MINUTES OF THE JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/K-12 OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Seventy-third Session April 21, 2005

The Joint Subcommittee on Human Resources/K-12 of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means, was called to order at 8:00 a.m. on Thursday, April 21, 2005. Chair Barbara Cegavske presided in Room 3137 of the Legislative Building, Carson City, Nevada. Exhibit A is the Agenda. Exhibit B is the Attendance Roster. All exhibits are available and on file at the Research Library of the Legislative Counsel Bureau.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Senator Barbara Cegavske, Chair Senator William J. Raggio Senator Dina Titus Senator Bernice Mathews

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Sheila Leslie, Chair

Mr. Mo Denis

Mrs. Heidi S. Gansert

Ms. Chris Giunchigliani

Mrs. Debbie Smith

Ms. Valerie E. Weber

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Gary L. Ghiggeri, Senate Fiscal Analyst Steven J. Abba, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst Bob Atkinson, Senior Program Analyst Janet Johnson, Program Analyst Jo Greenslate, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Alexander Haartz, M.P.H., Administration, Health Division, Department of Human Resources

Carol Sala, Administrator, Aging Services Division, Department of Human Resources

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We are reviewing the Department of Human Resources, Health and Aging Services budgets today.

HEALTH

<u>HR, Vital Statistics</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-9 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3190

Steven J. Abba (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Please refer to page 2 of my handout entitled Joint Subcommittee on K-12, Human Resources Closing List #3, Exhibit C, original is on file at the Research Library). One major issue staff has identified in this budget is the recommendation for a new administrative services officer position in enhancement 325.

E-325 Services at Level Closest to People – Page HEALTH-11

There has been quite a bit of discussion regarding this position, and the Division has been forthcoming in providing additional information. This position would be responsible for providing financial support to the Bureau of Health Planning and Statistics that consists of the Vital Statistics and Cancer Registry budgets. Some of the justification from the Division indicates this particular bureau currently does not have financial support, although financial support is provided through the Health Administration office. The Division indicates this has not provided them full-time support because the positions in Health Administration perform other functions. Staff has looked at the information provided by the Division, and from our analysis, we are not recommending this position at this time.

The Bureau is one of the smaller, if not the smallest, bureaus within the Division. There are no new programs or significant expansion of existing programs recommended in the *Executive Budget* to help support or justify this position. I provided information, on page 3, of your closing documents (Exhibit C) concerning our analysis. The Division requested this position be General Funded for this biennium with an attempt to cost allocate it in the future. Our suggestion would be to look at grants through this interim to see if this position could be cost allocated for the next biennium. At that time, there might also be program enhancements or expansions within this Bureau such as with the Sentinel Events Registry that would help support this position in the future.

The items on your closing document are not major issues.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page HEALTH-12

Enhancement 710 provides roughly \$20,000 each fiscal year for hardware and software replacement. The items that have been identified by the Division all meet the Department of Information Technology (DoIT) replacement schedule. Staff has made some adjustments for software prices. Additionally, item number 2 on page 3 of Exhibit C is information provided by the Division for the Subcommittee's request on the fees charged for birth and death certificates in the State of Nevada compared to the other western states. This is provided for information only. It indicates that Nevada's fee for birth certificates is slightly below the western average, and Nevada's fee for death certificates is about \$2 lower than the average. Each dollar increase in fees provides approximately \$134,000 from a death certificate and approximately \$85,000 from a birth certificate. Fees received by the Bureau of Health Statistics are deposited directly into the General Fund. We have no recommendation on this particular issue.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

The Senate passed a bill imposing a \$1 increase for a death certificate. I do not remember the bill number. I believe the \$1 increase in the bill has been designated for a different destination.

Mr. Abba:

The Senate bill you are referring to is designated for a specific purpose and, to support that purpose, would not be deposited into the General Fund.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I agree with staff. It is not the time to go forward with another administrative position. We can track it over the next year and see if there is federal funding available to support it.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3190 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS FOR THE COMPUTER EQUIPMENT IN DECISION UNIT E-710.

SENATOR RAGGIO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR TITUS AND ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will go to budget account 101-3209.

<u>HR, Health Aid to Counties</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-24 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3209

BOB ATKINSON (Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

The Subcommittee will recall that the 2003 Legislative Session approved the Governor's recommendation to eliminate this account, and, in the current session, the Governor did not recommend reinstatement of the account. The Subcommittee heard testimony from the county health districts in Clark, Washoe and Carson City requesting the account be reestablished at a per capita rate of \$1.10. Three versions of A Statewide Plan for Chronic Disease: Nevada's Public Health Improvement Fund (Formerly Health Aid to Counties) (Exhibit D, original is on file at the Research Library) were distributed to you. The first version has the \$1.10 per capita rate, the second version is \$0.825 per capita and the third version is \$0.55 per capita.

I have indicated, at the top of page 7 of Exhibit C, the cost of the \$1.10 per capita plan, broken down by counties, is \$2.4 million in the first year and \$2.5 million in the second year of the biennium. The three health districts indicated if the funding were reinstated, it would be used for a chronic disease program with emphasis on improving the nutritional habits of Nevadans, increasing the physical activity of Nevadans and focusing on tobacco reduction. In the combined health district requests, 47 percent would be used to hire

19 employees, 21 percent would be used on a public information campaign and so forth. Staff would indicate there are three choices from which the Subcommittee could choose. The Subcommittee could reestablish the account at the \$1.10 per capita or some variation of that amount or they could approve the Governor's recommendation to eliminate the account.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3209 WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR LESLIE:

We asked the counties to return and provide us with a program. The one they prepared is appropriate. Suddenly this morning, however, we have three proposals. One is at \$1.10, one at \$0.825 and one at \$0.55. If we are going to make a policy decision, for the last two biennia, we have given them no money. If we are deciding, as a Subcommittee, this is something we are not going to do, we should not leave them out there asking us for something we are not going to provide. Whether the state should be subsidizing public health at the county level is the policy question.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (SENATOR TITUS AND ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.)

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to budget account 101-3194.

<u>HR, Consumer Health Protection</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-25 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3194

Mr. Abba:

There are two issues in this account. The first is the transfer to the Division of Environmental Protection (DEP) the portion of this account that relates to the Safe Drinking Water Program. That would include the transfer of 17.5 positions from this account to a new account that has been set up in the DEP. The transfer of safe drinking water activities was actually initiated by the 2003 Legislature with the approval of transferring the Safe Drinking Water Revolving Loan program. This completes the transfer of the remaining portions of this particular program to the DEP. There did not appear to be adverse testimony regarding this transfer. Staff has looked at the ins and outs of the budget modification, and they appear to be reasonable. The two Divisions involved in this transfer have testified to that fact. Staff believes this is a reasonable budget recommendation. As a side note, the Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety, Natural Resources and Transportation approved the receiving end of this transfer two days ago.

The other issue under Other Closing Items on page 9 of Exhibit C involves the Division's re-request for an environmental health specialist position. It is not recommended in the Executive Budget, it is the Division's second request for

this position. The original request took place at an Interim Finance Committee (IFC) meeting. At that particular meeting, the Division requested two positions to help with their Food Inspection Program. One position was approved for that activity. The other supervisory position was not approved. The Division requested these two positions, and were going to support them with increased fees. The Division went forward with that assumption and increased the fees. When the IFC did not approve the one position, the Committee instructed the Division to approach the Legislature for the upcoming biennium with a request for the position as part of the budget review process.

The Division requested the position but it was not included in the *Executive Budget*. However, the increased fees to support that position were included in the Base Budget. The Division has provided staff additional information regarding this position. It will be a lead position located in Las Vegas. The position appears reasonable. It is not included in the closing documents, but staff would recommend approving this position, supported by fees, if fees come in over the biennium to support the position. Staff would also recommend that if the Subcommittee wishes to approve the position, that it be contingent upon being supported by fees and all other positions in the budget that are currently supported by fees would continue to be supported by fees in the future.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I do not disagree with the staff recommendation. However, I am curious as to how we handle that in closing the budget if that is the Committee's desire. The idea is that we are not appropriating any General Funds for those purposes. If we recommend that, and it goes into the budget closure, how do we handle that if, at some point, the fees are not there?

Mr. Abba:

If the Subcommittee approves the position, staff would create the position in the budget supported by fees. The Division would have to monitor their fee acquisition over the interim to see if fees come in at a level necessary to support the position. The Division has other alternatives as well. If this position is more important than other positions in the account, they could perhaps leave another position vacant for a period to support this position. Staff looked at their fee levels. There is heightened activity in some areas in the current fiscal year that would probably be able to support an additional position.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page HEALTH-29

I have a quick note on enhancement E-710. There is approximately \$81,000 over the biennium recommended for hardware and software replacement. Staff has reviewed the Division's replacement cycle. It meets the DoIT criteria. Staff recommends approval and has made technical adjustments according to new cost estimates.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Does the Division have the authority to increase fees on its own? I know we authorized a certain amount of revenue.

Mr. Abba:

Yes, the Division has that authority through the regulation process.

E-811 Unclassified Changes – Page HEALTH-29

A module E-811 decision does not have to be made on this today. This is merely information that there is a current classified position in this account. It is a bureau chief position and is recommended to go into the unclassified service.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3194 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATION TO INCLUDE THE FEE-SUPPORTED POSITION AS OUTLINED BY STAFF, INCORPORATING SENATOR RAGGIO'S COMMENTS THAT ALL POSITIONS BE SUPPORTED BY FEES AND TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS MADE BY STAFF.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will next address budget account 101-3224.

<u>HR, Community Health Services</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-50 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3224

Mr. Atkinson:

This is the account that provides public health nursing services to all of the counties except Clark and Washoe. We received information in the budget hearing that the 2006 federal budget proposes elimination of the Preventive Health Block Grant. Nevada's portion of this block grant is included in this budget account. It comprises approximately 11.5 percent of this budget account at \$431,365. Because it is the federal 2006 budget, it would only affect the second year of the upcoming biennium. It would affect state fiscal year (FY) 2007. If the grant were eliminated, the Subcommittee could consider two options at this time to take care of that elimination.

The first would be to increase the General Funds in the account by \$431,365 with the provision that this funding would be reserved for reversion in the event the federal grant was not eliminated. The second option would be to approve the block grant funding as it was recommended in the *Executive Budget* with the understanding that if the block grant were eliminated, the Health Division would have to cut services, find some other revenue sources or approach the IFC or the 2007 Legislature for additional funds. Staff recommends the latter alternative, that the funding be approved as recommended in the *Executive Budget* and that the Health Division subsequently keep staff advised regarding how this is progressing. There would not be a problem if the block grant were not eliminated. If the funding is eliminated, the Division could keep staff advised of any other funding sources or if it looks as though they would have to come to IFC or the 2007 Legislature.

E-810 Other Salary Adjustments - Page HEALTH-54

In decision unit E-810, the *Executive Budget* recommends a two-grade increase for the 29 nurses in this account. The Division is hopeful that will allow them to fill the vacant nursing positions. Last time I checked, the Division was unable to fill either 12 or 14 nursing positions, I assume, due to the inadequate salary level.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page HEALTH-53

In decision unit E-710, the price of computers has been adjusted to reflect the most recent cost information. Staff would recommend the account be closed as recommended by the Governor with the provision that we know the block grant may be eliminated and, in which case, adjustments would have to be made to the account.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I think the staff recommendation is reasonable, and we should not appropriate money at this time without knowing whether the block grant is going to be eliminated. We need to give the Division access.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3224 WITH THE UNDERSTANDING, IN THE EVENT THE BLOCK GRANT IS ELIMINATED, THE DIVISION WILL ADVISE STAFF AND SEEK REPLACEMENT OF THAT FUNDING AT THE APPROPRIATE LEVEL THROUGH THE IFC.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to budget account 101-3220.

<u>HR, Health Communicable Disease Control</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-57 (Volume II)

Budget Account 101-3220

Mr. Abba:

There is one major issue in this account.

E-250 Working Environment and Wage - Page HEALTH-61

Decision unit E-250 recommends six new positions funded with a federal grant. As the Subcommittee will recall, the duties of five of these positions will be performed by temporary contractors. These contractors are working in the Breast and Cervical Cancer Early Detection Program. In the Las Vegas area, they serve as case manager patient navigators and provide program outreach for that particular program. The Division wanted to continue the effort using contract services on a long-term basis to perform these duties. The Division solicited a

request for proposal (RFP) during the interim but did not receive any qualified responses. Since then, the Division has been using temporary contract staff and has incurred a significant amount of turnover in those positions.

The information the Division provided indicates of the 5 positions in which they use temporary staff, there has been a turnover of 6 incumbents within the last 16 months. This has presented problems for them continuing the program on a stable basis. Based upon that information, staff feels the recommendation in the *Executive Budget* for state classified positions is reasonable and would recommend approval. As a side note, the state classified positions are slightly less expensive than the use of contractors. One of the positions in the E-250 is a management analyst. This position is recommended to provide financial support to several programs in several budgets and would be cost allocated against several grants. The Division has reviewed this information and believes the position is supported by the information provided.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page HEALTH-61

Under item E-710, the decision unit for computer replacement, there is approximately \$29,000 over the biennium recommended for hardware and software replacement. Staff has reviewed the replacement schedule, and it is reasonable and meets the DoIT criteria. Staff has made technical adjustments. There is also an information item in Exhibit C, decision unit E-811.

E-811 Unclassified Changes – Page HEALTH-63

Decision unit E-811 recommends declassifying the current classified state epidemiologist position. The Subcommittee does not have to make a decision on this today.

CHAIR LESLIE:

We will save money as well as do the right thing by converting the temporary position to permanent status. I would support that. We should leave decision unit E-811 the last issue until we make that decision on both sides.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3220 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS OUTLINED ON PAGES 13 AND 14 OF EXHIBIT C.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to budget account 101-3222.

<u>HR, Maternal Child Health Services</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-78 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3222

Mr. Atkinson:

There are no closing issues in this budget account. There are a couple of technical adjustments. The *Executive Budget* included an error that suggested the classified health program specialist be unclassified as a public information officer. The Budget Division submitted Budget Amendment No. 50 to correct that error. Both decision units affected by that change have been corrected.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page HEALTH-83

In decision unit E-710, the price of the recommended replacement computer equipment is adjusted to the most recent pricing information. Staff recommends the account be closed as adjusted.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3222 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to budget account 101-3276.

<u>HR, State and Community Collaborations</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-101 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3276

MR. ATKINSON:

The Subcommittee may recall that the 2003 Legislature approved the removal of a number of programs from this account into other Department of Human Resources budgets. This left only the federal Part C Individuals with Disabilities Education Act funding in this budget account. At the same time, the Legislature approved a consolidation of several of the children's programs in various divisions within the Department of Human Resources into the Special Children's Clinic budget account. With that, the Bureau of Early Intervention Services was created. This budget account, containing the Part C funding, transfers all of that funding to the Bureau of Early Intervention Services budget account. The *Executive Budget* this session recommends those two accounts be merged. It will be in the next closing process when we actually close the budget for the Bureau of Early Intervention Services. However, in order to complete that consolidation, staff would concur with the Governor's recommendation that this account be merged into the Early Intervention Services budget account.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3276 WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to budget account 101-3218.

<u>Public Health Preparedness Program</u> – Budget Page HEALTH-135 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3218

Mr. Abba:

Staff has not identified any major closing issues in this particular account. The information included in the closing document (Exhibit C) provides general information regarding the Program. There are two grants in this account, one from the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and the other from Health Resource Services Administration. The two grants total approximately \$13.7 million each fiscal year. The budget is predicated on a status quo funding level compared to FY 2004 and the current fiscal year. There is a possibility of some reductions in the CDC grant based upon information the Division has received. That is dependent upon what happens with the President's budget proposal.

In light of no new information, the Division will receive recommendations from the federal government in May or June on any new targets they might have to meet with current grant money. They do not have that information at this time, and the budget submitted by the Governor is basically status quo. Appropriations to the various entities that receive funding through this program remain at a status quo level. That appears reasonable to staff.

There is a significant amount of computer replacement hardware and software in this account, \$25,000 in FY 2006 and approximately \$265,000 in FY 2007. The funding recommendation includes monies for the replacement of 34 servers, 19 laptops, 16 personal computers (PCs) and 15 printers of various qualities. I have outlined in Exhibit C information on the servers that will be replaced. The laptops are used at an emergency response center the Division operates. It is a subset of the state emergency response center. Staff has reviewed this information and the replacement cycle and concurs with the recommended replacements. Adjustments have been made for pricing changes.

E-250 Working Environment and Wage – Page HEALTH-137

Decision unit E-250 recommends a new position, a temporary contract position used on a full-time basis in this account. Staff feels this recommendation is reasonable and would provide for some savings over the biennium in addition to continuity of services. This account, for your information, includes an education information officer and two public information officers recommended to be placed in the unclassified service. That decision will be made at a later point.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This is not my area of expertise, but for the new position being suggested to replace the contract position, it indicates a savings of approximately \$10,700. It seems that more frequently these types of positions are difficult to fill. They are more in demand, and the salary and competition for these positions is becoming

higher. Is the salary that is allocated for this position sufficient to attract a qualified person to replace a contract position?

Mr. Abba:

I am not certain if the Division has had a difficult time attracting candidates.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

If representatives from the Division are here, I would like some assurance that hiring a permanent employee is feasible.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

I believe there are other positions the Divisions were unable to fill.

ALEXANDER HAARTZ, M.P.H. (Administration, Health Division, Department of Human Resources):

We would expect to be able to fill this position without difficulty.

E-811 Unclassified Changes – Page HEALTH-138

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Decision unit E-811 has one education and information officer (EIO) position and two public information officer (PIO) positions. Why do we need two PIOs? Generally, PIOs become the restriction point as far as information flow. I think some places use them to ensure it takes longer for people to access public records and documents.

Mr. Haartz:

I believe what this budget contains are two education information officers and one public information officer I position.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

It says the opposite, so could we clarify that?

Mr. Haartz:

I would be happy to, but I am aware of two EIOs and one PIO for the reason you mentioned, there are program goals that are met by the EIOs and one PIO I.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Tell me about this Public Health Preparedness for Bioterrorism, Hospital Preparedness. I have the Commission on Homeland Security's report. We received \$67 million, and I do not know where it went and on what we spent it. Did your agency receive any money from this group?

Mr. Haartz:

What the Health Division receives as dedicated funding is not from Homeland Security or the Office of Domestic Preparedness, but rather from the CDC and Health Resource Services Administration. Our funding is outside of what I believe you are referring to which is from the federal Office of Homeland Security. That funding does not pass through or interact with the Health Division other than we try to collaborate and ensure we work with the Homeland Security Commission. It is my understanding that funding is generally unrestricted and is allowed by the states to be allocated in whatever manner

they choose, whereas the Health Division's funding is more narrowly focused as your staff indicated in terms of specific deliverables.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Did your agency receive any of the \$67 million?

Mr. Haartz:

I believe there is a small amount that is currently being considered.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

In looking at the Commission on Homeland Security's report, I see they have a Health Committee. Are you able to participate? The Commission also has a Funding Committee and a Government ID Committee. Do you participate in any of those?

Mr. Haartz:

We do participate. The state health officer and our manager of public health preparedness, both as a condition of the state's receipt of the CDC funding, serve in an ex officio capacity.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Who are the officials and why would they dictate to us?

Mr. Haartz:

It is the state's Homeland Security Commission.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

When are we going to wrap our arms around this? It seems we have a lot of duplication, and I think you would be the experts.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

Where are we with the rogue virus we had and the laboratories destroying it? Has that been resolved?

Mr. Haartz:

Based on the information I saw this morning over the wire services, all samples around the world have been located, identified and destroyed. Within Nevada, that was also accomplished. To my understanding, no one became ill. They are currently reviewing how that specimen was selected and sent out as part of proficiency testing.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Decision unit E-710, the section that talks about allowing for mirrored configuration, is important. If they were to lose their data, this would give them the ability to recover quickly as opposed to a longer recovery time.

SENATOR TITUS:

I asked the environmental employees what was happening in Fallon, and they told me they were not doing any studying of the problem any more. They have wrapped it up, but there may be other things going on through the CDC or the Health Division. We were talking about epidemiology. Are you doing anything with Fallon?

Mr. Haartz:

The scientific studies, as far as the biological studies, have been concluded. They are not taking place through the state Health Division. There is some interest at the University of Nevada School of Medicine to conduct research studies at the cellular level dealing with some of the causalities of cancer and of childhood leukemia. There is research going on. It is, however, outside the state Health Division and the CDC at this time.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3218 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS OUTLINED ON PAGES 18 AND 19 OF EXHIBIT C.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

AGING SERVICES

<u>HR, Aging Services Grants</u> – Budget Page AGING-1 (Volume II) Budget Account 262-3140

JANET JOHNSON (Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

The Aging Services Grants budget supports the Independent Living Grants of the Fund for a Healthy Nevada. There is only one major issue and that is the reduction of tobacco settlement monies. There was a Letter of Intent two sessions in a row that asked the Division to go back and look for other sources of revenue, anticipating tobacco settlement funds decreasing in the future. They were unable to identify other sources of revenue, and General Funds have been included in the Governor's recommendation. Subsequent to the Governor's recommendation, the Treasurer's Office has re-projected those revenues. An increase has been restored to that reduction of about \$136,000 in FY 2006 and about \$232,000 in FY 2007. There are also approximately \$800,000 each year being transferred to Senior Services and EPS Homemaker programs.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I would encourage the Subcommittee to follow our previous Letters of Intent as outlined on page 21 of Exhibit C.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 262-3140 WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION AND TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS TO ADD ADDITIONAL REVENUE AND TO ISSUE A LETTER OF INTENT TO THE AGING SERVICES DIVISION TO PURSUE ALTERNATIVE FUNDING TO TOBACCO SETTLEMENT FUNDS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to the Aging Older Americans Act.

<u>HR, Aging Older Americans Act</u> – Budget Page AGING-5 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3151

Ms. Johnson:

The Aging Older Americans Act budget is primarily the administrative account for the Division of Aging. There are no major issues in this account. Staff has recommended adjustments in the Base Budget to equal the actual coupon sales from the Taxicab Authority that will give an increase of approximately \$57,000 in FY 2006 and \$49,000 in FY 2007 to the Senior Ride Program.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page AGING-9

There are also technical adjustments in E-710 to revise equipment prices and to split software replacements between the two years.

E-800 Cost Allocation - Page AGING-9

We are asking for approval to go in and make changes to the cost allocation once final closings are made.

E-811 Unclassified Changes – Page AGING-10

Decision E-811 recommends salary adjustments for positions being moved to the unclassified area. The positions are the Division administrator, two deputy administrators and the elder rights bureau chief. Additionally, the adjustments will change two classified positions, the executive assistant and the social services chief, to unclassified service.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3151 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND THE TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS OUTLINED ON PAGES 22 AND 23 OF EXHIBIT C.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN SMITH SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will move to the Senior Services Program.

<u>HR, Senior Services Program</u> – Budget Page AGING-13 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-3146

Ms. Johnson:

The Senior Services account is the one that provides services to those seniors most at risk for nursing home placement. This account has several major closing issues, primarily in the arena of caseloads. At the direction of the Subcommittee, the Division submitted a revised caseload plan that should accommodate each of the caseloads recommended. The plan incorporates both short-term and long-term components. In the short term, they are looking at aggressively processing cases, creating an assessment worker assignment, whereby some social workers would do assessments only. Once those cases are approved, they would be transferred to another worker for ongoing casework. Supervisors would conduct some assessments, probably around five, for a four-month period.

The long-term plan would include continuation of the aggressive processing of new cases and recruitment of new social workers, including the addition of advertisements in newspapers and Web sites, contracting for specific case management activities and the use of retired social workers interested in working on an as-needed basis. Based on the Division's revised plan, it appears the annualized caseload in the Base Budget and the demographic growth in the M-200 decision units will be accommodated.

M-200 Demographics/Caseload Changes – Page AGING-15

The original plan for caseload growth in the additional Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) waiver slots has been reduced from 160 to 90 over the biennium. After reviewing the plan, staff believes it to be reasonable, and we have included closing adjustments based on that revised plan.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

One of the proposals under the Division's plan is to use retired social workers that would be working on an as-needed basis. There is a sunset on the critical labor legislation. I am assuming that is about what they are talking. We should be aware of this critical labor provision in the law used primarily for teachers. I wonder how many retired social workers it might affect.

Ms. Johnson:

I know that bill is sunseting for the long term. There is the possibility, however, for retired individuals to come back and work for the state if they are under contract, such as the Rivas contract issue. The amount of time and the amount of money they can make is limited.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

Did that answer your question, Senator Raggio?

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Partially, because I do not know if the need is going to be filled by the limitation we have on retired employees coming back on a contract basis vis-à-vis being able to keep their retirement and return to work on a more full-time basis. That was the purpose of the critical labor issue.

CHAIR LESLIE:

Senator Raggio brought up something the Division ought to consider. In reviewing the short-term and the long-term plan for filling these positions, I think the Division did a good job, and I want to publicly thank them for being willing to work with our staff and come up with numbers that are realistic. We all want to help these people, but if you do not have the staff, I understand you cannot do it. We do not like to be in the position of appropriating money and getting community expectations up and then not being able to follow through. The revised caseload plan is good, and I would recommend we approve it. The Assembly is interested in eliminating patient liability. We would recommend that we follow the *Executive Budget* in that regard.

One thing we need to consider is the possibility of replacing at least a partial amount of the tobacco settlement funding in this account with General Funds. We have harassed the agency for several biennia to try to find alternative funding sources. They have not been able to define anything. We know that tobacco settlement revenues are going down, and if we continue to use only tobacco funds in this account, we are headed for a disaster.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Ms. Johnson, we have long argued that we should be taking the tobacco settlement money out of this and replacing it with General Funds. This session we have an opportunity to do so. This program is for our more vulnerable senior citizens. It is a wonderful program. I would like to know what we could anticipate in General Fund dollar amounts to fund this agency, perhaps a high, medium and low, so we have some idea as a Subcommittee.

Ms. Johnson:

The tobacco settlement funding for the Senior Services Program and the Homemaker Programs accounts total approximately \$800,000 each year of the biennium. The amount for the Senior Services account is slightly over \$600,000, and the amount for the Homemaker Programs account is \$200,000. This represents the amount of tobacco funding in these accounts being targeted for replacement with General Funds.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

I do not know if we have gone over all of the issues, but I would argue that this is the time to start moving in that direction. I would prefer to see tobacco settlement funds completely taken out, but if we have to make a compromise, this is a start in the right direction. Please reiterate, the caseload base that has been redone, the additional 160 CHIP waiver slots were reduced to 90? Does that mean we will have people on a waiting list or is that because something was recalculated?

Ms. Johnson:

That is correct. There will be people on a waiting list as the result of this caseload plan. They are trying to be realistic in what they can accomplish.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Is the funding mechanism available where, if suddenly they were able to hire someone to handle the caseload, they could do so?

Ms. Johnson:

At this stage, additional General Funds would have to be added to do that. The only avenue I am aware of would be to use the Contingency Fund.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

Would they have access to the Contingency Fund if they were able to hire?

Ms. Johnson:

Yes, as long as they leave some General Fund dollars in this budget.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

It goes back to Senator Raggio's questions about agencies' ability to find individuals to fill certain positions, mostly social workers. Is that correct?

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

That is what we have heard on the other budgets as well.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

We talked about salaries for social workers, but we never landed anywhere in any of the budgets as far as that is concerned.

Mr. Abba:

The revised caseload plan provides new slots for population demographics. It also provides the 90 new slots to reduce the waiting list. Probably more important than the issue of the waiting list is wait time. The Division has indicated that the wait time is approximately three months. This may improve upon that. That is about the time it takes for the Division to perform case management activities on new clients coming onto rolls, and that is a goal that has attempted to be maintained over the last several sessions. It is maintained with the new plan the Division has developed.

Ms. Johnson:

On page 26, item 3 of Exhibit C, is a request for one health care community coordinator II position. This position has been looked at a great deal and the request appears to be reasonable. The impetus behind this position request is the requirement of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) which are fairly hefty. This position is also being requested in the Health Care Financing and Policy Division and the Mental Health area in the three regional offices. The requirement from CMS is that we be accountable, to prove what we are doing is what we say we are doing.

The CMS have asked that the Division develop a Quality Management Committee which requires evidentiary-based information, reports, a review of the accuracy of eligibility requirements, incident reporting systems with tracking, trending and presentation. Additionally, CMS would like several system developments to monitor service refusal, analyze the impact on health and safety and monitor the system that identifies addresses to prevent abuse, neglect and exploitation. The Division would like a system to interview recipients based on satisfaction and evidence that recipients have been afforded choice, and to ensure funds are expended based on the plan of care. Based on those arguments, staff has recommended the position.

The next issue is the S.B. No. 174 of the 71st Session positions. These positions are for those people who require assistance for bathing, toileting and feeding. The recipients must qualify for all three criteria. There were nine people on the waiting list when the budget was built. That number has decreased to two at the moment; however, the Division has 36 ongoing clients in that area. The Division indicates they will be phasing in those nine people over the biennium. They will probably reach that number around April and continue through the biennium. Since the agency usually takes those clients immediately because of the high risk and the need, they will have accepted those nine additional cases, and staff recommends approval.

Item 5 is the elimination of patient liability. This is approximately \$167,000 each year of the biennium. This is a policy decision as to whether or not the Subcommittee is interested in eliminating patient liability. As a reminder, it is the only waiver that remains with co-payments, and it confuses many people who will not return for services because they think they cannot afford it.

We have already discussed item 6. This is the decision unit that reduces the waiting list from the original recommendation of 160 down to 90. The last major issue is an amendment to this budget for personal assistance services, a rate increase from \$17.00 to \$18.50 per hour. When the Committee closed the Office of Community Based Services budget, it was recommended that increase be phased in over the biennium with an increase of \$0.75 per hour the first year, and an additional \$0.75 per hour the second year. What that will do is reduce the General Fund by approximately \$40,000 each year with this recommendation.

M-100 Inflation - Page AGING-14

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page AGING-18

Other items include a slight modification in module M-100 for the statewide cost-allocation plan. However, that could be changed and will be handled statewide, at one time. There are minor reductions for module E-710 for equipment pricing based on revised prices that we received from the Purchasing Division. In the final decision, we would like approval to make modifications to the cost allocation once these budgets are finalized.

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3146 ON THE FOLLOWING BASIS: THAT THE DIVISION'S REVISED PLAN REDUCING THE CHIP WAIVER SLOTS TO 90 BE APPROVED; TO APPROVE MAJOR CLOSING ISSUES ON PAGE 25 OF EXHIBIT C, NO. 1, BASED ON THE PLAN OF ANNUALIZING THE CHIP CASELOAD GROWTH; NO. 2, TO APPROVE THE DEMOGRAPHIC CASELOAD GROWTH IN THE CHIP PROGRAM, M-200, AND TO ADOPT THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION; NO. 3, TO RECOMMEND THE NEW POSITION FOR COMMUNITY BASED CARE; NO. 4, TO AUTHORIZE FUNDING FOR PHASING IN NINE PERSONS ON THE WAIT LIST TO THE CHIP PROGRAM; NO. 5, TO ELIMINATE THE PATIENT LIABILITY FROM THE CHIP MEDICAID WAIVER CO-PAY AND RECOMMEND APPROPRIATION TO THE STATE'S MATCH; NO. 6, TO ADD THE CHIP WAIVER SLOTS, PHASED IN FOR A MAXIMUM OF

90 BY APRIL 2007; NO. 7, TO AUTHORIZE THE INCREASE OF \$0.75 PER HOUR EACH YEAR OF THE BIENNIUM FOR THE PERSONAL ASSISTANCE SERVICE; AND TO APPROVE STAFF TECHNICAL ADJUSTMENTS AS DESCRIBED ON PAGE 28 OF EXHIBIT C.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER SECONDED THE MOTION.

CHAIR LESLIE:

I could support most of the motion, but I will not support the tobacco settlement money. This is a year when we have an opportunity to start replacing the tobacco settlement money with General Funds. I think one-half of the tobacco settlement money should be replaced with General Funds.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

I also will not support the motion as it is without eliminating a portion of the tobacco settlement money for this program. I believe it was \$623,000 the first year and \$630,000 the second year. We have the money. These are our most vulnerable senior citizens. Some of us raised taxes last session, so let us take care of our older population.

THE MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS MATHEWS AND TITUS VOTED NO. ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS AND ASSEMBLYWOMEN LESLIE, GIUNCHIGLIANI AND SMITH VOTED NO.)

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3146 AS STATED IN THE PRIOR MOTION WITH THE EXCEPTION TO REPLACE ONE-HALF OF THE TOBACCO SETTLEMENT MONEY WITH GENERAL FUNDS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

This is not the time to start suggesting adding General Funds to these budgets. We have not received the Economic Forum report. That is why I would vote no.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

I appreciate Senator Raggio's concerns. However, this is a policy decision at this point. I believe we can close the budget this way. If the Economic Forum spending recommendation comes in even higher, we could replace even more than one-half of the tobacco settlement money with General Funds.

SENATOR TITUS:

I realize the Economic Forum report has not come in, but we have been hearing many proposals for different amounts of money, and this is an excellent program. All the seniors talk about what a great program this is because it helps them stay in the home and obtain services. It is one that you pay a little for now and gain a lot down the road. I believe there will be \$600,000 extra, and if you are going to set priorities, this should be at the top of the list. It is a phase-in, because tobacco settlement money is phasing out. We need to be responsible and look for other sources.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

Nobody is suggesting cutting the program. It is being funded appropriately. The Governor recommends the use of tobacco settlement funding which is what this Legislature designated for that purpose. I do not understand, at this point, why we are not continuing the program. Unless others have their eyes on tobacco settlement money for other purposes, this is a high priority, and that is where it ought to be.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT:

Since I am new, let me try to understand the situation. If we do not replace tobacco settlement funds right now, can the agency come to the IFC for money if there is not enough tobacco funds later?

SENATOR RAGGIO:

As long as there is General Fund money in any budget, they have the opportunity to approach IFC.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT:

Therefore, we can make them whole later, if necessary.

CHAIR LESLIE:

The issue, from my viewpoint, is that tobacco settlement money is being reduced. Next session we may be back here. Funding essential services with tobacco money is not as secure as funding it with General Funds. If in two years we are back and, similar to last session, there is not enough money and things start contracting, the programs that have tobacco money in them will be in jeopardy. I think this is an opportunity to swap out tobacco money with stable General Funds.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

What will happen to the tobacco settlement money that we are proposing be replaced with state money?

Ms. Johnson:

That money will stay in the grants budget and go to Independent Living grants.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

That is the point Senator Raggio was making. The money is there now, and that is where the money needs to be. I understand the discussion and the two viewpoints, but I will not support the motion either.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

I do not think anyone that votes one way or the other is trying to say, at this point, he or she does not support the program. We should have never done it this way four years ago. We were strapped and did not want senior citizens losing their homes and being forced into nursing homes. We made a decision at that time to find the revenue from tobacco settlement money which was the only place. We then said go try to find other federal grants; there was nothing available. We have cut budgets already this session that has saved well over \$600,000. I do not think we need to wait for the Economic Development Forum. We have money in the budget now. I think it is time, policy wise, that we say this should have never been started with tobacco settlement money.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

It is a question of what we do with the tobacco settlement money. It is still there and available, and we need to use it where it is.

SENATE: THE MOTION FAILED. (SENATORS RAGGIO, CEGAVSKE AND MATHEWS VOTED NO.)

ASSEMBLY: THE MOTION CARRIED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN GANSERT AND WEBER VOTED NO.)

* * * * *

SENATOR RAGGIO MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3146 AS STATED IN THE PRIOR MOTION, WITH THE EXCEPTION OF ITEM NO. 2 UNDER MAJOR CLOSING ISSUES ON PAGE 25 OF EXHIBIT C, THE CASELOAD GROWTH IN THE CHIP PROGRAM.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I withdraw my motion. We will hold this budget.

SENATOR MATHEWS:

I voted no because I was wondering what happens to the tobacco settlement money. If it is going to be sitting there with you trying to find places in Independent Living in which to use it, that is what changed my mind.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

We will now go into the EPS, the Homemaker Program. It is on page 29 of Exhibit C.

<u>HR, EPS/Homemaker Programs</u> – Budget Page AGING-21 Budget Account 101-3252

Ms. Johnson:

The EPS/Homemaker Program is for elder protective services for aging adults and for homemaker services for those individuals who are isolated or cannot perform services for themselves. There are two major issues in this budget. One is the addition of two social work supervisors, one in Reno and one in Las Vegas. Currently, there is one social service manager in each of those offices to oversee both the Elder Protective Services Unit and the Long-term Care Ombudsman Program. The Ombudsman Program is not part of this budget, but those managers oversee both of those areas. There are a total of seven social workers assigned in Reno and Carson City, along with the four elder rights advocates. In Las Vegas, there are four social workers assigned to protective services and six to the Ombudsman Program. There are currently no supervisors in either of those offices, and staff would recommend these positions as they appear to be reasonable to reduce the span of control.

E-456 Effectiveness of Family Services – Page AGING-23

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

This is one of the areas in which we had a question in decision unit E-456. In looking at the closing documents, we noticed there are six social workers in Reno, one in Carson City and four in Las Vegas. Could someone address why there is such a difference, and why there are so few in Las Vegas?

CAROL SALA (Administrator, Aging Services Division):

In Las Vegas, our social workers only investigate abuse of the Medicaid clients. We have a contract with Clark County, and they have a large elder protective services unit that handles the rest of the population.

Ms. Johnson:

The other issue in this budget is two social work positions requested to reduce the caseload from 30 to 25 which is representative of the national average. If the Subcommittee will recall, this caseload ratio was reduced last session from 37 cases to 30. The National Association of Adult Protective Services Administrators has recommended a 25:1 ratio to agree with the national average, and staff has determined this is a policy decision.

The other closing issue in this budget is the Title XX money. This is another funding source issue where General Funds could be reduced or tobacco settlement money for that matter. There is an additional \$475,000 in FY 2006 and \$468,000 in FY 2007 in Title XX monies that has not yet been allocated. It is my understanding the Subcommittee closed the grants management budget with some differences between the Senate and the Assembly. The Senate closed to put all the Title XX money into this budget or into Aging Services budgets and the Assembly closed to put 50 percent of those monies into this budget.

Another issue is the statewide allocation. It could be revised when you do the statewide. There are minor changes in E-710 including equipment pricing for software and hardware and to split the software replacements between the two years.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page AGING-24

Again, staff seeks approval to make changes to the cost allocation modules E-800 and E-801 based on your final closing.

E-800 Cost Allocation - Page AGING-24

E-801 Cost Allocation – Page AGING-24

CHAIR LESLIE:

I am comfortable following the Governor's recommendation in the Elder Protective Services account. I am not ready to change my mind on Title XX, so we may have to take two separate votes since the Senate disagreed with us previously, and that affects this budget account.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN LESLIE MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3252 WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATION ON ALL ISSUES OF THE ELDER

PROTECTIVE SERVICES BUDGET IN TERMS OF ADDING ADDITIONAL STAFF.

SENATOR RAGGIO:

I would like clarification. Are we only talking about adding the supervisory staff? The Senate is going to stand on the issue of the funding.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

For the second part, we will hold.

We will move on to the senior citizens' property tax assistance.

<u>Senior Citizens' Property Tax Assistance</u> – Budget Page AGING-26 (Volume II) Budget Account 101-2363

Ms. Johnson:

The final budget is the Tax Assistance Program for the elderly. The major closing issue is when the budget was built, the 2005 payments had not been completed. Staff indicated, at that time, that a recalculation would be done. The Division of Aging Services has since provided that calculation, increasing the General Fund need in FY 2006 by approximately \$86,000 and by \$23,000 in FY 2007. The reason for the smaller projection in FY 2007 is because of passage of Assembly Bill (A.B.) 489 which was the tax package putting a 3-percent cap on assessed valuation. The Division's projections have followed that cap.

ASSEMBLY BILL 489: Provides for partial abatement of ad valorem taxes imposed on property. (BDR 32-1383)

We are also recommending the projected carryforward of approximately \$85,000 be applied to the first year. The bottom line is to handle this growth, the Subcommittee would need to approve \$1,406 in the first year and \$23,512 in General Fund for the second year.

The other issue in this budget is S.B. 72.

SENATE BILL 72 (1st Reprint): Revises provisions concerning refunds of property taxes paid by certain senior citizens. (BDR 38-282)

I need to inform the Subcommittee that $\underline{S.B.72}$ increased the assessed value of a claimant's home from \$87,500 to \$120,000. It also increased the allowable liquid asset limit from \$150,000 to \$205,000, and it increased the maximum refund from \$500 to \$1,000 for senior citizen refunds. On the basis of those changes, the Division has given us an estimate of the fiscal impact which would be slightly over \$1 million in the second year of the biennium. This budget does not have those monies in it. Therefore, passage of $\underline{S.B.72}$ would require the

funding if it were to pass in that way. My understanding is the bill has been referred to the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means.

The other issues are technical adjustments.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page AGING-28

Decision unit E-710 revises prices for equipment hardware and software for data processing. We would seek approval to make changes to the cost allocation plan.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI:

I do not believe we have yet heard <u>S.B. 72</u> in the Assembly. Based on the passage of that, we would make the adjustments accordingly.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GIUNCHIGLIANI MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-2363 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS THAT THE MONIES WOULD NOT REVERT AT THE END OF THIS FISCAL YEAR FOR THE PROPERTY TAX ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, AND, BASED ON THE PASSAGE OF <u>S.B. 72</u>, THERE MAY BE ADDITIONAL ADJUSTMENTS TO THIS BUDGET.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED. (ASSEMBLYWOMEN SMITH AND LESLIE WERE ABSENT FOR THE VOTE.

CHAIR CEGAVSKE:

There being no further business to come before the Subcommittee, the meeting is adjourned at 9:28~a.m.

	RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED
	Jo Greenslate, Committee Secretary
APPROVED BY:	
Senator Barbara Cegavske, Chair	
DATE:	<u> </u>
Assemblywoman Sheila Leslie, Chair	
DATE:	