MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman Bremner
Vice Chairman Hickey
Mr. Bergevin
Mr. Brady
Mr. Coulter
Mr. Glover
Mrs. Hayes
Mr. Horn
Mr. Marvel
Mr. Rhoads
Mr. Robinson
Mr. Vergiels
Mrs. Westall

4/13/81
Page 1

ALSO PRESENT: Bill Bible, Fiscal Analyst; Judy Matteucci, Deputy Fiscal Analyst; Mike Alastuey, Deputy Budget Director; Vern Bennett, PERS. (See Attached Guest List)

Chairman Bremner called the meeting to order at 8:00 a.m.

AB 168 Makes various changes in law relating to active members and members receiving disability retirement of public employees' retirement system.

Mr. Vernon Bennett, Executive Officer of the Public Employees Retirement System of Nevada (PERS), said that AB 168 is the system's general legislation bill. He distributed a handout to the committee and his comments are contained in EXHIBIT A.

Mr. Glover referred to Number 4 of EXHIBIT A and asked if there was legislation pending in Congress that would mandate Social Security coverage for public retirement systems. Mr. Bennett said that presently legislation is pending that would place federal employees under Social Security but it is anticipated that no legislation will be passed this session of Congress mandating coverage for state employees. It appears that the intent is to mandate the federal employees this year and state employees the following year.

Mr. Marvel asked how many states are involved with the lawsuit against the Federal Government if Social Security is mandated for state employees. Mr. Bennett said that it is anticipated that between 6 to 10 states would join in the lawsuit effort.

Mr. Rhoads asked if the cost of the lawsuit would be divided among the participating states. Mr. Bennett noted that Colorado has already reaised over $100,000 for a lobby effort but some of the smaller states may not have that much money available. In consideration of the position the new administration has taken on mandatory Social Security, Mr. Rhoads asked what would be the likelihood of this type of legislation passing. Mr. Bennett said that the change of administration has greatly delayed the passage of mandatory Social Security. He added that the purpose of this legislation (AB 168) is in case Social Security coverage is mandated before the Legislature convenes again in 1983, the lawsuit would have to be initiated as soon as the legislation is enacted.

Mr. Robinson referred to Section 15 of AB 168 and asked if the $62,000 annual cost per year is an aggregate of the 1/2 percent statewide. Mr. Bennett said that Section 15 is the employer side and is only for state employees who are under police and fire -- all other agencies who have police and firemen will be under employer-pay July 1, 1981 based upon an act passed by the 1979 Legislature. The only group that will receive the contribution rate increase from 8 1/2% to 9% will be the state employees who are in the police and firemen system, such as state policemen, prison guards and state parole and probation officers.

Mr. Robinson referred to another group of individuals who are not eligible to participate in the system -- persons employed after July 1, 1981 as part-time school crossing guards and asked if they had been previously covered under PERS. Mr. Bennett said that under current law if a person is employed for half-time or more, they have to be enrolled in the system -- if they work less than half-time, they do not have to be enrolled unless they work 120 consecutive days. He noted that some school crossing guards would work the 120 days and be covered for a short time and get a short amount of service. Because most of these people are over 60 years of age, Mr. Bennett said that very few have the opportunity to earn retirement eligibility, therefore, Las Vegas Metropolitan Police Department requested that they be exempted and this policy was endorsed by other sheriff's departments that handle school crossing guards.

4/13/81
Page 2

Mr. Ernest Newton, Nevada Taxpayers Association, said that Section 3 of AB 168 should be deleted as it seeks to condone and validate the practice of certifying certain employees of employee unions as employees of school districts. He said their PERS contributions have been paid by the teachers' union and, in turn, remitted to the PERS with the regular certified payroll. His comments are contained in EXHIBIT B. Mr. Newton added that NRS 288.270 prohibits any public employer from doing anything to "assist in the administration of any employee organization."

Mr. Glover asked what would be the result if NRS 288.270 were repealed. Mr. Newton said that in labor relations it is considered bad practice for an employer or an employee organization to get involved in the activities of the "adversaries."

Mr. Marvel asked how flagrant the violation is of this section of the law. Mr. Newton replied that to the best of his knowledge, it has been used in only one situation with the teachers' union and the school districts which would average 1 to 3 people per year and has been so used for the last 25 years.

Mr. Robinson asked for an explanation of item number 4 of Section 3 of AB 168. Mr. Bennett explained that the reason the system was not previously aware of this practice was because the employers in question would always certify on their monthly report that this person was a bonafide employee, had worked the full month and enclosed the regular contributions. It was determined by the Retirement Board to bring this matter to the Legislature to acquire legislative correction to alleviate any problems. However, if the Legislature does not correct this issue, Mr. Bennett noted the Retirement System has the responsibility to determine through the Attorney Generals' office if incorrect service has been granted and, if so, to remove it. He said it is the purpose of Section 3 to provide for a general "catchall" to correct the situation once and for all. He noted that PERS is not aware of anyone that did not receive service credit from 1947 to the present but in case they did not, this provides them the opportunity to purchase service by paying the full actuarial costs.

Additionally, Mr. Bennett referred to Mr. Newton's previous statement whereby it was noted that employees of the Nevada League of Cities were not allowed membership in the PERS system because it was requested that the professional staff of an organization be allowed membership in the system. He said this section applies to a regular member of the system who takes a 1 year leave of absence to work for an association and will return the following year. If they do not receive the credit, they lose survivor benefit eligibility, disability eligibility and a lot of people would not be able to serve in those positions. He added that the 1979 Legislature made it possible for such groups as the Nevada League of Cities to apply for membership in PERS as an agency in their own right if they are funded in part by public monies.

Mr. Newton noted an additional factor in that the employees in question generally become vested members in the system even outside the one year hiatus in the direct employment with the school district and consequently, the only thing the deletion of Section 3 would entail would be that they would have to actually work 30 years for the public employer with the 1 year hiatus. He noted that a hiatus occurs among public employees in many instances whereby a person could leave public employment for one year which means a break in service but does not impair his benefits but just delays for one year his eligibility for retirement.

4/13/81
Page 3

Chairman Bremner asked if Section 3 of AB 168 were not deleted, could the League of Cities' employees become members of PERS. Mr. Bennett indicated that because of a law passed by the 1979 Legislature, the employees of the League of Cities are now entitled to membership in the system provided they are funded in part by public monies.

Mr. Marvel asked what the result would be if the public employees went beyond a 1 year leave of absence from public employment. Mr. Bennett said that based on this legislation, they would be able to receive service credit.

When Mr. Glover asked what the consequence would be if the public employees on leave did not return to public employment, Mr. Bennett said the intent of the law is to legalize the current procedure. He said if this provision is not acted upon based upon PERS' discussions with the Attorney General, if the Legislature does not condone this practice through approval of this section, the matter will be turned over to the Attorney General's office for legal evaluation and appropriate action.

AB 353 Makes an appropriation to repair roofs on various state buildings.

Mr. William Hancock, Public Works Board, said that an appropriation of $623,000 was requested by the Public Works Board in their Capital Improvement Program for the repair of 33 roofs of state buildings. He added that also included in the State Public Works Board Capital Improvement Program was the recommendation for a statewide roofing crew to maintain roofs on a regular basis as contained in AB 353. He noted that this bill makes an appropriation of $443,850 to the Buildings and Grounds Division to initiate a roof repair system for state buildings. (EXHIBIT C)

Mr. Glover felt this approach of having Buildings and Grounds doing the roof repair put the state in a position whereby if the roofs continue to leak, the state would be responsible. He added that if the roofs were done by a licensed contractor, there would be a guarantee. He questioned whether the expertise would be available to do a good job noting that the proposed concept of using inmate labor could be detrimental. Mr. Mike Meizel, Buildings and Grounds, said the key to the success of the program would be locating a knowledgable person to conduct and supervise the roofing procedure. He said that a second variable would be ability and work ethic of the inmates involved in the program.

Mr. Glover asked Mr. Meizel if he felt this project could be successful. Mr. Meizel said that he has reservations regarding the success of the program. He felt the biggest problem with the program would be attracting someone from private industry to properly supervise the roofing projects.

Mr. Glover added that if the bill is approved, the Department of Wildlife building in Reno should be included in the project.

Mr. Hancock indicated that there are two aspects involved -- one is replacing roofs that have worn out after 20 years and the other is "first aid" treatment for deteriorating roofs.

Mr. Glover asked what will become of the truck and roofing pot that will be purchased specifically for this two-year project. Mr. Meizel felt that some type of ongoing roofing project is needed for state buildings but if this program proves unsuccessful, and the state returns to contracting for roof repairs, then the alternative would be to sell the equipment.

Mr. Horn suggested evaluating the success of the program after the completion of the roof repairs at the Nevada State Prison, Womens Correctional Center and the Northern Nevada Correctional Center. Mr. Meizel said that he agreed with that concept.

Mr. Glover asked what other alternatives the state has to the proposal by the State Public Works Board for $740,000 to hire outside contractors to do the roof repairs and this proposal in the amount of $443,850. Mr. Hancock said the alternative would be to let the roofs leak. He indicated the Clark County School District has a year around roofing crew on a urethane system that has been very effective.

4/13/81
Page 4

Chairman Bremner noted that the proposal by the Buildings and Grounds Division is approximately $300,000 less than the proposal by the Public Works Board and even if the projected salary for a qualified foreman would have to be increased it would still be cost effective for the state. Mr. Meizel said his biggest concern is that the roofs would not be completed in 2 years but noted the potential for cost savings.

Mr. Hickey asked what the age of the roofs are that need repair. Mr. Hancock said that of the 33 roofs involved, 22 of them are 20 or more years old. He said there are 6 problem roofs. Mr. Hickey asked how many of the 6 problem roofs are 20 or more years old. Mr. Hancock said the average age of the 6 problem roofs is 7 years old. Mr. Hickey referred to Mr. Hancock's previous statement whereby he noted that the Clark County School District had used urethane in roof repairs successfully and asked if it is anticipated that urethane could be utilized in the repairs of state buildings. Mr. Hancock said the roofs in need of repair are tar roofs. Mr. Hickey pointed out that perhaps a better quality roof should be used to eliminate the need for repairs every 6 or 7 years. Mr. Hancock said that roofs fail for three reasons -- they are improper design, improper construction and improper maintenance. He indicated that the problems with the roof of the Kinkaid Building are primarily a design problem and the problem with the roof at the Mental Health Institute is due to a concrete construction problem.

Chairman Bremner asked what monitoring of the roof repairs will be done. Mr. Hancock said that field personnel from the Public Works Board will make periodic inspections.

AB 333 Increases salaries of employees in classified service in the State of Nevada.

Bill Bible distributed to the committee a comparison of the three salary proposals currently before the Legislature -- the administration's salary proposal (AB 333), SNEA's salary proposal* and the Senate Finance Committee's salary bill (SB 516) EXHIBIT D.

Mr. Jim Wittenberg, State Personnel, said that the 4 basic considerations that have resulted in AB 333 include the CPI escalation during the past 2 years which exceeded 18%, high turnover and recruitment difficulty, a Factor Ranking Classification Study and the Wage and Salary Study. He said that during the last biennium, state employees experienced a 18.3% lag in salaries because of the CPI escalation and the constraint in terms of adjustment from the imposed presidential guidelines in 1979. He said that the school districts and city and counties' employees did not experience that lag because by mid-1979, it was evident that the presidential guidelines were not going to be adhered to and private and public employers were granting increases in excess of those guidelines. This point offers justification that the increase for state employees should be greater than that for teachers. He noted that the administration's recommendation is for a 14% across-the-board adjustment for all classified employees retroactive to January 1981.

The second part of the recommendation, Mr. Wittenberg noted, is in agreement with the SNEA proposal and is a 9% to 12% adjustment to be effective January 1, 1982, depending on two things -- the cost of living escalation, as well as revenue projections at that point in time.

In regard to the turnover rate, Mr. Wittenberg said it is recommended that positions at grade levels 27 and below, receive a merit salary increase after 6 months rather than the current 12 months. It is not being proposed through the entire rate range for those grade

*AB398

4/13/81 Page 5

levels but only for the first two steps. He said this is an attempt to adjust the entry rates and provide more incentive to try to curb the high turnover rate in these classifications. He indicated that 2,200 employees, approximately 1/5 of the work force, will benefit from this additional 5% increase in 6 months rather than 12 months.

Mr. Wittenberg said that an additional 5% is being requested for correctional officers and group supervisors as there has been a 50% plus turnover in these areas. He noted that the prevailing rate data in surveying western states reveals that Nevada's salaries lag 20% below other states in the area of correctional officers.

Mr. Wittenberg expressed the opinion that perhaps the prison riot in New Mexico could have been avoided by increasing the salaries of prison personnel prior to the incident.

Mr. Wittenberg said that of the 4,500 state employees studied under the Factor Ranking Study, 1,850 positions are being increased from 5% to 10%. Again, this focus is on the lower level (clerical and technical) positions in state government; 2,200 are involved in the merit salary increase proposal for an additional 5% after 6 months of service for the first two steps of a grade level.

Mr. Wittenberg further stated that this methodology (Factor Ranking) also reduces a number of classifications in state service, puts them in broader scope concepts and establishes a 10% differential between all levels of responsibility.

Mr. Wittenberg indicated that it is anticipated that these proposed changes will reduce the turnover rate in state government. He noted the turnover rate was 26% a year ago and 22% last year which means 1 in 5 employees a year are leaving state service and is costly in the long run.

Mr. Wittenberg continued by citing problems as seen by the administration with SNEA's proposal of $100 across the board increase recommendation. He said this application is not practical in state government considering that it is an organization with 10,000 employees and 1,400 different kinds of jobs. He said that the main problem is that an across-the-board increase simply reduces the incentive between levels by reducing the percentage differential between supervisor and subordinate. He said that if the argument for inflation is "dollars across the board" then it follows that it will need to be "dollars across the board" again, and will mean it would take $32 million to return to a 10% differential.

Chairman Bremner noted that the solutions by the Personnel Division have not cured the turnover problem. Mr. Wittenberg said that turnover has been decreased from 26% to 22% in the past year as a result of a concentrated effort by the administration.

Mr. Horn asked what grade level is receiving an annual salary of $15,500. Mr. Wittenberg said that salary range would be reflected in the grade 27 level and involves 4,800 employees at that level and lower. Using the Senate Finance Committee's proposal of an 8% increase plus $75, Mr. Horn noted that those employees (grade 27 and below) would have more of an increase in salary as compared to the administration's proposal of a 14% increase. When Mr. Horn asked how many employees would be affected in this category, Mr. Wittenberg said that 9,600 employees would be affected. Mr. Wittenberg said there would be some employees at grade 27 and below that would have more of an increase under the Governor's proposal because of the 6 month merit salary increase versus the current 1 year stipulation for a merit salary increase and there are 1,850 employees affected by the Factor Ranking Study which results in either a 10% or 23% increase.

In addition, Mr. Horn referred to Mr. Wittenberg's previous statement and asked how he could equate the New Mexico prison riot with a level of income. Mr. Wittenberg said that due to the fact that prison guard's salaries at the New Mexico prison were increased 20% subsequent to the riot, he concluded that it was determined that salaries were inadequate.

4/13/81
Page 6

In regard to the turnover rate of state employees, Chairman Bremner referred to a letter dated January 25, 1979, from Mr. Wittenberg which said the turnover rate for 18 months prior to the 1979 session was 18.17%, and secondly a letter dated February 9, 1981, revealed that the turnover rate for the 18 months prior to that date was 22%. Mr. Wittenberg said that the Personnel Division annualizes turnover on a calendar year basis. Chairman Bremner said that it appears that the Personnel Division bases the turnover rate figures on non-measurable factors. Mr. Wittenberg said the Personnel Division computes turnover rates on the calendar year and Bill Bible asked for turnover rates based on a different time frame (18 months). Based on the turnover rates provided by the Personnel Division of a reduction in turnover from 26% to 22%, Chairman Bremner asked for an explanation of what steps the Personnel Division has taken to accomplish this reduction. Mr. Wittenberg said that the high turnover rates in the prison system were identified and some training was provided to help the problem. Chairman Bremner noted that the action taken by the Personnel Division was to reduce turnover, not salary-related. Mr. Wittenberg indicated that the important variable at the Jean Prison facility to help curb the high turnover was the $6 per day travel differential allocated to prison employees with commuting expenses.

Mr. Wittenberg said that the administration's proposal to increase salaries will help eliminate the high turnover by bringing salaries to a comparable level. Chairman Bremner noted that the majority of state employees will have more of an increase under SNEA's salary proposal than they would under the administration's proposal. Mr. Wittenberg said that SNEA's proposal was $15 million more than the proposal by the administration. Chairman Bremner said that $15 million more was not the figure he had, in fact, the administration's proposal was at a cost of $37,896,000 and SNEA's proposal $46,651,000 which is based on 9% the second year under SNEA's proposal and if the administration's proposal was increased to 12% the second year, the difference would be even less (only $7 million or $8 million). Mr. Wittenberg said that the $100 across-the-board increase proposed by SNEA will create long range problems by affecting the productivity of the work force. Chairman Bremner said it was his impression that Mr. Wittenberg's big argument against SNEA's proposal was that managers and supervisors would not have as big of an increase as the lower grades (27 and below.) Mr. Wittenberg said that it was his opinion that administration and management are very important. Chairman Bremner pointed out that the high turnover, as documented by the Personnel Division, is in the grades 27 and below. Mr. Wittenberg said that the employees in the first and second steps of grades 27 and below are in a transition to higher grades noting that 50% of the turnover is promotional.

Mr. Hickey asked if Mr. Wittenberg was saying that if SNEA's proposal was adopted that productivity of employees would be affected. Mr. Wittenberg said that SNEA's proposal will have a negative affect by decreasing the differential between levels of responsibility.

Mr. Robinson commented that the economy and availability of other employment are factors in the turnover rate. In addition, Mr. Robinson asked for an explanation of the big change in turnover rates (turnover of 35% at grade 27 and 19% for grade 28.) Mr. Wittenberg said that grade 28 is the beginning grade level for professional staff.

Mr. Horn asked Mr. Wittenberg if it were his opinion that low productivity and high turnover are related to low salaries. Mr. Wittenberg said that low salaries can result in a loss of productivity. Mr. Horn additionally asked for reasons why people leave state service. Mr. Wittenberg said that turnover relates to salaries, lack of training, lack of promotional opportunity or working conditions. Mr. Horn commented that low productivity relates to what people do -- not to the amount of money they are paid; people are motivated by what they are given to do.

Mr. Glover asked what percentage of turnover is related to promotional advancement in state government and what percentage is related to employees leaving state government. Mr. Wittenberg said that promotional turnover figures are not included in the turnover rates that are presented to the committee.

4/13/81
Page 7

Mr. Del Frost, Director of the Rehabilitation Division of the Department of Human Resources, said that in his division at the present time in some situations, there exists only a 5% differential between supervisor and subordinate. He said that if an across-the-board increase is passed, it will errode that 5% difference even more and it would pose a problem in getting people to step up and accept the responsibility of a management position. Mr. Frost added that since 1973, he has conducted "exit" interviews with every employee who terminated with the Rehabilitation Division and, of the negative reasons given by employees for leaving, 50% were leaving because of excessive workload. He additionally pointed out that never had he had an employee specifically state they were leaving because of salary.

Charles Wolff, Director of the Department of Prisons, stated that he was in favor of this bill, as an across-the-board increase as proposed by SNEA decreases the incentive for upward mobility. Chairman Bremner noted that under the salary proposal by SNEA, the Correctional Officers in the Department of Prisons will have more of an increase in salary than that proposed by the administration. Director Wolff said that the prison employees would have more of an increase in salary in the long run under the Governor's proposal.

Mr. Vergiels asked Director Wolff to provide the committee with documented figures to substantiate his previous statement whereby Correctional Officers would make more money under the Governor's salary proposal. Warden Wolff said he could not provide those figures, rather it was his personal feeling that Correctional Officers would make more money under the Governor's proposal based on experience.

Mr. Ace Martelle, Director of Human Resources, testified in favor of AB 333 because the salary proposal by SNEA would compact the pay levels between lower level and supervisory jobs.

Mr. Glover asked if the department heads that testified in favor of AB 333 was spontaneous or coordinated through the Governor's Office. Mr. Martelle said that he was not asked by the Governor's Office to testify in favor of AB 333.

Chairman Bremner adjourned the meeting at 10:00 a.m.

DATE: April 13, 1981

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

GUEST LIST

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	REPRESENTING:
Will Keating	PERS
Vern Bennett	PERS
Gordon Cronenberger	DHR - Human Resources
Ace Martelle	DHR - Human Resources
Chas. Wolff	Prisons
Ellen Stevens	UNR - SNEA
Mary Lazzarini	
Mitch Burst	State Personnel
W. E. Hancock	Public Works Board
R. E. Baker	Public Works Board
Joyce Woodhouse	Nevada State Educ Assoc

VERNON BENNETT
EXECUTIVE OFFICER

WILL KEATING
ASSISTANT EXECUTIVE OFFICER

STATE OF NEVADA

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES RETIREMENT SYSTEM
693 WEST NYE LANE
CARSON CITY, NEVADA 89701
TELEPHONE (702) 885-4200

TESTIMONY PRESENTED TO ASSEMBLY WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE ON APRIL 13, 1981 REGARDING AB-168, SECOND REPRINT

I am Vernon Bennett, Executive Officer of the Public Employees' Retirement System of Nevada. AB-168, 2nd Reprint is the System's general legislation bill. The bill has received indepth hearings by the Assembly Government Affairs Committee. There are four sections which have significant fiscal impact which are as follows:

1. Section 10 will increase Board fees from $40 to $60 per day and add that fees will be paid for work projects and necessary travel.This increase was reflected in an amendment to our Budget Request. The additional cost will be $13, 180 in 1982 and $13,180 in 1983.

2. Section 13 will increase the employee contribution rate for police and firemen who are not under employer pay from 8.50 to 9.00 % of compensation. This will apply only to state employees who are police and firemen because all other police and firemen groups will be under employer pay effective July 1, 1981. There are 830 employees who will be affected. The fiscal impact in this section will be a .50 % increase in retirement deductions for the individuals involved. This rate is recommended by the Actuary.

3. Section 15 provides the employer contribution rate increase from 8.50 to 9.00% . We estimate this will cost the state $62,450 per annum. This is based on a current payroll of $1,040,828 for the 830 employees. There will be a slight increase each year thereafter as salary increases occur.

4. Section 31 will provide authorization to use PERS funds to sue the Federal Government if Congress mandates Social Security coverage. The Attorney General feels that Congress does not have the constitutional authority to mandate this coverage. We would join with several other states in the lawsuit. We cannot compute the cost. However, the cost could range from $100,000 to $1,000,000 depending on complexity of the lawsuit and the number of other Systems that participate.

We will be pleased to answer any questions which the members of the Committee may have.

EXHIBIT A

NEVADA TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION
P.O. BOX 633 200 N. Fall Street CARSON CITY, NEVADA
(702) 882-2697

E. T. HERMANN, SPARKS
PRESIDENT

E. L. NEWTON, CARSON CITY
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

6 April 1981

Subject: Assembly Bill 168, Re: Public Employees Retirement System

From: Nevada Taxpayers Association, E. L. Newton, Executive vice president

To: Mr. Roger Bremner, Assemblyman

This Bill contains a section (Section 3) which we believe should be DELETED prior to final passage of the Bill. It is a section that seeks to condone and validate a practice which we believe is illegal, and has been illegal for more than 30 years. The Section is reproduced overside:

The law (NRS 286.040) requires that every payroll submitted to PERS must certify that the employer is a public body and that every employee named on the roll is an employee of a public body. The law also prohibits any public employer from doing anything to "assist in the . . . administration of any employee organization." (NRS 288.270)

In spite of these laws, officials of employee unions have been certified as employees of school districts. Their PERS "contributions" have been paid by the teachers' union and, in turn, remitted to the PERS with the regular certified payroll. The result is that an employee can acquire full retirement credit for any combination of years worked for the union and the public employer.

Six or more months ago we called this illegal practice to the attention of the PERS Board, and the school district then making the false certification. The PERS Board acknowledged that the practice was improper but asserted that it had no authority to go behind the certification made by the District. In order to "validate" the practice the Board has now undertaken to secure the enactment of Section 3 of Assembly Bill 168.

The school official also acknowledged the apparent illegality of the practice and discontinued the practice.

We have no present desire to seek prosecution of any public official for the false certification. But we do believe that the practice should be stopped and, further, that legislation should not be enacted to permit the entry of retirement credits in the PERS for employees of an employee union; or for an organization of employers. We believe it is bad public policy, even if it were not prohibited by the statute. (NRS 288.270)

We urge you to further amend Assembly Bill 168 by striking Sec. 3 from the Bill.

EXHIBIT B

W.R. McGREW, LAS VEGAS
VICE PRESIDENT

WALLIE WARREN, RENO
VICE PRESIDENT

JOHN ECK, RENO
SECRETARY TREASURER

SEC. 3. *1. A public employee on leave to work for a recognized employee or employer association may remain a member of the system if retirement contributions to the system are continued.*

2. When an employee on leave continues to be a member of the system, the public employer from whom the employee is on leave shall include the payment of the contributions and all other required information on his regular monthly retirement report as provided in NRS 286.460.

3. For the purposes of this section, "compensation" shall be deemed to be the salary paid for the position from which the employee is on leave.

4. Any member of the system may purchase credit for any period on or after July 1, 1947, for which contributions were not paid, which qualifies under this section. The member must pay the system's actuary for any necessary computation, and must also pay the full actuarial costs determined by the actuary.

ROOFING PROJECT OF STATE BUILDINGS
1981 - 1983 BIENNIUM
SECOND DRAFT

1289

FOREMAN AND HELPER	$ 80,000
2-TON HYD TRUCK	21,000
350 GALLON POT	6,500
MATERIAL	288,270
PROPANE, TOOLS, ETC.	5,000
OUTSIDE CONTRACTS	
WINNEMUCCA	16,000
ELY	14,000
VEHICLE OPERATION @ .25¢ PER MILE	2,240
INMATES WAGES	
271 DAYS X $8.00 PER DAY X 5 MEN	10,840
	$443,850

INCLUDES THE FOLLOWING BUILDINGS:

NEVADA STATE PRISON
WOMEN'S CORRECTIONAL CENTER
NORTHERN NEVADA CORRECTIONAL CENTER
NEVADA MENTAL HEALTH INSTITUTE
4 NATIONAL GUARD ARMORIES
3 BUILDINGS IN THE CAPITOL COMPLEX

PUBLIC WORKS BOARD ESTIMATE------------------$740,100

EXHIBIT C

81-2 Roof Repairs, State Facilitied
Project Breakdown

			Number of Buildings	Area (Squares)	Estimated Construction Cost
1.	Nevada State Prison - Carson City		7	298	$ 66,800
	Kitchen Building	- 7,200 s.f.			
	Tower 1	- 400 s.f.			
	Tower 2	- 300 s.f.			
	Tower 3	- 300 s.f.			
	License Plate Plant	- 8,000 s.f.			
	Balance of Cell Blocks	- 12,000 s.f.			
	Old Warden's House	- 1,600 s.f.			
		29,800 s.f.			
2.	Women's Prison		1	95	21,300
3.	Northern Nevada Correctional Center		16	1,474	330,500
	3 Dorms				
	2 Industrial Buildings				
	Gym				
	Vocational Training Shop (Auto)				
	Education Building				
	Administration Building				
	Gate House				
	Kitchen - Dining Hall				
	Pump House				
	4 Towers				
4.	Nevada Mental Health Institute		6	215	48,200
	Building #1	- 10,000 s.f.			
	Buildings #2A, 8A, 8B, 8C (low roofs only)	- 1,000 s.f.			
	Building #10	- 10,500 s.f.			
5.	Capitol Complex		4	305	68,400
	Heroes Memorial Building	- ~~30,000~~ 3,000 s.f.			
	Supreme Court	- 7,000 s.f.			
	State Museum (Mint Building)	- 7,000 s.f.			
	Kinkead Building	- 13,500 s.f.			
6.	Armories		4	381	85,500
	Reno	- 17,700 s.f.			
	Winnemucca	- 5,700 s.f.			
	Yerington	- 10,200 s.f.			
	Ely	- 4,500 s.f.			
			38	2,768	$620,700
7.	Repair Museum Ceiling	- 800 s.f. @ $3.00 =			2,400
				($224.24/sq.)	$623,100

1981

ADMINISTRATION SALARY PROPOSAL (General Fund)--A.B. 333

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	Total
January 1, 1981--14% Classified	$3,972,003	$ 6,698,171	$ 7,500,741	
January 1, 1981--14% University Classified	1,141,857	1,694,857	1,864,444	
Correctional Officer/Group Supervisor Salary Adjustment	303,666	638,155	667,127	
Factor Ranking	381,472	837,765	897,871	
Merit Acceleration		498,559	521,193	
Holiday Increase		199,423	208,477	
Subtotal - January 1, 1981--14% and Special Salary Adjustments	$5,798,998	$10,566,930	$11,659,853	$28,025,781
January 1, 1982--9% C.P.I. Increase, Classified		$ 2,422,781	$ 5,460,158	
January 1, 1982--9% C.P.I. Increase, University Classified		620,521	1,366,828	
Subtotal - January 1, 1982--C.P.I. Adjustments		$ 3,043,302	$ 6,826,986	$ 9,870,288
Total	$5,798,998	$13,610,232	$18,486,839	$37,896,069

EXHIBIT D

SNEA SALARY PROPOSAL (General Fund)--A.B. 398

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	Total
January 1, 1981--$100 + 10% Classified	$5,245,665	$ 8,698,611	$ 9,604,112	
January 1, 1981--$100 + 10% University Classified	1,620,484	2,443,933	2,671,320	
5% Correctional Officer Increase	226,994	474,176	570,136	
5% Mental Health Technicians	135,880	248,015	289,011	
5% Mechanical and Construction Trades	24,793	48,379	56,368	
5% Mechanical and Construction Trades--University	61,183	125,426	128,561	
Subtotal - January 1, 1981--$100 + 10% and Special Salary Adjustments	$7,314,999	$12,038,540	$13,319,508	$32,673,047
January 1, 1982--12% C.P.I. Increase, Classified		$ 3,585,806	$ 7,537,451	
January 1, 1982--12% C.P.I. Increase, University Classified		890,975	1,964,060	
Subtotal - January 1, 1982, C.P.I. Adjustments		$ 4,476,781	$ 9,501,511	$13,978,292
Total	$7,314,999	$16,515,321	$22,821,019	$46,651,339

SENATE FINANCE SALARY BILL (General Fund)--S.B. 516

	1980-81	1981-82	1982-83	Total
January 1, 1981--8% + $75, Classified	$3,806,822	$ 6,254,191	$ 6,815,283	
January 1, 1981--8% + $75, University Classified	1,169,027	1,804,077	1,855,750	
Subtotal - January 1, 1981--8% + $75, Salary Adjustments	$4,975,849	$ 8,058,268	$ 8,671,033	$21,705,150
January 1, 1982--8% C.P.I. Increase, Classified		$ 2,182,918	$ 4,614,733	
January 1, 1982--8% C.P.I. Increase, University Classified		565,961	1,173,734	
Subtotal - January 1, 1982, C.P.I. Increase		$ 2,748,879	$ 5,788,467	$ 8,537,346
Total	$4,975,849	$10,807,147	$14,459,500	$30,242,496