

MINUTES

Assembly WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE - 60th SESSION

March 9, 1979

Chairman Mello called the meeting to order at 7:32 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mello, Mr. Barengo, Mrs. Cavnar, Mr. Glover, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Mann, Mr. Rhoads, Mrs. Wagner, Mr. Webb

MEMBERS ABSENT: Vice-Chairman Bremner

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Bible, Fiscal Analyst; Judy Matteucci, Deputy Fiscal Analyst; Mike Alastuey, Deputy Budget Director; Mr. Wittenberg, Personnel Division; Mr. Wally Voskuil; Mr. Mitch Brust, Personnel Division; Mr. Bill Swackhamer, Secretary of State; Mr. Roger Laird, Personnel Division; Mr. Lody Smith, Division of Forestry

ADMINISTRATION - PERSONNEL DIVISION

Mr. James Wittenberg, Director of Personnel Division stated that the function of the Personnel Division is to provide the best possible personnel services to the various operating agencies within the state. He commented that although the agency is service oriented, there are many controversial areas such as Classification, Examination and Productivity. The objectives of the agency are accomplished through an organizational structure containing 5 sections: Special Services, Classification and Pay, Recruitment and Examining, Training and Productivity and Employee Relations.

Mr. Wittenberg asked Mr. Alastuey to address the funding structure of the budget. Mr. Alastuey distributed a memorandum (Exhibit A) addressed to the Fiscal Analysis Division which details by source the assessments that fund the Personnel Division. He explained that the regular personnel assessment has been established at .009 of gross payroll assessed uniformly to all agencies. Mr. Alastuey continued that the contributors to this source are all state agencies and separately submitted are payments from Nevada Industrial Commission, Public Employees Retirement System, Employment Security Department, Highway Department, University System and not reflected anywhere else is Longevity Pay which creates its own assessment income to the Personnel Division. The Budget Division concludes that the estimated amounts will be short of the estimated need in Personnel Division by about \$70,000 per year. Mr. Alastuey further explained that during 1977-78 Personnel Division incurred salary savings of about \$70,000 which could be introduced to the Personnel budget as an off-set.

Mr. Alastuey continued with the next assessment which is a .002 rate that is charged to agencies for the functioning of the Personnel Payroll System. The agency obtained from Interim Finance last year an allocation of \$15,507 to make up for a short-fall; however, when adding the two entities which remit into this source, a shortage of \$160,000 the first year and \$170,000 the second year was found.

Mr. Alastuey stated that the Personnel budget contains sufficient funding for operating the program at the present level; however, the budgeted assessment amounts in other agency budgets are not sufficient. He said that a .0015 increase is necessary.

Chairman Mello asked what would be the result if the rate increase is not approved and Mr. Alastuey stated there would be insufficient income to operate the basic Personnel Payroll system. Mr. Alastuey then referred to the State Unemployment Compensation account which is administered by the Department of Administration and is a flow-through account which collects .004 on gross salaries from all state agencies on a bi-weekly basis and is used to pay on a quarterly basis, the actual cost of unemployment compensation to those who have state service.

Mr. Alastuey noted the current balance is \$322,745.55 and only \$3,580.38 had been expended through the quarter ending March 1978. The quarterly disbursement ending June 1978 was \$10,992.27 and an additional \$54,884.48 was collected leaving a fund balance at \$376,637.76. Mr. Alastuey suggested reducing the unemployment compensation to the extent that the payroll assessment is not sufficient.

Chairman Mello suggested the possibility of using those funds to help fund the budgets of those agencies that paid the money.

Mr. Mann suggested that reductions be made in Personnel's budget to compensate for the revenue short-fall.

Chairman Mello asked how many people present were from Personnel and if they were on leave. The response was no, and Mr. Wittenberg stated they had come to answer any questions relative to their program.

Mr. Wittenberg continued his explanation of the Personnel Division by stating that the area of Special Services is self-sustaining and provides technical assistance to local political sub-divisions upon request. Another area within Special Services is the Affirmative Action area which focuses on the work-force composition with reference to ethnic minorities, women and handicapped individuals.

Mr. Wittenberg stated a third area under Special Services is the Inter-Governmental Personnel Act which during the past seven years has distributed approximately three-fourths of a million dollars of Federal money to Nevada at both the state and local level to improve Personnel practices.

Mr. Wittenberg pointed out an Occupational Assistance Program which is a counseling service to employees with problems serious enough to affect their work productivity.

Mr. Wittenberg requested a position for an additional Analyst for the Classification section to meet the increased demand. He noted a volume increase in the Classification Review process in 1978 which was a result of the Factor Ranking Classification study.

Mr. Wittenberg stated the Recruitment and Examining takes the largest percentage of the resources.

Mr. Wittenberg told the Committee that in 1977 he had requested staff to conduct Productivity Studies, which have resulted in the elimination of 14 positions in the agencies studied so far. He noted that a recommendation from the study on the Department of Taxation would send the \$234,000,000 collected each year from sales tax to a bank where it could collect \$330,000 interest.

Mr. Mann asked if the Productivity Study on the Department of Taxation was conducted by the Personnel Division or by a private consultant. Mr. Wittenberg pointed out that due to a large turn-over of staff, contract services were required.

Chairman Mello asked who did the Productivity Study for the Personnel Division. Mr. Wittenberg said the study was done with people from the Personnel Division along with the Productivity Consultant.

Chairman Mello asked how many Grade 40 positions there are in the Personnel Division, how many people they supervise and if any were re-classified lower. Mr. Wittenberg answered that there are 5 Grade 40 positions, none were re-classified and all have subordinate staff ranging from 5 to 15 people.

Chairman Mello pointed out that the Chief of the Highway Patrol with 211 employees is a Grade 41; Chief of the Drivers License with 85 employees is a Grade 38; the State Librarian is a Grade 40 and that there are only 9 classified people in State service, other than medical personnel, who make more money than Mr. Wittenberg.

Chairman Mello pointed out that Mr. Wittenberg was in violation of the law by receiving more money than he was entitled, and that he was in further violation by teaching at a Community College.

Mr. Mann asked Mr. Wittenberg is he or any of his staff had lobbied in an effort to keep Mr. Wittenberg's position classified. Mr. Wittenberg replied that they had not.

Mr. Mann stated that in the past Mr. Wittenberg had told the Ways and Means Committee that because of Federal regulations his position could not be unclassified and Mr. Wittenberg had been asked to produce documents verifying such regulations but had never done so.

Mr. Wittenberg stated that today there are no such regulations; however, sometime ago there were such regulations.

Chairman Mello pointed out that he had requested a copy of the regulations several times but had never received them.

Chairman Mello asked Mr. Wittenberg for an explanation on why his position should not be unclassified.

Mr. Wittenberg expressed his concern that the person responsible for the employment system, if unclassified may have a tendency to politicize the employment service. He used the Federal General Services Agency as an example of a political agency that had problems.

Chairman Mello stated that Mr. Wittenberg had allowed himself to be a tool of the administration in the past.

Mr. Wittenberg said he was responsible to his "boss," whether it was the Governor, Gene Barrett or the Personnel Advisory Commission.

Chairman Mello asked Mr. Wittenberg if he felt the General Services Division was corrupt.

Mr. Wittenberg answered no, and explained that a system that ensures people are hired on merit and fitness with objective standards is not flawless, but it is the best process.

Chairman Mello asked Mr. Wittenberg is anyone from the Personnel Division had made any statements to any Legislators implying that the bill changing Mr. Wittenberg's position to unclassified as was introduced by the Ways and Means Committee was introduced to put pressure on him. Mr. Wittenberg answered that he wasn't aware of any.

Chairman Mello stated that almost every administrator in State government has expressed their dissatisfaction with the service from the Personnel Division. Mr. Wittenberg responded that he was aware of that fact and felt that Personnel was unable to provide the kind of service they would like because of the lack of resources.

Chairman Mello further stated that administrators in State government were dissatisfied with the Productivity Study. Mr. Wittenberg said if anyone thinks they will be pleased with the results of a Productivity Study, they do not understand what is involved. He said that a Productivity Study results in the reduction of staffing in many agencies, changing procedures and changing methodology, some of which were adopted by the agency administrators.

Chairman Mello stated that a Productivity Study should be independent of any State agency.

Mr. Mann said remarks that nothing constructive had come from the Productivity Study were made by Mrs. Glover, Director, Department of General Services. Mr. Wittenberg responded that the results of the Study in that agency could be indicative because 4 positions were eliminated and \$22,000 a year was recovered from a change in staffing. Mr. Mann said he understood from Mrs. Glover that most of the recommendations made by the Productivity Study had previously been initiated by the agency.

Mr. Wally Voskuil, Personnel Division, detailed for the Committee savings in the General Services Department from the Productivity Study. Mr. Voskuil stated that one warehouse position was eliminated; but, in addition, he noted changes in operation, work-flow, time utilization and what people are doing versus what they are supposed to be doing.

Mr. Wittenberg pointed out that the results of the Productivity Study eliminated 14 positions from State government at a savings of more than twice the amount of the Study.

Mrs. Wagner asked Mr. Wittenberg how many Clerical Technical positions there are in the State government. Mr. Wittenberg stated about 4,000. Mrs. Wagner commented that that represented about one-half of government employees, and asked why they were excluded from membership on the Factor Ranking Committee. Mr. Wittenberg stated there was someone now on that Committee that represents that segment and that the purpose and design of the Committee with reference to the Classification method is to get a cross-section of managers. Mrs. Wagner asked who determined the philosophy would be a cross-section of managers. Mr. Wittenberg said the philosophy was changed recently when a person was appointed who was not in a management position. Mrs. Wagner stated the Committee's decision to rank the Clerical Technical separate from the professional level was found by some of the Committee as an inequitable approach.

Mrs. Wagner asked Mr. Wittenberg for his comments on the pending lawsuits in Indiana on the Factor Ranking Benchmark System. Mr. Wittenberg then expressed his concern for the effectiveness of the system but felt it had validity to hold up under suit. Mrs. Wagner asked when the Factor Ranking Committee was established. Mitch Brust, Personnel Division, stated that it was started in March 1978. The Committee met last week to rank a representative sample of the Benchmark jobs that are used in the Clerical Technical area. Mrs. Wagner noted that a representative of the Clerical Technical area was not put on the Factor Ranking Committee until the study was almost complete.

Mrs. Wagner stated there were a lot of people who do not agree with Mr. Wittenberg according to letters she has been receiving. Mrs. Wagner asked for a list of the Factor Ranking Committee members and the positions they hold. Mrs. Wagner further asked where the money was coming from to fund this Committee and Mr. Wittenberg stated there was \$15,000 from a Federal Grant.

Mr. Glover asked Mr. Wittenberg why it takes so long for applicants for State employment to hear test results, job status, etc. Mr. Wittenberg stated they are experimenting with methods to improve the examination service but that a limited staff slows the process.

Mr. Glover asked what amount of time transpires from the initial application and Mr. Wittenberg stated for a new examination, the average is 9 weeks.

Mr. Hickey questioned the number of supervisory positions listed under the "Classification and Pay" section. Mr. Wittenberg explained that the Chief Supervisor is responsible for the Classification system throughout State government, the Assistant is a Supervisory Personnel Analyst and there are two staff people - two professional Analysts and a Clerical Technical position - which makes a total of 5 positions in this area. He indicated that the payroll function has been moved to the Employee/Employer Relations area.

Mr. Hickey asked why there was a break-down when supervisors were actually supervising in other areas and Mr. Wittenberg said in this case it was true and the budget classifications were incorrect.

Mr. Mann asked for an explanation from Mr. Wittenberg on a Employee Relations position that was transferred to a State position from a formerly Federally funded position. Mr. Alastuey responded that Mr. Mann was correct in noting that the bulk of the transfers made are reflected in the existing position field; however, they are captioned as clearly as possible. Mr. Mann reiterated his concern for such transfers and suggested that the transfers be listed as new positions with a change in funding.

Chairman Mello asked for an explanation for the difference in the Work Program and the Governor Recommends under Other Contract Services. Mr. Alastuey said that item included an MC/ST machine rental.

Mr. Bible referred Mr. Wittenberg to the Interim Finance meeting in which a request was made for \$8,542 over the amount budgeted by the Legislature, partially as a result of changes in the MC/ST Center involving acquisition of new equipment. This configuration allowed for the elimination of an MC/ST Operator; however, Mr. Bible noted that the position has not been eliminated. Mr. Wittenberg stated that the MC/ST position had been vacant for 22 months, but was filled two months ago. Mr. Bible noted that there is now both the increased machinery and the position.

Chairman Mello asked Mr. Wittenberg if he had an explanation. Mr. Wittenberg stated the position was filled in an attempt to provide better service to the State agencies.

Chairman Mello brought to Mr. Wittenberg's attention an agreement with the Nevada Women's Government Training Session Conference, which cost \$1,100. Chairman Mello asked if this money was spent during the same year that the Personnel budget was overspent. Mr. Wittenberg replied that it was.

Mr. Wittenberg addressed the Committee in support of the new position in the Employee/Employer Relations stressing the importance of the position in dealing with the Employee Organization. Mr. Mann suggested an existing administrator in the Personnel Division assume the duties of the position in the Employee/Employer Relations. Mr. Wittenberg stated that it had previously been handled in that way but the time wasn't being devoted and it did not work effectively.

#### INTER-GOVERNMENTAL PERSONNEL

Mr. Wittenberg stated this area provides for the administration for the improvement of personnel systems. Fifty percent of the money is funneled into local government for their programs. Mr. Wittenberg indicated that he felt the projects have been cost beneficial.

#### COOPERATIVE PERSONNEL SERVICES

Mr. Wittenberg informed the Committee that this budget is self-sustaining from funds derived by payment from local government for services provided by the State Personnel Division.

Chairman Mello introduced Mr. Bill Swackhamer Secretary of State, who addressed the Committee with regard to the State Personnel Division. Mr. Swackhamer expressed a problem with Personnel in getting positions reclassified. Mr. Swackhamer made a formal request that he would like to be able to meet with the people who are going to determine the salary and classification levels. Mr. Wittenberg defended the Personnel Division's classification procedure and suggested the position in question be unclassified.

#### SENATE BILL 35

Mr. Swackhamer said Senate Bill 35 was introduced by the Office of the Secretary of State at the request of the Auditors and provides for a \$1,500 revolving fund from which refunds of over-payments will be made to various people who submit the funds. Mr. Swackhamer stated his support of the Bill to be in compliance with the Auditors.

#### SENATE BILL 283

Chairman Mello explained that this Bill appropriates \$1,000,000 to the Legislative Fund for the operation of the Legislature. Do pass motion made by Mr. Mann; seconded by Mr. Hickey. Motion carried.

#### ASSEMBLY BILL 498

Mr. Roger Laird, Employee Relations Officer from the Personnel Division stated that Assembly Bill 498 would provide for a pregnancy benefit in the State's group insurance policy. This change is mandated by Public Law 95-555 which requires that employers treat pregnancy the same as any other disability condition.

Mr. Laird continues that the current program the State offers employees only covers pregnancy health benefits if there are complications. The State's health insurance company estimates that the expanded benefit's cost will be 77¢ per month per employee to change the policy. Mr. Laird said basically the Bill requests that the additional 77¢ be added to the benefits that the State now pays for the employee's share of the Health Insurance Premium only for the months of April, May and June. The cost of \$23,700 is based on 10,250 participating State employees times 77¢ times 3 (months). (Exhibit B)

Mr. Bible asked if the General Fund will be paying the 77¢ for non-general fund employees such as the Employment Security Department, Highway Department and all the other Federal agencies. Mr. Alastuey stated that it would be paying for these employees.

Mrs. Cavnar asked if the participating employees desired the insurance or if everyone had to participate, and Mr. Laird stated that the Federal legislation did not provide for a choice. Mrs. Cavnar asked if the female spouses of the employees had the coverage. Mr. Laird stated the law is not specific on whether it mandates that the female dependents are covered, too. If in fact it is interpreted that way, the employee will have to pay for his dependent share.

Mr. Hickey asked the name of the insurance company and Mr. Laird stated the insurance company is Metropolitan. Mr. Hickey expressed his concern for the rising cost of insurance coverage and asked Mr. Laird to supply him with information on the bidding procedures used by the State in purchasing health insurance.

Mr. Laird explained the State has two options: 1. Pay the premium. 2. Assume the role of the insurance carrier and pay the women who have babies during that time period.

Mr. Bible asked why General Fund money would be used instead of assessing the Employment Security and Highway Department for their portion of the premium increase.

Mr. Alastuey stated he did not have calculations on what the non-General Fund pro-rata share would be, but an estimate would be \$6,000 for both Employment Security and Highway Department.

Mr. Bob Gagnier, Nevada State Employees Association, stated Federal Law prohibits decreasing any other benefits to off-set the 77¢.

Chairman Mello stated that since AB 498 was Federally mandated the money could be drawn out of Federal funds. Mr. Alastuey said he would provide those figures for the Committee.

#### SENATE BILL 179

Mr. Lody Smith, Division of Forestry, stated that SB 179 would allow the Division of Forestry to feed forest fire fighters within their municipality. He estimated the cost of SB 179 to be \$250.00 in 1978-79, \$300.00 in 1979-80 and \$300.00 in 1980-81.

#### SENATE BILL 296

Mr. Lody Smith, Division of Forestry, said that SB 296 provided a one-shot appropriation of \$197,400 for the purchase of forestry equipment. He detailed the equipment as found in Exhibit C. Mr. Webb asked if the new tanker-trucks were diesels and Mr. Smith answered that they were.

#### SENATE BILL 180

Mr. Lody Smith, Division of Forestry said that SB 180 would allow the State Forestry Firewarden to determine the cost of plant materials distributed by him. A recent audit had pointed out that existing law required that all costs, including plants, must be included in the materials sale cost, and Mr. Smith indicated that this could escalate the cost of the container stock to an unrealistically high level.

Mrs. Cavnar asked if the Nursery Operation was in competition with local Nurserymen. Mr. Smith stated there was no competition because there are certain requirements that need to be met to purchase Forestry Nursery stock. Mr. Rhoads expressed his concern that the container stock might be sold for less than what it costs to grow. Mr. Smith reiterated that flexibility was necessary to operate the Nursery.

#### ASSEMBLY BILL 296

A Do Pass Motion was made by Mr. Glover; seconded by Mr. Hickey. Motion carried.

#### SENATE BILL 35

A Do Pass Motion was made by Mr. Vergiels; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Motion carried.

#### SENATE BILL 179

A Do Pass Motion was made by Mr. Glover; seconded by Mr. Rhoads. Motion carried.

#### SENATE BILL 180

Mr. Rhoads stated that he was concerned that a State Agency might not include the cost of production in an article they sell. Mr. Alastuey responded to Mr. Rhoads by stating the Forestry Nursery Budget has had in the past, and is recommended for the future, to get General Fund appropriations, which in effect supports part of that operation with the remaining part made up from the sale of the plants.

Mr. Alastuey continued that at the present time General Fund appropriation defrays the cost of production and it is recommended that that policy continue.

Mr. Gover stated that he had confidence in Mr. Smith and was willing to give him the authority to determine the cost of the plants.

Chairman Mello suggested holding the vote for more Committee discussion.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.



DATE: 5/11

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)

REPRESENTING:

Doc (A. J. W. - R)  
Frank [unclear]  
Mitch Brent  
Reg. Treasurer  
LEON SMITH  
Walter [unclear]  
Wm. [unclear]  
Tom [unclear]  
Jim McKenny

SWED  
St. Personnel  
State Personnel  
Div. of Forestry  
" " "  
Personnel  
St. Personnel  
St. Personnel

March 7, 1979

MEMORANDUM

TO: Office of Fiscal Analysis, Legislative Counsel Bureau  
FROM: Budget Division  
SUBJECT: Payments to Personnel Division 1979-81 Biennium

Attached is a copy of a printout including detail by agency of Personnel and Payroll Assessments as well as budgeted longevity in the fiscal years 1979-81 Executive Budget. The estimated available assessments are as follows:

A. Personnel Assessment (.009 X Gross Payroll)

1. State agencies - derived by taking amounts on report BU02040A times Governor's recommended salary increases:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$812,048  
Fiscal Year 1981 - \$860,751

2. Nevada Industrial Commission - derived by taking current year biweekly payroll yielding an annual amount, adding 2½% per year merit increases and Governor's recommended salary increases:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$67,625  
Fiscal Year 1981 - \$71,171

3. Public Employees Retirement System - derived by taking agency payroll projections times .009 assessment rate:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$5,392  
Fiscal Year 1981 - \$6,305

4. Employment Security Department - derived by taking currently work programmed gross salary times 2½% annually for merit increases and applying Governor's recommended pay increases:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$ 98,885  
Fiscal Year 1981 - \$104,070

5. Highway Department - derived by taking agency payroll projections on page 735 of Executive Budget times .009 assessment rate:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$230,273  
Fiscal Year 1981 - \$243,522

EXHIBIT A

307

6. University System - derived from recommended classified salaries in each appropriation area, applying Governor's recommended salary increases and the .009 assessment rate:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$126,136

Fiscal Year 1981 - \$134,000

7. Longevity Pay - derived by applying .00564 (the proportion of personnel assessment from State agency longevity to State agency assessments on regular gross pay) to the sub-total of (1) through (6) above:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$7,560

Fiscal Year 1981 - \$8,008

Total personnel assessment:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$1,347,919

Fiscal Year 1981 - \$1,427,827

The amounts estimated above are less than the budgeted personnel assessment income to the Personnel Division by \$69,060 in fiscal year 1979-80 and by \$69,514 in fiscal year 1980-81. As in the case of other State agencies, the Personnel Division has historically developed salary savings. We would recommend a new salary line item in the Personnel Administration budget for salary savings in an amount of \$70,000 each year of the coming biennium. This savings figure would offset the estimated shortfall in Personnel Assessments.

B. Payroll Assessment (.002 X Gross Payroll)

1. State agencies - derived under same method as in A-1 above:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$196,202

Fiscal Year 1981 - \$208,428

2. Employment Security Department - derived under same method as in A-4 above:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$21,974

Fiscal Year 1981 - \$23,127

Total Payroll Assessment:

Fiscal Year 1980 - \$218,176

Fiscal Year 1981 - \$231,555

The amounts estimated above are less than the budgeted payroll assessment income by \$160,116 in fiscal year 1980 and by \$170,844 in fiscal year 1981. Clearly, the .002 rate is insufficient to support the costs of administering the Personnel-Payroll

Office of Fiscal Analysis

March 7, 1979

Page 3

System. An increase in rate from .002 to .0035 would be necessary in order to yield the budgeted amounts of payroll assessment income each year. In order to provide agencies with sufficient spending authority to pay an increased payroll assessment, we would recommend that the increase be programmed into the payroll costs of each agency in the legislatively approved budget.

MRA/md

Enclosure

## DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

HOWARD E. BARRETT  
Director

CAPITOL COMPLEX

CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

March 8, 1979

AB 498

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Assembly Ways and Means Committee

FROM: Budget Division

SUBJECT: AB 498 - Increases Amount Public Agencies May Pay for Group Insurance  
for Employees - General Fund Appropriation \$23,700

Federal Public Law 95-555, passed October 31, 1978, amends Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act to require that employers treat pregnancy the same as they would treat any other disability condition. Under the new law, it is mandated that group insurance provided by employers include pregnancy benefits not now included in the State group policy. Funding for such coverage is included in the recommended State agency appropriations for the 1979-81 biennium, but the law requires that coverage take effect April 30, 1979, leaving three months of the current year during which premiums in excess of the current statutory maximum will be payable (premiums are paid in advance).

This bill has two effects:

1. Increases current maximum monthly premium of \$42.32 to \$43.09 to accommodate pregnancy coverage.
2. Makes an appropriation of \$23,700 to cover added costs this fiscal year. The appropriation is based on 10,250 covered employees at \$.77 each for three months.

MRA/md

EXHIBIT B

STATE NEVADA  
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION  
CAPITOL COMPLEX  
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89710

ROBERT LIST

Governor

HOWARD E. BARRETT  
Director

March 7, 1979

AB 296

MEMORANDUM

TO: Assembly Ways and Means Committee  
FROM: Budget Division  
SUBJECT: A \$197,400.00 Appropriation to the Division of Forestry  
(Executive Budget, Page A20)

To purchase special equipment as follows:

|   |                     |
|---|---------------------|
| <b>RENO SHOP</b>  | <b>\$ 47,800.00</b> |
| Air compressor; present model is excess 1945 (\$1,800)                                      |                     |
| Overhead traveling crane in new shop (\$28,000)   |                     |
| Floor mounted hoist, capable of lifting 6x6 (\$10,000)                                      |                     |
| Air operated overhead service station, oil, grease, etc. (\$8,000)                          |                     |
| <b>ELKO SHOP</b>  | <b>\$ 5,000.00</b>  |
| Air compressor, lube equipment, jacks, etc. (\$5,000)                                       |                     |
| <b>LOW BOY</b>  | <b>\$ 15,000.00</b> |
| This unit to replace military unit 10' wide (\$15,000)                                      |                     |
| <b>TANKERS - 2</b>  | <b>\$100,000.00</b> |
| 4,000 gallon modern unit to back-up pumper. Western area<br>(\$50,000 each)                 |                     |
| <b>RENO NURSERY</b>   | <b>\$ 12,000.00</b> |
| Poison sprayer (\$1,000) for pesticide application  |                     |
| Two refrigerators (\$600)   |                     |
| Seed handling freezer (\$400)   |                     |
| Greenhouse/lath house completion (\$4,000)  |                     |
| Cooling fan system, auto watering system, complete electrical<br>system in office (\$3,500) |                     |
| Driveway/parking lot/sidewalks (\$2,500)  |                     |
| <b>LAS VEGAS NURSERY</b>  | <b>\$ 17,600.00</b> |
| Refrigerator (\$300)  |                     |
| Air compressor (\$300)  |                     |
| Electrical service parts (\$2,500)  |                     |
| Auto watering system (\$2,500)  |                     |
| Pallet truck and pallet lift (\$1,500)  |                     |
| Driveway/parking lot/sidewalks (\$3,000)  |                     |
| Metal storage building completion (\$7,500)   |                     |
| <b>TOTAL</b>  | <b>\$197,400.00</b> |

JMR/mm

EXHIBIT C