

Approved March 21, 1988  
Date

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

The meeting was called to order by SENATOR AUGUST "GUS" BOGINA at  
Chairperson

11:00 a.m. ~~8:30~~ on FEBRUARY 26, 1988 in room 123-S of the Capitol.

All members were present except:

Committee staff present:

Research Department: Scott Rothe, Russ Mills, Laura Howard, Lynne Holt,  
Paul West, Ed Ahrens

Revisor's Office: Norman Furse

Committee Staff: Judy Bromich, Pam Parker

Conferees appearing before the committee:

Winston Barton, Secretary, Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services

Gary Hulett, Under Secretary, Department of Health and Environment

Linda Selby, Community Mental Health/Mental Retardation Services

Lila Pasley, Association of Retarded Citizens of Kansas

Frances Jarchow, Public Advisory Committee for Energy Assistance and  
Weatherization

After calling the meeting to order, the Chairman explained that the Committee meeting today is the official hearing required by federal law with respect to the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services Federal Block Grant Hearing and with respect to the Department of Health and Environment Federal Block Grant Hearing.

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES FEDERAL BLOCK GRANT HEARING

The Chairman called the hearing on the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services Federal Block Grant Hearing to order.

Secretary Barton distributed and reviewed information relating to Kansas Social Service Block Grant, Low Income Energy Assistance Block Grant, Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant, Community Service Block Grant, and the Mental Health Block Grant funds. (Attachments 1, 2, and 3) Committee members questioned Secretary Barton concerning certain portions of the grants. In response to a question concerning the Community Service Block Grant, Secretary Barton stated that SRS tries to audit funds spent on this grant. He stated that there are some definite problems in this program and he stated that he would welcome a study of the program by Legislative Post Audit.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT FEDERAL BLOCK GRANT HEARING

The Chairman called the hearing on the Department of Health and Environment Federal Block Grant Hearing to order.

Dr. Hulett distributed and reviewed information relating to Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grants and Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant. (Attachment 4) Dr. Hulett noted that between 54 and 55 percent of the expenditures for the block grants are for state operations, between 37 and 38 percent is spent for aid to counties, between two and three percent goes for aid to local units other than local health departments, and four to five percent of the expenditures are for grants to other state agencies.

Ms. Pasley called attention to the importance of the block grant in Adult Services for those working with the mentally retarded citizens of the state. She reported that last year 2,000 individuals were served with those funds. She noted that in the FY 89 proposed budget there is a one percent increase, however due to the reduction of federal funds that grant will just about

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,

room 123-S, Statehouse, at 11:00 a.m./~~p.m.~~ on FEBRUARY 26, 1988

come out even with last year. She asked the Committee's support for not reducing those funds and pointed out that any reduction in this block grant would jeopardize people currently being served through those funds.

Ms. Jarchow presented her remarks. (Attachment 5)

The Chairman requested additional comments on any part of the federal block grants. Since there were no further conferees, he declared the hearing closed.

Senator Winter moved, Senator Talkington seconded, that the Committee introduce bill draft 7 RS 2495, an act relating to public wholesale water supply districts; authorizing a district to issue refunding general obligation bonds. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Senator Winter moved, Senator Feleciano seconded, the introduction of the following bill drafts as requested by the Board of Regents:

7 RS 1911 - An act repealing K.S.A. 76-161, creating dormitory operating fund.

7 RS 1916 - An act concerning institutional licenses for veterinarians.

7 RS 1919 - An act concerning the treatment act for mentally ill persons.

7 RS 2428 - An act concerning postsecondary education; relating to conferral of degrees and registration of courses and programs by certain institutions thereof.

7 RS 2625 - An act authorizing the state board of regents to sell certain real estate in Wichita, Kansas; imposing conditions thereon.

SB 550 - Appropriations for FY 89, department of administration, finance council, department of wildlife and parks, corporation commission and historical society.

The Chairman announced that the meeting will be adjourned before the completion of review of SB 550, and that time will be allotted for its finish on Monday, February 29th before the review of SB 572.

Staff distributed and Senator Werts began the review of the Subcommittee Reports on SB 550 and SB 571.

During discussion of Section 2, Department of Administration, Senator Doyen moved, Senator Feleciano seconded, the addition of \$5,000 in FY 1989 for the addition of the state seal in the center of the bronze star on the law enforcement memorial on the northeast lawn of the Capitol grounds. The motion carried on a voice vote.

Following the reading of his minority report regarding the State Finance Council, Section 2 of SB 571 and Section 3 of SB 550, Senator Feleciano moved, Senator Johnston seconded, to delete the Senate Subcommittee Recommendation number one for both FY 88 and FY 89. During discussion, Senator Kerr distributed a memorandum from the Kansas Legislative Research Department dated February 15, 1988 regarding Illustrative Salary Increases for State Classified Employees from FY 1973 to FY 1988. He noted that because of a lack of information available from KIPPS, conclusive summary data is not available which is needed for this kind of determination; however, staff derived four examples, that are as good as the information allows, of what employees might have been able to expect in working their way up through the plans over several years. (Attachments 6 and 7) He noted that the state already has a longevity pay plan through the pay matrix, promotion and longevity so it was his recommendation to the Subcommittee to delete the Governor's longevity pay plan and make that money available for a more targeted use. Senator Winter made a substitute motion, Senator

CONTINUATION SHEET

MINUTES OF THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,  
room 123-S, Statehouse, at 11:00 a.m.~~p.m.~~ on FEBRUARY 26, 1988

Johnston seconded, to add language which would appropriate \$1.0 million (State General Fund) to the State Finance Council leaving options available to implement the longevity pay plan in FY 1988 and FY 1989 or funding the Phase III of the reclassification plan. During discussion, Senator Winter stated that he would rather leave the money in the budget than to try to get it reinstated at a later time. Following further discussion, the substitute motion failed on a show of hands.

The primary motion by Senator Feleciano, seconded by Senator Johnston, carried on a show of hands.

The meeting was adjourned.



GUEST LIST

COMMITTEE: SENATE WAYS AND MEANS

DATE: 2/26/88

NAME (PLEASE PRINT)	ADDRESS	COMPANY/ORGANIZATION
Lila Kaslay		ARC/Kana
Justina D'Brien	Topoka	Washburn University
Bennie Steele	Olzburg, Ks.	Washburn University
Patricia Ross	Topoka	Washburn U.
Karen Joy	Topoka	Washburn U.
Stephanie Shiffin	Topoka	Washburn U.
Janet Schusser	Horton	Washburn U
Martin Carlson	Topoka <sup>2021 SW 65 ST</sup> 66619	Washburn U
Doi Kunnaworn	<del>Topoka</del> <sup>3131 SE 77th</sup> Berryton K. 66408	Washburn
Nelissa Ness	Topoka	KCSK
Janet Schalenky	Topoka	SRS/Adult
Don Paine	"	SRS/ADAS
Andrew O'Donovan	Topoka	SRS/ADAS
Wendy Apple	Topoka	Washburn U.
Ethel Marie McOler	Topoka	ARC/KS
Harry K. Hullett	Topoka	KDHE
Arthur Schuman	Topoka	KDHE
Ruth Shover	Topoka	KSMS
Joseph D. Komade	Topoka	KCC
Mark Intermill	Topoka	KCOA
Greg A. Duggs	"	Ks Dept of Aging
Laura Talle	"	KDHE
Kathy Valerone	Topoka	SRS
Linda Zalesky	Topoka	SRS/MS/RS
Ken Baker	Topoka	KAL PCCA
Julie Cross	Topoka	Washburn U.
Tom Low	PC	SRS
Pamela Klotz	Assoc of Dist Hts Ks	Topoka
John Conrad	Topoka	Governor
Dot Schwaninger	"	KDHE
Sherry Brown	Topoka	DoA/DISC
Charles Dodson	TOPEKA	KAPE
Walter Jants	Topoka	SWAM 2-26-88





DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES

PUBLIC HEARING

ON

BLOCK GRANTS

	<u>Page</u>
a. Kansas Social Service Block Grant	1
b. Low Income Energy Assistance Block Grant	4
c. Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Block Grant	6
d. Community Service Block Grant	7

Winston Barton,  
Secretary  
February 26, 1988

Summary  
**Kansas Social Service Block Grant**  
July 1, 1988 to June 30, 1989

Social and Rehabilitation Services views as its goal the formulating and carrying out of a program of social services designed to promote the welfare of targeted needy persons by enhancing the opportunity to develop their capacities to the greatest extent possible.

Historical Perspective

This is the eighth year of the social service block grant program. The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1981 replaced Title XX social services funding with the social service block grant. Along with the block grant system came a severe reduction in the amount of social service funds available. Consequently most social service programs funded under Title XX were carried forward under the social service block grant, but with reduced federal funding. The transfer of funds from the low-income energy assistance program helped to offset the loss of federal funds.

Probably the biggest change in funding concepts in Adult Day and Community Living services has been the switch from purchase of services for handicapped persons to a grant program. This new system provides the same high caliber service to the recipients with a significant reduction in paperwork and bureaucratic red tape.

Eligibility and Requirements

Individual eligibility for social service block grant funding is based on two criteria: 1) There must be a need for the service; and 2) income levels must be met. A single individual may not have a gross income exceeding \$687 per month. This scale is graduated upward. For example, for a family of four the gross income may not exceed \$1,400 per month.

All services must relate to one of the five national goals: 1) helping individuals to become economically self-supporting; 2) helping individuals to reduce dependency and become self-sufficient; 3) providing protective services for those in need (regardless of income); 4) providing services to help persons to remain in their own homes; 5) when no other alternatives exist, providing services to help persons receive the most appropriate institutional setting (i.e., adult care home, state institution, private institution, etc.)

Social service block grant funds will continue to be used on a statewide basis to purchase services where appropriate, to give direct grants where appropriate, and to provide direct services by Social and Rehabilitation Services employees where appropriate.

The attached chart shows an estimate of funds to be spent by social service category for FY 1988 and actual expenditures for FY 1986 and FY 1987.



Kansas Social Service Block Grant Summary  
July 1, 1988 to June 30, 1989  
Page 2

The Kansas Social Services Block Grant Plan will be presented at the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services public open meeting later this spring and a thirty-day public comment period will be allowed.

Department of Social and  
Rehabilitation Services  
Office of the Secretary  
Date: February 26, 1988

State of Kansas  
Proposed Social Service Block Grant  
Estimated Expenditures Report for 1986  
Projections for FY 1988

Types of Services	Actual Expenditures 07/01/85 to 06/30/86	Estimated Expenditures In Block Grant Proposal For 07/01/86 to 06/30/87	Projected Expenditures 07/01/86 to 06/30/87 12 mos. actual data	Estimated Expenditures 07/01/87 to 06/30/88
Abuse and Neglect Investigation and Prevention	\$2,610,131	\$2,935,592	\$2,934,547	\$2,883,844 775,644
Specialized Social Adjustment	4,435,733 186,251	3,342,124 209,470	4,559,806 209,401	3,785,525 205,783
SUBTOTAL	\$37,247,287	\$39,085,617	39,012,367	\$38,259,650
Information and Referral	621,675	699,186	698,043	686,867
Resource Development	1,326,211	1,491,573	1,491,047	1,465,285
Administration and Training	2,578,222	1,483,680	1,404,484	1,647,441
TOTAL	\$41,773,395	\$42,760,056	\$42,606,842	42,059,244

\* Includes Adult Life Skills Training, Day Care, Adult Residential and Work Activity/Adjustment

## FY 1989 LOW INCOME HOME ENERGY ASSISTANCE BLOCK GRANT SUMMARY

### BACKGROUND

The Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program (LIEAP) block grant is authorized by Title XXVI of Public Law 97-35, the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, amended by the Human Services Reauthorization Acts of 1984 and 1986. The current authorization expires September 30, 1990. The federal 1988 appropriation was \$1.531 billion with the Kansas share being \$13,670,911, a decrease from \$15.5 million in 1987 and from \$18.2 million in 1986. The administration is recommending FY 1989 funding at levels which would cut the Kansas share to \$10.2 million. The significant cuts experienced in 1987 and 1988 and those expected in 1989 are primarily due to Congressional attitude that states can use their oil overcharge monies to supplement the LIEAP Program.

SRS has traditionally transferred 10% of the LIEAP block grant to the Social Service Block Grant and another 15% for Weatherization activities, the maximum levels allowed. The remaining 75% has been available for the Low Income Energy Assistance Program.

### PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

LIEAP income eligibility maximums are 60% of the State's median income. The household must demonstrate that energy payments have been made in two of the previous three months, a requirement added by this state in 1983. The following types of LIEAP have been administered:

1. Winter Heating - Applications for the winter program have been taken during the period December through March. The amount of the benefit is determined by a sliding scale which considers four factors:

- \* Income
- \* Type of dwelling structure
- \* Type of heating fuel
- \* Utility rates charged by applicant's fuel vendor

Benefits averaging \$217 were provided to 50,266 households last winter, an increase of 7% over the prior year. Approximately 42% of recipient households contain a member 65 years or older.

2. Summer Cooling - Limited one-time summer benefits have been provided for elderly and disabled low-income persons. The 1987 program assisted 22,722 households, half of the recipients being over 75. The average benefit was \$114, individual benefits being determined by a sliding scale which considers three factors:

- \* Income
- \* Type of dwelling structure
- \* Electricity rates charged by the applicant's utility

3. Medical Emergency Cooling - This limited program has alleviated energy related medical emergencies by providing a) utility assistance if there is a potential disconnect, or b) a cooling appliance. A physician's statement of medical need for cooling is required for eligibility. A household may receive only one type of summer assistance (#2 and #3).



LIEAP assistance is issued in the form of a two-party check payable to the household and the utility, ensuring use for purchase of energy. All three phases of assistance emphasize the household's responsibility for its energy obligations by requiring the two self-payments in advance of eligibility. This requirement provides incentive for continued self-payment and encourages regular contact with the utility or other provider.

OPTIONS FOR COST CONTAINMENT

Assuming the FY 1989 federal funding remains at FY 1988 federal levels, approximately \$2.8 million in cost containment measures will be needed under the Governor's FY 1989 budget levels. Options being considered include:

1. Eliminate the two summer programs. Federal regulation does not require summer assistance and Kansas is one of 5 or 6 states providing such assistance. Estimated savings by eliminating this program would be \$2.8 million. This cost containment alternative is the most administratively feasible due by the total elimination of summer temporary staff, postage, and printing costs.
2. Reduce the households assisted in the winter and summer by lowering income eligibility maximums to 110% of poverty. This would reduce assistance by 12,803 households and produce savings of \$2.78 million.
3. Leave income eligibility standards at 60% of median income, but reduce the benefits levels by 18%.
4. Eliminate or reduce the 15% transfer of funds to Weatherization, which was \$1.9 million in FY 1988. This is not recommended due to the need for maintaining budget levels in the Weatherization Program.
5. Eliminate or reduce the 10% transfer to the Social Services Block Grant which was \$1.3 million FY 1988. This is not recommended due to the need for maintaining budget levels in the Home Care Program, also administered by SRS.

REFINEMENTS FOR 1989

The Department is planning to take winter applications earlier in the fall (October and November), and hold up benefit issuances until after the federal appropriation is announced in December. In this manner, if an increase of applications is experienced, or if the federal appropriation is lower than budgeted, the benefits can be adjusted accordingly.

Summer assistance is not being planned due to cost containment needs. However, if \$2.8 million additional funding is available, applications will be taken earlier this year (May and June) and benefit issuance held up until after the total number of applicants is known. In this manner, there will be no differential between planned expenditures and actual expenditures.

If summer assistance is administered, plans are to combine the two summer phases and provide similar utility assistance levels under the auspices of one program. Cooling appliance benefits formally available under Medical Emergency Assistance Program would be eliminated.

STATE OF KANSAS  
REPORT ON THE PROPOSED USE OF ALCOHOL, DRUG ABUSE  
AND MENTAL HEALTH BLOCK GRANT FUNDS

The Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services will soon begin the development of a ninth year Federal application for funding under the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Services Block Grant authorized by the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1981, P.L. 97-35.

Federal regulations governing the application process require the State Legislature to conduct public hearings on the proposed use and distribution of those funds for the period beginning October 1, 1988 and ending September 30, 1989.

ALCOHOL & DRUG ABUSE SERVICES

The FY 1989 federal block grant award to Kansas is expected to total \$3.9 million. Of that amount 41.89%, or \$1,634,000 must be utilized for alcohol and drug abuse activities. The balance of the total award must be utilized for mental health activities. The FY 1989 award available for alcohol and drug abuse activities will be \$100,000 less than was received for FY 1988. The proposed distribution of those funds would be as follows:

- |  |           |
|--|-----------|
| 1) Treatment grants to community based programs: | \$598,000 |
| 2) Prevention grants to community programs:      | \$673,000 |
| 3) Grants to provide services for women:         | \$200,000 |
| 4) State Agency (ADAS) administration:           | \$163,000 |

The Block Grant funds will be used in conjunction with other State funds to insure that effective treatment services are provided to individuals and families experiencing alcohol and/or other drug problems, and to insure that effective prevention services are provided to general and target populations to reduce alcohol and other drug abuse problems.

The State's criteria for distribution of funds will be prioritized based on demonstrated need for financial assistance, and directed to areas of the State that are underserved.

Further information on this program is available if required. Contact SRS/Alcohol and Drug Abuse Services, Topeka, Kansas.

Department of Social and  
Rehabilitation Services  
Office of the Secretary  
February 26, 1988

## Community Service Block Grant

The following testimony relates to the proposed 1989 Kansas Community Service Block Grant State Plan.

The Community Service Block Grant (CSBG) program intends to provide grants to states to ameliorate the causes of poverty in communities within the state.

The legislation contains provisions which "grandfathered in" community action agencies, requiring at least 90 percent of the funds available be used by states to fund existing community action agencies and migrant and seasonal farmworker organizations. Five percent of the funds are allowed for state administration. The remaining five percent is used to make discretionary grants.

CSBG funds are available for the following activities:

- 1 secure and retain employment
- 2 attain an adequate education
- 3 make better use of available income
- 4 obtain and maintain adequate housing
- 5 obtain emergency assistance
- 6 remove obstacles to self-sufficiency
- 7 achieve greater participation in the community
- 8 make use of other poverty programs

The Kansas Community Service Block Grant Program allocation was \$2,761,734 for FY 1988. The proposed federal budget indicates the 1989 state allocation will be the same.

For FY 1989, SRS proposes to maintain the same funding plan as established in FY 1988. This includes:

City of Wichita	20.83%
Economic Opportunity Foundation, Inc.	18.16%
Southeast Kansas Community Action Program	18.00%
Northeast Kansas Community Action Program	9.40%
East Central Kansas Economic Opportunity Corp.	12.39%
Shawnee County Community Assistance and Action	6.83%
Mid-Kansas Community Action Agency	7.04%
Harvest America Corporation	7.35%

Of the five percent available for discretionary programs:

Hunter Health Clinic, Wichita	24.90%
Senior Services, Wichita	21.20%
Shawnee County Indian Education Center, Topeka	21.10%



Community Service Block Grant  
Page 2

The following geographical area will be served in FY 1989: The cities of Chanute and Wichita, and the counties of:

Allen	Coffey	Harvey	Miami	Thomas	Grant
Anderson	Crawford	Labette	Nemaha	Wallace	Haskell
Atchison	Doniphan	Linn	Osage	Woodson	Seward
Bourbon	Douglas	Lyon	Shawnee	Wichita	Meade
Butler	Franklin	Montgomery	Johnson	Finney	Wilson
Cherokee	Greenwood	Wilson	Sherman	Kearny	

Approximately 100,000 low-income Kansans are served annually through this program.

The CSBG program was reauthorized in October 1986 for four years, which means it would continue until 1990.

Department of Social and  
Rehabilitation Services  
Office of the Secretary  
Date: February 26, 1988

ATTACHMENT 2  
SWAM 6/88

ATTACHMENT 2  
SWAM 2-26-88

State of Kansas  
Proposed Social Service Block Grant  
Estimated Expenditures Report for 1986  
Projections for FY 1988

Types of Services	Actual Expenditures 07/01/85 to 06/30/86	Estimated Expenditures In Block Grant Proposal For 07/01/86 to 06/30/87	Projected Expenditures 07/01/86 to 06/30/87 12 mos. actual data	Estimated Expenditures 07/01/87 to 06/30/88
Abuse and Neglect				
Investigation and Prevention	\$2,610,131	\$2,935,592	\$2,934,547	\$2,883,844
Adoption	702,026	789,564	789,281	775,644
Adult Day and Community Living*	10,858,173	11,174,436	10,694,911	10,755,537
Alternate Care	196,939	221,496	289,252	285,764
CINC Inquiry	593,657	667,679	667,444	655,912
Custody Supervision	3,148,184	3,540,734	3,539,475	3,478,321
Day Care	3,916,193	4,820,128	4,648,975	5,355,621
Divorce Custody Assessment	138,121	155,339	155,289	152,605
Evaluation	111,610	125,535	125,482	123,314
Family Services	1,681,786	1,891,492	1,890,817	1,858,148
Family Support	481,014	540,994	540,800	531,456
Guardian/Conservator	120,634	135,674	135,627	133,284
Home and Community Based Services	707,305	0	0	0
Homemaker	7,060,463	7,074,361	7,143,325	6,938,063
Interstate Compact	299,067	336,355	336,238	330,429
Job Preparation Programs	0	1,124,644	351,698	10,398
Residential: Child	4,435,733	3,342,124	4,559,806	3,785,525
Specialized Social Adjustment	186,251	209,470	209,401	205,783
<b>SUBTOTAL</b>	<b>\$37,247,287</b>	<b>\$39,085,617</b>	<b>\$39,012,367</b>	<b>\$38,259,650</b>
Information and Referral	621,675	699,186	698,943	686,867
Resource Development	1,326,211	1,491,573	1,491,047	1,465,285
Administration and Training	2,578,222	1,483,680	1,404,484	1,647,441
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$41,773,395</b>	<b>\$42,760,056</b>	<b>\$42,606,842</b>	<b>\$42,059,244</b>

Includes Adult Life Skills Training, Day Care, Adult Residential and Work Activity/Adjustment

Report on Proposed use  
of Mental Health Block Grant Funds

For the Federal fiscal year beginning October 1, 1988 and ending September 30, 1989, the State of Kansas expects to receive approximately \$2.3 million for mental health services. This is a reduction of approximately \$83,000 from the previous fiscal year.

The Department of SRS/Mental Health & Retardation Services proposes to continue the use of Mental Health Block Grant Funds to provide comprehensive mental health services to specially targeted populations with the intent of preventing unnecessary institutionalization. The majority of funding is targeted to community services for long-term mentally ill adults. Approximately 15% of Block grant funding is directed to services for severely emotionally disturbed children and adolescents. The remaining program funds are directed to services for the mentally ill elderly and other underserved populations. In accordance with federal guidelines, approximately 10% of the State's Block Grant allocation is utilized for administrative costs.

Mental Health Block Grant funds are distributed to licensed community mental health centers and their affiliates for the provision of services in the least restrictive environment. Services must be offered regardless of the client's ability to pay. They must be readily accessible and must assure continuity of care in a manner which preserves human dignity.

Grant funds are allocated based on the merit of the individual proposals. Grant review criteria include the following:

1. The service is directed to one of the specified target populations.
2. The program design includes measurable goals and objectives addressing the desired client outcomes.
3. The program design includes the use of other community resources.
4. The program design demonstrates networking with other components of the continuum of mental health care including state psychiatric hospitals, court system, education system, etc.
5. For continuation funding, the program must demonstrate successful client outcomes in the previous funding cycle.

For the current year grant funds have been distributed for the following service areas:

Psychosocial programs - 62%  
(includes outreach, case management, pre-vocational/vocational, social rehabilitation and children's programs)  
Partial Hospital programs - 20%  
Residential programs - 15%  
24-Hour emergency services - 2%  
Screening services - 1%

We anticipate a similar distribution of funding in the future with emphasis on maintaining programming that has demonstrated success in promoting independence and reducing necessity for institutional care. Due to the reduction in the 1989 federal block grant allocation, no expansion of programs will be possible this year and, in fact, some reductions in programming are likely.

Additional information regarding the Mental Health Block Grant is available through SRS/Mental Health and Retardation Services, Docking State Office Building, Topeka, Kansas 66612.

Department of Social and  
Rehabilitation Services  
Office of the Secretary  
February 23, 1988



SENATE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE  
LEGISLATIVE HEARING

PREVENTIVE HEALTH AND HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT  
MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH SERVICES BLOCK GRANT

February 26, 1988

The Federal block grant concept was implemented to enable states to provide more administrative authority over federal funding received with only broad general control exercised from the Federal level. The Department of Health and Environment has been awarded two Federal Block Grants - Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant (PH) and Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant (MCH).

By Federal Regulation, a legislative hearing is required for the Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant to insure that the funding will be utilized to meet the State's priorities. Since programs that may be funded by either of the two block grants overlap to some extent, the Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant is also included for this hearing even though not Federally mandated.

The Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant provides funding for preventive health services for individuals and families, especially those of limited means, and for a variety of public health services to reduce preventable morbidity and mortality and improve quality of life. These funds may be used to support public health programs such as:

Supporting comprehensive public health services.

Providing for community-based programs to help people reduce health risks.

Supporting programs to deter smoking and use of alcoholic beverages among children and adolescents.

Establishing and maintaining preventive health programs to detect and prevent hypertension (high blood pressure).

Supporting community and school based fluoridation programs.

Providing for services to rape victims and for rape prevention programs.

Providing for home health services.

The Maternal and Child Health Services Block Grant was affected by the 1981 Title V amendments of the Reconciliation Act representing another major effort to restructure the federal-state responsibility for maternal and child health programs, with states assuming a larger role in establishing their own priorities and programs. According to the federal act funding is to enable states to:

Assure mothers and children, and particularly those with low income or with limited availability of health services, access to quality maternal and child health services.

Reduce infant mortality and the incidence of preventable diseases and handicapping conditions among children, with emphasis on providing preventive services such as immunizations and primary care services, for low income children and prenatal, delivery, and postpartum care for low income mothers.

Provide rehabilitation services for blind and disabled children under the age of 16 who are currently receiving benefits under the Title XVI provisions of the Social Security Act (Supplemental Security Income Program).

Provide services for locating, and for medical, surgical, corrective, and other services, and care for, and facilities for diagnosis, hospitalization, and aftercare for children who are crippled or who have conditions leading to crippling.

The law further provides that states must submit annually a plan for intended expenditures, certain statements of assurances and an annual performance report to the federal government in order to receive funding.

Included in the hand-out material are three tables exhibiting actual expenditures for State FY 1987 and projected expenditures for State FY's 1988 and 1989.

The first page of tables exhibits expenditures for the two block grants on a combined basis. Since either source of funding may be used for the Home Visitor/Healthy Start Program and the mix is determined by funding availability, a combined analysis is the most meaningful. The table of combined expenditures shows the following:

Between 54 and 55 percent of expenditures are for State Operations.

Between 37 and 38 percent of expenditures are for Aid To County (Local Health Department) grants.

Between 2 and 3 percent of expenditures are for grants to Local Units other than Local Health Departments.

Between 4 and 5 percent of expenditures are for grants to another State agency.

State Operations expenditures includes the following:

MCH - Data processing costs for recording and producing reports from Crippled and Chronically Ill Children Program data.

MCH - Operating expenditures for Child Care Facilities Licensure Program.

PH - Minor part of Operating expenditures for Food, Drug, & Lodging Program.

MCH - Minor part of Operating expenditures for Disease Prevention & Investigation Program (Epidemiology).

MCH and PH - A part of the Operating expenditures for District Nurse Services and Health Information Services within the Health Promotion Program.

MCH - Minor part of Operating expenditures for Vital Statistics Program for health statistics.

MCH - Major part of Operating expenditures for Crippled & Chronically Ill Children Program.

MCH - Minor part of Operating expenditures for Nutrition & Health Program for developing nutrition resources and services that contribute to the prevention and correction of health problems related to nutrition.

MCH - Minor part of Operating expenditures for Well Family Health Program.

PH - Minor part of Operating expenditures for Laboratory Services to help fund its cost of preventive health tests.

The third table, or last page of the hand out, exhibits PH and MCH funding for Aid To County (Local Health Department) Programs and for Other Aid and Assistance Programs.

MCH - The Mother & Infants Program provides funding to approximately 29 counties to conduct Maternal and Infant Care Projects. Each county provides services for pregnant women of all ages and their infants, specifically those uninsured or with other access barriers. Such services include physician and nursing prenatal and post-natal supervision; nutrition assessment; consultation and intervention; social work services; health maintenance; perinatal and parenting education; family planning referrals; and follow-up of the mother and infant for the first year post delivery.

PH - General Health Services provides funding to local health departments for the support, development and expansion of general health programs. The services provided are basic community services including immunizations, multiphasic screenings, laboratory and sanitarian services. Preventive Health and Health Services Block Grant funding is used to supplement the State Formula Grant for Local Health Departments to insure that General Health Services funding is at least equal to 103% of the amount received during FY 1984.

MCH and PH - Home Visitor/Healthy Start services include the direct visiting by trained lay persons to prenatal clients and to families with a newborn infant to provide family support, to promote the use of preventive health resources and to prevent family stress leading to abuse and neglect of children.

MCH - Maternal and child Health funding provides three basic services. 1) A dental health project for the Wichita-Sedgwick County Health Department to assist parents in obtaining dental support for their children. 2) Outpatient medical services to provide a comprehensive program in Shawnee and Wyandotte counties to assist children on an outpatient hospital basis to receive screening, diagnosis and limited treatment or referral to the University of Kansas Medical Center if warranted. 3) Maternal and child health services are provided through demonstration projects in 37 counties which provide accident prevention and immunization education programs, immunization program, well-child clinics, womenhealth care services and EPSDT screening.

PH - Hypertension-LIVELY (Life, Interest and Vigor Entering Later Years) grants are for a maximum of \$25,000 for single county projects with the expectation of a two-year limit at which time other financial resources will have been identified for the support of the health promotion programming for aging persons.



MCH and PH - Health and Prevention Projects target funding to specific identified needs. FY 1989 funding is projected to provide \$50,000 to the Kansas Children's Service League to focus on family preservation and to implement a teenage pregnancy prevention/intervention service delivery and evaluation model in Wyandotte County, \$16,000 for Governor's Council on Fitness, \$17,238 for a Black Hypertension project, \$4,000 to assist the Heartland Health Conference, and \$1,000 to assist the Coalition on Aging Conference.

Transfers of MCH and PH funding to other State agencies:

MCH - Level III Centers (centers providing care for normal patients, but especially for all serious maternal, fetal, and neonatal illnesses and abnormalities) are partially funded at KUMC, Kansas City, and UKSM-Wichita/Wesley Medical Center, to provide consultation to physicians and hospitals statewide for care of high-risk mothers and newborns, outreach education activities, and leadership in planning and coordination for statewide perinatal care services.

MCH - PKU and hypothyroidism diagnostic and control clinic is funded at the University of Kansas School of Medicine. State statutes require KDHE to provide PKU and Hypothyroidism diagnostic control services.

PH - A part of the PH funding to Kansas is restricted for rape prevention programs. The rape prevention funding is granted to the Crime Victims Reparations Board to conduct the rape preventions programs.

Maternal and Child Health and Preventive Health Block Grants

FY & %	St. Opr.	Aid Co	* D Ass't	** Non Report	Total
Actual					
1987-MCH	2,034,184	1,250,092	76,500	193,000	3,553,776
PH	430,736	418,314	41,896	36,242	927,188
	2,464,920	1,668,406	118,396	229,242	4,480,964
	55.0	37.2	2.6	5.1	100
Projected					
1988-MCH	2,246,757	1,410,691	85,047	192,000	3,934,495
PH	449,422	431,846	67,117	35,952	984,337
	2,696,179	1,842,537	152,164	227,952	4,918,832
	54.8	37.5	3.1	4.6	100
Projected					
1989-MCH	2,348,800	1,689,038	66,973	204,000	4,308,811
PH	472,643	297,928	68,960	35,952	875,483
	2,821,443	1,986,966	135,933	239,952	5,184,294
	54.4	38.3	2.6	4.6	100

\* Grants to Local Units other than Local Health Departments  
 \*\* Transfers to Another State Agency for Expenditure

Maternal and Child Health Block Grant

FY & %	St. Opr.	Aid Co	* 0 Ass't	** Non Report	Total
Actual 1987	2,034,184 57.2	1,250,092 35.2	76,500 2.2	193,000 5.4	3,553,776 100
Projected 1988	2,246,757 57.1	1,410,691 35.9	85,047 2.2	192,000 4.9	3,934,495 100
Projected 1989	2,348,800 54.5	1,689,038 39.2	66,973 1.6	204,000 4.7	4,308,811 100

Preventive Health Block Grant

FY & %	St. Opr.	Aid Co	* 0 Ass't	** Non Report	Total
Actual 1987	430,736 46.5	418,314 45.1	41,896 4.5	36,242 3.9	927,188 100
Projected 1988	449,422 45.66	431,846 43.87	67,117 6.82	35,952 3.65	984,337 100
Projected 1989	472,643 53.99	297,928 34.03	68,960 7.88	35,952 4.11	875,483 100

\* Grants to Local Units Other than Local Health Departments  
 \*\* Transfers to Another State Agency for Expenditure

3000 AID TO COUNTIES	FY 87				FY 88				FY 89			
	Actual	SGF	MCH	PH	Projected	SGF	MCH	PH	Projected	SGF	MCH	PH
3013 MOTHERS & INFANTS	857,642	384,798	472,844		1,029,967	400,000	629,967		1,212,795	500,000	712,795	
3016 GENERAL HEALTH SERVICES	1,443,790	1,289,263		154,527	1,488,045	1,354,506		133,539	1,692,031	1,614,737		77,294
3017 HOME VISITOR/HEALTHY START	340,953	104,926	69,912	166,115	304,938	104,926	29,630	170,382	292,990	104,926	118,230	69,834
3018 MATERNAL AND CHILD HEALTH	707,336		707,336		751,094		751,094		858,013		858,013	
3026 HYPERTENSION - LIVELY	97,672			97,672	127,925			127,925	150,800			150,800
TOTAL	3,447,393	1,778,987	1,250,092	418,314	3,701,969	1,859,432	1,410,691	431,846	4,206,629	2,219,663	1,689,038	297,928
=====												
3100 OTHER AID AND ASSISTANCE	FY 87				FY 88				FY 89			
	Actual	SGF	MCH	PH	Projected	SGF	MCH	PH	Projected	SGF	MCH	PH
3115 INDIAN HYPERTENSION	26,693			26,693								
3116 HOME VISITOR/HEALTHY START	6,115			6,115	46,083		16,207	29,876	47,695		16,973	30,722
3112 HEALTH & PREVENTION PROJECTS	85,588		76,500	9,088	106,081		68,840	37,241	88,238		50,000	38,238
TOTAL	118,396	0	76,500	41,896	152,164	0	85,047	67,117	135,933	0	66,973	68,960
=====												
GRAND TOTAL	3,565,789	1,778,987	1,326,592	460,210	3,854,133	1,859,432	1,495,738	498,963	4,342,562	2,219,663	1,756,011	366,888
=====												



ATTACHMENT 5  
SWAM 2/26/88

February 26, 1988

TO: THE SENATE WAYS & MEANS COMMITTEE  
SENATOR GUS BOGINA, CHAIRMAN

FROM: FRANCES JARCHOW, 9300 Roe, Prairie Village, Kansas  
Chairman, Public Advisory Committee on Energy Assistance  
and Conservation

The Public Advisory Committee on Energy Assistance and Conservation has 18 members who represent various energy assistance and home weatherization programs throughout the state. Our responsibility is to monitor the SRS LIEAP and Weatherization programs.

I want to urge you to reconsider your decision to discontinue the summer LIEAP program. This program serves approximately 23,000 elderly and handicapped low-income recipients who are susceptible to heat stroke and other heat related issues. The average benefit is \$114. The program also includes approximately 1200 households that have an energy related medical emergency and a shut off notice. The summer LIEAP program is extremely important to these people.

My committee, which oversees the LIEAP program, recommends that, if LIEAP has to be cut, that you reduce the average winter benefit from \$217. to \$200. This would reduce the overall budget by \$1 million. We would then only need an additional \$1.8 million from oil funds for FY89.

Congress cut LIEAP because the states have the oil overcharge funds available for the program. If you decide not to use the oil funds for LIEAP, you are sending a message back to Congress that you don't believe the program is important.

We are only trying to maintain this program at current levels. When Congress does restore full funding for LIEAP, we would recommend that the remaining oil overcharge funds be used for weatherization.

ATTACHMENT 5  
SWAM 2-26-88

## MEMORANDUM

Kansas Legislative Research Department

February 15, 1988

## ILLUSTRATIVE SALARY INCREASES -- STATE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

FY 1973-FY 1988

The four attached tables show annual salaries, inclusive of both merit or step and "cost-of-living" increases, for state classified employees since FY 1973. No claim is made that the tables represent typical state employees; rather, the data should be viewed as illustrative of the effects of state pay plans and policies during the period FY 1973 through FY 1988. Two new pay plans were adopted in that period. Fiscal year 1989 is also shown to illustrate potential salaries including any step movement, the annualization of the FY 1988 mid-year 2 percent increase, and the further 4 percent increase recommended by the Governor. Separate lines for FY 1988 and FY 1989 are shown, one with and one without the Governor's proposal to enact a longevity based salary bonus payable in two amounts during calendar year 1988.

Three salary ranges were used for illustrative purposes -- Range 9 starting at Step B, Range 15 starting at Step B, and Range 21 starting at Step B and at Step F. Based on the latest data available to the Research Department (March, 1987), of the 26,604 classified employees on the payroll, 1,024 were assigned to Range 9, 2,100 to Range 15 and 1,761 to Range 21. It was, of course, assumed that the employee was on the particular range throughout the period, *i.e.*, not promoted or demoted. In this regard, however, it is important to note that also excluded from the tabulations are any salary upgrades occurring as a result of the "job rate study," the first phase of which was implemented mid-FY 1987 for about 7,400 clerical jobs, the second of which was implemented in mid-FY 1988 for about 4,000 mechanics, laborers, and operators plus registered nurses and certain therapists. Although the job rate study has included salary upgrades based upon individual responsibilities of employees, it has also involved general upgrades for entire classes of jobs based upon results of job market studies conducted by the Department of Administration.

The tables also show (1) the annual rate of inflation as measured by the Consumer Price Index -- All Urban Consumers (CPI-U) and the Gross National Product price deflator for personal consumption expenditures (GNP/PCE) and (2) the annual salary in FY 1973 dollars based on those two measures of inflation. For FY 1988, the January, 1988 CPI-U estimates of Data Resources, Inc., are used. No projections are available for the GNP/PCE index. The FY 1973-FY 1988 table excludes the longevity salary bonus.

In summary, the results are as follows:

Salary Increase, FY 1973-FY 1987				
	Range 9	Range 15	Range 21	
			Start at B	Start at F
Nominal or Actual Percent	\$ 9,924 191.4%	\$ 13,284 191.2%	\$ 17,136 184.0%	\$ 16,440 145.1%
In FY 1973 Dollars Based on CPI-U Percent	\$ 627 12.1%	\$ 833 12.0%	\$ 860 9.2%	\$ (648) (5.7)%
Based on GNP/PCE Percent	\$ 1,039 20.0%	\$ 1,386 19.9%	\$ 1,582 17.0%	\$ 110 1.0%

Salary Increase, FY 1973-FY 1988 (Exc. Bonus)				
	Range 9	Range 15	Range 21	
			Start at B	Start at F
Nominal or Actual Percent	\$ 10,074 194.3%	\$ 13,488 194.1%	\$ 17,400 186.9%	\$ 16,716 147.6%
In FY 1973 Dollars Based on CPI-U Percent	\$ 468 9.0%	\$ 621 8.9%	\$ 582 6.2%	\$ (941) (8.3)%

STATE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEE ON SALARY RANGE 9

(Annual Salary Includes Merit or Step Increases and "Cost-of-Living" Increases)

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Step on Range</u>	<u>Annual Salary</u>	<u>Percent Increase</u>	<u>Rate of Inflation</u>		<u>Salary in 1973 Dollars Based on:</u>	
				<u>CPI-U<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>GNP-PCE<sup>2</sup></u>	<u>CPI-U<sup>1</sup></u>	<u>GNP-PCE<sup>2</sup></u>
1973	B	\$ 5,184				\$ 5,184	\$ 5,184
1974	C	5,724	10.4%	9.0%	8.6%	5,253	5,273
1975	D	6,360	11.1	11.1	9.8	5,253	5,335
1976	E	7,296	14.7	7.1	6.8	5,628	5,729
1977	F	8,016	9.9	5.8	5.9	5,845	5,944
1978	F1	8,664	8.1	6.7	6.8	5,921	6,015
1979	F1	9,288	7.2	9.4	8.1	5,803	5,964
1980	F1	9,972	7.4	13.4	10.3	5,497	5,804
1981	4	10,836	8.7	11.5	10.3	5,355	5,716
1982	E	11,652	7.5	8.7	7.4	5,299	5,725
1983	E	12,408	6.5	4.3	4.8	5,409	5,816
1984	E	12,690	2.3	3.7	3.9	5,336	5,723
1985	E	13,824 <sup>a</sup>	8.9	3.9	3.4	5,595	6,030
1986	D15	14,664	6.1	2.9	3.1	5,767	6,204
1987	D15	15,108	3.0	2.2	2.7	5,811	6,223
1988	D15	15,258	1.0	3.8 <sup>b</sup>	c	5,652	
	Bonus	15,470	2.4			5,730	
1989	D18	16,428	7.7	4.6 <sup>b</sup>	c	5,814	
	Bonus	16,640	7.6			5,889	
Increase, 1973-1987		\$ 9,924	191.4%	160.0%		\$ 627 12.1%	\$ 1,039 20.0%
Increase, 1973-1988 (without bonus)		\$10,074	194.3%	170.0%		\$ 468 9.0%	

1) Consumer Price Index-All Urban Consumers.

2) Gross National Product price deflator for personal consumption expenditures.

a) Includes a one-time payment of \$204.

b) Estimated, Data Resources, Inc., January, 1988.

c) No estimate available.



STATE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEE ON SALARY RANGE 15

(Annual Salary Includes Merit or Step Increases and "Cost-of-Living" Increases)

Fiscal Year	Step on Range	Annual Salary	Percent Increase	Rate of Inflation		Salary in 1973 Dollars Based on:	
				CPI-U <sup>1</sup>	GNP-PCE <sup>2</sup>	CPI-U <sup>1</sup>	GNP-PCE <sup>2</sup>
1973	B	\$ 6,948				\$ 6,948	\$ 6,948
1974	C	7,656	10.2%	9.0%	8.6%	7,026	7,053
1975	D	8,484	10.8	11.1	9.8	7,008	7,117
1976	E	9,660	13.9	7.1	6.8	7,452	7,585
1977	F	10,596	9.7	5.8	5.9	7,727	7,857
1978	F1	11,400	7.6	6.7	6.8	7,791	7,914
1979	F1	12,228	7.3	9.4	8.1	7,640	7,209
1980	F1	13,032	6.6	13.4	10.3	7,183	7,585
1981	4	14,256	9.4	11.5	10.3	7,045	7,520
1982	E	15,300	7.3	8.7	7.4	6,958	7,517
1983	E	16,296	6.5	4.3	4.8	7,103	7,638
1984	E	16,662	2.3	3.7	3.9	7,006	7,515
1985	E	18,084 <sup>a</sup>	8.5	3.9	3.4	7,319	7,888
1986	D15	19,644	8.6	2.9	3.1	7,726	8,311
1987	D15	20,232	3.0	2.2	2.7	7,781	8,334
1988	D15	20,436	1.0	3.8 <sup>b</sup>	c	7,569	7,648
	Bonus	20,648	2.1				
1989	D18	21,948	7.4	4.6 <sup>b</sup>	c	7,767	7,842
	Bonus	22,760	7.3				
Increase, 1973-1987		\$ 13,284	191.2%	160.0%	142.8%	\$ 833 12.0%	\$ 1,386 19.9%
Increase, 1973-1988 (without bonus)		\$13,488	194.1%	170.0%		\$ 621 8.9%	

- 1) Consumer Price Index-All Urban Consumers.
- 2) Gross National Product price deflator for personal consumption expenditures.
- a) Includes a one-time payment of \$204.
- b) Estimated, Data Resources, Inc., January, 1988.
- c) No estimate available.

STATE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEE ON SALARY RANGE 21

(Annual Salary Includes Merit or Step Increases and "Cost-of-Living" Increases)

Fiscal Year	Step on Range	Annual Salary	Percent Increase	Rate of Inflation		Salary in 1973 Dollars Based on:	
				CPI-U <sup>1</sup>	GNP-PCE <sup>2</sup>	CPI-U <sup>1</sup>	GNP-PCE <sup>2</sup>
1973	B	\$ 9,312				\$ 9,312	\$ 9,312
1974	C	10,272	10.3%	9.0%	8.6%	9,427	9,463
1975	D	11,376	10.7	11.1	9.8	9,397	9,543
1976	E	12,852	13.0	7.1	6.8	9,914	10,091
1977	F	14,040	9.2	5.8	5.9	10,238	10,411
1978	F1	15,024	7.0	6.7	6.8	10,267	10,430
1979	F1	16,116	7.3	9.4	8.1	10,069	10,348
1980	F1	17,076	6.0	13.4	10.3	9,412	9,938
1981	D	18,624	9.1	11.5	10.3	9,204	9,824
1982	4	20,136	8.1	8.7	7.4	9,158	9,893
1983	4	21,444	6.5	4.3	4.8	9,347	10,051
1984	4	21,924	2.2	3.7	3.9	9,219	9,888
1985	4	23,724 <sup>a</sup>	8.2	3.9	3.4	9,601	10,348
1986	D12	25,680	8.2	2.9	3.1	10,100	10,865
1987	D12	26,445	3.0	2.2	2.7	10,172	10,894
1988	D12	26,712	1.0	3.8 <sup>b</sup>	c	9,894	
	Bonus	26,924	1.8			9,973	
1989	D15	28,764	7.7	4.6 <sup>b</sup>	c	10,180	
	Bonus	28,976	7.6			10,255	
Increase, 1973-1987		\$ 17,136	184.0%	160.0%	142.8%	\$ 860 9.2%	\$ 1,582 17.0%
Increase, 1973-1988 (without bonus)		\$ 17,400	186.9%	170.0%		\$ 582 6.2%	

1) Consumer Price Index-All Urban Consumers.

2) Gross National Product price deflator for personal consumption expenditures.

a) Includes a one-time payment of \$204.

b) Estimated, Data Resources, Inc., January, 1988.

c) No estimate available.

STATE CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEE ON SALARY RANGE 21

(Annual Salary Includes Merit or Step Increases and "Cost-of-Living" Increases)

Fiscal Year	Step on Range	Annual Salary	Percent Increase	Rate of Inflation		Salary in 1973 Dollars Based on:	
				CPI-U <sup>1</sup>	GNP-PCE <sup>2</sup>	CPI-U <sup>1</sup>	GNP-PCE <sup>2</sup>
1973	F	\$ 11,328				\$ 11,328	\$ 11,328
1974	F1	12,504	10.4%	9.0%	8.6%	11,475	11,519
1975	F1	13,188	5.5	11.1	9.8	10,893	11,063
1976	F1	14,148	7.3	7.1	6.8	10,914	11,109
1977	F1	14,724	4.1	5.8	5.9	10,737	10,917
1978	T1	15,324	4.1	6.7	6.8	10,472	10,638
1979	F2	16,884	10.2	9.4	8.1	10,549	10,841
1980	F2	17,868	5.8	13.4	10.3	9,849	10,399
1981	E	19,740	10.5	11.5	10.3	9,756	10,413
1982	L2	21,480	8.8	8.7	7.4	9,769	10,553
1983	L2	22,872	6.5	4.3	4.8	9,970	10,720
1984	L2	23,388	2.3	3.7	3.9	9,835	10,548
1985	L2	25,308 <sup>a</sup>	8.2	3.9	3.4	10,242	11,039
1986	D18	26,964	6.5	2.9	3.1	10,605	11,408
1987	D18	27,768	3.0	2.2	2.7	10,680	11,438
1988	D18	28,044	1.0	3.8 <sup>b</sup>	c	10,387	10,485
	Bonus	28,306	1.9				
1989	D18	29,448	5.0	4.6 <sup>b</sup>	c	10,422	10,514
	Bonus	29,710	5.0				
Increase, 1973-1987		\$ 16,440	145.1%	160.0%	142.8%	\$ (648) (5.7)%	\$ 110 1.0%
Increase, 1973-1988 (without bonus)		\$16,716	147.6%	170.0%		\$ (941) (8.3)%	

1) Consumer Price Index-All Urban Consumers.

2) Gross National Product price deflator for personal consumption expenditures.

a) Includes a one-time payment of \$204.

b) Estimated, Data Resources, Inc., January, 1988.

c) No estimate available.

Fiscal Year	State Classified Service <sup>1</sup>	Regents' Faculty <sup>2</sup>	Classroom Teachers <sup>3</sup>	Inflation Rate <sup>4</sup>	Avg. Weekly
					Change <sup>5</sup>
1974	5.0%	5.5%	*	9.0%	7.7%
1975	5.5%; \$30 minimum increase per month	10.0% - KU and WSU 11.0% - Others	7.25%	11.1	9.3
1976	5.0% plus \$25 per month	10.0%	10.5	7.1	8.2
1977	2.8% plus \$15 per month	9.0% - Ft. Hays 8.0% - Others	6.88	5.8	7.1
1978	3.0% or \$25 per month, whichever less; 2.0% for employees on Step F or above who were not eligible for a longevity increase	7.0% - Ft. Hays 6.0% - Others	6.62	6.7	6.3
1979	7.25%, subject to a maximum increase of \$125 per month	7.0%	5.92	9.4	8.6
1980	4% plus \$26 per month	6.5%	7.41	13.4	9.6
1981	New pay plan adopted; it was estimated that nearly all employees received at least an 8% increase and that the average increase was about 11%	9.0%	11.41	11.5	9.8
1982	5.0%	9.0% - Ft. Hays 7.0% - Others	9.4	8.7	8.7
1983	6.5%	10.2% - Ft. Hays <sup>a</sup> 7.5% - Others <sup>a</sup>	9.76	4.3	5.1
1984	4.5% effective 12/18/83	4.5% effective 12/18/83	5.99	3.7	4.8
1985	5.0% plus \$204 (\$102 in two payments)	7.0%	8.38	3.9	3.7
1986	New pay plan adopted; wide variation in individual percentage increases, but est. to average about 6%	5.0% <sup>c</sup>	7.41	2.9	3.8
1987	3.0% <sup>b</sup>	2.5% <sup>c</sup>	3.68 (est.)	2.2	
1988	2.0% effective 12/18/87 <sup>d</sup>	3.0% effective 12/18/87 <sup>c</sup>	4.0 (est.)		

1. So-called "cost of living" adjustments. The increases shown are in addition to merit pay or step increases, if any, to which individual employees were entitled in the fiscal year. Through FY 1980, merit increases of between 4 percent and 5 percent were typical until an employee reached the top of his range. There were no separate merit increases in FY 1981 when a new pay plan was implemented (classified personnel were assigned to specific ranges and steps on the new plan). Merit increases were approved in the budget for FY 1982, ranging from 5 percent to 7.5 percent for those entitled to such increases. A merit increase of about 1.25 percent for FY 1983, as authorized by the 1982 Legislature, was first deferred by order of the Governor and then was eliminated by the 1983 Legislature. No money was appropriated for merit increases in FY 1984 and 1985. The new pay plan adopted in 1985 permits step increases of approximately 2.5 percent for eligible employees in FY 1986 and thereafter (no "cost of living" increase in FY 1986).
  2. Base budget salary increases appropriated by the Legislature. Institutions under the Board of Regents allocate their appropriations for salary increases on a merit basis, not by a uniform or flat percentage increase. Thus, some faculty members received a higher percentage increase than shown in this column while others received less.
  3. Statewide average increase (excluding fringe benefits) for teachers in all unified school districts as reported by the State Department of Education.
  4. Consumer Price Index -- All Urban Consumers: the increase in the average index for the fiscal year (July-June).
  5. Source: Kansas Department of Human Resources. Based on fiscal year unemployment insurance coverage; excludes farm and government employment.
    - a) Also, \$900,000 was appropriated for allocation among faculty in specified curricula at all institutions.
    - b) In addition, salary upgrades for the clerical job series were approved beginning in the last six months of FY 1987.
    - c) The state's contribution for faculty retirement was increased from 5 percent to 6 percent in FY 1986, to 7 percent in FY 1987, and to 8 percent in FY 1988.
    - d) Plus salary upgrades for the mechanics, repairers, and operators job classes, effective 12/18/87.
- \* Not possible to compute percentage increase because comparable data are not available for FY 1973.

MONTHLY GROUP HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS  
 FY 1969-CY 1988  
 (Primary Carrier,\* Full Benefits Coverage)

	State Paid	Employee Paid	
	Member Only	Member Only	Dependents
FY 1969	\$ 8.32	\$ --	\$ 14.78
FY 1970	8.32	--	14.78
FY 1971	8.33	1.77 <sup>a</sup>	17.84
FY 1972	10.16	2.30 <sup>a</sup>	19.76
FY 1973	10.16	2.30 <sup>a</sup>	19.76
FY 1974	14.40	2.91 <sup>a</sup>	26.08
FY 1975	16.23	4.34 <sup>a</sup>	31.65
FY 1976	24.88	--	40.92
FY 1977	29.24	--	48.72
FY 1978	33.72	--	55.56
FY 1979	33.83	--	55.56
FY 1980	37.11	--	62.39
FY 1981	43.74	--	74.87
FY 1982	54.92	--	93.42
FY 1983	66.70	--	112.64
FY 1984	84.78	--	139.71
FY 1985	83.42 <sup>b</sup>	--	127.35
CY 1985 (8/1-12/31)	79.19	--	118.43 <sup>c</sup>
CY 1986 (1/1-7/31)	78.53	--	117.31 <sup>c</sup>
CY 1986 (8/1-12/31) <sup>d</sup>	92.55	--	148.87
CY 1987 <sup>d</sup>	92.55	--	148.87
CY 1988	111.47 <sup>e</sup>	1.00 <sup>e</sup>	163.03
	107.47 <sup>e</sup>	5.00 <sup>e</sup>	163.03
	102.47 <sup>e</sup>	10.00 <sup>e</sup>	163.03

\* Beginning in FY 1983, HMO coverage has been made available to employees residing in certain geographical areas. The HMO premiums are usually lower than those of the prime carrier for both single member and dependent coverage. By 1987, HMO enrollment had grown to one-third of the total.

- a) For FYs 1971-1975, a reduced benefits single-member policy was available which required no employee contribution.
- b) Beginning in FY 1985, dental coverage is included in the state-paid single-member premium. Dependent dental coverage is optional and not included in the dependent premium shown above. This dependent dental premium was \$9.84 for FY 1985; \$10.08 for FY 1986; \$9.25 for the 17-month contract of 1986 and 1987; and \$10.03 for CY 1988.
- c) The FY 1986 dependent premium rate included a discount which recaptured an excess of premiums over claims occurring during FY 1985.
- d) 17-month contract.
- e) Varies by annual salary of the employee (under \$17,000; \$17,000-\$30,000; over \$30,000).



ATTACHMENT  
 SWAM 2/26/88

Four Year Comparison

Salary vs CPI-U

Range 9

<u>Year</u>	<u>Salary</u>	<u>CPI-U</u>
1986	6.1	2.9
1987	3.0	2.2
1988	1.0	3.8
1989	<u>7.7</u>	<u>4.6</u>
Compounded Total	18.9%	14.2%

Range 15

1986	8.6	
1987	3.0	same
1988	1.0	
1989	<u>7.4</u>	<u>        </u>
Compounded Total	21.3%	14.2%

Range 21

1986	8.2	
1987	3.0	
1988	1.0	same
1989	<u>7.7</u>	<u>        </u>
Compounded Total	21.2%	14.2%

Range 21

1986	6.5	
1987	3.0	
1988	1.0	same
1989	<u>5.0</u>	<u>        </u>
Compounded Total	16.3%	14.2%

ATTACHMENT 7  
 SWAM 2-26-88