

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
FINANCE AND CLAIMS COMMITTEE  
MONTANA STATE SENATE

March 26, 1987

The 19th meeting of the Senate Finance and Claims committee met on the above date in room 108 of the State Capitol. The meeting was called to order following roll call by Senator Regan, Chairman.

ROLL CALL: All members present.

CONSIDERATION OF SENATE BILL 397: AN ACT TO PROVIDE FUNDING TO THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE FOR ADMINISTRATION OF SPECIAL REVENUE ACCOUNTS FOR TAX CHECKOFF PROGRAMS; AND PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE AND A RETROACTIVE APPLICABILITY DATE.

Senator Severson explained the bill and said, this bill evolved as a committee bill from the Taxation committee. The reason for it actually came out of Fish and Game commission, it concerns checkoffs on your income tax form for different type of programs and at the Fish and Game committee we ran into some of these. Each time there has to be some expenses to the Department of Revenue for handling it. He said, I asked Ken Morrison -- why can't you give a figure for the checkoff expense as far as a program is concerned instead of having to come in here each year with another bill to have to figure out an amount for each checkoff. Later Ken came to me and asked me what we could do and I said the only thing would be to come with a committee bill, and this is what we did. Basically this bill sets up the mechanism for any type of checkoff program so if someone could sell a checkoff program they would know what the expenses would be.

PROPOSERS TO SENATE BILL 397: Ken Morrison, Department of Revenue said, Senate Bill 397 was introduced at the request of the Department. He said it assures coordination between taxation and finance committees and other committees who assume checkoffs will be paid for. His testimony is attached as exhibit 1, SB 397.

Jim Flynn said, as mentioned the Department is involved in this process, this would help the Department recoup some of the costs involved and we feel the costs are reasonable, and support the bill.

There were no further proponents and Senator Regan asked if there were any opponents; there were none and she asked if there were questions from the committee.

QUESTIONS FROM THE COMMITTEE: Senator Boylan asked, how many of these are there? I know there is one for the Agriculture people to promote Agriculture in the schools and I think they had a report of the 6,000 or 7,000 dollars they caught it cost that much to collect it, so it was non-productive.

Ken Morrison said he was passing out a sheet which lists the current checkoff programs committee, attached as exhibit 2, SB 397.

Senator Jacobson asked, how much administrative money do you have in your budget for the checkoff? Mr. Morrison answered, the only funding we have received for checkoff's to date has been the wild life checkoff. There was a bill last session on wild life checkoff's, and I am thinking it was up to \$7,000. That was what we could spend, however we didn't charge that program that much money. We charged what our actual expenses were, and it was in the neighborhood of \$5,000.

Senator Jacobson asked, but there is money in your section of the budget, you are expected to take care of this as well as other things? Ken Morrison said, the only money that is in our budget for the checkoff programs through the appropriation process is for the wild life checkoff. We didn't receive any money for the other checkoff's.

Senator Regan said, I don't think she is asking you how much money there is for the checkoff program that is provided. As I understand the question, how much money is devoted to the administration of your Department? What is your administrative budget? Mr. Morrison answered, if I understand you correctly, our budget for the income tax division which includes miscellaneous taxes, withholding taxes and all that is some \$3.2 million.

Senator Regan asked, for administration? Ken Morrison said that is for the processing of all the returns and everything we do.

Senator Gage said Senator Severson, I had a similar kind of bill covering a different program in the '85 session and that was determined to be an appropriation bill and I had to start it through the House. Have you satisfied yourself that the House will not determine this to be an appropriation bill? Senator Severson said he had not made that determination.

Senator Boylan said, in the Agriculture in schools a fourth of it will go for administration. Senator Regan said, that is correct. She said she felt Senator Gage had raised a question which may indeed cloud the whole bill because when you read the description of the bill you are providing for a special revenue account and allowing them to charge money and whether this will meet the test of an appropriation bill or not, I am not sure.

There were no further questions, Senator Severson said he had nothing further in closing, and Senator Regan declared the hearing closed and the committee would take executive action on some bills.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 607: FUNDS FOR HIGHWAY SIGNS INVENTORY AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN which was sponsored by Representative Keenan.

Motion Senator Jacobson that House Bill 607 be concurred in.

Senator Keating asked about the cost and Senator Gage said \$35,000. Line 14, page 1.

Question was called, roll call vote, 9 yes, 6 no. Motion passed, Senator Jacobson to carry the bill on the floor.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 523: Senator Regan said this is the bill that provides for a veteran's checkoff for the cemetery at Ft. Harrison. The checkoff is only good for one year, 1987.

Motion by Senator Manning that House Bill 523 be concurred in.

Senator Regan said, I think we ought to look at this because there is an administrative cost for the checkoff.

Senator Gage said, I think your concern was the fact that they anticipate it will bring in \$8500 and the expenditure impact was \$11,410 to the Department of Revenue. Senator Regan asked, is the provision in the bill to pay the Department the expenses. When you look at the fiscal note the Department expenses associated with the checkoff are deducted from the proceeds of the checkoff. When you look at what is happening here, the checkoff would bring in \$8500 and the expenses would total \$11,410. I don't see in the bill the payment to the DOR for the costs. Perhaps it is not in the bill.

Senator Bengtson said, I don't understand how they thought the operating expenses will be paid for. Senator Regan said this is the fiscal note that was presented, and I assume that the Department estimated that would be what it would cost to administer the law, and the message they are trying

to send you is, it isn't worth it. The question of paying the Department for the checkoffs is still before us.

Senator Keating said, the handout we had would indicate that if Senator McCallum's bill presented by Senator Severson would become effective, I doubt there would be \$11,000 contributions. I question an \$11,000 charge by the DOR. If this becomes another checkoff it must compete with wild animals and child abuse and agriculture in schools etc. If you will notice the furry animals are in the lead on the most money and the most contributions. I guess if they want this bill it is one way they can help the veterans, and if we pass the other bill those people are paying for the administration through their donation.

Senator Smith said if we allow the others to do this we should also allow this group to do it. It may get to the point where nobody can make it.

Senator Bengtson said, they were saying they would do a great public relations. I am wondering for the \$8500 why the same people who would check it off wouldn't send in a dollar through a mailing.

Senator Gage said he would like to point out that unless we increase the DOR budget by \$11,400 this isn't going to cost one penny.

Question was called, voted, passed, unanimous. Senator Manning to carry the bill.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 611: Indirect costs to the Universities.

Senator Jergeson said he had a couple of amendments to House Bill 611. It would amend page 1, line 16. Strike FIFTY PERCENT OF ANY, and insert "any" and on page 1, line 21 strike SEVEN AND ONE-HALF and insert fifteen. This restores the reallocation of indirect costs and go back to 100% rather than 50% which was adopted by the House and changes the allocation for the 4 smaller units to 15% rather than the 7 1/2% that was adopted in the House amendments.

Senator Jergeson said the Appropriation subcommittee had a hearing on House Bill 611, we recommended it out of our subcommittee as it was introduced at the 100% level. Subsequent to that the Appropriation subcommittee that is working on the University budget on H.B.2 put in the allocation of 50% and apparently the House then amended that action. The common theme that was presented to us when we had our hearings was they claim they hold a key to the economic revitalization of Montana. That was the universal assertion made by all 6 units of the system. There may be some truth to that. I am suggesting that the study being

made under HB 2 take into account key economic indicators such as growth in personal income, claims in unemployment, business start ups, etc., and I offer this amendment as a down payment on the theory that the University system does in fact have a role to play in the economic revitalization of the state of Montana.

Question was called on the amendment, voted, passed, Senator Hammond voted no.

Motion by Senator Jergeson that House Bill 611, as amended be concurred in. Voted, passed, unanimous. Senator Jacobson said she would like to carry the bill.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 724: Senator Regan said this is the bill on vacancy savings. It would provide for a vacancy savings pool.

Motion by Senator Story that House Bill 724 be not concurred in. He said, we discovered some years ago that there were some vacancy savings and that we didn't have to fully fund all the agencies all their employees year around because there were some people coming and going some positions stayed open. As a general tool all around it made good sense as a way of understanding about what we would have to fund the state over all if we had so many FTE's that we were funding, but we began to break that down into Departments and mandated so much vacancy -- it is like using a hammer when you need a pair of pliers. It is not a good tool for telling any agency how many people they should have to do the job that we assigned them to do. This makes it even worse in my mind.

Senator Haffey said, I think there is some benefit in this. The Institutions subcommittee worked on this idea. A lot of work was done by the Legislative Fiscal Analysts staff during the interim on this idea. There are really 3 or 4 parts. Senator Story has outlined one part. Another part is that still vacancy savings a legitimate tool for appropriation if used properly. Another one is, that because there's a possibility that we, as legislators on the subcommittees, will sort of miss the target, misusing the vacancy savings, perhaps we should create a pool that could be reached into if we over reduce. If we tighten down too hard on a particular agency with vacancy savings they can reach into this pool and get some funding so they don't go below that level of service that they are either mandated by our laws, federal laws, or what they should provide. This bill puts language into statute what it is that we ought to try to do with vacancy savings, to determine what normal vacancy savings are as opposed to forced vacancy savings. He said if the first thing was done properly there would be no reach into the pool. He said he did not feel the sponsor would object if the pool part was taken out of the bill.

Senator Bengtson said, it is true that we in the subcommittee worked long and hard to respond to the Legislative Finance Committee. I think a greater understanding has occurred on the part of the Legislature on just what vacancy savings have done in the budgeting process. I too, think there is a lot of problems with the pool, and particularly after all the testimony from all the different agencies, that you can't co-mingle federal funds with other funds. I talked to the fiscal analyst and he seemed to think it could be handled, but there is no real assurance there will be any money in that pool at all. I don't think any of us will object to taking out that part of it. After studying this I am not too sure we may not confuse the issue even more by putting it in law.

Senator Gage said, I wanted to bring up the pooling. The Fish and Game, as you recall, indicated they cannot divert those funds other than for Fish, Wildlife or Park purposes or they lose their federal funds. The Highway Department constitutionally is required to use their funds for road building purposes. I don't know that we have any inkling of the problems that the thing may create down the road away.

Senator Himsl said, I agree with Senator Story, we have over played, over used, over abused this whole vacancy savings in manipulating budgets and tried to manipulate operations, and moving into an area where we force management to take positions and do things that they ought not to be doing in the name of vacancy savings. If we trust these people as operators, they are capable, let them manage without trying to force them into positions with this faked up idea of vacancy savings. I have a hard time accepting the whole concept of this.

Senator Haffey said, I agree with some of what Senator Himsl said. It is not correct to state that we haven't abused vacancy savings in some of the places we budgeted. The language on page 2, starting with line 7 through line 12 says don't put a vacancy savings rate in in places where positions are so essential that they have to be filled regardless of fiscal restraints.

Senator Haffey cited the direct care positions in the Department of Institutions that have to be filled, the 4% vacancy savings taken, and that as a result they had to eat into their budget. Now at the prison, they've studied what the normal vacancy savings is that they can accept, and it is a 1.85 % vacancy savings rate, and that is what we put in their budget. The other institutions we put 1.8 or 1.9 in all the direct care.

Substitute motion by Senator Haffey to delete sections 3 and 4 we would be removing all references to the establishment of a pool, and we would be leaving sections 1, 2 and 5 in

place which say do it and do it right. That is the way our fiscal staff has tried to operate this time.

Senator Jergeson asked, Senator Haffey would your amendment include striking subsection (b) on line 18, page 9 which references to the section you are striking.

Senator Haffey said yes, and anything else in the bill that is related to sections 3 and 4, and Curt will you clean it up?

Senator Smith asked, what is really left in the bill that is necessary? Senator Haffey said that what is left in the bill is necessary.

Senator Smith said, let's go through that a little more. They understand what they have done in their subcommittee, but Senators Story, Boylan and I serve on another subcommittee and most of that money was not general fund money. It is either fees or general federal monies. If they did set up a pool, would you be mingling federal money and fees in with general fund money or what?

Senator Regan said the amendment would remove the pool so this would no longer be a concern.

Senator Hammond said, I don't think there is a whole lot left in here, and I would certainly be in favor of removing sections 3 and 4. Every committee has worked with vacancy savings, every committee has taken a look at where you can apply it and where you can't. I don't think we need this bill. I think we have to look at these one at a time.

Question was called on Senator Haffey's substitute motion to delete section 3 and 4 from the bill and clean up any technical problem that remains. Voted. Passed, unanimous.

Motion by Senator Haffey that House Bill 724 as amended be concurred in.

Senator Gage said, in response to Senator Haffey's comments on the language beginning on line 7, page 2. It would appear to me if those positions were not essential that they are required to be filled, they should be deleted anyway.

Senator Haffey said that is not the case at all, what that language said is if you have to fill it 24 hours a day, save it and don't not fill it, you will be cutting their budget somewhere else. This has been a cop-out budget cutter. If you kill the bill you still have the cop-out.

Senator Story said, I agree with your points, but our subcommittee which did more cutting I think than anybody, did not use vacancy savings. We found what we thought they

absolutely needed to do the job and then we let vacancy savings alone. What I disagree with you on is that we have to put it in a law in order to do that.

Substitute motion by Senator Keating that Senate Bill 724 be not concurred in as amended. Voted, passed, Roll call vote. 10-6. Senator Keating to explain the decision on the floor.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 357: AN ACT REQUIRING THAT EXPENDITURES BY A STATE AGENCY BE MADE IN SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE WITH AN APPROVED OPERATING BUDGET; REQUIRING THAT THE OPERATING BUDGET AND CHANGES TO THE BUDGET MEET CERTAIN CONDITIONS; AND PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE.

Senator Regan said, this is the one that requires expenditures by the state agency be made, and they amended it in substantial compliance with the approved operating budget.

Senator Hims1 said, this is where there is a penalty against those who exceed their budget. I made the observation that it is fine to penalize them but then let's penalize the ones who make the estimate and miss by 5% too. The game has to be played both ways. I am not in favor of this bill.

Senator Keating moved House Bill 357 be amended by deleting subsection 3, lines 11 through 16 on page 2.

Question was called, voted, passed, unanimous.

Senator Keating said, the purpose for the bill now is that the Directors and Administrators and Bureau Chief's who want to make the change in their budget from what was appropriated and was Legislative intent to our process will be now required to fill out a B212 form and go before the Legislative Finance Committee and explain their reasons for the change in their budget and get interim committee approval before they start tampering with their budget. One of the things that is going on. We go to the subcommittees and lay out a specific Legislative intent as to how money is supposed to be spent and yet we find these people moving money within their budgets hither and yon, in violation of that intent. In one case there was an 18% vacancy savings taken so that enough money could be generated from that to buy equipment that was specifically denied in the subcommittee. It is those kind of violations that this legislation is intended to restrict somewhat by requiring that these people come before a legislative committee before they make any of these drastic changes.

Senator Regan asked, Senator Keating when you found that circumstance in the budget, did you pick up the hammer and adjust their budget for this biennium? Senator said, we



tried, but the full Appropriation committee stuffed it all back in.

Senator Haffey said the Finance Committee would disown this bill. They would vote, I think unanimously, to remove at least "by request of the legislative finance committee". It has been distorted and twisted and ripped apart. The bill with the language that remains in it does far more than we ever wanted to enable our staff to be able to do following operation plans that flow from legislative intent. I think we should ever go over the bill and take all the rest of the distortion out of there. It was not the intent of the finance committee, and whether we intend for our staff to consider letting them follow operating plans as they change from time to time. The language that says "substantial compliance means that no category in the approved operating budget may be exceeded by 5%, is the real punitive language and should be taken out.

Senator Himsl said, all of us worked these budgets as tightly as we could, and now it seems to me this is entirely too tight for anybody to operate under. They are going to have to adjust some of these areas in order to perform the services we think are essential government services. Another bad flaw in this bill is, there is the compliance in the approved operating budget by 5%. Some of those budgets are so huge that 5% doesn't mean a thing, and there are others where 5% could be of some significance. I think this is bad legislation, a bad bill. We have tried to tighten up on the budgets but still need to be reasonable about it and give them some credibility as administrators or directors to make the most of the minimum funds we have given them. I think we ought to kill this bill.

Motion by Senator Himsl that House Bill 357 be not concurred in.

Senator Jergeson said, I was going to make motion where we strip the rest of the House amendments from the bill. There are 2 areas where I think the 5% would cause a problem. One was the operating budget for the Board of Education. It is quite small, yet they were forced to become a party in a law suit on the foundation program and they would have had to make some changes in excess of 5% on their budget until they were able to come back for a supplemental. The same thing happened at MSU. If we do in effect follow Senator Himsl's motion to kill the bill we should at least clean up the language first, and therefore I will move to strip the rest of the House amendments from 357.

Senator Regan said this is a substitute motion to strip the rest of the House amendments from the bill.

Question was called, motion carried, Senators Keating, Gage, Smith and Senator Tveit voting no.

Question was called on Senator Himsl's original motion that House Bill 357 as amended, be not concurred in.

Senator Boylan asked, what is the function of the Legislative Finance Committee? What can they do except go over a bunch of verbage and budget figures? What authority do they have? They come, meet, go over the figures, and maybe point out some things and then go home. I wonder what the whole methodology of the thing is.

Senator Smith said, Senator Boylan raised a very good question. What authority does the Legislative Finance Committee have? What authority does the Legislature have? We work for 6 weeks on the budget and come back to find that we have a \$43 million supplemental. Something will have to be done.

Senator Regan said, we have a motion before us that House Bill 357 be not concurred in as amended. Roll call vote was taken. The motion carried, 9 to 7. Senator Himsl will carry the adverse committee report.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 573: AN ACT LIMITING SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS FROM THE GENERAL FUND TO THE AMOUNT IN THE GENERAL FUND OR MONEY TRANSFERRED TO THE GENERAL FUND; STATUTORILY REQUIRING A BALANCED BUDGET; AND PROVIDING AN IMMEDIATE EFFECTIVE DATE.

Motion by Senator Story that House Bill 573 be concurred in.

Senator Himsl said, As I recall this bill by limiting the supplemental appropriations to the general fund to the amount of money transferred to the general fund would require a special session to cover it. I don't think that would be cost effective, that is for sure.

Motion by Senator Story was withdrawn.

Motion by Senator Gage that House Bill 573 be not concurred in. Voted, passed, Senators Boylan, Keating, Story, Jergeson and Hammond voting no. Senator Gage to carry the adverse committee report.

Senator Regan said we would meet Monday morning to take care of 2 bills. One dealing with the oil overcharge money and the other is action on House Bill 434, the supplemental.

The meeting was adjourned.

  
-----  
Senator Regan, Chairman

ROLL CALL

50th LEGISLATIVE SESSION - - 1987

Date 3-26-87

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
SENATOR REGAN	✓		
SENATOR HIMSL	✓		
SENATOR JACOBSON	✓		
SENATOR BENGTON	✓		
SENATOR STIMATZ	✓		
SENATOR HARDING	✓		
SENATOR HAFHEY	✓		
SENATOR SMITH	✓		
SENATOR KEATING	✓		
SENATOR STORY	✓		
SENATOR BOYLAN	✓		
SENATOR JERGESON	✓		
SENATOR TVEIT	✓		
SENATOR MANNING	✓		
SENATOR HAMMOND	✓		
SENATOR GAGE	✓		

VISITOR'S REGISTER

NAME	REPRESENTING	Check One	
		Support	Oppose
Lorna Frank	MT. FARM Bureau	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Carol Mosher	mt. Stock growers mt. Ladsle Women	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Kay Nounding	WIFE	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

(Please leave prepared statement with Secretary)

Ken Morrison  
Department of Revenue

Testimony SB397  
Senate Finance and Claims

SB397 was introduced at the request of the department by the Senate Taxation Committee. The bill provides funding to the department of revenue for the checkoff programs.

The bill assures coordination between taxation and finance committees. The tax (or other) committees setup tax return checkoff programs assuming the department's administrative costs are funded. Last session 2 new checkoffs were approved and we didn't receive funds to administer the programs.

Senate Bill 397 provides that coordination in the future, and assures every program pays part or all of its administrative costs in a uniform manner. New programs will be changed for the initial setup costs of the checkoff. This is primarily the cost of changing the automated tax return processing system.

Then each year the checkoff program will be changed \$1 per checkoff except for the Public Campaign Funds. The \$1 will fully or partially compensate the department for the costs of processing the checkoffs and accounting for the funds. This is primarily for entering checkoff information to the automated system.

The \$1 charge is the same approach recently used by Senate Fish and Game Committee to fund the administration of the Wildlife checkoff.

What happens if the department isn't funded for the programs? It means the department doesn't perform some of its other tasks. Most important are the audit tasks. If these are not performed, the department loses revenue. These tasks produce \$10 for every \$1 spent.

We realize the tax return provides an economical means of soliciting contributions for special programs. It only seems reasonable that these programs pay the minimal costs associated with seeking contributions from over 410,000 Montanans.

SENATE FINANCE AND CLAIMS  
EXHIBIT NO. 1  
DATE 3-26-87  
BILL NO. 397

epb 1 - H B 11 - Jeezoo

OK with changes. Poody  
Sylvia 404

Amend House Bill 611 (third reading copy)

- 1. Page 1, Line 16  
\* Strike: "FIFTY PERCENT OF ANY"  
\* Insert: "~~ANY~~" "Any"
  
- 2. Page 1, Line 21  
\* Strike: "SEVEN AND ONE-HALF"  
\* Insert: "~~FIFTEEN~~"  
"Fifteen"

Income Tax Checkoff Programs

<u>Checkoff Programs</u>	1986 Checkoffs	1986 Amounts	Proposed Admin. Funding
NonGame Wildlife	4,146	\$31,869	\$4,146
Child Abuse	3,595	\$27,086	\$3,595
Public Campaign	2,486	\$ 2,486	\$ 500
Agriculture in Schools	1,317	\$ 8,487	\$2,000

SENATE FINANCE AND CLAIMS  
 EXHIBIT NO. 2  
 DATE 3-26-87  
 BILL NO. 397  
 S

ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

DATE 3-26-89 H. Bill No. 357 Time 9:05

NAME	YES	NO
SENATOR HIMSL	✓	
SENATOR JACOBSON	✓	
SENATOR BENGTON	✓	
SENATOR STIMATZ	✓	
SENATOR HARDING	✓	
SENATOR HAFNEY		✓
SENATOR SMITH		✓
SENATOR KEATING		✓
SENATOR STORY	✓	
SENATOR BOYLAN		✓
SENATOR JERGSON		✓
SENATOR TVEIT		✓
SENATOR MANNING	✓	
SENATOR HAMMOND	✓	
SENATOR GAGE	✓	
SENATOR REGAN		✓
	9	7

Sylvia Kinsey  
Secretary

Senator Regan  
Chairman

MOTION: C - m - 90  
Must to carry



ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

DATE \_\_\_\_\_ HB Bill No. 607 Time 8:20

NAME	YES	NO
SENATOR HIMSL		✓
SENATOR JACOBSON	✓	
SENATOR BENGTON	✓	
SENATOR STIMATZ	✓	
SENATOR HARDING	✓	
SENATOR HAFPEY	✓	
SENATOR SMITH		
SENATOR KEATING		✓
SENATOR STORY		✓
SENATOR BOYLAN		✓
SENATOR JERGSON	✓	
SENATOR TVEIT		✓
SENATOR MANNING	✓	
SENATOR HAMMOND		✓
SENATOR GAGE	✓	
SENATOR REGAN	✓	

9 4

Sylvia Kinsey  
Secretary

Senator Regan  
Chairman

MOTION:           
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

ROLL CALL VOTE

SENATE COMMITTEE

FINANCE AND CLAIMS

8:54

DATE

H.

Bill No.

724

Time

8:52

NAME	YES	NO
SENATOR HIMSL	✓	
SENATOR JACOBSON		✓
SENATOR BENGTON		✓
SENATOR STIMATZ	✓	
SENATOR HARDING	✓	
SENATOR HAFHEY		✓
SENATOR SMITH	✓	
SENATOR KEATING	✓	
SENATOR STORY	✓	
SENATOR BOYLAN	✓	
SENATOR JERGSON		✓
SENATOR TVEIT	✓	
SENATOR MANNING		✓
SENATOR HAMMOND	✓	
SENATOR GAGE	✓	
SENATOR REGAN		✓

10-6

Sylvia Kinsey  
Secretary

Senator Regan  
Chairman

MOTION:

Ref. Bill 9 m

(m - 9 m)

357  
724

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

SCRMB357

March 25,

1987

MR. PRESIDENT

## Finance and Claims

We, your committee on.....

House Bill

357

having had under consideration.....

No.....

third

blue

reading copy ( \_\_\_\_\_ )

color

### REQUIRING STATE AGENCY TO MAKE EXPENDITURES ACCORDING TO OPERATING BUDGET

Respectfully report as follows: That..... House Bill.....

No. 357.....

#### BE AMENDED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Title, line 7.

Strike: "SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE"

Insert: "ACCORDANCE"

2. Page 1, line 14.

Strike: "MUST"

Insert: "may"

3. Page 1, lines 14 and 15.

Strike: "IN SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE"

Insert: "only in accordance"

4. Page 1, lines 16, 17 and 18.

Strike: "SUBSTANTIAL COMPLIANCE MEANS THAT NO CATEGORY IN THE APPROVED OPERATING BUDGET MAY BE EXCEEDED BY 5%."

5. Page 1, lines 22 through 24.

Strike: "LEGISLATIVE" on line 22 through "ACT." on line 24

6. Page 2, lines 1 and 2.

Strike: "THE CATEGORIES OR"

7. Page 2, line 8.

Strike: "OPERATING BUDGET"

Insert: "operational plan"

8. Page 2, lines 11 through 16.

Strike: subsection 3 in its entirety.

DO PASS

DO NOT PASS

AND AS AMENDED  
BE NOT CONCURRED

Chairman.

Senator Regan

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

..... March 26 ..... 19 87 .....

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on..... **FINANCE AND CLAIMS** .....

having had under consideration..... **House Bill** ..... No. **523** .....

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

**CHECK-OFF ON STATE TAX RETURN TO FUND STATE VETERANS' CEMETARY**

**PAVLOVICH (Manning)**

Respectfully report as follows: That..... **House Bill** ..... No. **523** .....

**BE CONCURRED IN**

**XXXXXX**  
DO PASS

**XXXXXXXXXX**  
DO NOT PASS

..... **Senator Regan,** .....  
Chairman.

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

..... March 26 ..... 1997 .....

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on..... **FINANCE AND CLAIMS** .....

having had under consideration..... **HOUSE BILL** ..... No. **573** .....

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

**BALANCED BUDGET STATUTES**

**WINSLOW (Gage)**

Respectfully report as follows: That..... **HOUSE BILL** ..... No. **573** .....

BE NOT CONCURRED IN

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

.....  
Senator Pat Regan

Chairman.

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

..... March 26 ..... 1987 .....

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on ..... **FINANCE AND CLAIMS** .....

having had under consideration..... **House Bill** ..... No. **607** .....

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

## **FUNDS FOR HIGHWAY SIGNS INVENTORY AND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN**

**KEEHAN (Jacobson)**

Respectfully report as follows: That..... **House Bill** ..... No. **607** .....

BE CONCURRED IN

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

.....  
**SENATOR REGAN** Chairman.

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 26

1987

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on FINANCE AND CLAIMS

having had under consideration..... HOUSE BILL No. 611

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

## ALLOCATE REIMBURSEMENTS FOR INDIRECT COSTS TO UNIVERSITY

D. BROWN (Jacobson)

Respectfully report as follows: That..... HOUSE BILL No. 611,  
**be amended as follows:**

1. Page 1, line 16.

Strike: "FIFTY PERCENT OF ANY"

Insert: "Any"

2. Page 1, line 21.

Strike: "SEVEN AND ONE-HALF"

Insert: "Fifteen"

AND AS AMENDED

BE CONCURRED IN

~~XXXXXX~~

~~XXXXXXXXXX~~

.....  
SENATOR REGAN

Chairman.

# STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 26

19 87

MR. PRESIDENT

We, your committee on FINANCE AND CLAIMS

having had under consideration House Bill No. 724

third reading copy ( blue )  
color

## REQUIRE LEGISLATURE TO DETERMINE VACANCY SAVINGS RATES FOR CERTAIN AGENCIES

MILLER (Keating)

Respectfully report as follows: That House Bill No. 724

be amended as follows:

1. Title, lines 7 through 9.  
Following: "RATE," on line 7  
Strike: the remainder of line 7 through line 9
2. Title, line 10.  
Following: "PROVIDING"  
Insert: "AN IMMEDIATE"
3. Title, line 11.  
Strike: "DATES"  
Insert: "DATE"
4. Page 2, line 16 through page 6, line 1.  
Strike: sections 3 and 4 in their entirety  
Renumber: subsequent sections
5. Page 9, line 15.  
Strike: "dates"  
Insert: "date"
6. Page 9, line 16.  
Strike "(a)" through "are"  
Insert: "This act is"
7. Page 9, line 18.  
Strike: line 18

AND AS AMENDED

BE NOT CONCURRED

~~DO NOT PASS~~

Senator Reagan

Chairman.