

Assembly

GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

MINUTES OF THE MEETING

May 17, 1975

4- 1554

MEMBERS PRESENT: CHAIRMAN DINI  
VICE-CHAIRMAN MURPHY  
ASSEMBLYMAN CRADDOCK  
ASSEMBLYMAN HARMON  
ASSEMBLYMAN MAY  
ASSEMBLYMAN MOODY  
ASSEMBLYMAN SCHOFIELD  
ASSEMBLYMAN FORD  
ASSEMBLYMAN YOUNG

ALSO PRESENT: Tom Rice  
Don Paff  
Mr. Broadbent  
Bart Jacka

(The following bills were discussed: A.B. 801, S.J.R. 38, S.B. 225, S.B. 501, S.B. 647 (1971 session), S.B. 505, S.B. 498, S.B. 491, S.B. 612, S.B. 615, A.B. 380, S.B. 572, BDR 2106, SJR 18, S.B. 479).

Chairman Dini called the meeting to order at 10:10 A.M., with a quorum present.

The Committee discussed A.B. 801, which provides procedure for enforcement of certain special assessments. Assemblyman Schofield testified. This bill makes special assessments a part of the taxation of the property. The Clark County Treasurer has had quite a bit of difficulty with this situation.

Mrs. Ford stated that it was like the lien law.

Mr. Dini indicated that the committee had never taken any action on S.B. 6 either. Mrs. Ford stated that Mr. Lien had indicated that it is in the charter of the cities and not in the NRS.

The committee next discussed S.J.R. 38. Mr. Young stated that he had spoken to Ed Roland. He stated that he did not think that it took livestock off the range, but that it did take the miners and prospectors off.

May 17, 1975

4- 1555

The committee next discussed S.B. 225, which changes composition of certain county fair and recreation boards. Mr. Bunker testified. He stated that he is appearing in behalf of Mr. Broadbent. He stated that they had testified in favor of this bill before the Senate Government Affairs committee. This bill adds an additional member from Las Vegas and they do support this bill.

Mr. May stated that he supported this bill.

The next bill to be discussed was S.B. 501, which places Southern Nevada Water Project and Alfred Merritt Smith Water Treatment facility under control of the Las Vegas Valley Water District.

Tom Rice testified. He stated that he is the general manager of the Las Vegas Valley. This bill clarifies legislative intent that goes back a number of years. Mr. Rice referred to an article from the Gazette Journal.

He informed the committee that in 1971 S.B. 647 was passed and that this has become Chapter 646. This bill resulted in a contract which does not completely implement this act, much less the intent of the legislature. What they want is a clarification of that intent.

Mr. Paff testified next. A copy of his testimony is attached to the minutes of this meeting and made a part hereof.

Mr. Broadbent stated that they agreed with Mr. Paff.

The committee next discussed S.B. 505 and S.B. 498. Mr. Daykin explained these two bills to the committee because the committee had amended and passed out S.B. 491. He stated that with regard to S.B. 505 that since the committee had passed S.B. 491 that this bill was probably not needed.

He next discussed S.B. 498. He informed the committee that this bill does not relate to unincorporated towns. Its intent was to clear up an old reference to incorporated towns, the last of which was Carlin. He stated that there are no more incorporated towns in the State. The language does not have anything to do with S.B. 491. It does nothing. It should possibly be killed this session and maybe done right at the next session.

Mr. Moody moved for indefinite postponement of S.B. 498 and S.B. 505, which was seconded by Mr. Young. The motion carried unani-  
mously. Mrs. Ford, Mr. Murphy and Mr. Harmon were not present at the time of the vote.

The committee next discussed S.B. 612. Mr. Craddock stated that he was still waiting for the amendment. This bill should have been referred to transportation. He stated that it would provide that the small dealers can hire someone else to do the work of inspecting the vehicles.

The committee next discussed S.B. 615, which provides exception to limitation on salaries of county employees employed by or working under elected county officers.

Mr. Barton Jacka testified. He referred to A.B. 380. He stated that there was some concern in the Senate. This bill has a savings clause. Mr. Young moved for a do pass, which was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried. Mrs. Ford, Mr. Harmon and Mr. Murphy were not present at the time of the vote.

The committee then discussed S.B. 572. Mr. Broadbent stated that this bill was no problem. He indicated that it should be noted that they should only be responsible for payments as a result of prisoners being taken into custody.

ACR 86  
as BDR  
The committee next discussed the TRPA bill. Mr. Dini indicated that he had gone to the bill drafters and requested a study on the TRPA. The resolution was taken to Mr. Jacobsen. He asked the committee if they wished to make a committee introduction of BDR 2106. Mr. May moved for committee introduction which was seconded by Mr. Murphy. The motion carried unanimously. Mrs. Ford was not present at the time of the vote.

Chairman Dini stated that the chair would entertain a motion on SJR 18. Mr. Murphy moved for indefinite postponement which was seconded by Mr. Craddock. The motion did not carry.

Mr. Young then moved that the bill be referred to the floor with no recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Harmon. The vote was 4 to 4. Mr. Schofield did not vote. The motion did not carry.

The next bill to be discussed was A.B. 801. Mr. Schofield moved for a do pass which was seconded by Mrs. Ford. The motion carried unanimously. Mr. Dini did not vote.

The committee then discussed S.B. 225. Mr. May moved for a do pass which was seconded by Mr. Murphy. The motion carried. Mr. Harmon voted no.

S.B. 501 was discussed next. Mr. Schofield moved for a do pass, which was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried unanimously.

S.B. 612. Mr. Craddock moved for an amend and do pass which was seconded by Mr. May. The motion carried. Mrs. Ford did not vote on this bill.

S.B. 615. Mr. Young moved for a do pass which was seconded by Mr. Harmon. The motion carried unanimously.

S.B. 572. Mr. Schofield moved for a do pass which was seconded by Mr. Murphy. The motion carried unanimously.

S.B. 479. The committee discussed this bill. The committee decided that a conference report should be made up.

May 17, 1975

4- 1557

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

Respectfully submitted,

Barbara Gomez  
Committee Secretary

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
DIVISION OF COLORADO RIVER RESOURCES

4-1558

Testimony Regarding Senate Bill No. 501  
Assembly Committee on Government Affairs

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee. My name is Don Paff and I am the Administrator of the Division of Colorado River Resources.

Senate Bill No. 501, as now amended, sponsored by the Las Vegas Valley Water District, essentially proposes to reassign responsibilities now set forth in Chapter 268 from the Division of Colorado River Resources to the Las Vegas Valley Water District when the second stage of the Southern Nevada Water system is completed but not later than July 1, 1982.

During the 1973 legislative session, the Water District sponsored Senate Bill No. 553. Section 2, SB-553, of the 1973 session proposed, essentially, the same action as that in Senate Bill No. 501. Section 2 of Senate Bill No. 553 was not adopted. During the 1973 hearings I agreed to investigate the legal, financial and organizational aspects and impacts of the proposal and make a report so that if the proposal was reintroduced some more background and information would be available. The report, titled "Report on Investigation of the Implications of Transfer of Southern Nevada Water System to a Political Subdivision," was completed and submitted in early January 1975. I have

made copies available to the Chairman and have additional copies with me. You will find a brief summary on the cover memorandum dated January 14, 1975. This report did not specifically address Senate Bill No. 501, nor the amendments because the original bill was not available until April 9, 1975, and the amendment on May 16, 1975. However, we believe many of the implications and impacts of the report hold true. To date, the proponents of Senate Bill No. 501 have not responded in any substantial degree with solutions to the concerns expressed in that report.

Senate Bill 501 fails to identify long-term benefits to the people of the State, or water users. Indeed, there are some adverse affects which could outweigh any advantages indicated by the supporters of the bill.

The existing contract between the United States and Colorado River Commission of Nevada for the Delivery of Water and Construction of Project Works, Contract No. 14-06-300-1974, is a part of all the contracts between the Colorado River Commission and the water users, and is the governing contract. Section 30 of that contract deals with assignment and indicates no assignment or transfer of the contract, of any part, or interest, shall be valid until approved by the Secretary. This would then place the Secretary of the Interior in the position of approving, or potentially modifying, a contract involved in a legislative act of the State. Or, in other words, activities proposed by Senate Bill No. 501 would be subject to a Federal agency

action at some undeterminable period in the future, on or before July 1, 1982.

Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, the authorities granted the Division of Colorado River Resources under Chapter 268 of the 1967 legislature have been executed in the form of an operationally and fiscally sound existing water resource development project in the First State of the Southern Nevada Water System. The required future development of the Second Stage of the Southern Nevada Water System, as provided in that 1967 authority, is now under way and is expected to be equally successful and beneficial to the State and water users.

The Las Vegas Valley Water District is currently the operating agent of the State and the Division only retains general supervisory authority and acts on behalf of the State in contractual and financial matters. This designation was made by the 1971 legislature under SB-647 (Chapter 646). The specifics are identified in a contract dated August 1, 1971 implementing this legislative act.

We are concerned that SB-501 may produce a condition of uneasiness or confusion in our negotiations with the United States for second stage facilities, state financing set forth in SB-179 previously passed by the Assembly and Senate, and in any future federal consents required to implement the action proposed in the bill. Our concerns would be satisfied if it were completely understood that SB-501

does not take any force and effect until the completion of  
the system or July 1, 1982, and that further legislation  
is required to actually implement the intent. Such legislation  
to consider, at that time, this intent now expressed and  
consideration of all parties involved.

4/7562



4-1562

ASSEMBLY ACTION	SENATE ACTION	ASSEMBLY / SENATE AMENDMENT BLANK
Adopted <input type="checkbox"/> Lost <input type="checkbox"/> Date: Initial: Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/> Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/> Date: Initial:	Adopted <input type="checkbox"/> Lost <input type="checkbox"/> Date: Initial: Concurred in <input type="checkbox"/> Not concurred in <input type="checkbox"/> Date: Initial:	Amendments to Assembly / Senate Bill / Joint Resolution No. <u>612</u> (BDR <u>40-1931</u> ) Proposed by <u>Assemblyman Craddock</u>

Amendment No 9100



Amend the bill as a whole by adding a new section designated section 1.1 following section 1 to read as follows:

"Sec. 1.1. NRS 445.640 is hereby amended to read as follows:

445.640 1. [On and after February 1, 1974, subject] Subject to any applicable limitation of NRS 445.650 or any regulation [promulgated] adopted pursuant thereto, no used motor vehicle as defined in NRS 482.132

may be registered by a new owner in this state unless the application for registration is accompanied by a certificate of emission control compliance issued by any authorized station certifying that the vehicle is equipped with motor vehicle pollution control devices required by federal regulation or such other requirements as the commission may by regulation prescribe under the provisions of NRS 445.610 to 445.710, inclusive.

2. Any used vehicle dealer, as defined in NRS 482.133, [shall be] is responsible for ; [providing]

(a) Providing all certificates of emission control compliance for vehicles to which such certificates apply and for which a dealer's report of sale is required under the provisions of NRS 482.424 [.] ; or

(b) Paying all costs, including costs of inspections and any repair costs necessary to bring such vehicles into a condition which meets the requirements for such certificates."

Amend the title of the bill by deleting line 4 and inserting:

"cles; allowing used vehicle dealers to pay costs of inspection and costs of bringing certain vehicles into compliance with emission control requirements as alternative to providing certificates of emission control compliance; directing the state environmental commission to make a study of the cost".