LEGISLATIVE REVIEW OF ADOPTED REGULATIONS AS REQUIRED BY ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES ACT, NRS 233B.066

LCB FILE R139-13 Establishing A Grant Program To Benefit Sage-grouse Populations

The following statement is submitted for amendments, additions and deletions, to Nevada Administrative Code (NAC) 548 adopted by the State Conservation Commission.

1. The Need for and Purpose of the Permanent Regulation.

The need and purpose for the proposed permanent regulation, LCB File No. R139-13 is to provide for a process for the Conservation Districts to receive grants specifically for work to benefit sage-grouse populations. During the 2013 Legislative Session, \$40,000 was appropriated for each year of the biennium to be used by the Districts for conservation work benefitting the sage-grouse in Nevada. These adopted regulations are being put in place to facilitate decision making by the Commission on which Districts will receive funding and the amount of that funding.

2. A description of how public comment was solicited, a summary of public response, and an explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

The Conservation Districts Program (Program), as staff to the State Conservation Commission (SCC), solicited comment from the public by sending notice of workshops and hearings by electronic or regular mail as follows:

Date of Notice	Workshop/ <u>Hearing</u>	Date of <u>Workshop</u>	Number <u>Notified</u>	Representing Businesses
10-04-13	Workshop	11-05-13	175	~50
12-10-13	Hearing	1-15-14	175	~50
2-20-14	Hearing	3-25-14	175	~50
4-15-14	Hearing	5-16-14	175	~50

The mailing list included all Conservation District Supervisors, which includes officials of local City and County governments. Program staff, when appropriate, was also included.

There were no written comments received at the workshop. There was one written comment received at the Hearing held on 1-15-14.

The comments at the workshop were questions of availability and project information that would be required. These were answered and clarified in the draft regulation at the time, as well as the one that was eventually adopted by the SCC.

The written comment was requesting that the grant be more focused on habitat instead of the bird itself. This was incorporated into subsequent versions of the regulation.

A copy of the audio taped comments or the record of proceedings may be obtained by calling the Conservation Districts Program at 775-684-8600 or by writing to the Conservation Districts Program, 201 South Roop St Ste 101, Carson City, Nevada 89701, or by e-mailing the Program at timrubald@dcnr.nv.gov.

The Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) completed its review of submitted revisions on April 14, 2014. SCC adopted the regulation at the hearing held on May 16, 2014.

3. The number of persons who:

(a) Attended and testified at each workshop:

Date of Workshop	Attended	Testified
11-05-13	15	4

(b) Attended and testified at each hearing:

Date of Hearing	Committee/Public Attended	<u>Testified</u>
1-15-14	11	0
3-25-14	12	0
5-16-14	16	0

(c) Submitted to the agency written comments:

Date of Workshop / Hearing	Number Received
1-15-14 Hearing	1

Name	Telephone	Business Address	Business Telephone	Electronic Mail Address	Representing
Rich Wilkinson	775-246- 1999	P.O. Box 1807 Dayton, Nevada 89403	775-246- 1999	richardwilkinson@nv.nacdnet.net	Dayton Valley CD

4. A description of how comment was solicited from affected businesses, a summary of their response, and an explanation how other interested persons may obtain a copy of the summary.

Comments were solicited from affected and interested Conservation Districts, Supervisors, local governments, businesses and persons, by notices posted at the Nevada State Library; various USDA NRCS locations throughout the state; and at the Main Public Libraries in counties.

Only one person, a staff member of one of the Conservation Districts, commented at the hearings or in this case, in writing. His concerns were addressed in subsequent versions of the regulation.

A copy of the audio taped comments or the record of proceedings may be obtained by calling the Conservation Districts Program at 775-684-8600 or by writing to the Conservation Districts Program, 201 S. Roop St. Ste 101, Carson City, Nevada 89701, or by e-mailing the Program Manager at timrubald@dcnr.nv.gov.

5. If the regulation was adopted without changing any part of the proposed regulation, a summary of the reasons for adopting the regulation without change.

The permanent regulation was adopted with changes reflecting the verbal and written comments submitted to, or received by, the Conservation Districts Program, from Conservation District Supervisors and staff, during the workshop and hearings listed above. The SCC adopted the permanent regulation as revised during the workshop and adoption hearing; and believed no changes other than those made were necessary. There were also minor changes made to the regulation proposed by the Legal Division of the Legislative Counsel Bureau, by the SCC, during their final adoption action on May 16, 2014.

- 6. The estimated economic effect of the adopted regulation on the businesses which it is to regulate and on the public. These must be stated separately, and each case must include:
 - (a) Both adverse and beneficial effects; and
 - (b) Both immediate and long-term effects.

Beneficial Effects

Adoption of this regulation allows for appropriated funding to be dispersed to appropriate Districts in equal amounts. This will provide sage-grouse related projects, which have been developed, to be implemented on the ground. It will also provide an opportunity for additional federal dollars to be injected into the local economy through the possible use of federal matching funds for projects such as those being planned by the Districts.

Adverse Effects

The proposed permanent regulation presents no reasonably foreseeable or anticipated adverse economic effects to businesses or to the general public.

Direct and Indirect Effects

As noted in the impact statement, when modeled, there were no significant impacts to the regional economy due to the relatively small amount of funding available. Any direct or indirect economic effects would be positive.

7. The estimated cost to the agency for enforcement of the adopted regulation.

The Program does not anticipate any cost to the agency for enforcement.

8. A description of any regulations of other state or government agencies which the proposed regulation overlaps or duplicates and a statement explaining why the duplication or overlapping is necessary. If the regulation overlaps or duplicates a federal regulation, the name of the regulating federal agency.

There are no other state or government agency regulations that the adopted regulation duplicates.

9. If the regulation includes provisions that are more stringent than a federal regulation which regulates the same activity, a summary of such provisions.

The SCC and the Program are not aware of any provision in this regulation which is also governed by federal regulation.

10. If the regulation provides a new fee or increases an existing fee, the total annual amount the agency expects to collect and the manner in which the money will be used.

The regulation does not provide for a new fee, and does not increase an existing fee.

11. Is the proposed regulation likely to impose a direct and significant economic burden upon a small business or directly restricted the formation, operation or expansion of a small business? What methods did the agency use in determining the impact of the regulation on a small business?

The Program determined that the regulation will not impose a direct or significant economic burden upon any small business or restrict the formation, operation or expansion of a small business. In making this determination, the Program requested comments from sixteen trade associations and Chambers of Commerce, and received comments from one of them. They responded that the regulation will not place any direct or significant economic burden on the operation or expansion of any business within the industries they represented. There were no negative comments on the regulation.