

Joint Meeting
SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
MINUTES OF MEETINGS
APRIL 15, 1973

The joint meeting with Assembly Ways and Means was called to order at 11:15 a.m.

PRESENT: Floyd R. Lamb, Chairman
Warren L. Monroe
B. Mahlon Brown
James I. Gibson
William J. Raggio
Clifton Young
Archie Pozzi

Earl Oliver, LCB Fiscal Analyst
Bob Tripp, LCB Deputy Legislative Auditor
John Dolan, Chief Deputy Fiscal Analyst, LCB
Howard Barrett, Budget Director
Cy Ryan, UPI

Assemblyman Don Mello
Jack Schofield
Darrell Dreyer
Rawson Prince
Bob Robinson
Randy Capurro
Tim Hafen
Bode Howard
Hal Smith

PREDATORY ANIMAL CONTROL - Page 494:

The senate had added 9 new positions at a cost of \$149,156 the first year and \$152,756 the second. The assembly had approved the governor's recommendation.

Assemblyman Mello noted that the senate's recommendation was a 90% increase. Senator Monroe said, "The cattle industry has now had tremendous losses. This budget is for the same number of trappers we had in 1964. Since they did away with poison last year we need this number of trappers back. The coyottes are making terrific inroads on game. The sheep population has decreased to the point that it is hard for them to find something to eat."

Senator Gibson said, "I watched this wildlife show on television and the narrator was from the northwest and showed a picture of a coyotte they followed for three weeks, and he killed a lamb every other day. We have seen coyottes in Henderson. It seems to me that the people who came to testify in the hearing when we asked them said they could cut the losses in half with these new positions."

Senate Finance Committee

April 15, 1973

Page Two

Assemblyman Mello asked if when they figured the new budget it was on the basis that they were losing the \$162,000 from the federal government. He said it seemed now that the federal government would give the State of Nevada \$162,000. Senator Lamb said, "Yes, but if we give them the budget they asked for on the state level we would have the same number of trappers we had in 1964 when we had a chemical called 1040 which was a poison which was death on coyottes. They would shoot this stuff in a quarter of a horse and it would be good for 100 coyottes.

"Another thing I want to bring up. You think this is my bill, well I haven't seen one band of sheep in the county (Clark County) I represent or even in the surrounding counties of Lincoln and Nye. When I was a kid there was lots of coyottes and rabies was dangerous. If you have ever seen an animal who has rabies, its a dangerous thing. It happens when you get an overabundance of these kind of animals. They need some help. This is an industry that helped build this state right along with mining."

Assemblyman Mello said, "With the budget we have presented there will be \$418,000 in the first year alone (this includes federal funds) to spend on this program. If they are going to operate with any efficiency whatsoever you could kill a hell of a lot of coyottes with that kind of money." Senator Lamb said he felt it was incumbent upon the State of Nevada to give the ranchers a little help. Assemblyman Mello said, "In our budget you are giving them an 80% increase. With your budget you're giving them a hell of a lot more than an 80% increase." Senator Lamb said, "You want to increase the prison budget 150-200% and prisoners are the only ones who need the prison." Assemblyman Mello said, "What in the hell does that have to do with it?"

Assemblyman Capurro stated that the time has now arrived that the coyottes are getting their meat cheaper than the people, and he moved to approve the senate recommendation. This was seconded by Mr. Howard, and passed unanimously.

CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES RAISES:

Senator Lamb said, "It appears that we did make a mistake in the unclassified as far as page 252 of the budget did tie Classified salaries into the consumer price index.

Senator Gibson said, "Since 1963 we have considered unclassified salaries seperately and we don't give them consumer price index raises because we tried to put a brake on unclassified salaries. The objection, of course, is they become impacted in the second year. Again, that's the

unclassified

Senate Finance Committee
April 15, 1973
Page Three

purpose of the impact bill. Otherwise the legislature has no control on unclassified salaries." He stated that the private sector does not give CPI raises.

Mr. Howard stated that he felt this was one way to control the impaction problem, and that by granting the CPI to unclassified personnel the legislature would not be in the position two years from now of having to grant increases from 10-15% to remove the impaction problem. Senator Monroe stated that the senate had decided not to go for the CPI raises for unclassified employees and felt the 10% or better raises they received was sufficient. Assemblyman Mello said without it they would be back in two years giving them big fat pay raises. Assemblyman Mello said it really wouldn't be a big 5% automatic increase. The assembly felt they should give 10% raises and a cost of living, consumer price index raise.

Mr. Howard said, we get those impacts in the middle of the biennium then we have to give a 10, 15, 20% increase. Senator Brown suggested that both committees go with a straight 6% raise and a CPI raise. Mr. Howard said that this was still not solving the problem of impaction. Senator Gibson said, "Do you think a guy ought to get a salary increase every year no matter what?" Mr. Howard said, "I think if he's in there and doing a good job, certainly." Senator Raggio pointed out that the elected officials in the state don't get the benefit of these types of increases. Senator Lamb said if they did that they may as well just take the lid off. Mr. Howard said they were unaware that elected officials would not get an increase.

Assemblyman Howard said that to give CPI raises would not fool with the 95% factor (employees may only earn up to 95% of their bosses). He said it would give a scale increase to administrators so that employees below them wouldn't be locked in when their raise came due in the middle of the biennium and they now have to forego this raise because they earn 95% of what their boss does. Senator Lamb said he didn't think that was justifiably right either. Senator Lamb said he felt they had to control this thing. Assemblyman Mello said, "Okay, we don't give them the cost of living increase and do give it to the classified employee. Then we come back in here the next session and say we will hold the lid on them, and we give them a 10% to 12% increase to make up the cost of living increase the classified employees have been receiving." Senator Gibson said, "The administration since 1963 has tried to get this removed (the 95% factor), so it is a damper.

Senate Finance Committee
April 15, 1973
Page Four

Assemblyman Mello said, "Senator Pozzi, are you against the cost of living increase for employees?" Senator Pozzi said, "For unclassified yes, but I have tried to get this committee to take the 95% lid off every year."

Senator Lamb said senate finance was unanimous about this. Assemblyman Howard moved they go with the senate's recommendations. Mr. Capurro seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

A.B. 709:

SUMMARY: Prohibits augmentation of employees in state agencies above number specified in budget, except with prior approval of legislative commission.

Assemblyman Capurro said, "We didn't think it was unreasonable to ask that when a position is augmented from the executive budget that the legislative branch have an idea of the amount of increase. In the budget there were 139 positions added between our budget last time and what we have now. We felt we should know about them in the interim and this bill allows the legislative commission to approve these." Senator Gibson said, "I certainly have sympathy with this content of the bill but I wonder if we're not getting into a constitutional problem where the legislature in the interim is passing on an executive action."

Assemblyman Capurro said, "I don't see where we have a problem there. Its our budgets we approved at a definite figure and if they're augmented I feel we should know how much they're augmented." An assemblyman said, "We passed a letter of intent last time in regard to this particular subject."

Senator Pozzi moved that they reconsider this bill. Senator Raggio seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

Senator Pozzi moved they recommend do pass. Senator Monroe seconded the motion.

Mr. Barrett said, "I don't think we object to making you aware of the augmentations. What we do object to is having to call a legislative commission meeting every time we want to add a position." Senator Lamb said, "I don't think that's the intent of the bill." Senator Pozzi mentioned the additions of the EEA people.

Senate Finance Committee
April 15, 1973
Page Five

Assemblyman Capurro said that the legislative commission met at least once a month between sessions anyway and he couldn't see that this would create a problem at all, that Mr. Barrett could go to them and explain their needs. He felt it was logical it could be done. Mr. Capurro added, "You say you don't mind telling us, we asked you to tell us through our letter of intent, and we didn't know until we got here that we had these 139 new positions." Mr. Barrett said, "I don't think you asked last time to be told on a continuing basis. I think your letter was that you didn't want any new positions added unless they were justified. We do not add new positions..." Assemblyman Capurro said, "I don't think you added positions unless they were justified, but I think we should know about it." Mr. Barrett said, "We have no objections to having you review them and making you aware of what we are doing. If you don't like this, we can change." Senator Lamb said he didn't feel there was anything wrong with this.

Senator Pozzi moved they recommend do pass. Senator Raggio seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

S.B. 352 & A.B. 580:

SUMMARY: (SB 352) Increases benefits for widows of supreme court justices and judges of district courts.

(AB 580) Increases number of district judges in Washoe County.

Assemblyman Mello stated that they killed S.B. 352 that increased the pension of widows from \$350 to \$500. He also said they passed a bill to give Washoe County one judge beginning January, 1974. Senator Lamb said the committee had strong feelings about S.B. 352. Assemblyman Mello said that they had killed this bill because they had also killed the bill giving employees who retired prior to 1963 a \$30 across the board increase which would have cost \$218,000. The assembly felt they couldn't afford both these bills and shouldn't pass one and not the other. He said they passed S.B. 352 but then when the other bill (to give \$30 to pre-1963 retirees) came up they rescinded their action on S.B. 352 and killed it.

Senator Monroe said, "It seems to me where you are talking about cost of living increases that you certainly should give consideration to those people. Some of those people are really hurting." Assemblyman Mello said the problem was there are 610 retirees and the question was they didn't know what income they were in such as the senior citizens tax relief bill, but they couldn't find out how much of

Senate Finance Committee
April 15, 1973
Page Six

of the 610 really needed the \$30 a month, and then if you gave the entire 610 employees \$30 a month, it still didn't come to \$218,000, it was more like \$180,000, and we never could figure out where the \$218,000 figure came from.

Senator Brown explained that they would have an affidavit that they would fill out stating that they did not make more than \$500, and only those under that amount would qualify for the \$30.

Assemblyman Mello said, "Well it won't do us any good to talk about it anyway, because our committee has a rule that after so many days of the session any bill that is indefinitely postponed (killed) we cannot take any further action on."

Assemblyman Hafen said that with regard to S.B. 352 that their committee had a problem because there is no affidavit system about how much income they really have.

CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS: *Parks*

Belmont Courthouse -

Senator Young said that they felt they shouldn't put \$25,000 into fixing the roof unless they were going to restore the entire courthouse. He felt it was just creating liability to open the building where someone could harm themselves. Senate finance felt they should either go all the way or forget it. Assemblyman Hafen said that he didn't feel liability was a big problem. Assemblyman Capurro said they could extent no fault to the building. Assemblyman Hafen said, "I'm not going to keep the committee two days worrying about this damn thing, but I just want to find out about liability because the state has buildings and liability all over the state." Assemblyman Mello said, "The entire building is not that bad. We have buildings in the state that are a lot worse condition than this one."

Senator Raggio moved they approve the assembly's recommendation. Senator Young seconded the motion, and it passed.

yes - Senators Raggio, Young, Gibson, Monroe
no - Senators Brown, Lamb, Pozzi

SENIOR CITIZENS TAX RELIEF BILL -

There are 4,000 renters in the state that would qualify for this. Senator Brown said, "They are in just as bad an inflationary period as home owners. They would have the

Senate Finance Committee
April 15, 1973
Page Seven

same ratio of rebate as the home owners. About \$350,000 would go to the renters in this bill.

"The assembly had a bill to have the age of 62 qualify for this and the senate recommended 65. If you lower the age you have a larger group that you have to take care of. Certainly, if there is money available we felt 65 would be a better start but there is no objection to 62.

"The formula that is used by the senate is one that is used in Wisconsin and Minnesota, the assembly used the formula that is presently used in Vermont, but they both come out to the same amount of money, so that wouldn't be a problem.

"The fourth consideration is that we felt these old people who have reached 65 have had many frustrations all throughout their lives in dealing with governmental agencies and we felt we didn't want to put another one in by having them going to several agencies. As far as the home owner is concerned we proposed to have them go to the county assessor and getting credit just like the veterans and widows do and forwarding this by the assessor to the tax commission for whatever amount of money they allowed. This would be in the form of an affidavit. As far as the renters there is no way that they can get the money back that they paid to their landlord, so we felt they could fill out an affidavit and have the county assessor forward that to the tax commission and they would in turn send a check back. I know you had some question about the figures, and these figures were actually taken from the census and developed throughout this."

Assemblyman Mello said, "Your bill is different now."
Senator Brown said, "I just thought I would explain this so you would understand the difference."


The committees decided they would have to wait and see what happened to the bills.

The meeting adjourned at noon.

Respectfully submitted,


Ellen Hocker, Secretary

APPROVED:


Floyd K. Lamb, Chairman