

Assembly

4-1871

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

APRIL 28, 1975

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

MEMBERS ABSENT: Assemblyman Harmon  
Assemblyman Schofield

ALSO PRESENT: George Zappattini  
A. Jack Dieringer  
Chuck Dickson  
Gwen O'Bryan  
Henry Etchemendy  
George C. Hastings  
Richard D. Moser

(The following bills were discussed: S.B. 348, A.B. 637).

Mr. Dini called the meeting to order at 5:00 P.M.

The first bill to be discussed was S.B. 348, which authorizes State Land Registrar to exchange or sell certain state real property in Washoe County upon direction by Administrator of Mental Hygiene and Mental Retardation Division of Department of Human Resources.

Mr. Dixon testified. He stated that this bill allows the division to sell or trade two parcels of land that are adjacent to the Health Institute. The first parcel is a little over 8 acres and the second one is 2.6 acres. This will be traded for land north of the University of Nevada. It would be the site for a children's behavioral service for Washoe County. The parcel that is desired to be changed is Stempeck Park which is parcel C. Parcel D is a small strip in front of it. This fronts 21st Street in Sparks. The land has been master planned. The land is only available to exchange or sell. Parcel C is worth \$363,500.

Parcel d is worth \$115,500. There would be some money returning to the state. The land to be exchanged is appraised at \$309,250.

Mr. Murphy asked if it only involved Stempeck. Mr. Dixon stated that it involved Stempeck and a small parcel in front of it. Mr. Dini asked if it was under the director of Human Resources to which Mr. Dixon replied yes. Mr. Dixon stated that a group of private persons owned the land. It is adjacent to the University of Nevada, just north of the medical school. It is between the university and McCarren Boulevard and consists of 14 acres.

Mr. Craddock asked if there was only one appraisal to which Mr. Dixon replied yes. He stated that it was recommended by the Department of Public Works. Mr. Dini asked if that was what the law called for to which Mr. Dixon replied that he did not know.

The chairman indicated that testimony was concluded on S.B. 348.

Mr. Murphy moved for a do pass on S.B. 348, which was seconded by Mr. May. The motion was unanimously carried. Mr. Schofield, Mr. Harmon and Mr. Moody were not present at the time of the vote.

The next bill to be heard was A.B. 637, the Marlette Lake Bill.

Mr. Zappettini testified and passed out some suggested amendments to the committee, a copy of which is attached hereto and made a part hereof. He stated that the position of the committee was that they were not opposed to this project. They are merely trying to do their duty and protect the interest of the state and of the environment.

He stated that all of section 5 would be changed. Mr. Murphy asked how restrictive the language would be.

Mr. Dieringer stated that if it becomes necessary that Marlette be utilized to maintain the fish life, the cost would be charged to Carson for repayment.

Mr. Murphy asked if this was on the assumption that the plan will include Marlette as opposed to Hobart. Mr. Zappettini stated that they do not know.

Mrs. Ford stated that she read the bill and interpreted it that the state is financially responsible. She stated that the bill states that the state shall physically maintain it but that the costs shall be borne by Carson City.

Mr. Zappattini stated that it will be maintained so that problems will not be caused. There will be a study made.

Mrs. Ford stated that water shed was not defined. Mr. Zappattini stated that that would be the Marlette property. We should take it all in but it would increase the cost.

Mrs. Ford questioned an impact statement, if we went with Hobart.

Mr. Dieringer stated that we would probably not need an impact statement.

4-1273

Mr. May referred to minor obligations stated in the bill and asked if the word minor was necessary. Mr. Dieringer stated that some of the people have the right to 1,000 gallons of water and that was the reason for the word being used.

Mr. Dini referred to Storey County and asked how their allocation could be increased. He asked if they could get more water from the state. Mr. Glover stated that that would come from the state. We would renegotiate with them. Mr. Dini asked if Lakeview would negotiate with the state or with Carson City. Mr. Glover stated that Lakeview would buy additional water from Carson City.

Mr. Dini asked what the rationale was for using interim finance over the Governor. Mr. Zappattini stated that Mr. Barrett and others felt this way.

Mr. Murphy stated that there was nothing in the bill that requires the Public Works Board to do anything. You would need to tie this in. Mr. Murphy stated that he would come up with a suggestion.

Mrs. Ford indicated that some sort of impact should be made.

Mr. Dieringer stated that an impact statement is done on a specific project in a specific area. It can be an environmental assessment.

Mr. Etchemendy testified next. He stated that this was not the city's testimony. He indicated that one of the items could be taken out and that was the cement lining. Their response is that if that could be taken out for Hobart, then it could be taken out for developing Marlette. He stated that it would appear to him that it would not be possible to do this for \$4.3 million to take the Hobart alternative. It would appear that \$5,940,000 should be the figure.

Mr. Dini asked if Carson City would be interested in a contract to take a minimum amount of water whether or not they used it.

Mr. Etchemendy stated that that was the proposed contract. They would still use it for peaking. They would be guaranteeing a certain amount of dollars for repayment of the bond. He stated that cost was the problem.

Mr. Dieringer stated that there was the problem of the Indian water suit. Mr. Etchemendy stated that if we go into in impact assessment, one of the things that should be considered will be the fact that the ranchers are using water that they have been using.

Mrs. Ford indicated that the first move is the impact statement.

Mr. Dini asked if this project could be done in two years.

Mr. Etchemendy stated yes. It could be completed some time during 1977.

Mr. Dini then stated that the governor would be more logical on this than the interim finance committee.

Mr. Hastings testified. He stated that with regard to Mr. Etchemendy's testimony he could not find the 1-1/2 million dollar discrepancy.

Mr. Dini stated that the committee would go over the amendments.

The committee then took a five minute recess.

Mr. Dini called the meeting back to order and asked what the consensus of the committee was.

Mr. Craddock stated that everyone has been favoring Hobart except Carson City. It would seem to him that Hobart would be the more sensible way. He indicated that there would be versatility with Hobart.

Mr. Dini questioned the committee as to whether or not everyone was in favor of Hobart. The committee was all in favor of Hobart.

Mrs. Ford questioned the definition of the word facilities.

Mr. Dini stated that the bill drafters would have to look at it.

The committee then discussed the money factor of the bill. Mr. Dini stated that he thought that a \$5,000,000 figure should be put in the bill. Mr. May moved that the figure of \$5,000,000 be put in the bill which was seconded by Mr. Craddock. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Harmon and Mr. Schofield were not present at the time of the vote.

There being no further business to come before the meeting, the meeting adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,



BARBARA GOMEZ  
Committee Secretary



April 28, 1975

4- 1277

AMENDMENTS TO A.B. 637 BY THE MARLETTE LAKE WATER SYSTEM ADVISORY COMMITTEE.

Page 2, Line 1, Sec. 4 - "Project" means the (delete "acquisition")  
add construction

Page 2, Line 5, 1. - A severe and critical shortage of water (delete  
"Prevails"), add is imminent

Page 2, Line 16 - add and other minor obligations.

Page 2, Line 19 - (delete "a plan and program"), add an engineering  
study prepared by Water Resources Consulting Engineers, and Montgomery  
Engineers of Nevada, intended

Page 2, Line 21, No. 5 - change to read 5. The state shall maintain  
Marlette Lake as an efficient trout brood stock and spawn taking facility.

Page 2, Line 31 - change existing Sec. 6 to Section 7, Sec. 7, to 8, etc.  
Enter new Sec. 6

New Sec. 6 The State Public Works Board Shall:

1. Determine the nature and extent of the facilities to be  
constructed after analysis of engineering reports and consulta-  
tion with the Marlette Lake Water System Advisory Committee,  
the State Department of General Services, the State Department  
of Conservation and Natural Resources and the City of Carson City.
2. Verify the execution of a contract between State and City which  
will assure reimbursement to the State for the appropriate costs  
of design and construction of the facilities, and
3. Issue a resolution certifying the need for moneys to accomplish  
the project.

Page 2, Line 32 - (delete "acquire"), add construct

Page 2, Line 34, 1. - (delete "acquire"), add construct

Page 3, Line 2, Sec. 2 - The cost of the project shall include in addition to the items specified in NRS 349.168 not to exceed the sum of \$45,000 for preparation of an environmental impact statement under direction of the State Public Works Board. The initial sum shall be derived from the General Fund and not to exceed the sum of \$6,500 for the employment and retention of financial consultants and attorneys at law. The amount of \$25,000 shall be provided from the General Fund for preparation of a watershed management plan under the direction of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources.

Page 3, Line 15 - (delete "acquired"), add constructed

Page 3, Line 17 - (delete "acquiring"), add constructing

Page 3, Line 20 - (delete "acquisition"), add construction

Page 3, Line 23 - (delete "acquire"), add construct

Page 3, Line 24 - (delete "acquisition"), add construct

Page 3, Line 38 - (delete "lowest bidder"), add state

Page 4, Line 7 - (delete "to"), add including

Page 4, Line 12 - (delete "as recommended in the plan, program and"), add from the

Page 4, Line 43 - (delete "governor"), add Interim Finance Committee

Page 4, Line 48 - add after "by" NRS 331.170 or