

MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE APPROPRIATIONS SUB-COMMITTEE ON  
ELECTED OFFICIALS AND HIGHWAYS

March 2, 1983

(Tape 95, Side B, Tape 96  
and Tape 97, Side A)

The Appropriations Sub-committee on Elected Officials and Highways met at 8:00 a.m. on Wednesday, March 2, 1983 in Room 437 with Chairman Quilici presiding. The following members were present:

Chairman Quilici  
Rep. Connelly  
Rep. Lory

Senator Dover  
Senator Keating  
Senator Van Valkenburg  
Senator Stimatz

Also present: Terry Cohea, OBPP and Leo O'Brien, LFA.  
Representing the Department of Highways: Gary Wicks, Bill Salisbury and Don Harriott.

WORK SESSION

Department of Highways

Preconstruction

Mr. O'Brien told the committee that the primary differences are in "Contracted Services". Some adjustments were made by OBPP which were not made by the LFA. One was for additional outside appraisers to acquire more land. There were data processing costs which the LFA did not have and there were some adjustments in anticipated court and attorney costs allowed by OBPP which were not made in the LFA budget. In "Communications", the Commission Secretary was eliminated in "General Operations" and transferred to the "Preconstruction Program" which the LFA did not do. These costs were decreased in the "General Operations" budget and were not increased in the "Preconstruction Project" in the LFA.

"Travel" was presented as an issue in the LFA budget. This increased travel was for travel between districts. The Department has since indicated that travel would be for right-of-way agents to travel to various districts to acquire additional land.

In answer to a question from Senator Keating, Ms. Cohea said the equipment is rented internally. It was noted that this figure for additional travel would include per diem, lodging, etc. Senator Dover made a MOTION that the committee approve the OBPP figure for the total budget for "Preconstruction".

Senator Van Valkenburg asked Ms. Cohea what positions, if any, were vacant now. Mr. O'Brien responded that of the positions that are included for FY84 and FY85 the following positions are vacant:

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 2

one road planner checker, one civil engineer, one secretary, one steno clerk III, one review appraiser, and one civil engineer manager. There are six vacant positions according to the LFA's figures.

In answer to a question from Senator Van Valkenburg, Mr. Wicks said that they were trying to fill these positions, just as he had said yesterday. Mr. Stephen Kologi said that specifically one of these positions, that of road planner checker, has been filled. This position was promoted from within so that creates another vacancy at a different level. One person had retired. He said they are certainly trying to fill these positions as they become vacant. He added that you will usually find a vacancy or two. He couldn't speak for the others.

In answer to a question from Senator Keating, Mr. Wicks said that this Preconstruction budget includes new highway, re-work of old highway and all other preconstruction including Interstate program, an over-lay on the primary system, railroad crossing and bridges. In answer to a further question from Senator Keating, Mr. Wicks explained that there are times when they do purchase right-of-way that is not needed immediately, and that for the most part it is a matter of time before it is used. There are instances, however, where they do purchase more than is needed and in that case they have, in the past, tried to get rid of this through public auction.

Senator Van Valkenburg said that according to the Position Control document, there is a review appraiser's position vacant since August 7th, a civil engineer IV position vacant since September 30, and a general office clerk II position vacant since October 30. He asked for some justification for the length of time these positions have been vacant. Mr. Wicks said he would have to go back to the records and check as he couldn't do it off the top of his head.

Senator Van Valkenburg made a SUBSTITUTE MOTION that the committee approve 211 FTE in this division and that we delete from that the three positions: review appraiser, civil engineer IV, and general office clerk II. He said these are all positions that have been vacant for a minimum of four months and in the case of the review appraiser it is going on 7 months. He felt this was an indication that they don't need these people. He said this is still leaving them with 4 other positions in the department that are vacant now and have been vacant for as much as two months. Senator Van Valkenburg said he felt they had enough flexibility to work within that FTE level.

Motion carried. The Chairman asked for clarification of the Substitute Motion as to whether or not this included the total budget. Senator Van Valkenburg noted, after some discussion, that if there are "Operating Costs" which would be reflected in these three deleted positions he would like to have that deleted also. At the request of the Chairman, Ms. Cohea and Mr. O'Brien will research

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 3

this. The Chairman said this would be reflected on the total budget if there is any change. Discussion.

Senator Dover's MOTION on the total budget: Question being called for, the motion carried.

Revised Budget - Preconstruction

Mr. Wicks said there was a revised budget on "Preconstruction" based on an increase in federal funding. (Page 4 of Exhibit 1) Mr. Wicks explained that this is the revised budget based on an increased level of project activity from \$66 million to \$100 million.

In answer to a question from Senator Dover, Mr. Wicks said the 9 positions being asked for in this revised budget are: Clerk IV, two Draftsmen, two design techs I, two design techs II, a program analyst III and a civil engineer III.

Senator Dover said for purpose of discussion, he would make a MOTION to approve this budget. (Page 4 of Exhibit 1) Discussion. Senator Van Valkenburg asked if there are any of these positions that they won't fill after the committee authorizes them. Mr. Wicks said last session the committee authorized 281.3 FTE's in the Preconstruction Bureau. The agency reduced that on their own, without any requirements to do so legislatively, to 214, a reduction of 67.3 FTE's. They laid off a large amount of people in Preconstruction and he felt the record shows that they don't hire people they don't need. When asked by Senator Van Valkenburg what happened to the money the agency gets if they don't spend it on those positions, Mr. Wicks replied that the money stays in the Earmarked Account. He said that any money they don't spend remains in the Earmarked Account as unspent money. It adds to the cash balance that they carry forward every year for operating expenses.

The Chairman noted that the agency is asking here for the authority to hire these types of people when and if you need them on board. Mr. Wicks said this is exactly right. In answer to a question from Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Wicks said they didn't have specific projects that each individual would be working on, it is the general increase in activity and they will be assigned to a number of various projects in order to get them out to construction.

In answer to a question from Senator Dover, Mr. Wicks said these people are not seasonal, these are basically full-time permanent people who will be needed for as long as they have federal funds.

Senator Keating noted that there is \$180,000 in "Contracted Services" and wondered if there was any relationship with the 9 FTE's. Mr. Wicks said there was no direct relationship. That money represents money where the agency thinks they will have to go to consultant design work. This represents an effort to do

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 4

this by contract rather than hire permanent people. In answer to a question from Mr. O'Brien, Mr. Wicks said this was an estimated number that was not tied to any specific project. In answer to a question from Senator Van Valkenburg regarding the negative spending on "Land" of \$302,427, Mr. Wicks said that when they looked at their project list with the increase in federal funding, most of the funding came in the 4-R program and they had to change the mix of projects. By changing that mix they would change the necessity of purchasing some of the land that they previously had in the right-of-way.

Ms. Cohea explained that from their current level request, which the committee just approved, they would actually delete some of that and it would increase expenditures in FY85 because they are going to be working on a different type of project in FY84. They are requesting to decrease the FY84 request by \$302,427 and that they would increase the next year by approximately \$1 million.

Question being called for, the motion carried. (347)

Construction

The Chairman noted that in FY82 this division actually had 599.81 FTE's. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Wicks said they they were actually appropriated 725 FTE's in that year.

Senator Dover made a MOTION that the committee approve the OBPP budget except on "Supplies and Materials" we would approve the LFA's budget. Also that in "Equipment" we would add to the LFA's budget \$27,128 in FY84 and \$28,100 in FY85 for a total in "Equipment" of \$35,478 for FY84 and \$32,700 in FY85. Discussion.  
(Tape 96, Side A)

In answer to a question from Senator Van Valkenburg, Mr. Wicks said that the vacant positions of 18 in this program, reflect a 4% vacancy and that is normal. The agency is required to make up some of the salaries through vacancy savings which is not unusual. He would request that the agency be given the opportunity to look at those specific positions before the committee takes action on them.

The Chairman said that sounded logical.

Senator Keating asked if they didn't fill some of these positions in this program because it is a seasonal need rather than a continuous need. Mr. Wicks said that was correct. In answer to another question from Senator Keating, Mr. Wicks said the money that is reflected by vacancy savings remains in the Ear-marked Account. In answer to a further question by Senator Keating, Mr. Wicks said that last session the Legislature budgeted on a 3.5% vacancy savings and this was the portion that the agency had to eat in order to pay the salary increases. The agency didn't

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 5

have any problem with that because they had already cut back so many positions. Mr. Wicks said the number of part-time seasonal employees in this program goes up dramatically in the summertime and then drops off in the fall. He said that the Construction Management System that they hope to have in place this year will give them even a better handle on positions in terms of budgets and other program costs.

Senator Van Valkenburg made a SUBSTITUTE MOTION that the committee pass consideration on this program until the committee receives justification of the need for those positions. Senator Van Valkenburg again expressed his concern for authorizing positions until the committee can determine if they are necessary. (60) In answer to a question from Senator Keating, Mr. Wicks said the FTE's in this budget (Page 1 of Exhibit 2) were based on the agency's early anticipated amounts. This budget was based on the assumption that the agency would get federal funding in the neighborhood of \$70 to \$80 million. The agency eventually ended up with \$100 million.

Senator Dover noted that in FY82 this program was authorized for 725 FTE's and they have cut them way back, and cut back again in FY84 and FY85. He felt they need a little flexibility and they have shown that if they don't need the FTE level that was authorized, they don't use them.

The Chairman noted that the committee could pass the "Construction" budget and Mr. Wicks could tell the committee tomorrow what these FTE's are. The Chairman said it was just within the last month that this additional money became available and the program has not had time to really see where they are.

Mr. O'Brien noted that on two projects on the contractors list the payments to the contractors was greater than the letting figure by \$1,910,300. Mr. Wicks said they would have to check those figures and said that this was not abnormal. The Chairman asked Ms. Cohea to work with Mr. O'Brien to check on these figures.

Mr. Wicks said that contractor payments is one of the most difficult figures to come up with. It is based on assumptions about weather, projects, etc. He said they have not been very precise in the past but hopefully they will be more precise in the future because they are trying to tie the payments to the projects whereas before all they used was an historical estimate and the Legislature just adjusted that depending on what federal funds were anticipated. This is the first time they have indentified these payments by projects and Mr. Wicks felt that being off a million dollars in contracted payments is not that earthshaking to him. The important thing about contractor payments is that if the work doesn't get done the contractor payments are not made. This is the largest appropriation in the whole highway program but in terms of what happens if they don't meet the projected or appropriated amount it is simply a function of the contractors not getting paid. Mr. Wicks said that at some time in the future he would suggest that

an alternative way be found to fund these highway construction projects. He said that perhaps the way the federal government does it makes more sense. They do it on the basis of obligation authority.

Senator Stimatz noted that this figure would also include the 10% hold-back for when the job is finished but it hasn't been accepted. Mr. Wicks said this would be part of the total of contractor payments. He also said that they have cost-over-runs and cost-under-runs and these would be reflected in contractor payments.

Senator Van Valkenburg said that in this biennium there should be, as opposed to the past biennium, some way to tie the contractor payments to the proposed projects other than the idea of obligation authority. He suggested taking this list of projects and attach that in some fashion to the appropriations measure and say this is what you are going to spend money on. He asked Mr. Wicks if he had an objection to that.

Mr. Wicks said, "Yes". He said they have tied the projects to the expenditure even though they are off by the figure Mr. O'Brien identified. He said that could be or has been reconciled. He said they have done a lot better than they have in the past, he felt that was demonstrable and clear. This is the first time they have had a list of projects. He felt it would be a mistake to tie a specific project to a specific amount so there is no flexibility. This list of projects is based on a number of assumptions. One is that they get the work done in accordance with the plan and there are no stoppages. That happens most of the time but certainly not all the time. Secondly, it is based on the federal funding continuing. They have had more problems with this than in the past but that is an important assumption.

There are always going to be changes in the number of projects they let over the next two year period. It is inevitable. There are things they don't know about such as enviromental impact statements, litigation, etc. Mr. Wicks said there is no way they can be tied specifically to project by project authorization. There has to be that flexibility built in for them to make adjustments in letting schedules and replacing projects when they need to be replaced.

Senator Van Valkenburg agreed that there had to be flexibility and there are all kinds of things that can happen in the course of two years that would necessitate the deviation from precisely what is listed here. He said he didn't propose to make that law. However, Senator Van Valkenburg said that he does propose that the agency commit themselves to this particular work plan and that the Legislature expect that you are going to do that so there

is some measuring stick to look back on when the committee comes back two years from now and that the Legislature provide you with the flexibility to provide for these contingencies. He said there must be something somewhere between the two extremes of a 40 page lined item appropriations and a one page figure of \$83 million. Mr. Wicks said he would rather get into an obligation approach as he mentioned earlier. He said he didn't understand what was meant by commitment. He said they put this program together over the past year and adjusted it substantially in January to reflect the increased federal funding. He said he didn't understand why, when they've got this work plan, they've got people committed to getting this done, they've got schedules laid out, they've gone back and revised their whole work plan to accomodate the increased federal funds and the other programs they are proposing to the Legislature, why they would ever not want to get this done as they have laid it out. Their intention is to get this program. If they had more money they'd like to have more projects on that list. The Highway Department's objective is to build and maintain highways. This list is their best representation of what they can get done in the next two year period and without good reason they intend to do what they say they're going to do in the rest of the budget.

Rep. Lory suggested that it could be put in the boilerplate that in FY85 you could report deviations from your original plan and the reasons therefore. Mr. Wicks said he wouldn't have any problem with that. The Chairman said he would agree. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Senator Van Valkenburg said he would like to be able to look back two years from now and do a better job of analyzing the need for money in particular areas such as Preconstruction as opposed to Construction. He said that he wanted to be able to know whether we are putting money in asphalt and concrete instead of other things. We need to be able to know whether we are putting our money in the right place. Right now we just have to go on faith. Until we can look at projects and see in retrospect how it has been spent and what we are getting for our money in particular areas, he said he didn't think that we could do that.

The Chairman said that this language would give the committee a start and would let the Interim Finance Committee have something to work from, too. (358) Discussion. The Chairman asked Ms. Cohea and Mr. O'Brien to work on the language for this.

The Chairman said the committee would vote on this budget except for the FTE's which will be addressed tomorrow.

Senator Van Valkenburg WITHDREW his SUBSTITUTE MOTION.

Senator Dover's MOTION was again before the committee with the STIPULATION that the committee would vote on the FTE's at their next meeting.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 8

Senator Van Valkenburg said that the committee hasn't had a recent update on the status of the Earmarked Revenue Account in this area in terms of what the projected ending balance would be at this level of expenditures on the current level program. In addition, he said, we have not made a final decision in this committee as to the funding of the Highway Patrol. When we took action on that early in January we discussed the idea that we would wait and see where the Earmarked Revenue Account stood in that area before we decided to fund that with General Fund or Gas Tax money. In acting on this budget and committing ourselves to a level of expenditure in "Contracted Services" of nearly \$160 million over the course of the biennium we may well be locking ourselves in with respect to that other decision of funding the Highway Patrol. That is about a \$10 to \$11 million expenditure over the course of the biennium. The Chairman noted that just the salaries are closer to \$12 million. Senator Van Valkenburg said he thought that was important in the consideration of this level of construction. He said he had no doubt that the Highway Department could easily spend the money if it was given to them. He said he didn't feel there was sufficient money in the general fund to fund the Highway Patrol in terms of a current level budget being funded from the Gas Tax. He said that will have some affect on his vote. Discussion of funding on Exhibit 3. (Tape 96, Side B) Mr. Wicks went through the four pages of Exhibit 3 for the committee.

The revised construction program is simply a program that matches every federal dollar that is available to them. The presumption is that the Legislature is going to want to fund, at a minimum, to match every federal dollar. Mr. Wicks said this construction budget is not going to be affected that much by what is done by the end of the Legislature. The other programs including the Preconstruction Program will be affected if they don't get the kind of revenues that they requested or if the Highway Patrol is funded out of the Earmarked Account instead of the General Fund. Then you are going to have to come back and cut the projects and cut the budget that they have in the Reconstruction Trust Account. He said if the bonding program isn't approved we're going to have to come back and cut the budget. The "Construction" program itself is tied to federal revenues that he is confident they will have coming in during the next four years.

In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Wicks said that the Reconstruction Trust is all state funds and is principally for Primary.

Senator Van Valkenburg said that with the fall in gasoline prices that is taking place right now he thinks it is better to assume that there will be an increased consumption level in gasoline. That will mean an increased flow of revenue into the Earmarked Revenue Account. This is what he means by an update in projections on the ending fund balance in the Earmarked Revenue Account. He

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 9

feels that will be greater and is one factor that he feels may be necessary to fund the Highway Patrol out of the Earmarked Revenue Account.

Mr. Wicks said they don't have any way of predicting whether or not we are going to see an increase in revenue of about \$6 million. There are a lot of uncertainties at work here. Although we see highway use increasing fairly strongly in Montana and throughout the rest of the nation, the amount of gallons they use has leveled off and even though we see what could be a temporary or long-term, who knows? This will also be countered by a federal tax increase of 5 cents in April. If the Legislature approves the state tax, that would come in July. He said the point he is trying to make is that we made fairly conservative revenue estimates over the next four years and he is not prepared to back off those just because we are looking at a temporary reduction in gasoline prices. The other thing is that it all depends on the expectations of the American people, if they continue to buy as they have over the last several years, more fuel efficient cars, the leveling off of gas consumption that we witnessed over the past several years will probably continue. He said he is not going to predict that we would see a \$6 million increase in revenues from fuel taxes. It is the consumption not the rate.

Ms. Cohea said that about one-tenth of the Highway Earmarked Account comes from the mineral land leasing money. The Highway Department gets approximately one-third of the amount that comes into the state. Ninety per cent of that is made up of oil and gas royalties because they are at 12.5% of the price. So, for example, if oil falls to \$20 a barrel, that source of revenue into the Highway Earmarked Account is going to drop dramatically. In 1982 they got \$5.8 million from that source of revenue. She said they have projected \$6.1 million in 1984 and \$7 million in 1985. Since that is tied so closely to the price of oil that is something that could counter-balance any increase in gas consumption or revenues.

Mr. Wicks pointed out that it is also important to remember that the Highway Earmarked Account is not just gas tax revenues. Only a third of it comes from gasoline taxes. The rest comes from diesel tax, GVW, mineral revenues from the federal government and other small miscellaneous revenue sources. Rather than make the assumption that we are going to increase revenues because of the increase in gasoline prices if the Legislature decides to continue to fund the Highway Patrol out of the Highway Earmarked Account, the approach he would rather take is the conservative approach on revenues and to cut the projects that we have in the "Construction" program.

Senator Van Valkenburg said this was what he was discussing earlier, cutting the amount in "Contracted Services" in "Construction".

Mr. Wicks said that was correct but what they are talking about here is the federally funded program and the projects we would cut would be the state funded depending on what the Legislature does with the revenues. He said their first priority would be to spend every federal dollar that they've got. It is crazy not to with a matching ratio of 80-20 or overall 90-10.

That is what this program is based on. The other programs are based on some definitive action the Legislature would have to take and the level of those programs will depend on the level of funding the Legislature provides. If the funding isn't there they simply cut projects.

Question being called for, Senator Dover's MOTION carried. Senator Van Valkenburg voted "no". (The FTE level will be addressed at the next meeting.)

#### MODIFICATIONS

##### Revised Construction (Page 3 of Exhibit 2)

The Chairman noted that the FTE's for FY84 are 83.29 and they are cut down to 62.58 in FY85.

Mr. Wicks said that the big difference is in the Butte area on I-15. Instead of having a lot of reconstruction projects like they will have in 1984, in 1985 they will move these FTE's to the ACI program.

Senator Dover made a MOTION that the committee accept the Revised Construction budget. In answer to a question from Senator Keating, Mr. Wicks said that this modification is for the increased federal dollars. Mr. Wicks said if the ACI program is not approved this is the FTE level they will be operating at. The Modified Accelerated Interstate would be in addition to this if the House approves the bonding bill which the Senate approved. This is in response to the increased federal funding and the work for their extra 4-R projects. He said he thought it was important to point out that as he stated before, they are funding projects from the Primary System insofar as they have apportionment balance in 1984 but in 1985 they don't have that apportionment balance anymore so we are mostly talking about 4-R projects in 1985 and that is why the FTE drops off. If the Legislature approves the Reconstruction Trust Program there will be a slight increase and they will only need a very few FTE's in 1984 because they are funding them under the current program and then they will pick up more of those in 1985 as they have more state funded projects if the Legislature approves the fuel tax increase and the other revenues they have requested.

Mr. O'Brien said that in the Project Management System they are now attempting to put together, it tends to tie operating expenses back to personal services, specifically salaries.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Appropriations Sub-committee on  
Elected Officials and Highways, March 2, 1983, Page 11

The amount for travel is \$369,066 which represents roughly 26% of salaries. Under normal circumstances Mr. O'Brien asked Mr. Wicks if they attempted to tie travel to about 11% of salaries?

Mr. Wicks replied that they have a Construction Management System they have been working on that is not fully operational yet. The budgets are not prepared on the basis of the Construction Management System because it is not fully operational. He said they hope to have it operational this year and they hope to be coming closer to the standards they have set up. These standards are still in the process of being tested to make sure they run the way they should be run. This system is predicated on the other expenses relating to the Personal Services and being a percentage of Personal Services. Mr. Wicks said if you look at the overall budget they do come closer to these standards. Mr. O'Brien is correct in his assumption that they are trying to tie Travel to 11% of Personal Services expenditures. He said you can't look at these budgets separately, you have to look at them in total. The way they did the current budget, the one which the committee has already approved, this budget was predicated on a certain level of federal funding. There were hardly any state projects or primary projects in it beyond what the federal funds for the primary would have. Because all the other parts of the program would have to be in the modified Reconstruction Trust Account and 4-R projects were not included. When the federal government decided to give them more money and increase the fuel tax, instead of going back and changing everything in their whole budget and revising everything, they took the additions and allowed for project mix that was different in the current program than originally would exist under the modified program. For example, the level of primary projects, reconstruction projects, these were not in the original budget beyond what was allowed for by the federal government. It was all in the Reconstruction budget. Now those projects are being funded by federal funds because they made a decision that they would use as much federal dollars as they can on the primary system. So, the point he is trying to make is that the mix of projects has changed and they did not go back and revise the current level budget. They looked at the total program and decided what additional monies they would need and put it in the Revised Construction budget. So you can't look at the Revised Construction budget by itself, you have to look at it in total. If you do this, which is the only appropriate way to do it, in 1984 their travel expenditures are about 13% instead of 11%. Then in 1985 they are down to 11% which the Construction Management System would call for. He said if you look at the total budget they are pretty close to what the standards call for. (318)

Question being called for, the motion carried.

Modified Reconstruction Trust Fund (Page 4 of Exhibit 2)

Mr. O'Brien said the committee might hold off any action on this, pending legislation.

Ms. Cohea said the committee could consider the budget but make language contingent on the passage of the bills.

The Chairman asked Mr. O'Brien if he had a list of the 4.56 FTE's in this Modified.

Ms. Cohea said that in 1984 there would be 4.56 engineering tech I, Grade 10, In 1985 there would be 9.67 engineering tech I and 3 survey aide I.

In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Wicks said they would do approximately \$8 million of pavement preservation projects in 1984, they would be 100% state funded. This cannot be funded with federal money, it is a state responsibility. In 1985 they start spending the 100% state funds by doing the reconstruction work. The first year they would need the FTE's to do the pavement preservation that prior to last year were not let through the Engineering Division and they would need the FTE's to monitor those contracts. In the second year they would get into the heavier construction work.

In answer to a question by the Chairman, Mr. Wicks said these projects would be funded in part by the fuel tax and the coal tax.

Senator Dover made a MOTION that the committee approve this budget contingent on the passage of House Bill 16 and House Bill 730. (House Bill 16 is the fuel tax increase and House Bill 730 sets up the Reconstruction Trust Program.) Discussion. Motion carried. (Tape 97, Side A)

Modified Accelerated Interstate (Page 5 of Exhibit 2)

Mr. Wicks told the committee that this modification is dependent on Senate Bill 454.

Senator Dover made a MOTION that the committee approve this modification contingent on Senate Bill 454. Question being called for, the motion carried.

Ms. Cohea said that in addition to appropriating the expenditure of the bond proceeds the committee will also need to appropriate in language the payment of the principal and interest. Normally those payments are made from a debt service account which is a non-appropriated account under the fund structure. However, by the structure of the bonding bill they found it is most advantageous for interest, etc. to run it out of the Highway Earmarked Account. They will put the bond proceeds in that Highway Earmarked Account in a sub-fund. They will run the projects through it but they

will also have to pay the debt service in interest.

Rep. Lory made a MOTION that the committee be provided with this language and approve it.

In answer to a question from the Chairman, Ms. Cohea said that the bonds would be approved by the act itself. Ms. Cohea provided the committee with language which reads as follows: "In addition to the funds appropriated above, the amount needed to pay principal and interest on bonds issued under the authority of SB454 is appropriated from the highway earmarked account." She said the reason you don't have a specific dollar amount is that you don't know what the interest is or what the payment schedule will be.

Rep. Lory asked what was the advantage of putting this into the Earmarked Account. Ms. Cohea said as she understood it there were two chief advantages. One is to the general fund, that by placing that amount of money into the Highway Earmarked Account interest on that account goes into the General Fund. So it will help fund the general fund expenditures in FY84 and FY85. The second reason is that it will allow the department to spend the money more quickly rather than running it through the debt service. Mr. Wicks said that in terms of interest to the general fund, right now the interest on the Highway Earmarked Account, the cash balance that we just talked about, goes to the general fund. What they want to do with the bonding program is to leave both general fund and Highway Earmarked Account whole. That is, not to give anything extra to the general fund because of the bonding program and not cut anything out of the Highway Earmarked Account. Some of the interest has to come back to the Highway Earmarked Account if they're going to make this bonding program work and have a net cost. They amended the bill so the first two years, 1984 and 1985, the general fund gets the interest. After that then it all goes into the Highway Earmarked Account. In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Wicks said that Senate Bill 454 has forty years in it but they are looking at going to about 1990 or 1991. The details of that await specific financing decisions. The reason for the language is to come up with a program that will cost the State of Montana zero dollars. That is why they are talking about an ACI or Interstate program of about \$60 million. They are talking about a bonding level of \$145 million. It is using this borrowed money as leverage. What they are trying to do in the bonding program is to design a program that will cost the State of Montana zero dollars.

Rep. Lory reiterated his MOTION to approve the language which Ms. Cohea has read to the committee. (103)

Question being called for, the motion carried.

Service Revolving Fund (Page 1 of Exhibit 4)

Mr. Wicks told the committee that the differences were in  
"Contracted Services" and "Repair and Maintenance".

Senator Dover said for discussion, he would make a MOTION  
that the committee approve the OBPP for FTE's, "Contracted  
Services", "Repairs", "Other Expenses" and the balance would  
be LFA.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked if there were any vacancies in  
this program. This information will be available tomorrow.  
Rep. Lory made a SUBSTITUTE MOTION that the committee approve  
all the budget with the exception of the FTE's.

Mr. Wicks reminded the committee that in the hearing on this  
budget one of the things they asked for in addition to the OBPP  
for "Contracted Services", an additional \$11,236 for FY84 and  
\$11,910 in FY85 to cover the increased maintenance cost for  
the expanded computer equipment.

Senator Dover AMENDED his MOTION to include the additional  
figures under "Contracted Services" by \$11,236 in FY84 and  
\$11,910 in FY85.

In answer to a question from the Chairman, Mr. Wicks said  
this was for a maintenance contract paid to IBM.


Rep. Lory CLARIFIED his SUBSTITUTE MOTION by saying that his  
substitute motion included Senator Dover's motion as amended  
by Senator Dover with the exclusion of the FTE level which  
will be voted on tomorrow. Question being called for, the  
Substitute Motion carried.

Revised Service Revolving (Page 2 of Exhibit 4)

Mr. Wicks said this was necessary because of the increase in  
federal funding. Basically all the expenses in this budget  
are for the laboratory work and the increased number of FTE's  
would be in the lab. Almost all of the expenses are for in-  
creased lab work necessitated by increased materials testing  
with the increase in the number of projects they have. Rep.  
Lory made a MOTION that the committee approve this budget.  
The Chairman noted that under "Other Expenses" this would be  
for increased freight costs to send the samples in.

Question being called for, the motion carried. Discussion by  
the committee.

The meeting adjourned at 10:00 a.m. (222)

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Joe Quillici, Chairman

PRECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM									
AE/DE	DESCRIPTION	FY '82 ACTUAL	FY '83 APPROPRIATED	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	FY '84 DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	FY '85 DIFFERENCE
0000	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	252.42	216.00	214.00	214.00	-0-	214.00	214.00	-0-
1100	Salaries	\$ 4,776,134	\$ 5,763,936	\$ 4,975,527	\$ 4,975,527	\$	\$ 4,963,368	\$	\$
1400	Employee Benefits	685,256	1,109,039	722,447	722,447		729,119		
1500	Health Insurance	192,734		205,440	205,440		205,440		
	Total Level	\$ 5,654,124	\$ 6,872,875	\$ 5,903,414	\$	\$	\$ 5,897,927	\$	\$
2100	Contracted Services	\$ 750,487	\$ 1,985,342	\$ 851,682	\$ 721,189	\$ (130,493)	\$ 886,582	\$ 764,457	\$ (122,125)
2200	Supplies & Materials	28,211	32,323	42,727	45,269	2,542	45,716	47,980	2,264
2300	Communications	75,963	87,195	114,052	107,196	(6,856)	133,634	125,700	(7,934)
2400	Travel	220,417	274,032	255,348	228,960	(26,388)	264,274	238,568	(25,706)
2500	Rent	1,436	31,251	1,424	1,418	(6)	1,510	1,501	(9)
2600	Utilities	16,400	22,290	21,982	21,978	(4)	26,822	25,815	(7)
2700	Repair & Maintenance	4,838	7,201	7,919	13,322	5,403	8,393	14,030	5,687
2800	Other Expenses	137,317	14,500	146,761	144,866	(1,895)	154,951	153,554	(1,397)
	Total Level	\$ 1,275,069	\$ 2,454,134	\$ 1,441,895	\$ 1,285,226	\$ (156,669)	\$ 1,521,882	\$ 1,373,745	\$ (148,137)
3100	Equipment	\$ 2,031	\$ 9,402	\$ 2,920	\$ 5,770	\$ 2,850	\$ 5,084	\$ 1,920	\$ (3,164)
4100	Land	\$ 3,284,800	\$ 3,421,145	\$ 4,179,876	\$ 4,179,876	\$ -0-	\$ 1,889,352	\$ 1,889,352	\$ -0-
4300	Cap. Outlay - Other	310,155	623,680	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
	Total Level	\$ 3,594,955	\$ 4,044,825	\$ 4,179,876	\$ 4,179,876	\$ -0-	\$ 1,889,362	\$ 1,889,362	\$ -0-
02422	Highways Earmarked Sp. Rev.	\$ 10,526,179	\$ 13,381,236	\$ 11,528,105	\$	\$	\$ 9,314,255	\$	\$
02424	Highway Reconstruction	2,060	\$ 3,064,490	\$ 4,031,378	\$	\$	\$ 3,257,195	\$	\$
03407	Highway Trust-Sp. Rev.	8,075,489	10,316,746	7,496,727			6,057,060		
	Total Program	\$ 10,526,179	\$ 13,381,236	\$ 11,528,105	\$	\$	\$ 9,314,255	\$	\$

WGS:dk:nr:212/C5

# Preconstruction Program

<u>FY 84</u>	<u>FY 85</u>
\$130,493	122,125

## 00 - Contracted Services

<u>Category</u>	<u>FY - 84 Difference</u>	<u>FY - 85 Difference</u>
(a) 2101 - Appraiser Fees	\$ 44,955	\$ 47,652
(b) 2103 - D.P. Services	\$ 69,490	\$ 57,463
(c) 2108 - Legal Fees and Court Costs	\$ 15,857	\$ 16,808
(d) 2114 - Payroll Service Fees	\$ (2,517)	\$ (2,668)
(e) 2115 - Photographic Services	\$ 6,553	\$ 6,946
(f) 2135 - Education & Training	<u>\$ (3,845)</u>	<u>\$ (4,076)</u>
	\$130,493	\$122,125

- (a) Department will require more use of outside appraisers to acquire projected land acquisitions rather than add more FTE.
- (b) Reallocation of Data Processing costs. LFA did not have adjustments.
- (c) Anticipated court and attorney costs were allowed by OBPP to acquire projected right of way.
- (d) Department adjusted Payroll Service Fees. LFA did not have adjustments.
- (e) Public hearings require more photogrammetric mapping and displays. More aerial photography due to increased projects requiring this service.

FY 84      FY 85

\$ 6,856      \$ 7,934

2300 - Communications

Department recommends OBPP amount. The Commission Secretary position was eliminated in General Operations and duties transferred to the Preconstruction Program. Corresponding postage and mailing costs were decreased in the General Operations Program.

\$26,388      \$25,706

2400 - Travel

Increased travel is required in the Right-of-Way Bureau to purchase parcels of land. Estimated needs were based on parcels of land to be purchased.

\$ 5,770      \$ 3,164

3100 - Equipment

The Department, OBPP and LFA agree to accept LFA amounts for the biennium. Total differences in biennium request are minor in total.

WGS/dk/cp/236CC2

REVISED  
PRECONSTRUCTION

*offered 3/2/85*

AE/OE	DESCRIPTION	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	FY '85 DIFFERENCE
0000	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)						
1100	Salaries	9.0	-0-	- 9.0	9.0	-0-	- 9.0
1400	Employee Benefits	142,021	-0-	- 142,021	141,478	-0-	- 141,478
1500	Health Insurance	20,621	-0-	- 20,621	20,783	-0-	- 20,783
		8,620	-0-	- 8,620	8,640	-0-	- 8,640
	Total Level	171,262	-0-	- 171,262	170,901	-0-	- 170,901
2100	Contracted Services	180,338	-0-	- 180,338	189,371	-0-	- 189,371
2400	Travel <i>Contracted Services work</i>	3,814	-0-	- 3,814	3,891	-0-	- 3,891
	Total Level	184,152	-0-	- 184,152	193,262	-0-	- 193,262
4100	Land	(302,427)	-0-	302,427	1,029,068	-0-	-1,029,068
	Total Program	52,987			1,393,231		
02422	Highway Earmarked	18,545			487,631		
03407	Highway Trust	34,442			905,600		

WGS:dk:nr:212/C8

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

AE/CE	DESCRIPTION	FY '82 ACTUAL	FY '83 APPROPRIATED	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	FY '84 DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	FY '85 DIFFERENCE
0000	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	599.81	515.75	472.75	472.75	-0-	472.75	472.75	-0-
1100	Salaries	\$10,076,014	\$13,449,318	\$10,459,418	\$ -	\$	\$10,440,945	\$	\$
1400	Employee Benefits	1,456,647	2,794,469	1,549,040			1,564,932		
1500	Health Insurance	430,269		453,840			453,840		
	Total L-	\$11,972,930	\$16,243,787	\$12,462,298			\$12,458,724		
2100	Contracted Services	\$70,039,240	\$103,275,087	\$89,849,937	\$88,474,198	\$(375,739)	\$74,512,541	\$77,339,080	\$2,826,539
2200	Supplies & Materials	113,660	195,098	127,136	137,356	10,220	135,151	120,972	\$(14,179)
2300	Communications	74,304	80,300	114,023	114,023	-0-	136,791	136,791	-0-
2400	Travel	992,283	2,344,032	1,256,926	1,265,945	9,019	1,315,345	1,099,140	\$(215,897)
2500	Rent	747,624	1,148,376	833,151	893,278	60,127	833,151	828,175	\$(5,004)
2600	Utilities	84,795	109,048	111,109	111,555	446	132,653	134,270	1,615
2700	Repair & Maintenance	268,468	135,221	177,247	177,221	\$(26)	167,331	167,342	11
2800	Other Expenses	25,505	16,019	14,508	14,936	298	15,485	15,166	\$(319)
	Total Level	\$72,345,879	\$107,303,181	\$91,484,137	\$91,188,432	\$(295,655)	\$77,320,199	\$79,862,977	\$2,542,778
3100	Equipment	\$46,623	\$128,385	\$35,508	\$8,350	\$(27,158)	\$40,630	\$4,630	\$(36,020)
4100	Cap. Outlay - Other	\$44	45,228						
6100	Grants	\$1,167							
	Total Program	\$84,366,643	\$123,720,581	\$103,991,943	\$	\$	\$89,819,553	\$	\$
02422	Highways Earmarked Sp. Rev.	\$2,806,696	\$22,409,077	\$20,205,583	\$	\$	\$19,760,302	\$	\$
02423	Coal Tax	2,848,035	2,000,000	2,949,030					
02424	Reconstruction Trust	536,976	2,000,000						
03407	Highway Trust - Sp Rev.	78,174,876	97,311,504	80,826,330	\$	\$	\$70,059,251	\$	\$
	Total Funding	\$84,366,643	\$123,720,581	\$103,981,943	\$	\$	\$89,819,553	\$	\$

WGS:dk:mr:212/C9

*Long range Dept Board*

Exhibit 2  
3-2-83

	FY 84	FY 85
	<u>\$375,739</u>	<u>\$2,826,539</u>

2100 - Contracted Services - Department reduced Data Processing Services \$60,495 based on an allocation analysis. LFA did not have revised amounts.

Balance of difference in FY 84 and 85 is in Contractor Payments. The OBPP and LFA will reconcile differences between the project list used by OBPP and that used by LFA.

	\$ 9,019	\$ 215,897
--	----------	------------

2400 - Travel - The Department prepared travel requests by identifying crews working on specific projects and calculated anticipated costs. In FY 85 LFA related travel expenses as a percentage of total operating costs minus contractor payments and data processing. The Department recommends the OBPP amount for FY 84 and FY 85.

	\$ 60,127	\$ 54,667
--	-----------	-----------

2500 - Rent - The Department calculated vehicle rent by crews working on specific projects. In FY 85 LFA related rent as a percentage of total operating costs minus contractor payments and data processing. The department recommends the OBPP amount.

	\$ 27,158	\$ 36,030
--	-----------	-----------

3100 - Equipment - OBPP allowed the following and LFA did not:

2 Programmable Calculators	\$ 600	\$ 600
1 Pin Locator	400	
1 Typewriter	1,500	
1 Blue Print Machine	1,000	
1 Slope Inclinator		10,000
Water Well Pump Test Equipment	3,628	
Lab Equip. - Scales and Shakers	2,000	2,500
Hand Held Radios	6,000	2,400
Mobile Radios	10,800	12,600
Magnetic Locator	<u>1,200</u>	
	\$27,128	\$28,100

Department recommends the above totals.

REVISED  
CONSTRUCTION

*Approved*  
3/2/83

AE/OE	DESCRIPTION	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	FY '85 DIFFERENCE
0000	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	83.29	-0-	-	62.58	-0-	-
1100	Salaries	1,414,467	-0-	-	1,045,283	-0-	-
1400	Employee Benefits	189,803	-0-	-	140,896	-0-	-
1500	Health Insurance	79,958	-0-	-	60,077	-0-	-
	Total Level	1,684,228	-0-	-	1,246,256	-0-	-
2100	Contracted Services	35,588,038	-0-	-	37,908,990	-0-	-
2200	Supplies	25,214	-0-	-	14,510	-0-	-
2300	Communications	4,060	-0-	-	4,622	-0-	-
2400	Travel	369,066	-0-	-	270,466	-0-	-
2500	Rent	261,384	-0-	-	251,329	-0-	-
2600	Utilities	6,757	-0-	-	7,930	-0-	-
	Total Level	36,254,519	-0-	-	38,457,837	-0-	-
	Total Program	37,938,747			39,704,093		
02422	Highway Earmarked	6,449,587			6,352,655		
03407	Highway Trust	31,489,160			33,351,438		

WGS:dk:nr:212/C7

REVISED  
MODIFIED RECONSTRUCTION TRUST FUND

AE/OE	DESCRIPTION	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	FY '85 DIFFERENCE
0000	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	4.56	-0-	-	27.67	-0-	- 27.67
1100	Salaries	70,245	-0-	-	412,876	-0-	- 412,876
1400	Employee Benefits	9,896	-0-	-	60,160	-0-	- 60,160
1500	Health Insurance	4,378	-0-	-	26,563	-0-	- 26,563
	Total Level	84,519	-0-	-	499,599	-0-	- 499,599
2100	Contracted Services	8,629,190	-0-	-	9,141,821	-0-	- 9,141,821
2200	Supplies	367	-0-	-	5,259	-0-	- 5,259
2300	Communications				2,566		
2400	Travel	3,609	-0-	-	60,984	-0-	- 60,984
2500	Rent	3,057	-0-	-	86,815	-0-	- 86,815
2600	Utilities				3,119		
2700	Repair and Maintenance				632		
2800	Other Expenses				2,110		
	Total Level	8,636,223	-0-	-	9,303,306	-0-	- 9,303,306
	Total Program	8,720,742			9,802,905		

02424 Highway Reconstruction 8,720,742

9,802,905

REVISED  
MODIFIED ACCELERATED INTERSTATE

AE/OE	DESCRIPTION	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	FY '85 DIFFERENCE
0000	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	20.0	-0-	-	54.0	-0-	-
1100	Salaries	335,983	-0-	-	889,614	-0-	-
1400	Employee Benefits	47,315	-0-	-	127,122	-0-	-
1500	Health Insurance	19,200	-0-	-	51,840	-0-	-
	Total Level	402,498	-0-	-	1,068,576	-0-	-
2100	Contracted Services	1,061,978	-0-	-1,061,978	12,586,862	-0-	-12,586,862
2200	Supplies	2,767	-0-	-	3,172	-0-	-
2300	Communications				1,906		-
2400	Travel	47,925	-0-	-	222,200	-0-	-
2500	Rent	28,668	-0-	-	54,967	-0-	-
	Total Level	1,141,338	-0-	-1,141,338	12,869,107	-0-	-12,869,107
	Total Program	1,543,836			13,937,683		
02424	Highway Reconstruction	1,543,836			13,937,683		

*continued from 50*

FEDERAL APPORTIONMENTS  
(Federal Fiscal Years)  
(1,000's of dollars)

	1982 (Actual)	1983 (Prior to new Federal Law)	1983	1984	1985	1986
			(Based on New Federal Law)			
Interstate Construction	14,887	15,848	17,732	17,732	17,732	17,732
Interstate Resurfacing	12,127	12,336	29,815	36,696	42,811	48,163
Primary	17,466	19,098	21,007	23,581	25,827	27,512
Secondary	7,204	9,006	11,742	11,742	11,742	11,742
Urban	3,842	3,362	3,841	3,841	3,841	3,841
Bridge Replacement	3,245	5,223	9,990	10,483	11,208	13,383
Other	5,337	2,064	5,076	5,235	5,373	5,514
TOTALS	64,108	66,937	99,203	109,310	118,534	127,887
Obligation Authority	66,100	66,000	100,300 <sup>1</sup>	104,800	114,500	124,300

<sup>1</sup> New Federal Law provides obligation authority in excess of apportioned funds.

## Summary of Revenue Proposals

### Fuel Tax

- Make permanent 1-cent increment
- 3-cent increase effective July 1, 1983, with 1/2-cent to go to local governments
- 2-cent increase effective January 1, 1985

### Highway Patrol

- Fund with General Fund revenues effective July 1, 1983

### Coal Tax

- Earmark \$9 million (12 percent) from non-Trust portion for Fiscal Year 1986
- Earmark \$19 million (24 percent) from non-Trust portion for Fiscal Year 1987
- Earmark a constant 24 percent per year for future years

### Gross Vehicle Weight Fees

- No increase -- leave at current level

Highway Fund Cash Flow Analysis  
Governor's Proposed Program  
(COO's of \$)

	<u>FY 1983</u>	<u>FY 1984</u>	<u>FY 1985</u>	<u>FY 1986</u>	<u>FY 1987</u>
Beginning Cash Balance	37,058	29,273	24,483	22,732	10,624
Revenues					
Current Level1	80,907	78,291	80,335	83,439	88,373
2 1/2% Fuel Tax Increase2	-0-	12,835	12,835	12,835	13,139
2% Fuel Tax Increase4	-0-	-0-	5,134	10,268	10,512
Coal Tax Revenues3	-0-	-0-	-0-	9,000	19,000
Available Funds	117,965	120,399	122,787	138,274	141,648
Expenditures					
Current Level3	88,672	85,636	88,215	92,624	97,286
Modified Level	-0-	1,457	1,228	1,230	1,209
Reconstruction Trust	-0-	8,823	10,612	33,796	33,796
ACI	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Total Expenditures	88,672	95,916	100,055	127,650	132,381
Ending Fund Balance	<u>29,293</u>	<u>24,483</u>	<u>22,732</u>	<u>10,624</u>	<u>9,267</u>

Notes:

1 Assumes 1% fuel tax increment is made permanent.

2 Effective 7/1/83.

3 Highway Patrol funded from General Fund effective 7/1/83.

4 Effective 1/1/85.

5 See Schedule 3A for detail on sources of coal tax revenue.

SH:mb:228/Q3

# Coal Tax Revenues Taken From All Earmarked Accounts

	FY 1985	FY 1986		FY 1987	
		Current	Pro.	Current	Pro.
General Fund	23,383	27,941	24,521	30,734	23,514
Public School Equal.	6,154	7,353	6,453	8,088	6,188
Co. Land Planning	615	735	645	809	619
Local Impact	10,769	12,868	11,293	14,154	10,829
Conservation Dist.	308	368	323	404	309
State Library	615	735	645	809	619
Alternative Energy	2,769	3,309	2,904	3,640	2,785
Renewable Resources	769	919	807	1,011	773
Water Development	769	919	807	1,011	773
Parks & Cultural	3,077	3,677	3,226	4,044	3,094
Education Trust	12,307	14,706	12,906	16,176	12,376
Permanent Trust	61,535	73,530	73,530	80,880	80,880
Highway Program	-0-	-0-	9,000	-0-	19,000
Total	123,070	147,060	147,060	161,760	161,759

\* Funding for the Highway Program would amount to 12 percent of the Non-Trust revenues in FY 1986 and 23 percent in FY 1987.

Service Revolving

AE/OE	FY82 Actual	FY83 Budgeted	FY84 OBPP	FY84 LEA	FY84 Difference	FY85 OBPP	FY85 LFA	FY85 Difference
0000								
1100	73.25	68.25	68.25	68.25		68.25	68.25	\$
1400	\$1,305,017	\$1,483,139	\$1,444,011			\$1,439,313		
1500	246,219	305,266	210,104			211,867		
			65,520			65,520		
Total Level	\$1,551,236	\$1,788,405	\$1,719,635			\$1,716,700		
2100								
2200	79,087	99,995	104,526	99,998	-4,528	110,363	105,993	-4,370
2300	166,267	274,797	188,123	186,407	-1,716	201,413	199,555	-1,858
2400	31,655	42,488	28,908	28,881	-27	34,031	34,000	-31
2500	15,370	26,055	17,982	16,406	-1,576	18,625	17,025	-1,600
2600	313,213	431,857	474,375	474,371	-4	502,837	502,831	-6
2700	1,749	0	2,345	2,343	-2	2,884	2,880	-4
2800	36,290	76,257	59,200	48,656	-10,544	55,332	51,566	-3,766
	136,168	25,108	38,503	38,503	0	40,810	40,810	0
Total Level	\$ 779,799	\$ 976,557	\$ 913,962	\$ 895,565	\$ -18,397	\$ 966,295	\$ 954,660	\$ -11,635
3100								
4300	49,818	97,840	13,310	13,560	250	15,300	16,100	800
	135							
Total Pgm	\$2,380,988	\$2,862,802	\$2,646,907			\$2,689,295		
06507								
	2,380,988	2,862,802	2,646,907			2,689,295		
Total Pgm	\$2,380,988	\$2,862,802	\$2,646,907			\$2,689,295		

FY-84 FY-85

2100 CONTR. SERV. - a) OBPP added \$3,345 per Department's data processing services allocation analysis.

b) OBPP allowed \$576 for maintenance of new data processing terminals acquired by the Department.

c) OBPP allowed a net increase of \$607 primarily in the area of education and training processing personnel to implement advanced programming techniques.

4,528 4,370

2700 REPAIR & MAINT. - OBPP allowed for refurbishing of a copy machine in FY '84 of \$4,000, the calibrating of the aerial camera in FY '84 of \$3,000, and the repair of office equipment of \$2,513, and maintenance items of \$1,031.

10,544

3,766

2100 CONTRACTED SERVICES - The Department requests increased data processing maintenance costs for expanded computer equipment purchased in FY 83. This amount was initially proposed as a modified budget request in the General Operations program, but withdrawn when the Department decided to install necessary equipment in FY 83 to meet FY 84 needs by July 1, 1983.

11,236

11,910

*Approved*

*Approved*  
3/12/83

RECEIVED  
SERVICE REVOLVING

AE/OE	DESCRIPTION	FY '84 OBPP	FY '84 LFA	DIFFERENCE	FY '85 OBPP	FY '85 LFA	DIFFERENCE
0200	Full Time Equivalent (FTE)	5.0	-0-	-5.0	5.0	-0-	-5.0
1100	Salaries	66,164	-0-	-66,164	65,193	-0-	-65,193
1400	Employee Benefits	9,627	-0-	-9,627	9,702	-0-	-9,702
1500	Health Insurance	4,800	-0-	-4,800	4,800	-0-	-4,800
	Total Level	80,591	-0-	-80,591	79,695	-0-	-79,695
2100	Contracted Services	20,787	-0-	-20,787	7,146	-0-	-7,146
2200	Supplies	2,247	-0-	-2,247	2,420	-0-	-2,420
2400	Travel	6,180	-0-	-6,180	6,551	-0-	-6,551
2500	Other Expenses	16,954	-0-	-16,954	17,865	-0-	-17,865
	Total Level	46,068	-0-	-46,068	33,982	-0-	-33,982
	Total Program	126,659			113,677		
66507	Highway Service Revolving	126,659			113,677		

WGS:nc:212/C3