

STATE LAW LIBRARY

APPROPRIATION COMMITTEE MINUTES  
March 26, 1981

MAY 19 1981

OF MONTANA

The House Committee on Appropriations convened at 8 a.m. on March 26, 1981, in Room 104 of the State Capitol, with Chairman Lund presiding and all members present.

Chairman Lund opened the meeting to a hearing on testimony concerning a judgment against the state.

JACK LEWIS, Attorney for Jardine, Stephens, Blewett and Weaner, said he appeared before the committee on behalf of Leaseamerica Corporation of Wisconsin. A copy of the court's decision is EXHIBIT 1 of the minutes. Mr. Lewis said he had requested that Rick Larson of the Attorney General's Office be present to help answer any questions. Since the state has said it is not going to petition for a rehearing, he said he was present to request that the committee introduce a bill to appropriate this amount to the Department of Justice for satisfaction of that judgment. EXHIBIT 2 is a suggested house bill to do this. The total judgment is \$66,419.40 plus \$200 costs; \$6,685 is attorney's fees which the court approved to be paid.

Rep. Moore asked who broke the lease that caused this judgment. Mr. Lewis said it was the Attorney General. In the late 60s Attorney General Woodahl was authorized by the Legislature to lease certain equipment. He entered into a six year lease with Leaseamerica. For approximately three years the monthly payments were made. Shortly after Mr. Greely was elected Attorney General, they decided not to go ahead with this lease. Mr. Lewis said back in the 60s this particular lease type of system was in its infancy in the state and during the course of a few years considerable improvements were made in the system. He felt Mr. Woodahl decided he wanted to improve the capability of the system and decided to go with IBM on a second system. So there were two systems with the IBM more up-to-date although the first one did what it was listed to do. So there were two computers on hand when Greely came in and since his client's system was not in use, he discontinued the lease.

Rep. Bardanoue said he didn't recall authorizing leases for two computer systems.

Chairman Lund opened the meeting to a hearing on the following bills.

HOUSE BILL 831

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN M. SHONTZ, District 53, chief sponsor, said the bill requests \$85,000 for the Agricultural Experiment Station at Sidney. He introduced the following proponent.

SENATOR LARRY TVEIT, District 27, spoke next and a copy of his testimony is EXHIBIT 3 of the minutes.

PAUL L. HUBER, Vida, interested farmer, rancher, citizen, taxpayer, and President of the Sidney Experiment Station Advisory Committee, spoke next and a copy of his testimony is EXHIBIT 4 of the minutes.

JERRY KNICK, Agricom Oilseed, Culbertson, spoke next in support and a copy of his testimony is EXHIBIT 5 of the minutes.

Rep. Schontz indicated on a large map with flags where safflower is grown. Forty thousand acres were planted to safflower in 1980 with a smaller amount in North Dakota and South Dakota. Information on the current marketing activity, quality, and income-wise comparison with wheat is EXHIBIT 6 of the minutes. Safflower can be and is one of the top oil crops in Montana and is an excellent alternate cash crop. He said he hoped the committee realizes the value of this fine crop and passes the bill.

JOHN CROHN, Dagmar, member of the Sidney Experiment Station Advisory Committee, spoke next in support and a copy of his testimony is EXHIBIT 7 of the minutes.

JERRY BERGMAN, Superintendent of the Sidney Experiment Station, spoke next and a copy of his testimony is EXHIBIT 8 of the minutes.

REPRESENTATIVE L. DEAN SWITZER, District 54, said he strongly supports the bill. He said he had visited the station and agrees there is a need.

REPRESENTATIVE JOHN RYAN, District 49, said he would like to go on record as being a proponent of this house bill.

JAMES R. WELSH, Director, College of Agriculture, Montana State University, said in the interest of time he would cut his testimony short but the experiment station at Sidney is a top priority item.

WILLIAM TIETZ, President, College of Agriculture, Montana State University, said a copy of his testimony was made with Mr. Welsh in a letter to Senator Tveit (EXHIBIT 9). The university program emphasizes the large university request but the smaller stations have equally important requests and there is no smooth mechanism to prioritize them through the university system. Should be a mechanism to bring forward these small requests from our branch stations which mean so much to the particular commodities and those parts of the state. Safflower is an extremely important program and this has been a productive station so we encourage your support.

There were no opponents.

Questions were asked by the committee.

Rep. Waldron asked if Montana safflower is what is seen in the health food stores and what are some brand names. The answer was Hanes, Safolla, plus others. He said they furnish the bulk materials to the companies who put in into their bottles.

Rep. Waldron asked if there was any way to insulate the plant from the cleaning dust. Mr. Bergman said the building is insulated but the cleaning equipment is on wheels and moved in to be used and during that time the shop cannot be used for anything else. In response to another question, he said they store their equipment like tractors in the shed to keep them from deteriorating as quickly. When asked what the number one priority would be, he said the storage and processing of grain samples.

Rep. Hurwitz asked if North Dakota depends on Montana for our expertise. Are they duplicating what we are doing? The answer was we have the only safflower breeding work being done. The Williston station does cooperate with the Montana station.

Rep. Bengtson asked Dr. Tietz since the legislature took care of the Corvallis Station the last time and now this this session, does the university plan to come in with separate bills for each experiment station or is there a plan to incorporate some of your requests into the long range building program. Dr. Tietz said the bills are examples of the needs being expressed by the people in the area. It is a spontaneous generation from the area. He said it is not part of any planning. He said they do need to develop some mechanism that the aggregate of these requests can be brought for appropriate action.

Senator Tveit thanked the committee for their time. He said this alternate crop is needed desperately by the farmer and the state treasury.

Additional information left by the proponents of HB 831 include a portion of the December, 1980, report of the Montana Agricultural Experiment Station eleven member committee to evaluate the research centers - EXHIBIT 10; brochure on "A Record of Service - Eastern Agricultural Research Center, Sidney" - EXHIBIT 11; brochure on "Safflower Production Guidelines" - EXHIBIT 12; and a brochure on "Safflower: Breeding Make It Better" - EXHIBIT 13.

#### HOUSE BILL 570

REPRESENTATIVE GAY HOLLIDAY, District 46, chief sponsor, passed to the committee members copies of the bill with the amendments penned in. A copy of this and the amendments is EXHIBIT 14. A copy of her testimony is EXHIBIT 15 and part of the minutes.

WAYNE VAN VOST, Billings, Bureau of Mines and Geology, spoke as the hydrologist that would be involved in the work. He said they have developed considerable expertise, but the work has been haphazard in this area due to funding being difficult to get. He said the State Lands Department is given the responsibility of administering the mining regulations and this bill would provide funds for the Bureau of Mines to gather data to assist them in this area. He said it is extremely important to start addressing these problems and this is the appropriate mechanism.

BRACE HAYDEN, State Lands, said they are responsible for assuring that the ground water impacts will not be adverse and so they strongly recommend the bill. He said this is the single most asked question -what is the impact on ground water? He said in the past they have greatly used the Bureau of Mines to do these studies. He read from the codes the law concerning what his Department is required to do in checking on coal mining permits. A study must be completed prior to the issuance of the permit. Coal companies are required to provide one year of water data, and this is not long enough to check out cumulative effects on ground water. He said he supports the work of the Bureau of Mines and would like to see it continue to be funded at the level it has been in the past.

BOB TULLY, rancher from Roundup, said this is an important and timely bill. He urged a defusing of any controversy between the coal industry and affected agricultural interests. He said the bill is not intended to be anti-mining and would be to the interest of all parties if controversy could be avoided. A good deal of attention has been given to free flowing rivers and irrigation waters and industrial waters and this, too, is important as it deals with ground water and streams. Very important to a man in the grazing industry. All would acknowledge that coal mining does have an impact on ground water and surface water systems. You need to find out the best way to treat it and handle it. The State Lands Department does not have the research capability to do this. The coal company provides data that is concentrated within the permit area - which is understandable. Mr. Tully mentioned his own personal interest. In Mussellshell County there are two small mines currently operating and even if their current production were doubled they would not present a problem to water values. However, a huge mine is proposed that would produce 2 million tons a year and the effects of this scale of operations on the water must be considered. He urged a cooperative effort between all parties in addressing the acknowledged problems.

PAT WILSON, Billings, Montco, spoke in opposition. She said they would like to know where the studies are going to be conducted and are they going to be ongoing. In regards to hydrology

studies, she said Montco has spent 1 1/2 million since 1978 on such studies. She said they studied a 16,000 acre permit area and a buffer area which included 56 wells tested for ground water quality and quantity. She said Montco hydrologists do not stop but continue to test for the life of the mine which is approximately 30 to 40 years. Their studies are by no means a one-time shot. She felt the money being asked for would not be adequate for studying the hydrology. She said they are concerned that the funds being asked for in this bill will be used for a study of the Tongue River System which has been claimed to be unsuitable for mining in a petition by the Northern Plains Resource Council. She said Montco would like to go on record as opposing because of this point. Citizens' dollars should not be used for special interest concerns. She said she disagrees with Mr. Hayden's remarks that only one year's data is needed. Montco's applications have provided much more data.

STEVE ELLIOT, Wesco Resources, Billings, said he was caught a little offguard with the amendments, so his comments will be on the bill. He questioned the language on the top of page 2 on section 1 "cumulative impacts on hydrology systems of the area, in particular upon water availability" - the language comes close to one of the allegations in the NPRC petition for lands unsuitable for mining. On a map he indicated the area where the NPRC have filed a petition that the lands are unsuitable for coal mining. The impact on the water within that area is supposed to be studied by the Department of State Lands. He said they have spent \$700,000 to study 20,000 acres and this bill provides \$200,000 to study many more acres. He wondered if the committee was being hoodwinked and if this wouldn't be a waste of money. He said another concern in section 2 is that it talks of independent consultants that will speak on both on-site and off-site type impacts - if you are going to talk about on-site impacts the company involved should be a part of what goes on. He felt the question should be asked if the agency can use it to declare some lands unsuitable like under the Northern Plains Resource Council petition.

Questions were asked by the committee.

Rep. Cozzens asked for the reaction of the proponents to the testimony given by the opponents. Mr. Hayden responded that the amendments offered to the bill has the money going directly to the Bureau of Mines for their ongoing research. He said it is not the intent of the bill to use any of the money on the Tongue River petition area. The time frame does not allow it. To another point that the money is not adequate to do a cumulative study. The money is to provide continuing study. The Department of Lands routinely gets one year of data. Some companies have collected more than one year of data but many decisions are made on one year of data. Circumstances like drought might cause some things not to show up for two or three years. We need a base line to evaluate the impacts on. The opponents view this as a bill that won't aid industry. He disagreed as he said the Department has to deny or delay permits because data is not

available to decide when we act on a proposed mine. He said they are not proposing that new studies be begun but this is to fund present studies so they can continue.

Rep. Cozzens asked how many hydrologists in the Department. Mr. Hayden said there is one ground water hydrologist and one surface water. Rep. Cozzens asked why this wasn't part of the normal budget request. Mr. Hayden said the State Lands Department is not a research organization. They do not have a staff that is large enough for that. They look at available information from the Bureau of Mines, the United States Geological Survey and from Bozeman and then make a decision. He said they have never viewed themselves as an agency to employ a research staff. A critical part of the bill is that it provides for a memo of understanding between the Department and the Bureau of Mines as it encourages them to look into the following: What are your particular needs? Do you have a special problem? How can we integrate our research to better meet your needs? He felt the research is funded with the bill at a level to meet their needs.

Rep. Conroy asked if there is another high priority place where they plan to use the funds. Mr. Hayden said it would be left with the Bureau of Mines to continue research they have begun. Studies need to be done eventually on the Tongue River drainage as it certainly is a drainage that will receive impacts from mining, but this money is not for evaluation of the petition.

In response to a question on the Roundup area mine, Mr. Hayden said it has not been formally applied for. There has been communications between the Louisiana Land and Mining and State Lands.

Rep. Bengtson asked Mr. Sid Groff, Director and State Geologist, Montana Bureau of Mines, if funds for continuation work on research wasn't budgeted by the subcommittee. Mr. Groff said basically what would come out of the subcommittee budget if approved was \$30,000 for research in this area. That amount would pay Mr. Van Vost's salary and the salary of a secretary. He would still need to find the money to continue by contracting. Of course, he said they couldn't do anything if they didn't get the base money. Rep. Bengtson asked if this addresses the particular need for ongoing studies in this area. Mr. Groff said as far as it can. It only gives him a limited amount of money.

Rep. Lory asked why State Lands since they don't have the capacity of studying did not put in for contracted services. Mr. Hayden replied they plan to use the best research that is going. Tight fiscal year as you are all aware. Since they aren't a research

agency, they didn't consider funding research themselves but are interested in seeing ongoing study research being continued. Rep. Lory asked why they hadn't put in for contracted services instead of a special bill. Mr. Hayden said he would agree the same ends could be met. One problem is the bill as originally written would have had the money come to the Department of State Lands. Having the money go directly to the Bureau avoids the overhead charges which could run 25% to 60%. If they receive the money directly it is not considered a research project.

Rep. Quilici asked who pays for the present petition to designate land unsuitable. Mr. Hayden said the federal government pays. Rep. Quilici asked how much will it cost the state. Mr. Hayden said they have spent \$5,000 to \$10,000 and they received the petition last December.

Rep. Lory asked concerning the large overhead. Is this the way it works in the university system. Anytime a state agency contracts with you they have to pay overhead? And so efficiency is assured if the money is transferred directly to you? Mr. Groff said this is a field they know about and they are perfectly willing to do it for a state agency. The federal government has paid much of it but know it will not pay all. What Mr. Hayden is driving at is to use state funds to build the data base which the State Lands needs for regulation and management. If the money is available we can use it and do good.

Rep. Holliday said in closing that if the research information gained can be beneficial to the coal industry and the environment, then she felt the limited appropriation serves a purpose, and if that proves to be a true assumption, we can look ahead to the long term of having the proper data available to the state and the energy development of the future. She felt it would be appropriate to fund this from either the Resource Indemnity Fund or the Coal Tax Interest because of its importance in the development of coal extraction. She thanked the committee for a good hearing and asked for favorable consideration.

#### HOUSE BILL 542

REPRESENTATIVE ORVAL S. ELLISON, District 73, chief sponsor, said this was his first time before the committee and he wouldn't be here today if he didn't feel this was a top priority item. He said this has to do with the Stillwater Complex which extends to the Sweetgrass County. He said you may not know of it now but in ten or fifteen years everyone will know of it. He said it was destined to replace Butte as the richest hill on earth as it has chromium, platinum and palladium -- all strategic materials. Ninety-five percent of these materials are now being imported from unstable countries or potential enemies. The bill calls for \$28,000 which will be matched with federal dollars which are available for a cooperative study by the Bureau of Mines and the USGS of the ground and surface water of that area.

Presently there are two platinum, palladium mines that are almost a sure thing to go in the next two years. But probably the real value of the Stillwater Complex is the chromium.

SID GROFF, State Geologist and Director of the Bureau of Mines, said this \$28,000 is an emergency course of action. The study is needed on a large scale and it will be expensive. He said he wrote to the Secretary of the Interior in 1979 and explained the situation. The Secretary said it sounds like a good idea and came up with \$46,350 to be matched. They came up with \$18,350 for the match which leaves the \$28,000. Tried all ways to get it - talked to the Governor, all departments, the Old West Regional Council, Sweetgrass County. For awhile we thought Washington would also fund this but the thinking is now that it won't. The \$28,000 is essential and must be had this year to get the matching money for the spring and summer quarter. If we get the matching fund this year we can solidify and hopefully continue to get the \$46,350 so the project can be upgraded in years to come.

JOE MORELAND, United States Geological Survey, said he was not speaking as an advocate of the appropriation as it would not be appropriate since he is a federal employee to be asking for money from the state. He said this is a high priority. The federal money is being held in reserve to be matched by the state of Montana or local governments. All efforts to this point have been futile to raise the matching money. He said they will use the money to obtain a comprehensive hydrologic data base which is absolutely essential in the development of mining in the area. They need to plan for the influx of people that will be occurring. Later in the summer they will extensively survey surface water supplies. The information is needed before the regulatory agencies can issue permits. One year hydrology information is needed so they know what was there before somebody goes in and messes it up. A recent exploratory request was delayed for a year because there was no information available.

There were no opponents. In closing Rep. Ellison said this is an environmentally sensitive area and it lays along the Absaroka Beartooth Wilderness. He said he wished the committee would look on this as a loan rather than an appropriation. This area will bring a lot of money into the state. It will gross around a quarter million a day when they get into operation. This is just the tip of the iceberg of what will be developed in the next years.

Questions were asked by the committee. Rep. Manuel asked if this is underground or strip mining. Rep. Ellison said it is way underground - 5 to 6 thousand feet.

Rep. Bengtson asked if this will go into a holding pattern. Mr. Groff said if the appropriation does not go they will loose the federal matching money. They will still do what they can. Rep. Bengtson asked if there will be matching money in the



future. Mr. Groff said if we don't match now the opportunity in the future might be lost. We have to secure what we have now. Mr. Moreland responded that we may not be eligible again as a large portion of these monies comes through the cooperative program and they are in very high demand as the neighboring states have much higher cooperative monies than Montana. Once a cooperative program is established it maintains some sort of even keel. Looking at long term budget cuts. If we are not successful in expanding the program, we might have problems continuing.

Rep. Cozzens said if it is necessary to get federal 1981 fiscal money in use this spring, shouldn't the effective date be immediately and not in the next biennium.

Chairman Lund called for a recess. The committee convened again at 10:30 a.m.

#### HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 38

REPRESENTATIVE NORM WALLIN, District 76, chief sponsor, said he appreciated the chance to present the bill as he had missed the hearing date due to another meeting. This bill requests that an interim study explore the advantages of changing the state's fiscal year to coincide with the federal fiscal year of October 1. He felt the study would be worthwhile. He said it has a large number of unsolicited co-sponsors which would indicate quite a few people feel this way.

Rep. Hurwitz suggested it could be handled by the Legislative Finance Committee. Rep. Moore said that committee has been designated to look into it. Chairman Lund said this is not encouraging as there are quite a few in there. Priority will have to be determined.

#### SENATE BILL 270

SENATOR PATRICK L. RYAN, the bill's sponsor, being absent, REPRESENTATIVE JACK MOORE, District 41, said he would speak on the bill. The bill is to increase the pay that a discharged inmate will receive. He said there is an amendment which has been worked out with the Chief of the Corrections Division. On line 16, page 2, after the word "inmates" change "shall" to "may." He felt this would clarify how much will be received as the inmate may not need to be given anything. The remainder of the sentence as amended will read "may receive "gate money" up to \$100."

Rep. Bengtson asked if this would penalize those that save their money.

DAN RUSSELL, Chief of the Corrections Bureau, said they look at an inmate's account to determine if that person has enough to set himself up - to get to his destination and find a place to live. Now we only give \$25 and that doesn't go too far.

Rep. Hurwitz asked if every inmate earns money that wants to earn it. Mr. Russell said all except those in maximum security. They get paid up to a dollar a day. Rep. Bengtson said those who have saved won't be eligible to get money - wouldn't this be a disincentive. In response to this the answer was inmates are expected to take care of their personal needs so can save hardly anything. Those inmates that are trained in a craft or that have outside income do not need the discharge money. The prison needs to have the flexibility of the extra amount to help the inmates that are truly indigent.

Rep. Moore moved the amendments be adopted. The motion carried unanimously with those present. He moved the bill AS AMENDED DO PASS. This motion carried unanimously with those present. Absent was Rep. Stobie.

Chairman Lund asked the committee what they wanted to do on the Leaseamerica claim against the state which was heard at the beginning of the meeting. The broken lease award for \$66,619.40.

Rep. Bardanouve moved this be amended into the bill approving other claims on the floor. This motion carried unanimously with those present (Rep. Stobie absent).

Chairman Lund read a letter from Ronald F. Waterman of Gough, Shanahan, Johnson and Waterman (EXHIBIT 16), dealing with an equal opportunity lawsuit brought by Geraldine Strong, who had agreed to settle for \$11,500. Chairman Lund read a letter from Carroll South, Director, Department of Institutions, urging that this be settled out of court. A copy of this letter is EXHIBIT 17 of the minutes.

Chairman Lund said we need to approve the preparation of a bill to pay Geraldine Strong the \$11,500. The committee voted to approve the bill being written with all voting yes except Rep. Conroy, who voted no, and Rep. Stobie, who was absent.

Chairman Lund announced the committee would meet at 7 a.m. for the next two mornings. Chairman Lund opened the meeting to a consideration of the following bill.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

#### HOUSE BILL 801

Representative Quilici handed out suggested amendments and a copy of EXHIBIT 18 of the minutes. Rep. Quilici said the amendments came from Senator Dover and he asked Bob Robinson to explain what the amendments would do to implement the SB 141 into the act and HB 398 that set down guidelines for alternative energy. He said the Legislative Fiscal Analyst felt this language should be in 801 where the appropriation is. The language in the amendment would make it a loan rather than a grant.

Rep. Cozzens said there was a concern expressed on the part of the lenders. If we do give them a loan they need more equity. May get more making it a more selective grant program rather than a loan. Rep. Quilici said this has been addressed by some amendments. Chairman Lund asked if most of these could happen on the floor. Rep. Quilici said Senator Dover would prefer having the language in the bill as it leaves the committee.

Rep. Cozzens said if SB 141 were not to pass that language would need to be struck.

Chairman Lund said the language on the amendment would be tightening up the language for the 2 1/2 million.

Rep. Moore said as you go through these things, many of them are for something to put onto the house and I would propose to deny those sort of things. More home things done than you can shake a stick at.

Rep. Bengtson said she objected to going through them one by one as the committee could get bogged down. They have an Advisory Council.

Rep. Waldron said he wants to see the grant applications as there might be something unique. If we are going to start knocking out, we should see them.

Rep. Quilici encouraged them to look at the amendments. He said this gives the Department guidelines to follow in allocating the grants. He said this is not specifically in there now.

Rep. Hurwitz suggested putting this into a subcommittee which could study them more closely. He made this into a motion.

Rep. Cozzens suggested the agency be asked to see if the language would eliminate any questionable projects. Ask them to take a quick scan of their tentative grants and see if that eliminates them.

Rep. Quilici said the Department has been and will be at all the hearings concerning all the language and they are very cognizant of the language and he felt sure they would use the guidelines.

Chairman Lund said this would jump the gun as it would not be effective until July 1, 1981, and so can't be applied to the present grants.

Leo Berry, DNRC, said this hasn't been applied to the grants because it wasn't in existence at the time, but he felt sure most grants would pass the criteria. He said if the committee would like to have them review the applications and apply the guidelines of 398, they would be glad to.

Rep. Lory stated that he doesn't feel the committee can reassess the grant application. He stated that he feels if grants are cut, dollars should also be cut. He added that tentative grants total approximately \$1,800,000.

Leo Berry, Director, DNRC, stated that the \$381,000 detail in the request for proposal in the spring of 1980, could be used for part of the loan programs, but that funds are committed to alternative energy programs. He stated that he feels the Department ought to move away from small grants and into commercialization.

Rep. Stobie stated that some funds should be put into a loan category and not into grants.

Rep. Conroy stated that he feels the statute must be changed if the Department went to loans, as the law currently applies to grants.

Mr. Berry stated that if SB 141 passes, the appropriation could be put in for the next biennium. He stated that he requested an engineer and an assistant to monitor grants as there are 176 applications in the past year.

Chairman Lund stated that he feels the committee is concerned with how grants are made and that he questions how to put language in the bill, regarding the screening of applications for grants.

Rep. Bardanouve asked if projects were prioritized.

Rep. Lory stated that the committee could cut 10% off all grants.

Rep. Quilici stated that he feels the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation has taken steps to correct the problems with grants.

Rep. Donaldson asked what would happen if there were no tentative grants. Mr. Berry stated that on grants the amounts originally requested were much larger than the amounts actually approved by the Department.

Bob Robinson, LFA, stated that Senator Dover's amendment to SB141 to provide an immediate effective date would also apply to the bill sponsored by Rep. Quilici. He added that \$2,500,000 would be back in the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation if the bill passes.

Question was called on Rep. Hurwitz's motion to put the bill into a subcommittee. The motion failed with 10 members voting no, 6 members voting aye and Rep. Bardanouve not voting.

Rep. Conroy suggested that if SB 141 passes, that boiler-plate language be added to the effect that the Department be checked during the next session in regard to the awarding of grants.

amendments 10, 11 and 14. He stated that these referred to earmarked revenue funds, which must be certified as emergency funding and that they have not been so certified.

Rep. Lory moved that the committee line item that Teacher Retirement and PERS appropriations in the bill be contingent upon the passage of HB 45. The motion was unanimously approved.

Rep. Moore restated his motion to give HB 801 a DO PASS AS AMENDED. The motion was approved with 15 members voting aye, Rep. Ernst abstaining and Rep. Stobie voting no.

The meeting was adjourned at 12:27 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
REP. ART LUND, CHAIRMAN

eas and jc

Rep. Quilici recommended that boiler-plate language be added leaving grants to the discretion of the Director of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation.

Rep. Donaldson moved that the second sentence in the first paragraph of Sen. Dover's amendment should be deleted.

Rep. Lory said that if SB 141 passes, the amendment won't be necessary. Rep. Donaldson's motion was unanimously approved.

Rep. Quilici moved that the Dover Amendment be added to HB 801 as amended by the committee. The motion was approved with 14 members voting aye. Reps. Bengtson, Manuel and Waldron voted no.

Rep. Moore moved that the committee strike line 22 on page 3, Visual Services, \$200,000, and source of funding.

Rep. Waldron stated that these funds would be switched to the Montana Association for the Blind and that the Association stated it could come up with alternative funding by the next biennium.

Rep. Moore's motion was unanimously approved.

Mr. Gene Huntington, OBPP, stated that long range building must be authorized in Architecture and Engineering as well as in the proper areas of the budget, for expenditure authority purposes only. He stated that the amount requested is budgeted one time only, and that there is no duplication of the request elsewhere in the bill. He added that this action expands the scope of the project.

Rep. Moore stated that a House Joint Resolution was introduced on the floor directing the state to sell the lot purchased in Bozeman for the new Job Service Center, and that a less expensive lot was requested to be purchased.

Rep. Thoft moved that the committee delete lines 17 and 18, page 4, for Bald Eagle Study.

Mr. Robinson, LFA, stated that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service contracts with the State Dept. of Fish, Wildlife and Parks to study migration patterns of the Bald Eagle, for management purposes. He stated that no FTE was included in the appropriation and that the Department usually contracted with a wildlife biology student for the study.

The motion made by Rep. Thoft passed with 9 members voting aye and 8 voting no.

Rep. Moore moved that the committee pass HB 801 as amended.

Mr. Curt Nichols, LFA, stated that the LFA was concerned with

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

MARCH 26

19 81

MR. **SPEAKER:** .....

We, your committee on ..... **HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS** .....

having had under consideration ..... **SENATE** ..... Bill No. **270** .....

**A BILL FOR AN ACT ENTITLED: "AN ACT TO INCREASE THE AMOUNT  
OF MONEY THAT A DISCHARGED INMATE MAY RECEIVE; AMENDING  
SECTION 53-30-111, MCA."**

Respectfully report as follows: That ..... **SENATE** ..... Bill No. **270** .....

**Be amended as follows:**

1. line 16 and 17.  
Following: line 15  
Strike: shall receive an amount not exceeding \$100.  
Insert: may receive "Gate Money" in an amount up to \$100.
2. line 21.  
Following: line 20  
Insert: (after discharged or paroled). This amount shall be  
in addition to the "Gate Money".

**DO PASS AS AMENDED**