

MINUTES

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE - 59th Session

April 17, 1977

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Mello at 1:20 p.m.

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

ALSO PRESENT: John Dolan, Assembly Fiscal Analyst; Ron Sparks, Senate Fiscal Analyst; Judge Jim Guinan; Judge Howard Babcock; Judge Roy Torvinen; Judge Keith Hayes; Judge Gordon Thompson; Chief Justice Cameron Batjer; Jim Wittenberg, State Personnel; Jack Hull; Bob Wright, Nevada Cattlemen's Association; J. Bruce Imswiler, Manager of Exploration for Western United States for International Minerals and Chemical Corporation; Howard Winn, Nevada Mining Association; Bob Warren, Nevada League of Cities; Bruce Arkell, State Planning Coordinator; Andy Grose, Legislative Counsel; Richard Bunker, City of Las Vegas; Steven Stern, North Las Vegas and Bob Broadbent, Clark County Commissioners Association.

S.B. 424. Judge Guinan stated that the last thing he had heard about S.B. 424 is that the Senate had taken the bill off the Board. The Committee met and substantially reduced most of the proposed salaries. There was a \$3,000 reduction on District Judges' salaries from the proposed \$40,000. The Supreme Court salaries were lowered from \$46,000 to \$43,000. The Attorney General's salary was reduced from \$40,000 to \$37,000. Judge Guinan stated that according to the press, the reason for the reduction was that the Committee started comparing the figures in the bill with current salaries in other states, which to Judge Guinan seems irrelevant because the bill does not talk about current salaries. For example, as to District Judges, this is the only salary raise they can get for the next eight years. So what they are talking about is what the salaries are going to be in other states four, six and eight years in the future, not what they are today. It would seem to Judge Guinan that the pay raise should be substantial enough to take care of the intervening years.

Judge Guinan stated he didn't have a great deal to add to what was in the report to the Governor on the subject. If anything, Judge Guinan thought the recommendations are lower than they should be when considering the tax consequences. Judge Guinan pointed out that according to a publication of the National Center for State Courts called Judicial Salaries in State Court Systems, Nevada is 9th in per capita income among the states and is 33rd in the salaries that it pays to trial court Judges. Judge Guinan urged the Committee to restore the reductions that were made by the Senate and put the bill back not only in the form in which it was originally introduced, but in the amounts which were requested by the Governor.

Mr. Kosinski asked as to the study that ranked the salaries of District Court Judges in Nevada at 33 among all the states, if the salary today was at the recommended \$43,000 where would Nevada rank. Judge Guinan replied it would be high--that there are only a few states that pay more than that today.

Copies of the study were passed out to the Committee. (Please see attached.)

Judge Guinan stated that one of the reasons for keeping Judges' salaries up to a reasonable figure is so you can attract competent people to the bench. There is not a great rush of applications for the vacancy which is going to occur on the Nevada Supreme Court and the salary is one of the reasons why there is not a great rush.

Judge Roy Torvinen stated that Judge Guinan mentioned some of the tax consequences. Judge Torvinen stated this is not only applicable to District Judges but is applicable to everyone who makes over \$20,000 in state employment. Inflation is not only an insidious thing but takes away our spendable dollars. In the days when there wasn't much more than 2% or 3% inflation the people in the higher income brackets could afford to pay more tax, but that doesn't hold true when your spendable income is depreciated by inflation. Using the 1977 tax guide for the 1976 taxable year, a family of four would have \$3,000 personal exemptions and a standard deduction would be \$2,800 and adding about \$200.00 for tax credits, for a taxable income of \$24,000 the tax was \$5,660. So the increase to \$44,000 suggested in the Governor's study, the tax goes from \$5,660 to \$11,240. The tax table lists that the excess over the specified sum is a 36% tax on the income and it schedules the increase at \$38,000 which would be the taxable income for the same family of \$44,000 as a 45% tax. Looking at it one way you get a 45% increase in wages but your taxes more than double. The increases the Judges suggest the Legislature give them is not going to be the actual dollars that might be suspected on the surface, which is not pointed out in the Governor's report.

In closing, Judge Torvinen said the Judges would appreciate any consideration the Committee would give the Judges in maintaining a continued spendable income.

Judge Babcock, Judge Hayes and Judge Thompson joined in the observations of Judges Guinan and Torvinen and asked the Committee's consideration to restore the amount initially purported out by the Governor.

Judge Manoukian had hoped to be at the meeting, but had to go out of town. He wanted to be on record as concurring with the other Judges.

Chief Justice Cameron Batjer testified that in the report to the Governor, one of the significant things is the chart on Page 3 showing what their actual purchasing power last year was out of the \$35,000 received. Chief Justice Batjer not only requested that the Assembly restore the amounts that have been cut by the Senate, but he would also like to say that the only fair way that these salaries for elected officials in this inflationary aura the country seems to be in, would be to have a cost of living escalation clause attached to the bill. Another significant point to be made is the fact the Justices and Judges last raise was given in 1971 by the Legislature. That became effective four years later and actually it wasn't until 1975 that the Justices and Judges received the benefit of the raise.

Chief Justice Batjer pointed out that as Judge Guinan had said what they are talking about is eight years in the future because the raise won't take effect until January 1, 1979 and with the District Judges on a six year term, they would not be able to receive a pay raise in to the future. Fortunately for the Supreme Court, to take care of the fact that they are elected on alternating six year terms, the Legislature for many years historically has paid the members of the Supreme Court for being Ex-Officio members of the Pardons Board and in that way it adjusted the salaries.

In concluding, Chief Justice Batjer stated that first, if the Legislature raises the salaries, most of the Justices would have to be re-elected and secondly, they would have to live two years.

Jim Wittenberg, State Personnel, spoke in favor of the original bill. It is Mr. Wittenberg's understanding that the most recent amendments cut the salaries considerably from the first reprint.

Chairman Mello pointed out that the first reprint cut the Chief Justices' from \$46,000 to \$43,000.

Mr. Wittenberg stated he was primarily addressing himself to the original bill. He stated he was addressing himself to the study that was completed, the details and rationale that went into the study and some of the conclusions resulting from that. It was a joint study conducted by Mike Brown of the Supreme Court staff, the Department of Administration and his participation in the study. What they basically did was they went back at the outset and took a look at the study results from the Laxalt Committee which was completed in 1970, which resulted in the increases passed by that Legislative Session in 1971. That Committee was composed of a cross-section of leaders in this state (industry, business, labor and government). They spent considerable time addressing the issue that was contained in increases for elected officials and the reasoning and justification that the Laxalt Report used, Mr. Wittenberg thought, made a lot of sense to carry forward. They made some comparisons of salaries among the western states, which is contained in the study. One of the primary things addressed in the Laxalt Study Committee was the issue of inflation.

Mr. Wittenberg stated a very important issue is the effect of the salaries. They are making a comparison when they take a look at the western states and compare the salaries of the Judges and elected officials they are looking at, and in some cases they are fairly comparable today. That's a reasonable position to be in, but they are projecting ahead to 1979, 1983 and 1985, and in some cases Mr. Wittenberg felt action has to be taken now to keep the salaries at a reasonably competitive level at those points in time.

In addition to the recent study, they took a very close look at a salary survey of state governments conducted by Hay Associates. Hay Associates looked at primarily the Governor's and elected officials' salaries throughout the country. In summary, Mr. Wittenberg took several comments out of the Hay Associates summary: "In comparison to executives holding positions of equal job content and value in the private sector, state government executives salaries averages are lower than the lowest in the private sector. Governor's salaries' average are less than 50% of private sector base salary averages for positions of equal job complexity. A minimum of \$50,000 would be more commensurate with the complexities, duties and responsibilities of the office of Governor in the least complex of states." That is a conclusion probably a dozen management consulting firms that have studied the issue have come to and is certainly Mr. Wittenberg's conclusion in this recent study.

Mr. Wittenberg stated there are three western states that are giving consideration to raising elected officials salaries. In addition, there are three other states that have taskforces which will be studying raising salaries and making recommendations by 1978.

A.B. 653. Establishes legislative committee to review federal administrative policies, rules, regulations and related laws.

Assemblyman Rhoads stated this bill was introduced to establish some type of Legislative Committee to review federal administrative rules, policies and regulations. Since he originally introduced the bill, he has amended it in two different directions. He has cut the number of people from 6 to 4 (two Senators and 2 Assemblymen). He has also cut it to where the bill only pertains to policies concerning management of public lands under the control of the federal government.

Mr. Rhoads testified that in the past two or three years, especially in the livestock and mining industries, and possibly in the next year or two a reduction of uses for off-road vehicles and recreational use in the State of Nevada because it is owned 87% by the federal government, there have been problems. Through Mr. Rhoads' efforts and efforts of other people, they have been continually waltzing back and forth with Washington, D.C., and going to hearings throughout the west, but that hasn't done much good. Many have felt that such a review by these Legislators who would have the expertise of the Legislative Counsel to research and review these particularly harmful federal rules and regulations, and with the approval of the Legislative Commission, they could actually direct the Legislative Counsel to prosecute, intervene or appear and even subpoena witnesses into the state to testify on different programs Nevada felt would be harmful.

Jack Hull testified in favor of the bill. He stated as to background experience, he was raised in Elko and Winnemucca and has been a practicing attorney in Elko since December of 1974. In the law practice he has served general business and the livestock industry--public land matters extensively. He is the Elko City Attorney and has worked with recreation people in the area and served as an attorney for the Elko County Hospital and has done a great deal of work in the administrative law field in connection with federal rules and regulations. He reviewed what has happened on the ground in his area in connection with federal regulations.

They find more and more, at least in the legal fraternity, that the bureaucratic, rule making power is being abused and the rules and regulations being passed by the federal bureaucrats exceeds the congressional intent and the laws of Congress. There have been problems in Elko over rules and regulations, for example you go to the golf course to permit the relocation of Interstate 80--one corner of the golf course, approximately 2 acres of involved land. They went through the process to obtain it and in order to obtain 2 acres, before redesigning the golf course they had to agree that the Secretary of the Interior would set the green fees in Elko. This is how far the federal regulations are going. In the government sector they are increasing the cost of city government extensively and in many cases unnecessarily.

From the standpoint of the Livestock Industry, they are having problems with public lands. One of the most recent examples of rule making abuse is in connection with the Wild Horse Act, in which Congress recognized that they were talking about the wild horse as it appears on the public lands, not on private lands, and the Act provided that if the wild horses stray onto private land, the owner would request the Marshal or the Secretary of Interior to remove the horses and the Act requires they remove them. In order to implement that Act, BLM passed rules and regulations. One of the rules passed provides that unless the landowner has his private lands fenced they will not remove the horses. That is not in the Wild Horse Act. Mr. Hull questioned BLM about the reason for that and they said the solicitor told them that the Nevada Fence Law says the owner must fence livestock. He believed that went beyond the rights that were granted property owners in the State of Nevada.

A.B. 653, as amended, is a new approach. It is an oversight approach where the State of Nevada sets up a unique process which will catch on with the rest of the western states where this Legislature has an opportunity to review the impact of federal regulations on Nevada's own authority. Mr. Hull is in favor of the amendment. If Nevada finds, through proper legal administration opinion, that it is not a proper exercise of rule making power, we will have machinery set up to challenge the federal government.

Bob Wright, President of the Nevada Cattlemen's Association, spoke in favor of A.B. 653. His remarks are attached.

Bruce Imswiler, Manager of Exploration for Western United States for International Minerals and Chemical Corporation and also currently the representative of the Nevada Mining Industry on the U.S. Bureau of Land Management Multiple Use Advisory Board, testified in favor of A.B. 653.

As has already been mentioned 87% of the State of Nevada is controlled by the federal government and although there are many users involved, perhaps two of the largest productive users of the public domain concerned are the mining industry and the agricultural industry because these two industries are the two basic industries to any economy. Nevada has a rich heritage in both industries. One of the problems that needs to be elaborated on is how the problem of the BLM intervening and controlling a large of the State of Nevada came about.

In 1946, the BLM evolved from the General Land Office to survey and dispose of land. In 1964 the Multiple Use Act had been passed and it was still the purpose of the BLM to survey and dispose of the federal lands. However, under a concept of multiple use. In 1970 a policy of retention had been adopted and it wasn't until 1976, in October, that the BLM actually had a mandate in the form of the BLM Organic Act known as the Public Land Management Act of 1976.

In order to really appreciate this, up until this Act was passed in 1976, the BLM had assumed authority and had promulgated regulations without a congressional mandate. By the time this Act was passed, BLM had in fact established a strong bureaucracy and one that was functioning so it was in fact a self-created establishment.

As far as the industry Mr. Imswiler represents is concerned, they have had an increasing number of problems. This is typified by two most recent sets of rules and regulations that have been promulgated by the BLM, specifically the regulation for recordation of mining claims and the regulations for surface management regulations which came out in December. This service management of public land under U.S. Mining Laws came out on December 6, 1976. On December 9th, both Mr. Rhoads and Mr. Imswiler were in a meeting of the State Multiple Use Advisory Board and the State Director saw this for the first time at that point. He had no idea that it was coming. He asked Mr. Imswiler to comment on it because it affected Mr. Imswiler specifically. There was a 30 day comment period during the Christmas vacation and only through the efforts of the Governor and Congressional delegation that this period was extended. Essentially the same thing happened a year prior to that when the grazing fees were increased on the cattlemen and Mr. Imswiler had been in a steering committee meeting and asked the State Director of BLM specifically if Nevada was to be kept informed on all pertinent items and he assured Mr. Imswiler yes, and it was about 10 or 12 days after that that the new grazing regulations were announced and there was no prior warning.

These are examples of the necessity for an oversight Committee on the state level so that if we are not going to be able to accomplish anything on the Advisory Boards, the last hope is the State Legislature.

Howard Winn, representing the Nevada Mining Association, testified in favor of A.B. 653.

Bob Warren, representing Nevada League of Cities and National Association of County Commissioners, spoke in favor of A.B. 653. His remarks are attached.

Chairman Mello wondered if they wouldn't be better off having the Chairman of the Commission appointing the people to make sure that the people that are interested will be on the Committee instead of letting both Houses do it. Mr. Rhoads agreed.

Mr. Vergiels wondered how they would take \$8,600 and four Legislators and do a good job. Mr. Rhoads replied he had talked to Art Palmer and Frank Daykin and they hesitated to even put a fiscal note on the bill because they said it depends on how many studies the Legislative Functions Committee comes up with. If they come up with very few, he figured to have enough staff to do it right now.

Mr. Rhoads' bill was aimed at relieving some of the Legislators of the necessity of meeting constantly.

Mr. Howard stated he was in complete favor of what the bill is trying to do but wondered if the bill could be amended rather than the Interim sessions of the Legislature appointing by resolution, to put this in the statutes and have the Legislative Commission appoint the members who would be under the auspices of the Legislative Commission, which would give them more power.

Mr. Howard suggested that it be left as a statute as an ongoing Committee, but that the appointments would be made by the Legislative Commission.

Mr. Vergiels asked if they needed more money or if there wasn't enough personnel if they would go to the Commission and the Commission would appropriate more money for them so they wouldn't get caught in a bind. Mr. Howard replied exactly.

S.B. 229. Mr. Hickey testified that the bill was heard in Agriculture and passed out unanimously. This is a pass through. There will be some problems within the bee industry which this bill will help address. It deals primarily with a disease in the bee industry. The charge generally goes through the bee industry itself.

S.B. 87. Andy Gross testified that the bill was the only bill that came out of the Interim Study on record retention policies of local governments. Mr. Grose was assigned the responsibility for the staff study on the subject. Knowing absolutely nothing about it, they called upon Mr. Gale to assist them. He really didn't know what the problems were at the local government level either. The Legislative Commission approved a schedule that allowed Mr. Gale and Mr. Grose to visit all of the county seats in the state. They held meetings with local government officials (primarily county officials, although municipal officials attended as well). After visiting all the county seats, they compiled a listing of all the suggestions that anybody from any county seat had made. They also went before the local government Advisory Committee and Department of Taxation and explained to them what they had done up to that point. They then compiled all of this and sent it out to every local official that attended all of the meetings, and asked the local officials what they thought were appropriate suggestions to help the local officials out in terms of managing records at the local government level. In the answers received there was at least 75% support for anything in the bill.

The bill, as written, really has no fiscal impact. The fiscal impact that brings it before Ways and Means is a fiscal impact of about which Mr. Gale speculates, but which they cannot really say with any assurance is going to exist. That is the main point Mr. Grose concluded with.

Chairman Mello asked if Mr. Grose had the background of why the funds were requested by the Deputy Archivist. Mr. Grose replied that from what he understood the Chairman put his finger on it Friday when he pointed out that he did not get this position through the Executive Budget process and this looked like a likely vehicle on which he could try again.

Chairman Mello asked if the bill was necessary. Mr. Grose replied the state could live without the bill, but it would be a helpful piece of legislation. It would not add any burden to anybody. Chairman Mello asked who requested the legislation. Mr. Grose replied technically the Commission did.

Chairman Mello asked Ron Sparks, Senate Fiscal Analyst, why the money was needed. Mr. Sparks replied the bill does not necessarily call for putting the extra money in the budget. Senate Finance did feel that if the bill were to be passed, plus the request by the Archivist for one addition position and associated costs, that they felt they should put the money in if in fact the bill was going to be passed.

Mr. Sparks said one Archivist Assistant, in-state travel, operation and equipment were put into the budget by Senate Finance.

Mr. Sparks indicated that this is a combination of S.B. 87 plus the testimony for additional assistance regardless of S.B. 87. It is not tied to S.B. 87 but in addition to S.B. 87.

Chairman Mello asked if Senate Finance felt that there was sufficient worth there without S.B. 87 to add that position. Mr. Sparks replied no.

Chairman Mello asked if S.B. 87 fails, how would Senate Finance feel about it. Mr. Sparks replied they would have to make a redetermination.

A.B. 64. Mr. Hickey made a motion for a "Do Pass"; seconded by Mr. Vergiels. Motion passed.

A.B. 720. Mr. Kosinski testified in favor of the bill. He stated the bill would effectively regulate lobbying by state and local governments for the State of Nevada. The bill is essentially one similar to one that was introduced last Session. It would require, among other things, that each department or agency may only designate one person to be their lobbyist during the Legislative Session. The goal of the bill is two-fold: one would be to limit, or at least document the dollars spent during the Legislative Session for conducting the public's business. Secondly, the bill might have a positive effect in that some of the agencies would have one voice instead of in some cases where the Committee has maybe an agency Administrator testifying in one direction and possibly some of the people under him giving testimony that indicated the agency may go one way or another or may be willing to deviate from that single goal.

Mr. Kosinski felt the bill might also cut down on the number of people in the hallway who are trying to funnel Legislators in intermissions between Committee hearings and Sessions.

There are several problems with the bill. One is that the bill states that each department and other agency of the state and each of its political subdivisions, particularly on the state level and in many cases a department might be too large to have only one lobbyist representing the entire department.

Bob Warren testified against the bill, stating that if the bill were enacted, it would substantially increase the costs of city and county government and school district government in Nevada.

Mr. Warren stated that by lobbying, a lot of taxpayers' dollars are being saved. If they are unable to bring in their expert witnesses to bring the necessary information there is a problem. He further stated inasmuch as one-fourth of the bills that come before the Legislature have an impact on city and county government, it is a major concern to city and county government that they be permitted to have full access to the Committees and bring in the staff people and management level people whenever they feel they can make a contribution. An imbalance would be created by the bill. The private sector would have no restrictions on its input into the legislative process. The public sector would. This would imbalance the level and quality of testimony and completeness of the testimony.

Richard Bunker, representing the City of Las Vegas, opposed the bill.

Steven Stern, representing North Las Vegas, concurred with Mr. Warren's remarks and opposed the bill.

Bob Broadbent, Clark County Commissions Association, spoke in opposition to the bill. He stated for the small counties it is hard enough to get them over to testify anyway because many of them are frightened by the process and are afraid to come. When they do come, if they are afraid to do anything, they are probably going to lose the ability to even get any input from those people. Mr. Broadbent stated that in the case of Clark County or Washoe County, there are perhaps 400 or 500 bills that have some impact on them. If they are limited in the number of people they can use, the process of government for them may be hampered.

Mrs. Brookman, speaking as a Legislator, opposed the bill.

A Subcommittee of Mr. Kosinski, Mr. Howard, Mr. Warren and Mr. Bunker was appointed to study A.B. 720.

A.B. 653. Mr. Rhoads made a motion to amend the bill to cut down the number of Legislators from six to four, two being appointed from the Assembly and two being appointed from the Senate appointed by the Legislative Commission and who will report back to the Commission on any findings; and to amend the bill to where it would only pertain to the administration of public lands; and to amend the bill to state it would take three members for a quorum; and to amend the bill to provide for \$40.00 a day per diem; seconded by Mr. Vergiels. Motion passed.

Mr. Rhoads made a motion for a "Do Pass, as amended"; seconded by Mr. Howard. Motion passed. (Mr. Kosinski voted no.)

S.B. 229. Mr. Bremner made a motion for a "Do Pass"; seconded by Mrs. Brookman. Motion passed.

S.B. 87. Mr. Kosinski made a motion for reconsideration of the bill without fiscal impact; seconded by Mrs. Brookman. Motion passed.

Mr. Howard made a motion that the Committee hold tight and not go for the other funds; seconded by Mrs. Brookman. Motion passed.

Mr. Vergiels made a motion for a "Do Pass"; seconded by Mr. Kosinski. Motion passed.

A.B. 278. Bruce Arkell, State Planning Coordinator went over A.B. 278 with the Committee and went over his report relating to Board that receive no salary or some amount other than \$40.00 per day. (A copy is attached.)

so

Mr. Glover made a motion for adoption of the report; seconded by Mrs. Brookman. Motion passed.

The meeting adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

April 8, 1977

MEMORANDUM

TO: Senator Floyd Lamb
FROM: Ron Sparks, Office of Fiscal Analysis
SUBJECT: Senate Bill 424

A report, resulting from a joint study conducted by the Personnel Division of the Department of Administration and the Supreme Court Judicial Planning Unit, recommended the salaries of elected officials be raised, effective January 1, 1979, to the following:

Governor	\$51,000
Supreme Court Justices	49,500
Attorney General	44,000
District Judges	44,000
Secretary of State	35,000
Controller	35,000
Treasurer	35,000
Lieutenant Governor	15,000

Senate Bill 424, as drafted, does provide for increases in elected officials' salaries but not to the level that was recommended in the study. Below is a schedule showing the current salaries of the elected officials, along with those contained in Senate Bill 424:

		<u>Current Salary</u>	<u>Senate Bill 424</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>	
47	Governor	47 \$40,000	\$50,000	25 %	150%
43	Supreme Court Justices	43 35,000	46,000	31.4%	135%
37	Attorney General	37 30,000	40,000	33.3%	133%
	District Judges	40 30,000	43,000	43.3%	150%
	Secretary of State	30 25,000	33,330	33.3%	178%
	Controller	27 22,500	30,000	33.3%	150%
	Treasurer	27 22,500	30,000	33.3%	150%
	Lieutenant Governor	8 6,000	8,000	33.3%	122%

The primary factor in arriving at the salary levels for these officials is to raise their salary status in relation to other government and private industry salaries of comparable duties and responsibilities.

Attached is a copy of a survey of elected officials' salaries in western states.

Senate Bill 424 also provides for an increase in legislators' salaries from \$60 to \$80. 33 3% 100%

RS:fl
Attachment

SALARIES OF TOP ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICERS BY STATE

Functional Area	Governor	Lieutenant Governor	Secretary of State	Treasurer	Controller	Attorney General
Nevada Title	Governor	Lieutenant Governor	Secretary of State	Treasurer	Controller	Attorney General
<u>Western States</u>						
Nevada	\$40,000	\$ 6,000PT ^{cc}	\$25,000	\$22,500	\$22,500	\$30,000
Alaska	50,000	44,000	44,000	39,372 - 47,304	22,668 - 27,252	48,576
Arizona	43,200	none	25,920	24,300	a	37,800
Colorado	40,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	26,220	32,500
Idaho	33,000	8,000PT ^s	21,500	21,500	21,500	25,000
Montana	30,000	20,500	18,000	18,000	z	25,000
New Mexico	35,000	g	24,000	24,000	a	30,000
Oregon	42,350	none	35,090	35,090	See Secretary of State	35,090
Utah	35,000	22,000	k	21,000	a	25,000
Washington	42,150	17,800	21,400	24,150	a	31,500
Wyoming	45,000	None	28,000	28,000	28,000	31,296 - 41,928
<u>Other States</u>						
Alabama	29,475	PT ¹	22,959	22,959	23,249	33,500
Arkansas	23,438 ⁱ	12,175PT ¹	14,675 ⁱ	14,675 ⁱ	14,675 ⁱ	15,675 ⁱ
Connecticut	42,000	18,000	20,000	20,000	20,000	30,000
Delaware	35,000	12,000	18,720	18,000	20,000	30,000
Georgia	50,000	25,000	35,000	See Finance/ Administration	35,000	40,000
Indiana	36,010	23,504	23,504	23,504	a	27,014
Iowa	40,000	12,000PT ^v	22,500	22,500	32,750	29,000
Kansas	35,000	10,400PT	20,000	20,000	24,828 - 31,548	32,500
Kentucky	39,500	27,900	27,900	27,900	a	27,900
Louisiana	50,000	40,000	35,000	35,000	30,000	35,000
Maryland	25,000	44,856	24,000	44,856	44,856	44,856
Minnesota ^m	41,000 -	30,000 -	25,000 -	25,000 -	a	36,500 -
	51,250	37,500	31,250	31,250		45,625
Mississippi	43,000	a	28,000	26,000	a	30,000
Missouri	37,500	16,000	25,000	20,000	See Finance/ Administration	25,000
New Hampshire	33,744	a	25,101	25,456	28,644	28,846
New Jersey	65,000	None	43,000	43,000	See Budget	43,000
New York	85,000	60,000	47,800	35,020	60,000	60,000
North Carolina	40,332	31,500	32,532	32,532	32,532	36,708
North Dakota ^p	40,000	6,500PT	27,000	27,000	See Finance/ Administration	32,000
Ohio	50,000	30,000	38,000	38,000	38,000	38,000
Oklahoma	42,500 ^j	24,000	18,500	22,000	18,780 - 28,880	27,500
Pennsylvania	60,000	45,000	35,000	42,500	a	40,000
South Carolina	39,000	17,500	34,000	34,000	34,000	34,000
Tennessee	60,550 ^o	7,373PT ^o	41,292 ^o	41,292 ^o	a	47,269 ^o
Texas	66,800	7,200PT	39,900	42,300	42,300	42,300
Vermont	36,100	15,500PT	19,600	19,600	a	23,959
Virginia	50,000	10,525PT	20,000	36,150	35,650	37,500
West Virginia	50,000	None	30,000	35,000	32,000	35,000
Wisconsin	44,292	28,668	22,140	22,140	a	36,450

BOARD OF DIRECTORS

Sylvia Bacon, Associate Judge, Superior Court, District of Columbia
 Ronald J. Faricy, Judge, Ramsey County Municipal Court, St. Paul, Minnesota
 James A. Finch, Jr., Justice, Supreme Court of Missouri, *President*
 M. Michael Gordon, Judge, Municipal Court of Houston, Texas
 Robert H. Hall, Justice, Supreme Court of Georgia
 Lawrence W. L'Anson, Chief Justice, Virginia Supreme Court
 E. Leo Milonas, Supervising Judge, Criminal Court of the City of New York
 C. William O'Neill, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Ohio
 Edward E. Pringle, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Colorado, *Vice President*
 William S. Richardson, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Hawaii
 Joseph R. Weisberger, Presiding Justice, Superior Court of Rhode Island
 Robert A. Wenke, Superior Court, Los Angeles, California

Alice L. O'Donnell, Federal Judicial Center, Washington, D.C., *Secretary-Treasurer*
 Professor Maurice Rosenberg, School of Law, Columbia University, New York, New York, *Chairman, Advisory Council*
 John S. Clark, Esq., Petoskey, Michigan, *Vice Chairman, Advisory Council*
 John W. King, Justice, Superior Court of New Hampshire, *Chairman, Council of State Court Representatives*

Edward B. McConnell, Director, Denver, Colorado
 Arne L. Schoeller, Deputy Director, Washington, D.C.
 William J. Conner, Associate Director for Administration, Denver, Colorado, *Assistant Secretary-Treasurer*
 Barry Mahoney, Associate Director for Programs, Denver, Colorado
 Alexander B. Aikman, Director, Mid-Atlantic Regional Office, Williamsburg, Virginia
 Charles D. Cole, Director, Southeastern Regional Office, Atlanta, Georgia
 Daniel D. Conti, Director, Northeastern Regional Office, Boston, Massachusetts
 Robert Davis, Director, South Central Regional Office, Norman, Oklahoma
 Francis L. Bremson, Director, North Central Regional Office, St. Paul, Minnesota
 Larry L. Sipes, Director, Western Regional Office, San Francisco, California

RANK ORDER OF JUDICIAL SALARIES, POPULATION, AND PER CAPITA PERSONAL INCOME IN THE FIFTY STATES

The salaries reported for the highest appellate court refer to the salaries paid to associate justices. The general trial court salaries refer to the standard state-paid salary for ranking purposes. The Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, District of Columbia and United States courts are ranked relative to the states, but did not figure in the initial numbering.

JUDICIAL SALARIES

State	Highest Appellate Courts	General Trial Courts	Per Capita Personal Income ^a	Population ^a
ALABAMA	40*	45*	47	21
ALASKA	4	3	1	50
ARIZONA	30	24*	29	32
ARKANSAS	45	38	48	39
CALIFORNIA	1	1	8	1
COLORADO	17*	24*	16	28
CONNECTICUT	34	19	2	24
DELAWARE	15	12	3	46*
FLORIDA	17*	16	20	8
GEORGIA	17*	27	35	14
HAWAII	11	5*	7	40
IDAHO	44	39	34	42
ILLINOIS	5*	13	5	5
INDIANA	28	42 ^b	28	12
IOWA	25*	23	25	25
KANSAS	38*	49 ^b	17	30
KENTUCKY	25*	18	43	23
LOUISIANA	5*	5*	44	20
MAINE	50	45*	38	38
MARYLAND	13	11	10	18

^a U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis. March 24, 1976, statistics for 1974 (most recent year final statistics available).

^b Rank is based on lower figure of salary range.

* Another state has the same rank.

State	Highest Appellate Courts	General Trial Courts	Per Capita Personal Income	Population
MASSACHUSETTS	16	15	12	10
MICHIGAN	5*	40	11	7
MINNESOTA	31*	29	19	19
MISSISSIPPI	38*	33*	50	29
MISSOURI	31*	31*	30	15
MONTANA	49	47	31	43
NEBRASKA	22	14	26	35
NEVADA	35*	33*	9	46*
NEW HAMPSHIRE	37	22	33	41
NEW JERSEY	8	8	4	9
NEW MEXICO	40*	31*	49	37
NEW YORK	2	2	6	2
NORTH CAROLINA	21	28	37	11
NORTH DAKOTA	43	33*	14	45
OHIO	17*	48 ^b	15	6
OKLAHOMA	29	50 ^b	39	27
OREGON	27	17	24	31
PENNSYLVANIA	3	4	18	4
RHODE ISLAND	33	21	22	39
SOUTH CAROLINA	24	10	46	26
SOUTH DAKOTA	48	43	36	44
TENNESSEE	10	9	40	17
TEXAS	9	26	32	3
UTAH	46	41	42	36
VERMONT	47	44	41	48
VIRGINIA	14	7	23	13
WASHINGTON	23	20	13	22
WEST VIRGINIA	35*	30	45	34
WISCONSIN	12	37	27	16
WYOMING	42	33*	21	49
COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO	43 ^c	43 ^c		
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	15 ^c	10 ^c		
FEDERAL SYSTEM	1 ^c	7 ^c		

JUDICIAL SALARIES IN APPELLATE AND TRIAL COURTS

State	Supreme Court	Intermediate Appellate Court	General Trial Court	Date of Last Salary Change
ALABAMA	\$ 33,500	\$ 33,000	\$ 25,000 (36,700)	1/20/75
ALASKA	52,992		48,576	7/1/75
ARIZONA	37,000	35,000	33,000	1/6/75
ARKANSAS	31,189		29,013	7/1/76
CALIFORNIA	62,935	59,002	49,166	9/1/76
COLORADO	40,000	37,000	33,000	7/1/76
CONNECTICUT	36,000		34,500	1/3/73
DELAWARE	42,000		39,000	7/1/75
FLORIDA	40,000	38,000	36,000	1/1/75
GEORGIA	40,000	39,500	32,500 (44,600)	7/1/75
HAWAII	45,000		42,500	1/1/76
IDAHO	31,500		28,500	7/1/76
ILLINOIS	50,000	45,000	37,000	7/1/75
INDIANA	38,100	38,100	26,500- 31,500	6/1/75
IOWA	39,000	36,000	33,072	7/1/76
KANSAS	34,000	33,000	22,000 (30,400)	1/10/77
KENTUCKY	39,000	37,000	35,000	6/30/76
LOUISIANA	50,000	47,500	42,500	7/1/76
MAINE	26,000		25,500	4/1/74
MARYLAND	44,100	41,400	39,200	7/1/75
MASSACHUSETTS	40,788	37,771	36,203	1/1/74
MICHIGAN	43,500	44,478	27,700 (45,257)	1/1/76
MINNESOTA	36,500		32,000	7/1/73
MISSISSIPPI	34,000		30,000	7/1/74
MISSOURI	36,500	34,000	31,000	9/28/75
MONTANA	27,000		25,000	7/1/75

^b Rank is based on lower figure of salary range.

^c After all the states were ranked, these courts were ranked relative to the states.

Note: Salaries including supplements are shown in parentheses immediately beneath the figures for state-paid salaries.

State	Supreme Court	Intermediate Appellate Court	General Trial Court	Date of Last Salary Change
NEBRASKA	39,750		36,500 (38,000)	1/1/77
NEVADA	35,000		30,000	1/1/75
NEW HAMPSHIRE	34,060		33,956	1/1/75
NEW JERSEY	48,000	45,000	40,000	6/28/74
NEW MEXICO	33,500	32,000	31,000	7/1/76
NEW YORK	60,575	51,627	48,998	7/1/74
NORTH CAROLINA	39,816	37,224	32,016	7/1/76
NORTH DAKOTA	32,000		30,000	7/1/76
OHIO	40,000	37,000	23,500- 34,000	11/16/73
OKLAHOMA	38,000	35,000	21,000- 32,000	7/1/76
OREGON	38,720	37,510	35,090	7/1/76
PENNSYLVANIA	55,000	53,000	45,000	7/1/76
RHODE ISLAND	36,300		34,100	6/20/76
SOUTH CAROLINA	39,272		39,272	7/1/76
SOUTH DAKOTA	28,000		26,000	4/1/75
TENNESSEE	47,629	43,659	39,690	7/1/76
TEXAS	47,900	41,800 (46,400)	32,800 (46,400)	9/1/76
UTAH	30,000		27,500	7/1/75
VERMONT	29,900		25,800	7/1/74
VIRGINIA	44,000		41,000	7/1/76
WASHINGTON	39,412	36,325	34,250	7/1/75
WEST VIRGINIA	35,000		31,500	7/1/76
WISCONSIN	44,160		29,940 (39,948)	7/1/75
WYOMING	32,500		30,000	7/1/75
NATIONAL AVERAGE	39,581 ^a	40,218 ^b	33,446 ^a	NA
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA	42,120		39,600	10/1/76
FEDERAL SYSTEM COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO	63,000	44,600	42,000	10/1/75
	32,000		26,000	7/31/74

Note: Salaries including supplements are shown in parentheses immediately beneath the figures for state-paid salaries.

^aArithmetic average figured for the 50 states.

^bArithmetic average figured for the 27 states that have intermediate appellate courts.

Key to Abbreviations

AC	Appellate Court	DCA	District Court of Appeals
AdDirCt	Administrative Director of the Court	DistJ	District Judge
ADistJ	Associate District Judge	DpCJ	Deputy Chief Justice
AJ	Associate Judge, Justice	Equity C	Equity Court
AppDiv	Appellate Division	ExecOff	Executive Officer
AsstJ	Assistant Judge	GenSessCt	General Sessions Court
CA	Court of Appeals	J	Judge
CC	Circuit Court	JC	Justice Courts
CCivA	Court of Civil Appeals	JDRC	Juvenile and Domestic Relations Court
CCrA	Court of Criminal Appeals	JP	Justice of the Peace
Ch	Chancellor	Juv	Juvenile Court
ChC	Chancery Court	MC	Municipal Court
CirJ	Circuit Judge	PC	Probate Court
CJ	Chief Judge, Justice	PCirJ	Presiding Circuit Judge
Co	County	PJ	Presiding Judge
CoC	County Court	PoC	Police Court
CoDC	County District Court	SC	Superior Court
Comm	Commissioner	SCA	State Court Administrator
Comp	Compensation	SCoC	Superior County Court
CP	Court of Common Pleas	SpecJ	Special Judge
CrC	Criminal Court	SrC	Surrogate Court
CrDC	Criminal District Court	StIndustCt	State Industrial Court
CSA	Court of Special Appeals	SupCt	Supreme Court
Ct	Court	Supp	Supplement
DC	District Court	VCh	Vice Chancellor

Nevada League of Cities

ROBERT E. WARREN
Executive Director

AB 653 4-17-77

Assemblyman Rhoads:

Because of the continually increasing size and complexity of Federal & State governments, the multitude of regulations that daily flow from these entities are becoming increasingly complex and hard to understand.

after they fail to properly reflect the true intent of the Congress or State legislature.

This leads to a variety of interpretations by the local governments and the public in general - which is the target of most of these regulations

(over)

TERMINGTON

WINHEMUCCA

WELLS

SPARKS

RENO

NORTH LAS VEGAS

LOVELOCK

LAS VEGAS

BOULDER CITY

CALIENTE

CADILLAC

CARSON CITY

ELKO

ELY

FALLOON

GARRIS

HENDERSON

As a consequence local governments spend inordinate amounts of time and money meeting with the regulation making entities in a usually frustrating and time-consuming attempt to agree upon the interpretation of the regulations.

Sometimes there is a complete breakdown - leading to costly lawsuits that tie up important projects for years.

Your suggestion to establish a legislative committee to review Federal regs is excellent.

It will be even more useful if the concept is expanded to a review of state regulations.

Respectfully

Bob.

I am tied up in another hearing. Hope you can read this.

A. B. 653 - Review ~~of~~ Federal Adm. Policies and
rules and regulations:

Bob Wright - Pres. Nevada Cattlemen Ass'n.
Distinguished Leadership and Gentlemen of the Ways and Means Committee:

I would first give my approval to the statement
given by Jack Hull.

The laws ~~being~~ recently enacted by the Congress of
the U.S. have been ones that involve state and individual
rights. The rules and reg's. adopted to enforce these laws
have in some instances seem to ~~be~~ differ with the
intent of the Congress.

With the coming of more rules and reg's, ^{which} ~~greatly~~ ⁱⁿ
some way, ^{affects} ~~affecting~~ us all, the citizens ^{and the State} have a need for
a effective, respected oversight review committee to
determine the reasonableness ~~and~~ of these rules and
reg's. In the past about all the means of making your
needs known has been advisory Boards and being of
an advisory capacity this has not been effective. And now
most of these advisory boards are being abolished.

The citizens of the State have a real need for a
review committee of this type. With the respectability
this committee would have, perhaps the ~~people~~ persons
who formulate these rules and reg's. would be more
conscientious ~~in their~~ in following the intent of the law.

The Association that I represent respectfully ask that
~~you~~ a favorable consideration be given to A.B. 653, as
amended.

Thank you very much.

BOARDS IN AB 278 THAT RECEIVE NO
SALARY OR SOME AMOUNT OTHER THAN \$40/DAY

of Checked or
pt'd state/
cal officials

	Board	Current Rate	# Members Per AB278	# Meetings Per Year	Total Cost at \$40/Day
<i>delete</i>	Alfalfa Seed Advisory Board	0	7	4	\$ 1,120
<i>deleted</i>	Child Care Policy Board	0	9	4	1,440
<i>paid</i>	Children and Youth, Governors Advisory Council on	0	9	3	1,080
7	Communications Board, State	prohibited	7	4	-0-
2	<i>paid</i> Conservation Commission, State	0	9	4	1,120
	<i>paid</i> Credit Union Advisory Council	0	5	2	400
	Crimes, Delinquency and Corrections, Commission on	0	17	8	5,440
	<i>paid</i> Economic Development Advisory Council (Industry)	0	7	1	280
	<i>paid</i> Economic Development Advisory Council (Tourism)	0	7	1	280
9	Elderado Valley Advisory Group	0	9	1	-0-
	<i>paid</i> Employee-Management Advisory Committee	0	10	2	800
3	<i>paid</i> Energy Resources Advisory Board	0	15	6	2,880
5	<i>paid</i> Environmental Commission, State	0	9	4	640
	<i>paid</i> Federal Lands, State Multiple Use, Advisory Committee on	0	13	3	1,560
	<i>paid</i> Fire Marshal's Advisory Board, State	0	5	5	1,000
	<i>paid</i> Forestry & Fire Control, State Board of	0	7	2	560
	Game Management Boards (17) Co.	prohibited	3 ea	N/A	-0-
	Ground Water Boards	0	7 ea	N/A	-0-
	Hearing Aid Specialists, State Board of	0	3	1	120
4	<i>paid</i> Insurance, Committee on Group Land Use Planning Adv. Council, State	0	17	2	1,360
1	<i>paid</i> Libraries, Nevada Council on	0	7	2	480
	Liquefied Petroleum Gas Board, Nevada	0	5	3	600
3	<i>paid</i> Livestock Show Board, Nev. Jr.	0	7	2	320
	<i>paid</i> Lost City Museum Adv. Com.	0	7	3	840
	<i>paid</i> Medical Laboratory Adv. Com.	0	7	2	560
	<i>paid</i> Mental Hygiene & Mental Retardation, Advisory Board	0	7	4	1,120
5	Merit Award Board	0	5	2	-0-
2	Mining Board, Advisory	0	7	2	400
	<i>paid</i> Museum Board of Trustees, Nevada	0	9	9	3,240
1	Nursing Facility Home Administrators, Board of Examiners for Skilled	0	5	1	160
2	Oil and Gas Conservation Com.	0	3	0	-0-
	<i>paid</i> Older Americans, Advisory Committee on	0	9	6	2,160
	<i>paid</i> Park Advisory Commission	0	7	4	1,120
1	<i>paid</i> Post Secondary Institutional Authorization, Com. on	0	7	4	960
1	Private Investigators Licensing Bd.	0	5	4	640
	Racing Commission, Nevada	0	5	1	200
	<i>paid</i> Review Board (Occupational Safety and Health)	0	5	12	2,400
1	<i>paid</i> Textbook Commission, State	0	9	3	960
	<i>paid</i> Virginia City Historic District Commission	0	7	12	3,360
8	Vocational Technical Education, Nev. Adv. Council for	0	13	15	3,000
	<i>paid</i> Youth Services Agency Adv. Bd.	0	7	4	1,120
					<u>\$ 45,280</u>

Ways of TEANS

APRIL 17, 1977

PLEASE SIGN IN (PLEASE PRINT)

NAME

REPRESENTING

Sack & Hull

Self.

Doc Wright - attorney

Nevada Cattlemen's Assn.

J. Bruce Inswiler, Inswiler

Exploration Geologists of Nevada

Howard Wain

Stamm Stubb

Nevada Mining Assn

South Las Vegas

Bruce Akell

State Planning