

retained within the restructuring suggested in 1044. But I'm not sure doubling the positions, when we're starting into a restructuring process, is necessarily the, I guess, careful thing to do. My amendment would change the "thirty" to "fifteen", which would allow them a little more flexibility. It would give them the two positions that they seek for the Department of Aging and Office of Juvenile Services. But they would have to retain the same amount of exempt positions that they already have within the other three areas. And I realize we're taking five and rolling them into three, and they will be in different agencies. But I think this should be done in a little more thoughtful manner, and I think fifteen exempt positions... What this also allows is an exemption from compensation rules, which is salary. And we have no way of knowing, as in the fiscal note on 1323 states, that...they can't give us a fiscal note because it said they have no way of knowing if the agency heads will compensate the exempt employees at a higher rate or a lower rate. Well, generally, it's been...we've been trying to find out exactly how they are compensated and what the difference is, but it's been at a higher rate. So I...if we're trying to keep this fiscal note to at least a neutral fiscal note, I think it would be wise to retain the fifteen positions that they now have available, they are already using thirteen, and take a careful look at the salaries and the amount of money that is going into these exempt positions at this time before we go ahead and double that. If...I'm taking, of course, a conservative, probably very careful approach of fifteen, of just allowing an increase of two positions. I guess you could increase that to whatever portion you would think would be flexible enough for these individuals. But I still think that doubling it to thirty is too much of a jump from what we're doing now. And the fiscal impact could be a pretty large fiscal impact, when you think about it. I believe Mary Dean Harvey, the Director of...the past Director of DSS, was making approximately 75,000, and you can correct me if these figures aren't exactly correct, and was replaced by Don Leuenberger, who is, I think, making 114,000 or somewhere about, and also a position was created, as I understand, for Senator Rasmussen, and these positions involved quite an amount of money, if you put them all together. These positions could involve quite an expenditure of funds. So if we go ahead and double that, and salary jumps take those kind of jumps, from 75 to 114, all across the board on fifteen new positions, or it would be approximately seventeen new positions, that's quite a