

## **MINUTES**

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

#### **JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON GENERAL GOVERNMENT & TRANSPORTATION**

**Call to Order:** By REP. MARY LOU PETERSON, CHAIRMAN, on February 4, 1993, at 8:00 AM.

#### **ROLL CALL**

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

Rep. Mary Lou Peterson, Chair (R)  
Sen. Harry Fritz, Vice Chair (D)  
Rep. Marjorie Fisher (R)  
Sen. Gary Forrester (D)  
Rep. Joe Quilici (D)  
Sen. Larry Tveit (R)

**Members Excused:** None

**Members Absent:** None

**Staff Present:** Clayton Schenck, Legislative Fiscal Analyst  
Dan Gengler, Office of Budget & Program Planning  
Elaine Benedict, Committee Secretary

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

##### **Committee Business Summary:**

Hearing: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Executive Action: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

#### **HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION**

Tape No. 1:A:010

#### **GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT**

##### **Informational Testimony:**

SEN. CHARLES SWYSGOOD, DISTRICT 37, presented testimony in favor of ceasing involvement with the joint operation of the port in Coots, Alberta, Canada. He is a trucker, and although he does not use the port himself, he has heard several complaints from colleagues. The agreement with Canada stipulates that the U.S. reimburse Alberta for half the expenses of operating the port. This cost the U.S. \$12,000 last year and will cost them \$18,000 next year. The U.S. must also pay half the expense of building a truck inspection facility. This is a total cost of approximately \$170,000. The joint port between Montana and Idaho is much less

930204JG.HM1

expensive at approximately \$20,000/year. The legal situation of the joint U.S.-Canadian port is difficult because laws are different for each country. He suggests that the weigh station should be in Shelby. The savings from ceasing involvement with the joint port would allow the Shelby port to open. Also, Great Falls has a weigh station and 90% of all trucks passing through it go on to Canada. Although he agrees with the premise of a joint port, this particular U.S. Canadian port is too expensive and is more beneficial to Canada than it is to the U.S. Changing the site to Shelby would spur economic development in that town and would save the department money.

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

**SEN. GARY FORRESTER** stated that he feels it important to honor agreements and asked how ceasing involvement with the port would affect trade between Canada and the U.S. **SEN. SWYSGOOD** responded that the decision to make the agreement did not come before the Legislature; if it had he would abide by it. He feels that agreements made between Canada and the U.S. are more beneficial to Canada.

**SEN. FORRESTER** asked how far the U.S. has progressed in paying for the new facility. **Mr. David Galt, Administrator of the Motor Carrier Services Division**, responded that the facility is built, that payments are in installments and that approximately \$14,000 has been paid thus far.

**REP. JOE QUILICI** asked Mr. Galt to fully explain the agreement between Canada and the U.S. **Mr. Galt** responded that the agreement, signed by the governor, is to lease the facility and pay half the operating costs of the inspection station.

**REP. QUILICI** asked why the facility is on Canadian soil. **Mr. Galt** responded that the U.S. had a scale in Shelby, but that it was in very poor condition and only facilitated south bound traffic. Alberta had a very well kept and effective existing facility; only the inspection barn needed to be built.

**SEN. LARRY TVEIT** asked when the agreement was made. **Mr. Galt** answered that it was signed in the spring and summer of 1991 and that the operation became effective October 1, 1991. The agreement was drawn up by both the Executive Office and the Highway Department (now the Department of Transportation).

**SEN. TVEIT** asked how far north of the border the station is located. **Mr. Galt** answered that it is approximately 1 1/10 miles north.

**SEN. TVEIT** inquired about the Great Falls port. **Mr. Galt** explained that while the joint port facilitates northbound and southbound traffic, the Great Falls port facilitates only northbound. A port facilitating south bound traffic does not exist before Helena. If the joint port were closed, a new port

would have to be built in Shelby that could accommodate the same traffic flow. As it was, southbound traffic was diverted to Sunburst. Northbound traffic could be accommodated at Lima, but there are means to get around this port.

SEN. SWYSGOOD responded that this is true, but that the situation does not change with the existence of the joint port. If an action is found to be illegal in the U.S., but not in Canada, or vice versa, the one country can only warn the individual and he/she can still get away with the same thing.

SEN. TVEIT inquired about the differences in laws between the nations. SEN. SWYSGOOD explained that hauling of produce generally does not create problems because it must go all the way to California. Grain, however, creates a different problem due to its origination and the number of ports.

SEN. TVEIT asked if the joint port is open 24 hours. Mr. Galt answered that it is, except for holidays.

REP. MARJORIE FISHER asked if either country has issued citations that it has not been able to enforce. Mr. Galt explained that if an action is legal in Canada but not in the U.S., the individual can only be warned and possibly caught at a later time in the U.S. Traffic going into Canada that is illegal in the U.S. is issued a citation and the case must be heard in Shelby.

#### EXECUTIVE ACTION ON DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Tape No. 1:B:840

#### MAINTENANCE

##### Informational Testimony:

Mr. Clayton Schenck, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBITS 1 and 2

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to accept the LFA current level base. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

##### BUDGET ITEM COUNTY WEED CONTROL:

##### Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked what percentage of the counties are included in weed control. Mr. Tom Barnard, Department of Transportation, responded that each county can do as much weed control as it desires and bill the department. The amount has risen an estimated 38%.

REP. FISHER stated that she had suggested an amendment that would eliminate the counties ability to do this.

Mr. Schenck stated that a committee bill would likely be necessary to accomplish this.

Motion: REP. FISHER moved that a committee bill be drafted that would require counties to come before the legislature for approval of their weed control budgets.

Discussion:

Mr. Barnard suggested that each county's budget be reduced by its portion of the amount over the entire budget.

SEN. TVEIT stated that the committee bill might cause the counties to come in with even higher estimates.

Vote: THE MOTION FAILED.

BUDGET ITEM RESTORE 5% REDUCTION-MODIFICATION:

Motion: REP. QUILICI moved to restore the 37.5 FTEs because the department has agreed that it will not fill positions it does not need.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked if these positions are located throughout the state. Mr. Barnard answered that they are.

Vote: THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. FISHER and SEN. TVEIT opposing.

BUDGET ITEM COUNTY WEED CONTROL:

Motion: SEN. TVEIT moved to fund \$139,650 in the first year, and \$165,050 in the second year of the biennium.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. HARRY FRITZ asked what types of herbicides are used. Mr. Barnard responded that it is the option of the counties.

Tape No. 1:B:045

CHAIRMAN MARY LOU PETERSON asked if all counties participate. Mr. Barnard answered that some counties do not because of liability risks.

SEN. FORRESTER asked whether the state or the county would be found liable. Mr. Barnard answered that the county would, but that the state would likely be involved at some point.

SEN. TVEIT stated that weed control should be required on highway right-of-ways.

Vote: THE MOTION FAILED with REP. QUILICI, REP. FISHER and SEN. TVEIT opposing.

BUDGET ITEM EQUIPMENT:

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked what equipment is needed. Mr. Barnard responded that the program needs hand tampers, pressure washers, crack grouters, air compressors, brush tippers, and, most significantly, radio equipment.

REP. FISHER asked if this equipment is additional or replacement. Mr. Barnard answered that it is both.

BUDGET ITEM VACANT POSITIONS:

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to restore the vacant positions because they are seasonal and not accurately reflected in the "snap-shot." THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM ROADWAY STRIPING-MODIFICATION:

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked if this is required state-wide. Mr. Barnard responded that it is mandated for all Federally funded roadways.

Motion/Vote: REP. FISHER moved to accept the request. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM ICE CONTROL MATERIAL-MODIFICATION:

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked if this is being done in compliance with the clean air act. Mr. Barnard answered that it is being done to comply with this act and also to reduce windshield damage.

Motion: REP. FISHER moved to accept the request.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked if the de-icer will be used only in specific areas. Mr. Barnard answered that it will be used where necessary.

Vote: THE MOTION CARRIED with SEN. TVEIT opposing.

BUDGET ITEM HAZARDOUS WASTE-MODIFICATION:

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

**SEN. TVEIT** asked what comprises hazardous waste. **Mr. Barnard** cited lead based paint as an example.

**SEN. TVEIT** asked if the tar on highways is considered hazardous waste. **Mr. Barnard** answered that the EPA is attempting to have it declared as such. If they succeed, the financial impact will be monumental.

**REP. QUILICI** asked if the department has someone in house that can handle this issue, rather than having to hire a consultant. **Mr. Barnard** responded that a consultant will tell how to take care of the waste and that this cost is only a small portion of the expenses.

**REP. FISHER** asked how small. **Mr. Barnard** estimated approximately 10%

**Mr. Schenck** stated that the Executive budget shows the entire cost to be placed under consultant services.

**SEN. TVEIT** asked if the waste management is Federally required. **Mr. Barnard** answered that it is required by the EPA, and the Montana Department of Health and Environmental Science.

**REP. QUILICI** asked if the EPA will aid in the management. **Mr. Barnard** answered that it will only provide general guidance.

**SEN. FORRESTER** asked how many sites require clean-up. **Mr. Barnard** estimated that there is some clean-up required at all 130 maintenance sites.

**SEN. FORRESTER** asked if the program will receive Federal aid. **Mr. Barnard** answered that it will if there is a severe problem encountered.

**Motion:** **REP. QUILICI** moved to accept the request.

**Discussion:**

The subcommittee concurred that this is a large amount for consultant fees and that discretion is necessary.

**REP. QUILICI** requested a more accurate estimate of consultant fees and duties.

**SEN. FORRESTER** requested a sample consultant contract.

**Motion:** **REP. FISHER** moved that this issue be tabled until further information is known. **THE MOTION FAILED.**

**Discussion:**

**Mr. Barnard** stated that he would return with specific information.

**Vote:** REP. QUILICI'S MOTION CARRIED with SEN. TVEIT opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM PAVEMENT PRESERVATION-MODIFICATION:**

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

REP. FISHER inquired about the fuel tax increase. Mr. Barnard stated that the funding is equivalent to a 1.3 cent increase in fuel tax. If there is not a fuel tax increase, the only option will be ie. to use money from the Reconstruction Trust Fund Program.

REP. QUILICI requested the OBPP's view on this issue.

Mr. Dan Gengler, Office of Budget and Program Planning, stated that all modifications were considered when arriving at the recommendation of a 5 cent and cent 5 fuel tax.

Mr. Schenck, in response to REP. FISHER, explained that if the modification was not included in the Executive request for the fuel tax increase, the increase could theoretically be reduced by 1.3 cents.

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. FRITZ moved to accept the modification request. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUDGET ITEM REST AREAS-MODIFICATION:**

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

SEN. FRITZ asked why 10 new rest areas are being proposed when rest areas are being removed on some roads. Mr. Barnard responded that more rest areas are necessary for primary roads and on one interstate (near Bozeman). A rest area between Lincoln and Missoula was removed because of a severe septic problems.

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. FRITZ moved to accept the modification request. THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. QUILICI and REP. FISHER opposing.

**Discussion:**

REP. FISHER stated that she opposed the reinstatement of FTE because it is not fair to other agencies who must undergo the reduction.

REP. QUILICI stated that this program has an 87/13 Federal match.

REP. FISHER responded that taxpayers end up paying in either case.

REP. QUILICI emphasized the importance of good travel systems in this state.

**EQUIPMENT PROGRAM**

**Tape No. 1:B:1200**

**Informational Testimony:**

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBITS 3 and 4

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. TVEIT moved to accept the LFA current level base. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUDGET ITEM GAS AND DIESEL:**

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to accept the request. THE MOTION CARRIED with SEN. TVEIT and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM VACANT POSITIONS:**

**Tape No. 2:A:005**

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. TVEIT moved to reinstate the positions in order to maintain steadiness around the state. THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT-MODIFICATION:**

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

REP. FISHER asked if the use of magnesium chloride for de-icing would cause a decrease in the need for street sweepers. Mr. Barnard answered that it would where the de-icer is used, but that it is used in few places because it is expensive.

SEN. TVEIT asked if the request is for additional sweepers. Mr. Barnard answered that it is.

**STORES INVENTORY**

**Tape No. 2:A:090**

**Informational Testimony:**

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the division. EXHIBIT 5

**BUDGET ITEM ROADWAY STRIPING:**

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to accept the LFA current level base and the request for roadway striping. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUDGET ITEM ICE CONTROL MATERIALS:**

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to accept the LFA current level base and ice control materials. THE MOTION CARRIED with SEN. FRITZ opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM PAVEMENT PRESERVATION:**



Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to accept the LFA current level base and pavement preservation. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

STATE MOTOR POOL

Tape No. 2:A:187

Informational Testimony:

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBIT 6

Motion/Vote: SEN. FRITZ moved the LFA current level base. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM MOTOR POOL FLEET INCREASE-MODIFICATION:

Motion/Vote: SEN. FRITZ moved to accept the request. THE MOTION FAILED with REP. FISHER, SEN. FORRESTER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Tape No. 2:A:300

Informational Testimony:

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBITS 7 and 8

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to accept the LFA current level base. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM RESTORE 5% REDUCTION-MODIFICATION:

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to restore the 94.2 FTE because the department has agreed to hire only the positions necessary. THE MOTION FAILED with SEN. FRITZ, REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM VACANT POSITIONS:

Motion/Vote: SEN. FRITZ moved to restore the funding for the positions. THE MOTION CARRIED with CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM OPERATING COSTS:

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. FRITZ strongly opposed the transition to the metric system.

SEN. FORRESTER asked what has become of the proposal to have metric speed limit signs. Mr. Barnard answered that this has not been resolved in Congress.

REP. FISHER asked what the result would be if the transition is

not made. Mr. Barnard answered that Federal funds would be eliminated.

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to accept the request for operating costs. THE MOTION FAILED with SEN. FRITZ, REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM CAPITAL OUTLAY:

Motion: REP. FISHER moved to fund half the amount requested for each year.

Discussion:

SEN. FORRESTER stated that if right-of-way is not acquired during the window period, Federal funds will be lost. He feels the department should prioritize projects that have been requested by communities for a considerable amount of time.

Vote: THE MOTION FAILED.

Motion/Vote: SEN. FORRESTER moved to accept the full request. THE MOTION FAILED with SEN. FRITZ, REP. FISHER, and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT expressed concern that the projects would not be completed.

Motion/Vote: SEN. TVEIT moved to fund the request at \$550,000 a year. THE MOTION CARRIED with CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM ANALYTIC STEREO PLOTTER-MODIFICATION:

Motion/Vote: REP. FISHER moved to accept the request. THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. QUILICI and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM CONSULTANTS OPTION:

Informational Testimony:

Mr. Gengler stated that consultants were not a recommendation of the Executive budget. Restoration of the 5% personal service reductions was a recommendation.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

REP. QUILICI stated that if this were accepted, the state would be paying twice as much for consultants than to have the work done in house.

BUDGET ITEM RESTORE 5% PERSONAL SERVICE REDUCTIONS:

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to restore half the dollar amount of the reductions. THE MOTION CARRIED with CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM OVERTIME:**

Tape No. 2:B:330

**Informational Testimony:**

Mr. Jim Currie, Department of Transportation, stated that overtime in this program is zero based. A policy decision within the department was made that overtime throughout the department would be budgeted at FY92 base levels. Overtime in this program is inconsistent with the way it was budgeted for the rest of the program. The request is that the overtime estimated by the program's management system be placed in the current level budget. The funding is matched 80/20 with Federal funds.

Mr. Schenck stated that the existing budget is \$2.1 million. The request is for an increase of \$432,628.

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. TVEIT moved to accept the request. THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM AGGREGATE POSITIONS:**

**Informational Testimony:**

Mr. Schenck stated that, since the formulation of the LFA presentation, the program has requested additional funding in personal services for aggregate positions. This would result in an increase of \$238,584 for each year of the biennium.

Mr. Currie explained that a permanent aggregate position is a single position with multiple FTE authority. This is used to streamline the system, so salary levels vary. Paperwork is reduced. The Executive budget system looks at individual FTE, so this is inaccurate for an aggregate position and the department was under-funded.

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

REP. PETERSON asked if this showed up on an audit review. Mr. Currie responded that he does not believe so; the use of a permanent aggregate position is new.

Mr. Gengler explained that this situation is unique to the Department of Transportation. The Executive Office and the LFA budget it differently than if there were separate positions for each FTE. Although the Executive Office does not disagree with the request, Mr. Gengler suggested that the program redesign the position control system so that it is compatible with the budgeting system.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to accept the request. THE

MOTION FAILED.

**GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT**

**Tape No. 2:B:795**

**Informational Testimony:**

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. **EXHIBITS 9 and 10**

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. TVEIT moved the LFA current level base. **THE MOTION CARRIED** unanimously with four members present.

**BUDGET ITEM EQUIPMENT:**

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

SEN. TVEIT asked what equipment is needed. Mr. Galt answered that the program needs such things as scale equipment, light bars for vehicles and radar guns.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to accept the request, stating that the portable scales will keep truckers from being able to bypass weigh stations and that the use of the equipment will generate revenue. **THE MOTION CARRIED** with SEN. FORRESTER opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM VACANT POSITIONS:**

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to restore the 1.03 FTEs. **THE MOTION CARRIED** unanimously with five members present.

**BUDGET ITEM WEIGH STATION COMPUTERIZATION-MODIFICATION:**

**Questions, Responses, and Discussion:**

REP. FISHER asked if this is an overrun in cost. Mr. Galt answered that it is not. Mr. Schenck explained that this is an additional need and was not covered in the initial modification request.

REP. QUILICI asked why the multi-task system is necessary. Mr. Galt explained that the computer needs to handle several tasks at one time, such as weighing and identifying of vehicles.

SEN. TVEIT asked how many FTEs are at the joint Canadian/U.S. port. Mr. Galt answered that there are six and that they live in Shelby.

SEN. TVEIT asked what the cost would be to open the port in Shelby. Mr. Galt responded that if the Coots, Alberta, port were closed, a considerable amount of revenue from permits would be lost because the Shelby port does not facilitate both northbound and southbound traffic as the joint port does.

## Tape No. 3:A:060

**SEN. TVEIT** asked the difference in legal shipment weight between the two countries. **Mr. Galt** answered that Canada allows approximately 15-16% more weight. If a truck is over U.S. weight coming into this country, the individual must purchase a permit which will allow the truck to travel legally to Shelby. The truck is in violation beyond this point and is subject to citation. If there is a southbound vehicle in violation for other reasons, the problem is solved at the border or the truck cannot pass. If a truck is traveling over U.S. weight, the check at the joint port offers the advantage of knowing the necessary information on the truck so that it can be tracked.

**SEN. TVEIT** asked if this type of violation warrants excess fines. **Mr. Galt** answered that the judge is encouraged to fine the individual to the full extent of the law, but that no excessive fine is imposed.

**SEN. TVEIT** asked what the cost of building a weigh station would be. **Mr. Galt** answered that the cost of renovating the Shelby port would be approximately \$70,000. The cost of building a new one would be approximately \$1 million of total taxpayer dollars.

**SEN. TVEIT** asked if the problem is larger with traffic coming into the U.S. than going out and if Shelby can accommodate this. **Mr. Galt** responded that the joint port allows the program to find out that a truck is traveling overweight and can cite and fine it because that port is difficult to avoid. The Shelby port facilitates only southbound traffic and is therefore missing 50% of the traffic. The joint port also keeps the truckers from having to stop twice.

**CHAIRMAN PETERSON** asked if the program has an evaluation process for complaints. **Mr. Galt** answered that it does, but that the complaints come primarily from Canada and that no complaints have come from the U.S. in quite some time.

**CHAIRMAN PETERSON** asked if **Mr. Galt** was involved with the Executive Office in working out the agreement for the joint port. **Mr. Galt** stated that he was intricately involved in the process. He stated that the department did go to the Legislature and believed it had received authority to enter into interstate agreements for weigh stations between states and provinces and that statutes are in place for this.

**REP. QUILICI** confirmed that the department had received this authority.

**SEN. TVEIT** asked if the agreement for this port is Federally based or if it is between Montana and Alberta and is based on statutory authority for the Executive Office. **Mr. Galt** responded that the department has statutory authority to enter into interstate agreements with states and provinces. The department

also has authority to issue overweight permits. To Mr. Galt's knowledge, there was not an executive order issued. There was a contract signed by the governor and by the premier of Alberta. When the Federal government became involved, the 1991 highway act was amended to freeze the weights allowed on trucks. The department went to the delegates in Washington D.C. and asked for specific protection for the weight agreement between the border and Shelby. The department was granted the protection through language.

#### INTERFUND TRANSFER PROGRAM

Tape No. 3:A:480

##### Informational Testimony:

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBIT 11

Motion/Vote: REP. FISHER moved to accept the LFA current level base. THE MOTION CARRIED unanimously with four members present.

#### AERONAUTICS PROGRAM

Tape No. 3:A:508

##### Informational Testimony:

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBITS 12 and 13

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to accept the LFA current level base. THE MOTION CARRIED unanimously with four members present.

##### Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

SEN. TVEIT asked where the West Yellowstone Airport gets its proprietary funding. Mr. Currie answered that it comes partially from taxes collected by Gallatin county and partially from user fees.

##### BUDGET ITEM VACANT POSITIONS:

Motion/Vote: REP. QUILICI moved to reinstate positions 04008, 04010, and 04011. THE MOTION CARRIED unanimously with four members present.

##### Informational Testimony:

Mr. Bill Salisbury, Administrator, Administration, stated that if the airplane mechanic position is not reinstated, the department will have to contract out at a higher cost.

Motion: REP. QUILICI moved to reinstate position 04016.

##### Informational Testimony:

Mr. Marvin Dye, Department of Transportation, stated that the training service manager I position was vacant because the individual had retired. He stated that the public has requested this service.

Motion: REP. QUILICI revised his motion to include reinstatement of position 04002.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion:

REP. FISHER asked where these two positions are located. Mr. Dye answered Helena.

Vote: THE MOTION CARRIED unanimously with four members present.

Discussion:

REP. QUILICI recommended that the subcommittee tour the Department of Transportation.

BUDGET ITEM EXECUTIVE BUDGET REVISION:

Informational Testimony:

Mr. Dye stated that this is for repair and maintenance of beacons, roof, radio equipment, etc.

Motion/Vote: SEN. TVEIT moved to accept the revised request. THE MOTION CARRIED unanimously with four members present.

RAIL & TRANSIT PROGRAM

Tape No. 3:A:810

Motion/Vote: SEN. TVEIT moved to accept the LFA current level base.

Informational Testimony:

Mr. Schenck reviewed the budget for the program. EXHIBITS 14 and 15

BUDGET ITEM RESTORE 5% REDUCTION-MODIFICATION:

Motion/Vote: SEN. TVEIT moved to restore the 1.1 FTE and to allow the program to transfer it to the legal division of the Construction Program. THE MOTION FAILED with REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

BUDGET ITEM REVISED FUNDING:

Informational Testimony:

Mr. Gengler referred to a handout of the revised executive recommendation. EXHIBIT 16. He suggested that the subcommittee

accept the executive budget funding formula, as a methodology. If the three vacant positions are restored, they will be general fund. If they are not restored, the general fund would still be replaced for the positions that are highlighted.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. FISHER moved to accept the executive recommendation of \$95,384 and \$94,752 to be reduced from general fund. THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. QUILICI opposing.

**BUDGET ITEM VACANT POSITIONS:**

**Motion:** REP. FISHER moved to restore two of the three positions and that the two positions be the choice of the program.

**Discussion:**

SEN. TVEIT stated that with only these two positions the Rail Bureau will cease to exist.

Mr. Dye stated that the community has requested the services of this bureau. The positions were vacant because there has been some attempt by certain factions to shut down the bureau.

SEN. TVEIT stated that the bureau is important for its involvement in the McCarty farms case.

Tape No. 3:B:042

**Vote:** THE MOTION FAILED.

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. TVEIT moved to reinstate positions 05011, 05022 and 05034. THE MOTION FAILED with SEN. FORRESTER, REP. FISHER and CHAIRMAN PETERSON opposing.

**Motion/Vote:** REP. FISHER moved to reinstate position 26008. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUDGET ITEMS FTA GRANTS-MODIFICATIONS:**

**Motion/Vote:** REP. QUILICI moved to accept the request for all five grants. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

**BUDGET ITEM URBAN PLANNING PROGRAM-MODIFICATION:**

**Motion/Vote:** SEN. FRITZ moved to accept the modification request. THE MOTION CARRIED with REP. FISHER and REP. QUILICI opposing.


**BUDGET ITEM MCCARTY FARMS LITIGATION-MODIFICATION:**


**Motion/Vote:** SEN. TVEIT moved to accept the modification request. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.



ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 11:55 PM

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
REP. MARY LOU PETERSON, Chair

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
ELAINE BENEDICT, Secretary

MLP/EB

# HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Gen. Gov. & Hwys. SUB-COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE 2/4/93

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Rep. Mary Lou Peterson Chair	X		
Sen. Harry Fritz Vice Chair	X		
Rep. Marjorie Fisher	X		
Sen. Gary Forrester	X		
Rep. Joe Quilici	X		
Sen. Larry Tveit	X		

5401 03 00000

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Program Summary

## Maintenance Program

NB

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	651.88	654.88	614.43	651.88	(37.45)	614.43	651.88	(37.45)
Personal Services	21,358,889	22,836,530	22,590,878	23,758,195	(1,167,317)	22,903,899	24,087,021	(1,183,122)
Operating Expenses	25,655,696	26,830,776	25,574,693	25,435,043	139,650	25,285,373	25,120,323	165,050
Equipment	417,425	187,214	458,588	320,000	138,588	374,565	320,000	54,565
Capital Outlay	177,227	118,400	108,434	108,434	0	108,434	108,434	0
Total Costs	\$47,609,239	\$49,972,920	\$48,732,593	\$49,621,672	(\$889,079)	\$48,672,271	\$49,635,778	(\$963,507)
<u>Fund Sources</u>								
State Revenue Fund	47,609,239	49,972,920	48,643,679	49,532,758	(889,079)	48,583,357	49,546,864	(963,507)
Federal Revenue Fund	0	0	88,914	88,914	0	88,914	88,914	0
Total Funds	\$47,609,239	\$49,972,920	\$48,732,593	\$49,621,672	(\$889,079)	\$48,672,271	\$49,635,778	(\$963,507)

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-136  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A59

Current Level Differences

**5 PERCENT PERSONAL SERVICES REDUCTION**—The Executive eliminated 37.45 FTE in compliance with section 13, House Bill 2 requiring a 5 percent personal services reduction in the 1995 biennium. The positions are included in LFA current level. The Joint Committee recommended that the 5 percent reductions be permanently eliminated from the budget.

Exec. Over(Under) LFA  
 Fiscal 1994 Fiscal 1995

(1,168,616) (1,184,467)

**COUNTY WEED CONTROL**—The Executive Budget includes a 38 percent increase in operating expenses for the county weed control program along state highways. The state contracts with counties for weed control, and increases are anticipated for insurance and chemical prices. The LFA current level provides for a 10 percent increase.

139,650 165,050

**EQUIPMENT**—The Executive Budget includes funding for equipment at a level much higher than an average year, including large amounts for portable radios and other field communications equipment. LFA current level provides for a lower budget for the priority purchase of equipment based on average equipment expenditures in recent years.

138,588 54,565

**MINOR DIFFERENCES (NET)**

1,299 1,345

**TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL DIFFERENCES**

(889,079) (963,507)

**VACANT POSITIONS**—The Joint Committee on Appropriations recommended the elimination of 31.2 FTE for this program that were vacant on December 11, 1992. The positions are non-general fund, and are shown on the attached position reduction listing.

(1,031,054) (1,044,582)

Budget Modifications

**ROADWAY STRIPING**—This modification provides highways special revenue funds for roadway striping to address a deficiency noted by the Federal Highway Administration, that Montana is failing to maintain road striping year around.

1,000,000 1,000,000

**ICE CONTROL MATERIAL**—This modification provides highways special revenue funds to purchase chemical de-icer and washed sand for ice control on state highways. The new ice control materials are required to attain compliance with federal and state air quality regulations in areas designated as "non-attainment" areas.

1,285,091 1,373,391

**HAZARDOUS WASTE**—This modification provides highways special revenue funds to hire a consultant to develop a plan for DOT waste management disposal and to reduce existing hazardous waste materials in the department.

1,000,000 1,000,000

**PAVEMENT PRESERVATION**—This modification provides highways special revenue funds for the expansion of the pavement preservation program, including patching, crack sealing, seal and cover, and pavement

6,500,000 6,500,000

rejuvenation. This modification results in a 13.3 percent expansion of the Maintenance program. Funding for this modification alone requires the equivalent of a 1.3 cent fuel tax increase.

**REST AREAS**—This modification would use highways special revenue funds to maintain 10 new rest areas that DOT plans to add statewide. The modification provides funding for the entire biennium although the rest areas will not likely be open until near the end of the 1995 biennium.

165,000 165,000

**RESTORE 5 PERCENT REDUCTION**—This modification will restore the 37.45 FTE deleted in the Executive Budget in accordance with section 13, House Bill 2.

1,168,615 1,184,476

**Language**

None

EXHIBIT 1

DATE 2-4-93

HB

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

Page 1

Positions Removed by Joint Committee Action  
House Appropriations & Senate Finance and Claims  
January 6, 1993

01-Feb-93

EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 2-4-93  
HB

Position #	Position Description	Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Approp. FTE
		Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
General Fund Positions							
	None						
Sub-Total		0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-General Fund Positions						0.00	
74047	Equipment Operator	\$33,183	\$33,645	1.00		1.00	
74058	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	32,681	33,304	1.00		1.00	
90320	Office Clerk II	3,184	3,189	0.20		0.20	
90381	Laborer	6,013	6,096	0.20		0.20	
94125	Custodian II	23,303	23,334	1.20		1.20	
94130	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	61,715	62,571	1.92		1.92	
97380	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	192,859	195,535	6.00		6.00	
97480	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	128,573	130,357	4.00		4.00	
97580	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	154,288	156,429	4.80		4.80	
97581	Laborer	36,075	36,573	1.20		1.20	
97625	Office Clerk II	8,006	8,006	0.50		0.50	
97680	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	72,966	73,978	2.27		2.27	
97780	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	83,572	84,732	2.60		2.60	
97781	Laborer	6,013	6,096	0.20		0.20	
97827	Administrative Clerk I	8,325	8,352	0.40		0.40	
97880	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	64,287	65,179	2.00		2.00	
97881	Laborer	21,044	21,335	0.70		0.70	
97980	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	51,429	52,143	1.60		1.60	
97981	Laborer	6,013	6,096	0.20		0.20	
98780	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	51,429	52,143	1.60		1.60	
98781	Laborer	6,013	6,096	0.20		0.20	
98880	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	53,358	54,099	1.66		1.66	
98980	Truck Driver, Under 5-Ton	64,287	65,179	2.00		2.00	
Sub-Total		\$1,168,616	\$1,184,467	37.45	0.00	37.45	0.00

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
MAINTENANCE PROGRAM (Continued)

EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 2-4-93

~~68~~

		Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Appro- FTE
Position #	Position Description	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
Non-General Fund Positions (Continued)						0.00	
02003	Painter	34,511	35,239		1.00	1.00	
03020	Laborer	28,135	28,175		1.00	1.00	
03030	Field Maintenance Supervisor	38,170	38,829		1.00	1.00	
03043	Div. Maintenance Supervisor	42,917	43,524		1.00	1.00	
03045	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	31,653	31,698		1.00	1.00	
41001	Administrative Assistant III	24,274	24,309		1.00	1.00	
41014	Custodian II	21,424	21,710		1.00	1.00	
73042	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,319	32,862		1.00	1.00	
73045	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,589		1.00	1.00	
73082	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,758		1.00	1.00	
74009	Equipment Operator I	34,295	34,774		1.00	1.00	
74013	Field Maintenance Supervisor	37,659	38,366		1.00	1.00	
74037	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,681	33,147		1.00	1.00	
74045	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,350	32,862		1.00	1.00	
74072	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,412	32,862		1.00	1.00	
74075	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,908	33,407		1.00	1.00	
75101	Equipment Operator I	32,412	32,458		1.00	1.00	
76014	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,589		1.00	1.00	
77012	Equipment Operator II	34,511	34,992		1.00	1.00	
77024	Div. Maintenance Supervisor	42,564	43,165		1.00	1.00	
78028	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,589		1.00	1.00	
79005	Laborer	5,557	5,640		0.20	0.20	
87023	Equipment Operator II	34,589	35,284		1.00	1.00	
87028	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,589		1.00	1.00	
88012	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	31,398	31,463		1.00	1.00	
88020	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	31,398	31,442		1.00	1.00	
88024	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,589		1.00	1.00	
88033	Equipment Operator I	33,461	33,927		1.00	1.00	
88052	Field Maintenance Supervisor	38,922	39,469		1.00	1.00	
89016	Equipment Operator I	33,183	33,645		1.00	1.00	
89028	Truck Driver, Under 5-ton	32,143	32,768		1.00	1.00	
89032	Equipment Operator I	32,350	32,862		1.00	1.00	
Sub-Total		\$1,031,054	\$1,044,582	0.00	31.20	31.20	0.00
TOTAL		\$2,199,670	\$2,229,049	37.45	31.20	68.65	0.00

02/01/93

C:\DATA\LOTUS\5401\FTERED03.WK1

5401 08 00000

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Program Summary

## Equipment Program

DATE 2-4-93HB

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	122.00	121.00	122.00	122.00	0.00	122.00	122.00	0.00
Personal Services	4,043,691	4,109,662	4,390,450	4,390,483	(33)	4,453,779	4,453,829	(50)
Operating Expenses	4,385,091	4,625,845	5,174,444	4,969,167	205,277	5,319,555	5,105,730	213,825
Equipment	<u>4,907,914</u>	<u>4,905,659</u>	<u>4,899,245</u>	<u>4,899,245</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>4,899,245</u>	<u>4,899,245</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$13,336,698	\$13,641,166	\$14,464,139	\$14,258,895	\$205,244	\$14,672,579	\$14,458,804	\$213,775
<b>Fund Sources</b>								
Proprietary Fund	<u>13,336,698</u>	<u>13,641,166</u>	<u>14,464,139</u>	<u>14,258,895</u>	<u>205,244</u>	<u>14,672,579</u>	<u>14,458,804</u>	<u>213,775</u>
Total Funds	\$13,336,698	\$13,641,166	\$14,464,139	\$14,258,895	\$205,244	\$14,672,579	\$14,458,804	\$213,775

**Page References**

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-139  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A61

**Current Level Differences**

GAS AND DIESEL—The Executive Budget provides a 28 percent increase for gasoline over fiscal 1992 and an 8.5 percent increase for diesel fuel. The LFA current level provides smaller increases of 20 percent for gasoline before inflation and no increase for diesel before inflation (fiscal 1992 was a high year).

154,996 154,996

SUPPLIES—The Executive Budget includes higher amounts for shop tools, parts supplies, and propane. The LFA current level retained shop tool and parts supplies at base levels since there was no historical justification for an increase. LFA current level does not include the executive increase for propane, since it was related to the budget modification for expansion of the pavement preservation program and is not a current level expense.

39,958 39,958

**INFLATION DIFFERENCES**

7,782 16,330

**MINOR DIFFERENCES (NET)**2,508 2,491**TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL DIFFERENCES**205,244 213,775

VACANT POSITIONS—The Joint Committee on Appropriations recommended the elimination of 5.0 FTE for this program that were vacant on December 11, 1992. The positions are proprietary fund supported, and are shown on the attached position reduction listing.

(168,167) (170,697)

**Budget Modifications**

EQUIPMENT REPLACEMENT—This modification will fund 10 street sweepers in fiscal 1994 plus mowers, graders and other equipment in fiscal 1995 from the proprietary fund. This modification is in addition to the \$9.8 million equipment request in the Executive Budget current level.

1,000,000 1,000,000

**Language**

None

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
EQUIPMENT PROGRAM

EXHIBIT 4  
DATE 2-4-93  
HB

Positions Removed by Joint Committee Action  
House Appropriations & Senate Finance and Claims  
January 6, 1993

		Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Approp. FTE
Position #	Position Description	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
All or Partial General Fund Positions							
	None					0.00	
Sub-Total		\$0	\$0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non- General Fund Positions							
43016	Accounting Technician	\$20,970	\$20,999		1.00	1.00	
67006	Division Shop Superintendent	41,858	42,449		1.00	1.00	
67011	Machinist/Mechanic	35,401	36,057		1.00	1.00	
84002	Stockman with Terminal	32,588	33,136		1.00	1.00	
84005	Working Shop Foreman	37,350	38,056		1.00	1.00	
Sub-Total		\$168,167	\$170,697	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00
TOTAL		\$168,167	\$170,697	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00

02/01/93  
C:\DATA\LOTUS\5401\FTERED08.WK1



DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Program Summary

## Stores Inventory

DATE 2-4-93

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Operating Expenses	<u>14,227,849</u>	<u>14,901,886</u>	<u>14,452,195</u>	<u>14,452,195</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14,611,934</u>	<u>14,611,934</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$14,227,849	\$14,901,886	\$14,452,195	\$14,452,195	\$0	\$14,611,934	\$14,611,934	\$0
<u>Fund Sources</u>								
State Revenue Fund	<u>14,227,849</u>	<u>14,901,886</u>	<u>14,452,195</u>	<u>14,452,195</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>14,611,934</u>	<u>14,611,934</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Funds	\$14,227,849	\$14,901,886	\$14,452,195	\$14,452,195	\$0	\$14,611,934	\$14,611,934	\$0

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-141  
Stephens Executive Budget, A63

Current Level Differences

None

Budget Modifications

ROADWAY STRIPING: STORES—See below.

ICE CONTROL MATERIALS: STORES—See below.

PAVEMENT PRESERVATION: STORES—See below.

The three budget modifications listed above are companions to Maintenance program modifications discussed on page 7. They provide purchase authority in the Stores Inventory program to use \$17.7 million highways special revenue funds for roadway striping, ice control, and pavement preservation materials. The materials are then transferred and billed to the Maintenance program. A legislative appropriation is necessary for both the purchase and transfer of the materials under the existing DOT system.

Other Issue

STATEWIDE FUEL USER SYSTEM NETWORK—Former Governor Stephens signed an executive order creating a Statewide Fuel User System Network. The DOT may operate up to 80 percent of the fuel dispensing facilities in the network, and would have to purchase fuel for all users and then be reimbursed for fuel used by other governmental entities. The DOT will need additional spending authority in the Stores Program to purchase the additional fuel required when the network is initiated. The amount of the additional authority needed has not yet been determined.

Exec. Over(Under) LFA  
Fiscal 1994 Fiscal 1995

1,000,000 1,000,000

1,285,091 1,373,391

6,500,000 6,500,000

DATE 2-4-93HB

5401 07 00000

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## State Motor Pool

## Program Summary

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	5.00	5.00	5.00	5.00	0.00	5.00	5.00	0.00
Personal Services	155,522	149,900	162,244	162,243	1	164,481	164,480	1
Operating Expenses	240,303	241,929	287,401	287,401	0	317,428	317,428	0
Equipment	<u>333,776</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>443,300</u>	<u>443,300</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>284,800</u>	<u>284,800</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$729,601	\$391,829	\$892,945	\$892,944	\$1	\$766,709	\$766,708	\$1
<u>Fund Sources</u>								
Proprietary Fund	<u>729,601</u>	<u>391,829</u>	<u>892,945</u>	<u>892,944</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>766,709</u>	<u>766,708</u>	<u>1</u>
Total Funds	\$729,601	\$391,829	\$892,945	\$892,944	\$1	\$766,709	\$766,708	\$1

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-137  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A60

Current Level Differences

## MINOR DIFFERENCES

Budget Modifications

MOTOR POOL FLEET INCREASE—This modification provides motor pool proprietary funds to purchase 20 vehicles to expand the size of the motor pool fleet. Funding will be by an inter-entity loan from the highways special revenue fund and be repaid by a surcharge on rental rates paid by state agencies that use the vehicles. A recent legislative audit recommendation called for reduction of the motor pool fleet to its present size, and the July 1992 special session reduced the program equipment appropriation to accomplish this reduction.

Language

None

Exec. Over	(Under)	LFA
Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	

1

1

228,000

0

5401 02 00000

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Construction Program

## Program Summary

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	913.94	898.24	796.59	890.79	(94.20)	796.59	890.79	(94.20)
Personal Services	27,905,333	28,382,179	28,720,119	30,735,526	(2,015,407)	28,804,917	30,823,069	(2,018,152)
Operating Expenses	162,522,605	180,060,563	178,895,202	176,892,625	2,002,577	180,754,267	178,746,385	2,007,882
Equipment	716,203	774,285	858,040	858,040	0	683,220	683,220	0
Capital Outlay	4,526,381	3,944,800	6,150,000	5,400,000	750,000	6,150,000	5,400,000	750,000
Grants	44,938	0	100,000	100,000	0	100,000	100,000	0
Debt Service	<u>255</u>	<u>3,069</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$195,715,717	\$213,164,896	\$214,723,361	\$213,986,191	\$737,170	\$216,492,404	\$215,752,674	\$739,730
<b>Fund Sources</b>								
State Revenue Fund	59,981,204	67,292,235	56,353,994	55,624,191	729,803	56,531,664	55,799,315	732,349
Federal Revenue Fund	<u>135,734,513</u>	<u>145,872,661</u>	<u>158,369,367</u>	<u>158,362,000</u>	<u>7,367</u>	<u>159,960,740</u>	<u>159,953,359</u>	<u>7,381</u>
Total Funds	\$195,715,717	\$213,164,896	\$214,723,361	\$213,986,191	\$737,170	\$216,492,404	\$215,752,674	\$739,730

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-133  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A57

Current Level Differences

**5 PERCENT PERSONAL SERVICES REDUCTION**—The Executive eliminated 94.2 FTE in compliance with section 13, House Bill 2 requiring a 5 percent personal services reduction in the 1995 biennium. The positions are included in LFA current level. The Joint Committee recommended that the 5 percent reductions be permanently eliminated from the budget.

(2,015,491) (2,018,244)

**OPERATING COSTS**—The Executive Budget is \$4.0 million higher for operating expenses. Although the 1995 biennium construction plan shows only a modest increase over fiscal 1992 levels, and the DOT Construction Management System projected a need for 25.45 fewer FTE in the 1995 biennium, the Executive provides for an \$8.2 million increase over fiscal 1992 expenditures in construction administrative and overhead operating costs (excluding contractor payments) for the 1995 biennium. The lower LFA current level provides for a significant increase in operating expenses, but is still \$4.0 million below the Executive Budget.

2,000,000 2,000,000

**CAPITAL OUTLAY**—The Executive Budget includes more for the purchase of right-of-way for construction projects in the 1995 biennium than LFA current level. The LFA current level provides funding for right-of-way based on the budgeted construction plan, using a formula for estimating costs provided by the department.

750,000 750,000

INFLATION DIFFERENCES

2,577 7,882

MINOR DIFFERENCES (NET)84 92TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL DIFFERENCES737,170 739,730

**VACANT POSITIONS**—The Joint Committee on Appropriations recommended the elimination of 48.0 FTE for this program that were vacant on December 11, 1992. The positions are non-general fund, and are shown on the attached position reduction listing.

(1,522,542) (1,526,619)

Budget Modifications

**CITY PARK REST AREAS**—This budget modification would expand the City Park Rest Area program which began as a budget modification in the 1993 biennium. This modification would use highways special revenue funds to expand the program \$300,000 per year to supplement the \$200,000 per year in current level. The DOT contracts with localities to upgrade city parks as rest areas along major highways rather than constructing more expensive new rest areas.

300,000 300,000

**ANALYTIC STEREO PLOTTER**—This modification uses highways special revenue funds to purchase a third analytical stereo plotter for mapping and cross-section data.

225,000 0

RESTORE 5 PERCENT REDUCTION: CONSULTANTS OPTION—This modification is presented by the Executive as an alternative to the 5 percent personal services restoration modification discussed below. Using 25 percent highways special revenue and 75 percent federal funds, this modification would use contracted services for design work in lieu of restoring the 94.2 FTE removed as part of the 5 percent personal services reduction, with the intent that if the FTE were not restored, this option would be needed to continue the current level construction plan.

4,030,982 4,036,488

EXHIBIT 7

DATE 2-4-93

HB

RESTORE 5 PERCENT REDUCTION—This modification would restore the 94.2 FTE deleted in the Executive Budget in accordance with section 13, House Bill 2. See LFA Vol. I, page A-120.

2,015,491 2,018,244

### Other Issues

OVERTIME—The Executive Budget may be revised to include a larger request for overtime costs.

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM

Page 1

Positions Removed by Joint Committee Action  
House Appropriations & Senate Finance and Claims  
January 6, 1993

01-Feb-93

EXHIBIT 8  
DATE 2-1-93

HB

		Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non--Approp. FTE
Position #	Position Description	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
General Fund Positions							
	None						
Sub--Total		0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non--General Fund Positions						0.00	
40061	Civil Engineer Spec. IV	\$35,886	\$35,939	1.00		1.00	
54015	Materials Lab Technician II	24,274	24,309	1.00		1.00	
55026	Materials Lab Technician II	22,552	22,584	1.00		1.00	
55068	Accounting Clerk	19,541	19,568	1.00		1.00	
60032	Program Assistant II	22,552	22,584	1.00		1.00	
60047	Right--of--way Supervisor II	36,565	36,617	1.00		1.00	
90812	Planning Technician I	44,491	44,552	2.00		2.00	
93200	Drafter II	21,851	21,881	1.00		1.00	
94030	Materials Lab Aide II	35,628	35,675	2.00		2.00	
94032	Materials Lab Aide II	11,134	11,149	0.50		0.50	
94035	Accounting Clerk	9,102	9,115	0.50		0.50	
94069	Research Aide II	12,262	12,279	0.59		0.59	
95055	Drafter I	1,954	1,956	0.10		0.10	
95120	Administrative Clerk I	13,789	13,808	0.81		0.81	
95133	Survey Aide III	89,069	89,188	5.00		5.00	
95232	Materials Lab Aide II	22,624	22,654	1.27		1.27	
95261	Engineering Technician II	94,753	94,884	3.75		3.75	
95333	Survey Aide II	114,543	114,695	6.43		6.43	
95360	Engineering Technician II	24,274	24,309	1.00		1.00	
95421	Materials Lab Aide II	65,442	65,529	3.59		3.59	
95430	Administrative Clerk I	17,024	17,047	1.00		1.00	
95520	Office Clerk II	15,924	15,945	1.00		1.00	
95533	Survey Aide II	172,507	172,741	8.30		8.30	
95560	Engineering Technician II	7,282	7,292	0.30		0.30	
95633	Materials Lab Aide II	11,333	11,349	0.58		0.58	
95733	Survey Aide II	261,825	262,182	12.15		12.15	
95735	Engineering Technician II	45,480	45,541	2.40		2.40	
95930	Administrative Clerk I	12,768	12,785	0.75		0.75	
95933	Survey Aide II	431,058	431,648	19.11		19.11	
95960	Engineering Technician I	53,642	53,715	2.25		2.25	
97126	Typist I	7,962	7,972	0.50		0.50	
97133	Materials Lab Aide II	55,781	55,855	3.06		3.06	
97233	Materials Lab Aide II	129,701	129,878	5.75		5.75	
98099	Engineering Technician III	70,918	71,019	2.51		2.51	
Sub--Total		\$2,015,491	\$2,018,244	94.20	0.00	94.20	0.00

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
CONSTRUCTION PROGRAM (Continued)

DATE 2-4-93

MB

Position #	Position Description	Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Appro FTE
		Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
Non-General Fund Positions (Continued)						0.00	
30001	Administrative Assistant I	5,607	5,616		0.30	0.30	
30002	Civil Engineer Spec.	28,004	28,004		0.70	0.70	
32009	Designer II	28,254	28,295		1.00	1.00	
32028	Designer I	26,183	26,220		1.00	1.00	
32024	Design Technician I	22,552	22,584		1.00	1.00	
32035	Designer III	39,659	39,717		1.00	1.00	
32037	Designer II	28,254	28,295		1.00	1.00	
32039	Designer II	28,254	28,295		1.00	1.00	
32044	Designer I	26,183	26,220		1.00	1.00	
32071	Drafter II	20,970	20,999		1.00	1.00	
32075	Designer I	25,454	25,490		1.00	1.00	
32076	Designer III	36,801	36,854		1.00	1.00	
33004	Cultural Env. Spec.	32,664	32,710		1.00	1.00	
33008	Civil Engineer Spec.	42,670	42,923		1.00	1.00	
36003	Designer II	28,254	28,295		1.00	1.00	
36014	Traffic Engineer Spec.	39,334	39,392		1.00	1.00	
36032	Civil Engineer Spec.	35,886	35,939		1.00	1.00	
36044	Designer III	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
36045	Designer III	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
39008	Designer III	32,800	33,097		1.00	1.00	
39024	Designer III	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
39025	Designer III	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
40046	Designer III	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
40055	Civil Engineer Spec.	36,989	37,042		1.00	1.00	
40056	Information Systems Specialist	32,664	32,837		1.00	1.00	
50029	Civil Engineer Spec.	38,602	38,657		1.00	1.00	
50042	Civil Engineer Spec.	38,602	38,858		1.00	1.00	
53015	Materials Lab Technician II	27,990	28,029		1.00	1.00	
54064	Designer III	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
55010	Engineering Technician I	22,552	22,584		1.00	1.00	
55209	Accounting Clerk	24,042	24,075		1.00	1.00	
57220	Accounting Technician	23,421	23,455		1.00	1.00	
59209	Accounting Clerk	21,168	21,198		1.00	1.00	
59219	Purchase/Supply Assistant	25,450	25,486		1.00	1.00	
60003	Career Executive Assignment	46,372	46,440		1.00	1.00	
60024	Design Technician II	25,144	25,179		1.00	1.00	
60039	Right-of-Way Supervisor II	47,793	48,175		1.00	1.00	
60048	Designer II	31,306	31,351		1.00	1.00	
60052	Right-of-Way Agent IV	33,142	33,189		1.00	1.00	
60056	Review Appraiser	33,693	33,741		1.00	1.00	
60072	Review Appraiser	33,693	33,741		1.00	1.00	
60078	Utility Agent	31,116	31,160		1.00	1.00	
80021	Engineering Technician III	36,142	36,420		1.00	1.00	
80027	Civil Engineer Specialist	32,961	33,008		1.00	1.00	
91258	Civil Engineer Specialist	61,092	61,180		2.00	2.00	
91858	Civil Engineer Specialist	30,546	30,590		1.00	1.00	
92468	Civil Engineer Specialist	77,003	77,739		2.00	2.00	
Sub-Total		\$1,522,542	\$1,526,619	0.00	48.00	48.00	0.00
TOTAL		\$3,538,033	\$3,544,863	94.20	48.00	142.20	0.00

02/01/93

C:\DATA\LOTUS\5401\FTERED02.WK1

5401 22 00000								
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION								
Program Summary								
	Current Level	Current Level	Executive	LFA	Difference	Executive	LFA	Difference
Budget Item	Fiscal 1992	Fiscal 1993	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Fiscal 1995	Fiscal 1995
FTE	112.03	111.03	112.03	112.03	0.00	112.03	112.03	0.00
Personal Services	3,046,578	3,320,546	3,454,897	3,420,741	34,156	3,478,564	3,440,409	38,155
Operating Expenses	625,929	669,779	691,823	691,823	0	702,710	702,710	0
Equipment	191,369	41,700	62,250	33,200	29,050	40,750	11,700	29,050
Capital Outlay	0	98,500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total Costs	\$3,863,877	\$4,130,525	\$4,208,970	\$4,145,764	\$63,206	\$4,222,024	\$4,154,819	\$67,205
Fund Sources								
State Revenue Fund	3,715,304	4,130,525	4,192,970	4,129,764	63,206	4,222,024	4,154,819	67,205
Federal Revenue Fund	148,572	0	16,000	16,000	0	0	0	0
Total Funds	\$3,863,877	\$4,130,525	\$4,208,970	\$4,145,764	\$63,206	\$4,222,024	\$4,154,819	\$67,205

**Page References**

LFA Budget Analysis, A-142  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A64

**Current Level Differences**

PERSONAL SERVICES—The Executive Budget is higher, but has been revised to agree with LFA current level.

EQUIPMENT—The Executive budget is higher for equipment as it includes funding for law enforcement equipment.

**TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL DIFFERENCES**

VACANT POSITIONS—The Joint Committee on Appropriations recommended the elimination of <sup>1.03</sup> ~~1.03~~ FTE that were vacant on December 11, 1992. The positions are highways special revenue funded, and are shown on page 9 of the attached position reduction listing.

**Budget Modifications**

WEIGH STATION COMPUTERIZATION—This modification provides for the replacement of the operating system software in the automated weigh stations, using an 80/20 percent state/federal match, including \$14,000 state special revenue funds. This is a continuation of an automation project that has spanned the last two bienniums, including a budget modification in the 1993 biennium to complete the project.

**Language**

None

**Exec. Over (Under) LFA**  
**Fiscal 1994 Fiscal 1995**

34,156 38,155

29,050 29,050

63,206 67,205

(31,016) (31,059)

70,000 0

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
GROSS VEHICLE WEIGHT (GVW) PROGRAM

EXHIBIT 10  
DATE 2-4-93  
HB

Positions Removed by Joint Committee Action  
House Appropriations & Senate Finance and Claims  
January 6, 1993

Position #	Position Description	Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Approp. FTE
		Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
All or Partial General Fund Positions							
	None					0.00	
Sub-Total		\$0	\$0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Non-General Fund Positions							
22097	GVW Compliance Officer I	\$30,580	\$30,623		1.00	1.00	
92225	Office Clerk II	436	436		0.03	0.03	
Sub-Total		\$31,016	\$31,059	0.00	1.03	1.03	0.00
TOTAL		\$31,016	\$31,059	0.00	1.03	1.03	0.00

02/01/93  
C:\DATA\LOTUS\5401\FTERED08.WK1



5401 11 00000

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
Program Summary

Interfund Transfers Program

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
Transfers	<u>11,417,089</u>	<u>17,149,771</u>	<u>12,702,221</u>	<u>14,625,413</u>	<u>(1,923,192)</u>	<u>17,270,632</u>	<u>15,691,130</u>	<u>1,579,502</u>
Total Costs	\$11,417,089	\$17,149,771	\$12,702,221	\$14,625,413	(\$1,923,192)	\$17,270,632	\$15,691,130	\$1,579,502
<u>Fund Sources</u>								
State Revenue Fund	<u>11,417,089</u>	<u>17,149,771</u>	<u>12,702,221</u>	<u>14,625,413</u>	<u>(1,923,192)</u>	<u>17,270,632</u>	<u>15,691,130</u>	<u>1,579,502</u>
Total Funds	\$11,417,089	\$17,149,771	\$12,702,221	\$14,625,413	(\$1,923,192)	\$17,270,632	\$15,691,130	\$1,579,502

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-140  
Stephens Executive Budget, A62

Current Level Differences

This program provides appropriation authority to transfer sufficient funds from the highways special revenue fund to the RTF fund for budgeted RTF projects. The Executive Budget has been revised to concur with the LFA current level.

Budget Modifications

None

Other Issues

None

Exec. Over(Under) LFA  
Fiscal 1994 Fiscal 1995

(1,923,192) (1,579,502)

5401 40 00000

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## Aeronautics Program

## Program Summary

Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	10.24	10.99	10.24	10.24	0.00	10.24	10.24	0.00
Personal Services	347,681	379,801	384,352	383,457	895	390,104	389,212	892
Operating Expenses	211,596	356,149	256,693	256,693	0	260,561	260,560	1
Equipment	8,006	18,000	8,012	8,012	0	8,012	8,013	(1)
Grants	5,000	10,000	5,000	5,000	0	5,000	5,000	0
Transfers	<u>7,100</u>	<u>10,000</u>	<u>17,601</u>	<u>17,601</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>17,601</u>	<u>17,601</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$579,385	\$773,950	\$671,658	\$670,763	\$895	\$681,278	\$680,386	\$892
<u>Fund Sources</u>								
State Revenue Fund	486,279	631,924	507,240	506,345	895	516,076	515,184	892
Federal Revenue Fund	26,190	73,592	91,800	91,800	0	91,800	91,800	0
Proprietary Fund	<u>66,915</u>	<u>68,434</u>	<u>72,618</u>	<u>72,618</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>73,402</u>	<u>73,402</u>	<u>0</u>
Total Funds	\$579,385	\$773,950	\$671,658	\$670,763	\$895	\$681,278	\$680,386	\$892

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-144  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A65

Current Level Differences

## MINOR DIFFERENCES (NET)

VACANT POSITIONS—The Joint Committee on Appropriations recommended the elimination of 2.99 FTE that were vacant on December 11, 1992. The positions are non-general fund, and are shown on page 11 of the attached position reduction listing.

EXECUTIVE BUDGET REVISION—The Racicot Executive Budget has been revised to request additional funding that is not in either the Executive or LFA current level shown above. Funding for the increase is from state special revenue funds.

Budget Modifications

None

Language

None

Exec. Over(Under) LFA  
 Fiscal 1994 Fiscal 1995

895 892

(112,604) (115,132)

32,500 39,500

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
AERONAUTICS PROGRAM

EXHIBIT 13  
DATE 2-4-93

Positions Removed by Joint Committee Action  
House Appropriations & Senate Finance and Claims ~~HB~~  
January 6, 1993

Position #	Position Description	Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Approp. FTE
		Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
<i>All or Partial General Fund Positions</i>							
	None					0.00	
Sub-Total		\$0	\$0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<i>Non-General Fund Positions</i>							
04002	Training Service Manager I	\$49,010	\$50,310		1.00	1.00	
04008	Airport Manager	18,092	18,112		0.50	0.50	
04010	Firefighter Supervisor	8,241	8,251		0.39	0.39	
04011	Administrative Clerk I	1,474	1,477		0.10	0.10	
04016	Airplane Mechanic	35,787	36,982		1.00	1.00	
Sub-Total		\$112,604	\$115,132	0.00	2.99	2.99	0.00
TOTAL		\$112,604	\$115,132	0.00	2.99	2.99	0.00

02/01/93  
C:\DATA\LOTUS\5401\FTERED40.WK1

5401 50 00000 DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Program Summary			Rail & Transit Program			DATE 2-4-93		
Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	22.60	13.00	21.50	22.60	(1.10)	21.50	22.60	(1.10)
Personal Services	692,373	382,911	748,799	793,165	(44,366)	751,337	795,767	(44,430)
Operating Expenses	200,190	154,920	220,472	216,784	3,688	214,330	210,142	4,188
Equipment	595	500	0	0	0	0	0	0
Grants	914,930	704,684	1,007,309	1,007,309	0	991,327	991,327	0
Total Costs	\$1,808,090	\$1,243,015	\$1,976,580	\$2,017,258	(\$40,678)	\$1,956,994	\$1,997,236	(\$40,242)
<u>Fund Sources</u>								
General Fund	310,782	300,558	36,070	230,878	(194,808)	36,157	230,811	(194,654)
State Revenue Fund	162,601	71,250	314,611	255,679	58,932	314,715	255,870	58,845
Federal Revenue Fund	1,334,706	871,207	1,625,899	1,530,701	95,198	1,606,122	1,510,555	95,567
Total Funds	\$1,808,090	\$1,243,015	\$1,976,580	\$2,017,258	(\$40,678)	\$1,956,994	\$1,997,236	(\$40,242)

Page References

LFA Budget Analysis (Vol. I), A-146  
 Stephens Executive Budget, A66

Current Level Differences

5 PERCENT PERSONAL SERVICES REDUCTION—The Executive Budget eliminated 1.1 FTE in compliance with section 13, House Bill 2 requiring a 5 percent personal services reduction in the 1995 biennium. The positions are included in LFA current level. See the attached position reduction listing, page 13.

FUNDING—The Executive Budget replaces the majority of general fund with highways special revenue funds. The LFA current level retains the 1993 biennium funding formula, with minor adjustments due to special session funding switches in the program.\*

INFLATION DIFFERENCESTOTAL CURRENT LEVEL DIFFERENCES

VACANT POSITIONS—The Joint Committee on Appropriations recommended the elimination of 4.0 FTE that were vacant on December 11, 1992. Three of the positions are funded by general fund. The positions are shown on page 13 of the attached position reduction listing.

\* REVISED FUNDING—The Racicot Executive Budget has submitted a revision in the levels of funding. The revision includes more general fund than the original Executive Budget, but is still lower than LFA current level. The revised allocation would reduce general fund by \$190,136 below LFA current level.

Budget Modifications

FTA SECTION 3 GRANT—This budget modification provides Federal Transit Administration (FTA) funds to continue a fiscal 1993 budget amendment to construct a transit facility on the Fort Peck Indian Reservation and to place approximately 20 public transit vehicles in rural communities.

FTA SECTION 8 GRANT—FTA funds in this modification would be used for transit planning in Billings, Great Falls, and Missoula to comply with federal metropolitan planning requirements.

FTA SECTION 18 GRANT—FTA funds in this modification would be used to assist rural communities with operating funds for transit operations.

FTA SECTION 26 (A) (2) GRANT—FTA funds in this modification are new grants from the ISTEA to be used to provide planning funds to DOT to accomplish non-urbanized transit planning.

FTA SECTION 16 (B) (2) GRANT—FTA funds in this modification will provide increased funding for capital assistance to private, nonprofit organizations for the purchase of equipment for elderly and disabled persons.

Exec. Over (Under) LFA  
 Fiscal 1994 Fiscal 1995

(44,361) (44,426)

— —

3,683 4,184

(40,678) (40,242)

(133,197) (133,753)

(95,384) (94,572)  
 95,384 94,752

449,609 0

107,022 107,022

261,870 261,870

44,806 44,806

67,398 67,398

URBAN PLANNING PROGRAM—This modification would provide funds to comply with the ISTEA expanded federal metropolitan planning organization (MPO) requirements. It will fund 1.0 FTE in DOT for coordination and provide grant funds to Billings, Great Falls, and Missoula MPOs. The modification is funded by an 87/13 percent federal/state match.

281,986 282,023

MCCARTY FARMS LITIGATION—A general fund biennial appropriation of \$100,000 is requested to continue the McCarty Farms/Staggars 229 litigation. The legislature appropriated \$180,000 in the 1993 biennium for this litigation of which \$14,517 was reduced in the January 1992 special session. It is the legislature's intent that all of the costs which have occurred from this suit be recovered on final settlement and deposited in the general fund.

100,000 0

RESTORE 5 PERCENT REDUCTION—This modification would restore the 1.1 FTE deleted in the Executive Budget current level in accordance with section 13, House Bill 2.

44,361 44,426

Language

None

EXHIBIT

14

DATE 2-4-93

HB

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION  
RAIL AND TRANSIT PROGRAM

EXHIBIT 15  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

Positions Removed by Joint Committee Action  
House Appropriations & Senate Finance and Claims  
January 6, 1993

Position #	Position Description	Total Personal Services		FTE		Total FTE Removed	Non-Approp. FTE
		Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Removed by 5% Reduction	Removed by Being Vacant		
<i>All or Partial General Fund Positions</i>							
05011	Planning Manager I	\$49,717	\$50,077		1.00	1.00	
05022	Railroad Operations Officer	20,418	20,447		1.00	1.00	
05034	Economist II	33,071	33,119		1.00	1.00	
Sub-Total		\$103,206	\$103,643	0.00	3.00	3.00	0.00
<i>Non-General Fund Positions</i>							
70009	Attorney Specialist III	\$42,492	\$42,554	1.00		1.00	
92601	Research Aide III	1,869	1,872	0.10		0.10	
26008	Planner III	29,991	30,110		1.00	1.00	
Sub-Total		\$74,352	\$74,536	1.10	1.00	2.10	0.00
TOTAL		\$177,558	\$178,179	1.10	4.00	5.10	0.00

02/01/93  
C:\DATA\LOTUS\5401\FTERED40.WK1

RAIL & TRANSIT PROGRAM  
GF/SSR/FED FUND SWITCH

EXHIBIT 16

DATE 2-4-93

HB

BUDGET ITEM	FY94	FY95	% GF	% SSR	% FED	GENERAL FUND		STATE SPECIAL		FEDERAL	
	FY94	FY95	% GF	% SSR	% FED	FY94	FY95	FY94	FY95	FY94	FY95
LFA BASE:											
05013 Admin Officer I (support)	36,304	36,563	100%	0%	0%	36,304	36,563	0	0	0	0
05035 Div. Administrator (support)	48,003	48,387	100%	0%	0%	48,003	48,387	0	0	0	0
05011 Planning Mngr I (rail)	49,714	50,074	100%	0%	0%	49,714	50,074	0	0	0	0
05022 RR Op. Officer (rail)	20,418	20,447	100%	0%	0%	20,418	20,447	0	0	0	0
05034 Economist I (rail)	33,071	33,119	100%	0%	0%	33,071	33,119	0	0	0	0
05012 Planner IV (rail)	34,752	34,802	30%	0%	70%	10,426	10,441	0	0	24,326	24,361
SECTION 3 (transit)	8,290	8,290	100%	0%	0%	8,290	8,290	0	0	0	0
SECTION 16b2 (transit)	12,043	12,043	100%	0%	0%	12,043	12,043	0	0	0	0
SECTION 26a2 (transit)	11,201	11,201	100%	0%	0%	11,201	11,201	0	0	0	0
RESIDUAL	1,408	246	100%	0%	0%	1,408	246	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	255,204	255,172				230,878	230,811	0	0	24,326	24,361

**EB RECOMMENDATION (revised):**

05013 Admin Officer I (support)	36,304	36,563	20%	80%	0%	7,261	7,313	29,043	29,250	0	0
05035 Div. Administrator (supp)	48,003	48,387	20%	80%	0%	9,601	9,677	38,402	38,710	0	0
05011 Planning Mngr I (rail)	49,714	50,074	100%	0%	0%	49,714	50,074	0	0	0	0
05022 RR Op. Officer (rail)	20,418	20,447	100%	0%	0%	20,418	20,447	0	0	0	0
05034 Economist I (rail)	33,071	33,119	100%	0%	0%	33,071	33,119	0	0	0	0
05012 Planner IV (rail)	34,752	34,802	30%	0%	70%	10,426	10,441	0	0	24,326	24,361
SECTION 3 (transit)	8,290	8,290	0%	100%	0%	0	0	8,290	8,290	0	0
SECTION 16b2 (transit)	12,043	12,043	0%	100%	0%	0	0	12,043	12,043	0	0
SECTION 26a2 (transit)	11,201	11,201	0%	100%	0%	0	0	11,201	11,201	0	0
RESIDUAL	5,004	4,988	100%	0%	0%	5,004	4,988	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	258,800	259,914				135,494	136,059	98,980	99,494	24,326	24,361

**DIFFERENCE:**

05013 Admin Officer I (support)	0	0				(29,043)	(29,250)	29,043	29,250	0	0
05035 Div. Administrator (support)	0	0				(38,402)	(38,710)	38,402	38,710	0	0
05011 Planning Mngr I (rail)	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0
05022 RR Op. Officer (rail)	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0
05034 Economist I (rail)	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0
05012 Planner IV (rail)	0	0				0	0	0	0	0	0
SECTION 3 (transit)	0	0				(8,290)	(8,290)	8,290	8,290	0	0
SECTION 16b2 (transit)	0	0				(12,043)	(12,043)	12,043	12,043	0	0
SECTION 26a2 (transit)	0	0				(11,201)	(11,201)	11,201	11,201	0	0
RESIDUAL	3,595	4,742				3,595	4,742	0	0	0	0
TOTAL	3,595	4,742				(95,384)	(94,752)	98,980	99,494	0	0

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
VISITOR REGISTER

GEN. GOV. & HWYS. SUBCOMMITTEE DATE 2/4/93  
DEPARTMENT(S) Transportation DIVISION

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	REPRESENTING	
Bill Salisbury	MDT	
Jim Currie	MDT	
Tom Barnard	MDT	
MARV DYE	MDT	
Dave GALT	MDT	

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT  
FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.