

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Jeffrey  
Vice Chairman Redelsperger  
Assemblyman Mello  
Assemblyman Dini  
Assemblyman Kovacs  
Assemblyman Polish  
Assemblyman Schofield  
Assemblyman DuBois  
Assemblyman Rhoads

OTHERS PRESENT: Senator Wilson  
Arthur Johnson  
Larry Struve, Chief Deputy,  
Attorney General's Office  
Roland Westgard  
Bill Newman  
Maurice Bidart

The meeting was called to order at 2:10 P.M. by Chairman Jeffrey. Testimony was called for on AB 428.

AB 428 - Makes various changes to law relating to administration of underground water by state engineer.

Assemblyman Redelsperger was the first to testify. He stated that there have been a number of valleys that have been designated as critical ground water basins in the last two and one-half years. There have been a total of approximately 43 valleys designated since the beginning of 1978 through 1980 and prior to that from 1941 up until that year there had been approximately 27 valleys designated. There was a concern expressed while Mr. Redelsperger was campaigning that there was never any notice given when these valleys were designated as critical ground water basins. People had made substantial investments in these communities thinking they would be able to apply for water to irrigate their lands. After their initial investment, they suddenly learned one day that they had invested in land that was designated as a critical ground water basin area. This situation created a considerable amount of animosity between the residents of these valleys and the State Engineer. The State Engineer is presently in litigation in the Amargosa Valley. He stated that it is his hope that this bill will alleviate some of these problems. It is his feeling that if the State Engineer's office was instructed by law to make official notification to the residents of the valleys before such a designation it would thus eliminate many litigations.

There are two ways a valley can be so designated. It can be petitioned by the residents of that valley and by 40% of the holders of record of the appropriators of water, to file a petition with the State Engineers asking them to designate the valley. In the absence of such a petition from the owners of wells, the ground water basin, which the State Engineer considers to be in need of administration, he shall hold a public hearing within the basin to take testimony from those

owners to determine whether administration of the basin is justified.

The next part of the bill deals with ground water boards. Subsection 5, Line 22 states a water board or governing body shall provide such advice and assistance to the State Engineer as he may deem essential for the purpose of conservation of the ground water within the area affected.

Section 2 deals with how a water board would be formed. In each area designated as a ground water basin by the State Water Engineer, pursuant to NRS 534.30, and located entirely within one county, a ground water board may be established as provided in this section. It covers how various names would be submitted to the governor for the process of selection.

The committee heard considerable discussion regarding the formation of these water boards. Assemblyman Redelsperger explained the proposed formations of these water boards.

Assemblyman Redelsperger then referred to Subsection 7, Page 3, which calls for language on Lin 16. On Line 30, Page 3, Subsection 10, in brackets is State Engineer. Earlier in the statutes the Governor appointed the water board. This gives the State Engineer the power to dissolve the water board. It is his feeling that it should be the Governor that should dissolve the board and not the State Engineer.

Assemblyman Dini felt there is a technical error on Lines 42 and 43. It is his feeling that this language should be deleted. Unincorporated towns should be deleted from this section. Page 4, Subsection 7, Line 21 contains new language. Section 4 contains new language on Lines 21 through 35 in Subsection 1. This language is requiring public meetings.

Chairman Jeffrey called for further testimony in favor of AB 428.

Mr. Arthur Johnson of Fishlake Valley stated he is in favor of this bill and urges its passage. He stated that when he bought the land he was not ready to develop, so he waited for a period of time to take out a permit. Under an open valley designation, the statutes determine that if you apply for a permit, you are going to get it. Then came the Carrie Act Filings and the various owners got word that all these filings were taking place on the water. He then applied for water. Following that time from February 10, 1978 the State Engineer designated Fishlake Valley as a designated water basin. This ruling effectively closed the valley to irrigation and it was then that he realized that the ground he had planted was the extent of ground he would be able to cultivate. This amounted to only 43 acres. The decision was backdated until it took away previous permits and it meant that approximately eight of the deeded property owners in the valley lost the ability to make money from their ground. C-163

They were never notified that the valley was being considered for designation until after the fact. It is his feeling if this bill is put into effect and those valleys which are affected had prior knowledge and to be able to debate the information these determinations are based upon, there might be some very different determinations. He feels the information that is used by the State Engineer's office when designating a basin is antiquated.

Maurice Bidart, President of Nevada Association of Conservation Districts, supports this bill in its entirety. They would also want to strengthen this bill by adding a provision that at the annual meeting held in Carson City the Division of Water Resources would give a public report on the status of the state's water and of their water programs and receive public comments. (See Exhibit A)

Some of the questions they have on this bill are as follows: Page 2, Line 33 where it says, "and located entirely within one county." They foresee this as a possible problem as some of these basins are located in more than one county. This would possible eliminate a water board because it is located in more than one county.

In addition, another possible problem, you may be having more than one ground water basin located within one county, and more than one valley may not want to be regulated by the other valley, each one wanting their own water board.

Another concern is how the priorities will be set up in these designated areas. Historically, agriculture has been at the bottom of the list. This is of major concern with the agricultural people.

Mr. Bidart made one other point, that being the ground water boards would like to be able to be the ones to say who sets the priorities.

Assemblyman Redelsperger stated it was his feeling that there would be advisory boards.

Mr. Ross DeLipkow, an attorney in Reno, Nevada was next to testify. He stated that he represented no one in reference to this bill. He stated he is strongly opposed to this bill. The bill may have the effect of trying to create water when water is not available. The first supreme court decision to involve water took place in California in 1855. That case clearly established the doctrine of priority. The first person to get the claim gets the water. He thinks it is impossible to legislate around the situation when a person does not file an application. It is his feeling a person simply cannot sit by and say maybe in five years or so I will develop my land. If there is any doubt at all, that person should file. The first page, Section 2 states, "he shall hold a hearing". This is mandatory at such time it is felt a basin is in need

C461

of administration. If the State Engineer thinks XYZ Valley, for example, is possibly in need of administration, he will send out the appropriate notice. After that hits the newspaper, there will be thousands of applications on the State Engineer's desk. Thus, the problem would become out of control overnight. Then what good would the Advisory Board or Water Board be? Another problem he anticipates with water boards in general is that it has been his understanding that the Las Vegas Valley Board wasn't much help in its functions.

In Mr. Lipkow's experience in water right matters, there is probably less than one-half dozen really qualified ground water hydrologists in the State of Nevada. Therefore, you will get a board consisting of intelligent people, experienced ranchers, experienced businessmen, but probably not one of those people on the board will have reasonable input to the State Engineer on determining how to administer a basin.

In conclusion, it is his feeling that this bill would only add another layer of bureaucracy.

Mr. DeLipkow's objection is to having this lay board advising the State Engineer, who by means of himself and his staff are certainly experts in the area of ground water law and hydrology. These water boards are a waste of time.

Assemblyman Redelsperger stated these boards will be able to get the help necessary on Page 3, Subsection 9, Line 25, which states, "any ground water board may request from the State Engineer or other State, County, City or District Agency such technical information, data and advice as it may require to perform its functions." Assemblyman Redelsperger stated that these boards would indeed be of assistance to the State Engineer.

Mr. DeLipkow stated that the engineering fees would be astronomical. The staff and funds are just not available.

At this time the chair deferred to Senator Wilson, thus enabling him to return to a committee hearing in the Senate. He stated he was here to testify regarding SB 347 and SB 215. After Senator Wilson's testimony the meeting will return to testimony regarding AB 248.

SB 347 - Corrects errors made in amendment of Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.

Senator Wilson stated SB 347 contains the entire Tahoe Regional Act as amended in September 1980 by this legislature in special session. As you will recall, there were a couple of errors which the two states had agreed to correct during a subsequent regular session. They agreed to these and they are not controversial or adversary. One error is on Page 7. There is a reference to Paragraph H for judicial review which should have been Paragraph J. The correction appears on Page 16.

(Committee Minutes)

It clearly refers to the wrong paragraph. J is the paragraph that relates to judicial review. So, on Page 7, H should be bracketed out and J should be added.

The first substantive one that requires correction appears on Page 13. During the committee preceding the special session talked about the limited capital and the development of single family residential units during the interim period which was covered by the qualified moratorium. We had obtained the figure of 339 from Douglas County which was supposed to represent the total number of single family permits issued in 1978. The correct figure is 529 and it was telephoned to them as California was drafting their bill for action by their legislature. The figure was phoned by our staff and California dropped it. They agreed they dropped it. There is no controversy over the number, but at that juncture they passed the bill and it was too late for them to go back. So, we passed this bill with the understanding that we would come back and correct it to 529.

The third correction is on Page 21. When we drafted the language creating the transportation district, we adopted an extremely conservative posture on the taxing authority the district had. This is the district that manages whatever transportation system is finally settled on by the agency. We eliminated from their jurisdiction the power to impose a tax on gaming and gaming tables. They dropped the word "or gaming" which means the prohibition applies to gaming tables. The correction at Line 47 is to insure they cannot tax gaming. He is not sure they can anyway, but out of an excess of caution we expressly exempted from their jurisdiction a tax on gaming. That is the third and last correction.

Assemblyman Mello wondered about the words gaming or gaming tables being the same thing.

Senator Wilson replied no. You can tax a gaming table and you can tax gross revenues. They are different.

Senator Wilson stated that they are not proposing any amendment. These are previously agreed to corrections and all they do is clean up the bill. He stated that California has not passed them yet, but have agreed to them, or their negotiators have agreed to them.

Assemblyman Dini wondered if the purpose of this bill was to get this action started before California could commence theirs.

Senator Wilson stated this was precisely the case. We did not want to wait for California to take action on theirs first. When this act reached them, they could correct their own act. If they don't, it stays where it is.

Assemblyman Dini stated if this were the case, it would at least show intent on our part.

(Committee Minutes)

Senator Wilson replied that this was exactly the purpose and these corrections were spoken to when they had their proceedings. They are nothing new and nothing of a surprise. These corrections are anticipated.

Vice Chairman Redelsperger asked for questions from Senator Wilson.

Senator Wilson then testified on the intent of SB 215.

SB 215 - Authorizes attorney general to bring action if Federal Government's use of public lands impairs state sovereignty.

He stated that this is legislation related to the Sagebrush Rebellion. Sagebrush Rebellion legislation is based upon the premise that we would litigate for title to federal lands. Title itself, fee title. This act is based upon some legislative action in Oregon which is a slightly different approach and is a bit more surgical whereby the state takes the view that it's sovereignty is being imposed upon by federal action, roads, water control and use of land and the like. You can file an action against the feds to contest the use made rather than title and litigate that as being so extensive and so imposing against the state sovereignty that the state has the right to challenge the use. It is an alternative to the Sagebrush in the sense that instead of getting title, you are litigating the propriety of use and how it affects your people. In this state, statute expressly sets forth what the AG's jurisdiction is unless we give him the power to do something, he has no power to act. What this bill does is vest him with the power of jurisdiction to file an action by request of the Governor or others or on his own initiative to contest a federal land use decision which would impose on state sovereignty as described in the bill. It is a totally different legal theory and it seems to him in lieu of litigating for title, if we want to object to a federal land use, which we think is bad. If we think of prosecuting for a title search, we may be in litigation for some time. This provides us with some initiative that is limited surgically in its approach, less expensive, and considerably more certain in its legal outcome.

Assemblyman Mello wondered what the estimate of cost would be.

Senator Wilson stated that it could be from nothing to whatever was depended upon for the action. If you get a federal problem where a federal use is being made of land or water, that affects states. He recommends the bill. It is of good sound legal premise to litigating title. If you don't want to go the full route on that, this would create some specific and, perhaps, more immediate results. It is for that reason, he asks for your support on this bill.

At time time Mr. Larry Struve, Chief Deputy, Attorney General's Office, testified regarding SB 215. He stated that he concurs with everything Senator Wilson has previously stated in his testimony regarding SB 215. (Committee Minutes)

0467

He stated he views SB 215 as a compliment to Chapter 633 passed in the 1979 Legislature, known as the Sagebrush Rebellion Bill. What Chapter 633 is designed to do is to set up a legal test on how to protect the State of Nevada's equal footing under the constitution. This might require the disposition of the unappropriated public lands to the state's governmental authority. As pointed out by Senator Wilson, having that question resolved in the courts may indeed take a long period of time. It would restrict the Attorney General in taking action in that interim with respect to federal government actions that may impede the authority of the State of Nevada involving the roads, lands and water in the interim period. So, basically, it would give a complimentary set of authority to the AG during this interim time. Also, SB 176, if it is enacted, is to clarify our law respecting acquisitions in the State of Nevada and it addresses the jurisdictional questions between the federal government and the State of Nevada. SB 215 was designed to be a compliment to that legislation if enacted. This gives the Attorney General the authority to protect the sovereignty of the state. He stated the Attorney General's office urges passage of this legislation.

Assemblyman Mello wondered what kind of money these litigations may take.

Mr. Struve stated that there is probably not any way of knowing ahead of time as these suits will be filed on a case-to-case basis. If the particular litigation that they were to get involved in became exceedingly expensive and could not be funded through the regular special litigation fund, they have asked that the fund be raised from \$35,000 to \$100,000 for each year of the next biennium, not only to accommodate this type of legislation but all of the litigation expenses that they are responsible for in the Attorney General's office. It would appear from past experience, that should be sufficient to meet the obligations of this legislation. It would not appear that a special appropriation will be needed in order to implement the provisions of SB 215, but should be absorbed in their current work program.

Assemblyman Mello wondered about the increase from \$35,000 to \$100,000.

Mr. Struve stated that most of the agencies that have requested authorization to use the Attorney General's office in litigation do not ask for litigation costs as well, and the added costs have to come out of this special litigation fund of the Attorney General or there has to be a special supplement authorized by interim finance.

Assemblyman Mello stated that the only problem with this bill was how far the Attorney General would go, and if the Attorney General is at the edge of the funds that he has available for such litigation and feels he is going to obligate the state

into more monies, he should get permission from interim finance before proceeding into obligating the state. Perhaps this should be added to the bill.

Mr. Struve stated that he was certain the Attorney General would weigh very carefully the filing of litigation, which would end up having a very high price tag. If the sovereign interests of the state were deemed to be so critical, in view of the facts of the case, it may indeed behoove the Attorney General to come to the Interim Finance Committee and ask for a supplement to the special litigation fund, earmarked for that particular litigation. If the litigation, at the outset, appears to be an inexpensive venture that can easily be handled within the appropriation of the special litigation fund, but subsequently turns out to be more than was bargained for, it would have to be handled by presentation of the legislature, if it is in session, or again by the Interim Finance Committee. But, because we are dealing with a discretionary act on the part of the Attorney General, which is hard to predict because of what the federal government might do, it may not be possible for the Attorney General to come to the legislature for "x" amount of money because it could range from 0 to whatever they may already have if the legislature approves the special litigation fund. They would also build on the research and factual information that is being developed under the Sagebrush Rebellion appropriation that has been ongoing for the last two years.

Assemblyman Mello's concern is that there are more and more cases in litigation over water and as far as the Sagebrush Rebellion now getting into this area, it is possible that we could be spending millions of dollars in litigation in this area if the AG's office were given Carte Blanche.

Mr. Struve stated that if that amount of money were involved, it is his feeling that a very substantial sovereignty of the state would be involved. It is also his feeling that the Attorney General's office has been very careful not to abuse the money available to them. They are constantly trying to weigh the resources available to them against what they may be facing in litigation.

Mr. Struve stated if the Attorney General's office was faced with a case where there was tremendous expense involved, the Attorney General would be well advised to come to the Interim Finance Committee or the legislature and alert them to that fact and ask for their authorization or at least approval.

Mr. Jac Shaw of the Division of State Lands was next to testify in regards to SB 215 and stated that the division supports passage of this legislation. It supplements and enables the Attorney General to handle some issues that may come along and may require only a letter from the Attorney General's office to solve that particular problem.



At this time Vice Chairman Redelsperger called for additional testimony on AB 428.

Roland Westergard, Director of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and Bill Newman, State Water Engineer, were next to testify regarding AB 428.

Section 1 indicates their concurrence providing for a public hearing before a basin is designated. Additionally, he stated they have no objections to the statutes specifically providing for a public hearing before designation. He stated that Mr. DeLipkow's fears of there being a rush to the courthouse if public notice is given may very well be a valid one, but it is Mr. Westergard's feeling that it is more important to inform the people of the hearing than to avoid an onslaught of applications. There may be less repercussions if a public hearing is held prior to the designation of a basin.

Mr. Westergard noted the fiscal note on the bill indicates there would be no impact on local government and no effect on the state. It is his feeling this is not quite true. If the state engineer did have to hold hearings, with there already being approximately 67 basins designated in the state and an additional 254 valleys in the state, thus the possibility of this type of action in the future is very great indeed, and there could be certain costs incurred in that respect.

Section 2 of the bill, if you delete as proposed under Lines 34 through 36 the authority for the state engineer to establish a board, you, in fact, don't have any authority for the establishment of a board. He offered the counter suggestion if, in fact, this part of the bill is to be changed at all, perhaps it could be by a resolution of the county commissioners in the area, in the form of a petition to the state engineer for the creation of a board, and then provide that the state engineer would hold a public hearing before he made a decision as to whether to create a ground water board.

One of the concerns he has is that one board may not be able to serve two communities without there being considerable conflicts. There would have to be separate boards for each designated basin and there would be costs incurred. The question is what the cost itself would be and how it may fit into any ad valorem or any caps that legislature imposes in tax legislation.

On Page 3, Line 30 there was a ground water board in Las Vegas and about 1973 the representative of that board discussed with Mr. Westergard the possibility of dissolving the board because they felt it was no longer needed. There hadn't been one disagreement between the state engineer and board during its existence and they felt it was not worth the cost involved any longer. In 1973 the legislature accepted the concept to dissolve the water board and at that time the state engineer was given the authority rather than the Governor.

Assemblyman Redelsperger stated on Line 45 the word "state" should be "area". He brought this change to the attention of the bill drafter and they felt it should stay. He will again take this up with the billdrafter.

The amendments proposed in Subsection 7, beginning on Line 20 were discussed next. There has been another bill that has been processed that would give the State Engineer the authority in designated basins to deny permits without publication of notice of the applications if he had denied applications for similar purposes in the past. His concern is that the State Engineer would have to hold public hearings every time he felt it necessary to deny a permit. Assemblyman Redelsperger stated that he would work this out with the bill drafter's office and fully agreed with Mr. Westergard's concern in this area.

The amendment suggested on Lines 36 and 37 is not satisfactory. The current language is better. He feels the proposed language puts the State Engineer in a compulsory position where he "shall" designate preferred uses. In some areas it is not necessary, and if it is not necessary, why go to the whole cost and work of the public hearing process.

Mr. Bill Newman, State Engineer, stated he concurs with Mr. Westergard's testimony.

There being no further testimony regarding AB 428, Vice Chairman Redelsperger closed the public hearing on this matter.

Vice Chairman Redelsperger then called for testimony regarding SB 238.

SB 238 - Provides for payment to local governments in lieu of taxes if state obtains title to or management of public lands.

Mr. Jac Shaw was first to testify. He stated that SB 238 is a bill to help all concerns of local communities in the land issue of the Sagebrush Rebellion. One of the concerns of all of the local governments is the loss of in-lieu monies that they have been getting since the passage of the Organic Act in 1976. He feels it was never the intent of the 1979 Legislature when they passed AB 413 to hurt any local communities. From the information gained from meetings and discussions with local communities over the past year and a half, this bill came out as a continuation of any in-lieu funds derived from the revenues of the public lands if and when they are transferred to the state. He referred to Page 2, Section 3, Line 32 to 34 where there is an appropriation to go into a fund that would be a revolving fund and then later on, Line 42, by 1990 that money would have to be returned to the general fund. Therefore it is not a net expense. The fund is created and the money is put there and the treasurer is to invest it, but the funds are to be derived from the

income from the public lands if and when they are ever transferred to the state. This bill is in preparation of a land transfer. It has no current effect other than to assure the local communities that it was not the intent of AB 413 to take away any funds they have been receiving from the federal government.

Assemblyman Mello stated that the state had better start looking at other ways of setting up something in the State Treasurer's office for expertise in investing monies. Presently the office is investing a little over \$3 million.

Assemblyman Rhoads referred to Section 3, Page 2, Line 28. Mr. Shaw explained that Sections 1 and 2 will become effective on receipt of the land, but Sections 3 and 4 become effective on July 1, 1981. Section 3 is the money being put in for investment in the State Treasurer's office.

Mr. Shaw stated in reply to a question from Assemblyman Mello that this bill is important in intent and for that purpose only.

There being no further testimony regarding SB 238, the public hearing was closed.

Assemblyman Mello moved DO PASS AND REREFERRAL to the Ways and Means Committee on SB 238, seconded by Assemblyman Polish and carried unanimously by the members present with Chairman Jeffrey absent from the vote.

Assemblyman Dini moved DO PASS on SB 347, seconded by Assemblyman Polish and carried unanimously by the members present with Assemblyman Jeffrey absent from the vote.

Assemblyman Mello asked that action on SB 215 be held until a fiscal analyst could check the language in the proposed bill for a possible fiscal impact. Vice Chairman Redelsperger appointed Assemblyman Mello and Assemblyman Dini as a subcommittee to work on possible amending language to SB 215.

Vice Chairman Redelsperger appointed a subcommittee of Assemblyman Kovacs, DuBois and himself to work on amendments for AB 428.

SCR 17 - Continues existence of select committee on public lands.

Assemblyman Rhoads then gave a report on SCR 17. He stated the select committee held eight meetings on this matter during the last two years. Their budget was \$31,881 and they spent \$23,121.

Originally this called for six members and the Senate had amended it to seven members. Assemblyman Rhoads stated that they wanted to get this passed so as to have enough time to

have a meeting before the legislature is over.

Assemblyman DuBois moved AMEND AND DO PASS on SCR 17, seconded by Assemblyman Rhoads and carried unanimously with Chairman Jeffrey absent from the vote.

SB 164 - Relates to the development of geothermal resources; provides for administration and utilization.

Chairman Jeffrey stated that there had been some interest expressed in SB 164. An amendment has been ordered to allow for temporary permits for gas, oil or geothermal wells. The language is to be changed to say, "he may waive the permit for construction or water used in drilling gas or geothermal wells."

Assemblyman Mello moved for the amendment, seconded by Assemblyman Polish and carried unanimously by the members present with Assemblyman Dini absent from the vote.

Assemblyman Mello referred back to SB 215 and stated that on Line 11 perhaps the language should be, "The attorney general may if he has sufficient funds to commence and conclude the following, if not then he must go to the Interim Finance Committee and obtain approval from the finance committee if the legislature is in session.

There was a motion made by Assemblyman Kovacs to get the amendment, seconded by Assemblyman Schofield and carried unanimously by the members present with Assemblyman Dini absent from the vote.

There being no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 4:10 P.M.

Respectfully submitted,

Judy E. Sappenfield  
Committee Secretary

April 15, 1981

ASSEMBLY

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT  
AGENDA FOR COMMITTEE ON AND NATURAL RESOURCES  
TUESDAY

Date April 21, 1981 Time 2:00 Room 222

Bills or Resolutions  
to be considered

Subject

Counsel  
requested\*

THIS AGENDA CANCELS AND SUPERSEDES ALL PREVIOUS AGENDAS FOR THIS DATE

- |         |  |  |
|---------|--|--|
| AB 428. | Makes various changes to law relating to administration of underground water by state engineer.                      |  |
| SB 215  | Authorizes attorney general to bring action if Federal Government's use of public lands impairs state sovereignty.   |  |
| SB 238  | Provides for payments to local governments in lieu of taxes if state obtains title to or management of public lands. |  |
| SB 347  | Corrects errors made in amendment of Tahoe Regional Planning Compact.  |  |





Nevada Association of Conservation Districts  
201 SOUTH FALL STREET  
NYE BUILDING, ROOM 114  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

---

April 20, 1981

To: Committee on Economic Development and Natural Resources

From: Maurice Bidart, President *M B*  
Nevada Association of Conservation Districts

Subject: AB 428

The Nevada Association of Conservation Districts supports this bill in its entirety. We would also like to strengthen this bill by adding a provision that there be an annual meeting, held in Carson City, at which the division of water resources would give a public report on the status of the state's water and of their water programs, and receive public comments.

*Exhibit "A"*

C474



Nevada Association of Conservation Districts  
201 SOUTH FALL STREET  
NYE BUILDING, ROOM 114  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

April 20, 1981

To: Committee on Economic Development and Natural Resources

From: Maurice Bidart, President *M B*  
Nevada Association of Conservation Districts

Subject: AB 428

The Nevada Association of Conservation Districts supports this bill in its entirety. We would also like to strengthen this bill by adding a provision that there be an annual meeting, held in Carson City, at which the division of water resources would give a public report on the status of the state's water and of their water programs, and receive public comments.

0475





April 20, 1981

To: Committee on Economic Development and Natural Resources

From: Maurice Bidart, President *M B*  
Nevada Association of Conservation Districts

Subject: AB 428

The Nevada Association of Conservation Districts supports this bill in its entirety. We would also like to strengthen this bill by adding a provision that there be an annual meeting, held in Carson City, at which the division of water resources would give a public report on the status of the state's water and of their water programs, and receive public comments.

5476



Nevada Association of Conservation Districts  
201 SOUTH FALL STREET  
NYE BUILDING, ROOM 114  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

April 20, 1981

To: Committee on Economic Development and Natural Resources

From: Maurice Bidart, President *MB*  
Nevada Association of Conservation Districts

Subject: AB 428

The Nevada Association of Conservation Districts supports this bill in its entirety. We would also like to strengthen this bill by adding a provision that there be an annual meeting, held in Carson City, at which the division of water resources would give a public report on the status of the state's water and of their water programs, and receive public comments.

0477