder.

We support amendments to Nevada Revised Statutes to allow for longer term non-use of ground water to help recharge the water table in basins where the water table is being drawn down.

We direct Nevada Farm Bureau to carry out an educational program on state water law and procedures to help members better protect their water rights. We also ask for a change in, or relaxation of, the prescribed procedure for changing a point of water diversion and for limiting the time allowed for putting an existing permit or certified use into action. We also ask for 1-year notification prior to any forfeiture.

### **Pumping Requirements: 329**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the use of various methods of water measurement from an agricultural well by the Nevada Division of Water Resources for water usage calculations. These methods may include meters, pump size, power use, discharge pressure, depth to pumping level, etc.

### **Water Management Plans: 330**

To avoid curtailment orders, we recommend a long term strategic well water management plan to work towards aquifer stabilization and recovery. This plan should be developed cooperatively by local water right owners and domestic well owners.

### **Well Abandonment: 331**

Nevada Farm Bureau seeks economical, efficient, rational, scientific well abandonment and well drilling regulations.

Nevada Farm Bureau will monitor and provide input to well-related regulation changes.

## **Policies For Surface Water Issues**

### **Abandonment of Surface Water Rights: 332**

The Nevada Farm Bureau supports the uniform application of current Nevada water law as it relates to abandonment of surface water rights which occurs when the owner of the water rights submits clear and convincing evidence to forsake and desert the water rights.

### **In-Stream Flows: 333**

Nevada Farm Bureau is opposed to using minimum in-stream flows as a means of transferring water.

**Nevada/California Water Management: 334**

We urge Congress, Nevada’s Governor and the Director of Conservation & Natural Resources to ensure that the decreed water rights under the Orr Ditch (including the 1935 Truckee River agreement) Alpine and Walker River decrees are unconditionally protected by not diminishing the water available to satisfy those rights.

We support the use of federal and state funding for the independent review of the Truckee River Operating Agreement by the affected communities.

**Storage Development: 335**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports and encourages the development of reservoirs or other water storage facilities throughout the state for purposes related to agriculture.

**Upstream User Compliance: 336**

We urge that municipalities and other government entities upstream from other users comply with state water quality standards and water pollution control permits.

**Policies For Irrigation Management Issues**

**Agricultural Practices – Irrigation: 337**

Nevada Farm Bureau believes farmers should be allowed to create new, use, maintain and improve existing drainage systems without a permit.

**Ditch Easements: 338**

Ditch easements and ditch maintenance easements should not be recognized or considered as public/recreational rights of way. We request all counties maintain the record of easements including owner of the easement.

**Ditch Maintenance Responsibility: 339**

Nevada Farm Bureau asks that municipalities or county governments be required to fund the maintenance, cleaning and replacement of severely damaged siphons, grates or other piping installed at the request of that governing body and such work to be exempt from permit. Construction and maintenance should be carried out by irrigation districts or ditch companies – not by local government entities. Local governments should reimburse for costs incurred for irrigation structural change requirements resulting from municipal needs. Additional maintenance, which results from changes, should also be paid for by local governments, who required the changes to be made.

We recommend that maintenance take place as often as necessary to assure public safety as well as the continued flow of water to downstream water users. In cases where ditches are used for stormwater control, the private ditch owner(s) be reimbursed for value received.

**Ditch Tampering: 340**

Nevada Farm Bureau encourages local governments to pass ordinances, protecting irrigation systems. Penalties should include restitution or possible jail time for any unauthorized person (or his or her parents in the case of minors) who tampers with ditches or irrigation structures. The guilty party should be held financially responsible for any damage done by his or her tampering including restitution for damages experienced by end users.

We encourage that this language be included in county ordinances.

**Historic Use of Water:****341**

Nevada Farm Bureau urges that all agencies and individuals who are custodians of lands recognize and honor the historic, customary uses and rights-of-way involved in the conveyance of irrigation waters while promoting efficient and timely delivery.

**Policies For Newlands Water Issues****Lake Tahoe Level:****342**

We oppose action by any agency, private, state or federal, to alter the minimum, or maximum levels of Lake Tahoe for any reason whatsoever. The prescribed levels were established in 1935 under the Truckee River Agreement and should remain as they are.

**Newlands Project:****343**

We believe any entity that acquires Newlands Project water rights for any purpose must mitigate operation and maintenance. The holder of such water rights must be treated in the same manner as other project water right owners under state water law. The remaining irrigated land must be sufficient to maintain a viable agricultural community.

Nevada Farm Bureau believes the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service should abide by their previous agreements.

Any private or public entity that acquires Newlands Project water rights must follow affected county weed and dust control ordinances.

All wetland areas within the Newlands Project, whether privately or publicly owned, should be considered as part of the 25,000 acres mandated by P.L. 101-618.

Nevada Farm Bureau will work to gain Congressional support for federal funding to finish repairs for the Truckee Canal.

**Newlands Project Allocations:****344**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports and encourages delivery of full water allocations to the Newlands Project water right owners in accordance with existing decrees and availability of water. Nevada Farm Bureau supports efforts to curtail diminishment of those rights by governmental regulation, legislation, or policy decisions that result in reduced allocations or a reduction in the amount of water available to be delivered.

Farm Bureau supports effective water management, which provides adequate flows and timely deliveries to property lines to meet field design and crop needs.

All return flows to wetlands should be included as a beneficial use of water in the calculating of water efficiency. The use of water rights on ditches and conveyance facilities is a beneficial use of water and the allocation appurtenant to them should be recognized as beneficial use.

**Transfer of Agricultural Duty:****345**

The Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), Truckee-Carson Irrigation District (TCID) need to recognize the water rights below Lahontan Dam that are not part of the Newlands Project and predate it shall be governed by the Alpine Decree. Any disputes of deliveries to these non-Newlands water rights should be handled by the Federal Watermaster. These water rights and their delivery should not be allowed to lower delivery efficiencies mandated of the TCID by OCAP (Operating Criteria and Procedures). The BOR, in their administration of OCAP and the Federal Watermaster with jurisdiction for the Alpine Decree need to be in accordance with each other. Further, the Alpine Decree states that if the manner of use is changed from irrigation to different use, only the consumptive use may be transferred.

## **Policies For Walker Water Issues**

### **Walker Irrigation Management: 346**

Nevada Farm Bureau supports the current and historic effective management of Walker River system as applied and directed by Walker River Irrigation District and the Walker River Water Master.

## **Policies For Water Right Transfer Issues**

### **Diversion/Lost Revenue: 347**

Farm Bureau requests the state engineer and other authorities to require those who purchase agricultural water rights and change the place and/or manner of use, which results in decreased diversions, be required as a condition of their “change certificate” to mitigate for:

Damage or economic loss resulting to remaining agricultural producers

Reduction in storage levels

Loss of diversions and decreased efficiencies including the loss between the original point of diversion and the new point of diversion.

Loss of vegetative cover on dewatered lands

Reduced tax base in the community.

### **Environmental Quality Protection: 348**

The Legislature should establish a set of general criteria for defining what is “environmentally sound” with regard to the basin of origin for interbasin transfers.

The general criteria should provide that:

1. A scientifically sound, independent inventory of hydrologic and biological conditions in the basin of origin must be compiled at the applicant’s expense to serve as a baseline against which potential effects or changes are gauged (should include but not be limited to springs, creeks, seeps, wet meadows; types of vegetative and animal species; and current groundwater levels and quality).
2. A proposed transfer must leave enough water in the basin of origin to satisfy the purposes of protecting existing water rights holders, and for designated public lands in that basin, such as parks, wildlife refuges and wildlife management areas, and other public lands with grazing allotments and wildlife needs. Drawdowns have occurred in basins of origins without water leaving the basin; therefore, current basins of origin with existing drawdowns should be protected from further drawdowns.
3. A proposed transfer must not threaten to eliminate or substantially reduce or degrade any population or habitat of any fish, animal or plant community, or any species that is listed or designated as a species of concern under federal or state law.
4. A proposed transfer must not threaten the health, safety or welfare of residents living in the basin of origin.
5. In assessing the potential environmental effects of a proposed transfer, the State Engineer should consider the cumulative effects of the proposed transfer together with historic uses and probable future uses, as well as the transfer’s individual effects.
6. In assessing potential environmental effects of the proposed transfer, the State Engineer should also consider the impacts to future water supplies in the basin of origin that may be affected by long term droughts and/or possible climate change.
7. A proposed transfer is not “environmentally sound” and must be denied if it is likely it will have the kind of effects listed above.

The State Engineer also should be directed to establish individualized criteria for specific basins in consultation with other agencies having relevant expertise, such as those that manage federally-managed lands or resources in the affected areas.

We oppose the formula and process of capturing the discharge from the evapotranspiration of phreatophytes to use in calculating available ground water for allocation.

### **Groundwater Export:**

**349**

Nevada Farm Bureau is opposed to the export and transport of groundwater out of the basin of origin without full protection of agriculture and wildlife waters.

1. Before any large inter-basin transfer of water is considered by the state water engineer, the potential exporter shall provide the funding to independent professionals to accomplish the following:
  - a. A water model of the regional alluvial and carbonate aquifers that has the capability of forecasting ground water levels and impacts on existing wells (including water quality) for 20 years
  - b. Studies required indicating the source, age and distribution of the water in the system
  - c. An adequate monitoring process to validate or update the water model results
  - d. A scientifically sound, independent inventory of hydrologic and biological conditions in the basin of origin must be compiled at the applicant's expense to serve as a baseline against which potential effects or changes are gauged (should include but not be limited to springs, creeks, seeps, wet meadows; types of vegetative and animal species; and current groundwater levels and quality).
2. All information gathered in the studies shall be available to the public
3. The basin of origin shall be totally adjudicated before any water is exported
4. After 20 years, the results of export shall be reviewed for impacts on agriculture and wildlife. This review will provide the basis for curtailment, reimbursement and/or replacement of waters to the adverse entities

Withdrawing large quantities of water from carbonate aquifer to export out of the geophysical basin when that basin is part of a larger flow system should be considered an experiment! The unexpected should be expected! When ground water is being exported from a geophysical basin and unexpected conditions occur in that basin or an adjacent basin(s), both present and future needs in those basins should have a priority over the water being exported.

To accomplish the process of establishing that the water is available and will not cause negative impacts, pumping should take place for at least two years, preventing the discharge from returning back to underground supplies in that basin.

### **Protection Of Rural Nevada Water:**

**350**

Nevada Farm Bureau stands solidly behind rural county defense of the water resources within their boundaries and will support meaningful debate before any control or change is attempted. We will further question whether applications for such water were filed appropriately, identifying specific amounts of water at specific sites, as required by law.

An appreciating in-lieu-of-property tax with an inflation clause included should be imposed on property used for out of county export of water. The tax should be imposed in such a manner as to sustain and increase the property values in the exporting county.

**Relocation:****351**

Unprecedented urban growth and the never ending desire of bureaucracies to bring about the removal of agriculture water for both urban growth as well as the creation of wetlands has the potential to create soil erosion, noxious weed invasions, wild fire and atmospheric particulate matter at a level never before witnessed in Nevada, if left unchecked.

Nevada Farm Bureau strongly supports the concept that if/when water, through purchase or other mechanism, is removed from a site and transferred to another site that the parties involved in the transfer must put into place sufficient reclamation procedures to ensure the establishment of permanent (perennial) vegetation to minimize the eventual environmental impacts that invariably occur when irrigated lands are retired from production.

We direct the Nevada Farm Bureau to take immediate and appropriate steps to educate landowners, county commissions, Nevada's Executive branch of government, including but not limited to the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and its appropriate subdivisions, and the Nevada State Legislature on this extremely important subject.