

MINUTES OF THE
MEETING OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE
ON FINANCE

SIXTY-FIRST SESSION
NEVADA STATE LEGISLATURE
January 23, 1981

The Senate Committee on Finance was called to order by Chairman Floyd R. Lamb, at 8:00 a.m., Friday, January 23, 1981, in Room 231 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Meeting Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Floyd R. Lamb, Chairman
Senator James I. Gibson, Vice Chairman
Senator Eugene V. Echols
Senator Norman D. Glaser
Senator Thomas R. C. Wilson
Senator Clifford E. McCorkle
Senator Lawrence E. Jacobsen

COMMITTEE MEMBER ABSENT:

(None)

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ronald W. Sparks, Chief Fiscal Analyst
Dan Miles, Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Tracy L. Dukic, Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Howard Barrett, Director, Budget Division
Patrick Pine, Clark County
Ed Greer, Clark County School District
Chuck Neely, Clark County School District
Richard Brown, Nevada Associated School Administration
John Hawkins, School Board Association
John Borda, Nevada Motor Transport Association
Marvin Leavitt, City of Las Vegas
Chris Woodyard, Las Vegas Sun
Ed Vogel, Las Vegas Review-Journal
Pat Gothberg, Nevada Nurses' Association
G. P. Etcheverry, Nevada League of Cities
Bob Felten, State of Nevada Employees' Association
Rod Jacson, KTNV-TV
Lance Frank, KTNV-TV
Greg McKenzie, KLAS-TV

Chairman Lamb called the meeting to order and asked Mr. Howard Barrett, Director of the Budget Division, to give his revenue projections and comparisons.

Mr. Barrett asked the Committee and the audience to reference page A-2 of the proposed budget, the Projection of General Fund Cash Balances, (See Exhibit C), and proceeded with an explanation of this section of the budget.

Senate

Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981

Mr. Sparks announced that he has made a comparison sheet of the two budgets prepared by the Fiscal Division and the Budget Division's revenue projections for 1981, 1982 and 1983.

Mr. Barret informs the Committee that an error in the Sales and Use Tax was made, and that he was not able to make all the corrections necessary prior to the meeting. He requests that the Committee allow him to deliver those at a later time.

Senator Lamb notes that there is quite a difference in the Sales and Use Tax portion of the budgets.

Mr. Barrett proceeds with his presentation, starting with the Cash Balance as of July 1978 up to the Cash Balance of July 1980. He states that his department is in agreement with the Fiscal Division's projections for the Cash Balance for July 1980. He continues, explaining the income estimates and reversions and the actual amount of appropriations for the next two years and states that the \$57,000 dollars in appropriation's money made by the Legislature in the last session has been excluded in this budget and the One-Shot's recommended, less the amount to reimburse the contingency funds and less the supplemental appropriations, mainly Welfare, less the Capital Improvements and the cost of the 1981 Legislature.

Mr. Barrett then presented income and appropriations for the next two years.

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Barrett if he included money for the Special Session.

Mr. Barrett replies that he did not.

Mr. Sparks interjects that the cost of the Special Session will be \$57,000.

Senator Lamb suggests that the Committee and Mr. Sparks and Mr. Barrett examine the budget proposals by taking each area of government one at a time and discussing the areas of agreement and disagreement in each of these.

Mr. Sparks notes that in Fiscal 1981, the tax structure is the same, but, because of the Governor's newly proposed tax structure, i.e., difference in revenue sources, the Budget Division's figures will differ significantly from the Fiscal Division's. He notes that in the areas of State Gaming, Liquor, Casino Entertainment, Sales and Use and Insurance taxes there will be very little difference in the two budgets. There has also been no estimate for the Racing Pari-Mutuel from the Henderson Dog Track because the track has been just recently opened. Mr. Sparks does note that the only differences are in the estimate of \$2 million dollars in tax increases and the Cash Balance estimate. He states that the Cash Balance projected by the Budget Division is \$16.6 million dollars in reversions while the Fiscal Division's estimate for the same category is \$14.5 million dollars, resulting in a \$2.1 million dollar difference.

Mr. Sparks said that for Fiscal 1982, the Governor's recommending a change in the way the Sales and Use Tax and the Casino Entertainment Tax is collected, and that this recommendation will bring a one-time excess collection into the General Fund. This was not reflected in the Fiscal Division's budget because they based their figures on the current method of collecting taxes.

Senate

Committee on Finance

January 23, 1981

Mr. Barrett goes on further to explain the Governor's recommendations for the collection of the Sales and Use Tax. He says that the recommendation asks that the Sales and Use Tax be collected on a monthly basis, instead of a quarterly basis, as has been the custom and practice in the past, for those businesses paying in excess of \$500 dollars monthly. He went on to say that the change will create a one-time windfall of \$7.7 million dollars due to the addition of two extra months of collection in the first year that this program is instituted. He said that the Governor is proposing to do the same with the Casino Entertainment Tax of \$3½ million dollars.

Mr. Sparks inquires of Mr. Barrett if the two changes in the method of proposed tax collection are added to the Fiscal Division's Revenue Projections, would that bring the total projections for Fiscal 1982 under the Budget Division's Projections.

Mr. Barrett said that the mistake in the Sales Tax would bring the overall figures down by approximately \$1 million dollars, and that they would be very close to the Fiscal Division's projections.

Mr. Sparks indicated that the charges for services to support State Park fees that go into the State Park Budget are now being showed in the General Fund. Normally, these revenues would go directly into the State Parks' Budget for the operation of the State Parks.

Mr. Sparks inquires of Mr. Barrett why the Budget Division is projecting \$187,000 dollars going into the General Fund for the next two years.

Mr. Barrett has no reply.

Senator Glaser asks what benefits the State will receive due to the monthly payment of increased Sales and Use Tax instead of a quarterly payment of this tax and what reaction has he received from the business community in regard to this change.

Mr. Barrett replies that he has not inquired of them, but he reiterates that it is only for those businesses paying in excess of \$500 monthly in Sales Tax.

Mr. Sparks then directs the Committee's attention to Fiscal 1983 and says that the bottom-line estimates for this year show little difference except for the projections in the Sales and Use Tax figure. The Fiscal Division projects revenues of \$166.7 million dollars while the Budget Division reflects projected revenues of \$162.6 million dollars. He noted that there resides the major difference between the two offices projections for Fiscal 1983.

Mr. Sparks further stated that the difference in Total General Fund Revenues are less than \$1 million dollars.

Mr. Sparks asks Mr. Barrett about the Budget Division's Interest Income Projections and if his projections for Interest Income for the State's General Fund included the \$20 million dollar appropriation for retirees.

Mr. Barrett states that up until 10 days ago, it had been, but that it was not now being recommended, and that, depending upon the revenues collected in February, he may want to recommend to the Legislature that they return the \$20 million dollars to the General Fund. He wanted, though, to make clear that the \$20 million dollar appropriation was now included in the Budget Division's projections on interest income.

Senate

Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981

Senator Lamb inquired of Mr. Barrett about the amount of money appropriated for the Cash Balance.

Mr. Barrett replied that in the past they have always held aside at least 10%, but that the Cash Balance proposed in this budget was less this time, \$35 million dollars, (subject to correction to be provided). At this time Mr. Barrett requested dispensation to revise the figures for the Total General Fund Revenues until after February 15th.

Mr. Sparks asked Mr. Barrett about the Governor's proposed increase in Gross Percent Fees for the tax on casinos. Mr. Sparks wanted to know if it was proposed to be deposited in the General Fund.

Mr. Barrett replies that it would not go to the State or to the General Fund.

Mr. Sparks asked if it would return as a property tax.

Mr. Barrett said that it will go directly to the County and not to the State.

Mr. Sparks asked about the change in proposed net proceeds from State Revenues and if the State would administer these proceeds or receive them.

Mr. Barrett stated that it would not mean an increase in General Fund money nor an increase to the Distributive School Fund.

Mr. Sparks also indicated that it would return to cities and counties as a property tax.

Mr. Barrett agreed.

Senator Lamb asked why there was a \$2 million dollar difference in the reversions.

Mr. Sparks said there is a difference in the estimated reversions for Fiscal 1981 and the Sales and Use Tax in the next biennium. He indicated that \$9½ million dollars would revert from the State Distributive School Fund and the balance would be \$5 million dollars in regular reversions. He also indicated that the Welfare accounts would not revert as much money as they have in the past.

Mr. Sparks goes on to note that the proposed increase in the Local School Support Tax will have a significant bearing on the funds needed in the Distributive School Fund. He said that the Governor is proposing to remove the support for the Distributive School Fund from the General Fund.

Mr. Sparks then directs the Committee to Schedule C, General Fund Appropriations for Education, (See Exhibit D), and shows the Committee the current appropriations allocated to support the Department of Education, i.e., the Distributive School Fund. He said that the General Fund support for the Distributive School Fund, after adjusting for the proposed 30¢ tax, is 1.7%. He also stated that the total Department of Education recommended increase for General Fund support has been reduced from a present 38.6% to 31.5% due to the change in increasing local resources of General Fund Support.

Mr. Barrett then directs the Committee to page 273 of the Governor's Proposed Budget and, specifically, to 1981-1982, and proceeds to analyze for the Committee the basic support for education. He states that there is a basic support increase of \$1,449 dollars, which is an increase of 8.9%, and this forms the basic support for the schools. Special Education is proposed to receive an increase of \$13 to \$14.5 million dollars for every ten units of Special Education per year. He states that the support is withdrawn from the General Fund and replaced by an increase in the Sales Tax from 1¢ to 1.3¢ per dollar.

Senate

Committee on Finance

January 23, 1981

Senator Gibson asks Mr. Barrett if these funds are to originate from the Governor's recommended Sales Tax increase.

Mr. Barrett replied that they are, including the support drawn from the 50¢ property tax, the privilege tax and Federal funds being matched by the Federal Government and other minor revenues.

Mr. Sparks said there will be \$140.5 million dollars from the General Fund this year and \$7 million dollars not used last year to contribute to the Distributive School Fund for Fiscal 1981 for the State's General Fund money available for education.

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Barrett if the State is not basing its source of revenue to operate itself more and more on the Gaming and Liquor tax revenues and further indicates that he does not feel secure with the dependency.

Mr. Barrett replies that the State is almost totally dependent on the Sales and Gaming taxes, which are highly susceptible to fluctuating.

Senator Wilson noted that there is a basic change in policy, shifting all the governmental units into a position of riding the economy as State services do.

Mr. Barrett agrees with this observation.

Senator Lamb expresses his concern over this condition existing and, possibly, getting out of hand, leaving the State at the mercy of an unstable national economy.

Senator Gibson makes the observation that the Legislature made this policy decision last session.

Senator Lamb replies that he understands that, but that the State is becoming more and more dependent upon these revenue resources.

Mr. Barrett interjects the thought that a healthy cash balance is all the more necessary in light of this reliance upon these taxes.

Senator Lamb is in agreement with Mr. Barrett on this point, and adds that he feels by relying so heavily on these taxes, Nevada is giving away sources of income and that it shouldn't be given away.

Mr. Barrett also comments that his estimates and projections are not as conservative as he would like to see them, and he recommends that, in light of the need to keep a healthy cash balance available, the Finance Committee not appropriate any more money for special interest groups.

Senator McCorkle asks if Mr. Sparks or Mr. Barrett have taken the possible impact of the MX Missile into account when they prepared their respective projections.

Mr. Barrett replies that he has, and Mr. Sparks replies that he has not taken this factor into account, but that it should not affect the budget directly.

Mr. Barrett concurs with Mr. Sparks' observation.

Senator Lamb observes that this consideration is not valid at this time because it is too uncertain.

Senator McCorkle inquires whether either Mr. Sparks or Mr. Barrett believes that this factor will add or detract in net revenues.

Mr. Barrett replies that if the MX Missile comes to Nevada, there may very well be additional costs to Local and State governments.

Senate

Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Barrett what the reason would be for this additional cost to Local and State governments.

Mr. Barrett replied that there will be an additional cost to such agencies as the Nevada Industrial Commission, the Public Defender's Office and in narcotics investigation.

Senator Lamb expresses the opinion that this can be avoided if the government properly negotiates.

Senator Gibson states that the basic foundation for State revenues has not changed in the last 25 years, although it is structured differently at the local level.

Senator McCorkle indicates that if the MX Missile being brought into Nevada is going to have a negative impact, that problem should be dealt with now. He felt that there is no way that Nevada should lose money as a result of the MX and that the increase in the Sales Tax should be able to more than compensate for any possible losses.

Mr. Barrett states that the MX was one of the considerations taken into account in the decision to raise the Sales Tax.

Mr. Barrett proceeds to explain the proposed budget projections for the Fish and Game Department, the Department of Transportation and the creation of higher Driver's License Fees and how this will generate more revenues in the General Fund.

Mr. Sparks presented the Fiscal Division's Schedules A and B, General Fund Appropriations Functional Summary, (See Exhibit E), and stated that it is a chart showing the current allocation of General Fund money amongst the various governmental functions as compared to what is contained in the budgets for the next two years for General Fund sources. He indicated that it did not take into account the change occurring in the Distributive School Fund. He went on to the Human Resources' section and said that this section is increasing because of the increase in the Title 19 Program and the ADC Programs of \$14 million dollars due to an increase in the caseloads and the medical costs. He said that these appropriations are also going to staff facilities that were formerly approved for construction by the Legislature in 1979 and to support the Mental Health Program. He told the Committee that in these areas the General Fund support for Title 19 will double in three years.

Mr. Barrett agreed with Mr. Sparks' observation.

Mr. Sparks then referenced the Committee to the Public Safety section of the budget proposals. He said that there is a significant increase in the allocation to the General Fund Totals amounting to 60%. He indicated that this was a reflection of the new prison system in Southern Nevada, including additional staff for the current system and a recommendation for a new Women's Pre-release Center not presently in existence.

Mr. Barrett also indicated that there was a proposal for two new units, one, a medium, and one, a maximum prison facility in Carson City, and in the second year of the biennium, there will be staffing needed for these two units.

Senator Lamb asked if there had been any proposal for the purchase of a water system for the prison system in Southern Nevada.

Senate

Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981

Mr. Barrett replied that there hadn't been.

Mr. Barrett then proceeded to explain the Regulatory Section of the budget proposals. He stated that one-half of 1% of the current allocation of the General Fund was going to the Regulatory Section, which would result in a 39% increase as a result of the increase in the Gaming Budget. This increase would be a 50% increase over the biennium, and 44 new positions would be created as part of this increase proposal.

Senator Lamb inquired as to what kind of personnel this would be.

Mr. Barrett replied that there would be some auditors, some enforcement agents, electronic testing equipment and a management information system and some new clerical positions.

Mr. Sparks then referenced to the Conservation, Agriculture and Energy section of the Governor's budget proposals and stated that there is basically no change in this.

Mr. Sparks directs the Committee to the Highway-DMV Section of the budget proposals and said that, currently, they are receiving .5% of the General Fund, and that from 1981 to 1983, there will be an increase up to .6%, which is a 57% increase. This is a result of the Urban Mass Transit appropriation which will be matched by Federal funds for a local mass transit system. Included in this presentation was the explanation of the need for additional General Fund support for the electronic swither located in the Highway Patrol.

Mr. Sparks directs the Committee to the Miscellaneous Section. Mr. Sparks indicates that this section is doubling this year because that is where the appropriations for the proposed salary increases for State employees is contained, but that the only amount that has been allocated already is the 1980 increase. This year's money is residing in the Salary Adjustment Budget Account.

Senator Lamb inquires how much that account is holding.

Mr. Sparks said that the General Fund salary increases for the next year are projected to be \$11.8 million dollars and \$16.3 million the year after. He noted that this would included the classified-unclassified employees and the proposed special salary adjustments for correctional officers, youth training supervisors and some clerical positions. He said that there is a One-Shot appropriation for this fiscal year contained in the One-Shot portion of this budget.

Mr. Barrett explains that this One-Shot appropriation provides for a 14% increase which will be retroactive back to January 1st of this year and a 9% increase in the following January. This contains the money for the reclassification of jobs, and it will also be retroactive with an additional 5% increase for correctional officers. This would enable employees to earn their merit increases at a faster rate than has been the custom under Grade 27. It would also add two new holidays for State employees.

Senator McCorkle said that he believes that this is a tight budget at the expense of the educational system. He stated that educational support is down 2%, with an increase in the basic support of approximately 8%. He asked where the money was to come from. He also noted that in the Governor's State of the State address, an \$800 dollar property tax reduction was proposed; how can a reduction in State support result in an 8% increase in the basic support to schools.

Senate

Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981

Mr. Sparks explains that they aren't proposing a change in the schools' current ability to assess property. The proposed increase is a result of an increase of .3% in the Local School Support Tax. He stated that the increase will diminish the need for General Fund support for the Distributive School Fund, and that decrease is being reallocated into other areas.

Mr. Barrett said that the 50¢ property tax on every \$100 dollars of assessed valuation would not be on the regular assessed valuation; it would be on an assessed valuation factored up annually. This would place everyone at the maximum assessed valuation each year.

Mr. Sparks refers to Schedule B of the General Fund Appropriations Functional Summary and proceeds to explain how the proposed redistribution of monies affects the educational system in the next biennium. He then referenced the Committee to Schedule C and explained the situation further. Higher education currently receives 19.4% of the Total General Fund resources, and next year, it will decline to 18.8%. This is a 1% increase in General Fund support for higher education for the next biennium. This change in revenues is due to a change in the student faculty ratio from 20 to 1 to 22 to 1 at UNR and UNLV and the community colleges. There is also a tuition fee increase contained in this proposal of from \$24 dollars to \$30 dollars per credit on the community college level and from \$13 dollars to \$17 dollars for the universities if the Board of Regents implements the proposed recommendations.

Mr. Sparks then references the Committee to Schedule C and proceeds to explain that this does contain the funding sources for every budget in the Executive Budget. Mr. Sparks notes that the current work program does not reflect the increases to the revenue structure the amount of money necessary for the salary increases approved by the 1979 Legislature. Last year's budget reflects these increases, but this year's does not. This salary increase will not be reflected until later.

Mr. Barrett interjected a comment that if there are no changes in the current employment statuses, at the end of the year, \$26,570 dollars goes towards meeting the payroll, and this would come from the Salary Adjustment Fund approved last session. These monies are not given unless needed, but if all the positions are filled, they will require all the money appropriated.

Mr. Sparks notes that it comes in as a General Fund Salary adjustment.

Mr. Sparks directs the Committee to pages B-8, the Source of Funds Summary for General Government (See Exhibit E), B-9, the Source of Funds Summary for Education (See Exhibit G), and B-43, the Source of Funds Summary for General Government (See Exhibit H), explains for the Committee what these schedules entail. He noted for the Committee that page B-43 showed the subfunction breakdown of governmental functions.

Senator McCorkle asked if the total budget increases would be 7.9%.

Mr. Sparks directs Senator McCorkle to page B-42, the Total General Fund Increase in all government functions (See Exhibit I), and said that for next year, it would be 4% and the year after, 9%.

Senator McCorkle asked if when the Federal funds are added what the Total General Fund increase would be.

Mr. Sparks said that for next year, it would be 17%, and the year after, 7%.

Senate
Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981

Senator McCorkle asked what assumptions were applied to these budget proposals for the factors of inflation and population.

Mr. Sparks said that it would be an inflation rate of 10 to 14% and a population growth rate of 5% per year.

Mr. Sparks then directed the Committee to page B-44, the Source of Funds Summary for Education (See Exhibit J), and proceeded to explain this to the Committee. He then directed the Committee's attention to page B-45, the Source of Funds Summary for Human Resources (See Exhibit K), and stated that there had been a proposed 52% increase in the Welfare Budget.

Mr. Barrett went on to enumerate the reasons for this 52% increase and stated that there had been an ever-increasing caseload of Welfare recipients, resulting in the dilemma of coming up with enough money to continue giving benefits to these people. He also indicated that another reason for this increase was the fact that cost, in general, has increased, and that the same was true with the Food Stamp Program. He believes that the increase in the Welfare Program is a direct result of the poor economy.

Mr. Sparks observes that George Miller's predictions that he rendered to the Committee were correct, although the Legislature did not decide to go with those predictions.

Mr. Barrett said that he is projecting that the number of recipients will go down in the coming years due to the projected economic recovery.

Senator Wilson asked Mr. Barrett if George Miller is in agreement with him.

Mr. Barrett replied that he was not; that he felt that Welfare caseloads would stay the same or go higher.

Mr. Sparks remarked that even if Welfare caseloads did go down, medical costs are projected to increase due to the Title 19 Program.

Mr. Sparks then referred the Committee to the Public Safety section of the proposed budget. He said that the Department of Prisons and the Department of Probation, both, have recommended increases because of the expansion of the current prison system, the staffing of these new facilities and an increase in caseload work.

Mr. Sparks then asked the Committee to look at the Regulatory section of the proposed budget and said that the primary increase in this section was due to the increases proposed in the Gaming programs.

Mr. Sparks explained to the Committee the Miscellaneous section of the proposed budget by saying that the disbursement of General Fund's monies to implement the proposed salary increases for State employees was the reason for the large increase in this section of the budget.

Senator Lamb asked Mr. Barrett to explain the Governor's proposed salary increases for State employees.

Mr. Barrett said that there was a proposed 14% increase the first year, and a 9% increase the second year, with an additional 5% going to correctional officers and supervisors and clerical staff and that there will be a reclassification in the Mental Health Program of its staff.

Mr. Sparks asked the Committee to reference the section called "Position Changes," page C-1, the Position Summary for General Government, (See Exhibit L), and explained that this was the position summary for all governmental functions and each individual budget. He directed the Committee to page C-37, the Position Summary, an All Positions Functional Summary, (See Exhibit M), and explained that this does include the proposed University employment positions as recommended by the

Senate

Committee on Finance
January 23, 1981


Governor. He indicated that the Governor was recommending \$450,157 dollars the first year and \$475,000 dollars each year after for the Graduate Assistance Program rather than specifying a specific number of new positions to be filled.

Mr. Sparks also indicated that the Conservation, Natural Resources and the Agriculture budgets were showing a 14% increase in General Fund support over the current work program this year, but only a 1% increase the following year.


Finally, Mr. Sparks stated that the only other category showing an increase was the Highway-DMV section of the proposed budget, and these increases were due to the proposed increase in gas taxes and other highway user fees.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 10:42 a.m.

Respectfully submitted by:


Tracy L. Duld, Secretary

APPROVED BY:


Floyd R. Lamb, Chairman

DATE: Jan 29- 1981

SENATE AGENDA

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Committee on Finance _____, Room 231 _____.

Day (See Below) _____, Date (See Below) _____, Time (See Below)

Monday, January 19, 1981, (Upon Senate Recess)

Committee Rules.

Tuesday, January 20, 1981, 8:00 a.m.

Revenue Projections (Fiscal Division).

Wednesday, January 21, 1981, 8:00 a.m.

**One Shot, Supplemental, and Capital Improvement Appropriations;
Howard Barrett, William Hancock.**

Thursday, January 22, 1981

No Meeting.

Friday, January 23, 1981, 8:00 a.m.

Revenue Projections, Budget Overview; Howard Barrett, Ron Sparks.

ATTENDANCE ROSTER FORM

COMMITTEE MEETINGS

SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

DATE: JANUARY 23, 1981

PLEASE PRINT	PLEASE PRINT	PLEASE PRINT	PLEASE PRINT
NAME	ORGANIZATION & ADDRESS	TELEPHONE	
BRUCE PINE	CLARK COUNTY		
Ed Green	CL Co. School Dist		
CHUCK NEELY	CLARK COUNTY School Dist.		
Richard Brown	News Assoc. Sch. Adm.		
John Hawkins	School Board Association		
John Borda	New Motor Transport Assoc.		
MARVIN LEAVITT	CITY OF LAS VEGAS		
Chris Woodward	Las Vegas SUN		
Ed Vogel	LAS VEGAS REVIEW-JOURNAL		
PAT GOTHBERG	NEVADA NURSES' ASSOCIATION		
G.P. Etcheberry	NEVADA LEAGUE OF CITIES		
Bob Felten	State of Nev. Employees Assn.		
Bob Jackson	KTNV-TV		
Lance Frank	KTNV-TV		
Greg McKenzie	KLAS-TV		
	8-9:40		

PROJECTION OF GENERAL FUND CASH BALANCES

A2
Revised: January 23, 1981

67

Cash Balance July 1, 1978		\$ 74,805,265
Income 1978-79	\$300,941,797	
Reversions 1978-79 Regular	45,034,530	
Appropriations for 1978-79	(241,376,950)	
1979 Legislative General Fund Appropriation	(90,664,108)	
Adjustments to Fund Balance	<u>743,920</u>	
Cash Balance July 1, 1979		\$ 87,996,614
Income 1979-80	\$322,356,013	
Adjustment to Prior Year Fund Balance	942,922	
Reversions	10,602,316	
Appropriations for 1979-80	(354,871,663)	
80-81 Appropriations moved to 1979-80	(882,500)	
Cash Balance July 1, 1980		\$ 66,143,702
Income 1980-81 (estimated)	\$334,043,134	
Reversions (estimated)	16,600,000	
Appropriations for 1980-81	(347,562,475)	
Less 80-81 Appropriations moved to 1979-80	882,500	
One-Shots	(13,022,969)	
Contingency Funds Replenishment	(5,780,466)	
Supplemental Appropriations	(16,680,029)	
Capital Improvement Appropriations	(7,693,800)	
Appropriations for 81 Legislature Session	<u>3,000,000</u>	
Cash Balance July 1, 1981		\$ 23,929,597

Cash Balance July 1, 1981		\$ 23,929,597
Income 1981-82 (estimated)	\$ 373,786,353	
Reversion Sports Pavillion	\$ 5,500,000	
Appropriations for 1981-82	(\$ 368,964,050)	
Cash Balance July 1, 1982		\$33,251,900
Income 1982-83 (estimated)	\$ 402,721,623	
Appropriations 1982-83	(\$ 403,578,401)	
Cash Balance July 1 - 1983		\$32,395,122

Interim Finance Contingency Fund, Emergency Fund, State Claims, Statutory Contingency Fund.

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS
EDUCATION
(in millions)

Schedule C

<u>Function</u>	<u>1979-81 Biennium*</u>		<u>1981-83 Biennium</u>		<u>% of Change Appropriation</u>
	<u>Appropriations</u>	<u>% of Total**</u>	<u>Appropriations</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	
Department of Education	\$239.5***	38.6%	\$243.6	31.5	1.7
Higher Education	120.4	19.4	145.6	18.8	20.9
Other Education Programs	<u>3.6</u>	<u>.6</u>	<u>4.3</u>	<u>.6</u>	20.7
Total Education	\$363.5	58.6	\$393.5	50.9	8.1
Total Budget	\$620.4***	100.0%	\$773.5	100.0%	24.7%

* Includes actual General Fund expenditures for 1979-80 and appropriations for 1980-81.

** Percentage of total General Fund budgets.

*** Excludes the appropriations in the 1979-81 biennium to replace the 30¢ school property tax (\$37.6 million).

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS
FUNCTIONAL SUMMARY
(in millions)

Schedule A

Function	1979-81 Biennium		1981-83 Biennium		% Change Appropriation
	Appropriations	% of Total	Appropriations	% of Total	
General Government	\$ 35.9	5.5%	\$ 44.3	5.7%	23.2%
Education	401.1	61.0%	393.5	50.9%	(2.0%)
Human Resources	127.1	19.3%	187.4	24.2%	47.3%
Public Safety	40.8	6.2%	65.5	8.5%	60.4%
Regulatory	19.5	3.0%	27.1	3.5%	39.0%
Conservation/Agriculture/Energy	16.2	2.4%	18.5	2.4%	14.5%
Highway/Motor Vehicles	3.2	.5%	4.9	.6%	57.0%
Miscellaneous	<u>14.2</u>	<u>2.1%</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>4.2%</u>	<u>128.2%</u>
Total - All Functions	<u>\$658.0</u>	100.0%	<u>\$773.5</u>	100.0%	17.6%

Source: Fiscal Analysis Division

Notes:

1. 1979-81 appropriations include actual general fund expenditure for fiscal year 1979-80 and appropriations for fiscal year 1980-81.

GENERAL FUND APPROPRIATIONS
FUNCTIONAL SUMMARY
(in millions)

Schedule B

Function	1979-81 Biennium		1981-83 Biennium		% Change Appropriation
	Appropriations	% of Total	Appropriations	% of Total	
General Government	\$ 35.9	5.8%	\$ 44.3	5.7%	23.2%
Education	363.5	58.6%	393.5	50.9%	8.3%
Human Resources	127.1	20.5%	187.4	24.2%	47.3%
Public Safety	40.8	6.6%	65.5	8.5%	60.4%
Regulatory	19.5	3.1%	27.1	3.5%	39.0%
Conservation/Agriculture/Energy	16.2	2.6%	18.5	2.4%	14.5%
Highway/Motor Vehicles	3.2	.5%	4.9	.6%	57.0%
Miscellaneous	<u>14.2</u>	<u>2.3%</u>	<u>32.3</u>	<u>4.2%</u>	<u>128.2%</u>
Subtotal - All Functions	\$620.4	100.0%	\$773.5	100.0%	24.7%
30¢ School Tax	<u>37.6</u>		<u>-0-</u>		
Total - All Functions	\$658.0		\$773.5		17.6%

Source: Fiscal Analysis Division

- Notes:
- (1) Education figures exclude the appropriations in the 1979-81 biennium to replace the 30¢ school property tax.
 - (2) 1979-81 appropriations include actual general fund expenditures for fiscal year 1979-80 and appropriations for fiscal year 1980-81.

**SOURCE OF FUNDS SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE**

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

	1979-80 ACTUAL	1980-81 WORK PROGRAM	1981-82 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE	1982-83 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE
GENERAL GOVERNMENT						
GENERAL FUND	\$ 17,050,791	\$ 18,887,818	\$ 21,591,579	14	\$ 22,678,519	5
HIGHWAY FUNDS	269,684	320,673	383,772	20	380,309	1-
FEDERAL FUNDS	1,756,970	1,884,558	2,594,156	38	2,685,895	4
OTHER FUNDS	2,646,801	2,766,480	5,092,134	84	4,420,018	13-
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	17,423,731	20,466,281	22,388,066	9	24,063,411	7
INTERIM FINANCE	117,142	100,913				
TOTAL-GENERAL GOVERNMENT	\$ 39,265,119	\$ 44,426,723	\$ 52,049,707	17	\$ 54,228,152	4
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	17,423,731	20,466,281	22,388,066		24,063,411	
NET-GENERAL GOVERNMENT	\$ 21,841,388	\$ 23,960,442	\$ 29,661,641	24	\$ 30,164,741	2

**SOURCE OF FUNDS SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE**

EDUCATION

EDUCATION	1979-80 ACTUAL	1980-81 WORK PROGRAM	1981-82 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE	1982-83 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
EDUCATION ADMIN	\$ 904,542	\$ 906,177	\$ 795,426	-12-	\$ 828,732	-4
GENERAL FUND	858,702	861,677	792,526	8-	819,932	-3
OTHER FUNDS	4,839	500	2,900	480	8,800	203
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	41,001	44,000				
ED SUPPORT SVCS			664,590		706,603	6
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER						
CARE OF DEAF & BLIND	430,044	724,066	571,050	-21-	628,155	-10
GENERAL FUND	430,044	724,066	527,050	27-	584,155	11
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER			44,000		44,000	
AUTOMOBILE DRIVER ED		205,000				
GENERAL FUND	189,385					
PROFF. STANDARDS COM.	5,871	8,160	8,160		8,160	
GENERAL FUND						
VOCATIONAL EDUCATION	2,592,883	2,582,295	2,512,920	-3-	2,735,074	-9
GENERAL FUND	528,240	551,430	306,379	44-	328,326	-7
FEDERAL FUNDS	2,053,118	2,030,865	2,151,766	6	2,348,654	9
OTHER FUNDS	11,525					
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER			54,775		58,094	6
ADULT BASIC EDUCATION	293,054	324,421	351,880	-8	360,437	-2
GENERAL FUND	15,090	15,222	15,222		15,222	
FEDERAL FUNDS	276,908	309,199	336,658	9	345,215	3
OTHER FUNDS	1,056					
HIGHER ED STUDENT LOAN	312,593	459,073	279,873	-39-	304,863	-9
FEDERAL FUNDS	42,329	259,073	79,873	69-	84,863	6
OTHER FUNDS	270,264	200,000	200,000		220,000	10
DISTRIBUTIVE SCHOOL FD	154,791,922	175,917,868	148,812,103	-15-	158,643,692	-7
GENERAL FUND	124,355,800	147,493,719	116,809,243	21-	122,621,050	5
FEDERAL FUNDS	24,237,310	23,095,000	24,192,000	5	27,161,000	12
OTHER FUNDS	6,198,812	5,329,149	7,810,860	47	8,861,642	13
FLEISCHMANN SCHOLAR		274,684	15,670	-94-		
OTHER FUNDS	264,317					
SCHOOL LUNCH	6,946,935	6,320,053	6,902,959	-2	7,460,846	-8
GENERAL FUND	360,000	360,000	360,000		360,000	
FEDERAL FUNDS	6,586,935	5,960,053	6,542,959	10	7,100,846	9
CETA	356,279	301,659	563,487	-87	617,022	-10
FEDERAL FUNDS	19,506	955				
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	336,773	300,704	563,487	87	617,022	10
DISCRETIONARY GRANTS		324,504	172,839	-47-	179,107	-4
FEDERAL FUNDS	244,724					

SOURCE OF FUNDS SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

	<u>1979-80</u> <u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>1980-81</u> <u>HQKK PROGRAM</u>	<u>1981-82</u> <u>GOVERNOR</u> <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	<u>PERCENT</u> <u>CHANGE</u>	<u>1982-83</u> <u>GOVERNOR</u> <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	<u>PERCENT</u> <u>CHANGE</u>
<u>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</u>						
<u>EXECUTIVE BRANCH</u>						
TOTAL - EXECUTIVE BRANCH	\$ 32,155,176	\$ 36,956,914	\$ 42,878,470	16	\$ 45,175,223	5
GENERAL FUND	15,959,789	12,338,633	13,463,578	12	14,243,459	6
HIGHWAY FUNDS	264,684	520,673	383,772	20	380,309	1-
FEDERAL FUNDS	1,734,703	1,683,603	2,594,156	38	2,685,895	4
OTHER FUNDS	1,727,959	2,256,794	4,048,898	79	3,802,149	6-
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	17,370,899	20,393,184	22,388,066	10	24,063,411	7
INTERIM FINANCE	42,142	64,055				
<u>JUDICIAL BRANCH</u>						
TOTAL - JUDICIAL BRANCH	\$ 3,450,130	\$ 3,770,262	\$ 4,856,978	29	\$ 5,009,854	3
GENERAL FUND	3,034,414	3,209,666	4,363,742	33	4,491,985	3
FEDERAL FUNDS	22,267	955				
OTHER FUNDS	315,617	389,686	493,236	27	517,869	5
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	52,832	73,097				
INTERIM FINANCE	25,000	36,858				
<u>LEGISLATIVE BRANCH</u>						
TOTAL - LEGISLATIVE BRANCH	\$ 3,657,012	\$ 3,649,549	\$ 4,314,254	17	\$ 4,043,075	6-
GENERAL FUND	3,050,588	3,579,549	3,764,254	5	3,943,075	5
OTHER FUNDS	606,424	120,000	550,000	358	100,000	82-
<u>GENERAL GOVERNMENT</u>						
GENERAL FUND	\$ 17,050,791	\$ 18,867,616	\$ 21,591,579	14	\$ 22,676,519	5
HIGHWAY FUNDS	264,684	520,673	383,772	20	380,309	1-
FEDERAL FUNDS	1,756,970	1,684,558	2,594,156	38	2,685,895	4
OTHER FUNDS	2,640,801	2,766,480	5,092,134	84	4,420,018	13-
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	17,423,731	20,466,281	22,388,066	9	24,063,411	7
INTERIM FINANCE	117,142	100,913				
TOTAL-GENERAL GOVERNMENT	\$ 39,265,119	\$ 44,426,723	\$ 52,049,707	17	\$ 54,228,152	4
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	17,423,731	20,466,281	22,388,066		24,063,411	
NET-GENERAL GOVERNMENT	\$ 21,841,388	\$ 23,960,442	\$ 29,661,641	24	\$ 30,164,741	2

**SOURCE OF FUNDS SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE**

ALL FUNDS FUNCTIONAL SUMMARY

	1979-80 ACTUAL	1980-81 WORK PROGRAM	1981-82 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE	1982-83 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE
CONSERVATION/AG/ENERGY						
GENERAL FUND	\$ 8,059,459	\$ 8,106,306	\$ 9,206,722	14	\$ 9,307,664	1
HIGHWAY FUNDS			30,000		35,000	17
FEDERAL FUNDS	4,119,864	5,788,294	6,163,538	6	6,414,914	4
OTHER FUNDS	11,696,673	23,837,408	46,394,201	95	49,385,337	6
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	318,802	385,000	446,166	16	477,632	7
INTERIM FINANCE	166,659	178,953				
TOTAL-CONSERVATION/AG/ENERGY	\$ 24,361,457	\$ 38,295,961	\$ 62,240,627	63	\$ 65,620,547	5
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	318,802	385,000	446,166		477,632	
NET-CONSERVATION/AG/ENERGY	\$ 24,042,655	\$ 37,910,961	\$ 61,794,461	63	\$ 65,142,915	5
HIGHWAY AND DMV						
GENERAL FUND	\$ 1,524,718	\$ 1,629,459	\$ 2,512,921	54	\$ 2,437,526	3-
HIGHWAY FUNDS	61,925,953	62,978,674	93,200,642	48	105,248,407	13
FEDERAL FUNDS	93,951,147	96,379,167	103,131,647	7	99,143,186	4-
OTHER FUNDS	2,805,816	5,640,030	6,538,712	16	6,805,300	4
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	650,534	622,346	639,706	3	663,963	4
TOTAL-HIGHWAY AND DMV	\$160,858,168	\$167,249,676	\$206,023,628	23	\$214,298,382	4
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	650,534	622,346	639,706		663,963	
NET-HIGHWAY AND DMV	\$160,207,634	\$166,627,330	\$205,383,922	23	\$213,634,419	4
MISCELLANEOUS						
GENERAL FUND	\$ 2,765,081	\$ 11,386,435	\$ 13,890,797	22	\$ 18,398,142	32
HIGHWAY FUNDS		798,059	1,359,102	70	1,808,314	33
FEDERAL FUNDS	25,138,788	16,346,991	26,542,653	62	28,719,840	8
OTHER FUNDS	18,989,184	23,773,244	27,883,551	17	30,176,577	8
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	302,630	764,072	613,000	20-	650,000	6
TOTAL-MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 47,195,683	\$ 53,068,801	\$ 70,289,103	32	\$ 79,752,873	13
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	302,630	764,072	613,000		650,000	
NET-MISCELLANEOUS	\$ 46,893,053	\$ 52,304,729	\$ 69,676,103	33	\$ 79,102,873	14
ALL FUNCTIONS						
GENERAL FUND	\$303,229,527	\$354,816,137	\$369,964,050	4	\$403,578,401	9
HIGHWAY FUNDS	62,671,925	64,559,429	95,311,137	48	107,839,278	13
FEDERAL FUNDS	230,111,374	239,227,090	279,960,436	17	290,825,575	4
OTHER FUNDS	57,607,638	86,402,768	127,106,575	47	134,031,216	5
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	33,043,093	38,790,360	44,024,458	13	47,677,232	8
INTERIM FINANCE	1,136,884	2,217,136				
TOTAL-ALL FUNCTIONS	\$687,800,441	\$786,012,920	\$916,366,656	17	\$983,951,702	7
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	33,043,093	38,790,360	44,024,458		47,677,232	
NET-ALL FUNCTIONS	\$654,757,348	\$747,222,560	\$872,342,198	17	\$936,274,470	7

**SOURCE OF FUNDS SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE**

EDUCATION

EDUCATION	1979-80 ACTUAL	1980-81 BUDG PROGRAM	1981-82 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE	1982-83 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	PERCENT CHANGE
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION	\$170,431,024	\$175,019,855	\$171,512,030	12-	\$162,042,748	6
GENERAL FUND	126,859,820	150,294,744	118,857,530	21-	124,775,795	3
FEDERAL FUNDS	42,307,759	39,171,374	43,298,238	14	47,310,792	9
OTHER FUNDS	6,765,671	5,819,333	8,029,430	38	4,090,442	13
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	371,774	344,704	1,320,852	285	1,425,719	7
UNIVERSITY OF NEVADA SYSTEM						
TOTAL - UNIVERSITY SYSTEM	\$63,600,843	\$72,473,968	\$71,115,864	15	\$70,173,071	10
GENERAL FUND	57,245,882	63,180,620	68,413,320	8	77,189,122	13
FEDERAL FUNDS		1,341,334	2,105,000	18	2,214,287	2
OTHER FUNDS	6,021,011	10,451,814	10,537,478	58	16,789,662	2
OTHER EDUCATIONAL PROGRAMS						
TOTAL - OTHER PROGRAMS	\$2,438,380	\$2,860,067	\$2,993,042	4	\$3,109,991	4
GENERAL FUND	1,751,748	1,796,849	2,106,701	17	2,177,933	3
FEDERAL FUNDS	819,012	954,814	830,190	12-	882,707	5
OTHER FUNDS	67,020	115,004	48,145	58-	49,351	2
EDUCATION						
GENERAL FUND	\$185,357,450	\$215,202,213	\$189,377,551	12-	\$204,142,850	8
FEDERAL FUNDS	43,126,771	41,967,422	46,301,533	10	50,437,786	4
OTHER FUNDS	12,874,308	16,306,151	24,015,133	50	25,924,455	5
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	371,774	344,704	1,320,852	285	1,425,719	7
TOTAL-EDUCATION	\$242,236,303	\$273,960,490	\$261,621,056	5-	\$281,905,810	8
LESS INTER-AGY TRANS	371,774	344,704	1,320,852		1,425,719	
NET-EDUCATION	\$241,864,529	\$273,615,786	\$260,294,154	5-	\$280,480,091	8

SOURCE OF FUNDS SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE

HUMAN RESOURCES

<u>HUMAN RESOURCES</u>	<u>1979-80</u> <u>ACTUAL</u>	<u>1980-81</u> <u>WORK PROGRAM</u>	<u>1981-82</u> <u>GOVERNOR</u> <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	<u>PERCENT</u> <u>CHANGE</u>	<u>1982-83</u> <u>GOVERNOR</u> <u>RECOMMENDED</u>	<u>PERCENT</u> <u>CHANGE</u>
<u>DEPT. OF HUMAN RESOURCES</u>						
<u>HEALTH DIVISION</u>						
TOTAL HEALTH	\$ 14,592,778	\$ 15,280,828	\$ 13,978,098	-9-	\$ 15,113,774	-8
GENERAL FUND	5,413,379	6,330,645	5,704,287	10-	6,119,148	-7
FEDERAL FUNDS	5,724,085	6,782,435	6,781,257		7,446,788	10
OTHER FUNDS	1,616,583	853,470	586,822	31-	583,099	1-
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	1,008,731	1,314,278	905,732	31-	964,739	7
INTERIM FINANCE	230,000					
<u>AGING SERVICES</u>						
TOTAL AGING SERVICES	\$ 3,707,249	\$ 3,552,139	\$ 4,349,838	-22	\$ 4,362,268	-3
GENERAL FUND	227,412	233,500	412,170	77	426,543	3
FEDERAL FUNDS	3,479,837	3,188,265	3,937,668	24	3,935,725	
INTERIM FINANCE		130,374				
<u>MENTAL HYGIENE & RETARD DIV</u>						
TOTAL MENTAL HYG & RETARD DIV	\$ 23,243,479	\$ 26,275,655	\$ 31,863,036	-21	\$ 33,826,542	-7
GENERAL FUND	13,254,868	15,740,874	16,977,244	8	17,932,932	6
FEDERAL FUNDS	3,233,603	3,110,947	3,651,137	17	3,150,670	14-
OTHER FUNDS	1,126,289	1,235,672	2,067,562	67	2,258,957	9
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	5,468,466	5,823,526	8,967,063	54	10,483,983	17
INTERIM FINANCE	162,453	364,636				
<u>WELFARE DIVISION</u>						
TOTAL WELFARE DIVISION	\$ 73,140,493	\$ 86,867,367	\$ 125,903,845	-45	\$ 141,358,857	-12
GENERAL FUND	31,580,445	36,725,717	55,867,048	52	63,487,060	14
FEDERAL FUNDS	36,430,340	43,385,175	64,564,860	49	72,076,590	12
OTHER FUNDS	1,030,605	1,103,890	978,000	11-	1,015,500	4
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	4,139,103	4,020,701	4,493,937	3-	4,779,707	6
INTERIM FINANCE		1,031,884				
<u>REHABILITATION DIVISION</u>						
TOTAL REHABILITATION DIV	\$ 9,815,229	\$ 11,329,998	\$ 10,767,515	-5-	\$ 11,275,010	-5
GENERAL FUND	1,993,351	2,153,206	2,249,268	4	2,698,731	20
FEDERAL FUNDS	6,869,792	7,726,583	7,122,771	4-	7,065,846	1-
OTHER FUNDS	138,472	581,644	445,140	23-	503,274	13
INTER AGENCY TRANSFER	813,614	868,565	950,336	9	1,007,159	6
<u>YOUTH SERVICES</u>						

22

**POSITION SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE**

GENERAL GOVERNMENT

GENERAL GOVERNMENT	1980-81 WORK PROGRAM	1981-82 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FY81-FY82	1982-83 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FY82-FY83
EXECUTIVE BRANCH					
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE					
EXISTING	14.00	14.00	.00	14.00	.00
NEW	.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.00
TOTAL	14.00	15.00	1.00	15.00	.00
EXTRADITION CLERK					
EXISTING	.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.00
GOVERNOR'S FUTURE COMM					
EXISTING	5.00	.00	5.00-	.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	5.00	.00	5.00-	.00	.00
MX PLANNING					
EXISTING	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
NEW	.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	.00
TOTAL	.00	8.00	8.00	8.00	.00
CRIME PREVENTION					
EXISTING	1.00	.00	1.00-	.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	1.00	.00	1.00-	.00	.00
OFF. OF OPERATION ANAL					
EXISTING	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
NEW	.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	.00
TOTAL	.00	4.00	4.00	4.00	.00
SOICC					
EXISTING	2.00	2.00	.00	2.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	2.00	2.00	.00	2.00	.00
STATEWIDE PLANNING					
EXISTING	8.00	8.00	.00	8.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	8.00	8.00	.00	8.00	.00
FOUR CORNERS COMM					
EXISTING	2.00	2.00	.00	2.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	2.00	2.00	.00	2.00	.00
SCETO					
EXISTING	6.00	6.00	.00	6.00	.00
NEW	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
TOTAL	6.00	6.00	.00	6.00	.00

POSITION SUMMARY
1981 LEGISLATURE

ALL POSITIONS FUNCTIONAL SUMMARY

	1980-81 WORK PROGRAM	1981-82 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FY81-FY82	1982-83 GOVERNOR RECOMMENDED	CHANGE FY82-FY83
GENERAL GOVERNMENT					
EXISTING	943.97	878.34	65.63-	876.34	2.00-
NEW	.00	42.00	42.00	46.00	4.00
TOTAL	943.97	920.34	23.63-	922.34	2.00
EDUCATION					
EXISTING	170.80	150.40	20.40-	150.40	.00
NEW	.00	11.00	11.00	11.00	.00
PROFESSIONAL	1,514.90	1,464.59	50.31-	1,499.90	35.31
GRADUATE ASSISTANT	79.66	.00	79.66-	.00	.00
CLASSIFIED	1,098.75	1,049.98	48.77-	1,068.06	18.08
TOTAL	2,864.11	2,675.97	188.14-	2,729.36	53.39
HUMAN RESOURCES					
EXISTING	2,428.55	2,325.55	103.00-	2,299.55	26.00-
NEW	.00	151.95	151.95	152.95	4.00
TOTAL	2,428.55	2,477.50	48.95	2,455.50	22.00-
PUBLIC SAFETY					
EXISTING	870.75	842.33	28.42-	841.25	1.08-
NEW	.00	179.93	179.93	259.44	79.51
TOTAL	870.75	1,022.26	151.51	1,100.69	78.43
REGULATORY					
EXISTING	549.50	525.00	24.50-	525.00	.00
NEW	.00	74.00	74.00	74.00	.00
TOTAL	549.50	599.00	49.50	599.00	.00
CONSERVATION/AG/ENERGY					
EXISTING	540.06	497.09	42.97-	497.09	.00
NEW	.00	24.00	24.00	24.00	.00
TOTAL	540.06	521.09	18.97-	521.09	.00
HIGHWAY AND DMV					
EXISTING	2,098.65	2,095.65	3.00-	2,095.65	.00
NEW	.00	44.00	44.00	46.00	2.00
TOTAL	2,098.65	2,139.65	41.00	2,141.65	2.00
MISCELLANEOUS					
EXISTING	1,409.75	1,385.25	24.50-	1,380.50	4.75-
NEW	.00	30.50	30.50	42.50	12.00
TOTAL	1,409.75	1,415.75	6.00	1,426.00	10.25
ALL FUNCTIONS					
EXISTING	9,012.03	8,699.61	312.42-	8,665.78	33.83-
NEW	.00	557.38	557.38	661.89	104.51
PROFESSIONAL	1,514.90	1,464.59	50.31-	1,499.90	35.31
GRADUATE ASSISTANT	79.66	.00	79.66-	.00	.00
CLASSIFIED	1,098.75	1,049.98	48.77-	1,068.06	18.08
TOTAL	11,705.34	11,771.56	66.22	11,895.63	124.07

BILL LOG

BILL NO.	DATE	INTRODUCERS	SUBJECT	ON AGENDA	HEARING	ACTION	SECOND READING	THIRD READING
SB40	1/21/81	Senator Faiss	Provides for increase in disability and retirement benefits for retired public employees.					
SB49	1/21/81	Committee on Fin.	Transfers money from Public Health Sanitarium Funds to generate State Fund.					
SB50	1/21/81	Committee on Fin.	Changes method of setting charges for materials distributed by State Forest and Fire Warden.					
SB59	1/21/81	Senator Glaser	Makes appropriation for development of industry and tourism.					
SB56	1/21/81	Committee on Legislative Affairs	Allows certain persons to obtain benefits from public employees retirement system while employed during legislative session.					
SB61	1/21/81	Committee of Judiciary	Creates Fund for interstate compact on juveniles and appropriates money to compact administrator.					