MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
52nd LEGISLATURE - 1st SPECIAL SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By CHAIRMAN BERV KIMBERLEY, on January 6, 1992, at 2:00 P.M.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:
Rep. Berv Kimberley, Chair (D)
Sen. Esther Bengtson, Vice Chair (D)
Sen. Gerry Devlin (R)
Rep. Ed Grady (R)
Rep. Jerry Nisbet (D)
Sen. Cecil Weeding (D)

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Roger Lloyd, Associate Fiscal Analyst (LFA)
Terri Perrigo, Associate Fiscal Analyst (LFA)
Carl Schweitzer, Budget Analyst (OBPP)
Bill Mandeville, Budget Analyst (OBPP)
Theda Rossberg, Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Announcements/Discussion:

Roger Lloyd, LFA reviewed the percentage cuts taken in subcommittees' agencies general fund operating expenses. The Department of Agriculture had 8% taken out each year. Fish, Wildlife and Parks had 8% each year. Department of State Lands had 5.5% taken out the first year and 5.11% the second year. The asterisk indicates that the federal fire reimbursement is included. The budget reflects that as federal dollars, but it is actually general fund dollars that the federal agencies refund to the Department of State Lands. This committee took $56,000 out of State Lands federal fire reimbursement, which is reflected in these percentages. **EXHIBIT 1.**

The Department of Livestock had no cuts taken out of their operating budget and the same is true for Department of Public Service Regulation and Department of Commerce.

The table shows the additional dollar amount necessary to cut out of their operating budget to achieve a 5% cut in their budget.

Any agency that already had 5% or more cut out of their operating budget shows zero. Those agencies with less than 5% have the amounts shown that are necessary for additional cuts.

Sen. Devlin asked, what is the purpose of these numbers?

Mr. Lloyd said, the subcommittee was directed to meet to look at areas of further reductions in the budget.

Rep. Grady asked, are we supposed to take additional cuts, even in the agencies which have already taken their 8%?

Mr. Lloyd said, the Department of Agriculture took a 8% cut out of their operating budget. Therefore, this committee doesn't have to take any further action in that department. The only agencies which received less than 5% cuts were the Department of Livestock, Public Service Regulation, Department of Commerce and Department of Natural Resources and Conservation. If the committee wishes to impose a 5% cut in the Department of Commerce's budget, it would amount to $108,959 in FY92. This could be done by a single line-item in the bill which would give the committee the prerogative of dividing these cuts among the programs as they see fit.

Sen. Devlin asked, what committee are you referring to?

Mr. Lloyd said, the House Appropriations Committee.

Sen. Devlin asked, are we looking at 3 departments that we have not cut?

Mr. Lloyd said, that is correct, if you exclude Public Service Commission.

HEARING - DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES & CONSERVATION

Karen Barclay Director, Department of Natural Resources and Conservation said, she was surprised to hear that her department hadn't met their target. As was discussed yesterday DNRC had already diverted over 8% to the general fund. As per the action of the water court, we are reducing 8.95%. We made this up from vacancy savings and mitigation measures which included our finding some private funds and federal funds which we could spend to free-up general fund dollars. What we are diverting to the general fund is nearly 9% and not 5%. I feel it is unfair that you are considering cutting our department further.

Mr. Lloyd said, **Ms. Barclay** is correct, but the page showing the department cuts are in operating costs only. Therefore, funding switches are excluded because that is not a cut in operating costs. For example, replacing $1 of general fund in operating costs with another $1 of state special funds. **EXHIBIT 2.**

Sen. Devlin asked, what are the percentages of general fund

because that is what we should be looking at?

Carl Schweitzer OBPP, said the Department of Livestock made a 8% reduction in FY92 and about 5% in FY93. DNRC had almost a 11% cut in FY92 and almost 8% in FY93, so they were way over.

Mr. Lloyd said, the reason this table was prepared was there was some concern among the legislators For example, the Department of Agriculture received an 8% cut in their general fund operating budget compared to Department of Livestock which received a zero percent cut. The Department of Livestock had a savings to general fund of $65,000, but that was a funding switch. Therefore, they will have received no cut in their operating budget.

Ms. Barclay said, if the goal is to free-up general fund dollars and if our agency has already done that, it shouldn't be how they accomplished that as long as we met our targets.

Sen. Bengtson said, most of the agencies took the cut in personal services, because of the way they can move between personal services and operating expenses. Does that have any bearing on the percentages because some cuts have come out of operating expenses?

Ms. Barclay said, we haven't received any kind of credit for any funding switches such as, if we were able to bring in federal dollars, we weren't given any credit for that. If you are considering further cuts, then we will be looking at the elimination of programs and employees. We have exceeded our general fund target and that is what this committee is looking at.

If I understand, what this committee is asking, you want us to come up with 8% general fund and no funding switches. We would go back and reduce our general fund areas which are primarily water rights, water courts, permits and etc. Then, we would reinstate the Missouri River EIS and lower priority programs.

Sen. Weeding said, there wouldn't be any net gain to the general fund by doing that.

Ms. Barclay said, if they were required to come up with the 8% it would be a net loss to the general fund.

Mr. Lloyd said, this is only a method for the committee to look at, you can choose others if you wish. DNRC had 4% of their operating budget taken out, excluding funding switches. If this committee wishes to bring that up to 5% of their operating expenses, they would have to come up with $49,000 additional general fund cut. It is assumed that all of the funding switches have already been approved by this committee.

Sen. Bengtson said, if funding switches have no impact on

operating expenses, why bother?

Mr. Lloyd said, the ultimate goal is to free-up general fund dollars which can be done through funding switches. There was some concern that some agencies were getting hit harder in their true operating expenses in their budget, so one way of looking at a measure of fairness is with a percent cut in operating expenses.

Sen. Bengtson asked, do we want to eliminate these programs or are we looking for cash-flow?

Rep. Grady said, we went along with the executive suggestions in all the departments except Department of Commerce.

Terri Perrigo LFA, said, all the cuts this committee approved in the Department of Commerce are basically pass-through funds and will not affect their operation. In the DNRC, the only reduction this committee adopted that differed from the executive was taking only $30,000 from the water courts in FY92 and nothing in FY93, which is what the general government subcommittee did with the water courts.

HEARING - DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK

John Skufka, Department of Livestock said, I would like to offer some support to the other agencies. We went along with the executive's suggestion and we wanted to save general fund with the least amount of impact on existing programs. We were willing to spend $45,000 each year for public health funds in our laboratory to replace general funds. If further cuts are necessary, we will have to cut programs such as milk inspection which would hinder the dairies. The laboratory budget would have to be cut which would hinder the public health and safety. **EXHIBIT 3.**

Sen. Devlin said, your department doesn't use hardly any general fund except the milk inspection until we got into the meat inspection program.

Mr. Skufka said, before these cuts we were previously about 18% general fund and with the funding switches this committee approved, there will be about 16% general fund.

Sen. Weeding asked, what was the percent of cuts in the general fund without the switches?

Mr. Skufka answered, about 5% over the biennium.

Sen. Devlin said, in the Department of Livestock we have used producer dollars to free-up what little general fund they have. That is the bad thing about percentages, because the different departments have different percentages of general fund.

Sen. Weeding asked, what was the amount of the department's cut? $45,000 was cut in FY92, what was the cut for FY93?

Mr. Skufka answered, $45,000 in the first year of the biennium replaced general fund in the laboratory. We didn't feel we could carry that through for both years.

Rep. Grady said, I cannot see crippling these agencies, when we don't know where we are at with the revenue.

EXECUTIVE ACTION DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK
Tape 1, Side B, 346

Motion/Vote: **Rep. Grady** moved not to take any additional cuts from the Department of Livestock. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Sen. Bengtson said, it seem to me that we have changed the ground rules. Taking cuts out of the operating is not what we are here for. I would not support cutting the operating budget.

EXECUTIVE ACTION
DEPARTMENT NATURAL RESOURCES & CONSERVATION
Tape 1, Side B, 415

Motion/Vote: **Sen. Bengtson** moved that the committee not take any further action on the Department of Natural Resources & Conservation's budget. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

HEARING - DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Chuck Brooke, Director, Department of Commerce said, at the direction of the executive recommendation, we looked at all the available options of reducing the general fund. By using the coal board grant money as an option, this generated 31% of our funding. 75% of that is economic development related programs. That amount still only reflects 8% state commitment to the economic development programs we have. We may have to expand the tax base in order to get us out of the mess we are in today. We will be looking at less loan applications, less businesses started, etc. With the remaining 25% of general fund dollars, we are looking at inspection services, services that generally protect the public. We are very close to losing some matched dollars.
EXHIBIT 4.

I would be glad to review any programs which may be of particular interest to this committee.

Chair. Kimberley said, up to this point, we have cut everyone but we didn't cut anything from the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Brooke said, as far as reductions go, we are one department

that came out of the last session with less money than we had in FY91.

Bill Mandeville, OBPP stated, the division of transportation which was a part of the Department of Commerce was transferred to the Department of Transportation. With that reorganization, went the general fund. The FY92 appropriation for the Department of Commerce was $3,392,537 less the transportation division would be $280,703 and with the budget modifications, the FY92 current level budget $346,366 less than their FY91 current level budget. The $346,366 is greater than the $311,000 of budget modifications, so even with budget modifications the department's FY92 appropriation is less than the FY91 appropriation. They reverted a great deal of general fund money during the last biennium. Because of the reversion, they ended up with less general fund.

Mr. Brooke said, during that biennium we consolidated a lot of services in a very conscious effort to reduce our expenses. Unfortunately, as you can see, we are not rewarded for those efforts.

Sen. Devlin said, this is very confusing because of the Department of Transportation moving out of the Department of Commerce.

Mr. Lloyd said, there were two programs taken out of the Department of Commerce, Aeronautics and Transportation.

Mr. Mandeville said, there are two numbers in the governor's executive proposal; one is the 40.4% reduction for the transportation division, in the FY93 receipts there was a minus .9%. Even with the budget modifications, the department has less general fund appropriations than they had the last biennium.

Mr. Brooke said, if this committee would give me some indication of what appropriation you need, maybe we can work something out.

Chair. Kimberley asked, what about the 5% cut?

Mr. Brooke said, he would take that as a target and come up with a proposal.

Sen. Weeding said, everyone else took an 8%.

Chair. Kimberley asked, what affect would the 8% have.

Terri Perrigo, LFA said, the 8% of their total general fund appropriation would be approximately $279,000 in FY92 and in FY93 it would be $230,933.

EXECUTIVE ACTION DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Tape 1, Side B, 1218

Motion/Vote: **Sen. Weeding** moved to have the Department of Commerce provide us an analysis of a potential cut of 5% reduction in the Department of Commerce budget which is $145,227 for FY92. Also, moved to approve the 8% reduction which is $230,933 in FY93 which is a total of $376,160.
MOTION CARRIED 5 - 1, REP. GRADY VOTING "NO". (Roll Call Vote).

Discussion:
Sen. Bengtson asked, would you clarify what the 8% reduction asked by the governor is? Is that 8% of your general fund budget?

Mr. Brooke said, as I understand it, we are to generate a equivalent savings of 8% of general fund.

Sen. Devlin asked, do you have enough money left in your budget to fulfill the applications that are left?

Mr. Brooke answered, yes, even the pre-apps.

Ms. Perrigo said, currently they have granted over a million dollars in FY92 and applications in of either pre-app or pro-app of $810,000.

Sen. Devlin said, where are these cuts going to come from?

Mr. Brooke said, he would review his budget and potential areas he could cut and report back to the committee.

Rep. Grady said, I think the executive was trying to have the least impact as possible with these cuts. It is our job to not create more problems in the future than we have now.

Mr. Mandeville said, there was an amendment to HB02 to strike lines 14 and 15 and replace with the following: "There must be retained in the local impact account established under 90-6-202, MCA, for the purpose of reverting to the state special revenue account for school equalization aid to public schools an amount not less than $500,000 in fiscal 1991 and $1,500,000 in fiscal 1993". **EXHIBIT 4-A.**

EXECUTIVE ACTION DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Motion/Vote: **Sen. Bengtson** moved to allow the amended language in HB02 in the Department of Commerce. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

HEARING - DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Sen. Bengtson asked, would you explain what the asterisk was for again, something about fire suppression money for State Lands. See **EXHIBIT 1.**

Mr. Lloyd explained, that was to remind the committee that in the budget it shows up as federal dollars but it is general fund which federal agencies reimburse the department for fighting fires. In reality, the true percent of reduction includes the $56,000 of federal reimbursement fire suppression.

State Lands has an appropriation to spend $100,000 of that money when they receive it from the federal government. The action taken by this committee reduced that by $56,000. The 5.5% in FY92 and 5.11% in FY93 is the total cut in their general fund budget. All the cuts that this committee took were in their operations. **EXHIBIT 5.**

Dennis Casey said, during the last legislative session when the pay plan was adopted there was an error made and our forestry division was under-funded by $104,000 in FY92 and $173,000 in FY93, which amounts to $277,000 that has to be made up by our forestry division. Therefore, the budget office considered that to be part of our total savings. The total adjustments to the general fund is about 6.7%. Each of the agencies had a goal of 8% and as I explained previously to the committee, the $250,000 economic study was at one time part of the total cuts and then the percentage to general fund was a little over 8%.

Questions:
Sen. Devlin asked, did this happen in any other divisions or just the forestry division?

Mr. Casey answered, this was only in the forestry division as far as I know.

EXECUTIVE ACTION DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Tape 2, Side A, 192

Motion/Vote: **Rep. Grady** moved to leave the Department of State Lands as is. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

HEARING - FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS DIVISION

Mr. Lloyd said, the total cut out of the budget of Fish, Wildlife and Parks Division is 8% and the total cut out of their operating budget is also 8%. **EXHIBIT 6.**

Sen. Devlin said, we already approved this cut.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON FISH, WILDLIFE AND PARKS DIVISION
Tape 2, Side A, 251

Motion/Vote: **Rep. Grady** moved to leave the Fish, Wildlife and Parks Division budget as is. **MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Rep. Mary Ellen Connelly reviewed the possibility of consolidating the Department of Livestock and Department of Agriculture into one department. In consolidating these two departments there could be some savings in consolidating positions. The executive secretary of the Board of Livestock makes $67,500 per year and a central management position which pays $46,400 could possibly be combined and there would be a savings there. I question whether or not the Department of Livestock needs an attorney position. I would think they could use the attorney from the Department of Agriculture. We probably do not have time to accomplish this in the special session, but it could be considered in the future.

I talked with some farmers and ranchers and they said they would consider it.

Rep. Grady said, I talked to some of the people and I think this would take some legislation to consolidate the Livestock Department into the Agriculture Department. In regard to the lawyer position, they said they would have to contract that out at $50 per hour even if they used the Department of Agriculture lawyer, so it would probably cost more than what the salary would be.

Sen. Devlin said, the funding for the livestock industry comes out of a per capita fee on livestock and agriculture is basically plant growers. This was set up to be run under a board and that board hires their own Executive Secretary and there are very dedicated people on that Board of Livestock.

Rep. Connelly said, I wouldn't want to eliminate the board but there is 16% of general fund in there that I thought we may be able to free-up.

Sen. Devlin said, in the Department of Livestock, that money is used for milk and egg inspection and meat inspection and that is where the general fund is in that budget.

Rep. Connelly said, they said they had a grant for the poultry inspection.

Sen. Devlin said, they use to hardly have any general fund for milk and egg inspection. Then, they got into the meat inspection which is growing by leap and bounds.

Rep. Connelly asked, what about the $110,000 grant they get from the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks?

Mr. Lloyd said, that is non-general fund money which is from fishing and hunting license.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 4:15 P.M.

Berv Kimberley
BERV KIMBERLEY, Chair

Theda Rossberg
THEDA ROSSBERG, Secretary

BK/TR

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE

ROLL CALL ~~VOTE~~

DATE Jan-6-92 BILL NO. _____ NUMBER _____

~~MOTION~~: _____

NAME	AYE	NO
SEN. ESTHER BENGTSON, VICE-CHAIR	✓	
REP. ED GRADY	✓	
REP. JERRY NISBET	✓	
SEN. GERRY DEVLIN	✓	
SEN. CECIL WEEDING	✓	
REP. "BERV" KIMBERLEY, CHAIRMAN	✓	

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE

ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE Jan-6-1992 BILL NO. _____ NUMBER _____

MOTION: Dept of Commerce

Weeding: Dept to provide a analysis of the impact of the 5% cut in FY 92 and 8% in FY-93 $145,227 FY 92 and $220,933 FY '93.

NAME	AYE	NO
SEN. ESTHER BENGTSON, VICE-CHAIR	✓	
REP. ED GRADY		✓
REP. JERRY NISBET	✓	
SEN. GERRY DEVLIN	✓	
SEN. CECIL WEEDING	✓	
REP. "BERV" KIMBERLEY, CHAIRMAN	✓	

5-1

Grady Voting "No"

STATE OF MONTANA

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

STATE CAPITOL
HELENA, MONTANA 59620
406/444-2986

TERESA OLCOTT COHEA
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST

2-6-92
EXH I.

January 6, 1992

TO: Members of the House Appropriations Committee

FROM: Teresa Olcott Cohea
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

RE: Overview of House Bill 2 Revisions

Net Reduction

The subcommittees have approved a net reduction of $12,223,687 general fund in House Bill 2. In addition, they have reduced general fund miscellaneous appropriations ("cats and dogs") by $1,906,080. Lastly, they have included language in the bill directing agencies to transfer $7,321,769 in fund balances or increased revenue to the general fund. In total, the subcommittees have endorsed "budget balancers" totalling $21,451,536.

Supplementals

The Executive Budget requested $20.8 million in general fund supplementals in House Bill 2. The subcommittees approved general fund supplementals totalling $20.0 million.

Percentage Reductions

The following table shows the impact of the subcommittee reductions on agencies' operating budgets. In this table, reductions that don't impact the agencies' internal operations--such as reductions in pass-through funding or benefits, funding switches, and fund balance transfers--are excluded. Only reductions in personal services, operating, and equipment are included.

Percentage reductions in agency operating budgets range from 0 percent for three agencies to 10.8 percent. The average percentage reduction is 3.7 percent.

Table 1
General Fund Operational Budget Reductions by Percent

Agency	% Cut FY 1992	% Cut FY 1993	% Cut Biennium
Department of Labor & Industry	10.87%	10.78%	10.82%
Department of Agriculture	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Department of Transportation	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Depatment of Fish, Wildlife & Parks	8.00%	8.00%	8.00%
Commissioner of Higher Education	1.67%	10.05%	5.89%
Library Commission	7.74%	4.00%	5.87%
Commissioner of Political Practices	9.80%	0.00%	5.77%
Legislative Council	6.43%	5.00%	5.72%
Department of State Lands *	5.50%	5.11%	5.31%
Legislative Fiscal Analyst	5.41%	5.11%	5.26%
Crime Control Division	8.00%	2.49%	5.17%
Office of Public Instruction	5.00%	5.00%	5.00%
Montana Arts Council	3.82%	5.08%	4.41%
Department of Natural Resources & Conservation	4.00%	3.31%	3.65%
Office of the Governor	2.79%	4.38%	3.57%
State Auditor's Office	2.87%	4.17%	3.50%
Secretary of State	6.58%	0.00%	3.37%
Legislative Auditor	6.17%	0.25%	3.17%
Department of Health & Environmental Sciences	3.24%	2.62%	2.92%
Department of Administration	2.95%	2.89%	2.92%
Historical Society	3.57%	2.12%	2.85%
Board of Public Education	2.67%	2.54%	2.61%
Environmental Quality Council	2.32%	2.45%	2.39%
Department of Justice	3.55%	0.70%	2.11%
Department of Military Affairs	3.20%	0.84%	2.06%
Judiciary	1.82%	1.50%	1.66%
Department of Revenue	1.31%	1.83%	1.57%
School For Deaf & Blind	1.34%	1.66%	1.50%
Department of Social & Rehabilitation Services	2.15%	0.56%	1.34%
Department of Corrections & Human Services	1.71%	0.63%	1.17%
Department of Family Services	0.05%	0.19%	0.12%
Department of Livestock	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Public Service Regulation	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Department of Commerce	0.00%	0.00%	0.00%
Average	4.13%	3.21%	3.70%

Comparison with Executive Budget

The attached sheet provides a comparison of subcommittee action with the Executive Budget by agency and subcommittee. In total, the net reduction approved by the subcommittees was $6.9 million less than requested in the Executive Budget.

The Executive Budget proposed a net reduction of 23.8 FTE. The subcommittee recommendations would increase FTE by 31.9 in fiscal 1992 and 36.5 in fiscal 1993.

TOC3E:lt:hsapprop1-6.92
cc: Legislative leadership

EXHIBIT 7

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION
Over/(Under)
EXECUTIVE BUDGET

Subcommittee/Agency	Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Biennium General Fund
GENERAL GOVERNMENT & TRANSPORT.			
Legislative Auditor	($18,512)	$57,550	$39,038
Legislative Fiscal Analyst	0	25,002	25,002
Legislative Council	0	65,164	65,164
Environmental Quality Council	0	0	0
Consumer Counsel	0	0	0
Judiciary	66,429	292,077	358,506
Governor's Office	0	0	0
Secretary of State	0	0	0
Commissioner of Political Practices	0	0	0
State Auditor	0	0	0
Crime Control Division	0	0	0
Highway Traffic Safety	0	0	0
Justice	0	0	0
Transportation	0	0	0
Revenue	0	0	0
Administration	(50,000)	0	(50,000)
State Fund	0	0	0
Public Employee's Retire. Board	(9,583)	4,000	(5,583)
Teacher's Retirement Board	0	0	0
Military Affairs	(5,100)	5,100	0
TOTAL	($16,766)	$448,893	$432,127
HUMAN SERVICES			
Health & Environmental Sciences	$36,485	$36,485	$72,970
Labor & Industry	0	0	0
Social & Rehabilitation Services	562,921	1,904,221	2,467,142
Family Services	1,089,543	1,752,926	2,842,469
TOTAL	$1,688,949	$3,693,632	$5,382,581
NATURAL RESOURCES AND COMMERCE			
Public Service Regulation	$0	$0	$0
Fish, Wildlife and Parks	0	0	0
State Lands	(800,000)	0	(800,000)
Livestock	0	0	0
Natural Resources & Conservation	10,891	40,908	51,799
Agriculture	0	0	0
Commerce	0	0	0
TOTAL	($789,109)	$40,908	($748,201)

INSTITUTIONS AND CULTURAL EDUCATION			
Montana Arts Council	$0	($103,865)	($103,865)
Library Commission	0	31,281	31,281
Historical Society	0	0	0
Corrections & Human Services	(572,284)	1,603,454	1,031,170
TOTAL	($572,284)	$1,530,870	$958,586
EDUCATION			
Board of Public Education	$0	$0	$0
School for the Deaf & Blind	0	0	0
Office of Public Instruction	394,364	195,373	589,737
Commissioner of Higher Education	0	697,397	697,397
Vocational-Technical System	0	10,608	10,608
Six University Units	0	224,648	224,648
Agricultural Experiment Station	0	9,712	9,712
Cooperative Extension Service	0	3,742	3,742
Forestry & Conser. Exp. Station	0	907	907
Bureau of Mines	0	1,648	1,648
Montana Council of Vocational Ed.	0	0	0
Fire Services Training School	0	294	294
TOTAL	$394,364	$1,144,329	$1,538,693
LONG RANGE PLANNING	($695,514)	$0	($695,514)
TOTAL SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION	$9,640	$6,858,632	$6,868,272

07:33 AM

01/06/92

C:\DATA\LOTUS\MISC\SUBCOMM.WK1

1-6-92

EXHIBIT 2

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCE AND CONSERVATION

1993 Biennium Adjustments

P:\5706\W0000000.LBP

Description	Pgm	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1993 Other Funds
House Bill 2													
1 Personal Svc Reduction	21	($43,716)	$0	($22,145)	$0	($43,716)	$0	($22,145)	$0	0	0	0	0
2 Personal Svc Reduction	23	(9,113)	0	(7,737)	0	(9,113)	0	(7,737)	0	0	0	0	0
3 Funding Switch	23	(66,523)	0	(66,527)	0	(66,523)	0	(66,527)	0	0	0	0	0
4 Personal Svc Reduction	24	(93,695)	0	(129,479)	0	(93,695)	0	(129,479)	0	0	0	0	0
5 Funding Switch	24	(30,000)	0	0	0	(30,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6 Funding Switch	24	0	0	(80,000)	80,000	0	0	(80,000)	80,000	0	0	0	0
7 Funding Switch	24	(40,891)	0	(40,908)	0	(30,000)	30,000	0	0	10,891	30,000	40,908	0
8 Funding Switch	24	(100,000)	0	0	0	(100,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9 Funding Switch	24	(87,000)	0	0	0	(87,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10 Personal Svc Reduction	25	(26,769)	0	0	0	(26,769)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11 Personal Svc Reduction	26	(21,935)	0	(3,455)	0	(21,935)	0	(3,455)	0	0	0	0	0
12 Funding Switch	26	(20,000)	20,000	(40,000)	40,000	(20,000)	20,000	(40,000)	40,000	0	0	0	0
Totals		($539,642)	$20,000	($390,251)	$120,000	($528,751)	$50,000	($349,343)	$120,000	$10,891	$30,000	$40,908	$0

1-6-92

EXHIBIT 3

DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK

P:\5603\W0000000.LBP

1993 Biennium Adjustments

Description	Pgm	Executive Budget Proposal - Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal - Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Executive Budget Proposal - Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal - Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action - Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action - Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action - Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action - Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.) - Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.) - Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.) - Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.) - Fiscal 1993 Other Funds
House Bill 2													
1 Funding Switch	01	($20,000)	$20,000	($20,000)	$20,000	(20,000)	20,000	(20,000)	20,000	0	0	0	0
2 Funding Switch	03	(45,000)	45,000	0	0	(45,000)	45,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
Totals		($65,000)	$65,000	($20,000)	$20,000	($65,000)	$65,000	($20,000)	$20,000	$0	$0	$0	$0

HB Commerce Exh#
1-6-92

1993 Biennium Adjustments

5501\W0000000.LBP		Executive Budget Proposal				Legislative Budget Action				Difference (Leg. - Exec.)			
		Fiscal 1992		Fiscal 1993		Fiscal 1992		Fiscal 1993		Fiscal 1992		Fiscal 1993	
cription	Pgm	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
se Bill 2													
Fund Balance Transfer	60	($500,000)	$500,000	($1,500,000)	$1,500,000					500,000	(500,000)	1,500,000	(1,500,000)
er Appropriation Bills													
HB 990 - L & C Interp Center	52	(56,000)	0	0	0					56,000	0	0	0
Totals		($556,000)	$500,000	($1,500,000)	$1,500,000	$0	$0	$0	$0	$556,000	($500,000)	$1,500,000	($1,500,000)

2-6-91

EXHIBIT #4

Natural Resources & Commerce Subcommittee

Amendment to HB02

1. Page C-27, lines 14 and 15
Strike: lines 14 and 15 in their entirety
Insert: There must be retained in the local impact account established under 90-6-202, MCA, for the purpose of reverting to the state special revenue account for school equalization aid to public schools an amount not less than $500,000 in fiscal 1992 and $1,500,000 in fiscal 1993.

2-6-9
EXHIBIT 5

DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

1993 Biennium Adjustments

P:\5501\W0000000.LBP

Description	Pgm	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1993 Other Funds
House Bill 2													
1 Vacant Position	01	($32,000)	$0	($36,000)	$0	($32,000)	$0	($36,000)	$0	0	0	0	0
2 Program Reductions	01	(8,500)	0	0	0	(29,700)	0	(21,200)	0	(21,200)	0	(21,200)	0
3 Equalization Payments	01	(21,200)	0	(21,200)	0	0	0	0	0	21,200	0	21,200	0
4 Program Reduction	03	(24,774)	0	(25,663)	0	(24,774)	0	(25,663)	0	0	0	0	0
5 Program Reduction	04	(42,000)	0	(15,000)	0	(42,000)	0	(15,000)	0	0	0	0	0
6 Nursery Program Reduction	25	(18,000)	0	(18,000)	0	(18,000)	0	(18,000)	0	0	0	0	0
7 Appraiser Position	25	(33,000)	0	(33,000)	0	(33,000)	0	(33,000)	0	0	0	0	0
8 Seasonal Employees	25	(48,987)	0	(49,667)	0	(48,987)	0	(49,667)	0	0	0	0	0
9 NW Field Office Vacancy	25	(5,000)	0	(15,000)	0	(5,000)	0	(15,000)	0	0	0	0	0
10 Program Reductions	25	(50,000)	0	(50,000)	0	(50,000)	0	(50,000)	0	0	0	0	0
11 Swan River Lumber	25	(5,000)	0	(5,000)	0	(5,000)	0	(5,000)	0	0	0	0	0
12 Fire Retardant Contract	25	(2,000)	0	0	0	(2,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
13 Rebuild Engines	25	(35,250)	0	(23,500)	0	(35,250)	0	(23,500)	0	0	0	0	0
14 Fire Capital	25	0	0	(13,333)	0	0	0	(13,333)	0	0	0	0	0
15 Metal Building	25	(24,000)	0	0	0	(24,000)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
16 Federal Fire Reimbursement	25	(56,000)	0	(56,000)	0	(56,000)	0	(56,000)	0	0	0	0	0
17 Nursery Funds	25	(35,000)	35,000	(35,000)	35,000	(35,000)	0	(35,000)	0	0	(35,000)	0	(35,000)
18 Slash Funds	25	(60,000)	60,000	(60,000)	60,000	(60,000)	0	(60,000)	0	0	(60,000)	0	(60,000)
19 Forest Fire FY92 Costs	25	6,373,650	0	0	0	5,573,650	0	0	0	(800,000)	0	0	0
Totals		$5,872,939	$95,000	($456,363)	$95,000	$5,072,939	$0	($456,363)	$0	($800,000)	($95,000)	$0	($95,000)

2-6-92

EXHIBIT 6

DEPARTMENT OF FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS

1993 Biennium Adjustments

P:\5201\W0000000.LBP

Description	Pgm	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Executive Budget Proposal: Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Legislative Budget Action: Fiscal 1993 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1992 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1992 Other Funds	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1993 General Fund	Difference (Leg. - Exec.): Fiscal 1993 Other Funds
House Bill 2													
1 Parks Reduction	06	($34,459)	$0	($34,837)	$0	($34,459)	$0	($34,837)	$0	0	0	0	0
Totals		($34,459)	$0	($34,837)	$0	($34,459)	$0	($34,837)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

VISITOR'S REGISTER

Natural Res. COMMITTEE BILL NO. _____

DATE 2-6-02 SPONSOR(S) _____

PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT PLEASE PRINT

NAME AND ADDRESS	REPRESENTING	BILL	OPPOSE	SUPPORT
Dennis Casey	DSL			
Wm. S. FRASER	Dept of Livestock			
John Skufca	" / "			
DAVE Mott	FWP			
Al Sool	FWP			
Ray Beck	DNRC			
Bob Kuchenbrod	DSL			

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.