

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT

Call to Order: By Chairman Darko, on March 2, 1989, 1989, at
3:30 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: All

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Lee Heiman, Legislative Council

Announcements/Discussion: None

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 457

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Sen. Gary Aklestad, District 6, stated that this bill allows the issuance of county or municipal refunding bonds at a higher rate. The communities need this bill by March 9 to realize tremendous savings. Cities and towns have borrowed from FHA and can now enter into a buy-out. This bill allows them to enter into a buy-down agreement even though it is not a lower interest rate than they presently have on those loans but the city or town must have a net savings.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Alec Hansen, Montana League of Cities and Towns

Proponent Testimony: Mr. Hansen stated that his organization supports this bill so that cities and towns can take advantage of buy-down opportunities. There is a built-in safeguard in the bill which provides that cities and towns must experience a net savings and it is an opportunity for them to save money.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent: None

Opponent Testimony: None

Questions From Committee Members: None

Closing by Sponsor: Sen. Aklestad asked that Executive Action be expedited because of the March 9 deadline. Rep. Iverson will carry the bill on the House floor.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 457

Motion: Rep. Gould moved SB 457 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Good seconded.

Discussion: None

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: The motion that SB 457 BE CONCURRED IN CARRIED unanimously.

HEARING ON SENATE 64

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Sen. Mike Halligan, District 29, stated that this bill is a separate provision of the lien law that allows for a notice to homeowners of a possibility of a lien being filed against their home. This bill is a fine tuning of the lien law. This does not involve the filing of the lien but the notice and that notice only lasts a year before a lien must be filed, another notice filed or the Clerk and Recorder removes the lapsed notice. This bill provides for the removal of that notice.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Riley Johnson, Western Building Materials Association
Cort Harrington, Montana Clerk and Recorders

Proponent Testimony:

Riley Johnson stated that this is a housekeeping bill and that the statute has worked well for his organization.

Cort Harrington stated that the Clerk and Recorders support this bill but request an amendment on page 3, line 11 that the notice of continuance also include the name of the person who was given the original notice. This would help the Clerk in finding the original notice. Mr. Johnson concurs with this amendment.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent: None

Opponent Testimony: None

Questions From Committee Members: None

Closing by Sponsor: Senator Halligan concurs with the amendment. Rep. Mercer will carry the bill on the House floor for Sen. Halligan.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 64

Motion: Rep. Gould moved SB 64 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Wyatt seconded.

Discussion: Rep. Good asked for an explanation of a mechanics' lien. Chairman Darko, Rep. Gould and Lee explained plus explained that this bill does not deal with the filing of the lien but only with the notice of a possibility of a lien being filed.

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: Lee explained the amendment request by Mr. Harrington. Rep. Gould moved to amend SB 64 suggested by Mr. Harrington. Rep. Stickney seconded. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

Recommendation and Vote: Rep. Gould moved SB 64 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. Rep. Guthrie seconded. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 69

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Pinsoneault, District 27, stated that this bill allows a political subdivision to be billed by the Clerk and Recorder rather than having to pay cash for each transaction. The subdivision must set up an account with the Clerk. An amendment is requested to enable agencies to still receive certain services free that were free to them in the past.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Chuck Stearns, Finance Director and City Clerk, Missoula

Proponent Testimony:

Chuck Stearns stated that he requested the bill because state law presently does not allow county offices to bill the city for certain services. They are required to pay cash for each transaction. The amendment is needed so that they will not have to begin paying for services that were previously rendered without charge since the city and county often cooperate in providing copies to each other without cost.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent: None

Opponent Testimony: None

Questions From Committee Members: None

Closing by Sponsor: Sen. Pinsoneault urged passage of the bill and the amendment. Rep. Brooke will carry the bill on the House floor.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 69

Motion: Rep. Gould moved SB 69 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Good seconded.

Discussion: None

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: Rep. Jan Brown asked why the amendment was needed. Lee explained that it could be construed that political subdivisions must pay a fee when they are not presently paying the fee. Rep. Gould moved the amendment. Rep. Brooke seconded. The motion to amend CARRIED unanimously.

Recommendation and Vote: Rep. Gould moved SB 69 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. Rep. Hoffman seconded. The motion CARRIED unanimously.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 71

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Severson, District 32, stated that this is a simple bill that changes the filing deadline for county park district commissioners from 30 to 75 days prior to the election. The statute was revised in the last session but this provision was missed.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Sue Bartlett, Montana Clerk and Records Association

Proponent Testimony:

Sue Bartlett said that her organization requested this bill to make it uniform with other elections being held in April. Only park districts have 30 days to file. All others have 75 days.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent: None

Opponent Testimony: None

Questions From Committee Members: None

Closing by Sponsor: Sen. Severson closed. Rep. Good will carry the bill on the House floor for Sen. Severson.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 71

Motion: Rep. Good moved SB 71 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Gould seconded.

Discussion: None

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: The motion CARRIED unanimously.

HEARING ON SENATE BILL 141

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Sen. Ethel Harding, District 25, stated that this bill provides for the Clerk and Recorder's report on expenditures to be made within four days of receipt of the Treasurer's report.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Sue Bartlett, Montana Clerk and Records Association

Proponent Testimony:

Sue Bartlett stated that this bill was requested because the Clerks are unable to comply with state law as it is currently written. At the end of the month the Clerk prepares the county general ledger which must contain tax receipts and all other sources of funds. When the Treasurer has their report prepared and gives it to the Clerk they can then prepare the remainder of the general ledger.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent: None

Opponent Testimony: None

Questions From Committee Members: None

Closing by Sponsor: Senator Harding stated that Clerks are trying to comply with the law and this bill would enable them to do so. Rep. Lee will carry the bill on the House floor for Sen. Harding.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE BILL 141

Motion: Rep. Good moved SB 141 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Dave Brown seconded.

Discussion: None

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: The motion CARRIED unanimously.

HEARING ON SENATE 77

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Senator Dennis Nathe, District 10, stated that this is an act to raise the county road mil levy in 4, 5, 6, and 7 class counties from 18 mils to 27 mils and in all other counties from 15 mils to 25 mils. There is presently 5 or 6 counties that are over that milage.

Testifying Proponents and Who They Represent:

Gordon Morris, Montana Association of Counties

Proponent Testimony:

Gordon Morris stated that this bill is a reflection of the association's policy on transportation. Exhibit 1. There are 68,000 miles of roads in Montana so for every mile of road there are 12 people paying the taxes necessary to build and maintain those roads. Road and bridge maintenance in Montana is extremely high in Montana. This is not a permissive levy since there is a cap on the amount. It is an effort to increase the maximum allowable under law for road maintenance. There is no rationale for the new numbers - they are arbitrary. County road fund budgets and mil levies are available. Exhibit 2. There are 31 counties that are at or currently exceeding the statutory levy. The per capita levy is \$42.06 per person to maintain county roads. This does not include the roads within a municipality. On the face it appears to be a property tax increase and at some point it probably will be an increase. The fiscal note, in his opinion, is not required but page three points out technical or mechanical defects and there are none. I-105 is in place so taxes are frozen and this does not represent an automatic tax increase but "like levies" would have to be cut to remain within the guidelines of I-105.

Testifying Opponents and Who They Represent:

Tom Hopgood, Montana Association of Realtors

Julie Hacker, Missoula County Freeholders' Association

Opponent Testimony:

Tom Hopgood presented himself as a cautionary voice. This increase would be subject to the provisions of I-105 and when the road levies are increased, other programs will have to be cut back.

Julie Hacker stated that this bill isn't needed. Exhibit 3.

Questions From Committee Members: Rep. Wallin asked Sen. Nathe why, since only 5 of the 56 counties are having problems, is the bill needed. Sen. Nathe said the 5 counties are exceeding the statutory limit and 23 more counties are at the limit. The county commissioners stand for re-election and they probably won't abuse their power since they are responsible people. The county commissioners are answerable every day to their constituents and the Legislature is only here for ninety days and are not as answerable to the people. The Legislature would be derelict if they did not help the counties and commissioners should be given flexibility.

Rep. Good asked Mr. Morris to comment on what is meant by a "like levy" and where can the counties cut. Mr. Morris stated that the comment about "like levies" is a levy assessed against the same property within the county - it is a county only levy. It is not applied to any property within an incorporated limits of a municipality. Therefore, if the county chose to increase under this proposal they would have to find a county only levy and reduce mils so that the road levy could be increased. County only levies are road, health, planning and library. One of those programs would have to be reduced to accommodate the increase in the road levy. County commissioners presently have the authority to prioritize funding for different programs.

Rep. Hansen asked Mr. Morris if the 25 mils would be mandatory. Mr. Morris stated that they only had to levy as many mils as required but they cannot go over unless there are certain conditions. The county would have to reduce mils somewhere else to increase the mil levies.

Rep. Rehberg asked Mr. Morris what other means the counties used to go over the limit. Mr. Morris stated that the rule of 15-7-122 cited in the fiscal note gives the counties the authority to increase by 105% regardless of statutory limits if there is a decrease in taxable value and inflation. Some counties have used it but rarely. The cities use it more often.

Rep. Guthrie asked Mr. Morris to further explain Judith Basin's road fund levy which is considerably over the 105%. Mr. Morris said that it should be looked at cumulatively, that is, you can go 105% in successive years as long as you have the necessary ingredients of loss of taxable value and inflationary considerations. Judith Basin's problem is probably an accumulation of 2 or 3 years.

Closing by Sponsor: Senator Nathe closed. Rep. Hansen will carry the bill on the House floor for Sen. Nathe.

DISPOSITION OF SENATE 77

Motion: Rep. Stickney moved BE CONCURRED IN. Rep. Hansen seconded.

Discussion: Rep. Good stated that she hoped everyone was "listening up" and realized that with the repeal of I-105 this bill would represent a 10% increase.

Rep. Wallin stated that some groups of people have to have limits placed on them. His county commissioners have not contacted him about this bill so he did not think that it was a major concern.

Rep. Dave Brown stated that one-half of the counties are at or exceeding the maximum. This is a local control issue - if the county commissioners levy additional mils they should take the heat at home and won't be re-elected.

Rep. Hansen stated that this bill shifts where the taxes are spent. This increase is not unreasonable. The committee was provided with the number of mils in each county but it would be interesting to see how many miles of road within each county.

Rep. Stickney stated that knowing the Custer County commissioners, there is little chance that the levy would be abused. She concurred with Rep. Brown.

Rep. Gould that he was concerned that this is not an increase but a shift. Missoula County has had problems with the library funds. Libraries are vitally important and taxpayers use roads every day but do not use libraries every day. Libraries would get shorted. He opposes the bill unless Class I counties are taken out of it.

Rep. Hoffman said that he was concerned with such a large increase (66-2/3% increase). Fifty percent is big. Twenty-five may be reasonable. When inflation increases, usually the taxable valuation does too.

Rep. Hansen pointed out to Rep. Gould that everybody can testify on the budget to not change the library mils. If the people of Missoula County don't want mils taken from the library fund they can lobby that way. Many counties' mil levies have decreased while inflation has gone up and Missoula is an example of that.

Rep. Darko stated that Lincoln County is lucky that it doesn't have to levy mils for roads and income is generated from the road fund to keep other levies down. However, people expect and demand road service. Local officials need the flexibility, maybe not as much as they have requested, but they should be given the flexibility. If the roads aren't maintained then people cannot get to work.

Amendments, Discussion, and Votes: None

Recommendation and Vote: The motion CARRIED 9 to 7 on a roll
call vote.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 4:45 p.m.



REP. PAULA DARKO, Chairman

PD/td

4911.min

DAILY ROLL CALL

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

COMMITTEE

DATE 3/2/89

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
BROOKE, VIVIAN	X		
BROWN, DAVE	<i>Handwritten mark</i>		X
BROWN, JAN	X		
DARKO, PAULA	X		
GOOD, SUSAN	X		
GOULD, BUDD	X		
GUTHRIE, BERT	X		
HANSEN, STELLA JEAN	X		
HOFFMAN, ROBERT	X		
JOHNSON, JOHN	X		
MCDONOUGH, MARY	X		
NELSON, THOMAS	X		
REHBERG, DENNIS	X		
STICKNEY, JESSICA	X		
WALLIN, NORM	X		
WYATT, DIANA	X		

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 3, 1989

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Local Government report that SENATE BILL 64 (REFERENCE copy -- blue) be concurred in as amended .

Signed: _____
Paula Darko, Chairman

[REP. MERCER WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

And, that such amendments read:

1. Page 3, line 9.

Strike: "AND"

2. Page 3, line 10.

Strike: ". "

Insert: "; and"

3. Page 3.

Following: line 10

Insert: "(iii) the name of the person to whom the original notice was given."

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 3, 1989

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Local Government report that SENATE BILL 69 (REFERENCE copy -- blue) be concurred in as amended .

Signed: _____
Paula Darko, Chairman

[REP. BROOKE WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

And, that such amendments read:

1. Page 3, line 11.
Strike: "and political subdivisions"

2. Page 3, line 14.
Strike: "the"
Insert: "a"

3. Page 3, line 15.
Following: "clerk,"
Strike: "the"
Insert: "any applicable"

4. Page 3, line 16.
Strike: "monthly"
Insert: "periodic"

5. Page 3, line 16.
Strike: ", UNLESS OTHERWISE PROVIDED"

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 3, 1989

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Local Government report that SENATE BILL 71 (REFERENCE copy -- blue) be concurred in.

Signed: _____
Paula Darko, Chairman

[REP. GOOD WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 3, 1989

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Local Government report that
SENATE BILL 77 (REFERENCE copy -- blue) be concurred in.

Signed: _____
Paula Darko, Chairman

[REP. STELLA JEAN HANSEN WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 3, 1989

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Local Government report that
SENATE BILL 141 (REFERENCE copy -- blue) be concurred in .

Signed: _____
Paula Darko, Chairman

[REP. _____ WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

March 3, 1989

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Local Government report that
SENATE BILL 457 (REFERENCE copy -- blue) be concurred in.

Signed: _____
Paula Darko, Chairman

[REP. IVERSON WILL CARRY THIS BILL ON THE HOUSE FLOOR]

1
3/2/89
77

IV. TRANSPORTATION/INFRASTRUCTURE

BASIC PHILOSOPHY

TRANSPORTATION

It shall be the policy of the Montana Association of Counties to:

- 1) Promote, offer suggestions and new ideas, investigate methods and research costs of providing improved and economical transportation for the public.
- 2) Coordinate transportation planning for all units of local government below the state level.
- 3) Consciously use and plan county roads as tools to encourage proper land use. The location of roads is a major factor in the pattern of controlled land development. Carefully planned road locations and reconstruction may promote proper land use.
- 4) Encourage improvements in signing, reconstruction and new construction based on a thorough study of available information. Efforts should be directed to develop a road and sign inventory using a uniform system.
- 5) Urge legislation or policy aimed at placing disposition of road funds at the county level.
- 6) Work with individual counties to develop road standards applicable to the county situation.
- 7) Pursue the development of planning, design, construction and specifications manuals for county government and seek

state or federal funding for the project.

- 8) Obtain a permissive levy for county roads to allow county government to meet their transportation obligation to the citizens and to pursue other alternatives to funding roads.
- 9) Work with the Department of Highways on the maintenance responsibilities of unclassified roads.
- 10) Seek legislation to require state maintenance of all secondary roads that were completely paved by counties prior to 1977.
- 11) Seek legislation to broaden tax levy authority under MCA 7-14-2502 to allow a maximum bridge levy of 8 mills.
- 12) Seek legislation to secure state and federal assistance in the construction and maintenance of roads used for recreational purposes or for access to public lands while granting counties greater discretion in determining road status and funding priorities.

INFRASTRUCTURE FUND

Montana Counties support legislation that would create a State Infrastructure Fund designed to address the needs of Montana as they are were identified in the Governor's Infrastructure Task Force Report, as submitted to the 1985 Legislature, and by local communities.

Senate Bill 77
Missoula Co Freeholders

3
3/2/89
77

We wish to go on record in opposition to SB 77 because we believe this raise in levy is not needed at this time. We observe government working for government solely without regard for the taxpayers of this state. We think that co. finance is a skewed mess and things that are mandated by state law in some instances are taking a back-seat to other activities that are being funded in the counties.

Since the inception and passage of I 105 we have listened to a parade of government officials screaming about the lack of funds, beating the electorate over the head, and declaring a freeze that is creating havoc with the system. We believe that the philosophy that caused the freeze to pass was the view that the people of the state of Montana want less government, not more. There are certain functions such as roads that are priority for the people, but somewhere the message has not gotten through to the local officials or the legislature. It is your responsibility to see that the basic needs of the citizens are taken care of and also to see that there is program in place to curtail spending.

~~Here we are~~
The first message that should be sent to local officials is that they only fund legislative mandated activities. Secondly, the legislature itself should not give any more work to the counties or complicate their duties in any way.

Our group has had an on-going budget study with the officials in our county and we understand what they do and where the money goes. No one will ever be able to satisfy government's lust for money nor its ability to erode their own tax base.

Within the past few years we have watched millions of dollars of real-estate removed from the tax rolls for housing projects, and there are other millions of tax dollars sitting in a fund for redevelopment projects.

We have approximately 7 million dollars in a delinquent & protested taxes and some of the money will be lost to bankruptcies in Missoula county. We have not found any of our members on this list----we pay our taxes. As legislators, you should realize that every extra dollar you funnel into government is a dollar taken out of the local economy that the local merchants never see. We would also suggest that you take a close look into the co budgets and see how much money is spent on travel, meals, lodging, dues, and memberships.

Now for the roads-----we have observed that the road department in our area has proved to be its own problem by literally destroying the surface on our gravel roads. They also failed to cooperate with a group in one end of the county on a maintenance project that would have been perpetual. In '85 our county did not levy the full amount allowed by law and this past year they did not either.

we would support more money for roads if it was included in the general fund ,given top priority and the general fund was capped at the current level. That would allow counties budget flexibility to take care of their greatest needs and assurance for taxpayers that the funds would be used for the benefit of the people.

We ask that you ammend this bill and remov e first-class counties and leave the levy at 15 mills.

Send a message to local government to make do, keep the essential, mandated services in place and return in two with a plan to re-structure county government finance.

Unless the bill is ammended to strike first-class counties, we would ask that you give it a do not pass.

Julie Harker

ROLL CALL VOTE

LOCAL GOVERNMENT

COMMITTEE

DATE 3/2/89

BILL NO. 77

NUMBER _____

NAME	AYE	NAY
GOOD, SUSAN		X
GOULD, BUDD		X
GUTHRIE, BERT		X
HOFFMAN, ROBERT		X
NELSON, THOMAS		X
REHBERG, DENNIS		X
WALLIN, NORM		X
BROOKE, VIVIAN	X	
BROWN, DAVE	X	
BROWN, JAN	X	
HANSEN, STELLA JEAN	X	
JOHNSON, JOHN	X	
MCDONOUGH, MARY	X	
STICKNEY, JESSICA	X	
WYATT, DIANA	X	
DARKO, PAULA	X	

TALLY

9 7

Temi Dore
Secretary

Paula A. Darko
Chairman

Motion: Rep. Stickney moved SB 77 BE CONCURRED IN. Rep.

Hansen seconded. The motion CARRIED 9 to 7.

Local Government COMMITTEE

DATE 3/2/89

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

FY 1983 COUNTY ROAD FUND BUDGETS

BUDGETED PROPERTY TAX REQUIREMENTS

COUNTY	COUNTY ONLY POPULATION	COUNTY ONLY MILL VALUE	TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURES	TOTAL NON-TAX REVENUES	PROPERTY TAX REVENUE	FY 88-89 MILL LEVY	PER CAPITA LEVY	BUDGETED CASH RESERVE
MUSSELL	1,730	\$12,444	\$201,218	\$78,892	\$118,332	9.509	\$66.11	\$50,780
PAK	6,290	\$12,354	\$409,280	\$187,306	\$143,804	11.640	\$22.86	\$55,200
PETROLEUM	380	\$2,836	\$167,400	\$109,000	\$8,688	3.000	\$22.86	\$18,107
PHILLIPS	2,570	\$30,377	\$937,000	\$212,160	\$455,655	15.000	\$177.30	\$293,896
PIONEER	3,150	\$14,701	\$505,088	\$148,050	\$220,515	15.000	\$70.00	\$70,000
PONDER RIVER	1,690	\$16,754	\$434,770	\$79,795	\$97,820	5.839	\$57.88	\$122,542
PRINELL	2,850	\$8,502	\$507,645	\$232,267	\$127,530	15.000	\$44.75	\$103,143
PRAIRIE	730	\$3,779	\$213,500	\$68,150	\$52,910	14.001	\$72.48	\$70,320
PRYNALL	19,110	\$22,612	\$900,060	\$416,245	\$284,464	12.580	\$14.89	\$210,000
RICHMOND	5,710	\$60,620	\$2,308,989	\$329,945	\$909,285	15.000	\$159.24	\$25,000
ROUSEVELT	5,250	\$40,882	\$1,248,901	\$92,650	\$613,228	15.000	\$116.81	\$415,300
ROSEFORD	9,660	\$212,457	\$1,527,329	\$241,625	\$697,920	3.285	\$72.25	\$485,199
SIMMONS	5,610	\$27,363	\$983,993	\$484,750	\$426,877	15.601	\$76.09	\$76,682
SHERIDAN	2,130	\$36,212	\$1,080,000	\$216,350	\$434,674	12.004	\$204.07	\$191,500
SILVER BOW	34,000	\$37,454	\$1,597,737	\$1,021,189	\$346,381	9.248	\$10.19	\$129,163
STILLWATER	4,610	\$16,102	\$415,792	\$108,796	\$289,836	18.000	\$62.87	\$89,331
SWEET GRASS	1,580	\$5,275	\$156,054	\$64,364	\$94,954	18.001	\$60.10	\$31,042
TETON	3,540	\$13,592	\$440,000	\$125,207	\$250,501	18.430	\$70.76	\$26,842
TOWLE	1,760	\$27,382	\$586,800	\$65,500	\$246,429	9.000	\$140.02	\$195,218
TREASURE	500	\$4,174	\$169,203	\$20,270	\$92,127	22.072	\$184.25	\$53,378
VALEY	4,320	\$25,689	\$800,000	\$381,650	\$385,341	15.000	\$89.20	\$247,001
WHEATLAND	910	\$6,615	\$244,000	\$28,330	\$119,067	18.000	\$130.84	\$61,000
WYOMING	650	\$16,238	\$590,761	\$150,001	\$227,329	14.000	\$349.74	\$20,000
YELLOWSTONE	32,240	\$81,893	\$2,213,683	\$1,007,495	\$1,228,395	15.000	\$38.10	\$842,819
TOTAL	405,660	\$1,436,375	\$43,241,944	\$15,670,553	\$17,063,489	11.403	\$42.06	7,953,035
FY 88 TOTAL	405,660	\$1,530,173	\$43,672,144	\$15,943,865	\$17,162,487	11.216	\$42.31	7,585,546
% CHANGE		-2.3%	-1.0%	-1.7%	-0.6%	1.6%	-0.6%	4.6%

1989 COUNTY ROAD FUND BUDGETS

BUDGETED PROPERTY TAX REQUIREMENTS

2
3/2/89
77

JUNTY	COUNTY ONLY POPULATION	COUNTY ONLY MILL VALUE	TOTAL BUDGETED EXPENDITURES	TOTAL NON-TAX REVENUES	PROPERTY TAX REVENUE	FY 88-89 MILL LEVY	PER CAPITA LEVY	BUDGETED CASH RESERVE
OVERHEAD	4,050	\$11,188	\$550,533	\$261,500	\$145,447	13.000	\$35.91	\$31,000
3 HORN	7,720	\$102,463	\$1,445,034	\$126,500	\$930,056	9.077	\$120.47	\$289,007
LINE	4,330	\$26,861	\$819,577	\$130,001	\$429,800	14.892	\$99.26	\$100,000
WATER	1,480	\$9,692	\$247,209	\$99,131	\$52,095	5.375	\$35.20	\$81,579
RDON	4,650	\$21,605	\$527,940	\$183,800	\$258,144	11.948	\$55.51	\$175,980
RIER	1,170	\$4,811	\$327,000	\$98,577	\$86,598	18.000	\$74.02	\$148,899
SCADE	20,270	\$35,723	\$1,242,356	\$581,381	\$535,845	15.000	\$26.44	\$117,308
MUTEAU	3,250	\$23,570	\$911,524	\$191,600	\$353,550	15.000	\$108.78	\$125,000
STER	3,630	\$7,803	\$340,551	\$90,935	\$161,658	20.717	\$44.53	\$44,070
VIELS	1,220	\$5,459	\$325,862	\$71,603	\$98,259	17.999	\$80.54	\$0
WSON	5,370	\$15,537	\$520,162	\$260,910	\$233,060	15.000	\$43.40	\$77,845
ER LODGE	10,700	\$8,680	\$442,506	\$0	\$0	0.000	\$0.00	\$0
LION	1,210	\$68,358	\$1,423,101	\$76,585	\$399,139	5.839	\$329.87	\$368,275
REUS	4,950	\$14,604	\$531,138	\$290,149	\$219,045	14.999	\$44.25	\$76,728
ATHREAD	38,260	\$59,704	\$2,960,055	\$1,795,400	\$865,709	14.500	\$22.63	\$592,344
LATIN	17,330	\$35,803	\$1,042,148	\$427,133	\$483,705	13.510	\$27.91	\$224,417
RIEFELD	1,250	\$6,267	\$263,500	\$105,750	\$112,801	17.999	\$90.24	\$76,131
ACIER	6,170	\$29,380	\$768,800	\$142,175	\$440,685	14.999	\$71.42	\$153,760
LDEN VALLEY	610	\$4,526	\$144,000	\$15,435	\$81,468	18.000	\$133.55	\$48,000
ANITE	1,030	\$6,076	\$259,031	\$117,082	\$109,368	18.000	\$106.18	\$86,343
LL	6,970	\$28,580	\$748,480	\$163,515	\$428,700	15.000	\$61.51	\$227,000
FFERSON	5,520	\$18,927	\$552,930	\$204,503	\$240,181	12.690	\$43.51	\$182,456
DITH BASIN	1,780	\$7,841	\$391,576	\$250,650	\$174,360	22.237	\$97.96	\$0
KE	14,730	\$25,427	\$995,000	\$306,417	\$381,139	14.990	\$25.88	\$303,947
WIS & CLARK	19,700	\$28,108	\$915,554	\$462,800	\$404,502	14.391	\$20.53	\$136,000
BERTY	1,290	\$13,118	\$538,749	\$158,476	\$188,375	14.360	\$146.03	\$25,000
NDOLN	13,470	\$31,505	\$1,879,855	\$1,555,622	\$0	0.000	\$0.00	\$0
DISON	3,830	\$14,525	\$361,091	\$64,566	\$152,655	10.510	\$39.86	\$48,524
COLE	1,670	\$7,776	\$314,729	\$188,350	\$139,962	17.999	\$83.81	\$82,153
AGHER	890	\$7,200	\$265,817	\$74,645	\$128,805	17.890	\$144.72	\$28,000
NERAL	2,390	\$7,762	\$246,513	\$179,673	\$0	0.000	\$0.00	\$0
SSOULA	43,740	\$69,129	\$2,299,360	\$1,125,702	\$956,316	13.834	\$21.86	\$220,796

VISITORS' REGISTER

Local Government COMMITTEEBILL NO. 457DATE 3/2/89

SPONSOR _____

NAME (please print)	REPRESENTING	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
<i>Alan Hanson</i>	<i>MLCT</i>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER

Local Government COMMITTEE

DATE 3/2/89

SPONSOR Halligan

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

VISITORS' REGISTER

Local Government COMMITTEEBILL NO. SB 69DATE 3/2/89SPONSOR Prisonersult

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Chuck SEARNS	City of Missoula	✓	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Local Government

BILL NO. SB 71

DATE 3/2/89

SPONSOR Lewison

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Local Government COMMITTEE

DATE 3/2/89

[illegible]

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.