

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON EDUCATION & CULTURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By **CHAIRMAN PECK**, on February 19, 1991, at 9:00 am

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Ray Peck, Chairman (D)
Sen. Greg Jergeson, Vice Chairman (D)
Sen. Don Bianchi (D)
Rep. Larry Grinde (R)
Sen. H.W. Hammond (R)
Rep. Mike Kadas (D)

Staff Present: Pam Joehler, Senior Fiscal Analyst (LFA)
Mary Ann Wellbank, Budget Analyst (OBPP)
Melissa Boyles, Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

HEARING ON WRAP UP

Tape No. 1

CHAIRMAN PECK distributed and reviewed a handout on Health Care for Montanans. **EXHIBIT 1**

SEN. JERGESON stated that Tom Pettit is searching through bill drafting requests and he can't find where a bill has been requested. **SEN. JERGESON** stated that the funding for the Rural Health Care Program will be affected by the losses of the five WICHE slots and in order to get this program in place, the legislature will have to at some point reconsider filling the five wiche slots. **Mr. Noble** said it could be done through appropriations and a letter of understanding, but a statute would make it a little more fair. We need an expendable trust account of which we can deposit appropriation proceeds for the loan repayment. **Mr. Noble** stated that it would have to be a reversion type account to accumulate balances and earn interest in order for the program to work over a period of time. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked if this is feasible given the subcommittee's feelings of WICHE slots. **Mr. Noble** said yes, but we need to figure out what it would be like with the WICHE slots removed.

CHAIRMAN PECK asked Mr. Noble if he has read the report from the Advisory Council. **Mr. Noble** said he has read earlier drafts. **CHAIRMAN PECK** said he feels they are being vague in the report on whether they are talking about positions only, or other Health Care Providers and asked Mr. Noble how he interprets it. **Mr. Noble** said the Commissioners Office proposed is to look at positions only at this time. If it works it could be expanded but we don't want to get too far afield with the program until it is in place and find out if this type of incentive would take hold and increase. **SEN. HAMMOND** asked Mr. Noble how this is superior to bills that he has carried in the past. **Mr. Noble** stated that there are a couple of advantages, one would be that the WICHE type pay-back requires a tremendous amount of administrative burden. If we started the WICHE pay-back program today we would have to trace 500 students per accounting year. This bill would reduce the general fund cost of WICHE and WAMI and would take the equivalent amount the students are going to pay and rig the loan repayment funds. **SEN. HAMMOND** asked if the students come to Montana and work in Rural areas, are their school loans relieved? **Mr. Noble** said yes, it is designed in an accelerated repayment plan over four years to keep them in the community longer in hopes that they may stay forever.

CHAIRMAN PECK stated that he is a little confused and is reluctant to act upon this until we know for sure what the Executive's position is on this issue. **Mr. Noble** stated that the Board of Regents (BOR) feel this is their proposal to help participate in a solution to increase position power in rural health. The Regents want to be cooperative but they want the Executive Branch to take the lead and come forth with the proposal and then the Regents would step up and initiate their part of the plan. Because of its implications of putting additional burdens on Med students the BOR does not want to go first. **Ms. Wellbank** said it was the OBPPs understanding that the subcommittee would have to carry this bill. **Ms. Wellbank** stated that Ron Sunsted, Budget Director for OBPP, felt the BOR could handle this without legislation, and that is one of the reasons it has not been pursued. **Ms. Wellbank** said with Mr. Nobles input something could be worked out.

REP. KADAS asked if the student pays the additional eight percent. **Mr. Noble** said yes. **REP. KADAS** asked what that amounted to each year. **Mr. Noble** said it would be \$1,760. **CHAIRMAN PECK** asked what the students response is to this. **Dr. Toppen** said he went to Seattle to visit with the WAMI students and one of the key questions was, how do you feel about this program. **Dr. Toppen** stated these students will not be affected by this but everyone felt this program was beneficial to them and the 2% surcharge would not have dissuaded them from enrolling with the WAMI Program.

Mr. Noble stated that there would be a one year lag, it was suggested that we not hit the students that are coming in to the program this coming fall. We will put out a notice that Medical

Education is going to be more expensive commencing in 1992. Those students planning to go or attending a Medical School will have their debts increased by \$8,000 by the time they get out. Mr. Noble stated that this is not inconsistent with other actions that have been taken on other high cost programs. CHAIRMAN PECK stated that a medical student coming back to Montana would probably see this in a positive light if he sees he is going to get \$30,000 paid on his schooling over a four year period. Mr. Noble said a lot of Montana medical students do come out to the rural areas of Montana. The likelihood of educating someone from Montana is and then returning to this state is greater than trying to bring someone in from New York.

CHAIRMAN PECK stated that if the subcommittee is going to pursue this there will have to be a meeting later in the week to do so. CHAIRMAN PECK stated that he would like some indication whether or not this subcommittee wants to pursue this bill or leave it up to the Executive.

311

Motion/Vote: REP. KADAS moved to get a bill drafted and introduced, conditional upon Mr. Noble determining it appropriate under WICHE circumstances. MOTION CARRIED unanimously.

327

CHAIRMAN PECK asked Pam Joehler if she had the language for the decoupling of the Six Units. Ms. Joehler said yes.

Ms. Joehler distributed a handout on Proposed Language. EXHIBIT 2

Ms. Joehler stated that SEN. JERGESON, REP. GRINDE, the Commissioners Office and herself met and put language together for the proposed alternative to the decoupling language that was introduced on February 18, 1991. Ms. Joehler reviewed EXHIBIT 2

Commissioner Hutchinson stated that he is satisfied with the language that was put together and appreciates the work that was done on it.

377

Motion/Vote: SEN. JERGESON moved the adoption of the language presented for decoupling. MOTION CARRIED unanimously 6/0.

384

Ms. Joehler distributed and reviewed a handout on Proposed Language for Plant Funds. EXHIBIT 3

SEN. JERGESON stated that this language clarifies that there are two different types of plant funds and they would be accounted for appropriately.

413

Motion: SEN. JERGESON moved the adoption of the language presented for Plant Funds.

Discussion: REP. KADAS asked SEN. JERGESON if the budget approval date is October 1 or July 1. SEN. JERGESON stated that they didn't consider that, they should have but they forgot to address that issue.

REP. KADAS asked what the down sides are of going to October 1. Mr. Noble stated that there wouldn't be a major downside. The University System is shut down then except for minor operations and summer session so the bulk of the expenditures don't start until school starts. REP. KADAS asked Ms. Joehler if she could see any problems moving to the October 1 date. Ms. Joehler stated that HB454 requires an operating plan consistent with the legislative appropriation to be approved by the first of the fiscal year. The October 1 date would conflict with that particular bill. During the last interim while working with a group to discuss the RERS system the University argued their case for extending that deadline to give more meaningful information that is put on to the RERS system. This would be used as a reference for analysis that would hopefully obtain more meaningful information than if they had to put this out by the first of July. CHAIRMAN PECK asked if the semester system would create a lot more expenditures earlier in the year. Mr. Noble said it would move the expenditures up. The materials will come into the Commissioners Office in late August and the book will be put together and ready for the Board Meeting the second or third week in September. The practical matter is going to be approved in the second or third week of September. We chose October 1 to avoid picking a day in the middle of the month. CHAIRMAN PECK asked if the faculty will be paid earlier in the semester. Mr. Noble said yes, but he is not sure what the campuses are doing in terms of that payroll date. REP. KADAS stated that he is willing to go with October 1 and see how it works. CHAIRMAN PECK asked Ms. Wellbank if the OBPP has reviewed this language. Ms. Wellbank said it was reviewed with Mr. Sunsted and there were no problems identified with it.

Motion/Vote: SEN. JERGESON amended his motion and changed July 1 on line 3 to October 1. MOTION CARRIED unanimously 6/0.

552

Ms. Joehler reviewed a handout on Subcommittee Action distributed on February 18, 1991. EXHIBIT 4

648

CHAIRMAN PECK stated that the CHAIRMAN BARDANOUVE decided that the Full Appropriations Committee is going to handle all appropriation bills in full committee.

664

REP. GRINDE asked if there has been a consensus on how the committees are going to handle the MODS, are they going to be line itemed. CHAIRMAN PECK stated that one Committee Chairman said they are setting off all of the MODS in line items so the Governor can exercise his veto on them if he so chooses. REP. GRINDE said he is curious to see if they will be available to look at when Full Appropriations meet. CHAIRMAN PECK stated that they will all be called to the attention of the Appropriations Committee. Ms. Joehler asked if the MODS are going to be voted on again in Full Appropriations. CHAIRMAN PECK said yes, the subcommittee is just making the recommendations for Full Appropriations.

698

REP. GRINDE asked if it will be brought up in the main Appropriations to adopt one standard on this compared to line iteming. CHAIRMAN PECK said yes.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 10:25 a.m.


REPRESENTATIVE RAY PECK, Chair


MELISSA J. BOYLES, Secretary

RP/mjb

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
EDUCATION SUBCOMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE

2-19-91

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. RAY PECK, CHAIRMAN	/		
SEN. GREG JERGESON	/		
REP. LARRY GRINDE	/		
SEN. DON BIANCHI	✓		
REP. MIKE KADAS	✓		
SEN. H.W. "SWEDE" HAMMOND	✓		

HR:1991
CS10LRLCALED SUB

HEALTH CARE FOR MONTANANS



"...for every dollar spent in early prenatal care, \$3-4 will be saved over the long term."

In sparsely populated areas, physicians depend upon one another for backup and consultation. When a physician leaves or terminates a service, additional pressure is placed on the remaining doctor(s), frequently triggering a chain reaction resulting in further physician loss. Then, because of the lack of providers, the obstetrical unit in the local hospital closes, forcing women to turn to other towns and other providers for perinatal services, an added expense to the economically disadvantaged rural family. The course is then set for inadequate perinatal care and pre-term delivery with resultant low birth weight infants and, as we have seen, an increase in the infant mortality rate. This is a tragedy to those who suffer the loss, it is also expensive. Available data indicate that for every dollar spent in early prenatal care, \$3-4 will be saved over the long term.

Inadequate compensation by Medicaid can lead to termination of obstetrical services or refusal to participate in the Medicaid program. Adequate compensation becomes an important motivation for physicians as the number of Medicaid-eligible women expands and the number of physicians who practice obstetrics declines.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

① Legislation

- As noted in Step 2, Governor Stephens is requesting that the Legislature approve increased Medicaid rates for obstetrical and pediatric services. This action will improve access to care for pregnant women and children and help provide financial support for physicians in rural and economically deprived areas.
- Governor Stephens is proposing legislation to provide a tax credit of \$5,000 a year, not to exceed three years, for new physicians locating in rural areas. Rural is defined as communities where the hospital is fifty beds or fewer or where no hospital is present.

② Executive Action

Currently, there are 48 openings for doctors in Montana. In order to address the shortage of physicians in rural areas, Governor Stephens is recommending the following action:

- The Board of Regents would impose an 8% tuition surcharge on all WAMI/WICHE medical students.
- The 8% surcharge money would create a pool of funds to entice doctors to practice in rural areas of Montana. The program could recruit up to seven physicians per year. For the purpose of this proposal, rural would be defined as an area with no hospital or a hospital with fifty beds or less.
- The incentive pay provided to each returning physician would be administered by the Board of Regents to be paid as follows: \$4,000 the first year, \$6,000 the second, \$8,000 the third, and \$12,000 the fourth and final year.

The Governor believes when this program is applied with the aforementioned tax credits and incentives from communities, that the state will have a viable program of physician recruitment for rural areas within the state.

- The Governor has directed SRS staff to review unusual costs of providing health care services in rural areas and extraordinary costs of health care service delivery as part of a study of hospital costs to be undertaken in fiscal year 1992. The cost of the hospital rate study is included in the Governor's executive budget request to the Legislature.

EXHIBIT 1
DATE 2-19-91
HB Ed'n Cur. Plac. Act.

Postally using fax transmission this:

To: Don Cherry	MT. Hosp. Assn.
Co: Dr. Miller	Dept. 444-6575
Dept: Comm. HLE	Fax: 444-7729

1 page letter - refact
FBI letter 2/20/91

REVISED DRAFT

OUTLINE FOR A BILL CONCERNING HEALTH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION
AND RURAL HEALTH CARE IN MONTANA

I. PURPOSE

- A. To encourage and assist physicians who are ready to enter medical practice, after schooling that was supported in part by the State of Montana through the WICHE or WAMI programs, to practice in a physician shortage area designated by the Board of Regents, by financing a debt relief program for physicians.

II. COMPONENTS OF THE BILL

- A. Student contributions to WAMI and WICHE medical program support fees.
1. Montana students who matriculate in WICHE and WAMI medical programs will pay a mandatory annual fee in addition to their regular tuition, which will comprise part of the WICHE and WAMI support fee paid by the State of Montana.
 - a. After a phase-in period the amount of the annual additional fee will equal 8% of the annual support fee for that educational program as negotiated by WICHE. WAMI students will pay 8% of the annual WICHE support fee for medicine, thus keeping the student contribution the same for all students enrolled in medicine.
 - b. The additional fee will be assessed by the Board of Regents and deposited in an earmarked account in the state treasury.
 - c. The phase-in period will begin in 1992 and apply to students who enter in 1992 and subsequently. For 1992 the annual student fee would be 8% of the annual support fee.
 2. The amount budgeted to the University System for WAMI and WICHE support fees from the General Fund will be decreased by an amount equivalent to the total additional fees collected from students.
- B. Creation of a trust fund to provide debt relief for physicians (and other health care providers) who practice in medically underserved areas. This is an integral part of the proposed legislation and cannot be dissociated from the above.

1. The fund shall be called the Rural Physician (or Rural Health Care Provider) Recruitment Incentive Fund (RPRIF) and be deposited in a dedicated expendable trust account in the state treasury.
2. An amount of money equivalent to the total mandatory annual fees paid by WAMI and WICHE students shall be credited annually by the state of Montana to the RPRIF. All interest earned shall accrue to the trust fund and be dedicated to the program.
3. The fund shall be administered by the University System with a board of advisors knowledgeable and experienced in the management of rural health care problems and resources.

C. Use of the Rural Physician Recruitment Incentive Fund

1. The funds will be used to pay educational debts of physicians (or other providers) who practice in medically underserved areas of Montana which can demonstrate need for assistance in physician recruitment.
2. The University System, with direction from the above advisory board, will determine the areas of the state in which practice of medicine would qualify a physician for debt relief. In general, the underserved community will have to provide the evidence that a physician shortage exists and/or that the community has been unsuccessful in recruiting physicians by other mechanisms. (At the present time the target areas would be communities having hospitals with fewer than 50 beds, especially in north-central and eastern Montana.)
3. Physicians would apply for debt relief by demonstrating an educational debt directly related to medical school, including debt incurred in preparation for medical school, and by contracting with the state that they would practice in underserved areas (as defined above) for periods up to 4 years. To receive the debt relief money the physicians would sign an annual contract which would specify that they would have to repay the money on a prorata basis should they cease practice before the end of the contract year. The maximum benefit would be the lesser of the total educational debt of the eligible physician or \$30,000. It would be paid out on an accelerating schedule as follows:
 - a. Year 1 - \$ 4,000
 - b. Year 2 - \$ 6,000
 - c. Year 3 - \$ 8,000
 - d. Year 4 - \$12,000.

4. The amount contractually committed in any given year could not exceed the annual amount credited to the fund.
5. Funds not used during a given year would be invested towards the goal of establishing an endowment that would make the program self funding and that would make it possible to decrease student fees in the future.
6. It is anticipated that students will be able to come up with the extra money needed to pay their contribution of the support fee from the usual sources, i.e. personal resources, family, student loans. However, if necessary, some portion of the RPRIF could be set aside as the basis of a supplemental guaranteed student loan program.

EXHIBIT 1
 DATE 2-19-91
 HB Ed. & Curr. Des. Div.

HEALTH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND RURAL HEALTH CARE IN MONTANA
 LOAN INCENTIVE AMOUNTS

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NUMBER OF PHYSICIANS & AMOUNTS</u>	<u>STUDENT FEE COLLECTIONS</u>	<u>LOAN AMOUNT</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>
1992	7 @ 4,000	36,480	28,000	8,480
1993	7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	78,432	70,000	16,912
1994	7 @ 8,000 7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	126,390	126,000	17,302
1995	7 @ 12,000 7 @ 8,000 7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	170,435	210,000	(22,263)
1996	7 @ 12,000 7 @ 8,000 7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	178,979	210,000	(53,284)
1997	7 @ 12,000 7 @ 8,000 7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	178,979	210,000	(84,305)
1998	7 @ 12,000 7 @ 8,000 7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	180,000	210,000	(106,337)
1999	7 @ 12,000 7 @ 8,000 7 @ 6,000 7 @ 4,000	180,000	210,000	(128,369)

HEALTH PROFESSIONAL EDUCATION AND RURAL HEALTH CARE IN MONTANA
STUDENT FEES

SUPPORT FEES*	EDUCATIONAL PROGRAM	8% 1992	8% 1993	8% 1994	8% 1995	8% 1996	8% 1997	8% 1998	8% 1999	TOTAL
	MEDICINE (INCLUDES WAMI)									
22,800	20 Students First Year	36,480								
22,800	43 Students Second Year		78,432							
23,940	66 Students Third Year			126,390						
23,940	89 Students Fourth Year				170,435					
25,137	89 Students					178,979	178,979			
26,394	89 Students							187,968	187,968	1,145,631

EXHIBIT 2
DATE 2-19-91
HB Ed. & Cur. Pers. Serv.

PROPOSED LANGUAGE
FOR THE MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM - SIX UNITS

Insert following the six university units:

It is understood by the 52nd Legislature that the appropriations contained in this act for the six university units may force the Board of Regents to limit or reduce enrollment during fiscal years 1992 and 1993. It is the intent of the 52nd Legislature that if actual enrollments during the 1993 biennium are fewer than the budgeted number of student full-time equivalents for the 1993 biennium, system-wide or by unit, the legislative fiscal analyst shall present to the 53rd Legislature a current level budget for the six units, system-wide and by unit, no lower than the budgeted amount for the 1993 biennium.

It is further understood by the 52nd Legislature that shortfalls in student tuition due to enrollment declines may be presented to the 53rd Legislature for a supplemental appropriation. These tuition shortfalls are not expected to be made up by per-student full-time equivalent tuition increases.

PROPOSED LANGUAGE
FOR THE UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Insert at the beginning of Section F of the general appropriations act:

All funds, other than plant funds appropriated in the long range building bill and current unrestricted operating funds, are appropriated contingent upon approval of the comprehensive program budget by the board of regents by July 1 (see note) of each year. The budget must contain detailed revenues and expenditures and anticipated fund balances of current funds, loan funds, endowment funds, and plant funds. All movement of funds between the current unrestricted subfund and the designated subfund account entities must be clearly identified in the state budgeting and accounting system.

Programs for the university units' budgets include instruction, organized research, public service, academic support, student services, institutional support, operation and maintenance of plant, and scholarships and fellowships.

All university units must account for expenditures consistently within programs and funds across all units and shall use the national center for higher education management systems program classification structure, along with the college and university business administration (CUBA) system, as a minimum standard for achieving consistency.

Included within current unrestricted funds to the six university units is the sum of \$11,887,000 in fiscal 1992 and \$12,131,000 from revenues generated under the provision of 20-25-423. The department of revenue shall levy the full 6 mills as authorized in 20-25-423. Revenues received by the university system under the provisions of 20-25-423 that exceed \$11,887,000 in fiscal 1992 and \$12,131,000 in fiscal 1993 are appropriated to the office of the commissioner of higher education for distribution to the university system and must cause a general fund reversion of a like amount.

Note: The university system has indicated that in order to provide accurate position and budget information to the Regents Employees Reporting System that would correspond to original operating budgets, the budget approval date should be moved to October 1 each fiscal year.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION WORKSHEET-POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
LFA CL, SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION, AND COMPARISON TO EXECUTIVE BUDGET
CURRENT AND MODIFIED LEVEL
ALL FUNDS

*****PRELIMINARY*****

	FY 92			FY 93			1993 BIENNIIUM		
	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS
U SYSTEM-6 UNITS									
LFA CL	\$85,536,663	\$44,510,817	\$130,047,480	\$85,611,056	\$44,754,817	\$130,365,873	\$171,147,719	\$89,265,634	\$260,413,353
SUBCMTE ACTION:									
Add arbitrated salary adj	\$3,877,453		\$3,877,453	\$3,877,453		\$3,877,453	\$7,754,906	\$0	\$7,754,906
Liab Ins Premium Increases	\$209,940		\$209,940	\$232,685		\$232,685	\$442,625	\$0	\$442,625
Audit-exec, 1st Year	\$160,973		\$160,973	(\$137,742)		(\$137,742)	\$23,231	\$0	\$23,231
Restore per svcs-ENC	\$18,000		\$18,000	\$18,000		\$18,000	\$36,000	\$0	\$36,000
MOD-RERS	\$95,862		\$95,862	\$95,862		\$95,862	\$191,724	\$0	\$191,724
MOD-Federal Minimum Wage	\$330,904		\$330,904	\$330,904		\$330,904	\$661,808	\$0	\$661,808
MOD-Library Catch-Up	\$1,002,560		\$1,002,560	\$0		\$0	\$1,002,560	\$0	\$1,002,560
TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	\$5,695,692	\$0	\$5,695,692	\$4,417,162	\$0	\$4,417,162	\$10,112,854	\$0	\$10,112,854
SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET	\$91,232,355	\$44,510,817	\$135,743,172	\$90,028,218	\$44,754,817	\$134,783,035	\$181,260,573	\$89,265,634	\$270,526,207
EXECUTIVE BUDGET*	\$89,640,773	\$44,136,156	\$133,776,929	\$89,108,360	\$44,356,544	\$133,464,904	\$178,749,133	\$88,492,700	\$267,241,833
SUBCMTE OVER(UNDER) EXEC	\$1,591,582	\$374,661	\$1,966,243	\$919,858	\$398,273	\$1,318,131	\$2,511,440	\$772,934	\$3,284,374
*EXCLUDES STATUTORY APPROPRIATION									

OCATIONAL TECHNICAL CENTERS									
LFA CL	\$7,018,306	\$3,546,039	\$10,564,345	\$6,983,554	\$3,562,515	\$10,546,069	\$14,001,860	\$7,108,554	\$21,110,414
SUBCMTE ACTION:									
Implemented Formula	\$1,271,444	(\$661,323)	\$610,121	\$1,227,200	(\$661,323)	\$565,877	\$2,498,644	(\$1,322,646)	\$1,175,998
SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET	\$8,289,750	\$2,884,716	\$11,174,466	\$8,210,754	\$2,901,192	\$11,111,946	\$16,500,504	\$5,785,908	\$22,286,412
EXECUTIVE BUDGET	\$7,693,789	\$3,522,599	\$11,216,388	\$7,673,371	\$3,542,032	\$11,215,403	\$15,367,160	\$7,064,631	\$22,431,791
SUBCMTE OVER(UNDER) EXEC	\$595,961	(\$637,883)	(\$41,922)	\$537,383	(\$640,840)	(\$103,457)	\$1,133,344	(\$1,278,723)	(\$145,379)

EXHIBIT

DATE

HB

Ed. & Curr. Pers. Dev.

SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION WORKSHEET-POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION
LFA CL, SUBCOMMITTEE ACTION, AND COMPARISON TO EXECUTIVE BUDGET
CURRENT AND MODIFIED LEVEL
ALL FUNDS

*****PRELIMINARY*****

	FY 92			FY 93			1993 BIENNIAL		
	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS	GENERAL FUND	OTHER FUNDS	TOTAL FUNDS
HIGHER ED AGENCIES									
LLFA CL	\$21,679,180	\$24,625,417	\$46,304,597	\$21,747,672	\$26,782,508	\$48,530,180	\$43,426,852	\$51,407,925	\$94,834,777
SUBCMT ACTION:									
Add arbitrated salary adj	\$471,412		\$471,412	\$471,412		\$471,412	\$942,824	\$0	\$942,824
Add "Other" expenses	\$35,003		\$35,003	\$35,003		\$35,003	\$70,006	\$0	\$70,006
Add Equip	\$3,700	\$5,700	\$9,400	\$10,700	\$3,000	\$13,700	\$14,400	\$8,700	\$23,100
Restore Poplar River exp	\$4,336		\$4,336	\$4,336		\$4,336	\$8,672	\$0	\$8,672
Base Difference Adj	\$148	\$6,771	\$6,919	\$147	\$6,722	\$6,869	\$295	\$13,493	\$13,788
CHE-Restore deleted position	\$31,227	\$24,086	\$55,313	\$31,153	\$24,032	\$55,185	\$62,380	\$48,118	\$110,498
CHE-Adjust fixed costs, audits	\$6,839	\$258	\$7,097	\$6,838	\$258	\$7,096	\$13,677	\$516	\$14,193
CHE-Temporary rent adjustment	\$14,850		\$14,850	\$3,713		\$3,713	\$18,563	\$0	\$18,563
CHE-Reduce Student Assistance	(\$180,563)		(\$180,563)	(\$239,873)		(\$239,873)	(\$420,436)	\$0	(\$420,436)
CHE-Reduce Fed Asst to est rev	\$284,124		\$284,124	\$0	(\$22,728)	(\$22,728)	\$0	(\$45,456)	\$734,075
CC's-Adj state support/cost	\$59,885	\$789,137	\$849,022	\$66,308	\$886,136	\$952,444	\$126,193	\$1,675,273	\$1,801,466
CHE-VotTech/CDPerkins		\$127,669	\$127,669		\$127,669	\$127,669	\$0	\$255,338	\$255,338
CHE-Add'l reinsurance (12)	\$7,554		\$7,554	\$7,900		\$7,900	\$15,454	\$0	\$15,454
FSTS-add recharges	\$60,000		\$60,000	\$125,564		\$125,564			
MOD-Biological Weed Control	\$122,167		\$122,167	\$108,015		\$108,015	\$230,182	\$0	\$230,182
MOD-RERS	\$200,000		\$200,000	\$0		\$0	\$200,000	\$0	\$200,000
MOD-Vo-Tech Center Contingency	\$63,590		\$63,590	\$63,590		\$63,590	\$127,180	\$0	\$127,180
MOD-SEOG Increased match	\$36,270		\$36,270	\$36,270		\$36,270	\$72,540	\$0	\$72,540
MOD-Perkins Loan incr. match	\$105,203		\$105,203	\$105,203		\$105,203	\$210,406	\$0	\$210,406
MOD-State Work Study-min. wage	\$0	\$140,547	\$140,547	\$0	\$141,044	\$141,044	\$0	\$281,591	\$281,591
MOD-Grp Insurance Add'l Costs	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0	\$100,000	\$100,000
MOD-Add'l Federal Funds (06)		\$269,546	\$269,546		\$269,546	\$269,546	\$0	\$539,092	\$539,092
MOD-Add'l Workload/GSL (12)									
TOTAL ADJUSTMENTS	\$1,325,745	\$1,390,986	\$2,716,731	\$1,286,230	\$1,485,679	\$2,771,909	\$2,426,411	\$2,876,665	\$5,303,076
SUBCOMMITTEE BUDGET	\$23,004,925	\$26,016,403	\$49,021,328	\$23,033,902	\$28,268,187	\$51,302,089	\$45,853,263	\$54,284,590	\$100,137,853
EXECUTIVE BUDGET*	\$21,813,048	\$25,211,257	\$47,024,305	\$21,783,664	\$27,694,781	\$49,478,445	\$43,596,712	\$52,906,038	\$96,502,750
SUBCMT OVER(UNDER) EXEC	\$1,191,877	\$805,146	\$1,997,023	\$1,250,238	\$573,406	\$1,823,644	\$2,256,551	\$1,378,552	\$3,635,103

*excludes distribution programs