DISCLAIMER

Electronic versions of the exhibits in these minutes may not be complete.

This information is supplied as an informational service only and should not be relied upon as an official record.

Original exhibits are on file at the Legislative Counsel Bureau Research Library in Carson City.

Contact the Library at (775) 684-6827 or library@lcb.state.nv.us.

Assembly Bill 392 Testimony in Government Affairs

Assembly Bill 392 would increase longevity payments made to encourage

retention of employees in state service. Currently, state employees are

eligible to receive a longevity payment totaling \$150 after serving 8 years in

state government. The longevity payment increases \$50 for each additional

year of service. After 25 years a state employee is entitled to receive an

annual longevity payment of \$1,000.

I have asked staff to compare the longevity plan provided by state and local

governments within the State of Nevada. City of Elko and Elko County

employees are eligible to receive a longevity payment of \$200 after nine

years of service. After 25 years of service employees are entitled to a total

of \$1,400. The City of Carson City provides a longevity payment of \$200

after 7 years and employees with 25 years of service receive \$650.

Employees of Washoe County receive \$500 after 5 years of service and

\$2,500 after 25 years of service. Clark County and the City of Las Vegas

employees earn longevity based on a set percentage times their annual

salary. For an employee earning \$40,000 per year, the City of Las Vegas

provides \$1,200 after 7 years and \$4,000 after 25 years. In Clark County

DATE: 4/3/03 ROOM: 3/43 EXHIBITG SUBMITTED BY: Maunt Comen arberty

longevity payments begin after 8 years of service. For an employee earning \$40,000, an employee would receive a total of \$1,824 after 8 years and \$5,700 after 25 years.

AB 392 would increase longevity payments from \$50 for each additional year of service to \$100 for state employees with at least 17 years of service. Beginning in year 24, the annual increase would be \$150 per year compared to the current \$50 per year increase. AB 392 would increase the longevity payment for a state employee with 25 years of service from \$1,000 to \$1,450. The projected cost of AB 392 totals \$351,000 in FY 2003-04 and \$776,000 in FY 2004-05. Approximately one-half of the cost would be a state General Fund responsibility

The Governor's budget for the upcoming biennium does not recommend a cost-of-living salary increase for state employees. If a salary increase cannot be provided to state employees during the upcoming biennium, an increase in the longevity program to assist in the retention of our most experienced state employees is something I believe the Legislature should consider.

I would be happy to answer any questions.

EXECUTIVE AGENCY FISCAL NOTE

AGENCY'S ESTIMATES

Date Prepared: March 20, 2003

Agency Submitting: Department of Personnel

Items of Revenue or Expense, or Both	Fiscal Year 2002-03	Fiscal Year 2003-04	Fiscal Year 2004-05	Effect on Future Biennia
Increased cost of Longevity Payment in December, 2003 (Expense)		\$350,925		
Increased cost of Longevity Payment in July, 2004 (Expense)			\$350,925	
Increased cost of Longevity Payment in December, 2004 (Expense)			\$424,725	
				\$1,551,300
Total		\$350,925	\$775,650	\$1,551,300

Explanation (Use Additional Sheets of Attachments, if required)

This bill proposes a \$25 increase in the rate of longevity for employees with 17 through 23 years of continuous service and a \$50 increase for employees with 24 or more years of continuous service, up to a maximum of 30 years. The projected cost of this proposal is based on the number of employees in Central Payroll and NDOT who were eligible and received longevity on December 31, 2002. The additional cost for each year of continuous service has been multiplied by the number of employees at that level, as represented on the attached spreadsheet.

Assuming there is no change in the number of employees eligible for longevity, the projected increase in FY 04 for one semi-annual payment covering the period from 7/1/03 through 12/31/03 would be \$350,925. It should be noted that the period from 1/1/04 through 6/30/04 is paid in July after the close of the fiscal year. Therefore, the additional expense for that period is projected in FY 05.

Effect on future biennia was also calculated with the assumption that there would be no change in the number of employees eligible for longevity.

	Name Carol L. Thomas
	Title Chief Personnel Manager
DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION'S COMMENT	Date March 24, 2003
Agency response and estimated costs appear reasonable.	
	Name John P Comeaux
	Title Director

Increased Costs of Longevity Payments for AB 392 Based on Number of Employees Who Received Longevity Payments in December 2002

		OT OTT I	יייפגונטב אטענטט	carved periog I aymentes III December 2002	ecemper 2007		
Years of	Increased	Number of NDOT &	Increased Cost of	Number of NDOT &	Increased Cost of	Number of NDOT &	Increased Cost of
Service	Cost of	Central Payroll	Longevity on	Central Payroll	Longevity on	Central Payroll	Longevity on
	Longevity	Employees on 12/31/02	December 2003	Employees on 6/30/04	July 2004	Employees on 12/31/04	December 2004
17		718 /	Pec 7,925	317	F 7 925	* X	120 8 350
18	@	241	12,050	241	12,050	317	1
19	75		12,525	167	12,525	241	18 075
20		140	14,000	140	14,000	167	16,270
21		175	21,875	175	21,875	140	17.500
22			29,400	196		175	26,250
23	+	155	27,125	155	27,125	961	34.300
24	9	168	37,800	168		155	34.875
25)	127	Pec 34,925	127	Ke	168	R 1 46,200
26		77	25,025	77		127	41.275
27	375	72	27,000	72	27,000	77	28.875
28	425		23,800	56	23,800	72	30,600
29			17,100	36	17,100	56	26.600
30	_		18,900	36	18,900	36	18,900
31	,	25	13,125	25	13,125	36	18.900
32			10,500	20	10,500	25	13,125
33	525	16	8,400	16	8,400	20	10.500
34			3,150	9	3,150	16	8,400
35			525	1	525	9	3.150
36			1,050	2	1,050		525
37			1,050	2	1,050	2	1,050
38			1,575	3	1,575	2	1,050
39			1,050	2	1,050	33	1,575
40		0	0	0	0	2	1,050
41	525		0	0	0	0	0
42			0	0	0	0	0
43			0	0	0	0	0
44			525	1	525	0	0
45			0	0	0	v-4	525
46			0	0	0	0	0
47			0	0	0	0	0
48	525	T	525	T	525	0	0
49						1	525
Total			350,925		350,925		424,725
(1	,	<		<		<

(a) = Ornemental Oncrease

() = Uncurrente Chang = +50 lack year.

* assuming a 5% Encrease?

Years of Service	Number of NDOT & Central Payroll Employees on 12/31/02	Number employees 2001	# Difference	% Difference
17	317	311	6	1.93%
18	3 241	248	-7	-2.82%
19	167	161	6	3.73%
20	140	194	-54	-27.84%
21	175	219	-44	-20.09%
22	196	187	9	4.81%
23	155	214	-59	-27.57%
24	168	182	-14	-7.69%
25	127	122	5	4.10%
26	77	107	-30	-28.04%
27	72	92	-20	-21.74%
28	56	72	-16	-22.22%
29	36	55	-19	-34.55%
30	36	52	-16	-30.77%
31	25	36	-11	-30.56%
32	20	33	-13	-39.39%
33	16	23	-7	-30.43%
34	6	8	-2	-25.00%
35	1	6	-5	-83.33%
36	2	8	-6	-75.00%
37	2	3	-1	-33.33%
38	3	5	-2	-40.00%
39	2	1	1	100.00%
40	0	1	-1	-100.00%
41	0	0	0	
42	0	2	-2	-100.00%
43	0	0	0	
44	1	1	0	0.00%
45	0	0	0	
46	0	0	0	
47	0	1	-1	-100.00%
48	1	0	1	
49				
Total	2042	2344		

CITY and COUNTY GOVERNMENT LONGEVITY BENEFITS

	First Year of				
Employer*	Eligibility	Initial Amount Paid	Amount Paid at 10 years	Amount Paid at 25 years	(As revised ner A.R. 392)
State of Nevada	. ∞	\$150.00	\$250.00	\$1,000,00	\$1.450.00
Carson City	7	\$200.00	\$275.00	\$650.00	00:06+;1\$
Clark County	8	Annual salary x 0.57% x	salary x 0.57% x years of service		
City of Elko	6	\$200.00	\$275.00	\$1,400.00	\$1.400.00
Elko County	6	\$200.00	\$275.00	\$1,400.00	\$1,400.00
Las Vegas (1)	7	3% of annual salary	5% of annual salary	10% of annual salary	10% of annual salary
North Las Vegas (2)	7	3.5% of annual salary	5% of annual salary	10% of annual salary	10% of annual calant
Sparks	\$	Base pay x 0.5% x years	Base pay x 0.5% x years service to maximum set by bargaining contracts to	ugaining contracts to	10 % OI allinai salai y
Washoe County	¥	0.000	c pay. Manimum follogevity p	ay 32,300.	
times come		00.00C¢	\$1,000.00	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00

^{*} Source: Department of Personnel as of FY 2002.

⁽¹⁾ Only employees hired before 9/1/01, or those represented by a bargining unit are eligible for program.

⁽²⁾ Only employees hired before 6/30/97, are eligible for program.