

## **MINUTES**

### **MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 53rd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION**

#### **COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS**

**Call to Order:** By REP. TOM ZOOK, on February 1, 1993, at 3:05 P.M.

#### **ROLL CALL**

##### **Members Present:**

Rep. Tom Zook, Chair (R)  
Rep. Ed Grady, Vice Chair (R)  
Rep. Francis Bardanouve (D)  
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. Linda Nelson (D)  
Rep. Ray Peck (D)  
Rep. Mary Lou Peterson (R)  
Rep. Joe Quillici (D)  
Rep. Dave Wanzenried (D)  
Rep. Bill Wiseman (R)

**Members Excused:** Rep. Ernest Bergsagel  
Rep. John Cobb  
Rep. Wm. "Red" Menahan

**Members Absent:** None

**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: None  
Executive Action: HB 23, HB 26, HB 275, HB 112

#### **EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 23**

**CHAIRMAN ZOOK** said there are some amendments **REP. PECK** has to offer.

**REP. PECK** said for the benefit of the Committee members HB 23 is the Bill that was requested by the Legislative Finance Committee

and would require reporting to the Finance Committee of significant contributions that would, in any way, obligate the state of Montana in the future. At the time of the hearing **REP. KADAS** discussed the language on lines 18, 19, 20, 21 of Page 1 and he wants to offer an amendment he and **Jim Haubein, LFA** worked out.

**Motion:** **REP. KADAS** moved to adopt Amendments 1, 2, 3, 4 to HB 23, Exhibit 1.

**Discussion:** **REP. KADAS** said his concern with the way the bill was worked originally is using the term "written agreement" and essentially by having "written agreement" first, it tended to define that a donation was necessarily a written agreement. He has stricken "written agreement" from the first part and made it specific to donation. Also at **REP. PECK's** suggestion, he put in a dollar limit. In order to fall under the initial criteria, it would have to be an agreement such as a "contract", a "trust agreement", or a donation of \$500 or more that is accompanied by a written agreement.

The second issue was (in Subsection c, Page 2, Line 2) that if we maintained the existing language, that would prohibit agencies from accepting money if they thought there was a possibility the money would increase future general fund obligations. What the legislature wants them to do is tell them the truth, whether they think it will increase general fund obligations or not, not mandate them to tell the legislature that it won't.

The language on page 9, line 19 raises a concern about whether tuition in the University System could be budget amended and the new language makes it clear that it can be. It also deals with the issue raised by the University System regarding federal funds for student loans and this makes it clear those could be budget amended as well.

**REP. BARDANOUVE** seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

**REP. PECK** presented the second set of Amendments, **EXHIBIT 2** which amends the title in Item 1 and it conforms this to other requests in consultation with the Budget Office and the significant one of theirs, Item 3.

**Jim Haubein, Legislative Fiscal Analyst**, said this amendment would do two things. First, the top part has to be a title change because they are amending some substantive portion of the bill. The second amendment is on page 9, line 19, which adds additional revenue and refers to proprietary fund revenue deposited in internal funds within the department. They need to add "Department of Administration" there, and it's as a result of increased service demanded by state agencies. What this would allow for is if information services division, **ISD**, received

demands from other state agencies where they would have to increase their services and it would go beyond what they are appropriated then they would be allowed to come in with a budget amendment. This would be similar to Central Mail. During this biennium, Central Mail found out that several agencies came in a lot more than they were budgeted for and started using their service so demand became greater. They received the revenue but they don't have the spending authority. This allows for those kinds of instances with this amendment.

The second part, page 14, line 3, is at the request of the Budget Office. You have instances where one agency may receive an appropriation but actually when the service is going to be provided, that service would be better performed in another agency. Currently, there is no mechanism to get the money from one to the other without an administrative appropriation which is questionable. By inserting this language it would allow that appropriation to be transferred from one agency to another if the other agency was performing the service. The original agency's appropriation would be reduced and it would increase the agency that was providing the service.

**Questions:** REP. WANZENRIED asked for an example of the instance Mr. Haubein just identified. Mr. Haubein referred to Jane Hamman, Office of Budget and Program Planning, who said one of the more recent examples is in the Reapportionment Commission. The appropriation was made to the Legislative Council and Bob Person indicated \$2000 of that appropriation was meant to be spent by the State Library doing some technical mapping and research for the Council as part of that committee work. They had to decrease the appropriation of the Council to get the \$2000 to the Library so they could do the work.

There are several in the Unemployed Parent and Jobs' Programs where funds are appropriated to the Department of Social and Rehabilitation Services with specific legislative intent that work will be done by the Department of Labor and Industry for training unemployed parents. Some funds have to be decreased in SRS, get the money over to Labor and increase their spending authority so they can meet that legislative intent.

REP. KASTEN referred a question to Ms. Cohea, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, asking if the Committee accepted this set of amendments as they accepted the first set, would she comment on the paragraph on 9 starting on line 18 and how would it read? Ms. Cohea said she noticed the problem there and they would have to prepare a coordinating amendment to read, following "revenue", "additional tuition collected by the Montana university system and additional revenue deposited". Mr. Haubein said these amendments did go through the Legislative Council editors and when they are put together will make sure they read appropriately. REP. PECK reminded the committee that on this amendment, Item 2, the last line following "department", you have to insert the words "of administration" which were omitted to

make the amendment complete.

**Motion:** REP. PECK moved the Amendments.

**Questions:** REP. KADAS referred to Amendment #3 and asked Ms. Cohea if that would allow the executive within the confines of the budget to do any significant departmental reorganization? Ms. Cohea said it would facilitate that if the reorganization was done within existing law because many programs are not statutorily required. It is an executive decision. The language saying "provided that the original purpose of the appropriation is maintained" and as long as the money was used for the same thing, the Budget Office would have the authority to move it to a different department than you had appropriated it to. REP. KADAS cited an example: if there was a statute that said agency X must perform a duty with wider resources and the executive decided they wanted Agency C to do it, could they do it? Ms. Cohea said she thinks not because the more specific law would control. This would deal more with cases in which there was not a specific statutory cite on which agency had to perform the function.

REP. QUILICI asked how this amendment would affect the Department of Administration's transferring funds from the State Auditor's office for payroll. Ms. Cohea said those cases are statutorily required duties for the various agencies to perform so that could not be done with this but it might be used if the Legislature had changed the statute but not changed HB 2 to reflect the change in appropriation. This would give the authority to OBPP to transfer the appropriation to follow the statute.

REP. BARDANOUVE seconded the motion.

**Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. PECK moved HB 23 DO PASS as Amended. Motion carried unanimously.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 26:**

REP. PECK said he has been getting so many conflicting signals on this. He brought this bill forward based primarily on the idea that it would assist students and defend them against tuition increases. The students have examined this bill and said they don't know whether they would be worse off with the Regents or the Legislature so he has some reservations about it and can't support it or oppose it but if a position is adopted by the students later he may come back to the Committee.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. PECK MOVED HB 26 BE TABLED. Motion carried unanimously.

**EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 275**

Ms. Cohea referred to a memo, EXHIBIT 3, page 3, saying after the

several points. The first point - are advances under state contracts a common practice or would this be setting a precedent? She contacted the office of the Legislator Auditor and asked if their staff was aware of how most state contracts were done. They reported that most state contracts are done on a reimbursement basis. The contractee performs a service, bills for it and then the state pays. The auditors were aware of very few cases in which there were actually advances and did express concern if agencies did get in the practice of advancing funds. If the service wasn't provided, it would be difficult to get the funds back.

The second question the committee asked was: Will federal regulations allow advancing of federal funds? As several agencies testified, recently the federal government has tightened up on cash management. In a September, 1992 directive, states were told that they had to manage grants out to sub-agencies in the same manner as they, themselves, receive federal funds and "to the maximum extent practicable within the recipient's actual immediate fund requirements in carrying out the program of projects". The OLA staff also noted as they audit agency's records under the Single Audit Act, one of the things they check is that the agency didn't draw down federal funds too quickly and thereby limit the federal interest earned.

The third question the committee was interested in is why were state agencies so slow in making payments to the tribe, causing this cash-flow problem. She contacted the Board of Crime Control because they were one of the agencies mentioned by one of the proponents. For several years the tribe has received DARE funds and previously advances of up to 30% were given. Because of the new federal regulations, the Board of Crime Control is no longer doing that on large grants. The Board did note that in several cases, tribal agencies were slow in providing required reports on expenditure of the funds and until those reports were provided they could not provide the grant funds. She also contacted SRS because there was concern that the nursing home payments were slow. SRS checked the actual payments and all of them had been made within two weeks of being submitted. The only cases in which there were delays were when the actual recipient had not yet been certified as Medicaid eligible and then there were delays of up to four or five months.

The last question that was raised was what would be the impact on interest. If advances were made, obviously, the state lost the interest. She contacted the Coordinator of Indian Affairs to find out if any central record was kept of the number and amounts of state tribal agreements. The Coordinator said that would be great if state agencies informed them but they are not informed. Short of calling every agency, she does not know what the total amount is. However, the Auditor said they could not advance federal money so the only money that would be advanced would be state money. Most of the interest on state accounts is paid to the general fund. To the extent you do advances it would have a

general fund interest impact.

**Questions:** REP. GRADY said a fiscal impact statement is needed to know what kind of affect they're having on the general fund. Ms. Cohea said that could certainly be requested and what the budget office would then have to do is ask each agency how many state tribal contracts they had, the amount, and what was likely to be advanced. One of the things that was very clear was that the major programs cannot do advances. For example, under the Federal Medicaid rules, the state cannot advance funds so it would probably make the fiscal note a little difficult to calculate, but they could find out what the amount out there is. REP. GRADY said there would not be any idea then whether it is sizeable or minimum impact. Ms. Cohea said certainly under the current tribal agreements, for nursing home care, significant amounts of money go out of the State Treasury to the tribes for that service, however, that could not be affected by this Bill because federal law would prohibit it from being advanced. She said she does not know how great the amount of state funds are that could be advanced.

REP. BARDANOUVE said it would be difficult to determine the exact dollar amount as it differs from time to time but it is clear it would be an adverse impact.

**Motion:** REP. KASTEN moved HB 275 DO NOT PASS

**Discussion:** REP. WANZENRIED said it is clear that people who testified think there is a problem in some areas and rather than having us incur the expense of going through all the agencies, we should give those people an opportunity to come back with listing of examples of where there have been any problems of state payments being delayed.

**Motion:** REP. WANZENRIED made a Substitute Motion to TABLE HB 275.

**Discussion:** CHAIRMAN ZOOK said he visited with REP. GERVAIS and part of the problem is they have not received the training to comply with these financial requirements in order to get the reports in on time.

**Vote:** Motion carried unanimously.

REP. BARDANOUVE said that was subject to possible reconsideration if real impact could be shown.

REP. ROYAL JOHNSON asked if they addressed the concern in HB 23 that the Guaranteed Student Loan people had. CHAIRMAN ZOOK said that Ms. Cohea feels that to the extent that it is federal revenue it is addressed.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 111

Motion/Vote: REP. KASTEN MOVED HB 111 DO PASS. Motion carried unanimously.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HB 112

Motion: REP. KADAS MOVED HB 112 DO PASS.

Discussion: REP. BARDANOUVE said we will not be putting any money into to the PR system because we are not going to finance it. It shows in the fiscal note the obligation will increase by the time the PR is paid off. They are postponing payment on this.

REP. PECK said that is correct but an obligation is being put on some local school districts but there are some numbers out there that are kind of vague and hard to pin down and putting a property tax on local taxpayers to some extent, fairly minor.

REP. KADAS said he wanted to emphasize "fairly minor". There are 89 people who could be eligible and if the cost is minimal the issue is one of fairness.

REP. KASTEN said after having sat on the State Administration last year, with 45 bills on retirement introduced, the different components always ratchet on each other. If one gets a benefit then the others want it. She feels they are opening the door to a lot of other people coming in wanting the same thing. Since it does seem to be only one person who has already bought and paid into the system, she would hesitate to pass this and opposed the bill.

REP. QUILICI said somewhere down the road there will be some costs to the school districts. However, he feels it is a sense of fairness and supports the bill.

REP. PECK asked REP. KADAS if there are any such glitches in the other retirement programs, such as PERS, sheriffs, and other people with different retirement systems, specifically with this window. REP. KADAS said he is not aware of any but that doesn't mean they don't exist. He understands REP. KASTEN's concern that there are little niches.

REP. KASTEN said those groups are often smaller but the amount paid into those groups is larger, proportionately, with what the state pays in.

REP. GRADY said they are talking about a smaller amount but wanted some clarification. Every "cat and dog" bill that goes out has an impact. He asked Ms. Cohea if that money will have to be taken out of the budget someplace else. She said as she understands the fiscal note, unless the committee approved additional money to fund the unfunded liability all that would happen is the unfunded liability in the TRS system grows. You do not have an obligation to fund this amount of money. You are

having a very slight impact on the long term stability of the TRS system. **REP. GRADY** said if they pass this bill there will be no worry about the \$99 million target. **Ms. Cohea** said no, unless you decide to make sure the TRS is exactly as it was when you came into the Session and calculate the impact on the teachers. These are very small amounts of money and normally an agency would not come in requesting a specific appropriation for something under \$200 or \$300 in a biennium.

**REP. ROYAL JOHNSON** said this is very familiar if you study the worker's comp. situation and not fund it.


**REP. KADAS** said, in closing, he would draw attention to assumption #4, which explains where the cost is. It is 1/10 of one year under the worst case if all 89 are eligible. They know they are not. If 10% are eligible that will probably be high.


Vote: Motion carried 11 to 5 with **REPS. GRADY, BARDANOUVE, DeBRUYCKER, FISHER AND KADAS** voting no.

HOUSE BILL 112 PASSED.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 4:45 P.M.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
REP. TOM ZOOK, Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
MARY LOU SCHMITZ, Secretary

TZ/mls



# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## APPROPRIATIONS

## COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE

2/1/93

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. ED GRADY, V. CHAIR	✓		
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	✓		
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEL			✓
REP. JOHN COBB			✓
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	✓		
REP. MARJ. FISHER	✓		
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	✓		
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	✓		
REP. MIKE KADAS	✓		
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	✓		
REP. WM. "RED" MENEHAN			✓
REP. LINDA NELSON	✓		
REP. RAY PECK	✓		
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON	✓		
REP. JOE QUILICI	✓		
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	✓		
REP. BILL WISEMAN	✓		
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	✓		

February 2, 1993

Page 2 of 2

6. Page 14, following line 3.  
Insert: "(4) Authority to expend appropriated money may be transferred from one state agency to another, provided that the original purpose of the appropriation is maintained. The office of budget and program planning shall report semiannually to the legislative finance committee concerning all appropriations transferred under the provisions of this section."


-END-

HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 2, 1993

Page 1 of 2

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Appropriations report that House Bill 23 (first reading copy -- white) do pass as amended

Signed: 

Tom Zook, Chair

And, that such amendments read:

1. Title, lines 8 and 9.  
Following: "FUNDS" on line 8.  
Insert: "AND FUND TRANSFERS"  
Following: "PROCESS;" on line 9.  
Insert: "PROVIDING FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS BETWEEN AGENCIES;"
2. Page 1, lines 20 and 21.  
Strike: "a written agreement, such as"
3. Page 1, line 21.  
Following: "contract,"  
Insert: "a"  
Following: "donation"  
Insert: "of \$500 or more that is accompanied by a written agreement"
4. Page 2, line 2.  
Following: "statement"  
Strike: "that"  
Insert: "concerning the degree to which"  
Following: "agreement"  
Strike: "will not"  
Insert: "may"
5. Page 9, line 19.  
Strike: "grant"  
Insert: "federal"  
Following: "revenue"  
Insert: ", additional tuition collected by the Montana university system, additional revenue deposited in the internal service funds within the department as a result of increased service demands by state agencies,"

HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 1, 1993

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Appropriations report that  
House Bill 111 (first reading copy -- white) do pass .

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Zook, Chair

Committee Vote:  
Yes 17 No 4

251613SC.Hpf

HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

February 1, 1993

Page 1 of 1

Mr. Speaker: We, the committee on Appropriations report that  
House Bill 112 (first reading copy -- white) do pass.

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_  
Tom Zook, Chair

Committee Vote:  
Yes 11, No 5.

251614SC.Hbf

Amendments to House Bill No. 23  
Introduced Copy

For the House Appropriations Committee

Prepared by Jim Haubein  
January 29, 1993

EXHIBIT  
DATE 2/1/93  
HB 23  
1/2  
60  
V. J. J.

adoption

1. Page 1, lines 20 and 21.  
Strike: "a written agreement, such as"
2. Page 1, line 21.  
Following: "contract,"  
Insert: "a"  
Following: "donation"  
Insert: "of \$500 or more that is accompanied by a written agreement,"
3. Page 2, line 2.  
Following: "statement"  
Strike: "that"  
Insert: "concerning the degree to which"  
Following: "agreement"  
Strike: "will not"  
Insert: "may"
4. Page 9, line 19.  
Strike: "grant"  
Insert: "federal"  
Following: "revenue"  
Insert: ", additional tuition collected by the Montana university system,"

{Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst

444-2986}

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 23 NUMBER

MOTION: Rep. Kadas moved to adopt Amendments 1,2,3,4.

Exhibit 1

Motion carried unanimously.

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V, CHAIR	X	
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	X	
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGE	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	X	
REP. MARJ. FISHER	X	
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	X	
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILLICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	18	0

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ADDOPDIATIONS

COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 23 NUMBER

MOTION: Rep. Peck moved to adopt amendments, Exhibit 2

Motion carried unanimously

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V. CHAIR	X	
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	X	
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEI	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	X	
REP. MARJ. FISHER	X	
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	X	
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANTZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	18	0



House Appropriations Committee Report on House Bill No. 23  
Introduced Copy

Requested by Representative Zook  
For the Committee on House Appropriations

Prepared by Jim Haubein  
February 1, 1993

EXHIBIT 2 *advised*  
DATE 2/1/93  
HB HB 23

1. Title, lines 8 and 9.  
Following: "FUNDS" on line 8.  
Insert: "AND FUND TRANSFERS"  
Following: "PROCESS;" on line 9.  
Insert: "PROVIDING FOR TRANSFER OF FUNDS BETWEEN AGENCIES;"
2. Page 1, lines 20 and 21.  
Strike: "a written agreement, such as"
3. Page 1, line 21.  
Following: "contract,"  
Insert: "a"  
Following: "donation"  
Insert: "of \$500 or more that is accompanied by a written agreement,"
4. Page 2, line 2.  
Following: "statement"  
Strike: "that"  
Insert: "concerning the degree to which"  
Following: "agreement"  
Strike: "will not"  
Insert: "may"
5. Page 9, line 19.  
Strike: "grant"  
Insert: "federal"  
Following: "revenue"  
Insert: ", additional tuition collected by the Montana university system, additional revenue deposited in the internal service funds within the department as a result of increased service demands by state agencies,"

6. Page 14, following line 3.

Insert: "(4) Authority to expend appropriated money may be transferred from one state agency to another, provided that the original purpose of the appropriation is maintained. The office of budget and program planning shall report semiannually to the legislative finance committee concerning all appropriations transferred under the provisions of this section."

{Office of Legislative Fiscal Analyst

444-2986}"

EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 2/1/93  
HB 14B23

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ADDODDIATIONS

COMMITTEE


## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 23 NUMBER

MOTION: Rep. Peck moved HB 23 DO PASS AS AMENDED.

Motion carried unanimously.

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V. CHAIR	X	
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	X	
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEI	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	X	
REP. MARJ. FISHER	X	
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	X	
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	18	0



## MONTANA GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

2500 Broadway • Helena, Montana 59620-3103

(406) 444-6594 FAX (406) 444-0684

Customer Assistance (800) 537-7508

January 15, 1993

EXHIBIT 3  
DATE 2/1/93  
HB HB 23

To: Representative Tom Zook, Chairman  
Appropriations Committee

From: Bill Langan, Director  
Montana Guaranteed Student Loan Program

Subject: House Bill 23, Revise Budget Amendment Law

For the record I want to clarify my position and opposition to House Bill 23 that amends Section 17-7-402 RCM.

The amended wording in Section 3 of H.B. 23 would prohibit the Guarantee Agency from receiving approval for future budget amendments. As I read the bill "... a budget amendment may not be approved: (a) by the approving authority, except a budget amendment to spend additional grant revenue or a new source of revenue that was not available for legislative consideration during the most recent legislative session open to that matter" The Guarantee Agency would not come under that section because the revenue it receives is not "grant" nor new sources of revenue. As I indicated in my testimony, the Guarantee Agency's sources of revenue come from services that are based on a contractual arrangement with the Federal Department of Education or Montana lenders. The funds are not "grant" funds.

Subsection (b) is not applicable to the guarantee agency since the agency does not receive any general fund support. Normally, subsections (c), (e) and (f) are not relevant.

Representative Zook, I have enclosed sufficient copies of this memo for your committee and have copied Representative Peck, Terry Cohea, Jim Haubein and Jane Hammond.

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me.

c: Appropriations Committee  
Representative Peck  
Terry Cohea  
Jim Haubein  
Jane Hammond

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ADDOPDIATIONS

COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 26 NUMBER

MOTION: Rep. Peck moved to Table HB 26

Motion carried unanimously.

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V, CHAIR	X	
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	X	
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEI	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	X	
REP. MARJ. FISHER	X	
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	X	
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARV LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	18	0

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 275 NUMBER MOTION: Rep. Kasten moved DO NOT PASS

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V, CHAIR		
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE		
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEI		
REP. JOHN COBB		
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER		
REP. MARJ. FISHER		
REP. JOHN JOHNSON		
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON		
REP. MIKE KADAS		
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN		
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN		
REP. LINDA NELSON		
REP. RAY PECK		
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON		
REP. JOE QUILICI		
REP. DAVE WANZENREID		
REP. BILL WISEMAN		
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR		

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 275 NUMBER           

MOTION: Rep. Wanzenried moved to TABLE HB 275 with a  
substitute motion

Motion carried unanimously.

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V. CHAIR	X	
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	X	
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEI	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	X	
REP. MARJ. FISHER	X	
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	X	
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILLICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	18	0

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 111 NUMBER

MOTION: Rep. Kasten moved HB 111 DO PASS

Motion carried unanimously

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V. CHAIR	X	
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	X	
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGE	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER	X	
REP. MARJ. FISHER	X	
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN	X	
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILLICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	18	0



# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

APPROPRIATIONS

COMMITTEE

## ROLL CALL VOTE

DATE 2/1/93 BILL NO. HB 112 NUMBER

MOTION: Rep. Kadas moved HB 112 DO PASS

Motion carried 11 - 5

NAME	AYE	NO
REP. ED GRADY, V, CHAIR		X
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE		X
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEI	X	
REP. JOHN COBB	X	
REP. ROGER DEBRUYKER		X
REP. MARJ. FISHER		X
REP. JOHN JOHNSON	X	
REP. ROYAL JOHNSON	X	
REP. MIKE KADAS	X	
REP. BETTY LOU KASTEN		X
REP. WM. RED MENAHAN	X	
REP. LINDA NELSON	X	
REP. RAY PECK	X	
REP. MARV LOU PETERSON	X	
REP. JOE QUILICI	X	
REP. DAVE WANZENREID	X	
REP. BILL WISEMAN	X	
REP. TOM ZOOK, CHAIR	X	
	11	5