

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE
ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT AFFAIRS**

**Seventy-Fourth Session
March 6, 2007**

The Committee on Government Affairs was called to order by Chair Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick at 9:01 a.m., on Tuesday, March 6, 2007, in Room 3143 of the Legislative Building, 401 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada. Copies of the minutes, including the Agenda ([Exhibit A](#)), the Attendance Roster ([Exhibit B](#)), and other substantive exhibits are available and on file in the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau and on the Nevada Legislature's website at www.leg.state.nv.us/74th/committees/. In addition, copies of the audio record may be purchased through the Legislative Counsel Bureau's Publications Office (email: publications@lcb.state.nv.us; telephone: 775-684-6835).

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Assemblywoman Marilyn Kirkpatrick, Chair
Assemblywoman Peggy Pierce, Vice Chair
Assemblyman Kelvin Atkinson
Assemblyman Bob Beers
Assemblyman David Bobzien
Assemblyman Chad Christensen
Assemblyman Jerry D. Claborn
Assemblyman Pete Goicoechea
Assemblyman Ruben Kihuen
Assemblyman Harvey J. Munford
Assemblywoman Bonnie Parnell
Assemblyman James Settlemeyer
Assemblyman Lynn D. Stewart
Assemblywoman RoseMary Womack

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Amber Joiner, Committee Policy Analyst
Scott McKenna, Committee Counsel
Emilie Reafs, Committee Secretary
Olivia Lloyd, Committee Assistant

Minutes ID: 473



OTHERS PRESENT:

Nicole J. Lamboley, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State
Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County
Michael W. Harwell, Department of Business License, Clark County
John Slaughter, AICP, Management Services Director, Washoe County
Edwin P. James, P.E. General Manager, Carson Water Subconservancy
District
Genie Azad, Watershed Coordinator, Carson Water Subconservancy
District

[Call to order, Roll call 9:01 a.m.]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

We are hearing two bills this morning, a BDR introduction, and a presentation. I would like to start with the bills.

Assembly Bill 220: Revises certain duties of the Secretary of State. (BDR 18-545)

Nicole J. Lamboley, Chief Deputy, Office of the Secretary of State:

I am joined by Kate Thomas, our Deputy for Operations and Doug Perry, Administrative Services Officer. Assembly Bill 220 was submitted by the Secretary of State's office. As you may recall the Secretary of State is required to submit to the Governor a biennial report on the business of the office. This was the report that Secretary Miller handed you when he made his presentation on the role and responsibilities of the Secretary of State.

Currently this report is due August first in even-numbered years. The bill proposes to change the effective date when the report is due to the Governor to September fifteenth. The reason we are seeking this change is because the fiscal year ends June thirtieth. It usually takes about a month and a half to accurately close out the fiscal year and report the expenditures and revenues. We are seeking the month and half delay in order to make sure we have accurately closed out the fiscal year.

Second, under current law the Secretary of State is required to refund payments made to the office in excess of \$15. Any excess payment that has not been refunded is deposited with the State Treasurer and credited to the General Fund. This bill would allow any refund that the Office could not make within 12 months, to be received and deposited with the State Treasurer. It would repeal the provision and allow the person who made the excess payment to claim a refund with the State Board of Examiners within 30 days of the

payment date. This does not remove the right of the person to seek a claim for refund of the excess payment, it just removes the requirement that they go through the Board of Examiners within 30 days. This would actually allow them, within a 12 month period, to seek the refund directly from the Secretary of State. This bill would align current practice of the State with the provisions of Chapter 353.115 of *Nevada Revised Statutes* (NRS).

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

How often do you have people that are far in excess of \$15?

Nicole Lamboley:

It is rare, but there are occasions. Corporate filings might miscalculate, but there is not a pattern that we can establish that would tell you the fiscal impact.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

What would you suspect?

Nicole Lamboley:

I can get that information; I do not have it at the current time.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

At this time I will ask is there is anyone who would like to support, oppose or be neutral on A.B. 220. [There was none.] I will close the hearing on A.B. 220.

The next bill is A.B. 221.

Assembly Bill 221: Authorizes a board of county commissioners, under certain circumstances, to provide a civil penalty in lieu of a criminal penalty for the violation of certain ordinances. (BDR 20-354)

Sabra Smith-Newby, Director, Intergovernmental Relations, Clark County:

I have Michael Harwell of the Clark County Business Licensing Department with me. [Read from statement, ([Exhibit C](#))].

[Page 3]...This is important because it puts into statute an appeals process by which the business may appeal an action from a license officer. In fact we already have a process for appeals set up that is currently used for things like work card denials, it would simply add another category to this appeals process. That process would end with an action from the Board of County Commissioners and if that did not work for the business, they could then take it to District Court. [Resumed reading from statement.]

Chair Kirkpatrick:

If this bill was to pass and went into effect July first, when would your ordinance go into place? Would there be a public process?

Sabra Smith-Newby:

The ordinance would have to go through the regular process which involves several different steps, hearings, and public input. It would probably need a Business Impact Statement, which is required by the NRS.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

For everyone's knowledge it said that there may or may not be a fiscal note, we did receive something back. There is a fiscal note, but there is no impact.

Assemblyman Beers:

If I understand this correctly, if only criminal penalties are allowed, the end result would be that pieces of the business base are lost and additional expense is incurred from pursuing criminal actions?

Sabra Smith-Newby:

I will ask Mike [Harwell] to answer that. I do not know where the criminal proceedings have ended as to what the result will be to business. There is additional expense for county and business in undertaking any legal action.

Michael W. Harwell, Department of Business License, Clark County:

The criminal process that we have now, we cite the business under one of our code violations, and we go through the court process, which could take up to a year. It would usually end up with a fine by the judge or some sort of probationary period, but all the while the business would continue operating, continuing the violations. If it is an unlicensed business, per se, it could be violating some areas of environmental regulations which could impact safety because it has not gone through the inspections that the licensing process would entail.

Assemblyman Beers:

There is a fiscal note, correct?

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Let me just clarify, because I misspoke. There is no impact on local government and they cannot determine if there is any real cost to it. You can pull it up on the Internet and look at the fiscal note. I will read the comments: "A small potential negative impact on expenses associated with staffing and hearing may be offset by revenues from fees collected in increased compliance." That was from Churchill County, and Humboldt County sent back a comment saying:

"According to the County Clerk, this Bill Draft Request (BDR) would result in associated costs if the Board of County Commissioners chose to impose these penalties, but those costs cannot be determined at this time. Costs will be associated with the enforcement of the issue, including but not limited to, the investigation of violators, hearing officer, or any other board."

So out of 17 counties, two counties are not sure what the impact will be, but it also says in here that they will have the opportunity to address that within their ordinance. That is the way I understand it.

Assemblyman Beers:

So it appears to me that adding the option of civil penalties is going to save a lot of money. Lawyers cost counties and towns, much less private individuals. Two years of legal action versus a couple of months...it seems fairly common sense.

Michael Harwell:

That is our point. District Attorneys (D.A.s) cost money, their attorneys cost money, there are court costs involved, plus it ties up the courts with these types of issues when they are dealing with so many other things. This process would alleviate that pressure on the court system and on the businesses that will comply. There are some people that are circumventing the law and hopefully they will come into compliance. The reason there would be an undetermined fiscal impact is the cost of the hearing process because of what we pay the hearing officer, and the fines that may be up to \$1,000 or may be \$0. It depends on how the hearing process turns out for each licensee. It could be resolved in that process and they file for the business license. Or the business owner could be assessed a penalty, and if he does not agree, there is a process where he could go to the County Commission and if necessary on to the District Court.

We feel that there is sufficient due process still in the system. We would be happy with more compliance. It makes it fairer for businesses that are complying and it serves to enhance the safety and the environment of the community by making sure that people are doing the right business in the right zone.

Assemblyman Beers:

This does not eliminate the criminal penalties that may be imposed if deemed necessary?

Michael Harwell:

No, it does not.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

For the committee, I represent both jurisdictions: Humboldt and Churchill and I will contact Chairman Frey and Chairman Milton. Clearly they must be misunderstanding something in the bill because the liability, whether it be criminal or civil, falls on the county to enforce. I do not know why there is opposition; it makes sense to me to put an ordinance in place to impose civil penalties.

Assemblyman Christensen:

Cities are able to work this way, as this bill outlines. How long have they been able to and why have counties not? [To Mr. Harwell] You said that it would alleviate pressure on the courts, I was just wondering if there was anyone here from the courts who was planning on speaking to that.

Sabra Smith-Newby:

In response to your first question, NRS 268.019, the power of cities to impose civil liability was added to the NRS in 1973. It was amended in 2005. I believe that Clark County had presented this bill once before but there were questions about what would happen if a business were in violation of a State statute as well as a local one. The concern was that if the County had the ability to impose a civil action against the business, then the State would not reap the financial rewards for the business violating the State statute. We fixed that this time with the clause that states that when there is a conflict between State statute and county code, that the State statute trumps the county ordinance.

It is also important to mention with respect to counties that may or may not want to enact it. Section 1, subsection 1, line 3 reads "A board of county commissioners *may* [emphasis added] by ordinance" so a county may choose not to enact this and that would be entirely within their rights.

Michael Harwell:

I am not aware of anyone here from the court system, but I know when we get into the situation where we are in the cases with the D.A.s that these are much more minor things that they are having to deal with than their regular case docket. These cases are often continued because of the D.A.s caseload and it is our impression that it would be relieving some burden from the court system by handling it administratively through civil penalties or the threat that there would be civil penalties to encourage compliance.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I would be curious to know how many cases occur in a year and you can get back to me with that, tell us how great a problem it is. I think there are some

real problems when you allow a business to continue to operate when they are not complying.

I am going to ask if there is anyone in support of the bill.

John Slaughter, AICP, Management Services Director, Washoe County:

I believe that Ms. Smith-Newby has well outlined the various issues related to the statute and the proposed change. We would just like to go on the record as supporting the bill.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Is there anyone else in support of this bill? Is there any opposition or neutrality? [There was none.] We will close the hearing on A.B. 221.

Next, we will go onto our presentation from the Carson Water Subconservancy District.

Edwin P. James, P.E. General Manager, Carson Water Subconservancy District:

I have Genie Azad and Peggy Pollyen from our staff. Bob Mills, our Chairman of the Board was hoping to be here but had a conflict.

We want to talk about who we are and why we exist and our integrated water planning along the Carson River. What you have in front of you is a PowerPoint presentation ([Exhibit D](#)). I will be going through the slides with you.

Slide 2 is the history of the Carson Water Subconservancy District (CWSD). We were originally created in 1959 by the Court. The idea was, it was part of the Washoe project to build several storage facilities on the upper Carson and Truckee Rivers. The Truckee has the Carson-Truckee Water Conservancy District, which is why we are known as a Subconservancy because we are focused on the Carson. The purpose was to negotiate a payback to the federal government with the ranchers to build the Watasheamu Dam on the Carson River. That went on for several years and at that time there were only two counties involved, Lyon and Douglas. In the 80s the federal government decided that they were not going to build the dam and withdrew their support. The Subconservancy continued on and in 1989 the Legislature realized that there were limited resources and huge demands on the Carson River. They felt it was important that the resources could be collaborated and so this body refocused the Subconservancy on watershed planning. At that time Carson City was added as a member and we looked at the resource as a whole. In 1997 there was a flood event, which got everyone concerned about what was happening, and then in 1998 the Carson River Conference was held. At that time people got together from all parts and said "If we are going to do planning,

we will do it on an integrated basis." In 1999 we came back to the Legislature and Churchill County became a member and then in 2001 Alpine County in California became a member. So we now represent the entire watershed and we have members from the entire area.

Slide 3 is called "The Structure of the Subconservancy." We have a 13-member Board that represents the five counties. Most of the people are elected officials from each of the counties; we do have some agriculture representatives on the committee. We have a combination of the political powers and the people that use the water up and down the watershed. Our budget for Fiscal Year 2006/07 is \$1.7 million and our main funding source is the property tax, three cents per \$100. We also get a lot of grants from federal, state, and other agencies with whom we coordinate. The Legislature also allowed us to do another seven cents on property tax for flood control projects, but with the property tax cap we will never be able to use that.

We have two full-time, three part-time, and two contract staff members. We have a lot of expertise on that staff. We are lean but focused and work together. Genie Azad has an aquatic background, Peggy Pollyen used to work for Los Angeles (LA) Water and Power in their water conservation program. She was responsible for the replacement of over 750,000 toilets when she was in Los Angeles. I have some background in agriculture but I also have an engineering and finance background. The main thing we do is try to help other agencies; we try not to duplicate efforts. For example, with the Conservation Districts we help provide funding to them to do river restoration projects and then we provide expertise where they need it.

[Slide 4] We match programs with the listed entities. Those are entities we work with up and down the entire watershed. We are the hub for projects, meaning that everything comes through us so we are not duplicating efforts and we are all working effectively. Our goal is to stretch the dollars as far as possible to look at the resources. We do a lot of groundwater studies through the United States Geological Survey USGS or we coordinate the studies on their behalf.

[Slide 5] It is important to understand, we are not an agriculture group, nor an environmental group, nor water purveyor. We work with all of these groups understanding that they all interrelate. Our goal is to integrate the resources and planning processes to make sure that when one person does one thing it does not adversely affect another.

[Slide 6] The size of the Carson River Watershed is about 3,966 square miles, the River is 184 miles long and our current population is about 125,000 but it is

predicted to reach 450,000. There is a lot of potential growth and stress on the system. What is unique, too, is that our biggest reservoir in the system, the Lahontan Reservoir, is two-thirds of the way down. On the Truckee, there is Tahoe, Boca and all these others in the upper watershed, but the storage we have in the upper watershed is less than 10,000 acre-feet. We really depend on Mother Nature. If she does not put snow in the mountains, we are going to have a drought. We could have a flood in the winter and a drought in the summer. We also have 11 major water purveyors in the watershed, so we are different from the Southern Nevada Water Authority or even from the Truckee. The Truckee has four major water purveyors, in southern Nevada there is one. Each of the eleven [purveyors] have their water rights.

[Slide 7] The current water situation: the River is fully appropriated. That means if you want to have any growth or any changes it has to come from somewhere else. Ninety-five percent of the River is used for agriculture and we are seeing some changes there. All of the groundwater basins are over appropriated, and we have to balance agricultural, domestic and environmental needs. We have water quality problems in the River and we have the pressures of growth. The interaction of groundwater and surface water is one of the biggest issues that is now impacting us up and down the watershed, causing conflict among the members. If someone is pumping groundwater and it impacts the surface water, it could impact the downstream user. We are recognizing that and trying to get all of the parties to work together.

[Slide 8] We are the [Section] 208 [of the Federal Clean Water Act] Planning Agency for the Carson River. We work with the Nevada Division of Environmental Protection (NDEP) and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) on the water quality. We do the A.B. No. 380 of the 70th Session buy out program, and we are doing regional water system planning. We have all these individual water entities and we are working to tie them together to enhance fire flows, and reduce redundancy in their system. We are trying to work cooperatively because we do not have any water to waste. We talk about regional support but local control. The remaining list is some of the studies that we are doing.

[Slide 9] The reason we have Integrated Water Resource Planning is because all systems are connected. When one action is taken, it has an impact on another. In the past, there were water purveyors who focused on their water resources but did not realize how it impacted the environment or agriculture. The current piecemeal approach does not work because people have built in our floodplains, which impacts flows of the River, which impacts quality, which impacts habitat. We try to bring all those demands together to make sure that we are working cooperatively.

[Slide 10] There has been human impact on this River. During the Comstock era, there was mining along the River. We have mercury issues. We had the [Army] Corps of Engineers come in and channelize the River. Straightening the River has caused a lot of problems. We also had wood drives; this picture shows logs in the upper watershed waiting for the spring flood waters. The logs would then float down the River, from Alpine County to Carson City. Imagine all those logs tumbling against the banks; anything that was in their way was just torn apart. The banks and all the habitats were destroyed in those log drives. We have a lot of water diversions on the River. Over the years those structures came to control the grade of the River.

[Slide 11] We have limited resources and other demands; we are developing the floodplains because we have no upstream storage. It is critical that we allow things to flood. On the Truckee they are going to spend almost a billion dollars redeveloping because they developed in their floodplains. We are hoping to get ahead of the curve and plan because if we develop our floodplain we are going to have to spend a lot of money to reengineer what was done. We have some habitat and water quality issues, you can see bank erosion and flood damage. This house [lower right] actually had water going through the living room and they are still finding pieces of furniture downstream. Needless to say, the owner did move her house.

[Slide 12] We have had, over the last 150 years, more than 20 major floods on the Carson, on the average one every 7 years. One of the things that we are looking into now is climate change and the experts that we are hearing from now say that if the temperatures rise just a little bit we can expect more flooding in this river system. We could expect to see a lot more damage and that is why our floodplain program is going to be so important.

[Slide 13] We have multiple groups with whom we work. We have our Subconservancy Board made up of elected officials, and again we have the political bodies up and down the watershed. We are developing a technical committee with representatives from each of the water purveyors to enable us to have technical expertise up and down the entire watershed looking at the issues. We also have a group called the Carson River Coalition (CRC). Genie Azad is in charge of that and will talk about the uniqueness of that group and what their goals are.

Genie Azad, Watershed Coordinator, Carson Water Subconservancy District:

[Slide 14] I am also the Watershed Coordinator for the Carson River Coalition. This unique group started in 1998 after the Carson River Conference. There are representatives from throughout the five counties, plus federal, state, local,

environmental groups, and private citizens. We meet on a regular basis. It provides a format for discussion of issues and the projects and programs so that everyone is aware of what is happening. We also have working groups in this coalition including a group on the river corridor and floodplain management that is very active in outreach and education, natural resources, water supply, and water quality. We also have an interaction and coordination committee.

[Slide 15] Some of the projects that we have been working on over the past ten years are listed here. A set of guiding principles were developed several years ago that provided direction to how we were going to approach issues and challenges within the watershed and how we would implement the principles. The idea was to develop a stewardship plan. We recently completed a draft that is out for review right now and hope to have a final by the end of the month. It will guide our river restoration and water quality efforts so that we are all working together. Another thing that we are doing is working with the Subconservancy and the Nevada Department of Water Resources to develop a floodplain management plan that looks at issues on a regional basis with solutions that could be implemented on a local level. We also work with Western Nevada Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) and other groups on the Carson River Work Days, which have been very successful over the past ten years. They have involved over 10,000 volunteers, but the number is probably higher than that now. It is an opportunity for community members and organizations to help get our river back into shape and get some community involvement. We had 10,000 copies of our watershed map made ([Exhibit E](#)). They have been provided to all of the local schools. They are provided at special and community events. The maps are very popular and we need to have more printed. Within the last two years we have actually started an environmental education program for local schools in all of the five counties. We have a woman, Linda Conlin, who is working with us on that program. She is with River Wranglers, a non-profit that was started many years ago. We also have snapshot days, workshops, conferences and newsletters to bring us all together.

Edwin James:

One of things that we found out is that a lot of kids did not know that we even have a river. A couple of years ago in Churchill County, a teacher of a third or fourth grade class asked them what major river goes through their county and the kids did not know. They did not realize that the Carson River was there; in fact most of the agriculture canals in Churchill County are bigger than the River. Most of the land along the Carson River is privately owned. These are some of the things that we are trying to address with our awareness efforts.

[Slide 16] I want to give you an example of how we use the integrated planning process. One is Lost Lakes Reservoir. This is a reservoir that the Subconservancy purchased at the headwaters of the west fork [of the Carson River] in Alpine County. We work with Calpine since the reservoir is in California. One of the things that Calpine wants to do with their resource is provide for recreation like camping and fishing, so we keep water in the reservoir during the summer. Then in late fall we release waters for in-stream flows along the west fork, when we found it to be at its lowest point. This water is released for habitat and fish. The water then flows into Carson City and is picked up into their induction wells for their water needs. This is only 200 acre-feet of water, not a lot of water, but it is used for many purposes and provides a critical service.

[Slide 17] This slide is titled 'How do you envision the future of the Carson River?' This is a question that we ask the communities all the time. One of the things that we look at is what the community wants the Carson to become. We have the example of "Do you want the River to become a channel?" or "Do you want it to become a living river?" We also ask "What are your visions of the watershed, where do you want to see your community going?" These are critical elements. If you do not ask that, then you do not know what people want. We plan from there. It can be difficult because people do not realize the amount of integration required and there are a lot of new people here.

Assemblyman Bobzien:

I was remarking at the wonderful map ([Exhibit E](#)) and pointing out some of the places that my colleague from southern Nevada needs to check out during his time here. I was particularly interested in your comments about in-stream flows and recognizing the recreational values of the Carson River, both the west fork and the east fork. I was interested in hearing any statutory hurdles you might have encountered in your in-stream flow program. Are there tools that you wish that you had, or that other entities had? It is a bi-state issue, so I would be interested in any comments you have.

Edwin James:

The opportunities are there, but we need to educate. We have a lot of different groups who have different goals. Those who want in-stream flows, where are they going to get the water? Buy up agriculture? But if you buy up agriculture, it does not guarantee the flows because we do not have the upstream reservoirs. You have to get more creative.

Through the Alpine Decree, which administers the surface water, we have the ability to have higher in-stream flows. The tough part is how do you physically get the water through and not adversely impact the environment? Agriculture

provides a lot of habitat enhancement, so if you start buying up all the agriculture for in-stream flows you get rid of other things. It is a balancing act. Also, legally if I wanted to, I could dedicate water from Lost Lakes to Stillwater. The problem is that it would never get there.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

Could you explain why the upstream reservoir did not get built?

Edwin James:

Reading the old documents of the 1960s, the federal government's benefit-cost analysis at that time was about 1.25 to 1. The main driver in that calculation was agriculture enhancement. Then in the 1980s the federal government went back and did the analysis again and found the ratio to be .25 to 1. The help to agriculture could not justify the expense [of building the dam.] But the biggest issue was that all the water was already appropriated. If you were to build upstream storage, what water was there to store? You could build a reservoir upstream, but if you wanted to put any water in it, you would have to dry up the agriculture for which you would be storing the water. Even as a flood control project, all the flood waters are claimed by someone. We need to be looking at groundwater storage and recharge: that is why agriculture is so important because it provides that sponge to recharge the groundwater.

Back in the 1950s the water would have come from the Truckee River. The goal was for the water to be used in Douglas County, and then the water would have gone to the Lahontan Reservoir and into the Newlands, because that water was being 'wasted' and draining into Pyramid Lake. No one really cared about Pyramid Lake in the 1950s. People's attitudes have changed, and that is one reason the federal government got out of it. They realized that you cannot take more water out of the Truckee without causing adverse affects to Pyramid Lake.

We did a study on the river and found that if we got rid of all of the agriculture in Douglas County, we would see more water flow down in spring time and in late summer the river would be dry [without agriculture]. Everything is so integrated in the process we have to be careful with our planning.

Assemblyman Goicoechea:

I agree that there is no water to be stored, but the release of water could be more controlled in flood years, since that is about every seven years. I realize that there would be a dry reservoir at some point, but flooding is also costly. The other issue is that 95 percent of the water is going to agriculture in Douglas County; clearly that will change as Douglas County changes and we will have to look at it again.

Assemblyman Settlemeyer:

Another reason why the Watasheamu Dam project never came to fruition and why it would be impossible now, is because it would require an agreement with California because the water would back up to there.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

I did not see anyone on the Board who represents wildlife or habitat groups. Do you have anyone like that?

Edwin James:

Not on our elected Board. Most of those members are County Commissioners. That is why we have the Carson River Coalition that Genie Azad heads. We have the Nature Conservancy, we have all different groups of people and that is how we get the broader perspective.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

This is a fabulous map ([Exhibit E](#)), but what is the cost of the education programs? How much could you do if the funds were there?

Edwin James:

I think we spend about \$27,000 a year for the one program. While additional funding would be helpful, the biggest problem that we are running into is collecting data. We have been working with the federal government, the State Engineer and other groups to see what data has been collected and then determine where the gaps are. That is where we could use more funding.

A couple of years ago, some of the groundwater basins did not even have a pumping inventory. We worked with the State Engineer to get a system implemented to collect that data. There are some gaps that we need filled and the additional resources to work with these entities would be helpful because we need to know where the water is going.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

It is interesting to me that in the six presentations, everyone has said that data is the key.

Assemblywoman Parnell:

I enjoyed coming to your meeting about a month ago. I wanted to let people know that there is a great river walk, or you can drive along Carson River Road.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

Thank you for coming to Government Affairs, we will be hearing from you in the future.

We have one BDR.

BDR 25-140—Revises and creates provisions relating to housing assistance.
(Later introduced as [Assembly Bill 255](#).)

It was requested by the Legislative Commission's Interim Study on Availability and Inventory of Affordable Housing. It is one of five bills coming out about affordable housing from the A.C.R. 11 of the 73rd Session.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN PARNELL MOVED TO INTRODUCE
BDR 25-140.

ASSEMBLYMAN SETTELMAYER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.

Chair Kirkpatrick:

We will take any public comment. [There was none. Meeting adjourned.
9:59 a.m.]

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Emilie Reafs
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Assemblywoman Marilyn K. Kirkpatrick, Chair

DATE: _____

EXHIBITS

Committee Name: Committee on Government Affairs

Date: March 6, 2007

Time of Meeting: 9:00 a.m.

Bill	Exhibit	Witness / Agency	Description
	A		Agenda
	B		Sign-In Sheet
<u>A.B. 221</u>	C	Sabra Smith-Newby, Clark County	Prepared Statement
	D	Carson Water Subconservancy District	PowerPoint Presentation
	E	Carson Water Subconservancy District	Watershed Map