

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

CHAIRMAN JACK MOORE called the Executive Session to order at 8:06 a.m.  
Committee members present were:

REP. CONROY  
REP. ERNST  
SEN. ETCHART  
SEN. THOMAS  
SEN. JOHNSON

Testimony was given by CARROL SOUTH, Director of the Department of Institutions; MR. R. L. HEARD, Superintendent of Boulder River School and Hospital; DOUG BOOKER, Office of Budget and Planning; EDITH BULKLEY, R.N. at Boulder River School and Hospital; MR. LAUMAEYER, Superintendent of Boulder School; JOE ROBERTS, Lobbyist for the Developmental Disabilities Council; ED ARGENBRIGHT, Superintendent of Public Instruction and JUDY JOHNSON, Director of Special Education.

MR. HOFFMAN explained the new figures (Exhibit 12 Page 1). He noted that the difference between the Executive Budget and the Legislative Fiscal Analyst has been reduced to 5.64. The 5.64 is what the Legislative Fiscal Analyst is recommending to bring up the direct care staffing pattern.

MR. SOUTH stated that in order to keep the total amount of employees down, he would rather have the laundry workers hired to free the direct care staff. He felt that at the present time the direct care staff is doing an adequate job.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if he was going to change the ratio at Eastmont.

MR. SOUTH stated not at the present time.

MR. HOFFMAN explained how the ratios were arrived at Boulder, and how the last legislative session determined those ratios. He asked Mr. Heard what the staff turnover was in a year.

MR. HEARD stated there was around a 60% turnover last year.

MR. HOFFMAN explained with turnover included, there will never be a 1-to-1 ratio.

SEN. THOMAS asked if there is a requirement for a 1-to-1 ratio.

MR. HOFFMAN explained the Medicaide reimbursement is on a 1-to-2 or 2.25 ratio. He stated the last legislature authorized an attorney to handle any legal matters. He wanted to know what happened to the attorney.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 2

MR. SOUTH stated he would not need to hire another lawyer, but would like to contract with the Attorney General's office for the Institutions. He noted he would like to have the money for the attorney left in the Institution Budget.

MR. BOOKER explained the legislative auditor fees for \$15,000 have been set up in a revolving fund at the Administrative Audit.

MR. LUND stated the audit fees are not in the Legislative Fiscal Analyst's budget according to the greenbook.

MR. HOFFMAN explained that if the legislative auditor is given the revolving fund, then the funds would be put into the budget. He further explained the difference in the Supplies and Materials amounted to \$901. This was basically due to the inflationary increases the Legislative Fiscal Analyst had not anticipated. He further explained the Legislative Fiscal Analyst's difference in Communications, Travel and Rent. In the Utilities, a problem has developed due to the inflationary increases used by Legislative Fiscal Analyst and the Executive Budget.

THE CHAIRMAN stated because Mr. South expressed strongly he does not want any supplementals next session, it would be necessary to work out a compromise on utilities.

REP. ERNST asked if utilities could be line itemed.

MR. SOUTH asked if language could be put into the bill to give flexibility on the utility portion of the budget, due to the upcoming rate increases.

SEN. THOMAS stated concern over the insulation being completed by the Long Range Building Program. He felt this would help reduce the utility bills.

REP. ERNST stated he felt that as slow as the state moves, the insulation might not affect the utility bills for some time.

THE CHAIRMAN stated it would be his proposal to use cash, rather than worry about selling bonds for capital construction.

SEN. JOHNSON asked if Boulder applied for the Energy Grant.

MR. HEARD stated they are participating in a portion of it, done by the Department of Administration, with matching funds.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 3

MR. SOUTH stated he would like to have the flexibility in the budget to use vacancy savings to offset costs in Operations.

THE CHAIRMAN stated, in the past, Equipment money has been used for other items. He felt that no one would mind giving Mr. South the bottom line, plus line items for Utilities in the Appropriation Bill.

SEN. THOMAS stated he would like to give Mr. South the responsibility of having the bottom line figure for the budget, and have him manage it.

MR. HOFFMAN stated if it is the intent of the Committee that line items can be transferred between Operations and Personal Services, it should be stated in the bill to have a spread between Operations, Personal Services and Equipment. The prior content of the bill was that Personal Services must stay within Personal Services, Supplies stay within Supplies. If it is the intent to allow money to be switched, then it would not be necessary to line item all areas.

MR. SOUTH stated he would rather have the three main areas line itemed. He explained the problems of upgrading in the budget. He felt he did not want the responsibility of putting operations money into Personal Services.

MR. HOFFMAN explained the difference in the Equipment amount. This difference was the bus which would be based on the approval of the educational plan for the 18 additional people at Boulder. If this is approved, then the bus would be necessary.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to continue on to the first Modified Program for the 6 laundry workers and 1 housekeeper supervisor. Where is the extra money for the Supplies and Materials and extra food these people would require.

MR. SOUTH stated he would need to request an additional amount for food under Supplies and Materials.

THE CHAIRMAN stated he had spoken to Mr. Argenbright and Mrs. Johnson to see what would satisfy the complaint from the Office of Civil Rights. He noted that if the 18 additional people were added, this might take care of the 21 and under residents, and would in turn free the other personnel to take care of the 21 and older residents.

MR. SOUTH stated the original budget request was for 96 people. He felt his first priority was to meet the federal law, since the state law could be changed.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 4

MR. BOOKER stated it was his understanding that it was this staffing in addition to what we have now for the 21 and under that would put us in compliance. That these people alone would not put the Boulder River School and Hospital in compliance.

THE CHAIRMAN asked what could be done for the 21 and older residents.

MR. HEARD stated he would have some resources left to continue services for those over 21.

MR. HOFFMAN asked Mr. Heard if in the last year he had reallocated his educational resources to the under 21 population, or was he going to still maintain the same level of services to the over 21 as in the past.

MR. HEARD stated he had not reallocated the staffing pattern he had in effect prior to the money received from the Office of Public Instruction. He noted Boulder was providing the same level of services to the school age people as well as the adults. Title I was earmarked for under 21, but both adults and children were served. It did not serve the entire population. There has been no change in that allocation of staff.

MR. HOFFMAN asked Mr. Heard with the addition of 18 personnel if he would be able to provide more services for those under 21.

MR. HEARD stated yes. Essentially these 18 positions consist of the current 16 provided by the Grant from the Office of Public Instruction and the addition of the Speech Pathologist and the adaptive equipment person for those 21 and under.

Recess 10 minutes.

MR. SOUTH explained to Ed Argenbright and Judy Johnson that the Committee is proposing to continue the staff currently working at Boulder under the Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction Grant with the addition of 2 more making a total of 18. This addition would serve the students under 21. He asked if they thought the 18 additional staff would comply as a good faith effort.

MISS JOHNSON stated she had no idea what the Office of Civil Rights were going to ask. She stated the Office of Civil Rights should have had the final resolution in her office by Monday. Certainly the 18 members are a sign of good faith, however, the Civil Rights Office is still looking at the least restrictive environment, which they are saying is not Boulder River School and Hospital. She felt we could prove the Boulder River School is the least restrictive environment.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 5

THE CHAIRMAN asked Miss Johnson if she would contact the Denver Office and explain to them what the Committee is contemplating in a Modified Program for the education of the 21 and under residents. He asked that they be told, we have to know now, and if they differ with us, have them tell us why and in what area and where. We are not discussing the least restrictive environment, we want to deal with a modified program for the residents so that special education can be available to them.

MR. SOUTH feels this does not address the least restrictive environment, and at this point this is a subjective matter as to what is the least restrictive area for these children.

MISS JOHNSON stated that with all the staffing done on these children, so far only one could be placed in the community if services were available. This did not refer to educational services, but to the medical needs. The rest of the children are being staffed to stay at Boulder and they are at the place they belong.

MR. ARGENBRIGHT stated he did tour the cottages, and he believes they are doing a good job, and he concurs with what Mr. South has stated.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if there was a possibility of any Federal funds being acquired for this program.

MR. ARGENBRIGHT stated he didn't believe so. He felt the funding for Boulder was given for two years at \$100,000 each year. This came through the Office of Public Instruction, and he felt the funding should go directly to the schools.

THE CHAIRMAN asked about the additional federal funding.

MISS JOHNSON stated she did not know what would be available through her office.

SEN. THOMAS asked Miss Johnson, if this situation occurred because of the state Special Education Plan. Is there any chance of modifying the state plan? He thinks a lot of people feel these children do not have the capabilities for 6 to 8 hours of education.

MISS JOHNSON stated the state plan follows the state guidelines. We have received our money even though the Office of Civil Rights has a complaint against us. The complaint stated the Office of Public Instruction was not following the state plan by not monitoring the program at Boulder River School and Hospital to see if they were in compliance with the education regulations. She stated the Office of Public Instruction is certainly monitoring the programs. This will apply to the

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 6

other institutions as well, including Warm Springs State Hospital and Pine Hills.

SEN. THOMAS asked if there was any indication from Denver that they will modify this complaint.

MISS JOHNSON stated she was told they would never be out of our hair. The Department of Education in Washington D.C. has a memorandum or understanding that all complaints to the Special Education will go through the Office of Civil Rights. The chief state school officers and the special education directors have a memorandum to President Reagen stating the problems with the Office of Civil Rights.

SENATOR THOMAS asked what the dollar amount of funds the Feds could take from us.

MISS JOHNSON stated she had asked them that. The first thing they said would be taken away was all of our federal dollars including highway funds etc. She felt the only thing they could do is take away the Special Education federal dollars, which is \$2.8 million that is the amount of Special Education dollars serving 94-142. She stated that California is getting ready to tell them to go home too. She felt the argument was in regard to the least restrictive environment.

THE CHAIRMAN stated we do have a school at Boulder River School and Hospital, don't we?

MISS JOHNSON stated, "Yes, Boulder does have a school."

MR. SOUTH stated that the representatives from the Office of Civil Rights will be coming to Warm Springs State Hospital on January 27, 1981.

REP. CONROY stated he would like to suggest we ask them to appear before the subcommittee.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that the subcommittee should ask them. He asked Mr. Heard to explain the term, "least restrictive environment."

MR. HEARD stated they go according to Montana State Law. See Exhibit II, page 5. He felt it was a difficult term to define.

MR. LAUMEYER, Superintendent of Public Schools, stated he did discuss with Lola Bliss, the attorney of OCR, the topic of least restrictive. She assured him that their office does not say everyone has to be out of Boulder. She said least restrictive is basically what Mr. Heard stated, and added one more point

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981.

Page 7

where all the child needs are being met. He stated he has sat in the staff meetings and in every case, they have found needs that cannot be met under the present services in the community, other than Boulder River School and Hospital. In most of the meetings the subject of attending Boulder Public Schools was discussed. Boulder Public School has not said these children may not attend. From the staffing program, however, most of the children could not be served either medically or educationally. He feels fairly comfortable with the OCR statement that they are not saying these people have to be out of Boulder. They are saying they have to be served in the least restrictive environment, and that means the setting that supplies all of their needs.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that is what we are trying to do with these residents.

MR. HOFFMAN asked Mr. Heard to explain the services received at Boulder in regard to the least restrictive environment.

MR. HEARD stated he has seen people placed in the communities in the past. He feels that just because the resident is living in the community, this is not always the least restrictive environment. He explained if a person was not able to leave the group home, he might be better off in Boulder where he was able to mix with the other residents and have more individual freedom. This depends on the home he was placed in, the traffic patterns, and the variety of dangers around him. He stated that during his tours throughout Montana, the community service programs have become more successful than at first anticipated. It is also important to bring out in regard to least restrictive environment, the ability of the individual to respond to and with the environment. This topic is being addressed with members of the Child Study Team, which has representatives from the School Districts, Boulder River School and Hospital staff, and Office of Public Instruction.

MR. ROBERTS, lobbyist for the Legislative Action Committee for the Developmental Disabilities, stated that Mr. Heard is one of the Saints of the whole deinstitutionalization effort and the chain of services these people get in the state. He noted that he has recently toured Boulder, and the change from 1973 is phenomenal. He felt it was a credit to our state that these services are occurring. He felt it was best if the CST, who work with each individual, deal with the term least restrictive environment. He wanted to make a statement on the budget process itself. When you look at the budget for Boulder River

School and Hospital and then look at the budget for the Developmental Disabilities Division and the Vocational Rehabilitation, there is a remarkable policy statement that comes from this. It states the era of de-institutionalization is essentially at an end. We have identified a population at Boulder of approximately 225 people who can best be served in an institution setting. He feels this is the underlying policy assumption that is contained in the budget for Boulder River School and Hospital and the D D Division. The only way to get true movement out of the institution into community programs, is if the budget is built to do exactly that. This was done two years ago, when the money was put into community programs. The money was reduced from Boulder throughout the biennium and it was mandated that 60 people were going to move out into community programs. He noted there were some problems in doing this, but it was accomplished. He feels the only way it will be accomplished again is if this legislature has a policy that states it will be done. He stated that as the budget is constituted now, there is no movement. He felt the policy should be stated that we have identified an institutional clientele that can best be served in that setting.

THE CHAIRMAN stated there is a possibility over a period of time the people we have put out in a group home setting will probably be better served if they were back in Boulder. I agree we have the core at Boulder than can best be benefited there.

MR. ROBERTS stated there may be some movement back into the institution. He doubted it would be any significant numbers. He felt that in terms of the net gain in population Boulder has seen in this biennium, the figure would be small. He noted there aren't many more going into Boulder and there would be a decrease by attrition.

MR. SOUTH explained the profile of the residents at Boulder. He noted there was one normal individual at Boulder and would like Mr. Heard to explain why.

MR. HEARD stated the man in discussion was 78 years old. He had done ranch work but due to health problems was placed in a nursing home. However, he became quite aggressive in this environment and was committed to Warm Springs State Hospital. He was diagnosed as mentally retarded so was transferred to Boulder. The Boulder staff knew he was average when he read the paper every morning, etc. Mr. Heard noted they tried to get him out into the community, or else transfer him to the Center for the Aged. This man visited Lewistown by bus and felt Boulder was where he wanted to be. Boulder decided to keep him because due to his aggressiveness, he might end up back in Warm Springs, and the cycle would continue all over again.



MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 9

SEN. JOHNSON asked what percentage of the people who came back from nursing homes were transferred out to group homes.

MR. HEARD stated he really didn't know. He noted that nursing homes were used in the late sixties by Boulder River School and Hospital. The returns from nursing homes have been minimal, outside of the emergency nursing home placements in 1974. At that time 110 were placed, and 50 returned. The nursing homes were given the option to retain those individuals for whom they felt they could provide the proper services. He felt from the 50 returned, maybe 10 to 15 were placed in group homes.

EDITH BLAKELY, LPN at Boulder River School and Hospital, explained the problems of taking care of 8 residents with only 1 Habilitation Aide. These residents have approximately the mentality of a 3 year old, and when one throws a tantrum, all the others throw one too.

THE CHAIRMAN stated if we authorize the budget for the 18 additional personnel, the \$30,000 difference in travel will be discussed in the second modificaiton.

MR. HOFFMAN explained to the committee that if the additional staff is authorized, the extra bus will be needed to meet the educational needs of the residents under 21. (EXHIBIT 12)

SEN. ETCHART moved that the Equipment amount of \$198,563 for FY 82 and \$45,488 for FY 83 be approved contingent upon the approval of the \$30,000 bus at a later time.

THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. CONROY moved the Goods Produced for Resale amount of \$10,273 for FY 82 and \$10,567 for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. ERNST moved the Other Expenses amount of \$5,929 for FY 82 and \$6,432 for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

SEN. ETCHART moved the Repair and Maintenance amount of \$58,440 for FY 82 and \$62,586 for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 10

THE CHAIRMAN noted there was a variance in the Fiscal Analyst and the Executive Budget in the Utility expenditures of \$39,322 in FY 82 and \$98,707 in FY 83. He asked that Mr. Hoffman explain his inflation factors.

MR. HOFFMAN explained the LFA estimated inflation factors for utilities at 13.5% for FY 82 and 12% for FY 83.

MR. SOUTH stated due to the difficulty of predicting the utility costs over the next two years, the 26% inflation factor built in, might be used up the first year.

THE CHAIRMAN stated the utilities will be line itemed.

REP. ERNST asked if the Office of Budget and Program Planning and the Utility Company could get together to determine what the rate increases would be over the next two years.

MR. SOUTH stated Montana Power Company has to buy their oil from Canada. Due to the OPEC price increases, no one has any control over the gas prices.

MR. HOFFMAN asked Mr. Booker what inflation rate he was anticipating.

MR. BOOKER stated that in electricity the rate would be 10% for FY 82 and 10% for FY 83. Natural gas rate would be 22.7% for FY 82 and 23.2% for FY 83.

THE CHAIRMAN asked what percent increase did the last biennium have.

MR. HOFFMAN stated there was a 14% difference between FY 80 actual and FY 80 estimated, and there was a 26.9% difference between FY 79 actual and FY 79 estimated.

REP. CONROY asked what was the difference between what they had asked for and what they received.

MR. WOLCOTT stated they are still short 12%.

MR. HOFFMAN stated that one of the factors for the difference in FY 79 was the severe winter conditions. The winter of 1980 was mild in comparison, and thus the rates were less.

THE CHAIRMAN stated the other subcommittee will get together and determine a standard rate to be determined when discussing the utility portion of the budget.

SEN. ETCHART moved the Rent amount of \$27,558 for FY 82 and

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 11

\$29,624 . for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

SEN. ETCHART moved we accept the Executive Budget for Travel of \$17,083 for FY 82 and \$19,646 for FY 83.

THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. ERNST moved the Communications amount of \$70,615 for FY 82 and \$76,618 for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

THE CHAIRMAN stated that we should accept the Fiscal Analyst's figures for Supplies and Materials. Depending on which modification is accepted, the amount of food and other supplies will then be added to that area.

REP. ERNST moved the Supplies and Materials amount of \$716,668 for FY 82 and \$807,807 for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

MR. HOFFMAN stated that the discrepancy figure of \$1,349 in the Contracted Service area between the Executive Budget and the Fiscal Analyst budget is due to inflation.

SEN ETCHART moved the Personal Service amount of \$7,357,179 for FY 82 and \$7,357,179 for FY 83 be approved.

THE MOTION PASSED.

MR. HOFFMAN noted these figures do not include pay increases.

SEN ETCHART moved that we accept the Modification Program No. 1, which would include the addition of 6 laundry workers, and 1 housekeeping supervisor. This would make the total FTE's for Personal Services 473.26, and add \$80,222 to the Personal Service Budget.

THE MOTION PASSED.

THE CHAIRMAN stated it has been decided to line item the Department of Institution into four line categories. These would be Personal Services, Operation and Maintenance, Utilities and Equipment.

MR. BOOKER asked if it will be stated in the Appropriations Bill that Mr. South will be allowed to take money from Personal

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS  
SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL BUDGET  
January 14, 1981

Page 12

Services to help out on Operations cost, but that he will not be allowed to take from Personal Services to assist in any other area. He stated that Boulder River School gets school lunch funds from the Federal government. He feels there is more flexibility if this money comes out of the General Funds directly. He felt there would be a problem in cash flow if this was done any other way. He assured the Committee that the money will be reverted to the general funds. In case there was a shortfall, Institutions will be held responsible.

MR. HOFFMAN asked what happens if there are more School Lunch Funds than anticipated.

MR. BOOKER stated the extra money that comes in for Boulder will go into the General Fund.

MR. HOFFMAN explained the school lunch revenue source to the Committee.

SEN. THOMAS moved to leave to the discretion of the Office of Budget and Planning to send communications to our Fiscal Analyst when the school lunch money comes in so that it will be returned to the General Fund.

THE MOTION PASSED.

There being no further discussion or comments the meeting was adjourned at 10:50.



---

JACK K. MOORE, Chairman

VISITORS' REGISTER

HOUSE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS SUB COMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS

BILL Executive Session for Boulder River School & Hospital Date 1/14/81

SPONSOR \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	RESIDENCE	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPO
<i>Carol [unclear]</i>	<i>Helena</i>	<i>Dept. of Inst.</i>		
<i>Keith [unclear]</i>	<i>HELENA</i>	<i>Dept of Inst.</i>		
<i>[unclear] [unclear]</i>	<i>[unclear]</i>	<i>B R S H</i>		
<i>[unclear]</i>	<i>Boulder</i>			
<i>[unclear]</i>	<i>Boulder</i>	<i>Local 971</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.  
 PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

EXPENDITURES

1982 Budget

1983 Budget

DESCRIPTION	1980 Actual	1981* Estimated	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec-LFA Variance	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec.-LFA Variance
FIE	495,26	484,26	472,262 466,26	471,90	5,64	466,26	471,90	5,64
Salaries	5,778,507	5,967,241	5,971,080	6,024,001	52,921	5,971,080	6,024,001	52,921
Benefits	1,203,837	1,490,902	1,386,099	1,399,435	13,336	1,386,099	1,399,435	13,336
Total Personal Services	6,982,344	7,458,143	7,357,179	7,423,436	66,257	7,357,179	7,423,436	66,257
Contracted Services	127,338	143,806	171,221	169,872	(1,349)	163,945	164,028	83
Supplies & Materials	592,282	609,387	717,569	716,668	( 901)	807,807	807,807	-0-
Communications	49,852	63,618	70,615	70,615	-0-	76,618	76,618	-0-
Travel	12,902	16,400	17,083	17,525	442	119,646	18,926	(720)
Rent	23,847	30,725	27,558	27,558	-0-	29,624	29,624	-0-
Utilities	366,257	419,261	511,061	471,739	(39,322)	627,054	528,347	(98,707)
Repair & Maintenance	55,978	72,700	58,440	58,440	-0-	62,586	62,586	-0-
Other Expenses	6,064	4,258	5,929	5,929	-0-	6,432	6,432	-0-
Goods Produced for Resale	8,605	9,864	10,273	10,273	-0-	10,567	10,567	-0-
Total Operating Expenses	1,243,125	1,370,019	1,589,749	1,548,619	(41,130)	1,804,279	1,704,935	(99,344)
Equipment	104,521	36,500	198,563	198,563	-0-	75,488	45,488	(30,000)
Total Program Costs	8,239,990	8,864,662	9,145,491	9,170,618	25,127	9,236,946	9,173,859	(63,087)

\* If estimated amount includes more than original appropriation, please explain

EXPENDITURES

1982 Budget

1983 Budget

Funding	1980		1981*		1982 Budget		1983 Budget		Exec.-LFA Variance
	Actual	Estimated	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	
General Fund	8,131,287	8,573,792	9,066,071	9,037,146	9,156,773	9,038,124			(118,649)
Other Funds**									
1. Title I	98,557	50,074	69,147	70,147	69,606	69,606			-0-
2. Revolving	23,695	14,324	10,273	10,273	10,567	10,567			-0-
3. School Lunch	46,754	40,446		54,052		55,562			55,562
4. Special Ed.	29,697	186,026							
5.									
TOTAL	8,329,990	8,864,662	9,145,491	9,170,618	9,236,946	9,173,859			( 63,087)

\* If estimated amount includes more than original appropriation, please explain

\*\* List each accounting entity separately.

PERSONAL SERVICES SUMMARY

MODIFIED SUPPORT  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL

	FY 80 Actual	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83
<b>Total Personal Services</b>			65,951	65,951
Salaries and Wages			16,752	16,752
Benefits			( 2,481)	( 2,481)
Less Vacancy Savings 3%				
<b>Total All Personal Services</b>			( 80,222 )	80,222
<b>FTE's</b>			( 7.00 )	7.00
Direct Care				
X Indirect Care				
6 Laundry Worker I				
6-2				
1 Housekeeping Supervisor				
11-2				
<b>Population</b>				



EXPENDITURES

1982 Budget

1983 Budget

	1980 Actual	1981* Estimated	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec.-LFA Variance	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec.-LFA Variance
General Fund			80,222	-0-	(80,222)	80,222	-0-	(80,222)
Other Funds**								
1.								
2.								
3.								
4.								
5.								
TOTAL			80,222	-0-	(80,222)	80,222	-0-	(80,222)

\* If estimated amount includes more than original appropriation, please explain

\*\* List each accounting entity separately.

**PERSONAL SERVICES SUMMARY**

MODIFIED OCR/  
BOULDER RIVER SCHOOL AND HOSPITAL

Page \_\_\_\_\_ of \_\_\_\_\_

	FY 80 Actual	FY 81	FY 82	FY 83
<b>Total Personal Services</b>				
Salaries and Wages			236,829	236,829
Benefits			55,021	55,021
Less Vacancy Savings			( 8,755)	( 8,755)
<b>Total All Personal Services</b>			283,095	283,095
<b>FTE's</b>				
Direct Care				
X Indirect Care				
5 - Teachers				
9 - Teacher Aides				
1 - Adaptive Carpenter				
1 - Speech Pathologist				
1 - Occupational Therapist				
1 - Rehab Aide				
<b>Population</b>			18.00	18.00

EXPENDITURES

1982 Budget

1983 Budget

Funding	1981*		1982 Budget		1983 Budget		Exec.-LFA Variance
	1980 Actual	Estimated	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	Exec. Budget	Fiscal Analyst	
General Fund			270,369	-0-	283,095	-0-	(283,095)
Other Funds**							
1. Title I			12,726	-0-			( 12,726)
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
TOTAL			283,095	-0-	283,095		(283,095)

\* If estimated amount includes more than original appropriation, please explain

\*\* List each accounting entity separately.