

**MINUTES OF THE
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY/NATURAL
RESOURCES/TRANSPORTATION
OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE
AND THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS**

**Seventy-third Session
May 12, 2005**

The Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation of the Senate Committee on Finance and the Assembly Committee on Ways and Means was called to order at 8:09 a.m. on Thursday, May 12, 2005. Chair Dean A. Rhoads presided in Room 2134 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 Dean A. Rhoads, Chair
Senator Bob Beers
Senator Dina Titus

ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ms. Kathy A. McClain, Chair
Mr. Mo Denis
Mrs. Heidi S. Gansert
Mr. Joseph M. Hogan
Ms. Ellen M. Koivisto
Ms. Valerie E. Weber

GUEST LEGISLATORS PRESENT:

Senator Mark E. Amodei, Capital Senatorial District

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven J. Abba, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Mindy Braun, Education Program Analyst
Michael J. Chapman, Program Analyst
Bob Guernsey, Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst
Janet Johnson, Program Analyst
Leslie Johnstone, Program Analyst
Mark Krmpotic, Senior Program Analyst
Jo Greenslate, Committee Secretary

OTHERS PRESENT:

Virginia (Ginny) Lewis, Director, Department of Motor Vehicles
John Singlaub, Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
Major Robert Wideman, Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety
Adjutant General Giles E. Vanderhoof, Special Advisor on Homeland Security
Frank Siracusa, Chief, Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 2

Doyle G. Sutton, State Fire Marshal, State Fire Marshal Division, Department of Public Safety
Chuck Schardin, Medical Administrator, Department of Corrections
Pete Anderson, State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
Andrew List, Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties
Doug Hunt, Acting Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife
Charles (Chuck) W. Fulkerson, Executive Director, Office of Veterans' Services

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will be recommending budget closings today. Please refer to Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation Closing List #8 ([Exhibit C](#), original is on file at the Research Library). We will begin with Field Services of the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV).

MOTOR VEHICLES

DMV, Field Services – Budget Page DMV-25 (Volume III)
Budget Account 201-4735

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

My remarks on budget account (B/A) 201-4735 are contained on pages 3 through 9 of [Exhibit C](#).

SENATOR TITUS:

Since we heard this, I have read in the newspaper about action in Washington, D.C., where employees at the DMV will have to check birth certificates before licensing drivers. Is that figured into this budget?

VIRGINIA (GINNY) LEWIS (Director, Department of Motor Vehicles):

The Real ID Act passed unanimously out of the U.S. Senate this week. It was not amended from the version that came out of the House of Representatives. This bill, which was tied to an appropriation for the war in Iraq, will require every state to perform many functions. The impact on Nevada, and all of the states, is significant at this point, but I cannot give you the dollar amount. We will require people to demonstrate they are United States citizens or that they are in this country lawfully.

SENATOR TITUS:

That will take a long time. Will they show their foreign birth certificate? How is our staff going to be able to do that?

MS. LEWIS:

In addition, we have to validate documents provided by the federal government which will mean we will have to interface with U.S. Immigration and their database. The logistics of these requirements clearly have not been thought out. The new requirements also mandate we retain copies of every breeder document provided to our staff at the time of application for an identification (ID) card or driver's license. The only logical solution we have is to put a scanner at every window. The alternative is the technician would have to get up

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 3

and go to a copy machine to make copies. I anticipate the budget we bring to you in 2007 will request what we will need.

SENATOR TITUS:
When does this requirement go into effect?

MS. LEWIS:
We have three years, and if the states do not comply, it will mean the federal government will not accept our driver's license or ID card for simple things such as boarding an airplane. The federal government is talking about grants. I have read numbers anywhere from \$100 million to \$500 million to implement this new plan, but we do not know what grants would be available to Nevada. We are trying to understand what the new plan will entail. I am not going to tell you that it will not impact the wait lines because it will, but I do not know the extent. We are quite concerned. I have talked to the Governor's Office in Washington, D.C., who has been tracking this legislation, as well as the Governor's Office in Nevada. We plan to review every requirement in the next few weeks to determine what this means to Nevada, our budget, if we can comply and we will go from there.

SENATOR TITUS:
The impact is going to be tremendous; it will be expensive, extend the lines, the wait time and turn DMV clerks into homeland security experts.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 201-4735 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS WITH THE FOLLOWING OPTIONS: UNDER MAJOR ISSUE 1, BULLET ITEM 2, ON PAGE 4 OF [EXHIBIT C](#); RECOMMEND APPROVAL OF THE NEW POSITIONS FOR DECATUR STAFFING WITH THE REQUIREMENT THE DEPARTMENT APPROACH IFC FOR RELEASE OF THAT FUNDING ON AN AS-NEEDED BASIS; APPROVE TWO NEW POSITIONS FOR FLEET TRANSACTIONS AND ONE FOR TITLES; AND APPROVE THE PAHRUMP OFFICE POSITION.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DMV, Motor Carrier – Budget Page DMV-54 (Volume III)
Budget Account 201-4717

MS. JOHNSON:
My remarks on B/A 201-4717 are contained on pages 10 through 13 of [Exhibit C](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 201-4717 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THREE AUDIT POSITIONS AND NINE SERVER CONNECTIONS ON THE TECHNOLOGY INVESTMENT REQUEST (TIR) AND THE REMAINING STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 4

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Tahoe Regional Planning Agency – Budget Page DCNR-180 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4204

STEVEN J. ABBA (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division,
Legislative Counsel Bureau):

My comments regarding B/A 101-4204 are contained on pages 46 through 50 of [Exhibit C](#). Regarding the Geographical Information Systems (GIS) Parcel-Based Permitting System, staff believes the Tahoe Regional Planning Agency (TRPA) has provided reasonable justification for the system and recommends its approval; however, with the stipulation that the funding be placed in a TRPA budget reserve. The TRPA can approach the Interim Finance Committee (IFC) once they have specific information regarding individual component costs of the project and when they know whether or not California plans to participate in the funding. If you wish to issue a Letter of Intent concerning the stipulation, that would also be an appropriate recommendation.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-4204 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS TO PLACE FUNDS FOR THE GIS PERMITTING SYSTEM IN RESERVE IN THE TRPA BUDGET FOR IFC APPROVAL AND ISSUE A LETTER OF INTENT ABOUT THE STIPULATION MENTIONED BY STAFF.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

JOHN SINGLAUB (Executive Director, Tahoe Regional Planning Agency):

We were surprised, when we found out yesterday, you have added federal funding to our budget. How did you do that?

MR. ABBA:

The agency has eight positions that are covered with federal funds. We typically do not fund positions covered by federal funds with cost-of-living allowance (COLA) money, which is state General Funds, for salary increases or onetime bonuses. That is why I added federal funds. The Division also has an assortment of fees in this account to cover salary increases or onetime bonuses for those positions. This is applying a consistent principle we use across budget lines in other state agencies.

MR. SINGLAUB:

Does that mean the pass-through money going through Department of Transportation (NDOT) will be increased by \$12,000? That is a set amount; the agency does not have a COLA built in.

MR. ABBA:

I indicated you have other funding sources, as well, if you cannot negotiate that additional funding through NDOT. There are a number of other grants, and I believe you are updating your fee schedule to increase fees in a variety of other areas.

MR. SINGLAUB:

The total decrease in our salaries, with the one-third/two-thirds split with California, consists of the \$27,000 reduction multiplied by three. We appreciate the calculation for the COLA, but the set funds we receive from the federal government do not have the COLA built into it. It puts us into an awkward position. It is an additional \$12,000 increase multiplied by the higher amount California contributes which creates a total decrease to us of approximately \$93,000.

We have a couple of other concerns, but we are talking about a small amount of money. Staff's explanation of the reduction and the amount we requested for replacement of hardware says some items could not be identified as needing replacement. That concerns us because we do not know what those items are.

MR. ABBA:

I can provide the TRPA with that information, and I can go by line item if you would like. It is a consistent practice we have applied with all state agencies based upon new computer hardware prices. We would be inconsistent if it were not applied to TRPA.

MR. SINGLAUB:

We appreciate that we can use the Nevada schedule to purchase the hardware and software. That would reduce the dollar amount needed. Our other concern is the 2-percent reduction because of presumed vacancy savings. We are a small agency. If we have a vacancy, we contract for the work using those savings to pay the outside contractor. This is another 2-percent cut, doubled if California follows suit.

MR. ABBA:

I used the same method we use for the University and Community College System of Nevada which is a vacancy savings rate of 2 percent. The vacancy savings rate is approximately \$75,000, shared two-thirds state of California, one-third State of Nevada, in each year of the biennium. I did not include benefits, the salary plan or seasonal salaries that are added. When you add those, the salary category is approximately \$6 million per year. We asked TRPA for information on their vacancies in order to help justify and support the 8-percent increase in the salary comparability study. The vacancy rate is approximately from 1 to 2 percent a month. This represents a salary of one position for an entire year. There are approximately 75 positions in this account. Staff believes that is a reasonable estimate for vacancy savings.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 6

CHAIR MCCLAIN:

I want to reiterate we support staff recommendation, and I do not intend to change my motion.

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will return to page 14 of [Exhibit C](#).

PUBLIC SAFETY

Public Safety Technology Division – Budget Page PS-17 (Volume III)
Budget Account 201-4733

MARK KRMPOTIC (Senior Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

My remarks on B/A 201-4733 are contained on pages 14 through 16 of [Exhibit C](#).

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Regarding item 1, the position funded by the Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) that remained in the budget, who is currently funding that position?

MR. KRMPOTIC:

The DMV proposes to spread that cost among its Public Safety divisions within the Department. There is no longer a separate allocation made to the DMV.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 201-4733 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDING APPROVING ONE POSITION UNDER ITEM 1 ON PAGE 15 OF [EXHIBIT C](#).

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR BEERS:

Under item 3, on page 15 of [Exhibit C](#), we are locked in with this vendor, the Mobile Data Communications system, because it is not Project 25 (P25) compliant, so they would probably perform the study at less than standard rates since the vendor will get all the purchases of the products that result from the study.

MAJOR ROBERT WIDEMAN (Central Repository for Nevada Records of Criminal History, Nevada Highway Patrol, Department of Public Safety):

Certainly, issues that are moving forward with interoperability through the various agencies in the state have a potential impact on the mobile data communications system, but it is not directly related to P25 standards. The complexity of this project is that there will be a need to have multiple means of data transmission throughout the state beyond the interoperable radio systems. The radio system is one means of moving that data transmission, but it is not the only means. We are also looking at issues, depending upon where the coverage is, of WiFi cell phone technology or even satellite connection. It needs to be essentially seamless depending upon where our people go. The radio is simply one portion of this. Changing radio technology, as it moves forward, will affect this; however, we do not know how at this point.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 7

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

I have a question on the Elko position in item 2, on page 15 of [Exhibit C](#). How many personal computers will be supported in Elko?

MAJOR WIDEMAN:

The distribution of workload throughout the Department of Public Safety is divided into three command areas or regions. The southern region is restricted to Clark County or a little beyond that; the northern region, which includes a larger area mostly in the north and western part of the state, and our central command area which encompasses, by far, the largest geographical area of the state but the fewest employees. The situation in Elko is not necessarily related to Elko itself, but it is the headquarters for most of that area and covers to the eastern border and as far as Alamo, through Tonopah, Winnemucca and back to the north. While there would be fewer devices under the responsibility of that Elko position, it covers many miles.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Public Safety, Criminal History Repository – Budget Page PS-52 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4709

MR. KRMPOTIC:

My remarks on B/A 101-4709 are contained on pages 17 through 20 of [Exhibit C](#).

CHAIR RHOADS:

When you say increases in court assessments, do you mean to increase the fee?

MR. KRMPOTIC:

It is not an increase in the fee but a re-projection of the number of assessments to be collected by the state over the next biennium.

SENATOR BEERS:

Someone recently e-mailed me a link to a sex offender's database online. Did your Department create that?

MR. WIDEMAN:

The Repository maintains a Web site for sex-offender information. We have had the Web site for approximately one year.

SENATOR BEERS:

I am wondering if that makes the nonprofit organization background check program obsolete.

MR. WIDEMAN:

Certainly not. The sex-offender Web site has information, at this time, concerning approximately 1,700 of the 4,700 sex offenders in the registry. In addition, the Web site has no information for any other criminal activity outside of sex-offender information.

SENATOR TITUS:

Was this budget affected in any way by the bill we passed yesterday to strengthen the sex-offender registration law?

MR. WIDEMAN:

That bill has not passed through the other House at this point. We have been through the Senate Committee on Finance with that bill on the fiscal note, and we believe we have enough money in reserve to be able to implement whatever program is necessary to update the Web site and make other needed changes in the justice link system.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT:

During the budget hearings, we discussed the 90-day time frame for processing sex-offender registration and if there was a way to flag those in the highest tier. Currently, the high-risk offenders are not flagged. Have you considered implementing that?

MR. WIDEMAN:

Yes, we have. It is a matter of case management and how we manage our workload inhouse more than it is part of the registry database per se. Management in the Repository is carefully reviewing how we manage cases and is trying to bring the process in line with the way we manage caseloads in other investigative areas of the Department.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-4709 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AS DESCRIBED ON PAGES 17 THROUGH 20 OF [EXHIBIT C](#), APPROVE \$25,000 IN EACH YEAR OF THE BIENNIUM FOR NONPROFIT ORGANIZATIONAL BACKGROUND CHECKS AND PROVIDE THE ABILITY TO CARRY FORWARD THE REMAINING BALANCE OF FUNDS BETWEEN YEARS.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Public Safety, Homeland Security – Budget Page PS-47 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-3675

MINDY BRAUN (Education Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

During the Subcommittee meeting on May 5, 2005, several questions were raised by the Subcommittee concerning the organization of this new office as recommended by the Governor. At the request of the Subcommittee, staff has worked with the agency to compile additional information for the Subcommittee to review in closing this budget. Please refer to your handout with an organizational chart on top ([Exhibit D](#)). My remarks on B/A 101-3675 are contained on pages 21 through 25 of [Exhibit C](#).

Item 2, on page 22 of [Exhibit C](#), is a reclassification of two full-time equivalency (FTE) positions from nonclassified to classified status. The Governor recommends the transfer of these positions, which is a grants and projects analyst II and an administrative assistant IV, from the Office of the Governor to the Department of Public Safety. These two positions are recommended to be in Las Vegas and would provide direct support to the Commission on Homeland Security. In [Exhibit D](#), the first page shows the organizational chart that lists the primary duties of these two positions which would be directly under the Commission of Homeland Security. The Subcommittee will recall these positions are recommended to be funded 100 percent with General Funds. According to the agency, because these positions were created through state legislation, there would be a supplanting issue if they were funded with federal funds. In meeting with the agency, it appears that staffing for the Commission on Homeland Security should be viewed as separate from the Office of Homeland Security. Based upon the review of duties for these two positions, staff recommends approval of this decision unit.

The third issue in this B/A is a request for five new positions which would be in direct support of the Office of Homeland Security. At the request of the Subcommittee, the agency has provided a revised organizational chart ([Exhibit D](#)). The first chart shows the proposed organization of the office with a summary of the duties for each of the five positions. The second chart shows the relationship of the proposed office to the Commission, the Department of Public Safety, including the Division of Emergency Management as well as the Department of Human Resources Health Division. Following the two charts, a document is included that contains the duties associated with each of the proposed positions.

The first position is an unclassified chief of homeland security appointed by the Governor. It is recommended this position be funded with federal funds received from the Division of Emergency Management and the Health Division. The second position is a classified grants and projects analyst supervisor and is proposed to be the senior analyst in the office. It is recommended this position also be funded with federal funds. The third position is a classified grants and projects analyst II as well. However, it is proposed to be the intelligence analyst for the office. This position would be funded with federal funds.

The fourth position is a classified administrative assistant IV and is proposed to be the executive assistant to the chief of homeland security. This position is also recommended to be funded with federal funds. The fifth and final position is an administrative assistant IV and is proposed to be the program assistant for the senior analyst and the intelligence analyst. This position is recommended to be funded 100 percent with General Funds as recommended by the Governor. As noted in the previous hearing for this B/A, the agency believes one position in the office should be funded with General Funds to show state support for the office and to provide a position that will not be tied to any one or a part of federal grants. Staff concurs with this recommendation.

The question for the Subcommittee is whether or not you wish to approve the five positions as proposed by the Governor. Based upon decisions made by the Subcommittee, staff requests authority to make adjustments for the costs associated with these positions including the cost for computer equipment,

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 10

office equipment and supplies. Finally, staff recommends the remaining decision units be closed as recommended by the Governor.

SENATOR BEERS:

It appears we are moving from two to three General Funded positions, and the new one is to show the federal government we care. Can we not show the federal government we care with the first two positions?

MS. BRAUN:

In working with the agency, the Commission on Homeland Security requires those two positions be funded with 100-percent state General Funds, and they are viewing the Commission as separate from the Office of Homeland Security. Since the Commission is viewed as a separate office, the agency felt support of a position in that separate office would be beneficial.

ADJUTANT GENERAL GILES E. VANDERHOOF (Special Advisor on Homeland Security):
The federal government's view is the Commission on Homeland Security was a state action approved in the last Legislative Session that was given two state employees to support it. The reason you see the separation between the Commission and the office that I have, and for which I am requesting the positions, is this is one that is required and there is one of me in every state. These are the minimum positions necessary to support the intelligence analysis we must have. My office is primarily involved in preventing and deterring terrorism. Most of the other things you are looking at are responding to an event. I would be involved in that also, but my effort is primarily in preventing and deterring. At the same time, the requirements placed on my office by the U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS) are significant.

I receive almost daily requests for new plans from the U.S. DHS. If we want input on the target analysis for this country, I have to send a person for two working groups for one week each and, subsequently, I have to go to Washington, D.C. and work with them. If we are not involved in the process, Nevada suffers because the focus is not where we are because we do not supply input. Although we work closely with the Commission, they are two separate offices, and it would be incorrect to look at them as the same. The federal government would not provide grant money to pay for the two people you have for the Commission. That is why you established the two positions two years ago.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT:

The question still remains, is there federal funding for that third position? I recognize the two offices are separate, but in your Department, are there federal funds available versus General Funds for that position?

GENERAL VANDERHOOF:

Are you talking about the administrative assistant IV that is in my office as opposed to the other two?

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT:

That is correct.

FRANK SIRACUSA (Chief, Division of Emergency Management, Department of Public Safety):

We are down to the wire with the Homeland Security dollars that we can use for personnel. We are allowed a percentage of the total Homeland Security Grant Program. The program took a substantial cut since federal FY 2004 when we received in excess of \$37 million to the State of Nevada to be disbursed statewide to receipt of \$26 million in federal FY 2005. Much of that disbursement was based on the high-risk urban area, particularly Clark County. That directly affects administrative dollars designated for personnel within this state. Those dollars are slim, and we would be hard pressed to fund another position.

SENATOR BEERS:

Last week, we replaced lost federal grants with General Funds for the nonmajor metropolitan counties' narcotics unit. It seemed what we were seeing was a shift by the federal government away from narcotics and law enforcement and toward homeland security. I fear the effects of methamphetamines on our state more than I fear "rogue Utahans." Perhaps we could find a way not to hire the third position and consider that part of our effort, because we funded the Nevada Division of Investigation office with General Funds, and tell the federal government we care.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Would you suggest not funding this third position?

SENATOR BEERS:

I would suggest not funding the new General Fund position and to determine how to rearrange the two existing General Fund positions to provide the support the agency needs.

GENERAL VANDERHOOF:

I see a connection between terrorism and narcotics, and we are seeing more of that all the time. One of the points I need to make is that my proposed office here is one of the main voices with the DHS. I am the only point of contact with the DHS, and that is where we have been lacking in telling our story and one of the reasons why our budget was cut this time for the grant dollars. Everyone knows our main goal is to have our 40 million tourists counted along with our census figures because we have to provide all of the services and protection we would for our own citizens. Yet, at this point, we are not getting credit for that. Some of these things are because we do not have a voice. That is why I gave the example of the opportunities we have to work in groups in Washington, D.C., where they are making plans, and we have not had people in those groups for well over a year. I actually need more than I am requesting, but whatever you decide, I will live with and do the best I can. What I have asked for is what I believe to be the minimum essential for my office to fulfill its responsibility.

SENATOR TITUS:

I appreciate what you are saying, General, and I know many of the requirements are coming from Washington, D.C., and you have to make residents and tourists feel safe. However, now you are going to have DMV officials helping you with the homeland security effort, and maybe that will remove some of your burden.

SENATOR BEERS:

The General's arguments notwithstanding, I sense there are efficiencies to be gained by combining the Homeland Security unit that exists in the Emergency Management Department and the new one we are creating in Public Safety. We might want to include a Letter of Intent requesting the Director of the Department of Public Safety to return next session with at least a good hard look at whether there are efficiencies to be gained by combining those offices and perhaps reorganizing the level at which this Commission reports. Rather than report to the Governor, perhaps it is more appropriate to report to the Department of Public Safety.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-3675 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDING CREATION OF THE OFFICE OF HOMELAND SECURITY; TRANSFER STAFF AND OPERATIONS FROM THE GOVERNOR; RECLASSIFY TWO POSITIONS UNDER ITEM 2, ON PAGE 22 OF [EXHIBIT C](#); APPROVE FIVE POSITIONS LISTED IN THE TABLE, ON PAGE 23 OF [EXHIBIT C](#), WITH THE CAVEAT WE NEVER ADD ANY ADDITIONAL GENERAL FUND POSITIONS TO THIS OFFICE; AND ISSUE THE LETTER OF INTENT MENTIONED BY SENATOR BEERS.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Public Safety, Fire Marshal – Budget Page PS-168 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-3816

LESLIE JOHNSTONE (Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

This budget was heard last week by this Subcommittee and is being brought forward for additional consideration. We discussed Senate Bill (S.B.) 497 on the Nevada Fire Safe Council issue that is before the Senate.

SENATE BILL 497: Makes appropriation for community protection and fire safety. (BDR S-1411)

We discussed S.B. 497 with the Department. It seems that issue would not be under the purview of the Fire Marshal. Therefore, we would like to separate the two issues and move forward with consideration on this budget. We discussed the fire prevention training decision unit and my remarks on this decision unit are on pages 27 and 28 of [Exhibit C](#).

M-504 Mandates – Page PS-172

Another major issue, item 3, on the top portion of page 28 of [Exhibit C](#), is pending legislation.

SENATE BILL 274: Revises certain provisions relating to governmental operations. (BDR 42-87)

This is S.B. 274, which, as of last week, had been scheduled for the Senate Committee on Finance, and it was heard on May 9. The Department submitted a fiscal note with this bill indicating there would be a loss of revenue of \$1.6 million a year if this bill were to pass. Staff met with the Department this week and received updated information which I will provide for background information.

The fiscal impact has been substantially modified. The Department is estimating the revenue loss would be \$534,000 per year instead of \$1.6 million. The Department provided information on the direct cost that would be impacted by the reduction in workload, primarily in Washoe County, Carson City and Clark County. That direct cost totals approximately \$385,000 each year of the biennium. Therefore, the revenue that would be lost of \$534,000 exceeds the direct cost that can be attributed to the reduction in workload by about \$150,000 in the first year and \$138,000 in the second year of the biennium. The Department provided preliminary proposed reductions, if S.B. 274 were approved, of approximately five FTE positions and associated operational costs totaling \$316,000 in the first year and \$333,000 in the second year of the biennium.

The bottom-line impact on the General Fund at this stage, if the proposed reductions were implemented, as well as the current estimate on the revenue loss, is a General Fund increase in cost in this B/A of \$217,000 the first year and \$200,000 the second year of the biennium. I bring this to the Subcommittee's attention, even though this bill has not yet passed out of both Houses, to give you an update on the financial impact. Staff suggests if the budget is closed, contingent upon the impact should S.B. 274 be approved, we would have to revisit this B/A.

I would like to point out a couple of issues under Other Closing Items. We discussed them, but I would like to refocus on them. On page 29 of [Exhibit C](#), item 6, relates to an issue regarding approximately 11 vehicles operated by the Fire Marshal which have in excess of 100,000 miles on the odometer. The Fire Marshal would like approval to reallocate savings in the Motor Pool onetime appropriation that resulted from a reduction in the number of new parole and probation officers required due to caseload in the Parole and Probation budget. The Subcommittee may wish to consider reallocating a portion of those General Fund dollars, approximately \$107,000, to purchase four replacement vehicles for the Fire Marshal. There was a reduction of six vehicles in the Parole and Probation budget that resulted in a savings of \$115,000. That would be available to reallocate if the Subcommittee chose to purchase four vehicles at \$107,000.

Another new item I would like to bring to the Subcommittee's attention is item 8. It was discussed this morning on the DMV Field Services budget that we have reflected office rent of approximately \$12,000 in this budget for the Fire Marshal's office in Pahrump. That cost had previously been paid from the DMV Field Services budget.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Do we need to change any figures on the information we have before us on the ending balance or the loss of \$1.6 million?

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 14

Ms. JOHNSTONE:

Since S.B. 274 has not completed its process through the Legislature, I would say no.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Can we close the budget and reopen it again if we need to?

Ms. JOHNSTONE:

That is correct.

CHAIR MCCLAIN:

Before I make a motion, could we review the position in the instructional supply cost account, starting on page 27 of [Exhibit C](#)?

Ms. JOHNSTONE:

I will review the information year-by-year. We have \$104,000, in the first year of the biennium, that would fund one new training officer position, in-state travel and some instructional supplies. The instructional supply budget is \$27,769 in the first year of the biennium. In the second year, \$197,076 total cost pays for the position with \$114,891 remaining in the instructional supply budget. The Department provided a detailed breakdown of where they intend to distribute the instructional supplies, and we could immediately identify \$90,000 in the second year of the biennium that would go toward events in Carson City, Reno and Sparks. The question before the Subcommittee is regarding the decision unit itself, whether to fund the new position, and subsequently, whether the scope of the position would be focused in the rural areas and/or the urban areas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN GANSERT:

I was thinking this extra person was going to be trained in the volunteer groups in the rural areas. Is this not the same position?

Ms. JOHNSTONE:

No, the position is targeted toward private citizens, young children and elderly adults on fire prevention.

DOYLE G. SUTTON (State Fire Marshal, State Fire Marshal Division, Department of Public Safety):

I want to clarify one thing on this position. Last session, the Legislature wanted us to create a plan for the Fire Marshal's office to define their role in the State of Nevada. As we continue to change the role and the mission of the Fire Marshal's office and move closer to the Department of Public Safety, we also looked at exactly what the Fire Marshal's office does. One of the primary functions is fire prevention and public education. This position is not a training position, but because of the way the state classifies positions, it has been classified as a training officer position.

We asked for a fire prevention and public educator with the primary function of developing programs, statewide, to assist in meeting goals of identifying hazards throughout the state. Nationwide and statewide we have identified groups that are at risk. We have seniors, children under five, and youth fire starters throughout the state who are at risk. I went to New York and

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 15

participated in programs that taught how to develop coalitions to address youth fire starters. This would be one of the primary functions of this position.

SENATOR TITUS:

My concern is this position is supposed to be for rural Nevada, but when you read the list of things he or she will do, they are all in Carson City, Reno and Sparks which is not rural Nevada.

MR. SUTTON:

Those are some areas we looked at; the list was not all inclusive. You try to target an audience throughout the state and include the most populated groups. The people who attend these events are not just residents of Reno, Sparks or Carson City; they are residents throughout the state. In the last three years, we have had events in Elko, Elko County, Lund and a few other smaller areas.

SENATOR TITUS:

How about Pahrump and places like that in southern Nevada?

MR. SUTTON:

We have not put a program together there, but that is a key place to consider, especially with the issue of fireworks in Pahrump and their wildlife and weed abatement problems.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-3816 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS; TO NOT FUND THE POSITION OR ASSOCIATED EXPENSES FOR THE FIRE PREVENTION TRAINING POSITION DESCRIBED IN ITEM 2, ON PAGE 27 OF [EXHIBIT C](#); TO APPROVE FOUR VEHICLE REPLACEMENTS, IN ITEM 6, ON PAGE 29 OF [EXHIBIT C](#); APPROVE ITEM 7, ON PAGE 29 OF [EXHIBIT C](#); AND PLACE LANGUAGE IN THE AUTHORIZATION ACT REGARDING HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AS SET FORTH BY STAFF.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

SENATOR BEERS:

The Subcommittee commends the direction the Fire Marshal's office has followed over the interim and applauds the emphasis on education, but thinks it could be done with existing resources.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

As I think about this issue, having been involved in education through the Parent Teacher Association, I would think, for less money, we could go into the schools and interact with all the children rather than some children at a few events such as the RibFest in Sparks. Perhaps there would be a partnership we could form with the schools. We need to provide fire prevention information to all children, not just those able to afford to attend special events.

SENATOR BEERS:

To a large extent, that is already happening with local fire departments.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 16

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Public Safety, Emergency Management Division – Budget Page PS-33
(Volume III)
Budget Account 101-3673

Ms. JOHNSTONE:

I would like to follow up with the Subcommittee on two smaller items that have nothing to do with the Fire Marshal. First is the Emergency Management Division B/A 101-3673. It was closed by the Subcommittee on May 5, 2005. However, after the hearing, the Division notified the Legislative Counsel Bureau (LCB) Fiscal Analysis Division that there were three projectors included in the media equipment for the new Emergency Operations Center approved by the Subcommittee that are already included in the Emergency Operations Center project funding. Therefore, staff requests the budget be reopened and approved to make a technical adjustment removing \$21,645 in equipment costs, of which \$9,169 is General Funds, and the balance is paid through the Department of Energy, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) and the Office of Domestic Preparedness Grant budgets. We request this action be taken today so we can make those technical adjustments.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO REOPEN BUDGET ACCOUNT
101-3673 AND GIVE STAFF AUTHORITY TO MAKE TECHNICAL
ADJUSTMENTS AS DESCRIBED BY STAFF.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Ms. JOHNSTONE:

The second closing item I wanted to bring to the Subcommittee's attention is to revisit the topic of inflation that was applied in the Department of Corrections' Medical Services Budget closed at the end of April 2005.

CORRECTIONS

Prison Medical Care – Budget Page CORRECTIONS-18 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-3706

We have provided background information on the sheet titled Medical Inflation ([Exhibit E](#)). In B/A 101-3706, staff proposed an alternative use of the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) projections that trend out historical expenditures for medical expenses and to use instead a five-year average of a medical consumer price index (CPI) trend. In the Corrections' budget, medical inflation is applied to hospital services, prescription drugs, dental supplies, medical supplies and durable medical equipment. The inflation decision unit uses different factors to try to get as close to each of those categories as possible.

The Subcommittee approved use of the medical CPI five-year trend in the Department of Corrections. This is different from the inflation methodology used in the Medicaid and Mental Health Services and Developmental Services (MHDS) budgets, wherein inflation is only applied to prescription drugs, and the CMS cost increase is recommended in those cases. One of the differences besides the expense categories to which inflation is applied is the methodology used to put together those budgets. In the Corrections' budget, the inmate population is a separate calculation and in the MHDS and Medicaid budgets it is not calculated in the same manner.

The Corrections environment is a heavily-managed-care environment. Therefore, it is justified to try to reduce that decision unit to the inflationary factor alone and not use a factor that includes utilization as well as caseload increases. The question before the Subcommittee, based upon this background information, is whether or not you would like to reconsider the decision made for the Department of Corrections to use the five-year medical CPI trend in putting that budget together.

CHAIR McCLAIN:

We already approved that budget closing recommendation using the five-year medical CPI trend. We should leave it that way.

CHUCK SCHARDIN (Medical Administrator, Department of Corrections):

The Department would like to request the CMS factor be approved by the Subcommittee. Staff mentioned the utilization is controlled because it is a heavily-managed-care system. However, generally, the inmates coming into the system have not availed themselves of medical care prior to being in the system, and a high percentage of them are substance abusers. To manage our outside medical costs, we provide remedial care, using drugs, to control our overall costs. I would argue this is a higher-risk population in terms of medical care that requires a higher utilization of drugs.

MARK W. STEVENS (Assembly Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

The inflation factors were not applied consistently between the MHDS and the Medicaid and Corrections' budgets. In the Corrections' budgets, inflationary factors were provided for hospital services, prescription drugs, dental supplies, medical supplies and durable medical equipment in each of those categories. In the MHDS and Medicaid budgets, the only inflationary factor was prescription drugs. If you were going to apply this consistently and provide the higher prescription-drug inflation cost, you would want to remove the inflationary increases that were provided in the original decision made by the Subcommittee for hospital services, dental supplies, medical supplies and durable medical equipment. In the Department of Corrections' budget, if we provided for inflation for prescription drugs at the CMS cost increase and took away everything else, I believe the Department would actually receive less. If you stay with the previous decision, the Department of Corrections is better off.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN:

If I understand correctly, the Department has offered an explanation that would suggest referring to this as an inflation adjustment does not cover what they are facing. That is, with many of the Department's incoming inmates, they have

some catch-up to do. It may not be as much a matter of ensuring inflation is covered as a matter of permitting them the funds to catch-up in the care and medications that may have been ignored prior to their coming under the control of the Department of Corrections. Is that the case?

MR. SCHARDIN:

Yes, that is exactly the case. I could further point out that the CPI is a basket of goods in each of the different categories that measures past inflation. It is a lagging indicator. The CMS looks forward; it is more of a leading indicator, especially in the area of drugs. New drugs come out all the time. We do not necessarily increase the usage of drugs, but we substitute a newer one that is more effective and helps prevent outside medical care later. We have quite a few inmates who have chronic and degenerative diseases. If we can manage them medically with medication, we can avoid outside surgeries or other medical procedures.

MS. JOHNSTONE:

I would clarify for the Subcommittee there are several components that go into the calculation of this inmate-driven expense. We have looked at the four-year trend in actual cost-per-inmate which should pick up changes in the demographics of the type of inmate coming into the facility. I would note there have been large fluctuations in the inmate-driven expense on a per-inmate basis. In FY 2004, which we used as the base year, it was actually substantially below the budget, and the Department is to be commended for that. We have tried to pick up the trend and the types of expenses they are faced with in establishing the baseline inmate-driven expense, and this decision unit is targeted at strictly the inflationary cost.

MR. SCHARDIN:

To respond, briefly, we were below our projections last fiscal year. However, this year we are above projections. If you look at the overall trend, it is trending upward.

MS. JOHNSTONE:

That was taken into consideration.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO LEAVE THE RECOMMENDED BUDGET CLOSING FOR B/A 101-3706 AS IS, USING A MEDICAL CPI FIVE-YEAR AVERAGE INFLATIONARY TREND.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONSERVATION AND NATURAL RESOURCES

Forestry – Budget Page DCNR-144 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4195

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 19

MICHAEL J. CHAPMAN (Program Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

My remarks on B/A 101-4195 are contained on pages 30 through 35 of [Exhibit C](#).

CHAIR RHOADS:

This may be a good time for Senator Amodei to explain his proposal to rehabilitate an existing helicopter airframe with a onetime appropriation as described in item 3 under Other Items, on page 34 of [Exhibit C](#).

SENATOR MARK E. AMODEI (Capital Senatorial District):

By way of brief recapitulation, I appeared in front of your Committee toward the beginning of the session to request a budget amendment regarding a \$150,000 onetime appropriation to rehabilitate a third airframe the state currently owns to supplement the Nevada Division of Forestry's (NDF) existing fleet of two helicopters. Questions arose regarding ongoing costs, insurance and things of that nature the Committee routinely deals with in this context. You have a response from NDF ([Exhibit F](#)) regarding capital costs and operational cost breakdowns. The plan for NDF is to rotate the third helicopter into the schedule of the two existing ships. I requested information regarding the potential additional revenue for billing during seasonal use for three ships.

CHAIR RHOADS:

On pages 36 and 37 of [Exhibit C](#), there is additional information regarding costs and revenue with the addition of a third helicopter to NDF's fleet.

SENATOR AMODEI:

I request, as a result of information provided at the hearing, along with this follow-up information, the Subcommittee give favorable consideration to a budget amendment in the context of this request.

CHAIR RHOADS:

We will return to B/A 101-4195.

MR. CHAPMAN:

To clarify the budget closing regarding Senator Amodei's presentation, the discussion and the closing packet is under item 3, on page 34 of [Exhibit C](#). The response provided to the Subcommittee's questions from the Division of Forestry is noted on pages 36 and 37 of [Exhibit C](#). Also distributed was a memorandum from Mr. Pete Anderson of NDF regarding an issue surrounding a plane crash in California during a fire-suppression-training mission ([Exhibit F](#)). It addresses issues regarding availability of federal aircraft.

I will continue my remarks from page 32, item 3 of [Exhibit C](#). This is a request for an increase from 50- to 100-percent General Funds to support a Minden fire control dispatcher. Currently, the position is funded with U.S. Forest Service federal dollars. The Governor's *Executive Budget*, in making this recommendation, reduces federal funding but does not restore it anywhere else in the budget. The agency testified they intend to use the freed-up federal dollars to support additional seasonal fire position costs in the field. In discussing this issue with the Department and the Budget Division, we encountered difficulty in reconciling the Governor's proposed budget and how

the federal funds are utilized. The fund maps did not reconcile with either the agency's budget request or the Governor's recommended budget. We have not been able to determine whether or not the Governor's recommendation to replace federal funding with General Fund appropriations is reasonable.

I have suggested a couple of options to consider in closing B/A 101-4195. First would be to approve the Governor's recommendation to replace the federal funding with General Fund appropriations for the dispatcher position. The cost would need to be increased to \$29,851 in the first year and \$30,401 in the second year of the biennium. This is a slight increase to accommodate the increase in the dispatcher's salary and fringe benefits. If that were the direction the Subcommittee takes, staff would recommend the funding not addressed in the Governor's *Executive Budget* be utilized to support the seasonal positions as suggested by NDF.

The other option would be not to approve the Governor's recommendation to replace the federal funding with General Fund appropriations since we have not been able to identify how the federal funding included in the budget is utilized within that budget. This would give the Department and the Budget Division an opportunity to reconcile this funding, and they could come back to IFC with work program changes or other funding issues that may arise.

I would like to direct your attention to two adjustments staff is recommending on page 34 of [Exhibit C](#). The first is to eliminate the reserve in this account associated with federal dollars placed in reserve as a result of the downward reclassification of a position. Staff reduced the grant funds accordingly to eliminate the reserve. Staff is also recommending a technical adjustment to reduce the General Fund appropriations associated with employee physical examination costs in this budget.

CHAIR RHOADS:

I suggest Mr. Pete Anderson discuss the helicopter rehabilitation proposed by Senator Amodei.

PETE ANDERSON (State Forester Firewarden, Division of Forestry, State Department of Conservation and Natural Resources):

Senator Amodei's request would give our third ship a rotation capability so we could keep two ships in service at all times. At this point, we have two ships serviceable, and when one is down for maintenance, we only have one ship in service. With the national focus on shifting to more rotary aircraft and smaller fixed-wing Single Engine Air Tankers, the ability of Nevada to have three ships and a rotation of two would greatly benefit the fire suppression effort across the state.

CHAIR RHOADS:

I understand one problem is that every ten hours helicopters must be maintained. Many times, during a big fire season, you only have two, rather than three, ships in the air.

MR. ANDERSON:

That is true. The helicopter is here, in Minden, and merely requires the breakdown and improvements to make it ready for service.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 21

CHAIR RHOADS:

Would it cost \$128,000 to prepare the helicopter for flight and \$33,000 a year for maintenance?

MR. CHAPMAN:

Based upon the information provided by the Division, it would take approximately \$129,000 to make the helicopter airworthy, along with another \$34,000 a year for maintenance and water buckets that need to be replaced frequently. Fuel costs, repair and maintenance are mostly covered in the fire suppression account. The information provided by the agency is they did not intend to expand the number of hours of operation, but it would be distributed over a larger number of aircraft.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Are you saying we are getting a \$1 million helicopter for \$129,000?

MR. CHAPMAN:

Yes, it is federal excess property.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Is there any revenue that would be realized by using the helicopter for federal purposes? It appears as though we cannot. Is that correct?

MR. ANDERSON:

There is some confusion in your report because on an emergency incident fire suppression, yes, they are fully billable for every minute the helicopter is in the air or on the ground and prepared to fly. In a nonemergency situation, public law 103-411 would be in effect. The vast majority of our revenue is generated through emergency situations.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

Are you saying there is a possibility we will be reimbursed for use of the helicopter in emergency situations?

MR. ANDERSON:

Yes, absolutely.

MR. CHAPMAN:

Just to clarify, Mr. Anderson is correct. There is a significant amount of fire reimbursement revenue that comes in. The only time I do not think that would occur is if it is for state-responsible fires or those portions that affect state property.

MR. ANDERSON:

That is correct.

MR. CHAPMAN:

For the Subcommittee's consideration, if you choose to approve this funding, staff would request this funding be placed in a separate category in order to provide better budget tracking on this project.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4195 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AS DESCRIBED ON PAGES 31 THROUGH 35 OF [EXHIBIT C](#); ITEM 3 ON PAGE 32, THE MINDEN FIRE CONTROL DISPATCHER, APPROVE STAFF OPTION 2 TO HAVE NDF AND THE BUDGET DIVISION RECONCILE THE FUNDING AND APPROACH IFC WITH WORK PROGRAM MODIFICATIONS IF NECESSARY; AND APPROVE THE HELICOPTER REHABILITATION AS RECOMMENDED BY SENATOR AMODEI AND PLACE THE FUNDING IN A SEPARATE CATEGORY TO PROVIDE BETTER BUDGET TRACKING ON THIS PROJECT.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Forest Fire Suppression – Budget Page DCNR-159 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4196

MR. CHAPMAN:

My remarks on B/A 101-4196 are contained on pages 38 and 39 of [Exhibit C](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4196 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Forestry Conservation Camps – Budget Page DCNR-164 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4198

MR. CHAPMAN:

My remarks on B/A 101-4198 are contained on pages 40 through 42 of [Exhibit C](#).

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4198 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 23

SENATOR BEERS:

Is the revenue in this account paid per supervised inmate, per job, or per month?

MR. CHAPMAN:

The revenue the camps earn is based upon a variety of different types of projects. Many times, it is through a contract entered into between the Division and the individual entity receiving the services. I believe the camps use an hourly rate for inmate labor along with equipment charges. Perhaps Mr. Anderson could clarify.

MR. ANDERSON:

That is correct. We have a rather extensive billing rate. We bill right down to chainsaw hours, tool trailers and so forth. Every project undergoes an analysis before we accept it. The contract is executed between whoever the provider is, whether it is a county, community or an individual landowner, and we agree upon the terms. It is based upon the hours and mileage that go into the project.

SENATOR BEERS:

I would be concerned about the motion we just passed because the number of inmates is going to be reduced as we flush out the camps and fill Casa Grande. The prison's own projections were around a 225-inmate reduction in population the second year of the biennium. If their revenue is based on per work hour, they may see a reduction in revenue.

CHAIR MCCLAIN:

In briefings, staff seems to think there will not be that big of a hit for too long a time on inmate workers. The camps will fill up quickly because some will transfer in from other places.

MR. CHAPMAN:

The Subcommittee closed the Department of Corrections' budget to populate the Casa Grande transitional housing with 50 inmates every two weeks. Based upon those population projections, I went back and looked at how that would affect the camps, looking at the number of inmates that were projected for each month, taking out the number of inmates that remained in the camp for camp jobs such as working in the kitchen, grounds maintenance, working in the office and so forth. In each fiscal year for each camp, I looked at the lowest number of inmates available and compared that to the number of inmates that would be needed to fully staff each crew in each camp. A couple of camps come close in the later part of the first year, seven or eight excess inmates in the Humboldt Camp and the Carlin Camp, but the remaining camps should have sufficient inmates to fully populate the crews.

CNR Forestry Inter-governmental Agreements – Budget Page DCNR-171
(Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4227

My remarks on B/A 101-4227 are contained on page 43 of [Exhibit C](#). At the bottom of the page there is an issue regarding the administrative assessment collected in this account from the various counties that is transferred to the Forestry main account in support of position costs associated with oversight of the various county agreements. The current funding calls for a transfer of

\$286,027 in each year of the biennium. This is a continuation from what was approved last session. Based upon the Subcommittee's inquiry, the Division provided an updated calculation, that is an attachment on page 44 of [Exhibit C](#), that would increase the amount to \$374,808 in both years of the biennium. This is based upon a formulary that was developed by the Nevada Association of Counties (NACO) and the Division during the 2001-2003 biennium.

In closing the budgets for this account in the 2001 Legislative Session, an administrative assessment of \$342,000 was budgeted and paid for by the various counties. During the interim, NDF and NACO got together and developed a new formula that reduced the amount to \$286,000 in this biennium. It is up to the Subcommittee if you would like to go along with the higher amount or leave it at the existing amount. I believe Mr. Andrew List is in the audience and probably has comments.

ANDREW LIST (Executive Director, Nevada Association of Counties):

This analysis is correct in the history of what happened with that formula. During the last interim, I met with Mr. Anderson from NDF and we worked out a formula to justify the cost allocation of what the counties pay to NDF for support in those fire protection districts. We arrived at an amount of \$286,000 that was agreed upon at that time. The NACO believes the formula does not adequately reflect the cost at this time, because it is based, in part, on assessed valuation of properties. This would increase the county cost allocation by more than 30 percent over the two-year period.

We understand what Mr. Anderson's office is going through and what his Department goes through with their increases in salaries, equipment maintenance and cost, and we understand the efforts they put forth. However, an increase of 31 percent over two years is difficult for us to accept. We agree on two things. One is to factor in an inflationary measure over the \$286,000 allocated last session, roughly 2.5 or 2.6 percent over the past two years, and individually increase those amounts. Subsequently, over the next interim, we would revisit this formula, bring it back into line and remove the assessed valuation component. When we developed the formula, we did not predict the spikes in assessed valuation that would drive our cost allocations up by more than 30 percent.

CHAIR McCLAIN:

If the formula is based on assessed valuation, is that before or after the 3-percent cap?

MR. LIST:

It is based on the amounts before the 3-percent cap.

SENATOR BEERS:

As we contemplate the effects of this cap, it is important to remember the percentage we are operating on as the amount of the increase does not accommodate newly-developed property. Newly-developed property will come on tax roles, particularly in Clark County, at a massively-inflated value even over this year's massively inflated value. There is a chronic underestimation of the proceeds of property tax in the Legislature.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 25

CHAIR RHOADS:

It appears even the small counties, such as Eureka, have an increase of approximately \$3,000. If we leave it like it is, that will be a hit on this budget. Is that correct, staff?

MR. CHAPMAN:

It would not be a hit on this budget the way it is currently funded with the \$286,000. The reason staff suggested looking into this during the budget hearing was an effort to try to reconcile what the assessments should reflect and offset General Fund appropriations that are supporting position costs in the main account.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Would it be reasonable to bring it up on the CPI?

MR. CHAPMAN:

I suppose that is one option available to the Subcommittee. Staff has not evaluated that option. Given the short time frame we have in closing these budgets, you could perhaps go with another percentage rate, but it would not be based on anything.

CHAIR RHOADS:

What are our options?

MR. CHAPMAN:

You could stay with what is currently in the budget or use the maximum amount, \$374,808, based upon the current methodology that NDF and NACO developed last interim. Another option would be to use something in between.

MR. LIST:

Going with some sort of CPI rather than with this formula that is out of line currently, with the increase in assessed valuations, would more accurately reflect NDF's costs and their increased costs over the last two years.

MR. CHAPMAN:

I would point out if the Subcommittee chose to use some type of CPI index, there is a variety of CPI index inflators, and we are uncertain as to which would be appropriate now. Staff would suggest going back to county, FY 2003 or FY 2004, in calculating the fire protection rate.

CHAIR MCCLAIN:

I suggest we split the difference and make it \$330,000, and NDF and NACO can work out something new for next session.

MR. ANDERSON:

No matter what, we have to revisit this formula because we did not anticipate the tax cap and the rapid growth in assessed valuations.

MR. LIST:

Splitting it up the middle is fine, but I would still like to see how that reflects on a county-by-county basis. I know NDF's workload in the more populated areas, such as Washoe and Douglas Counties, would cause those counties to take the

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 26

bigger brunt of this increase because there are more people and threats of fire in those areas.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4227 WITH A TRANSFER OF \$330,000 IN ADMINISTRATIVE ASSESSMENT TO FORESTRY B/A 101-4195.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Forestry Nurseries – Budget Page DCNR-176 (Volume III)
Budget Account 257-4235

MR. CHAPMAN:

Please refer to page 45 of [Exhibit C](#). There are no issues in this account. The only thing I would note is there is a CPI to renovate the Las Vegas nursery in Clark County. The CPI bill will probably include language to call for a repayment provision. Therefore, staff would recommend closing this budget as recommended by the Governor.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4235 AS RECOMMENDED BY THE GOVERNOR.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

MR. ANDERSON:

As you know, the nursery budget works as an enterprise account. If we are going to go into a repayment program of 20 years, we would appreciate support from all the other state agencies to utilize our nursery for plant materials and seed. We tread a fine line as it is with the private sector. It is difficult for us to raise revenues and prices of plants, and we play a critical role in evasive weed control, noxious weeds and fire rehabilitation. I do not wish to see the nursery placed into too big a bind.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

WILDLIFE

Wildlife – Budget Page WILDLIFE-1 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4452

Please refer to page 51 of [Exhibit C](#). There has been extensive discussion during the budget hearings and the work session held on April 19, 2005, regarding the ending reserve balances recommended by the Governor in this account and the Boating Program account (B/A 101-4456). Addressing B/A 101-4452 first, the Department provided a prioritized listing of suggested budget amendments,

bulleted on page 52 of [Exhibit C](#). The agency's response in providing those items is located on pages 56 and 57 of [Exhibit C](#). I have recapped the bulleted items on page 58 of [Exhibit C](#), showing the cumulative impact of those items. Based upon the Department's suggestions, the ending reserve would increase from \$52,680 at the end of the second year of the biennium to a projected level of approximately \$1.14 million, based upon these various budget amendments.

Staff has reviewed the budget amendments in conjunction with the review of the lodging tax receipts the Commission on Tourism collects. This budget included \$200,000 a year prior to FY 2004 that came from the Commission on Tourism. However, due to the tragedy of September 11, 2001, and the downturn in Nevada's economy, those transfers of room tax dollars to the Department of Wildlife (NDOW) were discontinued in the 2003-2005 biennium. Based upon revenue projections of this revenue source, there will be sufficient funds to reinstate the \$200,000 each year if the Subcommittee chooses.

On page 53 of [Exhibit C](#), based upon information provided by the NDOW, staff suggests the following options at the top of the page in closing this budget.

CHAIR RHOADS:

Does the Department have to follow a procedure to obtain the \$200,000 or would they receive it automatically?

MR. CHAPMAN:

It would be a budgetary action built into the Tourism budget as a transfer out. It would then be transferred into B/A 101-4452.

Staff would suggest accepting priority items 1, 2 and 5, relating to adjusting the balance forward from the amounts currently in the Governor's *Executive Budget* to slightly over \$1 million being balanced forward. This would reduce the transfers of \$100,000 a year from the Boating Program account and eliminate vehicle purchases in the second year of the biennium.

E-811 Unclassified Changes – Page WILDLIFE-10

Staff would suggest not accepting priority item 3 which eliminates positions recommended to change from classified to unclassified service in module E-811. Module E-811 will be discussed by the money committees at a later date.

The bulleted item at the top of page 53 of [Exhibit C](#) is to incorporate vacancy savings of \$200,000 each year instead of \$400,000 in the first year as suggested in priority item 4. This would be a more even distribution that would allow the Department to cover unforeseen costs associated with terminal leave payments paid out for individuals and staff who retire from the Department. It is more reflective of what the Department actually experiences in their category 01 expenditures.

Staff would not recommend accepting item 6 which was the Department's proposal to eliminate helicopter operations in the second year of the biennium at a cost of \$121,000. Assuming the other adjustments suggested by staff and the Department are accepted, this item would not need to be removed from the budget. We would modify priority 7 which is to address the actual statewide

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 28

cost allocation and Attorney General cost allocation in the budget to their final amounts. If the Subcommittee closes this budget based upon these recommendations, the projected reserve balance in the second year would increase to \$1.3 million.

The other item to note in this account is the increase in General Fund appropriations. My remarks regarding this item are contained on pages 53 and 54 of [Exhibit C](#).

CHAIR McCLAIN:

The Governor's *Executive Budget* recommends Upland Gamebird fee revenues of \$351,467 in FY 2005-2006 and \$389,958 in FY 2006-2007. Is that revenue coming in for the Sage Grouse projects?

MR. CHAPMAN:

Yes, that is revenue the agency is projecting to receive associated with the \$10 upland game bird fee. Those amounts are going directly into reserve. The Department, through the Wildlife Commission, develops a list of projects approved by the Wildlife Commission, for expenditure of those funds. Once the Wildlife Commission identifies and approves those projects, the Department usually submits a work program to the IFC for approval.

CHAIR McCLAIN:

Why cannot the \$300,000 Sage Grouse project be funded by the reserve?

MR. CHAPMAN:

You can probably make a decision regarding that funding. I know the Wildlife Commission approved a number of projects at their last meeting, and I do not know at what level they approved those projects. Perhaps Mr. Doug Hunt can answer that question.

CHAIR McCLAIN:

I have one more policy question. Are you saying the Wildlife Commission has authority to expend money, and legislative oversight is after the fact?

MR. CHAPMAN:

That is correct. The Legislature has granted authority to the Wildlife Commission to approve projects utilizing these funds.

CHAIR McCLAIN:

Are there any other commissions with similar authority?

MR. CHAPMAN:

I am uncertain of the answer.

CHAIR McCLAIN:

We have an anomaly with one commission that actually has budgetary authority and has for many years. Someone needs to look into that.

SENATOR BEERS:

The funds for the Wildlife Commission are different as well. There are not many things the state auctions off. Part of the appeal to the bidders of the auction is

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 29

knowing their proceeds are going toward a cause they strongly support. This is a different situation.

CHAIR MCCLAIN:

I understand that. My concern is that we have created a commission of nonelected laypeople and have given them total budget control. That is not a good policy.

DOUG HUNT (Acting Deputy Director, Department of Wildlife):

The Wildlife Commission, while they approve the projects, still have to take those projects before the IFC for final approval. That is the legislative oversight.

CHAIR MCCLAIN:

That is fine. It is just that they make all the decisions and then say they cannot change it because the board already made the decision.

ASSEMBLYMAN DENIS:

There are many more agencies that operate similarly. We have to rely on people who have been appointed to positions that specialize in specific areas to make some of the decisions for us.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER:

On page 53 of [Exhibit C](#), if we reinstate transfers of lodging tax receipts from the Commission on Tourism, since we closed several tourism budgets already, how will that affect those budgets?

MR. CHAPMAN:

I did not participate in that budget closing process, but it is my understanding there has been a large level of reserve identified in that account that has not been portioned out. When these budgets, such as the NDOW, the State Parks, which receives Tourism funding, go before the full closings in each of the respective money committees, those issues will be finally tabulated, and how the reserves are used in the Tourism account will be finalized at that time. This is one recommendation. There are a variety of recommendations before the money committees that address state parks, cultural affairs, railroad museums and that type of thing.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4452 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS AND STAFF SUGGESTIONS AS FOLLOWS: UNDER ITEM 1, INCLUDE \$200,000 EACH YEAR FROM ROOM TAX; UNDER DEFERRED MAINTENANCE, USE 100 PERCENT OF QUESTION 1 BOND PROCEEDS; AND USE UPLAND GAME BIRD FEES FROM THE RESERVE ACCOUNT IN THE AMOUNT OF \$150,000 ON THE SAGE GROUSE PROJECTS TO DEFRAID \$150,000 IN GENERAL FUNDS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 30

SENATOR TITUS:

I want to clarify when we take the money from Question 1 bond money what we are doing. That money was intended for something else, was it not? How much are we taking from Question 1, and where will that leave us?

MR. CHAPMAN:

The authorization for utilization of Question 1 bond proceeds is fairly wide open. The renovation of facilities is the focus of this decision unit. It is doing renovation work on residences in the various wildlife management areas and other projects. The authority to use Question 1 bond proceeds on renovation of facilities would suggest it would be an appropriate use.

SENATOR TITUS:

What is the status of the Question 1 money in terms of how much we have used, how much is there and how long it will last?

MR. CHAPMAN:

The first bond sale was around \$98 million, and approximately one-half remains. The NDOW's initial allocation was \$6 million. Of that \$6 million, \$5 million was targeted for the hatchery refurbishment program that we will discuss in a moment.

SENATOR TITUS:

How much would be used for deferred maintenance?

M-425 Deferred Facilities Maintenance – Page WILDLIFE-6

MR. CHAPMAN:

The total would be \$207,450 in the first year and \$249,276 in the second year of the biennium. As I indicated, the Governor recommended one-half of those amounts be paid with General Funds and the other one-half with Question 1 money. The motion was to fund all of deferred maintenance with Question 1 money. Currently, we have approximately \$450,000 in total funding cost for M-425. Approximately one-half of that is General Funds and one-half is Question 1 money. The motion would increase the Question 1 allocation to approximately \$450,000.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Wildlife - Boating Program – Budget Page WILDLIFE-14 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4456

MR. CHAPMAN:

We have a similar situation in this account as in the previous account. The reserve level recommended by the Governor was extremely low. The Department provided a priority list that would suggest increasing the ending reserve balance to \$591,000. Based upon a couple of corrections, that amount is reduced to \$297,000 at the end of the second year of the biennium. I have identified those and they are on pages 63 and 64 of [Exhibit C](#). Page 63 lists the

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 31

items suggested by the Department, and page 64 lists the corrections staff made.

E-710 Replacement Equipment – Page WILDLIFE-17

E-720 New Equipment – Page WILDLIFE-17

During the budget hearings and work session, there was a desire by the Subcommittee to try to reach a \$400,000 to \$500,000 ending reserve balance in the second year. If the Subcommittee chooses to accept staff recommendation of \$300,000 and would like to go closer to the \$500,000 range, the Department indicated they would be willing to eliminate new radios recommended in module E-720 that total \$182,000 in the second year. This would bring the ending reserve balance to \$479,000 with the understanding the Department could approach the IFC to reinstate those radio purchases should the funding situation change in this account. Additionally, in order to get to this reserve level, the Department suggested eliminating one boat in the first year of the biennium in module E-710.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE BUDGET ACCOUNT 101-4456 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDING NDOW'S SUGGESTION TO INCREASE RESERVES AND ELIMINATE ONE BOAT.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN KOIVISTO SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Wildlife Account – Trout Management – Budget Page WILDLIFE-21 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4454

MR. CHAPMAN:

Staff has no major closing issues in this account. Staff recommends closing B/A 101-4454 with the Governor's recommendations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4454 WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Wildlife Obligated Reserve – Budget Page WILDLIFE-23 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-4458

MR. CHAPMAN:

There are no major closing issues in this account. However, with the closing action taken in the main account, B/A 101-4452, transferring \$150,000 of upland game bird reserves to this account, staff requests authority to adjust this account to reflect that transfer. Other than that, staff recommends closing this account with the Governor's recommendations.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-4458 WITH THE GOVERNOR'S RECOMMENDATIONS AND WITH STAFF AUTHORITY TO ADJUST THIS ACCOUNT TO REFLECT THE TRANSFER OF \$150,000 OF UPLAND GAME BIRD RESERVES FROM B/A 101-4452 TO THIS ACCOUNT.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VETERANS' SERVICES

Commissioner for Veterans' Affairs – Budget Page VETERANS-1 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-2560

BOB GUERNSEY (Principal Deputy Fiscal Analyst, Fiscal Analysis Division, Legislative Counsel Bureau):

Please refer to page 69 of [Exhibit C](#). As the Subcommittee is aware, the agency requested 14 new positions under Items for Special Consideration. The initial budget recommended no positions. The Governor submitted budget amendment No. 2 which recommends six new positions to deal with some of the caseload problems at both the cemeteries and with the veterans' services officers and would provide adequate clerical support for those positions which has not existed in the past. The positions are scheduled to start on October 1, 2005. The operating and travel is scheduled to begin on July 1, 2005. Staff made technical corrections to align that with three-quarters of a year.

The statewide cost allocation has been adjusted. Item 2 under Other Closing Items talks about a move that is coming up. Funding is included for that move. We have adjusted computer prices. Item 4 on page 70 of [Exhibit C](#) indicates there is funding included for repaving at the two cemeteries. The State Public Works Board indicated they would not desire to manage this project and would like the agency to handle it. I have adjusted in-state travel and included information regarding salary recommendations in the budget for the unclassified positions contained within this budget.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-2560 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS INCLUDING THE SIX NEW POSITIONS LISTED IN BUDGET AMENDMENT NO. 2.

ASSEMBLYMAN HOGAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

Veterans' Home Account – Budget Page VETERANS-7 (Volume III)
Budget Account 101-2561

MR. GUERNSEY:

There are a number of adjustments contained within this budget beginning on page 72 of [Exhibit C](#). The Veterans' Home in Boulder City is a 180-bed facility. The budget is constructed at a 90-percent capacity rate. They are currently running between 149 and the low 150s. They also have 181 authorized positions. They have had significant problems in recruiting positions. They are currently running approximately 30 positions down, 20 of which are direct-care staff. It has resulted in major overtime problems. As of May 8, 2005, the Home has paid \$521,201 in overtime. It is a significant problem for the agency.

The Governor's *Executive Budget* includes a two-grade pay increase for nurses. The agency has recently received authority to bring positions in, certified nursing assistants, registered nurses and licensed practical nurses at an accelerated rate. The agency is already starting to feel the results of that, and the recruitment efforts have greatly improved. Staff is recommending that in order to monitor, on an ongoing basis, the overtime staffing problems, the Subcommittee may wish to ask the agency to provide quarterly reports to the IFC dealing with those items.

Under Other Closing Items, item 1, the budget was constructed with no increase in revenues for Medicaid and Medicare in FY 2007. Under item 3, staff has worked with the agency and is recommending increases to reflect the cost and salary increases reflected in the budget. That results in additional General Fund savings, under Medicaid, of \$120,442 in FY 2007, and under Title XVIII, savings of \$37,272. That would be a direct offset to the state General Fund.

The agency has both vacancy savings and operational savings in the current fiscal year. The agency has been working closely with the Budget Division trying to utilize those savings during the current year which would result in savings in the out years. That amount is reflected in item 4 under Other Closing Items, on page 72 of [Exhibit C](#), repairing the cooling towers, at \$86,000 per year. The agency feels this can be done during the current year using an alternative method and they would have sufficient funds to handle that.

Contracts have been reduced for a onetime item of \$50,000 and some other items. One item the Subcommittee needs to look at, near the top of page 73 of [Exhibit C](#), is decision unit E-200.

E-200 Reward More Efficient Operations – Page VETERANS-10

It is an education proposal displayed on page 74, and it is a unique item at \$8,976 in FY 2006 and almost \$18,000 in FY 2007. It is a proposal to reimburse employees for college classes. The student would have to obtain a grade of C or better and submit a copy of the grades with a receipt for the cost

of the class. This is an item that is not normally found in a state budget. I do not have a recommendation one way or the other.

I should briefly mention item 10 under Other Closing Items, on Page 73 of [Exhibit C](#). The agency originally requested a registered nurse V be reclassified to an administrative services officer. The agency has deleted that request, but is currently requesting of the Budget Division that a nonclinical position be reclassified to an assistant administrator. Currently, the administrator of that facility is the only one licensed to operate the facility. They need adequate backup and staff agrees. It is not directly reflected in the budget at this time, but will come before the IFC.

Item 13, on page 73 of [Exhibit C](#), is a onetime appropriation of \$126,000 to construct a vehicle shelter to protect vehicles in Boulder City. It was reduced by the Senate Committee on Finance to \$60,000.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN MCCLAIN MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO CLOSE B/A 101-2561 WITH STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS; REQUEST QUARTERLY REPORTS TO THE IFC ON OVERTIME COSTS AND CONTRACT NURSING PROBLEMS; AND TO SUPPORT CONTINUATION OF THE EDUCATION FUNDING REQUEST.

SENATOR BEERS SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

* * * * *

SENATOR TITUS:

There is a bill in the Senate Committee on Finance to create a Women's Veterans Coordinator for \$120,000 over the biennium. There are 30,000 women veterans in the state without a coordinator. Idaho has 6,000 women veterans, and they have a coordinator. Is there a way to put the Women's Veterans Coordinator into this budget with the staff increases?

MR. GUERNSEY:

That is S.B. 505, currently in the Senate Committee on Finance. The cost in FY 2006 would be \$52,188, and in FY 2007, \$62,500. The cost would cover staff support, an outreach program to deal with women veterans which is a silent group in our state that has demonstrated a need for services.

SENATE BILL 505: Makes appropriation to Office of Veterans' Services for establishment of outreach program for Nevada's women veterans.
(BDR S-1421)

CHAIR RHOADS:

Could we put that in this budget?

MR. GUERNSEY:

If the Committee so chooses, you could.

Joint Subcommittee on Public Safety/Natural Resources/Transportation
Senate Committee on Finance
Assembly Committee on Ways and Means
May 12, 2005
Page 35

CHARLES (CHUCK) W. FULKERSON (Executive Director, Office of Veterans' Services):
We would recommend the position be put into B/A 101-2560.

SENATOR TITUS MOVED TO RECOMMEND TO THE FULL COMMITTEE TO APPROVE AN APPROPRIATION OF \$52,188 IN FY 2006 AND \$62,500 IN FY 2007 TO ESTABLISH A WOMEN'S VETERAN COORDINATOR POSITION IN B/A 101-2560.

ASSEMBLYWOMAN WEBER SECONDED THE MOTION.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CHAIR RHOADS:
There being no further business to come before the Subcommittee, the meeting is adjourned at 11:05 a.m.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:

Jo Greenslate,
Committee Secretary

APPROVED BY:

Senator Dean A. Rhoads, Chair

DATE: _____

Assemblywoman Kathy A. McClain, Chair

DATE: _____