Assembly

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

February 3, 1975

MEMBERS PRESENT: Vice-Chairman Murphy
Assemblyman May
Assemblyman Moody
Assemblyman Harmon
Assemblyman Schofield
Assemblyman Ford
Assemblyman Young
Assemblyman Craddock

MEMBERS ABSENT: Chairman Dini

ALSO PRESENT: Roland D. Westergard, Division of Water Resources
Bruce L. Rice, Division of Water Resources
Jack Mitchell, City of North Las Vegas
Mr. Armstrong of the Press.

Vice-Chairman Murphy called the meeting to order at 9:05 A.M. Mr. Murphy informed the committee that the first item to be considered on the Agenda was AB 82, which directs Division of Water Resources of State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to commence negotiations concerning allocation of water supplies of the Virgin River. Mr. Murphy inquired if there was anyone who would like to speak in favor of the bill.

Mr. Roland Westergard of the Division of Water Resources advised the committee that he would like to speak with regard to AB 82. He advised that the Division of Water Resources did request that the Government Affairs Committee introduce AB 82, and that he appreciated the response to that request.

Mr. Westergard informed the committee that one of the issues that came to mind was the use of the water supply of the Virgin River, which is a tributary of the Colorado River System. He informed the committee that the states retain jurisdiction and authority, and that the Virgin River heads into the states of Utah and Arizona, and crosses the state line at the Mesquite/Bunkerville area in Nevada and that it is used in Nevada parimarily for agricultural purposes. The concern of the Division of Water Resources is partly based on the interests of Utah and Arizona, particularly Utah now, which is beginning to develop future water supplies of the Virgin River system. The yield for that basin, as far as water supply is concerned, is

100,000 acre feet for Nevada. That is what is available for Nevada with the current development that exists in Utah and Arizona. About one-third of the total is being used now. In the State of Utah there have been a couple of dams built, but the development in Arizona is smaller. However, the Division of Water Resources is concerned about diverting the existing water supplies to Utah and Arizona, but also about the existing trans-basin.

The people in the Mesquite/Bunkerville area use large portions of the water for ditch systems, so that their water rights are limited. Mr. Westergard informed the committee that with the increasing demand for water in Nevada and the west, that the Division of Water Resources felt that this legislation was needed. He informed the committee that the Division of Water Resources was in favor of the bill, and that they would furnish any additional information that the committee might need.

Vice-Chairman Murphy asked the committee if there were any questions that they would like to ask of Mr. Westergard.

Mrs. Ford asked Mr. Westergard as to how long this would take as there was no set timetable. Mr. Westergard stated that he would hope to report back to the legislature within two years. He also informed the committee that the Division of water resources had been talking to the Water Resources people in Utah and Arizona, and that the people in Utah are somewhat reluctant to proceed with this, but that the Division of Water Resources in Nevada felt it was urgent. He advised the committee that he hoped it would take no longer than four years, and that a finalized compact could be completed within two years.

Mrs. Ford then asked Mr. Westergard if it would help him to perhaps have some language in the bill that the Committee would want a report to the next session.

Mr. Westergard informed the committee that he would not be adverse to that.

Mrs. Ford then asked what the urban areas most likely to develop would be.

Mr. Westergard stated that it was in the St. George/Warner Valley area.

Mr. May then stated that there were only a couple of tributaries.

Mr. Westergard informed the committee that they were the Virgin River and the Muddy River and the Las Vegas Wash.

Mr. May then asked if the Muddy was pretty close and Mr. Westergard affirmed that it was.

Mr. May then inquired of Mr. Westergard as to what the polution value was.

Mr. Westergard stated that the quality was very poor and that, as a matter of fact, the federal government has been looking into it.

Mr. Craddock then asked Mr. Westergard about the salt content and as to whether it was due to natural springs.

Mr. Westergard stated that as far as quality was concerned that the federal government could assume most of the responsibility.

Mr. Murphy then asked if there were any other questions with regard to AB 82. He asked if anyone would like to speak in opposition to AB 82.

Vice-Chairman Murphy then informed the committee that they woul discuss the following technical bills that were on the Agenda.

AB 73 which is a technical amendment correcting internal reference in NRS 333.300, relating to state purchasing procedures. Mr. Murphy asked the committee if there was anyone who wished to speak with regard to AB 73.

A discussion then was had with regard to having someone from the counsel bureau sit in on the technical bills before this committee and it was decided to take a five minute break to see if the aid of the counsel bureau could be obtained.

Vice-Chairman Murphy then called the meeting back to order and informed the committee that the counsel bureau was a little short on having counsel available now, and that the counsel bureau was trying to get all of their drafting done. Mr. Murphy then informed the committee that they would just review all of the technical bills today.

Mr. Muryhy again asked the committee if there was anyone who wished to speak with regard to AB 73, and asked if there was any one in favor of the bill or opposed to it.

AB 74, which is a technical amendment correcting internal reference in N.R.S. 497.190 was then discussed, and Mr. Murphy inquired if there was anyone in favor of the bill or opposed to it.

AB 75, which is a technical amendment correcting obsolete reference to temporary emergency loan proceedure, was then discussed. Mr. Murphy asked if there was anyone in favor of the bill or opposed to it.

AB 76, which is a technical amendment conforming to section 2, chapter 587, Statutes of Nevada 1973, to section 8, chapter 542, Statutes of Nevada 1973. Mr. Murphy asked if there was anyone in favor of the bill or opposed to it.

AB 77, which corrects technical defect in 1974 amendment of North Las Vegas City Charter was then discussed. Mr. Jack Mitchell of the City of North Las Vegas spoke in favor of AB 77. The bill had been submitted to eliminate a technical error, and three other

errors had been incorporated. Mr. Mitchell stated that the bill would read correctly if it comes out as printed. Mr. Mitchell stated that it should go back to the bill drafters to review the existing law and for comparison. The wording was correct as written right now.

Mrs. Ford asked Mr. Mitchell if he had a copy of the bill draft request as it was made.

Mr. Murphy asked whether it was requested by Mr. Mitchell.

Mr. Mitchell said it was requested by the City Attorney, and that he had a copy of it.

Mr. Craddock suggested that we get the bill drafters to get it in proper order before the government affairs committee attempts to change it.

Mr. Murphy agreed, and said that it would be well for us to leave the bill drafters alone this morning. Mr. Murphy then asked Mr. Mitchell if he would mind coming back when the committee had the technically correct copy from the bill drafters.

Mr. Mitchell agreed.

Mrs. Ford told the committee that all that would have to be done would be to amend this one as that would be the cheapest way, and that the same number could be kept.

Mr. Murphy asked if there were any other comments.

Mrs. Ford moved that the committee ask the bill drafters to prepare this bill according to the original request and that the committee would be able to consider the measure better after this had been accomplished.

The motion by Mrs. Ford was seconded by Mr. Schofield.

Mr. Murphy then asked if there were any other comments. All of the committee members present were in favor of AB 77 being returned tothe bill drafters in accordance with the original request.

Mr. Murphy then proceeded to discuss AB 78, which corrects technical defect in amendment of Reno City Charter.

Vice-Chairman Murphy then informed the committee that this was the end of the formal Agenda.

Mr. Young recommended a "do pass" on AB 82.

Mrs. Ford informed the committee that it should be amended in subsection 2 that there would be a report made to the next session of the legislature on the progress of this project.

The motion made by Mrs. Ford was seconded by Mr. Schofield.

Mr. Murphy asked if there was any further discussion of the amendment of AB 82.

Mr. Craddock stated that the impression he had gotten from Mr. Westergard was that he would like to follow this up.

Mr. Young stated that Mr. Westergard did not have any objection to reporting to the next session of the legislature in two years.

Mr. Craddock stated that he did not think that Mr. Westergard was timid, but that the committee did not want to strap him by giving him a time limit.

Mr. Murphy informed the committee that he thought that we had a time element here and that the report should come back to the next session of the legislature that would in essence be a progress report, so taht two years from now we would know what progress they have made.

Vice-Chairman Murphy then asked if there was any other discussion. Mr. Murphy then asked the committee members to signify their approval of a "do pass" with regard to AB 82 with the amendment. The motion to pass AB 82 with the amendment was passed by a majority vote of the Committee. (For Roll call vote, please see attached Legislative Action Form). Opposed: None.

Mr. Murphy then asked if there were any other comments from the members of the committee.

Mr. May asked if we were rescheduling those technical bills for the next committee meeting.

Mr. Murphy informed the committee that he wished to speak to Chairman Dini this afternoon and see what he wanted to do.

Mr. May then asked Mrs. Ford if she was going to prepare the amendment for AB 82.

Mrs. Ford agreed that she would.

Mr. Murphy then asked the committee members if there were any other items of business for discussion. He then informed the committee that they would stand adjourned until 8:00 A.M. tomorrow morning, February 4, 1975.

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Gomez

Barbara Gomez,
Committee Secretary

ASSEMBLY

AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

Monday,
Date February 3, 1975 Time 9:00 A.M. Room 214

1- 0015

Bills or Resolutions to be considered	Subject	Counsel requested*
AB 82	Directs division of water resources of state department of conservation and natural resources to commence negotiations concerning allocation of water supplies of Virgin River.	

TECHNICAL BILLS

AB 73	Technical amendment correcting internal reference in NRS 333.300, relating to state purchasing procedures.	
AB 74	Technical amendment correcting internal reference in N.R.S. 497.190.	
AB 75	Technical amendment correcting obsolete reference to temporary emergency loan procedure.	
AB 76	Technical amendment conforming to section 2, chapter 587, Statutes of Nevada 1973, to section 8, chapter 542, Statutes of Nevada 1973.	
AB 77	Corrects technical defect in 1973 amendment of North Las Vegas City Charter.	
AB 78	Corrects technical defect in amendment of Reno City Charter.	

*Please do not ask for counsel unless necessary.

58TH NEVADA LEGISLATURE

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS

LEGISLATION ACTION

0021

DATE February 3, 1975

SUBJECT AB 82. Directs Division of Water Resources of State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources to commence negotiations concerning allocation of water supplies of the Virgin River.

MOTION:

Do Pass X Amend ____ Indefinitely Postpone ____ Reconsider ____

Moved By Assemblyman Young Seconded By Assemblyman Harmon

AMENDMENT: To subsection 3 that there would be a report made to the next session of the legislature on the progress of this project.

Moved By Assemblyman Ford Seconded By Assemblyman Schofield

AMENDMENT: ____

Moved By ____ Seconded By ____

VOTE:	MOTION Yes	MOTION No	AMEND Yes	AMEND No	AMEND Yes	AMEND No
DINI						
MURPHY	X		X			
CRADDOCK	X		X			
HARMON	X		X			
RAY	X		X			
MOODY	X		X			
SCHOFIELD	X		X			
FORD	X		X			
YOUNG	X		X			
TALLY	8		8			

ORIGINAL MOTION: Passed Yes Defeated ____ Withdrawn ____

AMENDED & PASSED: Yes AMENDED & DEFEATED: ____

AMENDED & PASSED: ____ AMENDED & DEFEATED: ____

Attached to Minutes February 3, 1975

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMIT. EE

GUEST REGISTER

DATE: February 3, 1995

NAME	BILL #	REPRESENTING	TESTIFYING
Roland D. Westergard	AB 82	Division of Water Resources	Yes
Bruce L. Rice	AB 82	" " " "	
JACK MITCHELL	AB 77	CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS	YES
George Archer		Self	
Beryl Armstrong	Press		