

H B

3 2 3

I. REQUEST

Bill/Resolution No: SCSCSHB 323 (SA)Title: Residency and residency re-
quirementsSponsor: State Affairs CommitteeRequestor: Senate Judiciary

II. FISCAL DETAIL

Agency Affected: RevenueProgram Category Affected: Coll. & Mgmt.BRU, Program of Subprogram(s) Affected:
Administration & Support

EXPENDITURES/REVENUES: (Thousands of Dollars)

	FY 83	FY 84	FY 85	FY 86	FY 87	FY 88
OPERATING						
100 PERSONAL SERVICES	-	-	-	-	-	-
200 TRAVEL	0	1.0	-	-	-	-
300 CONTRACTUAL	-	-	-	-	-	-
400 COMMODITIES	0	3.0	1.3	1.4	1.5	-
500 EQUIPMENT	0	2.0	-	-	-	-
600 LANDS & STRUCTURES	-	-	-	-	-	-
700 GRANTS, CLAIMS, ETC.	-	-	-	-	-	-
TOTAL OPERATING	0	6.0	1.3	1.4	1.5	-
CAPITAL						
	-	-	-	-	-	-
REVENUE						
	-	-	-	-	-	-

FUNDING: (Thousands of Dollars)

GENERAL FUND	0	6.0	1.3	1.4	1.5	-
FEDERAL FUNDS	-	-	-	-	-	-
OTHER (Specify Source)	-	-	-	-	-	-
Sport Fish Fund	0	(18.2)	(38.5)	(40.8)	(43.4)	-
Game Fund	0	(14.1)	(30.0)	(31.8)	(33.6)	-

POSITIONS:

FULL-TIME	-	-	-	-	-	-
PART-TIME	-	-	-	-	-	-
TEMPORARY	-	-	-	-	-	-

III. SOURCE OF FUNDS TO OFFSET FISCAL IMPACT OF BILL:

IV. ANALYSIS: Attach a separate page for any Analysis.

Prepared By: Cecilia A. WagonerDivision: Revenue - Fish and GamePhone: 465-2376Date: 6/13/83Approved by Commissioner: Joseph P. DonohueDepartment: RevenueDate: 6/14/83

Distribution:

Original to Legislative Finance

Copy to Office of Management and Budget (for Legislature introduced bills)

Copy to Department (for Governor introduced bills)

Copy to Sponsor

Copy to Requestor (if different from Sponsor)

IV. Analysis of SCSCSHB 323 (State Affairs)

Three thousand is needed to initially design and print applications and the permanent I.D. card and to order enough laminating jackets for the fiscal year. Each subsequent fiscal year we will have the cost of additional laminating jackets. The equipment cost is for three laminating machines; one for the Public Services Counter in Anchorage, one for Fairbanks, and one for Juneau. The travel expenditure is for the Records & Licensing Supervisor to go to Anchorage and Fairbanks and instruct the counter employees.

According to data received from the Department of Labor and the Committee for Older Alaskans, the percentage rate of senior citizens in our state is fairly stable from year to year.

Using FY 82 as the base, it is estimated that there will be a six percent increase in resident sales every year. It is also estimated that three percent of the resident sales are sold to residents sixty years or older.

We are recommending that this bill be amended to include an effective date of January 1, 1984, because license changes traditionally take place at the beginning of a calendar year. If implemented in the middle of the year, some licensees who could be eligible would have already purchased their license and it wouldn't be fair to them. Middle of the year implementation would also require special printing and mailing costs. Time is also needed to properly inform the public of the new law so that all who are eligible can apply.

Assuming that the bill goes into effect 1/1/84, there will be no effect in FY 83. There will be losses to both the Sport Fish and Game Funds in each subsequent fiscal year. FY 84 has a much smaller loss because only half of the fiscal year will be effected.

STATE OF ALASKA

BILL SHEFFIELD, GOVERNOR

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

POUCH C (MS 0200)
JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811
PHONE: (907) 465-2200

OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER

April 19, 1983

RECEIVED
APR 26 1984

Representative John Lindauer
Chairman, House Subcommittee on Dept. of Administration's
Budget
Pouch V
Juneau, Alaska 99811

Re: Classification Study

Dear Rep. Lindauer,

This is in response to an inquiry regarding the need for a classification study. Currently the state sets salary ranges for various job classifications on the traditional system of classification. This means that the goal is to set salaries on the basis of market wages and internal equity by comparing similar classifications.

The Problems

There are many problems with this system. It was established over 40 years ago and is administered manually by classifiers who try to properly match some 13,000 positions to some 1,200 definitions of classifications ("class specifications"). The matching is based on written job descriptions usually prepared by the employees. Our present system is too easily manipulated by the way position descriptions are creatively written and too readily influenced by subjective evaluations and fluctuating market values. The result has been that the state cannot now respond to complaints filed by women and minorities who demand to know for example, why carpenters are paid more than secretaries.

Liability

The traditional system of classification which the state now uses does not have the ability to respond to these questions of "comparable worth". At the present time the Public Health Nurses have a complaint filed against the state with a current liability of approximately one million dollars because they claim they should be paid the same as physicians assistants. We do not even have a classification system which can tell if this claim is justified. Since all physicians assistants are men and the overwhelming majority of public health nurses are women,

Rep. John Lindauer
April 19, 1983
Page Two

the claim is made that the state is intentionally discriminating against women. Other groups of employees stand ready to challenge our present classification system on the same or similar bases. Therefore, we must obtain a new state-of-the-art classification system which can adequately respond to these charges of discrimination and which will allow employees salary ranges to be set on a more objective basis.

Necessary Legislative Action

What is needed is the necessary funds in order to publish a request for proposals to obtain a modern classification system. Many private companies have such systems which can be implemented by the state. Both unions and management should be involved in the selection process and agree ahead of time on the method to resolve disputes which will result from a new system. All positions in the state must be reevaluated and assigned to appropriate classifications as a result of implementing the new, more objective system. This system would be automated and accessible and the classification process would become an open process.

In order to know the approximate cost of such a large project, three private firms were contacted to obtain an unofficial estimate. The average was approximately \$500,000.00. This is a large amount of money and if we could obtain the new system for less, we would lapse the remaining funds. While this figure is high, it is small in comparison to our liability in the face of continuing complaints.

I will be glad to answer any questions you have on this subject.

Sincerely,



Lisa Rudd
Commissioner

LR/FR/gmw


~~2500~~ 500

2500
1500

How job classif. vary
from Dept # 1510. for different rags

What skills are needed
for low-paying jobs?
Range 70-40

How many have college degrees?
How many overqualified, just
to get into system?



Bills

Court Adm removed from SRS

Teachers go back to 30 yr retirement

Open Registry System

Amend PA

Bargaining Unit Members by Range & Step Supervisors

Effective May 1, 1983

	A	B	C	D	E	F	J	K	L	M
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
12	2	7	2	3	4	1	4	2	0	0
13	0	0	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	0
14	9	5	10	3	3	7	3	0	0	0
15	0	5	2	3	4	3	0	1	0	0
16	6	9	5	3	5	6	1	4	1	0
17	3	5	3	2	3	6	4	4	2	0
18	20	27	19	9	19	18	11	18	2	2
19	6	8	5	12	11	20	8	7	2	0
20	23	27	26	28	25	42	31	39	10	3
21	12	11	13	10	12	15	19	18	7	1
22	17	13	17	13	24	25	14	25	5	1 154
23	7	10	11	8	7	16	10	12	4	1 86
24	0	5	4	4	4	6	5	6	0	0 31
25	1	0	1	0	2	0	3	1	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0
27	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0

Bargaining Unit Members by Range & Step GGU

Effective May 1, 1983

	A	B	C	D	E	F	J	K	L	M
5	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	35	4	11	5	2	4	0	1	0	0
7	255	156	51	28	12	25	2	14	3	1
8	259	299	155	66	43	69	32	28	8	1
9	265	156	73	36	23	37	8	17	6	3
10	116	28	75	46	43	52	23	17	6	0
11	228	134	54	26	18	20	9	9	4	0
12	170	131	90	77	45	39	33	25	3	0
13	140	208	68	40	47	75	17	25	8	1
14	227	155	104	73	43	62	33	19	3	0
15	55	32	26	26	34	32	23	26	8	1
16	270	214	146	97	65	87	31	47	6	2
17	62	50	26	15	4	17	7	2	1	0
18	112	131	90	80	57	77	49	66	16	4
19	62	38	49	34	30	37	15	20	4	0
20	16	30	20	20	20	23	11	6	1	2
21	25	16	28	15	16	29	9	15	1	1 309
22	1	2	6	3	5	6	2	6	0	0 31
23	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0 2
24	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4	0	0 6
25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
27	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

NOTE: ORIGINAL DOCUMENT IS COLOR-CODED. IF NECESSARY
TO PROPER INTERPRETATION, REFER TO ORIGINAL DOCUMENT
IN THE ALASKA STATE ARCHIVES

STATE OF ALASKA

Survey

Salaries & Benefits

KENNETH L. KAREEN
DIRECTOR of PERSONNEL

DECEMBER
1982

analysis

problem w/ % of COLA increases. lower ends hit hardest. yet COLA is based on % of your salary rather than a flat rate. should be more equitable

what determines range w/ job title. how can it be adjusted? Does AFSA have a say in structure as it is set-up currently? do not believe to say a sup to say best 4-5 - most exp, most exp. understand that for, commr only have sev I & I numerical at II & III's, few IV. yet, secretaries work done by III's primarily, but they are not classified higher than large 8.

class

Admin Officers

budget process, new comparable study classification

House budget 1/2 million

Lindau

after salary schedule

in prepared

7/2 no

3 1/4 no



changing - last

Name: John M. [unclear] / Labor Relations Guy / Frank Payne ~~PHS~~
 4403 / 4430

Percentage of emp in range 8-12 classes MIF
 Range 13 ~~14~~ - 18
 19-24
 break down in groups & sep act.

Sort w/ range 8 - 2 25-27
 give all back up on job titles that falling under (use check box) 37.5w/

Range 7A		CLT II
Range 8A	1,487	CLERK III
9A	1,578.00	CLERK IV
10A	1,673.00	Sec. I.
11A	1,782.00	Sec II
		Sec III
12A	1,881.00	Admin Admin ASST

what determines ~~class~~ range w/ job classification
 percentage that increase or raises vs. % of salaries.

Can that job titles be raised, how

400 Salaries

Personnel Rules - in law + rules

Title 34 — Exa Gov off.
DEC, where: Politically exempt. No names
classified open to public
political appointees. 1 yr to get on list
or get fired

Met w Bert go thru rules
Ranking fine
Open list you could have more women on priority
than on top 5.

~~work place range~~ average for state
average for Admin offices range 13+

special appro of. or amend Title 18 34) Chapter
~~for comparable work~~ 39.25 PA

to require d class
system to grow to
comparable work