MINUTES

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE - 59th SESSION

February 10, 1977

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mello at 8:00 a.m.

PRESENT: Chairman Mello, Mr. Bremner, Mrs. Brookman, Mr. Glover, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Kosinski, Mr. Serpa and Mr. Vergiels.

EXCUSED: Bode Howard, due to illness.

OTHERS PRESENT: John Dolan, Assembly Fiscal Analyst; Bill Bible, Budget Division; Roger Trounday, Welfare; George Miller, Welfare; John Duarte, Welfare; Lawrence Jacobson, Assemblyman; Mike Alastuey, Budget Division; Ace Martelle, Welfare; Keith Clark, Welfare; Bill Labadie, Welfare; Fred Hillerby, Nevada Hospital Association; Barbara Brady, Clark County Social Service; Charles Perry; Earl Yamashita, Welfare; Bill Walts, Nevada Association of Health Facilities; J. Faehling, Welfare; Minor Kelso, Welfare; Gloria Handley, Welfare, Carolyn Toggart, Welfare; Barbara Guzman, D.D.C.; Joe Chonia, Adult Group Care; Windy Van Curen, Adult Group Care; Vernon Stofleth, Adult Group Care and Leona Stofleth, Adult Group Care.

WELFARE ADMINISTRATION. Mr. Duarte stated that the Welfare Division is part of the Department of Human Resources. For Fiscal Year 1976, the Welfare Division spent approximately $50,000,000 which represents about 13.6% of the total dollars spent for state government and approximately 11.9% of the general fund monies. For the next biennium, the Governor recommends the division to spend a total of approximately 13.5% and 10% general fund. The funding in the Welfare Administration budget runs approximately 65.7% federal dollars and 34.3% state general fund dollars.

Existing Positions. Mr. Duarte explained to the Committee the existing positions. There are 430 existing positions, of which 27 are presently vacant. Welfare is transferring five positions from the homemaking budget (Page 410) to the Welfare Administration budget.

No new positions are recommended by the Governor and there are 7 existing positions eliminated from the budget.

Other Government Services were explained. This is an area which Welfare Administration has under contract with the Department of Motor Vehicles for two microfiche files ($3,000). The sum of $11,615 for the first year and $13,840 for the second year is for case documents. This is so Welfare can obtain birth and death certificates primarily in the child welfare area and the ADC. Welfare has to verify that people either are born or have died and Welfare owes these funds to other state agencies. Also included in Other Government Services are payments to various district health divisions for health checks, credit bureaus and to the Secretary of State's office for notary public fees.

Dues and Registrations. There is not an increase in dues and registrations. Welfare didn't spend $2,000 which is normally spent at the APWA in Fiscal Year 1976. $50.00 is for the State Finance Officer's Association dues and registrations. There is about $450.00 in miscellaneous other associations. Mr. Miller stated that he would like to attend the APWA but the budget was cut back. He feels that by not attending APWA it was pennywise and dollar foolish.

Buildings and grounds improvements are primarily for electrical work, general repair and moving of office equipment which has to be done in 28 different office locations.

Welfare requested seven new vehicles for their division. There are presently 12 vehicles that run from 1965 to 1973 vintages. In the outlying areas Welfare wanted four-wheel drive or pickup type vehicles to get into the back countries. In the Governor's recommendation, Budget felt that the request of three vehicles was sufficient.

Office furniture was requested for new positions.

ASSISTANCE TO AGED AND BLIND. Mr. Duarte explained to the Committee the budget. Mr. Duarte said that prior to 1974 this budget was a joint federal/state program operated by the state. On January 1, 1974 it was taken over by the federal government and is now a federally operated program. The state does have an obligation in this respect because the state has a state supplement on top of the federal supplement. This budget represents the state supplement and the figures which the state contributes to the aged and the blind. The federal government currently is paying $167.80 for their supplement and the state portion for the aged is $34.95. For the blind the figure is $265.00 which is set by statute. In December there were 3,575 aged recipients and 189 blind recipients. The budget is broken down in three basic categories (1) payments for the aged; (2) payments for the blind; and (3) payments for persons cared for in adult group care facilities.

The Governor's recommendation for the aged single individuals has increased from $34.95 to $40.05. For the couples, the state supplement was $71.20 and this is increased to $77.05. This portion is above the federal level. The federal level is raised every July 1st by statute by a formula of the Consumer Price Index. The amounts that appear in the budget may vary dependent on what the federal level may be. In the AGCF category, the state's present share is $97.25. It is recommended that this figure go to $113.10 or a 16.3% increase the first year of the biennium and $120.05 or a 6.1% increase the second year of the biennium.

In the blind category, Welfare is now authorized $87.20 for the state's share which is recommended to go to $98.05 or a 12.4% increase.

AID TO DEPENDENT CHILDREN. The purpose of this budget is to encourage the care of dependent children in their own homes or in the homes of relatives by furnishing financial assistance. It is recommended that the average grant be $60.00. It is presently $54.00 as authorized by the Legislature. It is also recommended that the program would have an average number of recipients of 14,500 per month. For December 1976, the caseload count of recipients was 12,619. For January 1977, the number of recipients was 12,367.

Mr. Miller stated that he felt the reason for the decline in caseload was that his office was doing a better job of keeping ineligibles from coming onto the rolls.

HOME MAKING SERVICES. This is a budget that provides home making services for elderly people or people with temporary health problems. Mr. Duarte said this is an extremely successful program and the Governor's recommendation is for 55,000 home making hours for each year of the biennium. The per hour figures for the home maker's costs are $4.90 the first year of the biennium and $5.17 for the second year of the biennium.

In response to Mr. Serpa's question on training, Mr. Duarte stated that his office did request that training funds be put in the budget but the Governor is not recommending training funds. Mr. Duarte said that Welfare home makers are trained but they try to do it in-house and in-service as they can. The home makers are recruited from State Personnel.

Mr. Duarte said that the 55,000 home making hours could be beefed up to somewhere around 65,000 to 70,000.

Mr. Vergiels said he would like to see Mr. Miller have a tight-fisted attitude towards the administrative costs and reduce those. Mr. Miller said this has been done but in the end it costs the state more money if administration is lax and the Welfare rolls start to soar.

FOOD STAMPS. Mr. Clark stated that the objective of the food stamp program is to provide a nutritious diet for low income families. The program was started in September of 1973 in Clark and Washoe Counties. In November of 1973 an additional office was opened in Henderson. The program went statewide in July of 1974 as mandated by the federal government.

In December 1976 there were 7,816 cases on the food stamp program, of which 1,913 were public assistance and 5,903 non-public assistance. There are permanent offices located in Carson City, Elko, Ely, Fallon, Hawthorne, Henderson, Las Vegas, Lovelock, Reno, Tonopah, Winnemucca and Yerington. Out-stations operate on a once a week basis in Fernley and Battle Mountain; out-stations operate every two weeks in Calients, Owayhee and Well; out-stations operating on a monthly basis are located in McDermott, Eureka, Austin, Nixon, Pahrump, Overton and Yhomba.

Mr. Clark explained that when a person wants to get food stamps, they go into one of the food stamp offices and make application. The eligibility social worker then determines whether the individual is eligible under a very complex system of rules. If the individual is eligible they are issued an authorization to purchase, which is taken to a certified U.S. Post Office where the individual purchases the food coupons. The more income an individual has the more money he is going to pay for food stamps. Some individuals get their entire allotment of food stamps free.

The bonus value is the difference between what the individual pays and the total allotment he gets when he goes into the Post Office. The bonus value is 100% federal money. In Fiscal Year 1975 this amount to 10 1/2 million dollars for Nevada; for Fiscal Year 1976 it was $10.1 million and Mr. Clark is projecting $9.3 million for the first year of the biennium and $9.8 million the second year of the biennium.

The caseload projection for the coming biennium is 9,000 per month, with approximately 10% new applicants each month. A caseload standard has been established of 115 cases per worker.

The Governor has recommended that existing positions decrease from 141 to 125 or a loss of 16 positions. Six new positions are recommended, so the net loss in total positions is 10.

Mr. Clark stated that the new positions are not new, per say, but reclassifications of 6 of the 16 positions that were reduced under existing positions.

There are presently 14 existing positions that are vacant, 9 of which have been identified as the 10 that will be lost. One has been identified as one of the reclassification positions.

The funding in the food stamp program is on a 50/50 state/federal basis. The food stamps themselves are 100% federal money. The total expenditures for the first year of the biennium under the Governor's budget is $2,607,128 and $2,707,567 for the second year of the biennium. There is a reduction over the current work program year. This is due primarily to the loss of the 10 positions.

Out-of-State Travel. $1,000 for each year of the biennium has been allocated for the out-of-state travel for the Chief and supervisors to attend federal policy meetings at the region headquarters in San Francisco.

In-state travel. $43,079 for the first year of the biennium and $45,449 for the second year of the biennium. The travel money is used primarily by the eligibility certification specialists to conduct home visits and run down various lead in verifying eligibility of an applicant.

Contractual Services. The biggest expenditures in the contractual services is for janitorial services. Contractual Services also contains Authorizations to Purchase that are sorted by FNB.

Other Contract Services. Mr. Clark said this was for copiers, postage meters and maintenance of typewriters.

Other Government Services. Mr. Clark said other government services includes a Department of Motor Vehicle microfiche system in two of their offices and additionally this item is for handwriting analysis and mugshots.

Mr. Clark explained that structural improvement is for a security fence around the parking lot in Las Vegas because of robberies and rape.

Mr. Clark explained that transaction costs is the fee that is paid to the Post Office for each issuing of food coupons. The fee is currently $1.10 and Mr. Clark has allowed for an increase to $1.15 for the first year of the biennium and $1.25 for the second year of the biennium.

Mr. Martelle explained the eligibility requirements of university students to obtain food stamps.

Mr. Clark stated that the last federal quality control review indicates a 3.1% ineligibles in the State of Nevada and his office is trying to get that figure down. Mr. Clark stated that the ineligible tolerance rate in food stamps is much harder to maintain than any ADC programs.

Mr. Clark stated that food stamps are not good for soaps, toilet tissues, papers, alcohol and tobacco.

Mr. Bremner stated that in this program substantial increases were requested in office supplies and communication expense. The Governor recommends amounts are very close to the current work program and wondered if there will be sufficient funds. Mr. Clark replied yes.

Mr. Martelle stated that five cases were recently presented for indictment for fraud. Three have been tried and convicted to prison or probation and restitution of all monies fraudulently taken from the program. There are also approximately 27 cases ready to be presented to the U.S. Attorney General. Mr. Martelle has requested a bill that will allow the state to prosecute fraud cases through the Attorney General's office rather than the U.S. Attorney General which would speed up the process. On claim actions that have been taken to date, payment agreements have been signed in the amount of $389,529. The amount that has been collected to date is $39,258.

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT PROGRAM. Mr. Clark stated that the primary purpose of this program is to reduce the cost of aid to dependent children to the federal, state and county governments and to produce revenues by forcing court obligations owed by absent parents to children who are on ADC. This is done by forcing support obligations by locating absent parents, by establishing paternity and by securing court orders for child support. The program came into being with the passage of Public Law 93-647 in January 1975. The states were mandated to participate in the program or suffer a 5% penalty of federal ADC matching funds. For the current fiscal year the penalty would have amounted to some $309,000. Even more important, there is the possibility of a conformity issue, in which case the state could have lost all federal ADC money which in the current year would have been $6,000,000. When the law was passed, the federal government was slow in providing guidelines to states as to exactly what their program entailed so Welfare's request to the Legislature was slow in getting in. Welfare applied for a waiver to the Secretary of HEW which was granted for a one year period. Welfare tried to renew the waiver for an additional year, but the Secretary, by law, could not renew it. Therefore, failing to get the additional waiver, Welfare presented a budget to the Interim Finance Committee in May of 1976 and as a result CSEP was funded for the current fiscal year. Due to the complexity of the program and the intricate relationship between the federal, state and county governments, the start-up was slower than anticipated. However, CSEP is now in operation and collecting support monies.

Mr. Martelle stated that CSEP has cooperative agreements and contracts signed with all the District Attorneys, except five small counties which they are handling through the Attorney General's office. Mr. Clark stated that no monies were collected until August 1976 - $784.00. That figure has been building up steadily. In September the figure went to $3,833; October it went to $7,341; November it went to $15,567; December it went to $20,129; January 1977 will probably be in the neighborhood of $30,000. The state gets 50% of the amounts collected. Mr. Clark is anticipating to increase their monthly collection each month throughout this fiscal year peaking in June. There is a continual turnover in cases. In June, Mr. Clark is projecting $36,552 to be collected. Mr. Martelle stated that this is a national program requiring all states to participate and cooperation. There is a national and state parent locater service.

Mr. Martelle stated that in the current budget Welfare is not adequately staffed to handle what they project to be the entire caseload within the State of Nevada. They are handling this program on a business-like relationship relative to the staff that they have. They want to collect revenues and be self-supporting and also generate monies that will go back to the state general fund. Additional monies would be used to enhance the program with more staff to collect more revenues and part of the monies that would be collected would go back to the state general fund. The county participates in this area and it is extremely cost beneficial for the counties.

Mr. Kosinski asked if the magnitude of the program was dictated by the federal government. Mr. Kosinski pointed out that Mr. Clark was asking for 50 additional employees and asked if Mr. Clark was asking for those additional positions pursuant to some federal requirement. Mr. Clark replied no, the request was based on anticipated caseload and revenues that they felt could be generated by pursuing those cases. The mandates of the federal government require that every ADC applicant register with child support, assist and cooperate with the child support program in locating the absent parent and recovering child support monies from that absent parent.

Mr. Clark stated that Welfare anticipates being able to collect on a total of 560 cases by the end of this fiscal year. Those 560 cases through the biennium would generate $1.1 million, approximately $550,000 would be state money. Mr. Clark feels that there are an additional 740 cases that could be handled with additional staff, but without additional staffing there is no way Welfare can get to these additional cases. Just to keep the caseload at 560 will be an effort because of the constant turnover.

Chairman Mello stated he felt this is a good program in that it is making people responsible for their actions.

CHILD WELFARE. Mr. Labadie stated that A.B. 141 relates to this budget. Mr. Duarte stated that this budget is the main budget for paying for foster care for foster children. The first part of the budget is for unmarried mothers and children awaiting adoption. The budget provides payments to unmarried mothers who are going to relinquish their children for adoption. The funds are to provide for foster care homes, clothing and transportation prior to the placement of the adoptive child. Also provided is a transportation cost when the children are moved to another state to make an adoptive placement or to move children into institutionalized care.

The next portion of the budget is for handicapped children who have a specialized educational need in which care is not available within their own communities. The handicapped children program is 100% state funds. Mr. Duarte is anticipating an increase in the next biennium in this particular category. For Fiscal Year 1976 there were approximately 7 1/2 children per month and they are anticipating 15 in Fiscal Year 1978 and 20 in Fiscal Year 1979. There seems to be a rise in the number of children that are being placed into this category. Mr. Miller stated that originally this program was meant to take care of a physical handicap. Now the courts have included mental, psychological and educational handicaps into this category. They are getting kids that no one else wants. Mr. Labadie stated that this is the thrust of A.B. 141. Some counties found out that if they can get the Justice to declare these children handicapped, instead of paying out the one-third that they pay out on FELCO, it's all state dollars. Frankly, he believes they are labeling some of the children as handicapped just to save money. This is the reason A.B. 141 has been introduced to get one-third county funds. Mr. Labadie seriously doubts if A.B. 141 will pass.

Mr. Dolan stated that the fiscal note indicates if A.B. 141 passes, it will reduce the general fund by about $50,000.

MEDICAL CARE UNIT. Chairman Mello stated that there is a supplemental appropriation in this budget (Page A-23) in the sum of $1,451,372 - S.B. 176. Mr. Duarte stated that during the past biennium they went into a fiscal problem as far as the Title XIX program was concerned. Their caseload rose more rapidly than was originally anticipated as well as medical costs and this was brought to the attention of the Interim Finance Committee. Subsequent to that, there were certain limitations that were made to the program in order to bring the costs back down somewhere near the appropriated amounts. Welfare had spent basically $5.9 million more in Fiscal Year 1976 than what was budgeted. The Interim Finance Committee allocated $1.2 million to help extend the program. At this time with the overexpenditure from 1976 brought forward into 1977, they will be overspent during fiscal year 1977 to a lesser degree than they were last year. Therefore, the Governor is recommending a supplemental appropriation of $1.4 million from the general fund plus about $1 million in federal anti-recession funds.

Mr. Duarte stated that this budget is to pay for medical costs for various types of services provided for eligible recipients. The program is basically a 50/50 federal shared program. There are some matchable costs at 75/25 but they are very minor in nature and have a very minor impact in dollars. The state portion is funded from the general fund and the 11¢ county ad valorem tax.

There are three new positions in the budget being requested and recommended by the Governor.

Contractual Services. For several years they have had a contract with the Health Division to do the screens of ICF facilities and skilled nursing home facilities. Part of contractual services for Fiscal Year 1977 is $73,968 to pay Health Facilities for screening. The biggest portion of $80,000 the first year and $84,000 the second year is to pay the Health Division for this service. The other portion is for general consulting services where they hire medical consultants. These are primarily to help in difficult cases where in-house expertise is not available.

Mr. Duarte stated that the fiscal agent is the contract with Nevada Blue Shield to handle the actual bill processing portion of the Title XIX program. All of the bills that come in from the various vendors go to Nevada Blue Shield who process all the pre-auditing and post-auditing of these bills and send them out for payment.

Mr. Duarte explained that the medical payments are for the basic costs of the program.

From the current year as a starting point, they estimate how many recipients they are going to have for each year of the biennium. They also estimate a cost increase based on the average cost per recipient in each of the recipient areas. From the estimated costs in 1976-77, they are anticipating increased costs of 12% for each of the two years of the biennium. Basically all you have to do is take the number of recipient months times the estimated costs per recipient months, which equals the total - $24,929,000 the first year and $28,258,000 the second year.

CHILD PROTECTION. This budget is to handle cases in the 15 rural counties. The budget is to provide for emergency foster care, emergency day care, transportation out of state for children and training of home makers in the home maker program that is separate and apart from the other home maker program discussed earlier. The program serves children in the prevention of child abuse and child neglect. This was a new program that was provided to the division last biennium. It is funded at 75% federal and 25% state. Mr. Labadie stated that these children are referred to the program through the courts or by anyone who is obligated to report child abuse cases to them.

PURCHASE OF SOCIAL SERVICE. Mr. Duarte stated that this is an authorization type budget for the Welfare division in which all social service monies will be transferred through to other programs. We originally asked that 6 programs be funded through the Welfare

Division which included employment services, home delivered mails, store services, adult day care, family planning (which in the current biennium is part of the Welfare Administration budget) and an alcohol and drug abuse program. The Governor has recommended these programs but in the funding the match is placed in third party match. That means there would be no general funds in this program. Therefore, there would be no actual expenditures by the division to run these programs. The only way to do this is to contract out to provide the matching funds.

U.S. INDIAN SERVICE. Mr. Duarte stated that this budget is a contract they have with the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide foster care for certain indian children. This is just an authority type budget because this is 100% federal dollars and the Bureau of Indian Affairs is billed for their actual costs. There will be no new children under this program.

FEDERAL CUBAN REFUGEE PROGRAM. Mr. Duarte stated that this program is 100% federally funded to take care of Cuban refugees that fled Cuba during the Cuban Crisis. There are presently approximately 120 cases which equates out to approximately 263 people.

INDO CHINESE REFUGEE PROGRAM. Mr. Duarte stated that this program is 100% federally funded to take care of the people from Indo China. There are about 246 individuals covered under this budget.

WORK INCENTIVE. Mr. Duarte stated that this program assists recipients of Aid to Dependent Children to become employable. It is a program that is worked in conjunction with the Employment Security Department. Recipients are referred to ESD to receive training and placement in jobs. The monies requested in assistance payments ($50,000) pays for child care for these people placed in the program. The payment to Employment Security is the amount of money transferred to Employment Security Department to handle the actual training portions of the program. This program is 90% federal, 10% state. The budget does not reflect the federal funds under the Employment Security portion. All that is reflected here is the federal funds that are brought in through Welfare.

Mr. Duarte stated that in Fiscal Year 1976, there were 2,177 WIN registrants; 2,612 referrals; and 992 people entering employment. Those still employed after 30 days were 683.

Mr. Fred Hillerby, Executive Director of the Nevada Hospital Association, spoke on the Title XIX budget. He stated the Association is concerned that the medical benefits portion of the Welfare budget represents a perpetuation of the cost containment measures instituted May 18, 1976. As everyone is aware, these measures were necessitated by the lack of funding. It should be pointed out that these cost containment measures in many instances only reduce expenditures by the division. The measures did not contain costs to other agencies nor provide services such as out-patient clinic services, emergency room services, pharmacy and in some cases hospital in-patient care. Previously under the Medicaid program, out-patient services such as the emergency room, clinic, lab and radiology were paid on a cost basis - a retrospective basis. At the end of the fiscal year a report would be filed indicating what actual costs were incurred to provide the service and the Medicaid program would pick up their share of that, depending upon the number of patients that were cared for during that period of time. With the cost containment measures that were implemented May 18th, these out-patient services were set up on a fee schedule. The fee schedules were based on the same fee schedules that are utilized for paying for similar care in a physician's office. Mr. Hillerby pointed out that these comparisons are not accurate when you consider that an emergency room of a hospital is equipped to handle severe injuries and is also open 24 hours a day, seven days a week in contrast with the physician's office. Consequently the cost to provide that service through the emergency room is considerably higher than the cost provided through the physician's office. On hospital admissions, one of the decisions made was that only emergency conditions could be treated and in most cases, Mr. Hillerby thinks that only emergency cases are treated. However, when a person presents himself for admission, there may be some question as to whether or not that is an emergency admission, but they are usually admitted and taken care of. The actual cost impact of these types of cutbacks is a little difficult for Mr. Hillerby to get a good handle on. Mr. Hillerby cited Washoe Medical Center as an example. He stated that May 18, 1976 through January 31, 1977, the total loss of costs incurred in treating Title XIX patients in their out-patient clinic is $109,347 (since the introduction of these cost containment measures). Every time Washoe Medical Center, through its out-patient clinic, sees a Title XIX patient, it costs them $16.21. The question is where do you get that cost back? The answers are (1) you have to determine how to increase your fees to the rest of the patients that are admitted and seen in that hospital so that you can recover that costs that you have lost in taking care of the Title XIX patient or (2) you start reducing the quality of the service that you offer. That's the very last option that they would ever want to see occur in the hospitals in Nevada and it has not been done to this date. Consequently, what happens is that we see a direct relationship between those costs that are not recovered through this type of program added onto the charges that must be passed on to you and I as private paying patients or to our insurance companies who cover us. Mr. Hillerby stated that they are trying now to get together the specifics as to what kind of cost impact the limitations are having on the hospitals. So far, the information he has is from Washoe Medical Center only.

Barbara Brady, Clark County Social Service, spoke to the Medical Care Unit budget. She stated that she met with Interim Finance because Clark County was concerned on the bills they would have to pick up with some of the cuts that the Welfare was forced to make. Clark County Social Service is concerned with the difference in the amount of money the Governor has recommended compared to what the agency has requested. They are very confident that Welfare can't make it with what the Governor has recommended. Since the Governor's budget came out, Welfare has restored two items and taken the burden off the county. She thinks they did this so they would then be in compliance with federal guidelines. Those two items alone, she feels, will make the Governor's budget incorrect. These are two programs that the counties will have to pick up if Title XIX is underbudgeted. The counties are funded by 100% county dollars whereas the federal matching returns $.50 to every dollar the state spends. She says they don't have a choice in picking up many of these things. They are mandated in NRS 428, so some how or another the county is going to have to come up with some money if the Welfare division cannot keep on the programs. These are not the cuts in services that Mr. Hillerby is alluding to. The county hasn't picked up those kinds of programs. When they have cut the whole program out, the county has had to pick it up so Ms. Brady asks the Committee to consider putting more money into the Welfare budget for the biennium, or in the alternative that the Committee would consider putting $5,000,000 available to the Interim Finance Committee should the Title XIX budget run out. The choice of what services are given should be the legislators' choice and that would give the legislators the choice of what services they want the people of Nevada to have through the state programs and what services they don't.

Charles Perry, President of the Nevada Association of Health Facilities and Administrator at Vegas Valley Convalscent Hospital

So

Hospital in Las Vegas, spoke to the Medical Care Unit budget. Mr. Perry feels that if the projections in the proposed budget are correct, that adequate funds for the present program are available in their health and care facilities provided that there is no increase in the number of recipients that are projected and that no new nursing home beds come into the program. Also as best he can tell, no provisions have been made for restoration of the services that were reduced in May of 1976. The legislative sub-committee that investigated the problems of the institutionalization of the aged and problems of the aging made some very strong recommendations in their Bulletin No. 77-7. Most of their recommendations were for more efforts in the area of rehabilitation, social and activity types of programs. He also pointed out that the on-sight surveys of the institutions were made by this sub-committee prior to the cuts being made in the program or the reduction of services in the program back in 1976. Mr. Perry feels that there are three things that bear an awful lot of consideration, one is the rate of inflation, two is the overall general increase in the aging population and three are new facilities that may be coming and are coming into the program in Nevada. He feels that if allowances are not made for these factors that there are certain alternatives that have to be faced. One would be a denial of services to some eligible citizens. Two would be a possible reduction in the quality of medical services that they are able to offer now. Three would be additional expense to the counties and loss of federal matching funds. Fourth that some facilities just might be forced to close if adequate funds were not available. The Association took the liberty of retaining an accounting firm to do some research into some of the areas on the budget and will present their findings to the Human Resources sub-committee.

Mr. Miller responded to Barbara Brady's presentation. He stated that some of the cutbacks have been restored by the federal guidelines.

Mr. Kelso responded to Mr. Perry's presentation. Mr. Perry stated that the long term care program is on a cost reimbursement basis. They are making some revisions in that program in spite of the cut-backs under the program that make some services available. We have social services available now in a greater degree than ever before. There is a requirement now laid down by the federal government for a Medical Director. There has been a question of some of the services that have been restricted such as dental in the nursing homes. There is a lack of understanding on the part of some of the providers as to just what is available in the dental area. If a failure to provide dentures causes a threat to the patient's general health , then Title XIX can reimburse for dentures.

Mr. Kelso replied to Mr. Hillerby's presentation. Mr. Kelso stated that Mr. Hillerby quoted a figure from Washoe Medical Center of a total loss in out-patient services of some $109,000 since May 18th. Mr. Kelso said he thought their accountants in Welfare would be interested in looking at those figures.

Chairman Mello asked Mr. Hillerby to present his figures to the Welfare Division and Welfare's analysis of the figures could then be reviewed before the sub-committee.

The meeting adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

PLEASE PRINT

DATE: Feb. 10, 1977

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

NAME	REPRESENTING
Keith Clark	Welfare
Gary Vannoziata	"
[illegible]	"
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
Minor Kelso	Welfare
Fred Hillerby	Nevada Hosp. Assoc
Ace Martelle	Welfare
Barbara J. Brady	Clark Co. Social Services
Gloria Handley	Welfare
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]
Joe Thomas	Adult Group Care
Windy V.F. Van Curen	Adult Group Care Assn
[illegible]	[illegible]
[illegible]	[illegible]

9 February 1977

	Collections With 31 Staff						Caseloads With 31 Staff				
	1 Monthly Collections	2 Cumm. Collections By FY	3 State Share	4 Cumm. State Share By FY	5 Potential Additional Collections By FY	6 Potential Additional State Share By FY	7 IV-D Cases PA	8 IV-D Cases NA	9 IV-D Cases Total	10 IV-D Cases Collected	11 Potential Additional IV-D Cases For Collection
Aug 76	$ 784	$ 784	$ 187	$ 187							
Sep	3,833	4,617	1,386	1,573			5,760	281	6,041	55	
Oct	7,341	11,958	3,215	4,788			5,436	1,046	6,482	107	
Nov	15,567	27,525	7,081	11,869			5,520	1,321	6,841	189	
Dec	20,129	47,654	10,064	21,933			5,512	1,782	7,294	279	
Jan 77	24,798	72,452	12,399	34,332			5,548	1,922	7,470	354	
Feb	28,643	101,095	14,321	48,653			5,583	2,062	7,645	409	
Mar	31,946	133,041	15,973	64,626			5,619	2,202	7,821	477	
Apr	33,249	166,290	16,624	81,250			5,654	2,342	7,996	508	
May	34,901	201,191	17,450	98,700			5,690	2,482	8,172	531	
Jun	36,552	237,743	18,276	116,976			5,725	2,622	8,347	560	
Jun 78	36,552	438,624	18,276	219,312	211,068	105,534	5,910	4,302	10,212	560	538
Jun 79	36,552	438,624	18,276	219,312	452,142	226,071	5,910	4,302	10,212	560	740
Total		1,114,991		555,600	663,210	331,605					

CHART #1

CHILD SUPPORT ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITY REPORT

9 February 1977

	Sep 76	Oct 76	Nov 76	Dec 76	Jan 77	Feb 77	Mar 77	Total To Date
A/P Located (By Fld. Off.)	120	133	371	458				1,082
Secured Vol. Paternity Acknowledgement	5	18	7	28				58
Referred to DA For Paternity Action	-	-	84	88				172
Secured Vol. Support Obligation	-	-	8	40				48
Referred to DA for Supp. Obligation Action	-	-	176	206				382

PARENT LOCATE SERVICE ACTIVITY REPORT

	Sep 76	Oct 76	Nov 76	Dec 76	Jan 77	Feb 77	Mar 77	Total To Date
Ongoing PLS Requests		212	254	318	530			(1,314)
Current Month PLS Requests		338	264	264	342			(1,208)
Absent Parents Located		58	61	22	60			201
A/P's Unable to Locate		238	82	18	60			398
New Information Referrals		-	57	12	87			156
End of Month - Ongoing PLS Requests		254	318	530	665			(1,767)

CHART #2