

MINUTES

Assembly

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE - NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE - 57th SESSION

April 24, 1973

Meeting called to order by Chairman Mello at 9:30 AM in the Ways and Means Committee Room.

PRESENT: Chairman Mello, Vice-Chairman Schofield, Messrs. Robinson, Dreyer, Capurro, Howard, Smith, Prince and Hafen.

ALSO PRESENT: John Dolan, Randy Webb and Lincoln Liston.

Motion to approve the Minutes of the meeting of April 23, 1973, made by Mr. Howard. Second by Mr. Dreyer. Motion passed.

On request of the Committee, Mr. Lincoln Liston presented a further explanation of the Distributive School Fund.

Mr. Liston explained that he and John Dolan and Bill Bible went over these figures with the bill drafters to make certain that there were no errors.

Some of the confusion might be arising out of the fact that the possible expectation that there is \$5.00 per pupil more statewide to be paid the first year of the biennium, everybody would get \$5.00 more and it would be \$7.00 less the second year, then everybody would get \$7.00 less. However, the mechanics of putting this ratio formula together the ratios do not work that way. This means that the rural districts get more than \$5.00 per pupil more the first year. By the same token the rural impact gets a reduction of more than \$7.00 the second year.

At this time the two attached sheet were distributed to the Committee.

Concerned with the last two columns on Attachment #1. The second to the last column sets forth the comparison by county. It shows the number 1.000 behind that school district where it is expected insofar as the equalized basic support is concerned the set of educational services can be provided at the lowest cost per pupil. Whenever that district spends one dollar, each of the other counties, in order to emulate that educational program they would have to spend a dollar and something more.

The last column is the column of ratios that divides up the total number of weighted dollars per pupil statewide. Whatever the number is at the bottom of the page and the calculations developing the ratios it is \$610. Of the \$610 the counties would get the percentage per dollar as listed.

On the two charts that are stapled together the numbers there originally have been crossed out because they were based on \$616 instead of \$621, for the first year of the biennium. Second year based on \$645 instead of \$652.

Mr. Hafen asked how many counties actually changed from the factor of the \$5.00 and \$7.00?

Mr. Liston replied that Esmeralda, Eureka, Humboldt, Lincoln, Nye, and Storey changed.

On the second page the reduction is an average \$7.00, although in some cases the reduction is as much as \$15.00.

Mr. Robinson asked how the low wealth figures in direct support or how it is arrived at; what sort of formula is used to determine direct support for low wealth counties.

Mr. Liston replied that they look at the resources of each of the school districts from receipts outside of basic support. There are three major resources to school districts from those sources: (1) the permissive 80¢ tax; (2) the distribution of motor vehicle taxes that go to schools general fund operation; and (3) the entitlements under P.L. 874. If these three resources do not provide as much money per pupil as 31.8 of their equalized basic support, then they put into direct support sufficient dollars per pupil to bring them to that level. It would take 133.3 to gain 100% fiscal neutrality.

Mr. Hafen asked on the 80¢ ad valorem how they arrived at that; is that total number of dollars by the number of people. Mr. Liston replied that it was; that it was the assessed value per pupil times 80¢. Mr. Hafen said that if the county is over-assessed there is no credit or under-assessed there is no penalty. Mr. Liston agreed with this.

Mr. Hafen asked what difference would a 2% assess difference make. Mr. Liston replied that based on 35% it would make a 6-1/2% difference.

Mr. Dick Morgan asked Mr. Liston if he was saying that under-assessment in a county (say 33%) really causes a drain on State dollars; but that if it is over-assessed there is not compensation for it. Mr. Liston replied that yes, he thinks you could say that.

Assemblyman Getto stated that whenever we go on a percentage increases the smaller counties keep getting poorer and the larger counties keep getting richer.

Mr. Robinson said that according to the testimony previously given to the Committee it was shown that the greater the population in the school district the greater the urban factor became. The student-teacher ratio by necessity in an urban area had to keep going down, that it was more necessary to have fewer students per teacher in an urban area than it was in a rural area because the problems became ever increasingly greater.

\$900,000 has been allocated to make up any difference in the P.L. 874 funds available to the Counties.

S.B. 645: This is another claim against the State in the amount of \$25,000. This arises out of an incident on Interstate 80 near Keystone Boulevard where horses again entered via the access road. There were ten automobiles involved in the accident and at least six people injured. So far, this is the only case in which a judgment has been granted. The Court judged that the State was negligent.

Mr. Dreyer moved for a do pass. Second by Mr. Capurro. Motion passed.

Mr. Dreyer asked that the Committee consider S.B. 451 which establishes a branch of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

Chairman Mello adjourned the meeting at 9:25 AM.

①
572

Support Values from Teacher and Other Certificated Employee Allotments and from Pupil Enrollments;
Support Values Per Pupil; Ratios of Support Value Comparisons

Nevada Plan 1973-74

Counties	Pupils Total Wgtd. Enrollment	Total Tchr. & Other Cert. Empl. Allot.	\$9,000 x Cert. Empl. Allotments	\$100 x Elem. Enrollment (Kdgn. .6)	\$140 x Sec. Enrollment	Total Support Value	Total Value Per Pupil	Ratio to Lowest Per Pupil Value	Ratio to Wgtd. State Value Per Pupil
H Churchill	2,863	155	\$1,395,000	\$150,600	\$189,980	\$1,735,580	\$606	1.012	.994
Lark(at rural thru non-rural allotments)	73,112	3,910	35,190,000	4,129,400	4,454,520	43,773,920	599	1.000	.982
Dough	1,920	104	936,000	103,100	124,460	1,163,560	606	1.012	.994
Elko	3,893	231	2,079,000	210,900	249,760	2,539,660	652	1.088	1.069
Esmeralda	65	9	81,000	6,500	-	87,500	1,346	2.247	2.207
Frederick	177	17	153,000	11,900	8,120	173,020	978	1.633	1.603
Goldfield	1,643	104	936,000	90,700	103,040	1,129,740	688	1.149	1.128
Harney	679	42	378,000	38,400	41,300	457,700	674	1.125	1.105
Lincoln	750	62	558,000	41,200	47,320	646,520	862	1.439	1.413
Manhattan	2,530	148	1,332,000	137,800	161,280	1,631,080	645	1.077	1.057
Mineral	1,765	100	900,000	95,000	114,100	1,109,100	628	1.048	1.030
Moapa	1,089	79	711,000	78,900	42,000	831,900	764	1.275	1.252
North Las Vegas City	4,573	247	2,223,000	240,400	303,660	2,767,060	605	1.010	.992
Ormsby	651	37	333,000	35,100	42,000	410,100	630	1.052	1.033
Orleans	98	11	99,000	4,600	7,280	110,880	1,131	1.888	1.854
Shoshone(at rural thru non-rural allotments)	28,467	1,532	13,788,000	1,587,800	1,762,460	17,138,260	602	1.005	.987
White Pine	2,523	150	1,350,000	131,600	168,980	1,650,580	654	1.092	1.072
Totals	126,798	6,938	\$62,442,000	\$7,093,900	\$7,820,260	\$77,356,160			
Statewide Average							\$610	1.018	1.000

1973-74 621
1974-75 645

Guaranteed Basic Support

373

Counties	Direct Support				Sub-total Direct Support	Equalized Basic Support	Guaranteed Basic Support	Major Resources outside Basic Support	Major Resources Per pupil	Total Resources per pupil	Handicapped Children	
	Transp.	Retire.	Low wealth	Urban							Program Allot.	@ \$14,500
Churchill	\$ 42	\$ 42			\$ 84	617	701	\$ 615,936	\$ 209	\$ 905	9	\$ 130,500
Clark	15	41	\$ 10	24	90	610	700	13,565,807	181	872	231	3,349,500
Douglas	44	42			86	617	703	764,207	339	1,037	6	87,000
Elko	29	46			75	663	738	1,135,572	284	1,017	14	203,000
Esmeralda	300	106			406	1,364	1,770	74,158	1,060	2,819	1	14,500
Eureka	168	74			242	993	1,235	155,711	865	2,092	1	14,500
Humboldt	44	49			93	700	793	447,916	256	1,043	6	87,000
Lander	36	48			84	685	769	220,944	315	1,079	3	43,500
Lincoln	48	64	105		217	875	1,092	119,528	171	1,256	4	58,000
Lyon	44	46			90	656	746	615,179	224	965	9	130,500
Mineral	34	43			77	639	716	568,516	330	1,041	6	87,000
Nevo	74	56			130	634	711	445,094	384	1,284	5	72,500
Ormsby	19	42	48		109	776	906	767,960	142	862	15	217,500
Pershing	47	44			91	616	725	236,413	381	1,108	2	29,000
Storey	48	85			133	641	732	53,765	489	1,760	1	14,500
Washoe	17	42		15	74	1,147	1,280	6,351,165	215	894	92	1,334,000
White Pine	31	46	32	12	109	613	687	461,153	192	961	9	130,500
Totals	\$ 20	\$ 42	\$ 9	\$ 14	\$ 85	\$ 616	\$ 701	\$ 26,549,024	\$ 203	\$ 904	414	\$ 6,003,000
				17	88	621	709					

374

111 resources
Guaranteed Basic Support.

Counties	Direct Support				Sub-total Direct Support	Equalized Basic Support	Guaranteed Basic Support	Handicapped Amt.	
	Transp.	Retires.	Low wealth	Urban				Program Allot. @ 14,500	
Churchill	\$ 44	\$ 44			\$ 88	641 \$ 648	729 \$ 736	9	\$ 130,500
Clark	16	43	\$ 10	\$ 24	93	633 640	726 733	242	3,509,000
Douglas	46	44			90	641 648	731 738	6	87,000
Elko	30	48			78	690 697	768 775	15	217,500
Esmeralda	315	111			426	1,415 +433	1,844 +859	1	14,500
Eureka	176	78			254	1,031 +142	1,285 +296	1	14,500
Humboldt	46	51			97	727 735	824 832	6	87,000
Lander	38	50			88	722 730	810 818	3	43,500
Lincoln	50	68	105		223	909 919	1,132 +142	4	58,000
Lyon	46	48			94	682 689	776 783	9	130,500
Mineral	36	45			81	664 671	745 752	6	87,000
■	78	59			137	806 815	943 952	5	72,500
Ormsby	20	44	48		112	640 647	752 759	16	233,000
Pershing	49	47			96	666 673	762 769	2	29,000
Storey	50	90			140	1,192 +205	1,332 +345	1	14,500
Washoe	18	44		15	77	637 644	714 721	99	1,435,500
White Pine	33	48	32		113	692 699	805 812	9	130,500
<i>Est. Average</i> Totals	\$ 21	\$ 44	\$ 9	\$ 17	\$ 91	645 \$ 652	736 \$ 743	434	6,293,000