

MINUTES

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE - 60th SESSION

May 24, 1979

Chairman Mello called the meeting to order at 8:10 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Mello, Vice-Chairman Bremner, Mrs. Cavnar, Mr. Barengo, Mr. Glover, Mr. Hickey, Mr. Mann, Mr. Rhoads, Mr. Vergiels, Mrs. Wagner and Mr. Webb.

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Bible, Fiscal Analyst; Judy Matteucci, Deputy Fiscal Analyst; Mike Alastuey, Budget Office; Mr. Julio Lucasey, Architect, Las Vegas; Dr. Brock Dixon, Acting President, UNLV; Mr. Peter Newman, Nevada Trial Lawyers Association; Mr. Russ McDonald; Mr. Gary Silverman, Washoe County Bar Association; Mr. Mike Maloy, Assistant District Attorney, Washoe County; Mr. Peter Breen, District Court Judge, Washoe County; Mr. Steve Brown, Washoe County Commissioner; and Senator James Gibson.

AB 762 and SB 574

Mr. Mann requested permission to make a statement to the Committee. Mr. Mann stated that he, Darrell Tanner, and Bill Brady in conjunction with the FBI, the Carson City District Attorney's office and the Carson City Sheriff's Department have been working on a bribery situation that was devised to obtain favorable passage for one of the Gerovital bills currently before the Committee. He continued that in his room the previous night the FBI and the local law enforcement agencies photographed an entire bribery attempt from an adjoining room. He stated that a man was arrested for paying him 10 - \$100 bills. He added that the conversation that ensued was tape recorded. Mr. Mann said that the taped conversation indicated that the man arrested made accusations against several people charging that they had been bribed and that he explained the ramifications for the attempted bribery of Mr. Mann. He continued that in addition to the cash offered the bribe includes a free three year scholarship to law school. Mr. Mann stated that because he has been working as a "plant" within this bribery group, he has been instructed by the law enforcement agencies to mention no names of those parties involved. He said that for these reasons he would like to move that no further testimony be heard on SB 574.

Motion made by Mr. Mann to defer consideration of SB 574; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Motion approved.

Chairman Mello commented that under the circumstances it would seem adviseable not to hear AB 672 either.

SCR 27

Mr. Julio Lucasey, Architect from Las Vegas stated that State architects have been in complete accord with the proposal to establish a School of Architecture at UNLV. He said that the Northern and Southern chapters of the American Institute of Architects and the Nevada Society of Architects have concurred with the proposal. He stated that the National Association of Architects are also in favor and are in a position to assist the program. He indicated that surveys show that there are prospective students for the school and individuals willing to support the program. He continued that this resolution is being requested to encourage the architects in this endeavor and that two years hence facts, figures, and feasibility projections will be presented to the legislature.

Dr. Brock Dixon, Acting President of UNLV, indicated that passage of SCR 27 would encourage the university system to act more promptly

on its long term intentions to offer a program in architecture and related design disciplines at UNLV. He stated that it would also encourage the architectural profession to organize itself to support the university efforts to establish the school. He said that with the passage of this legislation several courses of action would begin: (1) the architectural profession would organize itself to help meet the start-up costs for the school; and (2) the administration of the university and the Regents would revise their planning and feasibility studies with a view towards including a small college of architecture in the next biennial budget request. He added that this present proposal requires no appropriation. Dr. Dixon stated that the architectural school has been long endorsed by the University Regents, and has been on their priority list for six years.

Dr. Dixon stated that only Nevada and Wyoming of the fifty states lack schools of architecture. He indicated that Nevada law and standards set by the profession require continuing education for architects and that a school of this type would be an ideal vehicle for that purpose. He said that schools of architecture are still expanding in the west. He pointed out that one small school of architecture in California turned away 1,000 qualified applicants last year. He continued that the starting class for a college of architecture would be small probably numbering 20 to 30 students, and that this small group will ensure that the program will not be over-reached. Dr. Dixon added that architectural education as compared with professional education overall is not unduly expensive. He stated that architectural colleges operate on a student/teacher ratio does not significantly differ from all university ratios and that the establishment of this college would attract a whole new body of students.

Chairman Mello asked how much money it would cost to establish a college of architecture. Dr. Dixon replied that he did not have a specific figure nor could he provide one at this time, but he did add that the student cost would be comparable to the university-at-large student cost. He continued that the funding figures would be in the next biennial budget request with full justification and alternatives provided. He indicated that at this point it is premature to put a dollar figure on the cost, but he predicted that the figure would be somewhere between one quarter and one half million dollars.

Mrs. Wagner asked how many students who are interested in pursuing an architectural career have been denied admittance to an architectural college. Mr. Lucasey said that at Arizona State out of 400 applicants to their college of architecture only 53 students were admitted and of that figure only one student was from Nevada.

Mrs. Wagner re-iterated her question as to how many Nevada students in the last year or the last two years have been turned down for admittance to schools of architecture nationwide. Mr. Lucasey said that those specific figures were not available at this time. Mrs. Wagner responded that she would like to have that information. Mr. Lucasey stated that many of the Nevada students interested in pursuing a career in architecture are unable to afford to financially travel out of the State and attend a school of architecture in another area that would charge them out-of-state tuition fees. He added that this financial restriction, in particular, affects the middle and lower income students in this State.

Mr. Hickey commented that one of the problems for students interested in architectural education is that program of study is not involved in the WICHE agreement.

Mrs. Wagner asked for clarification on the Board of Regents approval of a school of architecture plan that has been on their priority list for the last six years, and what is the ranking number of the proposed school of architecture and the school of law. Dr. Dixon said that over the last six years both schools have been on the top of the list at different times and that neither has been implemented. He added that in 1974, architecture was ahead of law on the list; in 1976, law was ahead of architecture; and in 1978, the Regents in anticipation of this session did not endorse either program with a ranking number on the list.

Mrs. Wagner asked if establishing the school of architecture could be accomplished by other means than through this resolution. Dr. Dixon answered that the school could probably be established without the resolution, but he added that he believes the profession needs the support of the resolution to organize themselves to help meet the start-up costs. He summarized that technically the answer to the question is "yes," but in order to obtain the support of the profession this resolution is important. Mr. Lucasey concurred with Dr. Dixon's statement, and added that he did not believe that the members of the architectural profession in the State expect a guarantee of the college being established based on the passage of this legislation.

Mr. Vergiels asked if the projected planning would include the capital improvements. Mr. Lucasey answered that if the profession has the resolution it will initiate a process of attempting to locate the monies to support the college.

Mr. Vergiels pointed out that it was his concern that if the resolution passes and the feasibility study is conducted and presented before the legislature : two years hence the program would have a better chance of passage if the professional organization could show a commitment of monies to help fund the college. Mr. Lucasey indicated that raising funds was one of the intentions of the professional organization.

SB 243

Chairman Mello stated that SB 243 would provide for two additional judges in Washoe County.

Mr. Peter Newman from the Nevada Trial Lawyers Association stated that there is a definite need in Washoe County for two additional district judges. Mr. Newman said that in his civil law practice the waiting time for a trial has gone from six months to nine months in the last three years. He continued that currently there are seven district judges but under the pressure created by the backlog of cases awaiting hearing 28 trials are scheduled every Monday morning which means each judge receives four cases--three of which cannot be tried in the time period available. He pointed out that the district judges in Washoe County are hard working and that they are attempting to cope with the backlog of cases.

Chairman Mello asked if the two additional judges are appointive positions. Mr. Newman stated that he wished to defer that question to Mr. McDonald.

Mrs. Wagner asked for clarification on the filling of a position if a vacancy occurs. Mr. Newman responded that he is not familiar with the mechanics of the bill, but that Mr. McDonald could answer.

Mr. Russ McDonald stated that the County Commissioners had endorsed this program more than ten months ago, and that the County Bar Association is in complete agreement. Mr. McDonald pointed out that the County Commissioners are concerned that a situation will occur in Washoe County similar to what happened with the Federal intervention in Clark County. Mr. McDonald said that he is employed as a financial consultant for Washoe County and that at the time the County Commissioners endorsed the two positions they appropriated \$100,000. He stated that those funds are in their current building fund to provide for rent or for necessary renovations to the court house in the event the two new judges come on board. Mr. McDonald continued that those funds are still available and will remain in the building fund. He distributed the District Courts budget and additional written testimony which is included as Exhibit A.

Mr. Mann asked if the Washoe County officials are aware that this request must conform with the spending cap provisions. Mr. McDonald answered that the Commissioners have been apprised of the spending cap limitations, but that they feel that it is a necessity and that they are willing to cope with the future financial impact.

Mr. Gary Silverman, representative of the Washoe County Bar Association, stated that he would like to present some statistics relating to civil

matters before the courts. He said that the Washoe County district judges are currently spending 60% more time without juries listening to civil cases than in 1975. He indicated that the legislation asks for a 28% increase in manpower to handle that case load. He pointed out that 3,387 civil actions were filed last year in Washoe County as compared to 2,663 filed in 1972 which is a 28% increase. He re-iterated that he believes the judges are doing a good job on a qualitative basis. He added that this legislation does have community support.

Mr. Mike Maloy, Assistant District Attorney of Washoe County, stated that criminal matters take precedent over civil cases for trial hearings. He said that since 1973 when the legislature added the seventh district judge to the bench in Washoe County, there has been a 110% increase in the number of filings for criminal cases. He indicated that the number of criminal cases is accelerating to the point in the near future where criminal cases will be heard to the near exclusion of any civil proceedings.

Mr. Peter Breen, District Court Judge for Washoe County, stated that he wished to indicate that the district court judges currently on the bench are in support of this bill.

Mr. Steve Brown, Washoe County Commissioner, indicated that the commissioners are aware that Washoe County will be impacted by the proposed spending caps, but that it is the feeling of the Commissioners that they would be remiss in performing their duties if they did not support the addition of two judges to the bench in Washoe County District Courts.

SCR 61

Mr. Alastuey explained that this legislation has the effect of rescinding ACR 8 of this session and will provide direction for the issuance of \$1 million in bonds instead of \$3.5 million of which \$200,000 will go to the City of Sparks for park purposes and \$640,000 will go to Washoe County for the acquisition of that land commonly referred to as the San Rafael Ranch for use as a public park. He added that by reducing the bond issue to \$1 million a savings of about \$225,000 per year will accrue because of the decrease in principal and interest.

Mr. Rhoads asked if this legislation will have any effect on the Wildhorse Reservoir in Elko County. Mr. Alastuey replied that it will not.

SB 357

Chairman Mello explained that this legislation will provide the division of forestry with assistance in the management of the Marlette-Hobart watershed.

Mr. Bremner indicated that he wished the camping provision amended out of the legislation. He stated that his reasoning is two-fold: (1) the lake is a drinking water source and overnight camping would be inappropriate within the vicinity, and (2) the lake is suppose to be maintained as a fishery, which would be difficult to do with campers in the area.

Mr. Glover commented that the proposed camp sites are not in the watershed vicinity but will be located in the north canyon.

Moved by Mr. Bremner to delete the overnight camping provision from SB 357; seconded by Mrs. Cavnar. Mr. Webb voted NO. Motion approved.

Motion made by Mr. Bremner DO PASS AS AMENDED on SB 357; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Motion approved.

AB 762

Motion made by Mr. Barengo DO PASS on AB 762; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Mr. Mann abstained. Motion approved.

SCR 60

Senator Gibson explained that this legislation will implement a request from the Lost City museum for authorization to seek a grant from the Fleischmann Foundation. He stated that when SB 255 was passed in the Senate, the Fleischmann Foundation indicated that they could not proceed with further negotiations until they had legislative approval. Senator Gibson said that the bill will permit the museum to purchase Indian grounds near the airport in Overton, Nevada which are currently being vandalized and are in danger of losing their historical significance.

Mr. Hickey asked where the Indian grounds are located near the airport. Senator Gibson responded that he did not know the exact location.

Mr. Glover asked if there is any opposition to this legislation from special interest groups such as the Indians. Senator Gibson replied that he was not aware of any opposition.

Mr. Rhoads asked how many acres of land are involved in the purchase. Senator Gibson stated that he did not have the exact figure.

SB 220

Chairman Mello asked Senator Gibson to provide further details on the \$214,000 requested appropriation. Senator Gibson answered that the funds are to be used for a continuing survey of the quality of the water and for constant review of future water quality standards because of its proximity to the densely populated Las Vegas area. He stated that the funds will be used by the DRI to purchase the necessary sophisticated equipment that will permit the department to continue to monitor the water quality and detect trends. He added that he felt it was important for the State to be involved in the development and the interpretation of the data.

Mrs. Cavnar questioned that need for funds to purchase two trailers for this project. Senator Gibson responded that the field work necessary will be conducted in locations remote from the central laboratories, and that the trailers will make it possible for the analysis and review of the data to be done on site.

SB 511

Senator Gibson explained that this legislation is related to the one-shot appropriation requested by the Governor for the Lincoln County School District to assist in the construction of school facilities at Alamo. He stated that he objected to the special nature of that action and he requested that this legislation be prepared as a general statute so that other districts in the same circumstances could have similar assistance available. He continued that strict eligibility criteria have been written into the language of the legislation to prevent giving wide-open access to assistance funds. Senator Gibson stated that the situation in Lincoln County that made it necessary for the local citizenry to request State aid came about because the residents in the local area passed the bond issue but they do not have the financial capability to repay the bond indebtedness required to finance the school construction.

Mr. Hickey questioned the validity for expansion of the school at Alamo. Senator Gibson responded that the school facilities are not really being expanded, but that the building dating from the early part of the century has been condemned as unsafe.

Mrs. Cavnar asked if the Alamo school program could continue to function with the current situation for the next eighteen months until the Interim Study Report on the problem is prepared. Senator Gibson stated that the guarantee of the Federal loan will not last for eighteen months and that with the current inflationary trends in the economy the situation will be additionally aggravated by increased construction costs. He continued that he has no objection to committing State funds to rural areas that do not have the financial ability to handle a serious problem.

SB 574

Motion made by Mr. Bremner to indefinitely postpone SB 574; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Motion approved.

SCR 60

Motion made by Mr. Bremner DO PASS on SCR 60; seconded by Mr. Webb. Motion approved.

SB 243

Motion made by Mrs. Wagner DO PASS on SB 243; seconded by Mr. Webb. Motion approved.

SCR 61

Motion made by Mr. Webb DO PASS on SCR 61; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Motion approved.

SCR 27

Motion made by Mr. Vergiels DO PASS on SCR 27; seconded by Mr. Hickey.

Chairman Mello stated that by utilizing a letter of intent to indicate that the study is to be conducted the resolution would not be necessary.

Mr. Vergiels withdrew his motion.

Motion made by Mr. Vergiels to issue a letter of intent; seconded by Mr. Hickey. Motion approved.

SB 220

Motion made by Mr. Bremner DO PASS on SB 220; seconded by Mrs. Wagner. Motion approved.

SB 511

Motion made by Mr. Rhoads DO PASS on SB 511; seconded by Mr. Mann. Motion approved.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.



WASHOE COUNTY

"To Protect and To Serve"

March 15, 1979



1205 MILL STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 11130
RENO, NEVADA 89520
PHONE (702) 785-4179

OFFICE OF THE COUNTY MANAGER

TO: Russell W. McDonald
FROM: Bea Moore
SUBJECT: District Courts' Budget, FY 1979/80

Enclosed is a copy of the line item tentative budget for the District Courts.

Also enclosed is my memo to the Commissioners analyzing the budget request.

During the budget hearing, the Commissioners reduced the tentative budget to the following amounts:

	Present Seven Courts	Two Additional Courts	Total
Personal Services	\$ 931,157	\$128,020	\$1,059,177
Services and Supplies	504,100	75,000	579,100
Capital Outlay	551	58,384	58,935
Total	<u>\$1,435,808</u>	<u>\$261,404</u>	<u>\$1,697,212</u>

Please call me if you have any questions.

Bea Moore

Internal Auditor

BM:wc
Encl.

EXHIBIT A

WASHOE COUNTY IS AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY EMPLOYER

WASHOE COUNTY

"To Protect and To Serve"



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY MANAGER

1205 MILL STREET
POST OFFICE BOX 11120
RENO, NEVADA 89520
PHONE (702) 785-4179

February 27, 1979

3/5/79
BCC
Approved
as Recommended

TO: Board of County Commissioners
FROM: Bea Moore
Department of Budget and Analysis (DBA)
SUBJECT: FY 1979-80 Budget
District Courts

<u>BUDGET REQUEST/ANALYSIS SUMMARY:</u>	<u>Present Seven Courts</u>	<u>Anticipated Two Additional Courts</u>	<u>Total Budget</u>
FY 1978-79 Budget:	\$1,377,562	-	\$1,377,562
FY 1979-80 Budget:	1,438,939	\$275,064	1,714,003
Percent Increase (Decrease):	4.5%	-	24.4%
FY 1978-79 Budget excl. Cap. Out:	1,372,039	-	1,372,562
FY 1979-80 Budget excl. Cap. Out:	1,435,257	215,470	1,650,727
Percent Increase (Decrease):	4.6%	-	20.3%
Department's FY 1979-80 Request:	1,438,939	275,064	1,714,003
DBA Recommendation:	1,435,808	261,404	1,697,212
New Positions Requested:	0	: 7	7
DBA Recommendation:	0	: 6	6
Capital Outlay Request:	3,682	59,594	63,276
DBA Recommendation:	551	58,384	58,935

ANALYSIS: This budget request anticipates the Legislature will add two more District Courts to Washoe County and includes funding for these two additional Courts, as summarized above.

Excluding the addition of the two Courts, the budget request is within the seven percent guideline. All of the new positions requested are personnel for the anticipated additional Courts.

EXHIBIT A

2094

The seven new positions requested for the anticipated additional Courts are:

Salaries:

2 Judicial Law Clerks	\$32,160
2 Judicial Secretaries	38,224
2 Court Clerks	26,318
1 Counter Clerk	9,959

\$106,661

Benefits

33,809

Total Salary and Benefits

\$140,470

Each Court would require one Law Clerk, one Secretary and one Court Clerk. It is difficult to evaluate the need for the Counter Clerk since no workload data was submitted. However, based on observations, it appears that additional workload could be absorbed by the present staff.

Therefore, it is recommended that salary and benefits of \$12,450 for the Counter Clerk position be deleted from the budget.

Also, it is recommended that capital outlay of \$1,210 requested for the Counter Clerk be deleted from the budget.

Capital outlay requested for the present seven Courts includes a file cabinet and carpet for part of the Clerk of the Court's office area and for the Jury Commissioner's office. I recommend the capital outlay budget be reduced by \$3,131 and the open area behind the Clerk's counter not be carpeted as this is only part of a larger uncarpeted office area.

I recommend that \$261,404 (of which \$58,384 is capital outlay) of the total budget and six positions be approved conditionally, to be expended only if two additional District Courts are created.



Bea Moore
Internal Auditor

BM/dc

cc: Judge Peter Breen
Laura M. Neal

RUN DATE: 02/15/79					WASHOE COUNTY		GENERAL FUND DISTRICT COURTS UNDESIGNATED			
DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET WORK SHEET										
-A-	-B-	-C-	-D-				-E-	-F-	-G-	-H-
ACTUAL	FISCAL YEAR 1978/79						FISCAL YEAR 1979/80			
FY 1977/78	YEAR TO DATE Jul-JAN	ADJUSTED BUDGET	PROJECTED ACTUAL	ACCT NOS	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	LN NO	DEPARTMENT REQUEST	TENTATIVE BUDGET	Two Add. COUNTS	PRESENT 7 COUNTS =
					*** PERSONAL SERVICES ***	1				
625,842	578,129	750,037	711,355	001	SALARIES--DISTRICT COURTS	2	876,756	876,756	106661	
				003	OVERTIME	3				
75,008	14,330	29,917	27,274	017	GROUP INSURANCE	4	31,092	31,092	3818	
13,051	7,180	15,825	15,010	018	WIC	5	18,500	18,500	3490	
92,794	55,786	112,507	106,703	019	RETIREMENT	6	131,513	131,513	24810	
10,469	4,597	11,753	12,075	020	UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INSURANCE	7	13,766	13,766	1691	
						8				
767,164	560,027	920,039	872,417		PERSONAL SERVICES TOTAL	9	1,071,627	1,071,627	140470	931157
						10				
					*** SERVICES AND SUPPLIES ***	11				
20,505	9,240	19,000	19,000	100	OFFICE SUPPLIES & EXP	12	26,000	26,000	3000	23000
				151	PUBLICATIONS	13				
	15			201	WITNESS FEES	14				
76,794	58,325	120,000	100,000	202	COURT REPORTERS	15	140,000	140,000	20000	120000
49,817	19,520	60,000	55,000	210	ATTORNEY COURT ORDERS	16	75,000	75,000	5000	70000
24,600	12,300	27,000	24,600	212	JUVENILE COURT MASTER STAFF	17	30,600	30,600		30600
				213	MASTER PRO TEM	18	5,000	5,000		5000
74,221	39,706	75,000	75,000	220	JURY TRIALS	19	110,000	110,000	20000	90000
10				221	GRAND JURY	20				
81,539	43,843	87,500	87,500	222	COURT REPORTER PER DIEM IN COURT	21	120,000	120,000	20000	100000
9,067	4,279	8,000	8,000	321	LEASE-OFFICE EQUIPMENT	22	9,000	9,000		9000
356	38	500	500	330	REPAIRS	23	500	500		500
				335	CONF BILLINGS	24				
10,664	5,309	13,000	13,000	341	TELEPHONE	25	18,000	18,000	4000	14000
13,234	6,849	13,000	12,000	344	PRINTING	26	14,000	14,000	1000	13000
2,782	1,720	4,000	4,000	382	TRAVEL	27	6,000	6,000	2000	4000

EXHIBIT A

RUN DATE: 02/15/79

WASHOE COUNTY
DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET WORK SHEET

GENERAL FUND 001
DISTRICT COURTS 230
UNDESIGNATED 000

-A- ACTUAL	-B- FISCAL YEAR		-D- PROJECTED ACTUAL	ACCT CODES	ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION	LN NO	-E- FISCAL YEAR		-G-	-H-
	1978/79	1979/80					1979/80	1979/80	1979/80	1979/80
187,778	25,517	25,000	22,000	499	*** SERVICES AND SUPPLIES ***	1				
					MEDICAL AND OTHER EXPENSES	2	25,000-	25,000-	-	25000
						3				
184,041	510,691	452,000	420,500		SERVICES AND SUPPLIES TOTAL	4	579,100-	579,100-	75000	504,100
						5				
					*** CAPITAL OUTLAY ***	6				
7,492	4,547	5,521	5,521	500	OFFICE FURNITURE, FIXTURES & EQUIP	7	63,276-	63,276-	59594	3682
				560	DISTRICT COURT REMODELING COSTS	8				
						9				
7,492	4,547	5,521	5,521		CAPITAL OUTLAY TOTAL	10	63,276-	63,276-		
						11				
					*** MISCELLANEOUS ***	12				
				999	UNDESIGNATED BUDGET REDUCTION	13				
						14				
						15				
						16				
						17				
					TOTALS	18	1,714,003	1,714,003	275,064	1438,939
						19				
						20				
						21				
						22				
						23				
						24				
						25				
						26				
						27				
1,158,687	678,250	1,377,562	1,298,540		DIVISION TOTAL	28	1,714,003-	1,714,003-		

EXHIBIT A - J

2097

RUN DATE: 02/15/79					WASHOE COUNTY		GENERAL FUND DISTRICT COURTS COURT ADMINISTRATOR			
					DEPARTMENTAL BUDGET WORK SHEET		001 230 270			
-A-	-B-	-C-	-D-				-E-	-F-	-G-	-H-
ACTUAL	FISCAL YEAR 1978/79				ACCOUNT DESCRIPTION		FISCAL YEAR 1979/80			
FY 1977/78	YEAR TO DATE JUL-JAN	ADJUSTED BUDGET	PROJECTED ACTUAL	ACCT NOS	LN NO	DEPARTMENT REQUEST	TENTATIVE BUDGET	FINAL BUDGET	REVISED BUDGET	
					1					
15,146				001	2	COURT ADMINISTRATOR-SALARIES				
426				017	3	GROUP INSURANCE				
257				018	4	HIC				
1,970				019	5	RETIREMENT				
443				020	6	UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION INSURANCE				
					7					
18,242					8	PERSONAL SERVICES TOTAL				
					9					
					10	*** MISCELLANEOUS ***				
				960	11	COUNTY MATCHING MONEY				
					12					
18,242					13	DIVISION TOTAL				
					14					
					15					
					16					
					17					
					18					
					19					
					20					
					21					
					22					
					23					
					24					
					25					
					26					
					27					
1,176,929	475,250	1,177,562	1,208,510		28	DEPARTMENT TOTAL	1,714,001	1,714,001		

*This has been
re-allocated
to Division 960*

EXHIBIT A

898