MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By Chairman Gary Spaeth, on January 9, 1989, at 8:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: All members present

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Carl Schweitzer, LFA

Jane Hamman, OBPP

Donna Grace, Committee Secretary

HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Tape No. 4:A(002)

Presentation and Opening Statement: John North, Acting
Director, Department of State Lands, stated that the
Department was responsible for managing 5.2 million
acres of surface lands and 6.1 million subsurface acres
of school trust land. There are responsible for mine
permitting and reclamation on all lands in the state,
direct wildfire protection on state and private lands
and fire districts in the state and assisting county
fire programs. These responsibilities, as well as
other forestry-related programs are outlined in Exhibit
1.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group They Represent:

Jim Williams, Department of State Lands Kathleen Harrington, Board of Public Education Greg Groepper, Board of Public Eduction Tony Campeau, Board of Public Education Gary Amestoy, Department of State Lands

List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:

None.

Centralized Services Department. (085)

Mr. Williams, Administrator of this department, stated that the function of his department is to perform those

support services common to all units within the Department. He reviewed three segments, which were Administration, Aviation Operation and Maintenance and the Trust Land Management System. Mr. Williams' comments in their entirety are attached as Exhibit 2.

- Discussion followed. In answer to a question from Senator Jergeson, Mr. Williams stated that as directed by the last session of the Legislature, all records on state school trust land had been removed from the Secretary of State's office and were now in the office of the Department of State Lands.
- Mr. Williams discussed at length the Trust Land Management System budget. The department has requested \$218,482 more in resource development funds for further development of the system over the LFA's current level. Mr. Williams explained that prior to the implementation of the system it was estimated that there were 12,000 parcels of trust land. When all were entered into the system, it was found that there were actually 16,000.
- Mr. Greg Groepper, representing the Office of Public Instruction stated that he was present at the meeting to support the portion of the budget that would provide for an auditor and related travel for auditing oil leases owned by out of state corporations. He stated that this would insure that people who had responsibilities to the state of Montana paid their fair share.
- Mr. Tony Campeau, also representing the Board of Public Education, stated that as a state agency constitutionally responsible for the supervision of the school system and as an agency responsible for developing policy regarding equalization payments to schools, he said that he is well aware of how critical and important the income from state lands is to the public school system. His department, therefore, supports the modifications proposed by the Department of State Lands, and supported by the Governor, to insure that the trust receipts and royalties paid are correct. (Exhibit 3)
- 5:A:001 Mr. Schweitzer, LFA, presented members of the committee with a document entitled "Legislative Action", Exhibit 4, which compares the executive budget with the LFA current level and outlines the issues to come before the committee.

EXECUTIVE ACTION:

Issue No. 1. Vacancy Savings. (Department Summary) Mr. Schweitzer stated that this matter will be considered at a later date.

Centralized Services Division

- Issue No. 1. Trust Lands Management System. Mr. Schweitzer explained that the executive budget recommends \$218,482 more resource development funds for the trust lands management system than does LFA current level. The executive budget proposes that four new components of the system be developed in the 1991 biennium at a cost of \$373,590. LFA current level provides \$155,108, which is a continuation of the amount expended in fiscal 1988 and would provide for development of one or possibly two new components.
- Motion: Representative Swift made a motion that funding be approved for two components of the Trust Management System, approximately \$105,000 for the biennium, over and above actual operating costs.
- Vote: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.
- At this point in the meeting Senators Devlin and Jenkins were excused. Mr. Spaeth stated that no further executive action would be taken.

Reclamation Division(307)

- Gary Amestoy, Administrator of the Reclamation Division, stated that the Reclamation Division is responsible for administering all of Montana's mined land reclamation statutes and administrative rules. Mr. Amestoy's testimony is attached as Exhibit 5. Bureaus covered in this division are Coal and Uranium Bureau, Hard Rock Bureau, Opencut Bureau and the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Bureau. At this meeting he presented testimony on Administration, Opencut Bureau and Abandoned Mine. His testimony will be continued on January 10.
- Announcements/Discussion: Chairman Spaeth announced that the committee would meet at 8:00 a.m. on January 10 to take executive action relative to the Central Service Division of the Department of State Lands.

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

January 9, 1989

Page 4 of 4

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 11:00 a.m.

REP, GARY SPAETH, Chairman

GS/dg

0726.min

DAILY ROLL CALL

NATURAL RESOURCES

SUBCOMMITTEE

DATE

NAME PRESENT ABSENT EXCUSED Representative Spaeth Senator Devlin Representative Kimberley Representative Iverson Representative Swift Senator Jenkins Senator Jergeson

EXHIBIT 1-9-89	
H3.	

STATE LANDS TESTIMONY

Natural Resource Subcommittee Appropriations Hearing

Opening Remarks

The Department of State Lands is responsible for:

- a) managing 5.2 million surface acres and 6.1 million subsurface acres of School Trust Land:
 - b) mine permitting and reclamation on all land in the state;
- c) direct wildfire protection on state and private lands in fire districts in the state and assisting county fire programs; and
- d) other Forestry related programs such as fire hazard reduction, technical assistance to private landowners and the production of seedlings for conservation and state forestry by the nursery.

As a result of funding shortfalls, the Department's personnel decreased by 14.75 FTE's over the '86-'87 biennium. Over the last biennium, were it not for the assumption of Block 3 firefighting responsibilities, the size of the Department's workforce would have remained virtually the same. The overall workload of the Department has not decreased, however. The Department has been able to carry out its functions through reorganization and the dedication of many employees.

The proposed executive budget asks the Department to tighten its belt another couple of notches by accepting 2% vacancy savings in each program and by funding an employee pay increase within its current level appropriation. While the Department can probably continue to function with the 2% vacancy savings, we believe that funding the pay increase from current level could

reduce the effectiveness of the Department and restrict its ability to accomplish its mandated goals.

As you probably know, the Commissioner of State Lands normally presents all initial testimony for each of the Department's programs. Because I have only recently become Interim Commissioner, I have asked the department's division administrators to present their budgets. They will present them on a control variable basis, referencing the LFA worksheets and the LFA/OBPP sheets comparing the LFA and Executive Budget by control variable. They will concentrate their testimony on the major differences with which we have concern.

DATE 1-9-89
HB

As you probably know, the Commissioner of State Lands normally presents all initial testimony for each of the Department's programs. Because I have only recently become Interim Commissioner, I have asked the department's division administrators to present their budgets. They will present them on a control variable basis, referencing the LFA worksheets and the LFA/OBPP sheets comparing the LFA and Executive Budget by control variable. They will concentrate their testimony on the major differences with which we have concern.

grin gillucia

Program 01- Central Management Division

General Statement - The function of the Central Management Division is to perform those support services common to all units within the Department such as payroll, claims, revenue collections, air operation, personnel, legal services and data processing. This session you will be reviewing the Central Management Division in three segments or Control Variables. They are: Administration, Aviation Operation and Maintenance, and Trust Land Management Systems.

Administration Budget

The first segment is the Administration budget (Control Variable).

Current Level Request	<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
Personal Services	771,146	773,368
(FTE)	28.00	28.00

Explanation: Included in the Administration personal services budget are the salaries for the Commissioner, secretarial and reception, legal services, data processing, accounting and personnel. In addition to performing Department-wide administrative duties, this staff is responsible for receiving and disbursing in excess of \$40 million annually in income earned from trust

lands. The staff processes more than 25,000 checks and 9,500 expenditure claims which include the bills for fire suppression and handles approximately 10,000 Commodity Certificates annually.

Changes to Current Level:

This budget reflects the transfer of 10.50 FTE's from the Forestry Division. House Bill 2, passed by the 1987 Legislature, required the Department to consolidate support functions in one program. Two FTE's and the funding for these positions were eliminated from the Forestry Division. The General Services Bureau in Forestry has been eliminated and 10.50 FTE's have been added to the Central Management Division. Duties and responsibilities have been shifted to accommodate the consolidation of functions and workloads. Under this reorganization all employees involved in support activities are in one program.

Vacancy Savings -

LFA ISSUE 2. The Executive Budget reduced the personal service request by 2% in FY 90 and 91. This amounts to \$15,016 in 90 and \$15,059 in 91. The Executive Budget also recommends a 2% pay increase which is to be absorbed by current level agency budgets. This means that funding for salaries and wages in the Administration budget will be 4 percent and 6 percent short respectively in each year of the next biennium. Vacancy savings and the pay increase would cost this budget \$31,446 in FY 90 and \$47,169 in FY 91. These amounts cannot be absorbed without laying off more employees. The LFA recommends a 4 percent vacancy savings which makes the funding situation for salaries even worse.



I request that the Committee adopt the Executive budget recommendation for personal services in the Administration budget.

In the Operations and Equipment portions of the Administration budget I will only discuss those categories or issues where there is a significant difference between the Executive and LFA recommendations.

<u>Contracted Services:</u> FY 90 <u>FY 91</u> \$121,478 \$88,442

<u>Explanation:</u> Included in contracted services are legal and consulting fees, vehicle insurance, printing, Legislative audit fees, janitorial costs for the offices in Helena, and payroll service fees paid to the State Auditor.

Differences between the Executive Budget and the LFA

LFA ISSUE 3.

Included in the Executive Budget but not in the LFA budget is \$4,500 per year to contract with surveyors and abstractors to perfect titles on lands that state agencies are requesting the Department to sell. House Bill 29, as passed by the last Legislature, requires the Department to be the repository for all deeds to real property owned by the State of Montana. Section 77-1-205, MCA, states: "To the extent feasible within available funding and personnel, the Department shall: (a) verify the accuracy of information contained in the ownership records,..." During FY 88 the Department became involved with selling two parcels of non-trust state-owned land. In order to perfect the titles before the land could be sold, the services of a certified land surveyor and abstractor were needed. The probability that DSL will be required to sell non-trust land again is high and the HB 29 responsibilities exist independent of any sales.

 η I therefore request that the Committee adopt the Executive budget recommendation for contracted services in the Administration budget.

<u>Travel:</u> <u>FY 90</u> <u>FY 91</u> 24,511 24,511

Explanation: This category is made up of commercial transportation,

Department aircraft rental, lodging, and vehicle mileage to meet the travel

needs of the Commissioner, legal staff, personnel officer, and royalty auditor.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets:

183

201

LFA ISSUE 5.

The LFA removed the travel budget for the Department's royalty auditor because it was an increase above current level of the base year. During FY 88 the auditor was being trained and was not ready for any audit assignments. Currently, he has been involved with both in-state and out-of-state audits. During each year of the next biennium he will make five out-of-state trips of two weeks in duration per year, at an average cost of \$1,680 per trip or \$8,400 per year. The auditor will travel in-state approximately five weeks per year at a cost of \$405 per week or \$2,012 per year. This is a very effective program. Recently a royalty payer agreed to reimburse the trust for under-paid royalties of \$305,000. That translates to a \$19 return for every \$1 expended for salary and travel costs of the auditor. If the auditor cannot travel, his effectiveness is eliminated.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for travel in the Administration budget.

Rent:

FY 90

FY91

\$64,338

\$80,178

Explanation: Included in this category are the amounts needed for storage and office space for the Department's main office in Helena.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets:

LFA ISSUE 4.

The LFA removed the amount requested in FY 91 for additional office space in the building currently occupied by the Department. A request has been sub-

mitted to the Long Range Building Program for planning funds to construct an office building in Helena to alleviate overcrowding and to provide a facility that will accommodate the current organizational structure. The request was denied and the need still exists for more office space.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for office rent for the next biennium in the Administration budget.

216

<u>FY 90</u> <u>FY 91</u> \$23,640 \$21,000

<u>Explanation:</u> Included in this category are the funds necessary to purchase professional work stations for the Administration Program and to replace obsolete microprocessors throughout the Department.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets:

LFA ISSUE 6.

Professional Work Stations The Department's Information Processing plan provides for six more computerized work stations - one for each of the four attorneys to speed up brief preparation and one each for the Personnel and Accounting sections. The LFA removed three stations from the budget. This equipment is necessary in order to maintain an efficient office operation and to speed the process of handling Department litigation.

Department Computer Replacement The Department's Data Processing Management Committee, which is the group that oversees the use and development of data processing applications, has adopted a policy of replacing Department microprocessors on a five-year cycle. A budget for ongoing replacement of these computers is necessary to prevent costly downtime and provide for technological currency. The Department requested that funding be included in the Executive Budget to replace 17 microprocessors per year in the next biennium. The Budget Office denied the request and recommended 21,000 in FY 91 for repairs on

existing equipment. The LFA reduced the repair funding by 11,000. The Department has approximately 80 units and has become increasingly dependent on microprocessors to more efficiently accomplish its mission. Although the Department needs \$69,000 to replace all obsolete and worn or defective units, the Executive Budget would allow the Department to replace those units most in need of replacement.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for equipment in the Executive Budget. This recommendation will provide for the purchase of new equipment and a minimal amount of funding for replacement of existing computers.

This concludes the testimony for the Administration budget or Control Variable. I will move to the Aviation Operation and Maintenance budget.

Aviation Budget

353

General Statement- The Aviation Operation and Maintenance Bureau is responsible for managing the aircraft, pilots, and funding for all Department aviation, including maintenance, insurance, pilot training, and hanger facilities.

Current Level Request FY 90 FY 91

Personal Services 131,271 132,276

<u>Explanation:</u> Included in this category is the funding for Personal Services for the pilots and the maintenance supervisor.

Changes to Current Level:

This budget reflects the increase of 1.50 FTE's because of an IRS ruling that requires certain positions to be employed rather than contracted positions. The actual number of pilots have not increased, only their status has changed.

<u>Vacancy Savings -</u> As with the Administration budget, the Executive recommendation contains a 2 percent vacancy savings factor that will have to be absorbed in this budget. The LFA vacancy savings factor could not be absorbed without cutting back the scope of the Program.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for personal services in the Aviation Program.

In the operations portion of the Aviation Program budget I will discuss the three expenditure categories where differences exist between the Executive and LFA budgets.

Supplies and Materials:	FY 90	<u>FY 91</u>
	42,122	42,122

Explanation: Aviation fuel for the aircraft is purchased, with the amounts budgeted in this category. Fuel is purchase with funds appropriated from the revolving account.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets.

LFA ISSUE 6.

The LFA reduced the request by approximately \$11,000 in the next biennium. It has been the experience of the program that fuel costs annually are higher than what the LFA has proposed for this category.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for aviation fuel.

Travel:	FY 90	<u>FY 91</u>
	2.887	2,887

Explanation: The travel category includes meals, lodging, and travel for pilots to attend training.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets.

The LFA has reduced this category by approximately \$3,000 in the next biennium. It is a Department policy to provide comprehensive training for Department pilots to assure the safe operation of aircraft.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for travel in the Aviation Program budget.

Rent:	<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
	11,130	11,430

Explanation: This category contains rent for hanger space in locations for aircraft assigned to locations outside Helena.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets

The LFA has reduced the rent category by approximately 2,800 in the next biennium and this will not allow the aviation program to acquire enough hanger space for Department aircraft. Not having hanger space to house aircraft increases maintenance costs.

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive recommendation for rent in the Aviation budget.

This concludes the testimony on the Aviation Program budget. I will move next to the Trust Land Management Systems budget.

Trust Land Management Systems Budget

Explanation: The Trust Land Management System is a mainframe computer application that contains information about ownership, leases, and revenue earned from trust lands. This budget contains funding for operations, maintenance and development in the next biennium.

Differences between the Executive and LFA budgets.

LFA ISSUE 1.

The LFA disagrees only with the amount of funding that is available in the Resource Development account. Both the Executive and LFA budgets are in

agreement on what is needed for operations and development provided adequate funding is available. A few days ago the revenue estimator for the LFA and the Chief of the Department's Fiscal Bureau met and discussed the differences. There will be sufficient funding to support the Executive recommendation for the Trust Land Management Systems budget.

I request that the Committee the Executive recommendation for this budget.

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARISONS

REPORT EBSR99 DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/53/01

ES ONLY	DIFF FY 91		4,680	20,971	-7	170	6,420		15,840	-477	32,771	11,000	11,000			64,742	53,496	64,742
CURRENT LEVEL SERVICES	LFA FY 91	28.00	636, 683 6, 228 100, 816 40, 020 -31, 350	752,397	-780 -81 -901	498	82,022 12,606	13,384	64,338 9,605 1,465	4,014	203,560	10,000	10,000	265,000	265,000	1,230,957	1,120,677	1,230,957
CURRENT	EXEC FY 91	28.00	636, 683 10, 908 100, 816 40, 020 -15, 059	773,368	-780 -88 -901	668	88,442	24,511	9,605	3,537	236,331	21,000	21,000	265,000	265,000	1,295,699	1,174,173	1,295,699
	D1 FF FY 90		3,384 1,000 16,255	20,639	;	70	4,500	11,127		-477	14,924	11,000	11,000			46,563	35,023 11,540	46,563
	LFA FY 90	28.00	636, 683 6, 228 98, 847 40, 020 -31, 271	750,507	-565 -38 -816	205	116,978	13,384	64, 338 9, 605 1, 465	4,014	237,866	12,640	12,640	265,000	265,000	1,266,013	1,156,027	1,266,013
	EXEC FY 90	28.00	636,683 9,612 99,847 40,020 -15,016	771,146	-565 -43 -816	275	121,478	24,511	64, 338 9, 605 1, 465	3,537	252,790	23,640	23,640	265,000	265,000	1,312,576	1,191,050 121,526	1,312,576
	BUDGET FY 89																	
TE LANDS T PROGRAM	ACTUAL FY 88		395, 399.21 6, 228.19 80, 773.97	482,401.37			104, 391.58	13,821.27	62,657.50 9,604.65 1 464 04	4,014.36	223,431.71	30,439.44	30,439.44	265,000.00	265,000.00	1,001,272.52	913,054.94 88,217.58	1,001,272.52
AGENCY: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS PROGRAM: 01 CENTRAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CONTROL: 01002 ADMINISTRATION	DE SCRIPTION) FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)	SALARIES LONGIVITY LEMPLOYEE BENEFITS HEALTH INSURANCE VACANCY SAVINGS	TOTAL LEVEL	CONTRACTED SERVICES-INFLATI SUPPLIES & MATERIALS-INFLAT COMMINICATIONS-INFLATION		CONTRACTED SERVICES SUPPLIES & MATERIALS			OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL LEVEL	5 EQUIPMENT	TOTAL LEVEL	O GRANTS	TOTAL LEVEL	TOTAL PROGRAM	01100 GENIRAL FUND 03070 CENIRALIZED SER-GRANT REIMB	TOTAL PROGRAM
AGENCY PROCRA CONTRO	AE/0E	0000	1100 1113 1400 1500		2021	2024	2200	2300	2500	2800		3100		0009			011	

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARISONS

REPORT EBSR99 DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/53/01

ONLY	DIFF FY 91	•	2,828	2,828	686 -42 5,445	1,766	9,300		12,128	9,221	12, 128
CURRENT LEVEL SERVICES ONLY	LFA FY 91	4.50	107,298 500 1,074 21,830 4,140 -5,394	129,448	4, 493 -122 33, 059 36, 677	2,966 1,121 9,985 115,155 2,905	206,243		335,691	154,894 180,797	335,691
CURRENT LE	EXEC FY 91	4.50	107,298 500 1,074 21,830 4,140 -2,566	132,276	5, 179 -164 33, 059 42, 122	2,966 2,887 11,430 115,155 2,905	215,543		347,819	164, 115 183, 704	347,819
	D1 FF FY 90		2,807	2,807	479 -42 5,445	1,766 1,445	9,093		11,900	9,010 2,890	11,900
	LFA FY 90	4.50	107,298 500 836 21,043 4,140 -5,353	128,464	3,139 -128 31,204 36,677	2,966 1,121 9,685 115,155 2,905	202,726	3,500	334,690	154,056 180,634	334,690
	EXEC FY 90	4.50	107, 298 500 836 21, 043 4, 140 -2, 546	131,271	3,618 -170 31,204 42,122	2,966 2,887 11,130 115,155 2,905	211,819	3,500	346,590	163,066 183,524	346,590
	BUDGET FY 89										
LANDS PROGRAM & MAINTEN	ACTUAL FY 88		81,735.06 1,746.10 842.59 19,758.57	104,082.32	45,990.59 29,503.23	2,486.05 1,120.55 5,955.00 78,683.71 2,904.44	166,643.57		270,725.89	134,034.77	270,725.89
AGENCY: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS PROGRAM: 01 CENTRAL MANAGEMENT PROGRAM CONTROL: 01010 AVIATION OFERATION & MAINTEN	AE/OE DESCRIPTION	0000 FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FT!)	1100 SALARIES 1102 OVERTIME 1113 LONGEVITY 1400 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS 1500 HEALIH INSURANCE 1600 VACAHCY SAVINGS	TOTAL LEVEL	2021 CONTRACTED SERVICES-INFLATI 2022 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS-INFLAT 2023 COMMUNICATIONS-INFLATION 2100 CONTRACTED SERVICES 2200 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2300 COMMUNICATIONS 2400 TRAVEL 2500 RENI 2700 REPAIR & MAINTENANCE 2800 OTHER EXPENSES		3100 EQUITMENT TOTAL LEVEL	TOTAL PROGRAM	01100 GENERAL FUND 06538 AIR OPERATIONS INTERNAL SVC	TOTAL PROGRAM

() () ()

	FY86	FY87	FY88	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991
Agricultural Leases	64,217,358	\$5,500,000	\$8,547,526	24,200,000	\$7,250,000	67,250,000
Grazing Leases	\$2,968,679	\$3,000,000	\$3,231,169	\$3,000,000	\$3,000,000	£3 ,000,000
OiltGas Leases	\$3,701,535	\$2,605,000	\$2,139,790	\$1,580,000	\$1,580,000	\$1,580,000
Non-Drilling Penalties	\$2,729,571	\$2,400,000	\$1,333,276	\$925,000	\$800,000	\$700,000
Oil&Gas Bonus	\$736,849	\$333,400	\$179,449	\$150,000	\$125,000	\$125,000
Other Rentals	\$508,695	\$180,600	\$188,135	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
TOTAL	\$14,562,687 ====================================	\$14,019,000 ********	\$15,619,145 ========	\$10,105,000 =================================	\$10,105,000 \$13,005,000 \$12,905,000	\$12,905,000 ========
Income from Resource Development on State Lands	State Lands			£5+.		
	FY86	FY87	FY88	FY 1989	FY 1990	FY 1991
Agricultural Leases	\$4,393,681	\$7,229,903	\$8,892,079	\$4,375,456	\$7,552,870	\$7,552,870
Grazing Leases	\$3,262,417	\$3,234,765	\$3,557,287	\$3,296,703	\$3,296,703	\$3,296,703
Oil#Gas Leases	\$4,179,649	\$2,853,173	\$2,315,607	\$1,784,101	\$1,784,101	\$1,784,101
Non-Drilling Penalties	\$3,238,254	\$2,025,767	\$1,504,349	\$1,097,402	\$949,104	\$830,466
Oil&Gas Borus	\$771,130	\$225,750	\$179,449	\$396,000	\$396,000	\$396,000
Other Rentals	\$284,169	\$210,331	\$281,483	\$340,414	\$340,414	\$340,414
TOTAL	\$16,129,300	\$15,779,689	\$16,730,254	\$11,290,076	\$11,290,076 \$14,319,193 \$14,200,555	\$14,200,555
	10 10 12 12 12 13 14 15 14 14	14 15 11 10 10 10 10 11 11 11	18 10 51 12 15 11 11 12 16 17	10 15 15 12 16 11 11 11 12 25 11	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	18 10 18 18 18 18 18 18 18
02450 Besource Davelonment (.025)	\$403.233	269.7625	\$418.256	\$282.252	\$357.980	\$355,014
•	620,119	\$25,000	0\$	0\$	0.	0\$
Total	\$453,352	\$419,492	\$418,256	\$282,252	\$357,980	\$355,014
	10 11 11 11 11 11 11		14 14 14 14	10 10 11 11 11 11	11 10 11 11 11	14 14 14 16 16 17
Fiscal 1987 STIP earnings are based on an average balance of \$422,800 at 6 percent.	are based on an a	iverage balance	of \$422,800	at 6 percent.		~
•		•				4

4) Since Fy 86 wehrers
Collowed over 400,000 for year

1 Chp.
2) Grazing
2) Ox G 15 within 2,011 &
2) Ox G 15 within 2,011 &

EXHIBIT_	3
DATE	1-9-89
H3	100

WITNESS STATEMENT

NAME ANTONI CAMPEAU BUDGET
ADDRESS 210 EWING #3
WHOM DO YOU REPRESENT? Board of Pub. Ed.
SUPPORT OPPOSE AMEND
COMMENTS: 355 STATSIMENT
·
·
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Form CS-34A Rev. 1985



Board of Public Education

BOARD MEMBERS
EX OFFICIO MEMBERS:

January 9, 1989

Claudette Morto

Ted Schwinden, Governor

Ed Argenbright, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Carrol Krause, Commissioner of Higher Education

APPOINTED MEMBERS:

Alan Nicholson, Chairman Helena

Arthur "Rocky" Schauer, Vice-Chairman Libby

Anita Johnson Lewistown

Ted Hazelbaker

Sarah "Sally" Listerud Wolf Point

Bill Thomas Great Falls

Thomas A. Thompson Heart Butte Testimony in Support of Modifications in the State Lands Budget

Members of the Natural Resources Joint Subcommittee of House Appropriations and Senate Finance and Claims:

As the state agency constitutionally responsible for supervising the public school system and agency responsible for developing policy with regard to the equalization payments to schools, the Board of Public Education is well aware of how critically important the from state lands is to income of public is school system Montana. Ιt understanding that modifications have been proposed by the Department of State Lands and supported by the Governor for additional accountants to improve the auditing of reports to ensure that the trust receive Believing that this is a cost its correct royalties. saving measure, because these auditors will save the state money by improving collection of money due the state, the Board of Public Education would like to go on record supporting this modification.

Thank you for your consideration of this issue.

DATE_1-9-89

5

PROGRAM: Department Summary

LEGISLATIVE ACTION

AGENCY: Department of State Lands

(\$749,214) (131,225) 0.00 640,595 2,352,455 \$3,025,869 \$164,044 Difference Executive LFA Curr Lv1 \$7,770,055 \$17,515,290 2,957,545 304.38 \$7,454,861 6,496,702 606,182 ----- Fiscal 1991 \$20,541,159 \$7,618,905 \$7,020,841 5,310,000 304.38 7,137,297 474,957 (\$661,383) (108,964) 0.00 615,170 2,354,962 \$163,083 Difference \$3,024,251 Executive LFA Curr Lvl \$7,434,873 \$17,729,100 \$7,787,202 304.38 6,716,847 622,342 2,955,038 ----- Fiscal 1990 \$7,125,819 304.38 \$7,597,956 7,332,017 5,310,000 \$20,753,351 513,378 Operating Expenses Personal Services Non-Operating General Fund TOTAL EXPENSES Equipment Ë BUDGET TIEM

FUNDANG

\$20,541,159 3,277,576 10,059,038 183,704 1,103,645 2,579,099 2,890 \$3,024,251 7,483,843 \$17,729,100 2,277,421 180,634 3,381,066 10,062,942 \$20,753,351 183,524 State Special Rev Federal Revenue Other Revenue TOTAL FUNDING

1,206,996 2,565,180

2,070,580 7,493,858 \$3,025,869

\$17,515,290

2,907

180,797

ISSUE 1: Vacancy Savings

The difference in vacancy saving factors results in the executive budget being \$311,699 greater than LFA current level. The general fund portion of the difference is \$227,950. The executive budget proposes that a 2 percent vacancy savings factor be applied to the department's personal services. LFA current level contains a 4 percent factor.

General Fund

Gross

\$311,699 \$227,950

CSS:kj:tow

BUDGET ITEM	Executive	LFA Curr Lv1	Difference	Executive LFA Curr Lv	-	Difference
TE	32.50	32.50	0.00	32.50	32.50	0.00
Personal Services	\$902,417	\$878,971	\$23,446	\$905,644	\$881,845	\$23,799
Operating Expenses	652,842	521,121	131,721	637,231	484,382	152,849
Equipment	27,140	16,140	11,000	21,000	10,000	11,000
Non-Operating	265,000	265,000	0	265,000	265,000	0
TOTAL EXPENSES	\$1,847,399	\$1,681,232	\$166,167	\$1,828,875	\$1,641,227	\$187,648
	10 16 16 18 19 19 10 10 10 10 10	10 14 14 14 10 10 10 14 14 14 14	13 24 23 66 14 11 11 11 14	67 18 86 88 11 11 11 11 92 89	11 14 14 14 16 11 14	61 10 11 11 11 11 11 11
FUNDING						
General Fund	\$1,354,116	\$1,310,083	\$44,033	\$1,338,288	\$1,275,571	\$62,717
State Special Rev	188,233	80,529	107,704	185,357	74,579	110,778
Federal Revenue	121,526	109,986	11,540	121,526	110,280	11,246
Other Revenue	183,524	180,634	2,890	183,704	180,797	2,907
TOTAL FUNDING	\$1,847,399	\$1,681,232	\$166,167	\$1,828,875	\$1,641,227	\$187,648
	18 ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++	11 14 14 15 16 16 11 11	11 11 11 11 11 11	11 11 11 11 11 11 11 11	## 	##

General	Fund
	H
	Management System
	Trust Lands
	ISSUE 1:

\$218,482

-0-

w

Gross

lands management system than does LFA current level. The executive budget proposes that four new components of the system be developed in the 1991 biennium at a cost of \$373,590. LFA current level provides \$155,108, which is a continuation of the amount expended in fiscal 1988 and would provide for development of one or possibly two new components. The executive budget recommends \$218,482 more resource development funds for the trust

land income indicate that there will not be sufficient revenues to finance the executive proposal. Revenue projections of the resource development fund which receives 2.5 percent of trust As Table A indicates, the executive recommended expenditures of resource development funds would result in over-expending the available funds at the end of fiscal 1991 by \$169,988.

	딥
of State Lands	Fiscal 1990
Table A Resource Development Fund - Department of State Lands Fiscal Years 1989 - 1991	Fiscal 1989
	ł

	Fiscal 1989	Fiscal 1990	Fiscal 1991
Beginning Fund Balance Interest 0.025 of Trust Income	\$203,771 15,398 282,252	\$101,391 10,000 357,980	\$ (35,171) 10,000 355,014
Total Funds Available	\$501,421	\$469,371	\$ 329,843
Disbursements - Executive Budget Trust Management System Resource Development Division Department of Revenue	\$ 73,559 293,433 33,038	\$188,233 280,477 35,832	\$ 185,357 278,652 35,832
Total Disbursements	\$400,030	\$504,542	\$ 499,841
Ending Fund Balance	\$101 + 391	\${35*1 <u>71</u> }	\$\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\

There are two sub-issues contained in the issue. First, what is the correct revenue estimate; and second, what level of funding does the legislature wish to provide the trust management system.

The following two worksheets provide a format for the committee to make decisions on the 1991 biennial budget.

Resource Development Account 1991 Biennium Income Projections

	LFA Revenue Est.	OBPP Revenue Est.
Projected Fund Balance at the end of Fiscal 1989	\$ 101,391	\$ 179,741
Fiscal 1990 Income STIP Interest 2.5% of Trust Income	10,000	10,000
Fiscal 1991 Income	10,000	10,000
STIP Interest 2.5% of Trust Income	355,014	400,500
Total FY 91 Income	365,014	4 10,500
Total Available Income	\$ 834,385	\$1,000,741

Jan. 6, 1989

Resource Development Account 1991 Blennium Expenditures

	LFA	0 B P P	Subcommittee
Projected Revenues	\$834,385	\$1,000,741	
Expenditures			
1. Dept of Revenue	71,664	67,833	
2. Resource Devel. Prog.	476,552	559,129	
3. Trust Mgmt. Syst.	155,108	373,590	
Total Expenditures	\$ 703,324	\$1,000,552	
Projected Fund Balance	\$ 131,061	\$ 189	

18,393	13,956	ISSUE 7: Aeronautic Operating Expenses - Primarily Gasoline Costs	ISS
22,000	17,363	ISSUE 6: Equipment	ISS
22,855	18,113	ISSUE 5: Operating Expenses Difference - Primarily Travel for Oil and Gas Auditor	ISS
15,840	13,089	ISSUE 4: Increased Rental Space - Fiscal 1991 Only	ISS
000,6	Frust Lands 7,103	ISSUE 3: Surveyors and Abstractors Consultant Services Costs to Perfect Title on Non-Trust Lands 7,103	ISS
\$ 9,064	\$ 7,164	ISSUE 2: Employee Benefits	ISS
Gross	Fund		

General Fund

CSS:kj:dslw

EXHIBIT 5

DATE 1-9-89

HB 100

PROGRAM 03 - RECLAMATION DIVISION

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Reclamation Division is responsible for administering all of Montana's mined land reclamation statutes and administrative rules. This involves regulating mining activities on all lands in the state, regardless of ownership. Specifically, the statutes administered by the Reclamation Division are: (1) the Montana Strip and Underground Mine Reclamation Act and its Federal counterpart, the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977); (2) the Montana Metal Mine Reclamation Act; (3) the Montana Opencut Mining Act; (4) the Montana Strip and Underground Mine Siting Act; (5) the Montana Environmental Policy Act, as it relates to mine permitting; and (6) the Montana Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program.

The responsibilities of the Reclamation Division include:

- reviewing applications for exploration, prospecting and mining activities.
- (2) determining reclamation bond amounts;
- (3) making permitting decisions for the issuance of permits and licenses for exploration and mining of all minerals including sand, gravel, copper, gold, silver, coal and uranium;
- (4) field inspections and enforcement activities;
- (5) evaluation and approval of reclamation bond releases;
- (6) coordination with other state and federal agencies;
- (7) preparation of the necessary environmental assessments documents in the form of a Preliminary Environmental Review or Environmental Impact Statement to insure compliance with the Montana Environmental Policy Act; and
- (8) reclamation of abandoned mines.

For administrative purposes the Reclamation Division is divided into four bureaus. They are as follows:

- Coal and Uranium Bureau (Montana Strip and Underground Mine Reclamation Act and Montana Mine Siting Act)
- 2. Hard Rock Bureau (Montana Metal Mine Reclamation Act)
- 3. Opencut Bureau (Montana Opencut Mining Act)
- 4. Abandoned Mine Reclamation Bureau (Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program)

These Bureaus are funded from the following sources:

- 1. Coal and Uranium Bureau: 30% state and 70% federal
- 2. Hard Rock Bureau: 100% state
- 3. Opencut Bureau: 100% state
- 4. Abandoned Mine Reclamation Bureau: 100% federal

For the purposes of this budget testimony, I will be describing the Reclamation Division's budget request on a program by program (Control Variable) basis. I will justify the budget recommendations outlined in the Executive Budget, compare it to the Legislative Fiscal Analyst Budget as outlined in Attachment A, and discuss the differences between the two budget proposals. I will relate my testimony to the Issues described in the handout that Mr. Schweitzer distributed to you this morning and I will include cross-references to the issues described in Volume II of the Budget Analysis 1991 Biennium prepared by the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst. For the sake of brevity, I will only be addressing those line item categories where there is a significant difference between the Executive Budget and the LFA Budget.

RECLAMATION BUDGET

The Reclamation Division's budget request is made up of the following Programs and Modifications to the existing program:

(1)	Administration	Control Variable	03003
(2)	Opencut	Control Variable	03113
(3)	Abandoned Mine	Control Variable	03116
(4)	Coal and Uranium	Control Variable	03182
(5)	Hard Rock	Control Variable	03185
(6)	Environmental Analysis	Control Variable	03333
(7)	Superfund/Hazardous Waste Liaison	Control Variable	92002
(8)	Cost-Effective Reorganization	Control Variable	92006
(9)	USGS/OSMRE Data Base	Control Variable	92013

Please note that all of the above are described in specific detail in Attachment A.

(03003) ADMINISTRATION

100% State Funds

The Reclamation Administration portion of the Reclamation Division budget consists of the State Fund portion of the administrative/support function of the Reclamation Division. This program has 1.60 FTE's. These positions are made up of 0.5 FTE Administrator's position (the other 0.5 FTE is in control variable 93182); 0.6 FTE Environmental Coordinator position (the other 0.4 FTE is in control variable 03182); and a 0.5 FTE secretarial position. The expenditures for Reclamation Administration will basically remain the same as in previous years with the exception that there will be additional out-of-state travel expenses. The reason that there will be additional out-of-state travel is discussed below in the Travel section of the Operating Expenses justification.

PERSONAL SERVICES:	<u>FY 90</u>	FY 91
	\$45,768	\$45,794
Current Lev	el 1.60 FTE	1.60 FTE

Explanation: Personal Services for the Division includes salaries, employee
benefits and health insurance.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: ISSUE 1: VACANCY SAVINGS (LFA Budget Book, Page C-36) The most significant difference between the Executive and LFA Budgets is the additional 2% of Vacancy Savings that is recommended in the LFA Budget. If the 2% vacancy savings, as recommended by the LFA budget, is added to the 2% vacancy savings and 2% salary increase as recommended in the Executive Budget, the budget for Personal Services are actually reduced by 6% and 8% or by \$2802 and \$3737 for the respective years of the biennium.

Considering that there are only 1.6 FTE's in this program, it is very difficult,

if not impossible to makeup these funds from within the program. Therefore, I request that the Committee adopt the Executive Budget recommendations.

OPERATING EXPENSES:

FY 90

FY 91

\$11,488

\$11,491

<u>Explanation</u>: Operating Expenses for the Reclamation Administration include contracted services, supplies and materials, communications, travel, rent, repair and maintenance and other expenses.

Travel:

<u>Explanation</u>: Most of the travel expenses for Reclamation Administration are incurred during travel for mine inspections and meetings with operators and other state and federal agencies.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: As was discussed briefly above, the main reason for the increased travel budget request is due to additional out-of-state travel. This travel is a result of the Environmental Protection Agency's decision to promulgate rules for the regulation of non-coal mining wastes under Subtitle D of the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). This will result in trips to Denver and Washington, DC. The promulgation of these federal rules will have a most significant impact on the functions of the Hard Rock Bureau. It is important that Montana monitor and participate in this rule making effort because these additional regulations may impact Montana's hard rock mining industry and the Department's mined land reclamation program by increasing the level of Federal regulations and oversight of mining activities.

<u>Equipment:</u> <u>FY90</u> <u>FY91</u>

\$4,000 \$300

<u>Explanation:</u> The amount budgeted for the purchase of equipment reflects the normal yearly cost of equipment plus the purchase of a personal computer work station.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget:

The most significant difference between the Executive Budget and the LFA Budget is not in the total expenditure over the biennium, but when the expenditures are made. The Executive Budget recommends \$4,000 in FY90 and \$300 in FY91. The LFA Budget recommends \$1,400 in FY90 and \$2,258 in FY91. The Division prefers the Executive Budget recommendations because it will more adequately meet the needs of the Division Information Processing Plan.

I request that the Committee approve the Executive Budget recommendations.

TOTAL PROGRAM	<u>FY90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
	\$61,256	\$57,585

I request that the committee approve the executive budget.

(03113) OPENCUT

100% State Funds

The function of the Opencut Bureau is to administer and enforce the Montana Opencut Mining Act and the Montana Environmental Policy Act with respect to opencut mining (sand, gravel, scoria, bentonite and phosphate rock). The Bureau has mine permitting and regulatory authority over all lands in the state. This includes some 2500 individual mining sites in all 56 counties in Montana. This program has 3.0 FTE's. These positions are made up of a Bureau Chief and two Reclamation Specialists.

The <u>most significant difference</u> between the Executive Budget and the LFA Budget for the biennium is that the State Fund portion of the LFA Budget for FY90 is \$13,747 lower than the amount actually spent by the Bureau in the base year of FY88, which was \$138,657, and \$18,509 lower than the base year in FY91. The Bureau cannot continue to perform its required functions at the level of State Funding that is recommended in the LFA Budget.

Below, I have attempted to explain this very complicated budget.

PERSONAL SERVICES:	<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
	\$95,627	\$95,917
Current Level	3.00 ድሞዊ	3 በበ ፑጥፑ

Explanation: Personal Services for the Opencut Bureau includes salaries, employee benefits and health insurance.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: ISSUE 1: VACANCY SAVINGS (LFA Budget Book, Page C-36) The most significant difference between the Executive and LFA Budgets is the additional 2% of Vacancy Savings that is recommended in the LFA Budget as has been discussed previously in this presentation. Considering the fact that there are only 3.0 FTE's in this program and traditionally

there have been no vacancies, it is very difficult, if not impossible to make-up these funds from within the program. Therefore, I request that the Committee adopt the Executive Budget recommendations.

OPERATING EXPENSES:

FY 90

FY 91

\$30,373

\$39,764

Explanation: Operating Expenses for the Opencut Bureau contracted services, supplies and materials, communications, travel, rent, repair and maintenance and other expenses.

A. Contracted Services:

Explanation: Contracted Services for the Opencut Bureau include laboratory testing, photographic and film services, information systems development and consultation and professional services for certain aspects of permit review that are beyond the expertise or capability of the Bureau.

<u>Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget:</u> The most significant differences in the Executive and LFA Budgets are in budget categories of Contracted Services and Systems Development. These differences are explained below.

1. Summer Intern: The Executive Budget provides for normal yearly expenses plus the cost of contracting with the University system to hire one summer intern for approximately three months in the summer to assist the program in reducing the backlog of opencut mine site evaluations, bond releases and follow-up reports (\$8,683). This contracting authority is necessary because with only 3.0 FTE's in the Opencut Program, it is not possible to inspect the sites that need attention. Additional costs related to the hiring of this proposed intern position are included in the Travel category under In-state Motor Pool, In-state Lodging and In-state meals.

- 2. Bond Forfeiture Appropriation: ISSUE 2: Bond Forfeiture Appropriation (LFA Handout, Page 2) and ISSUE 4: BOND FORFEITURE APPROPRIATION (LFA Budget Book, Page C-37). The LFA Budget, although significantly larger (\$51,427), actually only allows for the normal yearly expenses of approximately \$1,427. This is because the LFA Budget includes a \$50,000 continuing appropriation that the Bureau may spend under contracted services to hire independent contractors to reclaim mine sites where the permits have been revoked and the reclamation bonds forfeited by the Department. These funds are actually Earmarked Revenues because they can only be spent for reclaiming the mine where the reclamation bond was forfeited. In the past, the spending authority for forfeited reclamation bonds has been obtained through the budget amendment process. reason the Bureau requested a \$50,000 continuing appropriation was because there are always a certain number of bond forfeitures on an annual basis and the budget amendment process is often quite time-consuming and unnecessary when we know in advance that there will always be a number of these types of projects. These funds can only be spent for reclamation. cannot be spent as part of the Operating costs.
- 3. Opencut Bureau Informational Processing: ISSUE 5: Informational System Upgrade (LFA Handout, Page 2). The Executive Budget provided funding for a portion (\$9,200) of the Opencut Bureaus request for the development of information system. This system is necessary for records management of the thousands of files that are associated with the Opencut Program. If this information was more accessible and retrievable, the Opencut records would be more manageable. The LFA budget only includes normal yearly expenses plus the Continuing Appropriation of \$50,000 as explained previously.
- B. Supplies and Materials:

Explanation: Supplies and Materials for the Opencut Bureau include gasoline, film, and office supplies.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: The most significant difference in the Executive and LFA Budgets (\$1,750) is due to additional gasoline costs attributable to the purchase of a vehicle for the Opencut Bureau. At the present time, Bureau personnel are utilizing their own vehicles to perform their duties. The cost differential between purchasing a reliable vehicle and allowing the staff to drive their own vehicles is negligible. However, the staff no longer desire members to drive their personal vehicles because of the additional depreciation to their vehicles. Using Motor Pool vehicles is not a very good alternative because, in most situations, the type of vehicle needed by the Bureau is not available on a short-notice basis.

C. Communications:

Explanation: Communications expenditures for the Opencut Bureau include the normal yearly communication expenses plus an additional expense in FY90 for the mailing and distribution of the revised administrative rules for the Opencut Program.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: The most significant difference in the Executive and LFA Budgets (\$500) for FY90 is due to the additional costs associated with the mailing and distribution of the revised administrative rules. The rules need to be revised to reflect recent changes in the Opencut Mining Act and changes that have been recommended by the industry and the public. The Executive Budget and the LFA Budget are comparable for FY91.

D. Travel:

Explanation: Travel expenditures for the Opencut Bureau include in-state personal car mileage, in-state aircraft rental, in-state motor pool, and in-state and out-of-state meals and lodging.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: The most significant difference in the Executive Budget (\$12,925 for each year of the biennium) and LFA Budgets (\$16,657 for each year of the biennium) is attributable to mainly two things - they are the Summer Intern position and the purchase of a new vehicle as compared to having the staff continue to drive their own vehicles. The specific differences are described below.

- 1. Summer Intern: As explained previously in the Contracted Services section, the Bureau proposes to hire a Summer Intern to work for approximately three months in the summer to help the Bureau catch up on the backlog of work. The additional costs in travel for in-state meals, lodging and transportation is reflected in this amount.
- 2. Purchase of a New Vehicle: If the Bureau is allowed to purchase a new vehicle, the costs associated with in-state personal car mileage would decrease, thus reducing the cost of travel. However, it must be noted that these savings are only shifted to Supplies and Materials and Repair and Maintenance because of the additional cost of gasoline and repairs for a Bureau owned vehicle.

E. Repairs and Maintenance:

Explanation: Repair and Maintenance expenditures for the Opencut Bureau include repair and maintenance of office equipment and vehicles and the purchase of grease and lube, tires and tubes and general vehicle maintenance.

<u>Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget:</u> The most significant difference in the Executive Budget and LFA Budgets is attributable to the costs associated with repairs and maintenance on one vehicle as compared to two vehicles. The Executive Budget is providing for repairs and maintenance on two vehicles while the LFA Budget is allowing for normal yearly expenses as spent in FY88.

EQUIPMENT: FY90 FY91

Explanation: The Opencut Bureau equipment needs are basically limited to vehicles and computer hardware. Vehicles are needed so the staff can travel to the various mine sites to meet with the mine operators, complete inspection and enforcement activities and perform bond release inspections. Computer hardware is needed so the Bureau can more efficiently manage the information contained in the several thousand permit files.

Difference Between Executive and LFA Budgets: The most significant difference in the Executive Budget and the LFA Budget is in FY90. The Executive Budget recommends \$13,000, which would allow for the purchase of a vehicle, and the LFA Budget recommends \$7,208, which in our experience would not allow for the purchase of a vehicle. In FY91, the Executive Budget recommends \$3,319 and the LFA Budget recommends \$2,092. Both budget recommendations allow for the purchase of some computer hardware.

I recommend that the Committee approve the Executive Budget recommendations.

TOTAL PROGRAM:

FY90

FY91

\$139,000

\$139,000

PLEASE NOTE THAT THIS BUDGET IS ONLY \$343 INCREASE OVER THE FY88 BASE YEAR BUDGET EVEN THOUGH IT INCLUDES THE 2% VACANCY SAVINGS AS OUTLINED IN THE EXECUTIVE BUDGET, THE HIRING OF AN INTERN AND THE PURCHASE OF A VEHICLE.

(03116) ABANDONED MINE

100% Federal Funds

The function of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program is to administer

Title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (P.L. 95-87)

and the abandoned mine land portions of the Montana Strip and Underground Mine

Reclamation Act, Montana Metal Mine Reclamation Act and the Montana Opencut

Mining Act. The program is 100% federally funded through a federal tax on

Montana's coal production. The AML Program receives 50% of the federally

collected funds to reclaim abandoned mine sites through annual Administrative

and Construction Grant Applications. These federal funds have been set aside

specifically by federal law for three years to be used for abandoned mine

reclamation in Montana. After three years, the Secretary of Interior may

allocate them to other states. The Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program, under the

Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act, is scheduled to terminate in 1992

unless it is reauthorized by the Congress.

PERSONAL SERVICES:	<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
	\$159,169	\$159,618
Current Leve	1 5.50 FTE	5.50 FTE

Explanation: Personal Services for the Bureau includes salaries, employee benefits and health insurance.

<u>Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget:</u> ISSUE 1: VACANCY SAVINGS (LFA Budget Book, Page C-36). The issue of vacancy savings or the proposed 2% salary increase is not an issue in this Bureau. There will be adequate funds to cover any of these issues.

OPERATING EXPENSES:	<u>FY 90</u>	<u>FY 91</u>
	\$2,655,687	\$2,656,492

Explanation: Operating Expenses for the Abandoned Mines Bureau includes contracted services, supplies and materials, communications, travel, rent, repair and maintenance and other expenses.

A. Contracted Services:

Explanation: Contracted Services for the Abandoned Mines Bureau basically consists of contracting with independent Consulting Engineers to provide engineering services for the evaluation, design, administration and inspection of reclamation projects for abandoned mine sites. At the present time, the Bureau has seven firms under contract to provide these services.

Differences between Executive and LFA Budget: The basic difference between the

Differences between Executive and LFA Budget: The basic difference between the Executive Budget and the LFA Budget is that the Executive Budget recommends the expenditure of an additional \$200,000 over the base year of FY 88. This additional expenditure was requested because an increase is planned in the program's activity in order to assure the identification and the development of engineering plans for all abandoned mine sites which are a threat to public health and safety prior to the possible termination of this program in 1992. Therefore, I request that the Committee adopt the Executive Budget recommendations.

EQUIPMENT:	<u>FY90</u>	<u>FY91</u>
	\$31,950	\$21,950

Explanation: The Abandoned Mine Bureau's equipment needs are basically limited to vehicles and computer hardware. Vehicles are needed so the staff can travel to the various mine sites to inventory mine sites, to meet with the engineering contractors and construction contractors and for inspection of project activity. Computer hardware is needed so the Bureau can more efficiently manage the information pertaining to abandoned mine sites.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: The most significant differences between the Executive Budget (\$31,950 in FY90 and \$21,950 in FY91) and the LFA Budget (\$17,617 in FY90 and \$13,866 in FT91) is that the Executive Budget allows for the purchase of a replacement vehicle to replace existing vehicles in each year of the biennium, the purchase of an All Terrain Vehicle and trailer to be used for transportation into extremely remote and limited access abandoned mine sites in the first year of the biennium, computer hardware for use by the entire Division/Department in the first year of the biennium and multi-user computer in each year of the biennium. The LFA Budget basically allows for the purchase of replacement vehicles in both years of the biennium and the purchase of some computer hardware in FY91.

Therefore, I request that the Committee adopt the Executive Budget recommendations.

CAPITAL OUTLAY:

FY90

FY91

\$5,000,000

\$5,000,000

<u>Explanation:</u> This expenditure by the AML Bureau is for actual reclamation of abandoned mines. Reclamation is accomplished by contracting the actual earth moving with construction contractors.

Differences Between Executive and LFA Budget: Issue 1: Abandoned Mine Program (LFA Handout, Page 1) and ISSUE 3: ABANDONED MINE PROGRAM (LFA Budget Book, Page C-37). The difference between the Executive Budget and the LFA Budget is approximately \$2,300,000. This difference is mainly due to the fact that the Abandoned Mine program is planning to increase the amount of actual on-the-ground reclamation that will be accomplished before the scheduled program termination date of 1992. The additional funding is being requested for the actual construction activity required at these mine sites. The construction grants received by the AML program are three-year grants, beginning in May and

running for three years. Each grant is for \$4,000,000 - \$5,000,000. The projects can be let for bid any time during the 3-year period which makes it very possible that \$5,000,000 could be spent from a combination of 3 grants during any one year. This increase in reclamation construction projects is consistent with the budget increase described in the contracted services portion of this presentation. Since the Abandoned Mine program is scheduled to terminate in 1992, I believe that it is wise to complete as much reclamation as possible before that date.

BUDGET MODIFICATION FOR ABANDONED MINES PROGRAM (92006) COST-EFFECTIVE REORGANIZATION

100% Federal Funds

ISSUE 9: Budget Modification (LFA Budget Book, Page C-38). The Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program could save an estimated \$100,00 annually in administrative expenses by hiring 2 engineers, 1 abandoned mine reclamation specialist and 2 seasonal positions. These funds could then be spent on actual on-the-ground reclamation work. These positions would be responsible for working on hazardous mine opening reclamation projects that present a hazard to public health, safety and the environment. Experience has shown that hazardous mine opening projects cannot be completed economically by contracted services because often the cost of project administration is nearly equal to the cost of reclamation.

Presently, these projects are inventoried, designed and administered by independent engineering consultants. However, based on the high administrative costs associated with these types of projects as compared to the actual cost of reclamation completed on-the-ground, hiring state personnel would be more cost-effective.

The estimated cost for this Modification is as follows:

	FY90	<u>FY91</u>
Personal Services:	\$104,864	\$105,087
Operating Expenses:	\$42,016	\$42,016
Equipment:	\$54,385	
TOTAL PROGRAM:	\$201,265	\$147,103
	4.0 FTE	4.0 FTE
TOTAL PROGRAM:	<u>FY90</u>	<u>FY91</u>
Existing Program:	\$7,856,406	\$7,842,660
Modification:	\$ 201,265	\$ 147,103
TOTAL:	\$8,057,671	\$7,989,763
	9.5 FTE	9.5 FTE

I request that the Committee adopt the Executive Budget recommendations.

REPORT EB ROS DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/53/01

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARISONS

PAGE 404

01100 02027		3100		2021 2024 2024 2100 2100 2300 2400 2500 2500 2800		11100 1113 1400 1500	0000	VI /0E	AGF NGY FROGRAM CONTROL
01100 GENFPAL FUND 02027 RESOURCE IND TR FD INTEREST TOTAL PROGRAM	TOTAL LEVEL TOTAL PROGRAM	EQUIPMENT	IDIAL LEVEL	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS-INFLATION COMPUBLICATIONS-INFLATION TRAVIL-INFLATION CONTRACTED SERVICES SUPPLIES & MATERIALS COMPUBLICATIONS TRAVIL RENT OTHER EXPENSES	IOIAL LEVEL	SALARTIS LORGIVITY LMPLOYEE BENEFITS HEALTH INSURANCE VACANCY SAVINGS	FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FIE)	DESCRIPTION	: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE : 03 RECLAMATION PROGRAM : 03003 ADMINISTRATION
ин, 317.20 ин, 317.20	2,685.67 44,317.20	2,685.67	9,316.78	122.01 2,347.60 1,328.63 3,578.54 1,905.00	32,314.75	25,952.66 558.64 5,803.45		ACTUAL	LANDS
								68 A 1 1 19008	
61,256 61,256	4,000 61,256	000, 4	11,488	14 -111 5 122 2,347 1,328 6,108 1,600	45,768	38,566 569 5,911 1,656 -934	1.60	1X 90 1XIC	
56,658 56,658	2,600 56,658	2,600	9,224	-111 -111 5 122 2,347 1,329 3,578 1,905	44,834	38,566 569 5,911 1,656 -1,868	1.60	14 90 117	
-56,658 61,256 4,598	1,400	1,400	2,264	2,530 -305 40	934	934		DIFF FY 90	
57,585 57,585	300 57,585	300	11,491	-111 12 122 122 2,347 1,328 6,099 1,600 75	45,794	38,566 569 5,938 1,656 1-935	1.60	EXEC FY 91	CURRENT LEV
56, 35h 56, 35h	2,253 56,354	2,258	9,236	19 -111 12 122 2,347 1,329 3,578 1,905 35	44,860	38,566 569 5,938 1,656 -1,869	1.60	LFA FY 91	CURRENT LEVEL SERVICES ONLY
-56,354 57,585 1,231	-1,958 1,231	-1,958	2,255	2,521 -305 40	934	934		DIFF FY 91	ONLY

FFFORT FBSR99 DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/53/01

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING FXICUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARTSONS

TOTAL PROGRAM	01100 GENERAL FUND 02027 RESOURCE IND TR FD INTEREST 02096 RECLAMATION - BOND FORFEITU	TOTAL PROGRAM	TOTAL LEVEL	3100 EQUIPMENT	TOTAL LEVEL	2021 CONTRACTED SERVICES-INFLATION 2022 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS-INFLATION 2024 TRAVEL-INFLATION 2100 CONTRACTED SERVICES 2200 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS 2300 COMMUNICATIONS 2400 TRAVEL 2700 REPAIR & MAINTENANCE 2800 OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL LEVEL	1100 SALARIES 1113 LONG VITY 1400 EMPLOYEE BENEFITS 1500 HLALEH INSURANCE 1600 VACAYCY SAVINGS	0000 FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FIE)	AL/OE DESCRIPTION	AGENCY: \$501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE PROGRAM: 03 RECLANATION PROGRAM CONTROL: 03113 OPEN CUT
138,656.79	138,656.79	138,656.79	17,682.17	17,682.17	23,427.56	1,470.90 2,564.76 2,857.78 16,089.94 87.18 357.00	97,547.06	80, 358.55 934.81 16, 253.70		FY 88	LANDS
										89 A.J 1.30008	
139,000	69,500 69,500	139,000	13,000	13,000	30,373	50 254 254 4,33 4,314 3,398 12,925 357	95,627	79, 745 1, 419 12, 275 4, 140 -1, 952	3.00	64 90 EXEC	
174,910	124,910 50,000	174,910	7,208	7,208	74,026	100 -55 -55 51, 427 2, 564 2, 858 16, 657 87 357	93,676	79, 745 1, 419 12, 275 4, 140 -3, 903	3.00	LFA LFA	
-35,910	-55,410 69,500 -50,000	-35,910	5,792	5,792	-43,653	42 154 22 76 -42,744 1,750 540 -3,732 239	1,951	1,951		D11F	
139,000	69,500 69,500	139,000	3,319	3,319	39,764	16 353 -61 240 17,892 4,314 2,898 12,925 830 357	95,917	79, 745 1, 631 12, 359 4, 140 -1, 958	3.00	EXEC FY 91	CURRENT LE
120,148	120, 148	120, 148	2,092	2,092	24,096	16 132 -67 1, 435 2, 564 2, 858 16, 657 87 357	93,960	79, 745 1, 631 12, 359 4, 140 -3, 915	3.00	LFA FY 91	CURRENT LEVEL SERVICES ONLY
18,852	-50,648 69,500	18,852	1,227	1,227	15,668	221 6 183 16,457 1,750 1,750 40 -3,732 743	1,957	1,957		DIFF FY 91	ONLY

REFORT EBSP99 DATE: 01/03/89 THRE: 10/53/01

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARTSONS

TOTAL PROGRAM	03067 DSL FEDERAL RECLAMATION GRA	TOTAL PROGRAM	TOTAL LEVEL	4000 CAPITAL OUTLAY	FOTAL LEVEL	3100 EQUIPMENT 3300 CAPITAL LEASES - EQUI	TOTAL LEVEL	2021 CONTRACTED SERVICES-INFLATI 2022 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS-INFLATION 2023 COMMUNICATIONS-INFLATION 2026 UTILITIES-INFLATION 2100 CONTRACTED SERVICES 2200 COMMUNICATIONS 2300 COMMUNICATIONS 2400 TRAVIL 2500 RENI 2600 UTILITIES 2700 REPAIR & MAINTENANCE 2800 OTHER EXPENSES	TOTAL LEVEL	1100 SALARHS 1113 LONG VITY 1400 LMPLOYLE BUNLELIS 1500 HEALTH INSURANCE 1600 VACANCY SAVINGS	(111) INTIAVIDAT BALL 1104 Occur	AL OF DESCRIPTION	AGENCY: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STAFE PROGRAM: 03 RECLAMATION PROGRAM CONTROL: 03116 ABANDONED MINE
			2,02	2,0		EQUIPMENT	2,49	127	=	., -	= ,		OF STATE LANDS N PROGRAM MINH
4,665,665.00	4,665,665.00	4,665,665.00	2,026,742.50	2,026,742.50	17,208.71	17,208.71	2,458,922.06	2,311,802.70 4,689.38 8,744.12 21,377.53 66,213.00 1,417.10 5,132.69 39,545.54	162,791.73	133, 714, 34 1, 433, 66 27, 643, 73		ACTUAL	SCIA
												68 A.1 1 19008	
7,856,406	7,856,406	7,856,406	5,000,000	5,000,000	41,550	31,950 9,600	2,655,687	18 141 -292 2,508,594 4,689 8,773 21,009 66,424 1,417 5,133 39,546	159, 169	132,693 1,801 20,333 7,590 -3,248	5.50	06 X1 1X1C	
5,305,351	5,305,351	5,305,351	2,679,991	2,679,991	17,617	17,617	2,451,823	16 141 -292 2,304,732 4,689 8,743 21,009 66,424 1,417 5,133 39,546	155,920	132, 693 1, 801 20, 333 7, 590 -6, 497	5.50	06 A1	
2,551,055	2,551,055	2,551,055	2,320,009	2,320,009	23,933	14,333 9,600	203,864	203,862	3,249	3,249		06 A.I HIG	
7,842,660	7,842,660	7,842,660	5,000,000	5,000,000	26,550	21,950 4.600	2,656,492	35 182 -314 367 2,509,261 4,689 8,743 21,009 66,424 1,417 5,133 39,546	159,618	132,693 2,123 20,470 7,590 -3,258	5.50	1 XI.C	CURRENT
5,305,351	5,305,351	5,305,351	2,682,498	2,682,498	13,866	13,866	2,452,626	31 182 -314 367 2,305,399 4,689 8,743 21,009 66,424 1,417 5,133 39,546	156, 361	132,693 2,123 20,470 7,590 -6,515	5.50	LFA LFA	CURRIANI LEVEL SERVICES ONLY
2,537,309	2,537,309	2,537,309	2,317,502	2,317,502	12,684	000 th	203,866	203,862	3,257	3,25/		16 41	ES ONLY

CURRENT LEVEL SERVICES ONLY

PEPORT FBSR99 DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/53/01

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARTSONS

AGENCY : 5501
FPOGRAM : 03
COMIROL : 03182 DEPARIMENT OF STATE LANDS RECLAMATION PROGRAM

	01100 02027 03067			3100		2700 2800	2500	2300	2100 2100	1202	202 2	2021		1113 1400 1500		Ormo	407.47	CONTR
TOTAL PROGRAM) GENERAL FUND FRESOURCE IND TR FD INTEREST DSL FEDERAL RECLAMATION GRA	TOTAL PROGRAM	TOTAL LEVEL	EQUIPMENT	TOTAL LEVEL	RIPAIR & MAINTENANCE OTHER EXPENSES	RAVEL	COMMUNICATIONS	CONTRACTED SERVICES SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	TRAVEL - INTLATION	COMMUNICATIONS-INFLATION	CONTRACTED SERVICES-INITATI	TOTAL LEVEL	TONGE VITY TMPLOYEE BINEFITS HEALTH INSURANCE VACANCY SAVINGS	SALARIES	FOLE THE EQUIVALENT (FIL)	DI SCRIFTION	CONTROL: 03182 COAL AND URANIUM
621,237.86	99, 723.64 527, 514.22	627,237.86	23,252.03	23,252.03	260,750.46	3,819.16 53,046.21	20,475.83 30,967.06 6,635.78	19,419.47	116,253.88 11,743.07				343,235.37	2,641.49 58,277.22	282,237.81		ACTUAL FY 88	
																	68-41 130003	
748, 106	224,432 523,674	748, 106	25,688	25,688	289,413	53,007 53,007	25, 733 34, 202	19,420	130,865 15,213	955 907	- 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25 - 25	1,588	433.005	3, 124 55, 309 20, 562 -8, 837	362,247	14.90	06 A1 0.01X1	
700,620	190, 656 509, 964	700,620	14,966	14,966	261,486	53,047	20, 459 31, 519	19,420	114,576 12,043	7.09 9.57	-89 <i>7</i>	1,3//	424, 168	3, 724 55, 309 20, 562 -17, 674	362,247	14.90	LFA AFT	
47.436	-190,656 224,432 13,710	47,486	10,722	10,722	21,927	- 52 26	5, 274 2, 683	· :	16,289 3,170	: 6	رہ عن ح	211	8.837	8,837			06 AJ JHIO	
759, 185	227, 755 531, 430	759, 185	37,688	37,688	281,767	3,892 53,007	34,202 5,026	19,420	127,865 15,213	1.255	-906	2,371	433,730	4, 154 55, 619 20, 562 -8, 852	362,247	14.90	EXEC FY 91	
711,534	193,930 517,604	711,534	24,024	24,024	262,631	3,820 53,047	31,519	19,420	114,576 12,043	71 1.255	150 -917	2, 162	424,879	4, 154 55, 619 20, 562 -17, 703	362,247	14.90	LFA FY 91	
47,651	-193, 930 227, 755 13, 826	47,651	13,664	13,664	25,136	72 - 40	2,683	7 01:	13,289 3,170	63	405 11	209	8,851	8,851			DIFF FY 91	

CURRENT REVEL SERVICES ONLY

REFORT (BSR99 DATE : 01/03/89 TIME : 10/53/01

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROCRAM PLANHING LXLCUTTVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARTSONS

ACHROY : 5001 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS
PROGRAM : 03 RECLAMATION PROGRAM
CONTROL : 03185 HARD ROCK

TOTAL PROGRAM	01100 GEREAL THID 02027 RESOURCE TRD TR FD THITREST 02096 RECLAMALION - BOND FOREFITU 02451 RECLAMALION HARDROCK	101AL FROGRAM	TOTAL TIVE	3100 EQUIPMENT 3400 INTANGIBLE ASSETS	IOIAL LIVEL	2300 COMMUNICATIONS 2400 TRAVEL 2500 RENT 2700 REPAIR & MAINTENANCE 2800 OTHER EXPENSES	2023 COMMUNICATIONS-INTENTION 2024 TRAVEL-INFEATION 2100 CONTRACTED STRVICES 2200 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS	2021 CONTRACTED SERVICES-INFEAT	101AL LEVEL	THO SALARTES 1113 LONGEVERY 1500 HEALTH INSURANCE 1600 VACANCY SAVINGS	0.000 1.011 1.181 1.001 1.011 (1.11)	ALZOE DESCRIPTION	CONTROL: 03185 HARD ROCK
379,611.60	82, 797, 41 296, 814, 19	379,611.60	36,208.67	36,208.67	85,322.96	13,821.71 34,806.81 923.00 358.69 2,840.22	25,968.20 6,604.33		258,079.97	211,414.67 1,645.94 45,019.36		ACTUAL	
												68 A3 Fragina	
518,283	173,471 244,812 100,000	518,283	13,500	13,000 500	230,962	74, 321 29,090 902 902 529 2,840	-5/1 1, /58 168, 894 12, 823	368	273,821	203,706 2,026 34,877 13,800 -5,588	10.00	06 A1 01X1	
517,228	367,728 50,000 100,000	617,228	12,175	12,175	236,820	31,573 31,573 923 1,338 2,840	-589 1, 758 175, 683 9,062	210 11	268,233	228,706 2,026 34,877 13,800 -11,176	10.00	FY 90	
1,055	-193, 757 244, 812 -50, 000	1.055	1, 325	825 500	-5,858	-2,483 -21 -809	18 -7,079 3,801	5 <i>7</i> 158	5,588	5,588		06 A1 1110	
421,524	176, 364 245, 160	421,524	13,500	13,000 500	133,790	79,090 902 979 2,840	-618 4,266 67,604 14,123	105 6 <i>1</i> 8	274,234	228, 706 2, 261 35, 064 13, 800 -5, 597	10.00	EXEC	
370,791	370,791	370,791	12, 306	12,306	89,847	13,021 31,573 923 1,338 2,840	-618 4,266 25,883 9,422	74 325	268,638	228,706 2,261 35,064 13,800 -11,193	10.00	FY 91	
50,733	-194,427 245,160	50, 733	1, 194	500 169	43,943	-2,483 -21 -359	41,721 4,701	353 353	5,596	5,590		16 AJ	

FCFORT TREE-99 DATE: 01/03/89 THM: 10/53/01

PAGE 409

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PEOGRAM FLAMMING
AGENCY/FROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET SESTEM
AGENCY/FROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET & PEOGRAM FLAMMING

ACTROX : 6201 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

TOTAL TEVEL 144,451.85 500,000 500,000	TOTAL PROCESS 144,451.85 500,000 500,000	02838 DEL TRY, IMPACT STATEMENTS 144,451.85 500,000 500,000	
104, 200 , 75 184 , 74 66 , 35			
	500,000	500,000	500,000 500,000 500,000
	500,000	500,00 0	500,00 0 500,000
	500,000	500,000 500,000	500,000 500,000

OFFICE OF BUDGEL & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGEL SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGEL DETAIL COMPARISONS

REPORT LBSR99 DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/55/50

TOTAL PROGRAM	03067 DSL FEDERAL RECLAMATION GRA	TOTAL PROGRAM	TOTAL LEVEL	3100 EQUIPMENT	TOTAL LEVEL	2200 SUPPLIES & MATERIALS 2300 COMMUNICATIONS 2400 TRAVEL	TOTAL LEVEL	1100 SALARIES 1400 EMPLOYEE BEHEFITS 1500 HEALTH INSURANCE 1600 VACANCY SAVINGS	0000 FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FIE)	AE/OE DESCRIPTION FY 88	AGINCY: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS PROGRAM: 03 RECLAMATION PROGRAM CONTROL: 92002 SUPERFUND/HAZ WASTE LIAISON
										BUDGET FY 89	
31,449	31,449	31,449	795	795	6,537	943 1,000 4,594	24,117	19,549 3,680 1,380 -492	1.00	EXEC FY 90	
										LY 90 LFA	
31,449	31,449	31,449	795	795	6,537	943 1,000 4,594	24, 117	19,549 3,680 1,380 -492	1.00	DIFF FY 90	
30,711	30,711	30,711			6,542	948 1,000 4,594	24, 169	19,549 3,733 1,380 -493	1.00	EXEC FY 91	MODIFIED L
										LFA FY 91	MODIFIED LEVEL SERVICES
30,711	30,711	30,711			6,542	948 1,000 4,594	24,169	19,549 3,733 1,380 -493	1.00	DIFF FY 91	ES ONLY

REPORT EBSR99 DAIL: 01/03/89 THME: 10/55/50

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROCRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARISONS

AGERICY: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS PROGRAM: 03 RECLAMATION PROGRAM

	030			310		250 250 260 270	220		110 140 160	000	Al /	PRO CON
TOTAL PROGRAM)67 DSL FEDERAL RECLAMATION GRA	TOTAL PROGRAM	TOTAL LEVEL)O EQUIPMENT	TOTAL LEVEL	TCT -		TOTAL LEVEL	DO SALARIES DO LMPLOYEL BENEFITS DO HEALTH INSURANCE DO VACANCY SAVINGS	DO TULL TIME EQUIVALENT (ITE)	OE DESCRIPTION	AGERCY: 5501 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS PROGRAM: 03 RECLAMATION PROGRAM CONTROL: 92006 COST-EFFECTIVE REORGANIZATION
											ACTUAL FY 88	EZAT FON
											BUDGET	
201,265	201,265	201,265	54,385	54,385	42,016	8,832 1,400 3,000	9,000 4,144	104,864	85, 404 16, 080 5, 520 -2, 140	4.00	EXEC FY 90	
											14 90 11 A	
201,265	201,265	201,265	54,385	54,385	42,016	8,832 1,400 3,000	9,000 4,144 9,600	104,864	85, 404 16, 080 5, 520 -2, 140	4.00	D111	
147,103	147, 103	147, 103			42,016	8,832 1,400 3,000	9,000 4,144 15,640	105,087	85, 404 16, 308 5, 520 -2, 145	4.00	EXEC FY 91	MODIFIED
											LFA FY 91	MODIFIED LEVEL SERVICES ONLY
147, 103	147, 103	147, 103			42,016	8,832 1,400 3,000	9,000 4,144 15.640	105,087	85,404 16,308 5,520 -2,145	4.00	DIFF FY 91	SES ONLY
		201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103	201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103	54,385 54,385 201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103	54,385 54,385 54,385 54,385 201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103 201,265 201,265 147,103	TOTAL LEVEL 42,016 42,016 42,016 EQUIPMENT 54,385 54,385 TOTAL LEVEL 54,385 54,385 TOTAL PROGRAM 201,265 201,265 147,103 TOTAL PROGRAM 201,265 201,265 147,103	RENT 1,400	SUPPLIES & MATERIALS 9,000 9,000 9,000 9,000 COMMUNICATIONS 4,144 4,144 4,144 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 15,640 18,832 8,832 8,832 8,832 8,832 1,400 1,400 3,000	TOTAL LEVEL SUPPLIES & MATERIALS COMMUNICATIONS COMMUNICATIONS RENT TRAVEL RENT UITLITIES UTILITIES REPAIR & MAINTENANCE REPAIR & MAINTENANCE TOTAL LEVEL EQUIPMENT TOTAL LEVEL TOTAL PROGRAM TOTAL PROGRAM TOTAL PROGRAM TOTAL PROGRAM TOTAL PROGRAM TOTAL PROGRAM 201,265 201,265 147,103	SALARIES 16,1001 165,1001 165,1001 165,1001 165,1001 165,1001 165,000	TUIL TIME EQUIVALENT (III)	ACTUAL BUDGET EXEC LEA DIFF EXEC DIFF DIFF

OFFICE OF BUDGET & PROGRAM PLANNING EXECUTIVE BUDGET SYSTEM AGENCY/PROGRAM/CONTROL -- BUDGET DETAIL COMPARISONS

REPORT EBSR99 DATE: 01/03/89 TIME: 10/55/50

AGENCY: 5501
PROGRAM: 03
CONTROL: 92013 DEPARIMENT OF STATE LANDS RECLAMATION PROGRAM USGS/OSMR DATA BASE

AE/OE 03067 DSL FEDERAL RECLAMATION GRA 2100 CONTRACTED SERVICES TOTAL LEVEL DESCRIPTION TOTAL PROGRAM TOTAL PROGRAM ACTUAL BUDGET FY 89 90,000 90,000 90,000 90,000 EXEC FY 90 90,000 LIA FY 90 90,000 90,000 90,000 DIFF FY 90 90,000 90,000 MODIFIED LEVEL SERVICES ONLY EXEC FY 91 LFA FY 91

	Matural Resources	SUBCOMMITTEE		
AGENCY (S)	State Lands	DATE	1-9-8	79
DEPARTMENT	·			
·	<u> </u>			

NAME	REPRESENTING	SUP- PORT	OP- POSE
Kathleen Harrington	Brand of Public Ed	6	
John North	Dart of State Rands	~	
Im William	Dept of Stute Lunds	<u>_</u>	
Randy Mosley	MT. Dept. of state Lands	V	
Say Amosta	Syl of State Lands	-	
	/ /		
	·		
		<u> </u>	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT. IF YOU HAVE WRITTEN COMMENTS, PLEASE GIVE A COPY TO THE SECRETARY.