

STATE AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

March 22, 1965

The meeting was called to order by the Chairman, who called for action on H.B. 920. Miss Jacquart moved that it be recommended favorably. Motion was seconded by Mr. Meckel and carried unanimously.

H.B. 993 came up for discussion, and the Chairman asked if they wanted to consider amending the State Treasurer out, and Mr. Fribley moved to recommend the bill favorably as it is written. Motion was seconded by Mr. Buchele and carried unanimously.

Mr. Fribley explained H.B. 926, stating that it deals with ~~sanitation~~ around the federal reservoirs and sets up the mechanics (sanitation) for controlling the situation. Mr. Buchele stated he was concerned about his area where there were watershed lakes, and asked to amend Sec. 2, Subsection (a) in line 13, by adding the words "or any reservoir constructed as a part of a watershed district project." Mr. Fribley moved that the amendment be adopted and it was seconded by Mr. Ford. Miss Jacquart stated that she felt an expert should give an opinion concerning this matter. Mr. Griffith mentioned the Cheney Reservoir area and Mr. Brown of Reno said he thought legislation two years ago took care of this area by zoning. Mr. Buntun stated that we might be asking the State Board of Health to inspect construction of septic tanks, etc. which they may not be qualified to do. The Chairman stated that with all of this conversation he would hold the matter over until tomorrow; that the proposal seeks to control the sanitation situation and if it is allowed to go for too many years, we will have an awful situation.

Mr. Unruh presented an additional amendment on his H.B. 775, and Mr. Griffith stated that he was worried about the mandatory clause, and moved that the bill be changed to read "may" allow attorney fees. Motion was seconded by Mr. Ford and carried with a vote of 12 yes. Mr. Griffith abstained, explaining that he had a personal interest in this legislation. Mr. Taylor stated that he would have bill drafting prepare this amendment.

H.B. 1029 came on for discussion, and Mr. Unruh wondered if the employees involved would be willing to pay their share retroactively in securing prior credit. Mr. Buchele stated that his County Clerk was interested in this; that he felt he would be covered under the bill, but that he had called the Retirement man who said it would cost the system better than \$200,000. Mr. Marshall stated that it seemed to him ever since the act was passed that we come up and try to stretch it some more to take care of an individual, or to change the age or something and he wondered just how far we

should go with this sort of thing. Miss Jacquart suggested a legislative Council study on the cost, and then moved that this be done. Mr. Buchele seconded the motion and same carried unanimously. Mr. Taylor asked Miss Jacquart to have a resolution drafted.

Meeting was adjourned.