

MINUTES OF MEETING - WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE - NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
1968 SPECIAL SESSION - FEBRUARY 13, 1968

JOINT - EDUCATION COMMITTEE and CLARK COUNTY DELEGATION

The meeting was called to order at 10:40 AM by Mrs. Tyson, Chairman of the Clark County Delegation, in the Ways and Means Room.

Present: Glaser, Mello, Bowler, Ashworth, Young, Tyson, Howard, Jacobsen
Absent: Webb

Also Present: Education Committee
Senate and Assembly Clark County Delegation

Mrs. Tyson explained the absence of Don Moyer who was scheduled to be present to talk on A.B. 8, and then introduced Neil Humphrey who would be making the presentation.

A.B. 8: Authorizes construction of buildings and grounds building at Nevada Southern University: building costs to be paid from capital improvement fee fund: no cost to state

Mr. Humphrey, Acting President of the University of Nevada, said the University has been charging \$42 per semester per full time student for a capital improvement fee fund. They have a commitment to come back for authorization from the Legislature for the buildings. They have used some for the purchase of small parcels of land or renovations, but this is the first example when they wish to use this for buildings and there is no necessity of bonding. The cost of this project is \$60,000. It would provide some 24,000 square feet for maintenance and shop, 96,000 for office and storage, relieving 1,000 presently used in Grant Hall. The capital improvement fee fund is being used for 2 other purposes at this point: an interval loan to the dormitory and dining commons for insuring the initial bond payment which will eventually be paid back to this fund- \$51,000; and \$34,000 spent on 80 trailers to provide office space temporarily, one being used for a lab. It is their intention and they have requested cooperation from the State Planning Board not only in the supervision of construction but also in handling the design. He estimated the balance in this fund, through receipts of registration, to be \$236,000. This is a separate fund for each campus. As an indication of annual receipts, Mr. Humphrey said this year's receipts were \$191,000. This is based upon a fee of \$3 per credit hour for part time students and \$42 for full time students per semester.

Mr. Wilson asked how the trailers would be utilized when they have ample office space. Mr. Humphrey said this would be a long and slow process, so the trailers would be used for a good long time.

Mr. Jacobsen asked if there is any stipulation on the range of use of this fund. Why use student funds for maintenance buildings. ... Mr. Humphrey said that land acquisition was paid off by revenue bonds. This is for the proposed new buildings and other construction. It was a regents fund.

Mr. Hilbrecht said that two uses have been outlined to which the fund has been put. Have they actually purchased tracts of real estate? Mr.

Humphrey said yes - at NSU. This is only for authorization. He gave the breakdown on the use of the fund and indicated a balance of \$45,000. Last year was the first this fee had been charged.

Mr. Young asked about the refund of this fund to students as mentioned in the receipts for fund figures. Mr. Humphrey explained that this pertains to those students who withdraw from a class or the school. They get a partial refund according to schedule based upon when they withdraw.

Mr. Getto asked if the dormitories are filled to capacity and if there is a problem keeping the students in the dorms. ... Mr. Humphrey said no, they are not filled to capacity. However, they are more full now than last year because they opened in the middle of the year, last year. We are temporarily overbuilt as far as bed space on both campuses - 260 beds at NSU. However, we expect that campus to be full next fall. Reno expects to be full, although we have closed Artemesia Hall.

Mr. Getto questioned whether private enterprise could not do as well as the University in providing dorms. ... Mr. Humphrey said that the private dorm next to Nye Hall has a capacity of 400 students and is now being used by 150 or 160. He said that federal regulations involved in selling the bonds require the dorms to pull in students 21 years of age and under. We have legislative authority for additions on each campus. To secure the loans, we have to prove we have a number of students waiting for rooms to fill the facility, so even though we have authorization we have a while to fulfill it.

Mr. Ashworth asked if there were any statutory limitation on the amount charged students for the capital improvement fee. Mr. Humphrey said no - it is not a legislatively authorized fee. It is a regents fee. Our commitment to you is that when we want to construct a new facility as compared to the purchase of trailers and the remodeling of buildings, we return to you for permission. If we use it for bond return, we would have to come for permission as you have absolute control. However, the use for outright construction is a limited thing.

Miss Dungan asked questions regarding the capital improvement fund not being under the direction of the Legislature and yet permission is asked to spend it. Mr. Humphrey said that technically they do not have to come to the Legislature for permission. However, they committed themselves to this when it was established.

CLARK COUNTY DELEGATION dismissed at 10:55 AM.

Mr. Garfinkle called the joint meeting of the Education Committee and the Ways and Means Committee to order at 11 AM.

A.B. 13: Provides for community college districts

Mr. Homer recounted various precedents for community college districts as provided in many states. He cited several questions as to the purpose of the community college, and said that A.B. 3 ignores the answers. He said that 45 out of 49 states which have community colleges provide for independent districts governed by officials elected in the area and they enjoy the full cooperation of the school system. They are more economical, more practical and easier to administrate. One of his objections to the community college being tied to the school system is that they have demonstrated that they cannot change their approach from academic to technical.

Dr. Homer repeated the Governor's comments on the community college system, saying that the system at present is University directed and organized, leaving an educational gap effecting the 70% who may not and should not go to the University. Dr. Homer read the editorial of the "Reno Evening Gazette" dated February 9, 1968, and entitled "Rigid System of Education Fails to Meet Needs". You cannot correct this problem by placing it in the hands of those who have already failed. Dr. Homer objected to the hard core academic subjects everyone must take including the technical students in order not to obscure our culture. He said that Dr. Tucker told us the budget requirements were in the neighborhood of 2 million dollars. Dr. Homer said he feels sorry for those in Elko who have worked so hard and given so much of themselves only to be beat over the head and told that they must operate to please the school administration or else. A.B. 13, with a token assistance of \$25,000 to get it off the ground, would fill a great need. From then on, we would operate on local financial assistance, whereby the area in which the college is located would support it by taxing in that area only. The pilot project should give both the college programs a chance and then compare the results. He feels that A.B. 3 would still leave that gap we now have.

Mr. Ashworth asked for the plan of local taxation referred to. Dr. Homer said they would use the 1% of the total assessed valuation tax which now is used in fire districts. He went on to say that it would be his feeling that if the Elko project were turned down, the Elko people would find some way to carry on, inasmuch as they have accomplished so much thus far.

Mr. Lingenfelter asked questions concerning any control by the state educational system, pointing out that cooperation is far different from control. Dr. Homer said that other states' experiences prove complete cooperation with the state. There would be on the board of the college a member of the county school district. However, the board of the college would have complete control over their administration and curriculum.

Mr. Glaser said that philosophically there is no difference between the two bills - 13 and 3. He would like to approach the problem as in A.B. 13, but politically it is not feasible, as he could not get the Governor to place it on the agenda that way. Part of the problem with the Legislature and the Governor is that everyone is opposed to placing another strata on our present educational system. If we did this and it would prove unsuccessful, it could cost the state much money. Mr. Glaser stated that he is apprehensive about his bill getting through the Senate. We see the need and feel we will grow into this thing by attaching it to the school system at the initial stages and as we grow into it and mature and savings are reflected in the other institutions, then we could sever it. These savings should be reflected in the boys' and girls' schools, the prison and a lesser gain in the University enrollment because of the lesser monetary outlay of the community college, so we should have some offset gains. This is the way I feel we have to go politically.

Mr. Getto commented on the cluster approach of the Elko Community College bill as being advantageous because of the guidance and direction beginning in the junior year of high school.

Mr. Lingenfelter asked if, in view of the bad debts accumulated by Carson Community College, the state would be obliged to pick up any under A.B. 13.

Dr. Homer said the reason he put in his bill was for legislative sanction for the community college district which would lend great credence in the minds of the public in this area for this. It would take away the stigma and we could raise money. The pilot project would just pertain to one year. There would be no follow-through connected. He didn't see how it could fall back on the state.

Questions on the legality of the 1% tax, if it would be supported by the commissioners of the counties and the public, and the support to this bill by the county commissioners of the 3 counties mentioned in Section 4. ... Dr. Homer said that this tax would be legal; it has been done before for other purposes. It would be decided by the area as to how much tax would be used for the college - 1% or even $\frac{1}{2}$ of 1%. It is under the control of the elected officials. Dr. Homer said his bill is open for amendment - in fact one is being drafted now. He would suggest we limit this to Ormsby County to start with, but leave the door open for other counties to participate. We have in this county ample personnel to draw from for facilities, manpower, teaching and we already have some commitments for classrooms. Dr. Homer said he does not yet have commitments from any of the county commissioners including Ormsby, that is in the form of resolutions or any formal document.

Mr. Prince asked the objective of taking the other counties in after you get it off the ground with financing. Dr. Homer said only as a service to them, and to make it a bigger and more meaningful college.

Mr. Getto asked about the feeling of the Ormsby County School Board. ... Dr. Homer said he had a member to serve on the board of the college but because of pressure, he backed off. Mr. Getto commented on the value of the cooperation of the school board for utilization of their buildings, etc. which would keep costs down. Dr. Homer said they have commitments on using 2 church buildings, homes, businesses, and even privately owned equipment. They also intend working out something with the unions.

Mr. Bowler asked about support from citizens, in view of the lack of cooperation from the county commissioners and the school board. Dr. Homer told of various speeches he has made to groups and schools and the feeling of support he has received. Mr. Bowler pursued his questions as to any concrete program worked out and adopted by the taxpayers for financial support. ... Dr. Homer-no, he does not have such a program worked out yet. He stressed the need for legislative sanction in order to accomplish the selling job to the public.

Mr. Ashworth asked if he could get the Ormsby County Commissioners to come before the Legislature to say they will go along with this 1% tax. Dr. Homer said he has received support from these men separately & individually, but they will not come right out as a body and endorse it because they recognize this fight with vested authority.

Dr. Homer was dismissed at 11:30 AM.

A.B. 14: Provides emergency financial relief to Lincoln County school district for fiscal year ending June 30, 1968

Mr. Prince said he had discussed the problem in January with the people of the Lincoln County school district, and much of the problem is a

matter of their apportionment coming in late. The budget people said they thought he should cut out programs and the school people suggested maybe he could get by on \$13,000 aid but he asked us for \$19,500. This would make his operation a little more comfortable. He may not have to spend any more money, but he would have it to fall back on. Even though he spent some of the money before the school year began, it still doesn't alter the fact that he needs money to finish out the school year.

Mr. Garfinkle mentioned S.B. 5 as a related bill which calls for \$101,000 to be appropriated to those counties in trouble.

Mr. Glaser said the school and the budget representatives have had hearings before the Senate and at that time Mr. Larsen indicated that he would like to see the Nevada Plan amended so it would be a procedural matter on the handling of emergency matters. He felt the money was already there in the Distributive School Fund for emergency appropriations because of ADA falling off which accumulates money in the fund and under the amendments could be used for emergency appropriations. The difference of opinion with the Senate involves who does the approving. The Senate would like the State Board of Examiners in there along with the Department of Education and also a third party comprised of members of the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee called the Interim Financial Committee of the Legislative Commission. The Department of Education feels their close scrutiny is enough. Mr. Glaser said he realizes the problem of keeping the formula clean and not have to come back for appropriations. If we pass these amendments, it still may not help Lincoln County this year unless the enactment were effective immediately or the first of the year. Since part of the trouble in Lincoln County is the over-estimate of ADA, this procedure may take care of it.

Discussion on the \$19,000 including the track field, which should not be included in the emergency monies. Mr. Prince and Mr. Bowler said this was not included in the request, only in the original request for more.

Mr. Garfinkle thinks the best approach is to watch what the Senate does with S.B. 5.

Discussion on faulty procedures on the Lincoln County school budget, as they have always asked for additional money and the state has always bailed them out.

Discussion on the worth of having the 3 parties involved in approval under the amendments to the Nevada Plan. Mr. Jacobsen, Mr. Glaser, Mr. Garfinkle and Mr. Howard expressed their agreement with the representation of the State Board of Examiners and the Interim Finance Committee along with the Department of Education. This idea actually originated in this committee.

Mr. Ashworth felt the solution to the problem of Lincoln County and their sparsely populated areas would be consolidation with Clark County. ... Mention made of the \$1,000 increase in budget due to the increase from the girls' school.

Meeting adjourned at 11:50 AM.