

• MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
March 17, 1981

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chairman Floyd R. Lamb, at 8:00 a.m., Tuesday, March 17, 1981 in Room 231 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Floyd R. Lamb, Chairman
Senator James I. Gibson, Vice Chairman
Senator Eugene V. Echols
Senator Lawrence E. Jacobsen
Senator Norman D. Glaser
Senator Thomas R. C. Wilson
Senator Clifford E. McCorkle

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ronald W. Sparks, Chief Fiscal Analyst
Dan Miles, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Candace Chaney, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Howard Barrett, Budget Division

Nevada State Council of the Arts (Pg. 309)

Ms. Jacqueling Belmont, Director of the Nevada State Council of the Arts, presented the budget for this agency. Highlights regarding the functions and the budget of this agency are attached. (See Exhibit C.)

Senator Lamb asked Ms. Belmont how much time she spent at her job. Ms. Belmont stated she spent an average of 50 to 60 hours per week working. She noted the rest of staff worked their full hours and more.

Senator Wilson inquired as to the agency's outlook on Federal funding during the biennium. The Director indicated there would be no problem for 1981, those funds were secured. In 1982, the situation would be dependent on what happened within the separate sections of the endowment budget. The agency's funding were obtained from the "programs" part of that budget. If that section received the smallest cut, then the agency would be in the most favorable position. She noted only a portion of the agency's Federal funds were in jeopardy and added, whatever happened, the Council would look to honing its own programs to better utilize those Federal funds.

The Chairman asked if the local population donated money to the Council. Ms. Belmont said the monies were not donated to the Council directly, but were given to the programs the agency funded and to the individual artists.

Senator Lamb requested an explanation of the "artists in schools" program. Mr. Bill Fox, Deputy Director of the Council, explained the "artists in residence" program hired professional artists who were working and recognized in their field and placed them in schools and other educational settings for periods of one to six months. They were not hired to be teachers in schools, they were hired to be an artist in the school although they did teach the students and the teachers. This group not only taught, but they also did their own work while in those educational settings. Ms. Belmont noted the schools matched the Council investment in the program with cash and the artists were paid monthly with those funds.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

The Chairman noted the possibility of tighter budgets for the school system and asked if that would have an effect on the "artists in residence" program. Ms. Belmont felt the program would continue and indicated the communities had become very supportive of the program and provided funds for such.

Mr. Neldon C. Mathews, representing the Nevada Alliance for the Arts, stated in his county, Lincoln, there were "artists in residence" and felt this program was one of the very few sources in the rural areas as far as contact with artists.

Senator Echols inquired if there were any volunteers involved with the aforementioned program. Ms. Belmont indicated the volunteer involvement with the program was very heavy, with people contributing their time, effort, goods, and services.

DEPARTMENT OF CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Office of the Director (Pg. 778)

Mr. Roland Westergard, Director of the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, presented the budget for the Office of the Director. He noted the agency's prime responsibility was for the administration and management of the State's natural resources. This was accomplished through the Office of the Director, nine operating divisions, and two commissions.

Mr. Westergard indicated the Director and the Deputy Director of the department sat on numerous boards and commissions, most notably the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency and the Western States Water Council.

The Director said the most significant items to note in the budget were the two positions being cut, the Assistant Director and a Management Assistant I position. The budget reflected the customary cost for payroll expenses.

In-state Travel. The budget requested a \$1,000 increase for this item.

Operating Budget. Under "legal and court" expense, the appropriation provided for a Deputy Attorney General and one clerical position. Mr. Westergard indicated the operating budget for 1980-81 totaled approximately \$275,000 and the request for 1981-82 showed a reduction in that amount to \$257,000. For 1982-83, the request was for \$261,000.

Senator Jacobsen, referring to the snow survey, asked where those monies went. Mr. Westergard said the Cooperative Snow Survey expenses was a contribution to the Soil Conservation Service. Those funds were used to assist the agency in the stream-flow forecast to provide the management of the surface water flows on a year-to-year basis.

Senator Glaser inquired as to why there were no out-of-state travel expenses shown in this budget. Mr. Westergard indicated the Office of the Director's out-of-state travel monies came from the Governor's out-of-state travel budget.

Senator Echols commented that he thought this was one of the most important departments in State government.

Mr. Westergard noted there was an entry in the budget for Nevada Tahoe Regional Planning Agency support in the amount of \$3,500. Those monies were to defray the expenses of the members of the Nevada TRPA board when they were involved in responsibilities that related strictly to the State of Nevada.

Division of Water Resources (Pg. 780)

Mr. Bill Newman, State Engineer, presented the budget for this division. Mr. Newman described the functions of the division. He noted, by statute, there were three basic areas of responsibility; the appropriation, the adjudication, and the distribution of public waters. In addition, other duties included dam safety and engineering, the processing of applications to develop geo-thermal

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

resources, the licensing of well drillers and water rights surveyors, the maintenance of part of the Truckee River, and approval of water availability to subdivisions and condominiums statewide. The agency also collected and maintained water resources data.

Addressing the budget, Mr. Newman stated there were no increases; the budget only reflected inflation and salary increases. There were no new programs. The agency was requesting a capability of a very basic computer, addressed in Senate Bill No. 207, for the second year of the biennium. An operation and maintenance budget was shown in the budget document for the computer program.

Mr. Newman said the agency was requesting six new positions: four engineers, one Engineering Technologist, and one Mag Card Operator. A chart was displayed to the committee showing the increased number of applications received by the agency to indicate justification for the new positions.

Senator Wilson inquired, referring to the dramatic agency workload increase, if the new positions, coupled with the new computer system, would help the tremendous backlog experienced at the agency. Mr. Newman thought they would help the backlog quite dramatically most notably in abstract preparation. Mr. Westergard noted there was an Interim Committee that had suggested twelve new positions for this division, but, upon analysis of the workload, it was felt the six positions requested would be adequate. The Director also indicated there had been a vacancy factor problem in this division.

Senator Wilson commented that he had heard this division had quite a turnover problem due to poor salary levels and increased engineering activity. Mr. Westergard concurred, noting a third factor to the problem involving the frustration experienced by the staff in not being able to catch up with the workload.

Senator Wilson asked what the division projected the increased workload would be with the advent of the MX project. Mr. Newman felt the number of MX applications were fairly well fixed at present. He thought the related industry that supported the MX project would add more applications to the division's workload.

The Chairman inquired as to how many applications the division had received for the MX project to date. Mr. Newman said there were 116 applications filed. He left a chart with the committee showing the distribution of those applications by district and county. He noted all applications were by the Air Force. The applications represented a total request of approximately 40,000 acre feet of water per year for the construction phase of the project, and approximately 15,000 acre feet per year during the operation phase.

Senator Wilson asked where the collateral industries connected with the MX project were anticipated. Mr. Newman stated, depending on which site was chosen, there could be 3,000 to 5,000 people there overnight affecting seriously any municipal water supply that might be located there.

Senator Wilson inquired as to how much Federal monies had been obtained by the division for the MX project, and, would the division be able to handle the flow of applications anticipated. Mr. Westergard stated it was anticipated in the next six months for the department to receive \$275,000 in Federal monies, \$40,000 of that would go to the Division of Water Resources and those funds were shown in the MX Office budget. The Director indicated the \$40,000 would be used to hire consultant help to analyze some of the specific problems in that area. Senator Wilson commented that \$40,000 would not be enough money for the division.

Senator Lamb remarked that the major portion of applications for MX had probably already been processed. Mr. Newman noted that approximately 80 of those applications had gone for publication, of those, over 300 protests had been filed against.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Senator Lamb, referring to the Pahranaagat Valley, noted there were quite a few applications for that area which would result in many protests from the local community. Mr. Newman indicated many large ranchers and environmental organizations were protesting.

Senator Wilson inquired about what the division did when they had a hearing as a result of a protest filed to determine the effect of the well application upon already limited groundwater rights, and, was an investigation necessary to determine the effect of the application granted. Mr. Newman stated the division had been requested by the Nevada Cattleman's Association to investigate each one of the sites. That group had complained that the Air Force had proposed wells near their water source because they were known sources of water.

Senator Wilson asked if the division had the personnel to do the aforementioned. Mr. Newman stated they hoped to have; the six new positions would be used for the basic data gathering information.

Senator Glaser commented that he was a member of the Interim Study Committee that had recommended the twelve additional positions for this division. He noted concern over the fact the agency was only requesting six positions. He added that the Interim Committee had also recommended increasing the divisions fees to partially offset the increase in staffing as outlined in Assembly Bill No. 16.

Senator Wilson requested an estimate by the division on how much of their increased workload over the next biennium was the result, directly or indirectly, of the MX impact. Mr. Newman noted in 1980 there were 2,800 applications to appropriate water, 116 of those were MX related, less than half of 1% of the total applications received by the division.

Senator Lamb remarked the division knew better than the Finance Committee as to whether the division could handle the workload or not. He asked the division to tell the committee if they felt they had sufficient staff to do the job as the situation was of vital concern to all. Mr. Westergard stated if the division could obtain and hold a full time staff with the addition of the six new positions, he felt the Division of Water Resources could handle the impact. He thought there would be a decrease in the number of applications with fewer and fewer permits being issued.

Senator Glaser asked how long it took to process the subdivision reviews. Mr. Newman stated, by statute, the division had 15 days to respond to those applications.

Mr. Newman displayed a chart showing the increase in protests being filed with the division. He noted the protests could entail a field investigation, and/or, a hearing depending on the intensity of the contest. He said Nye County had filed the most protests in the past two years.

Senator Glaser inquired if the division felt if the present protest fee of \$10 were raised to \$20 that would discourage the filing of protest applications. Mr. Westergard thought it might to some extent but noted the complaints the division had received objecting to fees by people who felt they should not be penalized by being required to pay a fee to protest.

Senator Lamb asked if the division agreed that fees should not be changed. Mr. Westergard agreed but thought there was room for adjustment on the other fees; they could be increased. Mr. Newman disagreed to an extent, noting when the division had a \$2 protest fee, the agency was subject to many harassment protests. People were merely protesting to be on the record. When the fee was raised to \$10, only the most serious protesters filed applications as they were the ones that really had something to protect.

The Vice Chairman inquired how the agency determined the affect an application for a new well would have on existing wells in that area, for example, the well being dug at Coyote Springs. Mr. Newman said if that well went into production, there would be monitoring wells spaced out several miles from it that would be

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

checked on a regular basis. Senator Gibson asked if that would be a requirement made to the Air Force. Mr. Newman stated it would. Referring to the Coyote Springs well, he noted it was about ten to twelve miles from the source of the Muddy River and there were gauges on all the discharges on those springs read once a month. If production was started in that area, those gauges would be read once a week.

The Chairman inquired as to what would happen if the agency denied a well that had been drilled for the MX project. Mr. Newman indicated if the water law had been followed, as the MX people had indicated it would be, then a denial would have to be appealed in a district court. He said the test would come if the denial was appealed in a district or a Federal court, or if the reservation doctrine was invoked.

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Newman what he anticipated. Mr. Newman said he was hoping the MX people would go to the State District Court and follow the procedures set by the statutes. The Chairman commented if MX went to a Federal court, that meant they did not recognize the State's water rights.

Senator Echols inquired if the Western States Water Council was as effective as indicated in the narrative. Mr. Newman thought it was the most effective voice the West had in the area of Federal water policies and programs. Mr. Westergard concurred with that statement.

Senator Jacobsen asked, referring to geological survey, if the MX people were doing what the State wanted them to. Mr. Newman stated the division had built those programs on a priority basis and were anticipating an attitude of cooperation with the MX people in those areas.

Senator Glaser inquired, referring to the Hydraulic Engineer III position, if those employees were hired experienced or did they come to the division from right out of college. Mr. Newman stated those engineering positions would not qualify right out of college; they had to be a graduate of an engineering school and have four to six years of experience. The Senator asked what the salary would be for an engineer hired right out of college. Mr. Newman indicated the salary would start at approximately \$16,000 per year. He said the division would accept any kind of engineering degree and would train that individual in hydrology.

Senator Jacobsen noted there was no "training" item in the budget. Mr. Barrett believed no funds were requested for training by the division. He felt the division would be eligible to receive training funds from the Governor's Training account.

Mr. Newman showed the committee a chart indicating the number of applications denied and noted that was the area where the division generated a great number of their court appeals. The division was in litigation presently with approximately sixty of those types of appeals.

Division of Water Planning (Pg. 784)

Mr. Jim Hawk, Administrator of the Division of Water Planning, presented this budget to the committee. Mr. Hawk recapped the status of his division noting it was created by legislature in 1977 as a separate agency. He stated there were two basic types of activity within the division: working with local communities in developing water resource plans, and, waste-water disposal when it affected overall water management. The agency also studied storm water activity. For the State, the division also was involved in policy activity, recommendations for economic development, and the overall management of the State's water resources.

Mr. Hawk said 80% of the agency's last two years activity had been directly aimed at the local communities, 20% of their activity was on a statewide basis. The agency's philosophy in their approach to water planning was to use the available resources through the U.S. Water Resources Council. This was a

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Federal agency which, through its Title II program, gave funds to the State of Nevada. Those funds were used on a matching basis to hire consulting professional engineers to provide the direct assistance that the local communities needed. By doing that, the agency was able to respond quickly and appropriately to the communities' needs without adding to the number of agency personnel.

The State appropriation received by the agency was utilized to support the activities of the division which was comprised of two professional staff members and one clerical assistant. Mr. Hawk said the budget presented to the committee did not address one of the major changes taking place in Nevada presently, the MX missile project. The budget did reflect the growth changes in Nevada and the demand and need for water planning. He indicated the budget had been organized by way of listing the highest priority projects.

Senator McCorkle asked if the division involvement with deep-water wells would have a significant impact on supplies. Mr. Hawk stated the division had felt an impact in several ways peripherally. He noted an ongoing study being done on deep-water wells conducted through a regional study of the USGS from which the division was receiving some information. He felt the MX project was going to fund a substantial research project soon concerning deep-water wells, also.

Senator McCorkle felt the DRI was taking a very passive role in working on the deep-water well project with the Air Force. Mr. Hawk thought the DRI was being reasonably aggressive on the subject and were being very cooperative in working with his division and the State Engineer in preparing their proposal. Mr. Westergard thought the DRI was being as aggressive as they felt they could be. He said one of the problems that occurred was when DRI submitted their proposal; the Air Force indicated to them that the results of their investigation would not be subject to public disclosure. He felt that any public monies spent on those types of investigations should be available to the public. He added, referring to the shallow wells the Air Force had been drilling, that information had to be submitted to the agency.

Program Income. The regular appropriation, separated from the salary items, represented a 2% decrease for the 1981-82 program. For the 1982-83 program, there would be a 3% decrease.

Salary. Mr. Hawk stated, in keeping with the Governor's recommendation to reduce State personnel, the agency had reduced their Management Assistant position from full-time to half-time.

Senator Glaser asked how secure the appropriation of \$345,000 from the Water Resource Council was. Mr. Hawk stated those monies were uncertain and not at all secure. He noted there had been a lot of interest generated in developing a block grant type of appropriation to develop a water planning grant to states.

Senator Echols inquired if the division had done any research on the recycling of water. Mr. Hawk stated the agency was very interested in that type of program. He indicated a current program of the division dealt with on-site waste water treatment.

Senator Jacobsen asked what the agency's forecast was for the summer. Mr. Hawk indicated the forecast did not look good at present, approximately 50% of what the normal level should be.

California/Nevada Interstate Water Compact (Pg. 786)

Mr. Westergard said this program was for funds to initiate Congressional consideration of the California/Nevada Interstate Water Compact which would allocate the waters of Lake Tahoe, the Truckee River, and the Carson and Walker Rivers between the states of California and Nevada. The program was ratified in the Nevada Legislature of 1971, and, hopefully, at a future date, to have it ratified by U.S. Congress. The \$500 shown in the budget were the monies necessary for the expenses of the Nevada Commission to prepare for that effort.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Oil and Gas Conservation Commission (Pg. 787)

Ms. Joyce Hall, Administrator of the Division of Mineral Resources, presented this budget. This fund was established prior to 1977. The monies came from a .5¢ per barrel tax levied against every barrel of oil produced in the State of Nevada. There would be a tax levied of .5¢ per 50,000 cubic feet of natural gas if there were any in Nevada. There was also a fee of \$50 for every oil and gas permit issued in the State of Nevada. These funds were used to administer the Oil and Gas Conservation Law. Hearings were held, on occasion, at the request of operators in the State pertaining to spacing of the oil fields, water disposal, etc., to insure orderly development of the State's oil and gas resources.

The balance forward shown on the budget were the monies not spent from the prior receipts into the fund. Oil and gas production fees for 1981-82 were estimated to be approximately \$9,000. Ms. Hall noted the decline of oil and gas production in the State during the last year.

Senator Lamb asked how often the agency's Board met. Ms. Hall stated the Board met approximately four times a year. She noted an error in the budget; the Board's funding did not come out of this account as shown.

Division of Mineral Resources (Pg. 804)

Ms. Hall presented this budget to the committee. She indicated this division served several functions: the administering of the oil and gas conservation laws, the review and evaluation of policies of the Federal government as they affected the oil, gas, and mining industry in Nevada, and the issuance of permits for all wells drilled in the State. The agency also maintained records of information pertaining to those wells. The division published monthly oil and gas production reports.

Ms. Hall felt the most important of the division's functions was the monitoring of the Federal government. She noted the tremendous growth of mining activity in the State and the great influx of requests received by the agency asking for mining information.

Positions. This budget reflected a reduction of the Management Assistant I position from full-time to half-time.

Board and Commission salaries. These salaries were based on a \$60 per diem for four meetings per year. The Board was composed of seven members.

Office supplies and expense. Reflected inflationary impacts over 1979-80.

Communication expenses. Reflected inflationary impacts.

The Chairman inquired if the Board's travel budget reflected inflationary increases also. Ms. Hall concurred.

Division of Conservation Districts (Pg. 788)

Ms. Pamela Wilcox, Administrator of the Division of Conservation Districts, presented her agency's budget to the committee. She noted conservation districts existed throughout the State and worked with private landowners, assisting them to accomplish soil and water conservation. Also, the agency worked on public lands by agreement with the public agency involved.

Senator Lamb asked Senator Glaser if he saw any benefits in the conservation districts program. Senator Glaser indicated he lived in a conservation district and thought there were some instances where the agency performed beneficial services. He believed the agency helped to reduce some of the stringent rules and regulations imposed by Federal agencies and recommended the continuation of the division's budget.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Senator Jacobsen noted this division was very active in his area, Lake Tahoe, Douglas County and Carson City. He felt the State would be hard pressed to find another agency that could perform those kinds of services, the catering to agricultural interests and development.

Senator Echols requested an explanation of the "Special NIC" item in the budget. Ms. Wilcox said, by statute, it was required that members of elected boards and appointed commissions be covered by NIC insurance. The division had not been aware of that requirement in the past and were now budgeting for it in the biennial budget.

Senator Echols asked Ms. Wilcox if she was familiar with the conservancy problem in Washoe County. Ms. Wilcox stated she was familiar with the problem, although her division had no direct connection with the situation. She added the conservation district in Washoe County was heavily involved in the urban sub-conservancy problem.

Senator Jacobsen requested a chart of accomplishments of this division over the past year. Ms. Wilcox said she would provide such. She noted the Best Management Practices Manual prepared by her division as a result of the Federal government requiring the State to develop a water quality management plan for control of non-point source pollution. The manual provided information on how to prevent soil erosion, how to farm, construction management practices, etc.

The Chairman commented that he had been involved with conservation districts all his life. He said this division had been able to acquire equipment through the Federal government at a very minimal cost. Presently, he was receiving complaints from private entities indicating the division was doing work all over the State and making it difficult for those private entities. He felt, if the division was beneficial in any way, it was through the acquisition of that equipment and the subsequent rental of that equipment to farmers.

Ms. Wilcox said the division had become increasingly more involved with urban activities. These areas had an agreement with their local planning commission for assistance in plugging resource information into the master planning process and the process of reviewing development proposals.

Division of State Lands (Pg. 790)

Mr. Jack Shaw, Administrator of the Division of State Lands, presented this budget. Mr. Shaw noted, referring to the division's Land Records section, two years ago, the agency indicated they were going to store all the old land records on computer so the originals could be put in a protected area. To date, all the clear lists from grants were stored in the computer with the originals being kept in a fire-proof safe in the Archives division.

Income. Mr. Shaw said the agency had no grant monies although the budget showed under the Governor's recommendation column a figure of \$40,000 in grant monies. He noted this was due to a change in administration; the agency had received HUD monies in the past for their land-use planners in assisting the smaller communities. These monies were becoming harder and harder to get, so, the agency had decided they could do without those funds. He stated the Governor and the Budget Division decided the division should have the \$40,000 in HUD monies.

Senator Lamb asked if the division thought it would receive the \$40,000 in Federal HUD funds. Mr. Shaw felt they would not and had some deep concerns regarding those monies. In his opinion, he believed the division's two planners had done an exceptional job in helping the small communities with their planning problems. If those Federal monies were lost, and personnel had to be cut, those communities would have to hire consultants. Mr. Shaw felt that alternative would not be cost-effective or good for the people of Nevada. He thought the division would not need the full \$40,000 in Federal funds because of the administrative costs

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

incurred in the handling of the Federal grants. He requested the committee to consider the possibility of those funds being cut.

Existing positions. One position had been eliminated. Mr. Shaw felt the division would not progress as fast in their Land Records section as they would like, but thought they would be able to get by.

Sagebrush Rebellion position. Two years ago, the legislature approved \$250,000 through Interim Finance to staff this division with one Planner for the two year interim. The division used approximately one quarter of those funds. Mr. Shaw felt because there were so many bills this session concerning the land issues, the agency felt it would be better to let any decisions concerning this position be made after all legislation had been heard. He hoped the Finance Committee would consider refunding that position, as the division was recommending, to allow the land issue study to continue. He noted, last month, Secretary of the Interior Watt sent an emergency letter to Governor List requesting him to ask all the communities what lands they would like to see released around their urban areas. Part of the responsibilities of the Planner position was to inventory those lands.

Senator Glaser asked how many acres the communities wanted released. Mr. Shaw stated the inventory showed that Clark and Elko counties had requested that 500,000 acres be released out of a total of 800,000 acres inventoried state-wide. Due to the interest Nevada generated in the whole land issue, Secretary Watt had already asked for two pieces of Congressional action. One piece of legislation would change the Wilderness Act to allow lands to go back into multiple use management immediately. The other would change the Wild Horse Act to allow for reasonable management of numbers. Mr. Shaw felt those two pieces of legislation, alone, would return the \$250,000 ten times over.

In-state travel. The division had requested \$11,000 for this item, the Governor had recommended \$7,500. When the division prepared its original budget, they included the Sagebrush position with the travel that position would require. Later, the agency decided to take out that position but did not reduce the in-state travel in the budget document, accordingly.

Senator Jacobsen requested an explanation of the "special reports" item. Mr. Shaw indicated those reports had to do with any type of report the division prepared.

Senator Echols asked if there were any fees charged for the permits issued by the division. Mr. Shaw stated the agency charged very few fees. He said the budget concerning the Carey Act contained fees and that budget operated totally off a trust fund.

Senator Echols inquired if the MX project would have any impact on the division. Mr. Shaw said it had an impact on every State agency.

Senator Echols requested a status report on data processing within the division. Mr. Shaw stated there was a transfer of monies in the budget to a "special EDP charges" category in order to put the division's records on the computer. He noted the division might not use all those monies next year due to their decreased staff.

Senator Echols felt there should be more user fees charged by this division. Mr. Shaw indicated the agency was working hard in developing fees for services they performed. One possibility pertained to charging the small communities for planning services if HUD monies were not obtained. Senator Lamb noted the smaller communities had funding problems also.

State Multiple Use Advisory Committee on Federal Lands (Pg. 793)

Mr. Shaw said there were no changes in this budget other than the general increase in per diem to the committee members.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Carey Act Trust Fund (Pg. 794)

Mr. Shaw indicated this program was running out of trust funds due to the three year delay involving a suit between Idaho and the Department of the Interior. The agency was not going to continue with its one staff member, but would continue by using existing members of staff within the Division of State lands. He said the agency was very close in getting individuals on the land. If that happened before the legislature finalized all the budgets, and, if the agency had some concrete evidence that individuals were residing on the land prior to Spring, they might come back to the legislature and request an advance, the way the program started originally. This would be a loan from the General Fund to be repaid when the settlers paid for the land.

Senator Jacobsen asked what the status was on the Verdi Fish Hatchery appraisal. Mr. Shaw noted that appraisal had just started.

The Vice Chairman indicated he had just spent a few minutes with General McCarthy of the U.S. Air Force discussing the issue concerning the deep-water well testing. General McCarthy said there was a misunderstanding over this issue because government contracts indicated any information gathered was proprietary to the client. The Air Force obtained the information first, but then that information would be released. There was no intention of keeping that material secret. General McCarthy told Senator Gibson he would follow up on this particular situation.

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) (Pg. 803)

Mr. Westergard noted the TRPA was reconstituted during a special session of the legislature last Fall. The budget requested \$150,000 for the State's share of monies necessary to operate the agency. The responsibilities of the TRPA over the next two and one-half years were going to be extremely significant, according to Mr. Westergard.

Senator Lamb requested an explanation of why the agency had only requested \$50,000 for this budget, yet, the Governor had recommended \$150,000. Mr. Westergard said when the budget was first proposed, it was before the special session and before Congress had ratified the compacts. The agency was not sure if it would be charged with the responsibility of developing threshold-carrying capacities and amendments to the general plan. TRPA felt, in order to carry out those responsibilities in an effective manner, it would take monies somewhere in the area of \$600,000 to \$700,000. The compact itself provided that \$150,000 of those funds should come from the local entities. Nevada's share would be \$150,000, and, California, under the terms of the compact, would be required to pay \$300,000.

Senator Gibson asked what California's status was on their allocation and those portions of money they had not contributed. Mr. Westergard said California had indicated they did not intend to appropriate funds for their prior share not submitted. He stated that he had heard from sources in California that the state would attempt to secure the funds to support the agency for the balance of this fiscal year and would also support funding for the next biennium.

Senator Wilson felt the problem had to do with the Governor's office in California and not that state's legislature.

Senator Echols requested a copy of the staff breakdown within this agency. Mr. Westergard said he would provide that information to the committee.

Senator Jacobsen asked how far the Nevada segment of TRPA would go before calling it quits with California if that state did not pay. Mr. Westergard stated there had been no discussion concerning that matter.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Senator Jacobsen inquired as to what Nevada's attitude was concerning the matter of cooperation with California on TRPA. Mr. Westergard thought Nevada's attitude was good. The State had developed rules of procedures, had adopted an emergency ordinance which would exempt certain activities within the basin, and had adopted draft ordinances concerning charges. Mr. Westergard felt the State had come a long way in the past two months and had proven TRPA was the vehicle to protect the basin.

Mr. Westergard noted the agency was in the throes of developing a water quality management plan and the ordinances to implement water quality details. Directions were given to the staff to prepare an ordinance that would allow a single family residence construction on individual lots. Lands that were not sensitive areas could be developed.

Senator Jacobsen asked if the Nevada counties had all made their contributions. Mr. Westergard said county representatives served on the Board and had been vocal in advancing their positions.

Comstock Historic District Commission (Pg. 808)

Mr. Westergard stated this commission was not actually a division within the department but had been included in the department's budget sequence. This agency was responsible for protecting the historical resources within the Comstock district. The budget monies were to provide funds for certain janitorial services to insure the responsibilities of the district were carried out.

Senator Jacobsen said he, Senator Getto, and Assemblyman Dini had met with the Comstock Commission to find out how they felt about putting the commission under History and Museums. Mr. Westergard noted there were pros and cons both ways on that issue. He believed the historical and archaeological resources of the State were, in a sense, a natural resource. In that regard, he felt it would be a natural conclusion to have this agency in the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources. Mr. Westergard said he would not oppose the transfer of the commission if the legislature felt it would be served better in another department.

Environmental Protection (Pg. 799)

Mr. Lou Dodgion, Administration of the State Division of Environmental Protection, presented this budget to the committee. He noted this division was charged with the implementation and enforcement of the State Water Pollution Control Act, the Air Pollution Control Act, and the Solid and Hazardous Waste Management programs. He said the programs were mandated by Federal law, the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act. These were implemented at the Federal level by regulations promulgated by the Federal Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. Dodgion stated the agency had thirty-three authorized positions in addition to a contract for an Intergovernmental Personnel Act individual from Region IX. Twenty-one of the positions were supported from the General Fund, twelve were supported totally from Federal funds. The division was organized into four sections: Administrative, Air Pollution Control, Water Pollution Control, and Waste Management.

The Chairman asked Mr. Dodgion to justify the agency request for ten new positions. Mr. Dodgion noted these positions were being requested for the Construction Grants Management administration. The 1977 amendments to the Clean Water Act provided that the administration of that program could be delegated solely to the states with the majority of the decisions being handled at the state level. The division approved the 1979 legislature and requested permission to implement that program. It was approved by the 1979 legislature as a one-line budget item of \$250,000 with the understanding that when the delegation agreement had been completed with EPA and the grant awarded, the staffing requirements would be determined and submitted to Interim Finance for their approval. Mr. Dodgion said the agency had received the agreement and grant award with sufficient funds to support the program through Federal fiscal year 1982. The staffing

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

requirements determined by the agency were the ten positions as shown in the budget. He noted the advantages to the State in the administering of this program; it would provide better services to the Nevada communities, more accountability as to which projects would receive funding, better service could be provided in getting the grant payments out, etc. The program would enable the division to provide assistance to the smaller communities for their grant preparations.

Mr. Dodgion indicated, since budget preparation, it had been made apparent that construction grants funding was going to be reduced. The latest information received by the agency indicated that rather than receiving 20 million dollars for each of the next five years, 12 million dollars for each of the five years would be funded.

Senator Lamb asked what the agency would do when that Federal money ran out. Mr. Dodgion said when the funds ran out, the program would end and staffing reduced.

Senator Gibson requested a list of the agency's five year program. Mr. Dodgion said he would provide such to the committee.

The Chairman requested an explanation of "hazardous waste" as defined by the agency. Mr. Dodgion stated, under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, the EPA was required to promulgate regulations and to establish a nationwide hazardous waste management program. Hazardous waste under this program excluded the radioactive materials.

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Dodgion as to how much power his agency had with regard to the decision making process for any of the areas the division was involved in. Mr. Dodgion noted the agency had very limited statutory authority presently to control hazardous waste disposal in the State. The agency had developed a bill, Assembly Bill No. 196, which would give the agency a great deal of authority to regulate the generation, storage, transportation, processing, and disposal of hazardous waste in the State.

Senator McCorkle inquired if the hazardous waste category included chemical wastes. Mr. Dodgion said it did. The Senator noted a list published by the agency showing violators of the Federal standards without, in Senator McCorkle's opinion, any evidence to support the allegations. Mr. Dodgion said he concurred with the Senator's statement. He indicated, prior to November of last year, a contractor was hired to try and identify any and all activities in all of the states of those people who might conceivably generate some sort of hazardous waste in order to get a handle on that problem.

Senator McCorkle asked if the State had any advocate concerning the over-abundance of regulations in this area. Mr. Dodgion felt there was not, unless the State EPA was given the authority to administer those regulations rather than the Federal agency.

Senator Glaser asked how many citations were given by the agency for violations of the Clean Air and Clean Water Act last year. Mr. Dodgion was not sure of the number of citations issued.

The Chairman commented on how much good it was to issue a citation if the agency had no power to enforce them. Mr. Dodgion noted there was enforcement power in the water and air program. The reason revenues did not appear in the budget for fees and fines was because the statutes provided that those funds revert to the educational fund. Mr. Barrett stated those funds showed in the Permanent School Fund budget.

The Vice Chairman inquired as who defined "hazardous waste". Mr. Dodgion said the Federal EPA defined such under their rules and regulations. Senator Gibson noted there were some criminal penalties in Assembly Bill No. 196 where individuals were made responsible without telling them what they were responsible for. Mr. Dodgion felt the hazardous waste regulations promulgated by the Federal EPA were going to be changed a great deal. Senator Gibson thought the bill, as presently written, was ambiguous and obscure.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Senator Lamb asked if the agency had gotten involved with the Kennecott problem in Ely. Mr. Dodgion indicated he was involved with the situation, presently but was not with the division when most of the problem was occurring. He said the company was still in operation, and, the agency, through the Governor's office, was issuing variances to the State regulations while waiting for EPA to act on the amendments to the State implementation plan. In addition, there was an amendment to the Federal act, known as the Non-Ferrous Smelter Order, that was specifically introduced to the Federal act for the McGill smelter. He stated that EPA had now acted on the legislation and had issued their regulations on how one went about obtaining a Non-Ferrous Smelter Order which would exempt them from some of the requirements. The company had their application for an exemption under the Non-Ferrous Smelter Act before the agency for evaluation at present.

Senator Glaser felt the aforementioned was one of the few justifications for this State agency, the ability to intercede between the State and the Federal government. Unless this agency was able to act as a buffer between the State and the Federal EPA, and, administered the rules and regulations ensuing in a fair and reasonable manner, Senator Glaser did not think there was any reason to continue this agency.

Senator Jacobsen, referring to the previous day's Interim Finance meeting, said it was apparent that the Ways and Means Committee was unhappy about the new positions being requested by the agency. Mr. Dodgion stated the Construction Grants Administration program was not a regulatory program and was not an enforcement program. The program provided monies available through the Federal Clean Water Act for grants to local municipalities to construct or improve their waste-water treatment plants to meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act.

The Chairman commented if the agency had not received the grant money, they would not be requesting the new positions. Mr. Dodgion concurred. Senator Lamb said the committee was just as concerned about the grant money as they were with the taxpayers money. Mr. Westergard pointed out that if the State did not assume the obligation, the decision on where those grant monies went would be made by the Federal EPA in San Francisco rather than by a representative of the State of Nevada.

Senator Lamb stated this program could mushroom into something bigger than what the State wanted. He thought the EPA was not popular throughout the communities of Nevada and noted the State agency still waited for the Federal government to make up its mind. Mr. Dodgion felt the State and the agency had quite an impact on the Kennecott situation. Senator Lamb thought it was Senator Cannon and his group who had made the impact.

The Vice Chairman asked what the status was at the Kennecott operation. Mr. Dodgion indicated the mining operation was shut down primarily because of the ore. The smelter was still operating. Senator Gibson asked if it was Mr. Dodgion's agency that promulgated the standards on handling mine dumps, etc. Mr. Dodgion said mine dumps were exempt from the hazardous waste program under the Federal government. If the mine dump were operated as an acid-leaching situation, then the agency did control the construction and the monitoring of that pond.

Senator Gibson requested an explanation of the out-of-state travel increases for the agency. Mr. Dodgion stated that item had increased from \$2,500 to almost \$16,000. The majority of the increase was associated with the pending ten new positions for their coordination travel back and forth to San Francisco for discussions with the Federal EPA.

Mr. Dodgion indicated the budget was made up of \$631,072 in General Fund appropriations with the remainder being anticipated grant fundings. The agency had budgeted the General Fund money for \$487,930 to support the twenty-one General Fund positions, and \$25,051 for in-state travel.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Mr. Dodgion stated the agency's original budget request had asked for two positions which were subsequently eliminated in the department budget reviews. However, some of the associated expenses for those positions remained in the budget in the amount of \$5,364. A memo had been submitted detailing where those monies were located in the budget.

Senator Lamb remarked when the budget was first submitted, two positions were cut. Then, the agency was promised more money through a Federal grant and now was requesting ten more positions. Mr. Dodgion said that was what the agency was proposing to the legislature.

Senator Echols requested an explanation of the "contractual services" item. Mr. Dodgion noted all contracts were not shown under this budget item where they had been previously shown in different areas. He indicated he would provide the Senator with a detailed breakdown of all the contracts.

Senator Echols also requested information concerning the qualifications of the Chief of Environmental Services, what the Public Engineer position entailed, an explanation of the Public Health Engineer, and information regarding the "EDP systems" category. Mr. Dodgion said he would furnish the information as requested.

Environmental Commission (Pg. 796)

Mr. John Fransway, Chairman of the Environmental Commission, introduced Mr. Jim Hannah, the Executive Secretary of the commission. Mr. Fransway presented general comments concerning this budget.

Mr. Fransway felt it was an impossibility for the EPA to be a buffer between the State and the Federal government. As long as the EPA reached out to "snap" the grants, the agency could never be a buffer, in Mr. Fransway's opinion. He noted the main concern of the Environmental Commission was Nevada industry and felt his commission was very instrumental in enabling the Kernecott mine to stay open.

Mr. Fransway stated the Commission was involved in controlling air quality, water quality, and solid waste. Referring to dumps, he said the Commission had acted as intermediary to help work out a solution that was suitable to everyone.

The Chairman of the Environmental Commission said the agency ran for two years after his appointment with a half-time secretary. He felt it was absolutely urgent that the commission have a full-time secretary as approved by the last session of the legislature. If the commission was to remain independent from the EPA, they needed to have a full time staff.

Senator Wilson asked Mr. Fransway if he was referring to the Management Assistant I position as shown in the budget. Mr. Fransway said yes. The Senator noted this half-time position cut was an agency request. Mr. Fransway stated that his opinion was not considered when that request was submitted nor had it been brought to his attention. Mr. Fransway indicated he was dissatisfied with Mr. Westergard's stance on this matter.

Mr. Fransway noted his commission had rejected a 1.2 million dollar Federal grant for the reason of not wanting to be under any obligation to the Federal government.

Mr. Howard Wynn, speaking for himself, testified in support of Mr. Fransway's position on the retention of the full time Management Assistant I employee because of the principal it involved. He said the Environmental Commission was very important to the State and performed important functions in the settling of water quality standards and was a buffer between the State and the Federal government. Mr. Wynn concluded by saying he felt the agency needed more staff assistance to increase its level of activity and the Commission's stature needed to be enhanced.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Senator Echols requested an explanation of "agency publication". Mr. Hannah said NRS 223B.070 required the agency to provide their regulations and rules of practice to the public upon request.

Senator Echols asked what "state owned building rent" constituted. Mr. Hannah said that item had previously been under the State EPA division.

Senator Glaser inquired as to where Mr. Hannah was housed. Mr. Hannah stated the agency was located in Room 104 of the Nye Building.

Senator Jacobsen asked Mr. Hannah if he thought the agency needed a full time secretary. Mr. Hannah remarked he was obligated to support the budget requested, at whatever level it was approved.

Senator Wilson felt it was Mr. Hannah's obligation to speak candidly, as a matter of judgement, concerning the full time position. Mr. Fransway commented that the commission needed to be taken out from under the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and be made an independent commission. He noted all other regulatory commissions in Nevada were independent. He felt the situation, as it was currently, would not work.

Mr. Westergard responded to Mr. Fransway's statements. He said it was necessary to set some priorities within the department since monies available to the State were going to be more limited than in the past. He stated in almost every one of the department's divisions, those agencies had experienced staff reductions. The department felt that by combining four half-time positions into two full time positions, they would be able to meet the State's responsibilities, and, at the same time, be responsive to the need to cut expenses.

Senator Lamb thought that in most cases, the committee would agree with Mr. Westergard's position, but noted no one could be totally tight with all the budgets. He felt it was foolish to sit and argue over a reduction of half a position. Mr. Westergard said, in his opinion, a half-time position would be adequate for the commission. The Chairman asked if any of the duties of the commission would be neglected if the position were reduced. Mr. Westergard felt that would not occur.

Senator Lamb stated the committee was not going to "rubber stamp" the department's budgets. Mr. Westergard stated he understood that.

Senator Jacobsen noted he had never received an answer from Mr. Hannah concerning his feelings over the position reduction. Mr. Fransway said there had been some difficulty in the department over the fact of who Mr. Hannah worked for. Mr. Fransway felt he worked for the Environmental Commission while Mr. Westergard thought Mr. Hannah worked for the department.

In response to Senator Jacobsen's question, Mr. Hannah stated he would try to fulfill his duties with the half-time position. He added that he did believe the volume and content of the commission's output would decline as a result.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST NO. 41-756 (S.B. 418)

Senator Jacobsen moved for approval for introduction of Bill Draft Request No. 41-756 related to Gaming.

Senator Echols seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

BILL DRAFT REQUEST NO. S-1850 (S.B. 417)

Senator Jacobsen moved for approval for introduction of Bill Draft Request S-1850 related to the Hoover Dam Power contract.

Senate Committee on Finance
March 17, 1981

Senator Echols seconded the motion.

The motion carried unanimously.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 9:50 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:


Candace L. Chaney, Secretary

APPROVED BY:


Senator Floyd R. Lamb, Chairman

DATE:

3/31/81

SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committee on FINANCE, Room (See Below).
Day (See Below), Date (See Below), Time 8:00 a.m.

MONDAY, MARCH 16, 1981 - ROOM 131

1. Interim Finance Committee Meeting

TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1981 - ROOM 231

1. Nevada State Council of the Arts (Pg. 309 - Jacqueline Belmont)
2. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (Pgs. 778-842)
(Roland Westergard)

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 18, 1981 - ROOM 231

1. Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (Completion of the budgets)



Nevada State Council on the Arts

101-2979

329 Flint Street
Reno, Nevada 89501
(702) 784-6231

FY1982-1983 BIENNIAL BUDGET PRESENTATION

Agency Mission: "...it is the policy of the State of Nevada to join with institutions and professional organizations concerned with the arts to insure that the role of the arts in the life of the communities of the state will continue to grow and play an ever-increasing part in the cultural development and educational experience of the citizens of the State of Nevada."

(Nevada Revised Statutes 233C, 1967)

PROGRAM STATEMENT

In 1967, Nevada Revised Statutes 233C established the Nevada State Council on the Arts. To carry out its mission, the agency provides the following services statewide:

1. The Council serves as the official State agency to receive and disburse federal funds from the National Endowment for the Arts for cultural organizations and individual artists throughout Nevada;
2. The Council provides leadership, information, programming and technical assistance in the development of the arts at the community, regional and statewide levels;
3. The Council serves as the official State agency to receive federal funds to provide professional arts resources in public and private schools and other community-based education settings throughout Nevada.

PROGRAM FUNDING

The Council has two basic programs—the GRANTS PROGRAM and the ARTISTS-IN-RESIDENCE PROGRAM and provides technical assistance and information services through each of those programs.

State General Fund Appropriation - To provide operating funds for administration of agency programs and services and programs from the Western States Arts Foundation.

Basic Federal Arts GRANT PROGRAM - (National Endowment for the Arts)

This grant will cover all the Federal/State Partnership programs for the arts in Nevada with the exception of the Artists-in-Education (Residence) program (formerly entitled the Artists-in-Schools program by the Endowment).

The Program Serves:

1. Nevada communities and community arts support organizations;
2. Professional artists and arts organizations in the areas of music, dance, theatre, visual arts and literature;
3. Other State agencies.

The Program Benefits:

1. Provides "seed money" which requires partial, then full support by private and/or public sector; generates local and state earned income and tax revenues for/from artists' wages, goods and services purchased by artists, arts organizations and audiences;

Monies generated by the program in FY1980-81:

- a. Funded organization budgets - \$5,521,890
- b. NSCA Grant Funds - \$ 551,970
- c. Applicant Match to NSCA - \$1,233,628

2. Supports activities which generate business for hotels, restaurants, media; for paper, printing, transportation, construction, gaming and entertainment industries; for community facilities;
3. Assists artists and arts organizations to develop and maintain sound business management and accounting procedures;
4. Supports employment of professional artists, arts organization professional personnel, and special constituencies—handicapped, elderly, ethnic minorities;
5. Cooperates with other State agencies to provide cost-effective programs and services.

Program Location Benefits:

Nevada communities served in FY1980-81 include:

1. Total applications received FY1980 - 146
2. Total applications received FY1981 - 100 (to date)
3. Total applications funded FY1980 - 96
4. Total applications funded FY1981 - 63 (to date)
5. No. of Nevada communities funded - 16

Carson City, Elko, Ely, Fallon, Hawthorne, Henderson, Lake Tahoe, Las Vegas, Lovelock, Panaca, Reno, Schurz, Sparks, Tuscarora, Virginia City, Winnemucca

ARTISTS-IN-RESIDENCE PROGRAM (Artists-in-Education)- This program is part of a nationwide arts program federally funded through matching grants made by the National Endowment for the Arts to state arts agencies.

The Program Serves: Nevada students, educators, artists and arts organizations by providing professional residencies in the areas of music, literature, theatre, architecture and the visual arts, statewide, in schools and school districts and other community-based education settings for grades kindergarten through 12.

The Program Benefits: 1. Provides "seed money" requiring community matching support to grants for artists' residencies for artists salaries, supplies, transportation and housing;

Monies generated by the program in FY1980-81:

- a. NSCA Grant Funds - \$70,200
- b. Applicant Match to NSCA - \$62,915
- c. No. Nevada Counties Funded - 9

- 2. Generates local and state earned income and tax revenues for/from artists' wages, goods and services purchased through the program; supports direct employment of professional artists; creates a statewide job-bank of and provides job information for professional artists;
- 4. Cooperates with other State agencies (primarily Department of Education) to provide cost-effective programs in architecture, literature, music, theatre and visual arts;
- 5. Provides professional training for teachers in arts-related fields;
- 6. Generates income for hotels, restaurants, gaming and entertainment through sponsorship of regional/national conferences conducted in Nevada.

Program Location Benefits: Nevada communities served in FY1980-81 include:

- 1. 9 communities; 38-1/2 residency months - FY1980
- 2. 8 communities; 39 residency months - FY1981

Counties: Carson, Clark, Humboldt, Lincoln, Storey, Washoe, White Pine

Federal Flow-Through Grants - The agency acts as financial liaison for Nevada arts organization which receive grant funds directly from the National Endowment for the Arts.

1183

SUB-ACCOUNT EXPLANATIONS

Salaries: No new positions are recommended.

In-State Travel: Included are provisions to cover travel costs for Council members' and staff travel to attend one annual granting session, one annual policy session and committee meetings, plus staff travel to provide technical assistance to artists, arts and community organizations and to perform on-site audits of funded programs in rural Nevada and Las Vegas, as required by the National Endowment.

Operating: The proposed amounts cover basic inflationary increases, based on actual operating costs for agency programs and services in FY1980-81.

Dues: Proposed amounts reflect actual increased dues to the National Assembly of State Arts Agencies and to the Association of Community Arts Agencies, the national representative organizations for State and community arts agencies, respectively, to the National Endowment. Council membership in these organizations provides information, technical assistance and training to the Council and its constituents and representation through agency personnel on national arts issues affecting Nevada.

Federal Sub-Grants to Arts Organizations and Individual Artists - Grants are awarded through the Council's GRANTS PROGRAM to qualified applicants. In the fiscal 1982-83 biennium, categories in which grants will be awarded are: Direct Assistance, Organizational Development, Arts Services Development and Special Projects. These funds are also used to pay consultants to the Council to fulfill recommended criteria of the National Endowment in processing federal funds awarded to the agency for grants disbursement.

Artists-in-Residence Program - Schools, school districts and community-based education centers apply to the Council for matching grants which fund residencies established on criteria recommended by the National Endowment, which awards these federal funds to the Council.

Western States Arts Foundation (WESTAF) - The Foundation provides regional, cost-effective assistance to the Council, the State, Nevada arts organizations and communities in the areas of touring programs, research, professional training and development of arts programs and projects. The 10 member states include Arizona, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, New Mexico, Oregon, Utah, Washington and Wyoming.

Additional Materials Available:

1. FY1980 & 1981 Basic Grants Program
Financial & Location Summary
2. FY1980 & 1981 Artists-in-Residence Program
Financial & Location Summary
3. Western States Arts Foundation
List of Benefits to Nevada
4. In-State Travel
Itemized Budget for FY1982-83 (Projected)