

*The Big Sky Country*



MONTANA STATE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE  
SPECIAL SESSION  
NOVEMBER 17, 1981

EXECUTIVE SESSION

The meeting of the House Appropriations committee was called to order at 4:30 p.m. on Tuesday November 17, 1981. All members were present. The purpose of this meeting was to take executive action on HB 2.

Chairman Donaldson said that the committee would consider one section of the bill at a time as presented by the three subcommittees.

Representative Moore made a motion that the committee adopt the subcommittee amendments as incorporated into the grey bill contained in the Report to the House Appropriations Committee by the Joint Subcommittees I, II, and III. This, he stated, will provide us a base to work from.

Question was called on the motion and the vote carried unanimously.

Dave Lewis, Governor's office, asked the Chairman if he could address the committee concerning the terms of the call. Mr. Lewis questioned the committee's consideration of amendments to HB 500 that were not within the Governor's call.

Chairman Donaldson asked Mr. Lewis to be more specific as to what amendments he was referring to.

Lewis: Concerning the Governor's office budget there has been a minus \$6,000 amendment offered for FY '83. There are several in here. I just want to make sure that it is very clear that the action that is being taken is being done properly. First we have the Governor's call which is to address the Governor's amendments and second the issue as to whether the other amendments that have been added are within the scope of the call.

Donaldson: We have taken the Governor's proposal and modified it or rejected it whichever the case may be into the subcommittee reports.

I do not feel this is outside the call at all. However, as we go along if there are certain amendments that you feel are outside the call I hope you will point them out.

Lewis: It appears that this is the committee's final action and there are such issues as the county assistance that haven't even been considered as required by the terms of the call.

Cozzens: We did discuss the county proposal in subcommittee III but no decisions were reached.

Lewis: So it is your position that discussion without a vote meets the terms of the call?

Donaldson: I think the committee's decision to act or take no action on an issue is within the terms of the call.

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE -A1-

Representative Shontz asked Dave Lewis to comment on the bill A-4 of the grey copy line 5 and 6. (All references are made to the Report to the Appropriations Committee from Subcommittees I, II and III.)

Lewis: What happened is that Old West spending authority was removed so the money that we had in the office of program planning is no longer needed there. A minus appropriation has been inserted in this bill. At the end of the year our office will show a minus appropriation of \$6,193 which will put me in violation of the statute that says I will be liable for a \$500 fine and six months in jail if I have a negative appropriation on the books at the end of the year. I do not think this is necessary and I think it may be very difficult to handle. I think this is outside the terms of the call.

Judy Ripplingale said that the committee wanted to remove the \$106,193 spending authority in the department because of the removal of Old West. It just so happened, she stated, that they did not have enough spending authority in their budget to cover this removal so it shows up as a minus. It would not have even come up as an issue if they would have had more than a \$100,000 in their budget. As long as you eliminate the program you eliminate the authority that went with that program and that is what the language in the bill was intended to do.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (Cont.)

Bob Pyfer addressed the committee concerning this issue also. Mr. Pyfer felt that this action was within the scope of the call. He said that to unnecessarily restrict the interpretation so that you could not address anything except the exact numbers in the bill without giving any kind of consideration for the full treatment of the program would be over-restrictive.

Judy Rippingale explained how and why the committee arrived at this negative appropriation. She said that \$106,193 was a legislative appropriation for the Old West Council in the budget of OPP. Right now on SIBUS that agency shows that amount of authority. The committee by this language is trying to tell the agency to take this appropriation off. Ms. Rippingale said that the agency can make the appropriation appear to be negative on the books if they want to but not because they need to. The appropriation received by this agency to set up Old West was received by two different appropriations bills. The department requests that the spending authority of \$106,193 be removed. In order for the legislature to comply with that request and only use HB 500 this is the approach the committee chose to use.

Lewis: We don't have any other federal funds appropriations for FY '83 to offset this reduction. HB 840 gave us money to reimburse agencies for the cost of the pay plan. In this particular incidence there is no one in the Governor's office paid out of the funds because there is no federal funds remaining. Under HB 840 we cannot allocate federal funds authority under the pay plan because there is no one there that is subject to the pay plan increase. So there is no option except that I will end up with a minus \$6,193 appropriation. But the main issue as far as I am concerned is that this is a "Backdoor reduction" to HB 840 which was not included in the call.

Representative Quilici made a motion that this language (A-6 lines 6 thru 9) be removed from the bill and line 5 thru 14 on page A-4 be deleted.

Question was called on the motion and a roll call vote taken. Motion failed 10-6 with one abstention. See HB2 vote #1 on roll call vote sheet.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (cont.)

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

Representative Moore said that he had one technical amendment to make as follows:

Page A10, line 16.

Following: "... costs only."

Insert: "Funds not reappropriated for coal tax defense during the 1983 biennium shall revert to the general fund upon passage of this bill."

Following discussion, question being called, a vote was taken and passed with 16 yes and 1 no. Representative Lory voted no.

BOARD OF CRIME CONTROL

Status-quo

DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

Representative Lory said that the department has announced that they will discontinue night plowing of roads in order to build up the funds.

Representative Hurwitz said this would be addressed through the gas tax bill.

Status-quo

DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Representative Moore said that the Disaster and Emergency Services would be a separate item since it pertains to \$75,000 in federal funds. It should be in Long-Range Building. He stated that presently this issue is in a stalemate position.

Remainder of department- Status-quo

Representative Moore made a motion that the committee approve Section A as amended. A vote was taken and passed unanimously. See roll call vote HB2 vote #2.

Chairman Donaldson said that the committee would now consider Section B. Human Services.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 5

EXECUTIVE SESSION (cont.)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH

Representative Bardanouve said that in the area of family planning (-B1-) the subcommittee took action that reduced general fund spending authority of \$22,950. This was appropriated last session. He stated that it was not his intention to do this and he believes that some of the other committee members did not understand that they were reducing authority that was already appropriated last session.

Representative Bardanouve made a motion to restore the \$22,950 general fund spending authority for the family planning program to the department.

Representative Waldron said that this \$22,950 represents services for about 306 women. The loss of these funds will mean about 78 unwanted pregnancies resulting in approximately 51 births, 12 abortions and 14 miscarriages.

Representative Cozzens said that it seems to him that if the agency has over \$2.4 million general funds for the biennium they could make some kind of administrative cuts to make up for \$22,950 which is about one-half of one percent of the budget.

Question was called on the motion. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried with 9 members voting yes and 8 members voting no. See roll call vote sheet HB2 vote #3.

Representative Bardanouve said that even though the committee voted against appropriating money for the Indian health clinics he has received many comments expressing concern about this. They believe, he stated, that they can run three clinics with minimum care for about \$99,057. These three clinics are located in Helena, Great Falls and Missoula.

Representative Bardanouve moved that the committee add \$99,057 to the Department of Health's general fund appropriations for these three clinics. (Refer to page B-1 grey copy in the subcommittee report.) This would make the total appropriation for FY '83 \$3,238,495 instead of \$3,139,438 (See B-1 line 9).

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 6

EXECUTIVE SESSION (cont.)

(Information on the Indian Association proposal is contained in the testimony submitted at the November 16, 1981 meeting and is EXHIBIT 3 of those minutes.)

Representative Stobie said that we can not keep spending more money than we are taking in and he could not support this motion.

Representative Conroy said that sometime-somehow, we are going to have to coordinate Indian and non-Indian services so that we live under the same guide lines and rules. This will be difficult to do because we will have to get rid of a lot of prejudices and old wounds. He said he would support the motion with reservations and the understanding that we must come to an understanding between the state and federal government about coordinating some of these services.

Representative Hurwitz said that we have to take that step now even though there will be some hurts and prejudices.

A roll call vote was taken on Rep. Bardanouve's motion. The motion failed with 5 members voting yes and 12 members voting no. See roll call vote sheet HB 2 vote #4.

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR & INDUSTRY

Status-quo

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION

-AFDC-

Representative Waldron said that the state should consider some type of funding to the counties since some of the recipients of these other programs will turn to the county for assistance when they are cut from the other programs.

Representative Quilici agreed and said that he hoped the committee would take this into consideration when we look to granting some type of aid to local governments next session.

No motions were made.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (cont.)

MEDICAID

Representative Bardanouve said that the unemployed parents that will be losing benefits on that program will also lose medicaid. "We are right on the fine line as to whether we are losing or gaining more by cuts in the program. The county will have to pick up some of this assistance but on the other hand we will probably eliminate some of the freeloaders."

Moore: There is always the possibility that due to the actions taken by this legislature that there could be some redistribution of those recipients. Perhaps they will go to some other state. So each of these welfare agencies might not be as hard hit as you think.

No motion was made.

-Social Services-

Status-quo

-DCA-

Status-quo

-Low Income Energy Assistance-

Quilici: I guess I just have to speak on this one more time. I am not a real advocate of local government but I am an advocate to see that we put money into local government. In December of 1979 Montana Power's rate for natural gas was 2.28 for the first 15 MCF, in September of 1981 it had gone up to 3.28 for the first MCF. That is a \$1 increase in two years. So when the energy assistance runs out if we don't give some money to the local governments to pick this up I do not know what these people will do.

Representative Moore asked Representative Cozzens for some statistics on the increase in the Low Income Energy Assistance Program over the past years.

EXECUTIVE SESSION (cont.)

Cozzens: In 1977 when the program began there was \$1,480,000, in 1978 \$994,000, in 1979 \$1,183,000, in 1980 6,489,000 and in 1981 \$10,044,000. We are looking at \$7.5 million for the program this coming year which is a 16% increase over 1980 plus they have the unidentified reserve. I don't recall hearing about too many people that were freezing to death in the winter of 1980 which was a much colder winter than last year.

Moore: The point is, there is a corresponding increase in the program as compared with the cost of energy.

Quilici: There has been a 16% increase in the last two years in the program funds but there has been a 50% increase in fuel cost. That doesn't balance out.

Cozzens: In 1977 when the program started there were 13,000 participants, in '78 there were 39,000, '79 is a blank, in '80 there were 16,971 and in '81 there were 16,200 which is a drop of 700 families and an increase of \$10 million.

There were no motions made.

-Administrative Savings-

Status-quo-

-Developmental Disabilities Division DDD-

The department of SRS recommended reductions of current level DD services of \$625,000. The subcommittee recommended reductions of \$325,000.

Representative Moore inquired whether or not Easter Seals had applied for any of this DD money since many of the DD people work in that area.

Mr. LaFaver said that they have a contract with Easter Seals. They are one of the major shelter work shops for DD.

Representative Bardanouve asked if there will be enough money in the budget to provide the new DD services that the legislature appropriated money for last session.

Mr. LaFaver said there would be no cuts in the services as provided for last session.

Representative Shontz pointed out that many of the DD clients are also receiving low income energy assistance. He said that the legislature is replacing some of the funds they will lose in that program.

Representative Marks asked if some of the savings in this area were based on the "phase in".

Mr. LaFaver said that they were not. The cuts were based on administrative savings within the department and the provider shops.

Representative Sales said that he had an amendment that would remove language from HB 500 that was no longer needed. This amendment is dealing with Medicaid. Refer to page B-9, grey copy, in the subcommittee report. The amendment would be as follows:

Page B-9

Following: line 14

Strike: line 15 through 19 in their entirety.

Insert: "The legislature finds, by way of factual determination, that no further reductions in federal medicaid funding during fiscal 1982 are foreseen or anticipated within the meaning of section 17-7-301, MCA."

Representative Sales said that all indications from Washington D.C. are that there will not be any further cuts regarding Medicaid in FY '82.

Representative Sales made a motion that the amendment as stated above be inserted into HB 2.

Waldron: There was a proposal by the Governor for a \$5 million contingency fund should there be additional cuts. They indicated that they anticipate a 5% cut which would probably devastate the Medicaid program. Your proposed language would say that rather than having contingency the Governor should come to the legislature with a supplemental appropriation request.

Sales: This is true if it actually happens, but everything that we can find out indicates that this is not going to happen during this biennium, however, it could happen in 1983.

Waldron: You did not answer my question. Is it your intention that should this happen the Governor should come to the legislature and ask for a supplemental appropriation?

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 10

Sales: If we do not allow the contingency fund we have to allow this. I do not think this would happen though.

Bardanoue: How can we make "factual determination" when we don't have any facts? I'm not even sure what he means by way of "factual determination". I would like Mr. LaFaver to give his view on this amendment.

LaFaver: I did look at this language earlier and I expressed reservations to Representative Sales about it. When your average person reads it he doesn't know what it means. If it is Representative Sales intent by this motion that if we have a short-fall in Medicaid or DD funds that we come to the legislature for a supplemental request in '83 then I would ask that you say that.

Bardanoue: I would like a definition of "factual determination".

Lee Heiman: A factual determination would be what the legislature determines by vote to be facts. If from the information you have received during the hearings you do not feel there will be this reduction in funds then you can so state it here.

Cozzens: One thing that you should all be aware of is that thru contact with Washington we have been informed that Congressman Smith has withdrawn his 5% cut. Also Senator Dole has indicated that there will not be any further reductions in Medicaid for FY '82.

Shontz: There was a request by the department requesting that the Medicaid appropriation be biannual instead of annual. The subcommittee made it an annual appropriation. In the law (17-7-301 MCA) it says "if the Governor finds that due to an unforeseen and unanticipated emergency that the amount anticipated for the first fiscal year will be insufficient for the operation of the department, institution or agency, he may after careful consideration of the request of the budget officer, authorize an extension during the fiscal year made from appropriation from the second year". So the amendment made by Representative Sales is saying that the Governor may allude to this.

Quilici: I am still trying to understand this "factual determination". How can we know what the federal government is going to do.

Representative Moore moved that the motion be split into two parts. The first being to remove the existing language and the second to insert the new language. Vote #6

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 11

A vote was taken on that motion and carried unanimously.

Representative Sales restated his motion to strike lines 15 through 19 in their entirety on page B-9.

Mr. LaFaver said that if there are problems with this language he would ask that they be cleared up because the department needs clear instructions on what to do.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion and failed with all members voting no. See roll call vote sheet HB2 vote #5.

Representative Sales withdrew the second part of the amendment.

Representative Sales said that he had another amendment regarding the Community Services Block Grant. A copy of the amendment is attached to the minutes and is EXHIBIT 3. The amendment is in two parts.

Representative Sales explained the amendments. He said that one of the concerns of the counties has been extension of the local services without any local control. In some counties they are very happy with the operations of the HRDC's. This amendment just leaves it open for the county to decide how to use the money in their own areas.

Representative Bardanouve wondered if there might not be some disagreement among the counties if some of them were happy with the situation as it is now. What would happen if some of these HRDC's were caught in between these counties? (some saying no and some saying yes)

Sales: I don't see this as a big problem.

Waldron: How much cost savings would there be in this administratively?

Sales: We would have to look at the individual counties.

Waldron: One of the counties told me they would like to turn the welfare office over to the HRDC's.

Waldron: Mr. LaFaver's office is doing a cost benefit analysis. It does not make sense to turn these funds over to the counties before this analysis has been completed.

Representative Donaldson asked Mr. LaFaver what they are studying in this cost benefit analysis.

LaFaver: The major items that we are studying are the administration of the Low Income Energy Program. We are reviewing that to determine whether or not the counties would be in the position, from a cost effective standpoint, to administer the program. We will have that determination made by next Fall. If we were to determine that the county welfare offices could administer this program more effectively that would also bring into consideration the use of the Community Service Block Grant. We could at that time move a portion of it to the county welfare office or the county commissioners and use that as a part of the administration cost. I have several reservations about the motion, which I only read a few minutes ago, but the area that I really have problems with is the formula for distribution. If the legislature wants to go that route there should be some type of direction to the counties as to what is expected from them in return for this money. It doesn't seem to me that we will get a lot out of that appropriation if it is just given out on a population basis.

Representative Sales pointed out that at several hearings throughout the regular session the counties indicated that they would like to have more control of local programs. This, he stated, is what I am trying to do with this amendment. I do not want SRS to be over burdened with developing a bunch of regulations to take care of this.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion. The motion failed with 8 voting yes, 8 voting no and one abstention. See roll call vote HB 2 vote #7.

Representative Hurwitz said that he would like to move an amendment to change line itemed match for medicaid certification from 1982 to 1983.

Page B-1 (grey copy) line 9  
Strike: 3,108,783 (FY '82) 3,139,438 (FY '83)  
Insert: 3,111,283 " 3,136,938 "

Page B-1, line 15.  
Strike: 2,500 (FY '82)  
Insert: 2,500 (FY '83)

A vote was taken and carried unanimously. Roll call vote #8.

Representative Moore moved that the committee reconsider their action taken on Representative Sales motion to distribute funds to the county to be distributed by them as they see fit. (Community Service Block Grant)

The motion was restated by Representative Sales.

A roll call vote was taken and the motion passed with 11 voting yes and 6 voting no. See roll call vote HB 2 vote #10.

Representative Moore made a motion that Section B. be approved in it's entirety. A vote was taken and carried unanimously. Vote #11

Chairman Donaldson said that the committee would recess for 5 minutes until 7:15 at which time they would consider Section C. Natural Resources and Business Regulation.

#### NATURAL RESOURCES AND BUSINESS REGULATION

-Department of Agriculture-

Status-quo

-Department of Commerce-

Representative Waldron made a motion as follows:

Page 3-3, line 16 (grey copy)

Strike: 595,524 (FY '82) 546,049 (FY '83)

Insert: 718,979 " 693,551 "

The reason for this motion is because there is no provision for transportation division in HB 500. The subcommittee reduced these figures too much. In other words, he stated, we eliminate a program without trying.

Representative Hurwitz moved the amendment. A vote was taken and carried unanimously. Roll call vote #12.

-Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks-

Representative Bardanouve said he would like to see more guidelines under the "gas allocation" than what the subcommittee put in. However, he stated, I don't know how

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 14

to go about putting them in. He asked for clarification on this from the Fiscal Analyst Office.

Norman Rostocki said that this department was one that received additional spending authority for projected increases in gas prices. The gas prices are not materializing as originally anticipated. This was a potential amount of spending authority that could have been reduced due to this but the department was kept at the same number of gallons as originally appropriated. The subcommittee decided to allow the department to keep the spending authority they were given which will allow them to buy more gas, since it costs less than anticipated, and thus increase their travel distance.

Representative Hurwitz stated that the department was really operating under restrictive conditions. This kept the law enforcement division from doing their job in the best manner.

Representative Bardanouve pointed out that anyone can travel in the department and he just thought there should be some better guidelines in regard to this.

Representative Stobie said that a motion could be made that would allow the department to keep 40% of the additional spending authority so that game wardens could get out more.

Representative Manuel gave a breakdown of the gas allocation within the department. He referred to testimony received in subcommittee II. The enforcement division is 40%, wildlife division is 24%, fisheries division is 19%, parks division 11% and the ecological service division receives 6%.

Representative Bardanouve said that he would like to give the additional spending authority to the individual divisions instead of giving to the department.

Judy Rippingale said that she could calculate those figures and add the appropriate increase into each division's gas allocation just as it is in HB 500.

Representative Conroy said he would move the issue.

No motions were made.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 15

-Department of Livestock-

Status-quo

-Department of Natural Resources-

Status-quo

Representative Moore moved that Section C. be adopted as amended. A vote was taken and carried unanimously. Roll call vote #13.

DEPARTMENT OF INSTITUTIONS-Section D.

Representative Moore, Chairman of Subcommittee II, gave each member a copy of proposed amendments to the Department of Institutions. A copy is attached and is EXHIBIT 4 of the minutes. He explained each amendment and the committee voted on each amendment separately.

Representative Moore said these amendments are for the purpose of "fine tuning" the subcommittee action. The proposed amendments do four things: Reduces an additional \$13,039 of excess general fund from the women's correctional facility budget due to the delay of the start date, line items the budget and places restrictive language in the use of the contingency fund, cleans up the language in HB 500 to reflect the women's correctional facility (the language being put in during a free conference committee) and finally it restricts the Department of Institutions from spending all of the Mental Health Block funds in FY '83 in order to provide funding for July, August and September of 1984.

Representative Bengtson asked what the rationale was for changing the subcommittee action which approved the department spending the block grant in 1983. (refer to amendment number 10)

Moore: This doesn't change the amount of money it just provides for a carry-over.

Bengtson: The original action was that they have a 50% carry-over. By conferring with the department and Mr.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 16

South we changed the language and said they could spend all of that block grant.

Ray Hoffman: What the proposed amendment is doing is insuring that the department carries forward those federal block grants for the last quarter of federal fiscal year '81.

Representative Bengtson asked Carroll South to respond to this question.

South: We would not spend that 3 months worth of money in any case. Having it in the bill just lets the mental health centers know as well that the money is not available in our fiscal-year '83. This does not take away any of the money it is just a safeguard.

All of the eleven (11) amendments as stated on EXHIBIT 4 passed by unanimous vote. Roll call vote #14.

Representative Quilici said he wanted to bring out the problem of "gate money" for released prisoners. He referred to a letter from the Board of Pardon's concerning this matter. They were authorized last session to give up to \$100 gate money instead of \$25. He stated that \$25 is not enough money in most cases to even get home. He said that the intent of the \$100 was to see that these parolees could get home and have a little money in their pockets so they wouldn't revert back to crime in order to get money. This \$100 is cheap compared to the \$12,000 per year to keep them in prison.

Moore: The department was given \$7,690 for gate pay for each year of the biennium.

Bardanoue: That doesn't seem like very much. You have more turn-over than that.

South: One thing we wanted to do last session was to get the authority to pay \$100 if we felt it was appropriate. There might be circumstances where we would not want to pay any if it happened to be a wealthy individual. I did not want to ask for an appropriation for \$100 for each of the anticipated parolees. We anticipate 312 coming out this fiscal year. That would be \$31,200 at \$100 each.

Quilici: I do not know what we can do with this matter but there is a problem here and we need to do something about it. The Board of Pardons thinks it is a major issue as far as keeping these people out of prison.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 17

Moore: I think we should leave it up to Mr. South as to whether there is a problem. He has not asked for additional funding.

Representative Moore moved that Section D. be approved as amended. Motion carried unanimously. See roll call vote #15.

OTHER EDUCATION -Section E.

-OPI-

Representative Moore said that the OPI came in for three requests: (1) \$464,000 to offset loss of general funds for the five vo-tech centers in the state, (2) \$144,000 for vo-ed administration, this was refined to \$111,018, (3) general office administration.

Representative Moore gave an overview of the committee action on these issues.

Representative Bengtson said that she would like to make an amendment that would be a compromise of the schools and the committee. A copy of this amendment is attached and is EXHIBIT 5.

This amendment would ask the vo-tech to raise tuition to \$150 which is comparable with the universities. Representative Bengtson said that the amendment as stated in exhibit 5 asks for the total appropriation. She would request that the committee consider a compromise and make up the difference after the \$50 raise in tuition which would be \$229,508.

Further discussion on vo-tech funding was held.

Representative Bengtson made the motion as stated above. A roll call vote was taken and the motion carried with 10 voting yes and 7 voting no. See roll call vote HB2 vote #16.

Representative Moore pointed out that the money should go to OPI and not the Office of BPP. He made a motion that the language be changed to Office of Public Instruction. A vote was taken and carried unanimously. Vote #17.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 18

Representative Bengtson submitted another amendment to the committee that would replace lost federal funding of \$51,094 for vo-ed with general fund money. This raises the total for vocational education administration to the \$111,018 requested by OPI before final subcommittee action.

Representative Bengtson said that the reason the committee changed their original recommendation of \$111,018 to \$59,924 was because we said they could use other funds which they had previously used for administration. It is my understanding, she stated, that the vo-ed administration has taken all they can from these other funds and they need the \$111,018.

Representative Bengtson asked Gene Chrisjohnson to respond to this.

Chrisjohnson: I would like the committee to note that we did eliminate the Emergency Occupations under section 120 as an effort to address Representative Moore's concern that we should use all other funds available. That leaves one variable account under section 120 and that is Apprenticeship. I have a question as to whether it would be statutorily correct to use these funds. In terms of the section 120 - 130 relationship, because of federal regulations we must have an 85 - 15 percent ratio. That is 85% of administration costs coming under 120 and 15% under 130. If we take more funds out of the 130 area we have to take more out of the 120 section.

Representative Bengtson pointed out that the department went from \$144,000 to \$111,018 which was a big cut.

Representative Bengtson moved the amendment. See EXHIBIT 6.

Curt Nichols, fiscal analyst office, gave an explanation of this amendment to the committee. In the past the department has taken funds from other areas and used them but now propose not to do that. The three areas that they could take money from without a general fund match are: Research, Teacher Development and Consumer Homemaking. The \$51,094 reduction that the committee recommended was based on the department using those funds. This amendment is saying that it will replace those funds with general funds.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 19

Question was called on the motion and a roll call vote was taken. The motion failed with 4 voting yes and 13 voting no. See roll call vote HB 2 vote #18.

Representative Waldron said that he would like to make an amendment in the School Lunch Program budget. The concerns expressed to him seemed to indicate that the schools are not concerned about the first year, 1982, but may not make it through 1983. A number of school districts might not open their program next year if they are in the red. The free lunches and the reduced lunches only make up 30% of the program. The full price lunches make up 70% of the program. He stated that the federal government looks at the big cities when they look for increases in the price. The problem with the larger cities is that about 73% of the lunches are either free or reduced. The fed's, he stated, are probably going to reduce another 5% off the program next year and eventually want to reduce all federal support. The cost this year on the full price lunch is estimated to be \$1.34. If the price goes up too much we will see a drop off in full price students and they actually carry the program. We could have the Superintendent of Public Instruction asking for a supplemental next session.

Representative Moore said that he would like to address this by stating that the Superintendent of OPI addressed the committee and did not request any additional funding for the school lunch program. He said that through good management within the program they could get by through 1983.

Representative Waldron pointed out that while the superintendent opposed increases for the school lunch program he supported increases for his own general office.

Question was called on Representative Waldrons motion as stated on EXHIBIT 7 of the minutes. A roll call vote was taken and the motion failed with 3 voting yes and 14 voting no. See roll call vote HB 2 vote #19.

-School for the Deaf & Blind-

Representative Waldron moved an amendment that would require the school to use the \$134,720 in the Interest and Income fund with the general fund money. This would still leave \$20,000 in the I & I account.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 20

Representative Moore said that he would resist this motion. He said that there was a vacancy savings of \$95,000 through the deletion of the assistance superintendents position. Out of the I & I account the legislature did appropriate \$154,000 for FY '82 and \$156,000 for FY '83 which leaves them about \$154,000 in the I & I account. We intended that this amount be in the account to start the '83 session. Representative Moore continued to give an overview of the subcommittee action.

Representative Donaldson said that he fails to see the difference between the Deaf & Blind schools I & I money and the regular school I & I. Why should we treat one differently than the other.

Representative Bardanouve expressed the same reservations.

A roll call vote was taken on the motion. Motion carried with 12 voting yes and 5 voting no. See roll call vote HB2 vote #20.

Judy Rippingale pointed out that the lines referenced in the motion are not correct and that they would be put into the bill properly.

A motion was made to accept Section E. as amended. A vote was taken and carried with 14 voting yes and 3 voting no. Representatives Moore, Thoft and Ernst voted no.

HIGHER EDUCATION-Section F.

Status-quo

Representative Moore moved to accept the subcommittee action in Section F. Vote carried unanimously.

Representative Moore moved that HB 9 be TABLED. A vote was taken and carried with 13 voting yes and 4 voting no. Representatives, Bardanouve, Shontz, Quilici and Bengtson voted no.

Representative Hurwitz moved that the committee accept the Report to the House Appropriations Committee from Subcommittees I, II, & III as amended. A vote was taken and carried unanimously.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

November 17, 1981

Page 21

Being no further business the meeting was adjourned at  
9:30 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
GENE DONALDSON/Chairman

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Cathy Martin/Secretary