

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
53rd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION
JOINT MEETING OF SENATE FINANCE AND CLAIMS AND
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

Call to Order: By SEN. JUDY JACOBSON, on January 21, 1993, at
7:00 A.M.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Tom Zook, Chair (R)
Rep. Ed Grady, Vice Chair (R)
Rep. Francis Bardanouve (D)
Rep. Ernest Bergsagel (R)
Rep. John Cobb (R)
Rep. Roger DeBruycker (R)
Rep. Marj Fisher (R)
Rep. John Johnson (D)
Rep. Royal Johnson (R)
Rep. Mike Kadas (D)
Rep. Betty Lou Kasten (R)
Rep. Red Menahan (D)
Rep. Linda Nelson (D)
Rep. Ray Peck (D)
Rep. Mary Lou Peterson (R)
Rep. Joe Quilici (D)
Rep. Dave Wanzenried (D)
Rep. Bill Wiseman (R)

SENATORS PRESENT:

Sen. Judy Jacobson
Sen. Harry Fritz
Sen. Gary Forrester
Sen. Larry Tveit
Sen. Mignon Waterman
Sen. Chris Christiaens
Sen. Thomas Keating
Sen. Cecil Weeding
Sen. Gary Devlin
Sen. Greg Jergeson
Sen. Eve Franklin
Sen. Gary Aklestad
Sen. Tom Beck
Sen. J. D. Lynch
Sen. Don Bianchi
Sen. Dennis Nathe
Sen. Chuck Swysgood
Sen. Bob Hockett
Sen. Ethel Harding
Sen. Eleanor Vaughn

Staff Present: Terry Cohea, Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Mary Lou Schmitz, Committee Secretary

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

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing: Joint Meeting of the House
Appropriations, Senate Finance and
Claims, and Legislative Finance
Committee

Executive Action: None

SEN. JACOBSON said the House Appropriations, Senate Finance and Claims, and Legislative Finance Committee will hear the Legislative Fiscal Analyst's analysis of the **Racicot** budget. **Terry Cohea, LFA** will briefly go through the sheet that was passed out yesterday for a meeting with the Joint Chairs and Vice Chairs of the Subcommittees who discussed target numbers that resulted from House Resolution 2.

Ms. Cohea spoke from **EXHIBIT 1, page 2**. The target for overall general fund and school equalization spending is \$1,837.9 million as shown. What the group discussed yesterday was how to allocate that spending within the General Appropriation Act for state agencies. The top part of the chart shows there were re-allocations in the spending target among the subcommittees but the net result was zero. The targets are within the overall spending target. The bottom part of the sheet shows the new spending target by subcommittee, compared to the LFA current level for the 1995 biennium. If all the subcommittees reach their targets, there will be \$70.7 million reduction in state agencies' spending and \$37.4 million in the foundation program. Some other statutory appropriations would actually increase slightly, for a total budget reduction of \$99.3 million as contained in HR 2. Just for information purposes, the LFA staff have compared the targets and what the **Racicot** budget proposes by subcommittee. The difference column is between the **Racicot** budget and the target amount. The **Racicot** budget includes several significant funding switches.

CHAIR JACOBSON asked **Ms. Cohea** to explain the other appropriations that are contained in the **Racicot** budget. **Ms. Cohea** said there are three categories. The largest is the cost of administering the sales tax. An appropriation has been requested of \$11.4 million. Also included in that number is the \$5 million general fund requested for the pay plan and two "cat and dog" appropriations, one for \$1.8 million for the Metnet system and \$2.6 million for the Natural Resource Damage Assessment. Those total to the \$19.9 million of new appropriations that are not included within the target number.

There were no questions from the Committee so **CHAIR JACOBSON**

asked Ms. Cohea to give her report.

Ms. Cohea spoke from EXHIBIT 2, BUDGET ANALYSIS 1995 BIENNIUM, Vol. III, analyzing the Racicot budget that was presented to the Legislature January 4, 1993. This analysis reflects the balance sheet and the electronic data given the LFA by the OBPP on January 11, 1993. The Executive Budget has had some revisions since then. However, the printed document deals with the January 11 data. As detailed on Page 1, there were relatively few amendments proposed by Governor Racicot to Governor Stephens' budget. The outline of general fund changes are in Table 1.

Ms. Cohea referred to the Tax Proposal, Page 3 and said last night her office received the revised estimate from the Department of Revenue on what the Racicot sales tax proposal will generate. They are estimating that in the 1995 biennium the 4% sales tax will raise \$391.7 million of gross sales tax revenue: \$218.2 million of that will be given out in tax relief so there will be a net revenue of \$157.5 million. So, there will be \$38 million more net revenue than was included in the original Racicot budget that could be used to fund the budget or as an ending fund balance.

REP. KADAS referred to the reversion numbers and increased flexibility and asked Ms. Cohea if she factored into her calculations potential reduced reversions because of increased flexibility? Ms. Cohea said no. The LFA reversion number anticipates full funding for all authorized positions. The Racicot budget reduces positions, some of which were held vacant to generate vacancy savings, but does not reduce reversions. REP. KADAS said the Racicot budget simply adopted the LFA number for reversions. Ms. Cohea said that is correct.

REP. KADAS referred to the proposal on K-12 to backfill foundation program amount with guaranteed tax base (GTB). He recalls that on GTB every state dollar leverages about \$3 property tax dollars. So, if schools were maintained at their current level of expenditure, no increase, even though they are currently allowed 4% increase over their previous year's budget, that would be a \$33 million increase in property tax. Ms. Cohea said essentially schools would come in exactly the same place that voting levies would need to total \$39.5 million. Of that amount the state would pay approximately \$11.2 million so the local increase would be 28.8%

SEN. VAN VALKENBURG said if he understood correctly, the Administration advised Ms. Cohea yesterday afternoon that the sales tax proposal will now generate \$64.2 million of additional revenue. There would be \$22.1 million of additional tax relief so there would be a net increase annually of \$42.1 million. Ms. Cohea said that is correct. The only thing is they are proposing vendor allowances be given so when they are taken out the actual net revenue increases \$37.9 million. SEN. VAN VALKENBURG referred Ms. Cohea to the \$37.9 million of net revenue increase

and asked if she had been advised how that would be allocated in the 1995 biennium by the Racicot administration? Ms. Cohea said no, she hadn't.

SEN. AKLESTAD asked why the estimate of how much the sales tax would bring in has increased by approximately \$60 million. Ms. Cohea said she believes two additional items are taxable under the actual proposal: used vehicles and utilities. That, plus fine tuning of the fiscal estimates yield this. **SEN. AKLESTAD** asked if the administrative cost is going to be about 9%? Ms. Cohea said when she was referencing the 9%, that was based on the old numbers and the net revenue available to spend was \$119.6 million. Administrative costs were \$11.8 million so that works out to be 9%. The \$11.8 million are the administrative costs during 1994 and 1995. It's approximately \$5.7 million per year. The 9% is of the net revenue figure. If you figured the gross revenue figure it would be a much smaller percentage.

CHAIR JACOBSON referred to Page 3 of the Racicot budget which shows a \$10 million surplus because of proposals to transfer to the general fund. She said Ms. Cohea alluded to legislation being required and asked if that is out of major change that the legislature would be allowed to move surplus from the School Equalization Account (SEA) into general fund? Ms. Cohea said she was not aware there has ever been a transfer that went from the SEA to the general fund. Normally, the SEAs have been baled out by the general fund. During the current biennium, the legislature appropriated \$32 million general fund to that account because it appeared that account would be short. As a result, the legislation was enacted in the July Special Session. Actually the \$32 million will not all be needed so in that case it will not draw down in a general fund Supplemental. She is not aware of a case in which SEA money has ever been moved to general fund.

SEN. FRITZ asked if it is true the Racicot Administration budget for the Montana University System rejects the formula and instead, adopts some kind of incremental system? Ms. Cohea said, in preparing their recommendation for 1994 and 1995, the Stephens', then adopted by the Racicot budget, did not use the formula. They used an incremental method of budgeting. **SEN. FRITZ** asked if the amount would not be based on the number of students? Ms. Cohea said no. How they handled that was to use actual 1992 expenditures and then have a budget modification to reflect some of the cost of the increased number of students. **SEN. FRITZ** said they expect more students to pay more tuition, so on the one hand, they are budgeting on no new students, but on the other hand, they want more students to pay higher tuition.

REP. KADAS referred to Page 4, Table 4, regarding the change in the sales tax proposal that generates the \$38 million. He asked if that is going to affect the cash balance for FY 1994. Ms. Cohea said it certainly would. If expenditures were not increased, if revenue remained at that level, there would be a front balance of over \$70 million. Obviously, there would be a

positive cash position of about \$35 million. It would have a very beneficial impact on both funding and cash balance. **REP. KADAS** said the estimate changes the revenue from the sales tax to \$370 million and that is five quarters' collections and would one quarter of that be for FY 94. **Ms. Cohea** said yes. If there is more revenue there is more accrual so there would be a widening of the gap because there is \$38 million more net dollars. **REP. KADAS** said the \$38 million is over five quarters so in 1994 you would only get one quarter of that or \$7.2 million, which would be the increase in 1994 and of that amount, how much is accrued? **Ms. Cohea** said the cash position in 1994 would be improved, net, by about \$4 or \$5 million so there is still a significant cash flow in 1994 and the 1995 position is enhanced.

REP. BARDANOUVE said it concerns him that if an agency was general fund it would receive a reduction in personnel. If it is outside of general fund it does not have those cuts. All agencies are not equal.

Dave Lewis, Director, Budget Office said as they work their way through the many fiscal problems facing everyone, the Governor's budget has proposed several items that **Ms. Cohea** has discussed but there are different perspectives on those items proposed in the Governor's budget. There will be constant updates as they work through the amendments, work through the tax base, etc.

CHAIR JACOBSON asked **Mr. Lewis** to address student tuition. **Mr. Lewis** referred to Page 16 and the targets the subcommittees have set for the 1992-1993 level of spending. Table 14 compares the Governor's budget proposal to the 1992-1993 level of spending to the Fiscal Analyst's independent calculation of what those comparisons would be. The \$15.61 million increased the spending as represented in the **Racicot** budget. In fact, it exceeds the \$13.3 million additional tuition revenue the Regents are contemplating. The discussion of using tuition, particularly the indexing proposal, will offset the general fund deficit. **CHAIR JACOBSON** said there were pretty telling numbers in the sheet the committee dealt with yesterday that show, over the last two years, the general fund increases to the University System have been \$4 million and the rest of the increases have been tuition. She said that concerns her because she does not feel the state is keeping faith with the efforts the students are making. **Mr. Lewis** referred to Page 2, Table 2, the **Racicot** budget for the University System is \$18.4 million more general fund than in **Stephens** budget.

CHAIR JACOBSON said it is simply an increase to the reduction because there is still discussion about reduction in the general fund. **Mr. Lewis** referred to the Schedule on Page 16, Table 14 and looking at total fund budget the University System is better off than other state agencies.

Mr. Lewis discussed the Foundation and SEA programs, and said the Budget office continues to encourage the districts and education

communities to look at administrative expenses and accreditation standards. His office has ongoing discussions with several legislators on several possibilities of how to fund public schools. There may be a way to restructure the current funding process that might increase the amount of equalization that we get for the dollars we spend. Everyone has the same objective and going to court every couple of years and losing another appeal is less than productive. We also recognize we have to come up with some way to deal with the equalization issue. He is making proposals that would go on beyond the proposed 5% reduction in schedules.

Mr. Lewis referred to Payment-in-Lieu-of-Taxes Proposal, Page 19, Table 16, as a complex issue but there is an opportunity for the state to take advantage of some things in federal regulation to receive a fairer share.

Mr. Lewis said the issue on impacts on local governments raised on Page 19 suggested inconsistency between counties to pay for running their welfare system at the same time the state assumes a lot of the cost of the Department of Family Services to the counties. He feels that is reasonable, particularly in regard to the general services proposal. One of the problems is in non-assuming counties (44 counties that operate their own welfare programs and pay computer processing costs associated with welfare operations in their counties. Currently, the state pays these costs in both assumed and non-assumed counties), for taking over total responsibility for the social workers and social work activities. The counties maintained they were not running the program anymore so why do they have to pay the overhead costs. It has been an ongoing problem and has to be resolved so that Department has an opportunity to move ahead to other issues.

Mr. Lewis spoke on the retirement issue and said the program has to be available to everyone. There cannot be any restrictions on the early retirement option.

Mr. Lewis said the Governor promised the people of the state he would press for tax reform as a mechanism to deal with the long term deficit and will put that before the legislature.

REP. KADAS referred **Mr. Lewis** to Page 4, Table 4. Even given the new revenue estimate on sales tax the cash balance for FY 94 would be a negative \$42 million and that has him concerned. He does not believe there will be enough money in the Highway Account to float an issue like that. He asked for **Mr. Lewis'** reaction how he intends to deal with that problem or does he see it as a problem? **Mr. Lewis** said if all accounts were put together it would total \$51 million. That is borrowing from accounts that don't have the right to retain their own interest. They are in the Treasurer's cash account. There are \$650 million state funds in the short term investment pool. In fact, they have the statutory right to retain their own interest. There are vehicles for amending statutes to change that. That is one

option. The proposed actions of the subcommittees will get fairly close to the goal they have proposed as far as spending reductions. There will be more spending cuts beyond what Governor Racicot has proposed. They don't know what will happen on some of the other taxation legislation. Looking at other accounts, an amendment to the statute that says any excess balances of the University System might be placed in the general fund would generate \$40 or \$50 million. There are statutory changes that can free that money to go into the Treasurer's cash account to be available to increase the amount of borrowing reserve.

REP. KADAS asked Mr. Lewis if he will be proposing statutory changes of that nature. Mr. Lewis said he will have amendments at the ready if it appears the spending cuts are not going to deal with it or the tax methods are not going to deal with it. There are bills that could be amended and would draft amendments. REP. KADAS said the issue is predicated on passage of a sales tax and asked Mr. Lewis' reaction to what the administration will propose in case the sales tax does not pass. Mr. Lewis said needless to say there have been substantial discussions about that during the last several months but the Governor's expectation at this point, is that the legislature will allow his proposal to be put before the voters on June 8. If that proposal is not adopted, obviously the legislature will be called back in Session to deal with a new situation.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked why the RIT moneys are given to the Department of Natural Resources to maintain a certain level when cuts are being made everywhere else. Mr. Lewis said he would refer the list of grant proposals, and the fact there are people who consider those to be very important, to the various areas. The Department of Natural Resources has worked with his office on an ongoing basis with high-priority projects and he is concerned about funding.

SEN. VAN VALKENBURG referred to the repeated statements about the University System ending up with more money than other agencies in state government. In the LFA analysis on Page 7, Expenditure Increases, it reads "the Racicot budget increases state agency budgets (excluding the Montana University System) by a net \$40.5 million". On Page 15 the LFA analysis says "the Racicot budget includes \$32.7 million less general fund for the MUS than was appropriated than was appropriated in the 1993 biennium" after special session reductions. In Table 14 Mr. Lewis alluded to the fact even if additional tuition revenue was taken out it would still be about a \$2 million increase in the Racicot budget. That hardly compares to a \$40 million increase in other state agency budgets. He asked if he understood him correctly. Mr. Lewis said Table 14, Page 16 compares the proposal in the Governor's budget to the spending for 1992-1993. That is the base the subcommittees have established for the rest of the state agencies. They are trying to cut back to the 1992-1993 level. He is suggesting the budget proposal exceeds that because that is

the subcommittees' target. Going back to the agency budgets and looking at the total funds increases he does not think his proposal for the University System will vary that dramatically.

SEN. JACOBSON referred to **Mr. Lewis'** statements in the meeting yesterday and the fact the University System will simply be brought back to the 1993 level. In fact, what they were looking at was general fund money. The result of that was the \$60 million increases to the Human Services Subcommittee and the \$14 million decreases that would go to the Institutions Subcommittee. It was felt by all in the room, these were un-achievable goals and then they shifted the burden to the University System and gave them an additional \$20 million general fund which brought them \$20 million below where they had been in their general fund appropriation in the 1993 current level biennium. **Mr. Lewis** referred to **EXHIBIT 2, BUDGET ANALYSIS 1995 BIENNIUM VOL. III,** and compared the total funds budget. The University System had a \$5 million budget amendment from their fees. In December he anticipates there must be another one because enrollments are still up. They were funded in the current biennium based on the assumption out-of-state enrollment had dropped. **SEN. JACOBSON** said she is suggesting they start thinking about the trend that has been going on. They continually increase fees to the students and rob general fund moneys, thereby, reducing the cost-per-student even lower than it is now which the Regents feel is too low. Her concern is they have shifted into that budget because it has a lot of general fund money. She feels \$25 million is not achievable in Human Services and is even more concerned about Institutions and the \$7 million cut considering some of the programs, such as the men's prison expansion and the building of the women's prison. She feels the cut translates much larger than \$7 million.

REP. BARDANOUVE said **Mr. Lewis** referred to putting a cap on the University enrollment for residents and asked him to explain. **Mr. Lewis** said the comment had to do with his discussion with the people who were involved in this budget process last biennium. They had indicated the calculations of fee income were based in particular on out-of-state students on the assumption that the out-of-state enrollments would drop if fees went up. That is not the case. Out-of-state enrollment has increased substantially, even with the increases of fees. That means there is fee income available for budget amendment by the Board of Regents that was not considered when the Legislature put that budget together.

REP. KADAS said in an overview sense, he understands and respects the position **Mr. Lewis** is in, particularly representing the Governor and trying to come from a position of leadership and development proposals that will deal with the issues. But looking at the overall budget that has been presented and the analysis of it, regarding the full proposal, there are still a very large number of loose ends in the executive proposal. He feels there are about \$40 million of proposals that may or may not pan out and some will clearly have problems, such as the

Motor Vehicle transfer, PILT money, the drug-enforcement money, the Medicaid cost estimates, the Work Comp that is not included, fire suppression, foster care, lost Medicaid from Galen which is included but shouldn't be, the reversion numbers and the early retirement numbers. SEN. JACOBSON said the SEA is probably short as there are extra students in that account. Mr. Lewis said with the exception of the Motor Vehicle money, there is nothing there that is not always the situation at this point in the Session. There are proposals the Legislature may accept or turn down. His position is, the use of those funds for motor vehicles for this biennium is unfortunate but unavoidable. If the legislature finds that to not be the case then he will have to come up with another answer.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 9:40 A.M.


SEN. JULY JACOBSON, Chair


MARY LOU SCHMITZ, Secretary

JJ/mls



STATE OF MONTANA

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

STATE CAPITOL
HELENA, MONTANA 59620
406/444-2986

TERESA OLCOTT COHEA
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST

TENTATIVE AGENDA
JOINT MEETING OF THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS,
SENATE FINANCE AND CLAIMS, AND
LEGISLATIVE FINANCE COMMITTEE
Thursday, January 21, 7:00 AM
Room 325

- I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL
- II. ANALYSIS OF GOVERNOR RACICOT'S EXECUTIVE BUDGET -
Teresa Olcott Cohea
- III. REMARKS AND RESPONSE TO COMMITTEE QUESTIONS -
Dave Lewis
- IV. ADJOURNMENT

TOC3J:mb:SFCHA1-4.ag

Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst
Expenditure Targets
 Figures In Millions

SC	Committee	Initial Target
01	General Government & Highways	\$109.637
02	Human Services	283.217
03	Natural Resources	39.992
04	Institutions & Cultural Education	156.040
05	Education	342.995
	Unallocated Target	<u>23.885</u>
	Sub-Total	\$955.766
	Statutory Appropriations	
	K-12 (SEA)	802.323
	All Other Statutory	<u>79.852</u>
	Grand Total	<u>\$1,837.941</u>
	HR 2 Target	<u>\$1,837.941</u>

EXHIBIT 1
 DATE 1 / 21 / 93
 HB

Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst
General Fund & School Equalization Accounts
Expenditure Figures in Millions

EXHIBIT 1
 DATE 11/21/93
 HB

	Current Level 93 Biennium	Current Level 95 Biennium	Dollar Change
General Appropriations			
General Act Plus Pay Plan	\$926.467	\$1,026.459	\$99.992
Supplementals	22.330	0.000	(22.330)
Miscellaneous	2.879	0.000	(2.879)
Continuing	<u>9.863</u>	<u>0.000</u>	<u>(9.863)</u>
Sub-Total	\$961.539	\$1,026.459	\$64.920
Other Appropriations			
Governor Elect	0.050	0.000	(0.050)
Feed Bill	<u>5.425</u>	<u>5.000</u>	<u>(0.425)</u>
Sub-Total	\$5.475	\$5.000	(\$0.475)
Statutory Appropriations			
Public Schools (K-12)	802.323	839.723	37.400
Property Tax Reimbursement	38.431	39.846	1.415
Debt Service	24.314	25.728	1.414
TRANS Interest	6.464	Unknown	(6.464)
Retirement	<u>6.700</u>	<u>7.814</u>	<u>1.114</u>
Sub-Total	\$878.232	\$913.111	\$34.879
Reversions	(\$7.305)	(\$7.305)	\$0.000
Totals	<u>\$1,837.941</u>	<u>\$1,937.265</u>	<u>\$99.324</u>

	95 Biennium Current Level	Proposed Target	Fund Position	Cash Position
Projected Deficit (6/30/95 by SCBR)			(\$168.869)	(\$215.640)
Revenues	1,738.373	1,837.373	99.000	99.000
Disbursements	1,937.265	1,837.941	(99.324)	(99.324)
Projected Deficit (6/30/95 after Targets)			<u>\$29.455</u>	<u>(\$17.316)</u>

EXHIBIT
DATE 11/21/93

Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst
General Fund Comparison
1992-93 Biennium vs. 1994-95 Biennium

Agency SEC Code	Agency Name	Current Level	Continuing	Supplementals	Total	Current Level	Current Level	Current Level
		Fiscal 1992-93 General	Fiscal 1993 General	Fiscal 1993 General	Fiscal 1992-93 General	Fiscal 1994-95 General	Dollar Cut	Percent Cut
01 1101	Legislative Auditor	\$2,405,934	\$0	\$0	\$2,405,934	\$2,598,280	\$192,346	7.99%
01 1102	Legislative Fiscal Analyst	1,640,161	37,400	0	1,677,561	1,730,163	52,602	3.14%
01 1104	Legislative Council	3,531,458	275,692	0	3,807,150	4,948,118	1,140,968	29.97%
01 1111	Environmental Quality Council	557,134	0	0	557,134	599,665	42,531	7.63%
01 2110	Judiciary	16,409,133	16,970	37,712	16,463,815	18,046,448	1,582,633	9.61%
01 3101	Governors Office	4,716,106	28,805	0	4,744,911	5,048,068	303,157	6.39%
01 3201	Secretary Of States Office	1,862,677	13,154	0	1,875,831	1,865,520	0	0.00%
01 3202	Commissioner Of Political Prac	254,823	24,138	0	278,961	251,177	0	0.00%
01 3401	State Auditors Office	4,140,769	44,433	201,170	4,386,372	4,285,698	0	0.00%
05 3501	Office Of Public Instruction	88,780,459	2,055,504	258,626	91,094,589	90,428,764	0	0.00%
01 4107	Crime Control Division	929,671	1,716	0	931,387	948,664	17,277	1.85%
01 4108	Highway Traffic Safety	366,160	0	0	366,160	420,000	53,840	14.70%
01 4110	Department Of Justice	21,849,203	109,905	185,000	22,144,108	26,894,613	4,750,505	21.45%
03 4201	Public Service Regulation	4,100,213	7,129	0	4,107,342	4,345,112	237,770	5.79%
05 5100	Montana University System	246,182,349	3,419	0	246,185,768	250,382,166	4,196,398	1.70%
05 5101	Board Of Public Education	208,748	1,232	0	209,980	229,268	19,288	9.19%
05 5113	School For The Deaf & Blind	5,418,939	19,965	65,443	5,504,347	5,626,423	122,076	2.22%
04 5114	Montana Arts Council	149,869	2,811	0	152,680	262,874	110,194	72.17%
04 5115	Library Commission	2,070,961	101,601	0	2,172,562	2,328,265	155,703	7.17%
04 5117	Historical Society	2,509,240	16,725	0	2,525,965	2,790,788	264,823	10.48%
03 5201	Dept Of Fish, Wildlife & Parks	778,023	0	0	778,023	846,110	68,087	8.75%
02 5301	Dept Health & Environ Sciences	6,472,799	0	145,962	6,618,761	6,616,383	0	0.00%
01 5401	Department Of Transportation	611,342	1,552	0	612,894	461,689	0	0.00%
03 5501	Department Of State Lands	17,561,922	20,026	248,558	17,830,506	18,700,093	869,587	4.88%
03 5603	Department Of Livestock	1,227,616	1,580	105,512	1,334,708	1,148,509	0	0.00%
03 5706	Dept Nat Resource/Conservation	8,657,844	30,132	0	8,687,976	10,375,645	1,687,669	19.43%
01 5801	Department Of Revenue	38,784,319	34,371	0	38,818,690	43,420,054	4,601,364	11.85%
01 6101	Department Of Administration	6,433,468	18,572	0	6,452,040	7,020,738	568,698	8.81%
03 6201	Department Of Agriculture	2,124,606	0	0	2,124,606	1,942,467	0	0.00%
04 6401	Dept. Corrections & Human Ser	146,938,264	679,935	3,570,238	151,188,437	164,701,766	13,513,329	8.94%
03 6501	Department Of Commerce	5,119,155	10,123	0	5,129,278	5,441,618	312,340	6.09%
02 6602	Labor & Industry	1,453,872	0	0	1,453,872	1,396,969	0	0.00%
01 6701	Adjutant General	4,084,257	28,029	1,800	4,114,086	4,321,645	207,559	5.05%
02 6901	Dept Social & Rehab Services	199,296,681	8,753	11,417,590	210,723,024	260,595,985	49,872,961	23.67%
02 6911	Department Of Family Services	61,137,485	44,963	3,239,078	64,421,526	75,439,238	11,017,712	17.10%
Totals		\$908,765,660	\$3,638,635	\$19,476,689	\$931,880,984	\$1,026,458,983	\$95,961,417	10.30%
01	General Government & Highways	108,576,615	634,737	425,682	109,637,034	122,860,540	13,513,480	12.33%
02	Human Services	268,360,837	53,716	14,802,630	283,217,183	344,048,575	60,890,673	21.50%
03	Natural Resources	39,569,379	68,990	354,070	39,992,439	42,799,554	3,175,453	7.94%
04	Institutions & Cultural Education	151,668,334	801,072	3,570,238	156,039,644	170,083,693	14,044,049	9.00%
05	Education	340,590,495	2,080,120	324,069	342,994,684	346,666,621	4,337,762	1.26%
Totals		\$908,765,660	\$3,638,635	\$19,476,689	\$931,880,984	\$1,026,458,983	\$95,961,417	10.30%

Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst
General Fund Comparison
1992-93 Biennium vs. 1994-95 Biennium

EXHIBIT 1
DATE 1/21/92
HB

Agcy SC Code	Agency Name	Current Level Fiscal 1992-93 General	Continuing Fiscal 1993 General	Supplementals Fiscal 1993 General	Total Fiscal 1992-93 General	Racion Fiscal 1994-95 General
01 1101	Legislative Auditor	\$2,405,934	\$0	\$0	\$2,405,934	2,598,280
01 1102	Legislative Fiscal Analyst	1,640,161	37,400	0	1,677,561	1,730,163
01 1104	Legislative Council	3,531,458	275,692	0	3,807,150	5,081,594
01 1111	Environmental Quality Council	557,134	0	0	557,134	599,665
01 2110	Judiciary	16,409,133	16,970	37,712	16,463,815	17,971,349
01 3101	Governors Office	4,716,106	28,805	0	4,744,911	5,271,791
01 3201	Secretary Of States Office	1,862,677	13,154	0	1,875,831	1,978,166
01 3202	Commissioner Of Political Prac	254,823	24,138	0	278,961	259,489
01 3401	State Auditors Office	4,140,769	44,433	201,170	4,386,372	4,176,040
05 3501	Office Of Public Instruction	88,780,459	2,055,504	258,626	91,094,589	101,208,613
01 4107	Crime Control Division	929,671	1,716	0	931,387	954,871
01 4108	Highway Traffic Safety	366,160	0	0	366,160	420,000
01 4110	Department Of Justice	21,849,203	109,905	185,000	22,144,108	13,851,548
03 4201	Public Service Regulation	4,100,213	7,129	0	4,107,342	4,510,522
05 5100	Montana University System	246,182,349	3,419	0	246,185,768	211,444,712
05 5101	Board Of Public Education	208,748	1,232	0	209,980	233,586
05 5113	School For The Deaf & Blind	5,418,939	19,965	65,443	5,504,347	4,843,714
04 5114	Montana Arts Council	149,869	2,811	0	152,680	285,635
04 5115	Library Commission	2,070,961	101,601	0	2,172,562	2,277,597
04 5117	Historical Society	2,509,240	16,725	0	2,525,965	2,840,319
03 5201	Dept Of Fish, Wildlife & Parks	778,023	0	0	778,023	1,433,321
02 5301	Dept Health & Environ Sciences	6,472,799	0	145,962	6,618,761	6,084,236
01 5401	Department Of Transportation	611,342	1,552	0	612,894	172,227
03 5501	Department Of State Lands	17,561,922	20,026	248,558	17,830,506	18,523,885
03 5603	Department Of Livestock	1,227,616	1,580	105,512	1,334,708	1,550,223
03 5706	Dept Nat Resource/Conservation	8,657,844	30,132	0	8,687,976	7,629,694
01 5801	Department Of Revenue	38,784,319	34,371	0	38,818,690	43,584,481
01 6101	Department Of Administration	6,433,468	18,572	0	6,452,040	7,177,016
03 6201	Department Of Agriculture	2,124,606	0	0	2,124,606	2,234,234
04 6401	Dept. Corrections & Human Ser	146,938,264	679,935	3,570,238	151,188,437	178,784,495
03 6501	Department Of Commerce	5,119,155	10,123	0	5,129,278	4,902,093
02 6602	Labor & Industry	1,453,872	0	0	1,453,872	2,347,624
01 6701	Adjutant General	4,084,257	28,029	1,800	4,114,086	4,580,851
02 6901	Dept Social & Rehab Services	199,296,681	8,753	11,417,590	210,723,024	249,971,163
02 6911	Department Of Family Services	61,137,485	44,963	3,239,078	64,421,526	76,962,955
Totals		\$908,765,660	\$3,638,635	\$19,476,689	\$931,880,984	\$988,476,152
01	General Government & Highways	108,576,615	634,737	425,682	109,637,034	110,407,531
02	Human Services	268,360,837	53,716	14,802,630	283,217,183	335,365,978
03	Natural Resources	39,569,379	68,990	354,070	39,992,439	40,783,972
04	Institutions & Cultural Education	151,668,334	801,072	3,570,238	156,039,644	184,188,046
05	Education	340,590,495	2,080,120	324,069	342,994,684	317,730,625
Totals		\$908,765,660	\$3,638,635	\$19,476,689	\$931,880,984	\$988,476,152

exhib. 2
EXHIBIT 2
DATE 1/21/93
HB

BUDGET ANALYSIS 1995 BIENNIUM VOL. III

The original is stored at the Historical Society at 225 North Roberts Street, Helena, MT 59620-1201. The phone number is 444-2694.



OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST



HELENA, MONTANA • JANUARY 1993



TERESA OLCOTT COHEA
LEGISLATIVE FISCAL ANALYST

STATE OF MONTANA

Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst

STATE CAPITOL
HELENA, MONTANA 59620
406/444-2986

EXHIBIT #2
DATE 1-21-93
1

January, 1993

Members of the Fifty-Third Legislature
Members of the Legislative Finance Committee

In accordance with the provisions of section 5-12-302, MCA, I submit for your consideration an analysis of Governor Racicot's amendments to Governor Stephens' Executive Budget. This analysis is based on the printed document submitted to the legislature on January 4 and the supporting details contained in the balance sheets and electronic data provided by the Budget Director on January 11, 1993. The analysis is designed to assist the legislature in its constitutional duties of appropriating funds, balancing the state's budget, and ensuring strict accountability of all funds.

We thank the Office of Budget and Program Planning and state agency staff for their cooperation during the budget analysis process. They were very helpful in providing needed information and answering questions.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Teresa Olcott Cohea".

Teresa Olcott Cohea
Legislative Fiscal Analyst