MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 53rd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Call to Order: By Rep. Ernest Bergsagel, Chairman, on February 19, 1993, at 8:00 AM

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Ernest Bergsagel, Chair (R)

Sen. Bob Hockett, Vice Chair (D)

Rep. Francis Bardanouve (D)

Sen. Ethel Harding (R)

Sen. Eleanor Vaughn (D)

Rep. Tom Zook (R)

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Jim Haubein, Legislative Fiscal Analyst

Jane Hamman, Office of Budget & Program Planning

Sandra Boggs, Committee Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and

discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:

Hearing: DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND HUMAN

SERVICES; DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION;

HB 6; HB 7; AND HB 12

Executive Action: UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS AND HUMAN SERVICES
Tape No. 1:A:007

<u>Informational Testimony</u>: Rick Day, Director, Department of Corrections and Human Services, spoke concerning their request for \$6.8 million in bonding authority for preferred construction projects at correctional facilities. **EXHIBIT 1**.

Mr. Day informed the committee that the construction proposed for the Rothe dormitory would bring it into compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. The proposed laundry facility at Montana State Prison would consolidate the three laundries at Boulder, Warm Springs and the one at the prison. Inmate labor could be used for that construction. Construction planned for the infirmary would expand the facility to allow quicker and better

storage for pharmaceuticals.

Mr. Day stated that an audit conducted after the prison riots noted that improvements should be made in some of the areas proposed for construction in this request.

Mr. Day proposed that the current dairy dorms or huts be replaced. The dorms have been temporary housing for some time, and this construction will cut down on contraband and security problems. There will be a complete upgrade of the fence system. A kitchen is proposed for construction on the lowside of the prison. The committee has heard testimony on the need for a bus barn and vocational education building. The industries need to be expanded within the compound, especially in the high security section. This project is critical to the level of population decrease recommendations for the prison. The expansion would also address the roof condensation problem on the D dorm. There may be funds available for this project from insurance claims or the architectural firm that constructed the building. The high security office space would be remodeled to make it more accessible to staff. A dry room will be constructed in the shower section to control contraband problems. The lowside dorms need remodeling of the bathrooms; currently there are thirteen inmates per bathroom.

Mr. Day stated that \$260,000 will be used to complete some minor upgrades at the Women's Correctional Center in Warm Springs. The projects will include visitation rooms and medical facilities.

Mr. Day stated that the \$6.8 million bonding request includes the \$1.3 million already considered by the committee. The DCHS feels that these projects can be completed with \$6.8 million if inmate labor is authorized for use on the projects. If inmate labor is not authorized, the projects will have to be done in priority order until funds run out.

Questions, Responses, and Discussion: REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE stated that if a bill is introduced that spends \$6.8 million on the mens prison after there has been no authorization to build a new women's facility, there will be an uproar. He stated that some of these projects are desirable, but are not high priorities. The DCHS is asking for too much. The laundry facility is a critical project, but he fears bringing this to the House of Representatives after the new Women's Correctional Facility was not funded. Mr. Day stated that the DCHS position is that the difference between the two projects has nothing to do with the mens and women's issues. There is now a large complex that needs to be maintained and upgraded to be run properly. He believes the state should maintain current responsibilities before building a new facility. He is not opposed to building a facility for women, he just believes the state should know exactly what is needed before the facility is built.

SEN. BOB HOCKETT asked if the projects were prioritized. Mr. Day

stated that they are not prioritized because the maximum population placed in the prison will affect which projects are most important.

Mr. Day stated that DCHS would like to have the flexibility to use \$300,000 in revenue from the ranch to purchase equipment.

CHAIRMAN ERNEST BERGSAGEL stated that no executive action would be taken today on this bonding authority request. Executive action will be scheduled for sometime after transmittal.

SEN. ELEANOR VAUGHN asked if the remodelling proposed for the women's facility will satisfy some of the lawsuits the state is being threatened with. Mr. Day stated that there is still a need for a new women's facility. The remodelling will address the primary areas that the lawsuits are concerned with, including the visitation areas and the medical care areas. DCHS wants to avoid a huge investment in this facility if the facility will not suit future needs. There are proposals to place a maximum population on the women's facility too. The population may be as low as 30 if the community treatment initiative is implemented.

Jane Hamman, Office of Budget and Program Planning, informed the committee that when the DCHS originally made proposals for construction of the Women's facility and for projects at the Men's facility, they were made with the assumption that current correctional trends would continue. The recently proposed community treatment initiative is a new direction for corrections in Montana. The initiative calls for downsizing facilities and a long-term reduction in personnel. Now DCHS is proposing a revision in its budget to reflect the new direction, and committee action will reflect the change in direction.

SEN. HOCKETT asked if the prison would be affected if the Finance and Claims Committee eliminates Galen. Mr. Day stated that the prison would not be directly affected.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked if the Institutions Subcommittee added personnel to DCHS for the community treatment initiative. Mr. Day stated that the Institutions Subcommittee has reduced personnel because DCHS can rely on private nonprofit organizations to run programs.

Tape 2:A:004

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked what percentage of the projects would be accomplished if inmate labor is not authorized. Mr. Day stated that if inmate labor is not used, a 40% increase in appropriations would be needed to accomplish all the projects, or there will be a 40% reduction in the projects accomplished.

SEN. VAUGHN stated that there will be a hassle if the women's prison only gets a \$260,000 appropriation.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON UNIVERSITY SYSTEM

Tape No. 2:A:106

BUDGET ITEM NATURAL GAS BY-PASS MOUNT SENTINEL:

Tape No. 2:A:110

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. ETHEL HARDING moved to approve \$500,000 in spending authority for the University of Montana Natural Gas Bypass of Mount Sentinel. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM LANGUAGE LABORATORY:

Tape No. 2:A:156

Motion/Vote: SEN. HARDING moved approval of \$350,000 in spending authority for the University of Montana's Language Laboratory. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BUDGET ITEM PURCHASE OF BUTTE VOCATIONAL TECHNICAL SCHOOL:

Tape No. 2:A:200

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. HOCKETT moved approval of issuing general obligation bonds to purchase the Butte Vocational Technical Center. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION

Tape No. 2:A:254

BUDGET ITEM SOCIAL AND REHABILITATION SERVICES COMMODITIES WAREHOUSE:

Tape No. 2:A:254

Informational Testimony: Greg Groepper, Office of Public Instruction, spoke concerning the interest OPI would have in utilizing the commodities warehouse along with the SRS. He stated that OPI would be willing to look at collaborative efforts with SRS if current services are not degradated. Currently OPI contracts with Capital Storage for storage of food commodities. The contract covers handling fees and fifteen days of storage. OPI has been able to negotiate a contract in which they only have to pay for the time the commodity is sitting in the warehouse. In 1991 OPI handled 113,790 units of product for \$85,000. Costs are kept down by minimizing the amount of storage time.

Mr. Groepper stated that when a building is bought, the opposite idea comes into play. The space is kept as full as possible. If SRS has the space and can store the commodities at less cost, then OPI will be interested in working with the project. OPI does not have any warehouse staff and that is one factor to be considered. Currently it would be ideal to have more frozen storage space available in the summer for school districts.

<u>Questions, Responses, and Discussion</u>: SEN. VAUGHN asked Ms. Fulton if it would cost SRS more for personnel if OPI utilized the warehouse. **Debra Fulton, Administrator, General Services**

Division, Department of Administrator, stated that it probably would not.

SEN. HOCKETT asked if SRS would be charging rates greater or more than the rates OPI is currently charging. Ms. Fulton stated that she had not heard OPI's rental rates before today. She does know that SRS is talking about \$36,000 charge for warehousing, and OPI paid \$85,000 last year. It seems certain that money could be saved for storage. Jim Nolan, SRS, stated that based on conversations with OPI it seems that savings for storage and transportation of the commodities would be realized.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL asked if no additional FTEs would be needed if OPI did not participate, and if FTEs are necessary if OPI does participate. Mr. Nolan stated that if OPI participates two trucks and two truck drivers would be needed. Mr. Groepper stated that this proposal should be broken down into two separate proposals, one to share warehouse facilities and one to share transportation of commodities. He stated that delivery of the product out to school districts is more complex than the issue of whether to share commodities storage space. OPI trucks do not go to the same places that SRS trucks go. He suggests that the committee concentrate on getting the commodities in the same place and worry about consolidating transportation efforts at a later time. School districts may not support a change in service or delivery schedule.

Ms. Fulton assured the committee that SRS will not build a warehouse that can't be paid for with current funds, unless a deal can be struck with other agencies that would want to utilize space. The total cost will not exceed \$1.7 million. The proposal does not hinge on the participation of OPI but SRS would like the flexibility to include them if it proves to be cost-effective.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL stated that the committee has difficulty with proposals that increase Montana's debt and are not firm. He asked SRS to get together with OPI over transmittal and bring back a firm proposal.

HEARING ON HB 6

Tape No. 2:a:789

<u>Discussion</u>: CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL stated that the Justice Department has taken \$800,000 of Resource Indemnity Trust project funds. Jim Haubein, Legislative Fiscal Analyst, stated that the Justice Department wants some of the RIT funds because they spend so much time defending coal tax cases. Ms. Hamman stated that a committee bill has been approved and has been sent to the Legislative Council. The bill would take FY 93 RIT funds which have already been spent. Lawsuits will surely occur if DNRC cancels all contracts on all those projects. The Legislative Council may not even allow the bill to be introduced because it is probably illegal.

Mr. Tubbs provided information concerning the effect of committee action on coal tax loans. EXHIBITS 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. Haubein provided information which compares committee action to the recommendations of DNRC for HB 6. EXHIBIT 5. He stated the amendments were completed for HB 6. The committee can take executive action on the bill as amended unless members wish to change the priority list for funding.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL stated that REP. ZOOK has requested that HB 6 not leave the committee yet.

HEARING ON HB 7

Tape No. 2:A:355

Mr. Haubein provided information which compares committee action to the recommendations of DNRC for HB 7. EXHIBIT 6.

Tape 2:B:049

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL stated that no executive action would be taken at this time.

HEARING ON HB 12

Tape No. 2:B:053

Mr. Haubein stated that Mr. Tubbs has informed the committee of the subsidies that are the only changes to be made to HB 12. There is no further information needed, unless the committee wishes to review the amendments. Refer to EXHIBITS 2, 3, and 4.

CHAIRMAN BERGSAGEL stated that REP. ZOOK also asked that HB 12 not be passed out of committee yet.

HOUSE LONG-RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE February 19, 1993 Page 7 of 6

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 9:30 AM

ERNEST BERGSAGEL, Chair

SANDRA BOGGS, Secretary

EB/sb

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

	LONG	_	RANGE	PLANNING	SUB-	-COMMITTEE
			•			. /
						7/19/93
ROLL CALL					DATE	2/11/

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
SEN. BOB HOCKETT, VICE-CHAIR			
REP. FRANCIS BARDONOUVE			
SEN. ETHEL HARDING	1/		
SEN. ELEANOR VAUGHN			
REP. TOM ZOOK			√
REP. ERNEST BERGSAGEL, CHAIR			

EXHIBIT	/	
DATE 2-	19 -	93
Se8		

PREFERRED CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS AT CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES

ROTHE	110,200
LAUNDRY	2,639,240
INFIRMARY	42,850
DAIRY	870,000
FENCE	583,200
LOWSIDE KITCHEN	1,100,000
BUS BARN AND HIGHSIDE VO. ED	452,000
EXPAND INDUSTRIES, PRESENT COMPOUND	256,700
REMODEL HIGHSIDE FOOD SERVICE	87,250
REMODEL OFFICE SPACE, HIGH SECURITY	139,000
DRY ROOM AT BACK GATE	121,000
REMODEL RECEPTION UNIT	90,000
REMODEL UNIT A, B, C BATHROOMS	50,000
WCC UPGRADE/REMODELING	260,000
TOTAL:	6.801.440

Water Development Loans

15-Feb-93

South Side Canal

EXHIBI	T		<u> ユ_</u>	
DATE		19-	93	
528				

11,500 Total Acre Feet of Active Storage in NF Smith Res.

1,535 Acres

2,500 Acre Feet of Stored Water from North Fork of the Smith River Res.

1,250 Acre Feet of additional Water for Irrigation

Interest Rate	Borrowers Payment	Cost per Acre Foot S	Cost for South Side Canal per Acre
6.0%	121,489	10.56	 17.61
5.5%	116,604	10.14	16.91
5.0%	111,815	9.72	16.24
4.5%	107,124	9.32	15.57
4.0%	102,534	8.92	14.92
3.5%	98,046	8.53	14.29
3.0%	93,663	8.14	13.66

Huntley Project Irrigation District

Number of Acres Current Cost per Acre 27,706 \$20 EXHIBIT___3

DATE__2-19-53

Loan Amount 1	Term	Interest Rate	Borrowers Payment	Total Cost per Acre	Annual Coal Tax Subsidy	Total Coal Tax Subsidy
\$4,875,440	20 yrs	6.0%	425,063	35.34	0	0
		5.5%	407,974	34.73	17,090	341,790
		5.0%	391,218	34.12	33,845	676,903
		4.5%	374,805	33.53	50,258	1,005,161
		4.0%	358,743	32.95	66,320	1,326,393
		3.5%	343,041	32.38	82,022	1,640,437
		3.0%	327,706	31.83	97,357	1,947,139

North Fork of the Smith River Project

Number of Acres

11,000

Current Cost per Acre

\$0.40

Loan Amount	Term	Interest Rate	Borrowers Payment	Total Cost per Acre	Annual Coal Tax Subsidy	Total Coal Tax Subsidy
\$1,393,467	20 yrs	6.0%	121,489	11.44	0	0
	•	5.5%	116,604	11.00	4,884	97,688
		5.0%	111,815	10.57	9,673	193,468
		4.5%	107,124	10.14	14,364	287,289
		4.0%	102,534	9.72	18,955	379,101
		3.5%	98,046	9.31	23,443	468,859
		3.0%	93,663	8.91	27,826	556,519

Tin Cup Water Co.

Number of Acres

1,300

Current Cost per Acre

\$7.02

Loan Amount T	Term	Interest Rate	Borrowers Payment	Total Cost per Acre	Annual Coal Tax Subsidy	Total Coal Tax Subsidy
\$303,240	20 yrs	6.0% 5.5% 5.0%	26,438 25,375 24,333	27.36 26.54 25.74	0 1,063 2,105	0 21,259 42,102
		4.5 % 4.0%	23,312 22,313	24.95 24.18	3,126 4,125	62,518 82,498

EXHIBIT 4

DATE 2 - 19 - 53

SB

Development
Water
_
Loans -

O	702	231	58,783	716
Difference	\$306,702	269,231	58,	\$634,716
Committee Action	\$1,640,438	287,289	62,717	\$1,990,444
Recommended 3% Subsidy	\$1,947,140	556,520	121,500	\$2.625.160
	Huntley Irrigation District	North Fork of the Smith River	Tin Cup Dam	

DATE 2-19-93 SB HB6

(\$1,153,928)

\$2,626,307 \$1,472,379

TOTAL

Project Name	Recommended Funding		Cumulative	Over/(Under)	Loans
Project Name	Funding	۷۰۰۰۰			
	6::5::5	Action		Recommended	
Water use efficients improvements	450 000	\$50.000	\$50000	Ş	\$50,000
Maiel ase ellicienty improvements	000,000	000,000	4 4 0 900	9 6	
Characteristics of extreme proving	000,00	000,00	000001	9 6	•
Mississics of exilented precip.	000,000	000,001	000,000	9 6	0 00
water system improvement	33,750	20,000	260,300	062,014	000,001
reliowstone Hiver project	000,001	000,00	310,300	(000,004)	o (
Sewer system	20,000	0	310,300	(\$20,000)	0
Innovative water resource education	94,900	0	310,300	(\$94,900)	0
Municipal compst production	20,000	50,000	360,300	\$0	49,864
School park project	25,300	0	360,300	(\$25,300)	0
Reforestation projects on state lands	21,974	60,000	420,300	\$38,026	0
Water system rehabilitation	50,000	50,000	470,300	\$0	50,000
Upper Ruby riparian area improvements	100,000	100,000	570,300	\$0	0
Blacktail Creek restoration project	100,000	0	570,300	(\$100,000)	٥
Groundwater protection/education	94,184	0	570,300	(\$94,184)	0
Sewer reconstruction	20000	50000	620,300	\$0	50,000
Water engineering study	40,000	40,000	660,300	\$0	0
Water system improvement	50,000	0	660,300	(\$50,000)	0
Crooked Creek recreation center	50,000	0	660,300	(\$50,000)	0
Midvale diversion structure .	25,905	25,905	686,205	0\$	76,537
Water storage system imprymnts	50,000	50,000	736,205	\$	
Water system improvements	50,000	0	736,205		100.000
Repair of Lohman Dam	34,217	34,217	770,422		65,783
Irrigation water measuring devices	36,173	36,173	806,595	\$0	63,827
Sweetgrass Hills groundwater eval.	100,000	0	806,595	(\$100,000)	
County recycling project	4,725	4,725	811,320	\$0	0
Water quality improvement project	15,000	36,000	847,320	\$21,000	0
Accelerate soil survey on forestlands	000'66	000'66	946,320	\$	0
	35,494	0	946,320	(\$35,494)	0
Camas Therapy Center	100,000	0	946,320	(\$100,000)	0
Installation headgate measuring devices	20,000	50,000		\$0	50,000
Sewage and collection treatment facilities	20,000	50,000	-	0\$	20,000
Fort Peck breakwater	100,000	0	1,046,320	(\$100,000)	0
Radon assessment of Montana's aquifers	99,812	0	-	(\$99,812)	0
Flathead Valley Coop. Groundwater Study	100,000	100,000	-		0
Alternative fuels initiative	56,185				0
Water reservations implementation	47,318		_		0
Groundwater vulnerability	88,340	70,672	_		0
Rural water system development	82,000	75,000	_		0
Guide to Montana water law	31,740	0	-		0
Salinity control project	20,000	4,		\$0	50,000
Recreational enhancement of Missouri River	2,000		_		0
"A" System diversion	20,000		_		0
Water use efficiency improvements	31,569		-		31,326
Rehabilitation & betterment study	20,000	0			0
Fish friendly irrigation	44,500	44,500	_		54,500
Protection of Swift Creek pilot project	13,921	OI	1,472,379	(\$13,921)	0
	Reforestation projects on state lands Reforestation projects on state lands Water system rehabilitation Upper Ruby riparian area improvements Blacktail Creek restoration project Groundwater protection/education Sewer reconstruction Water engineering study Water system improvement Crooked Creek recreation center Midvale diversion structure Water system improvements Repair of Lohman Dam Irrigation water measuring devices Sweetgrass Hills groundwater eval. County recycling project Water system improvement project Accelerate soil survey on forestlands Sweetgrass Hills groundwater eval. County recycling project Water system improvement facilities Fepair of Lohman Dam Irrigation water measuring devices Sweetgrass Hills groundwater eval. County recycling project Accelerate soil survey on forestlands Study of the impact of fourism Camas Therapy Center Installation headgate measuring devices Sewage and collection treatment facilities Fort Peck breakwater Radon assessment of Montana's aquifers Flathead Valley Coop. Groundwater Study Alternative fuels initiative Water reservations implementation Groundwater vulnerability Rural water system development Guide to Morrlana water law Salinity control project Recreational enhancement of Missouri River "A" System diversion Water use efficiency improvements Rehabilitation & betterment study Fish friendly irrigation	ate lands ate lands browements cation cation project muts s fer eval. project mestlands sm louring devices then facilities cantation of Missouri River fer eval. lot project frestlands sm lot lana's aquifers of Missouri River fer eval. lot lana's aquifers cantation fer eval. lot lot lot lot lot lot lot l	ate lands 25,300 ate lands 50,000 aprovements 100,000 aprovements 100,000 acation 50,000 anter 50,000 acation 60,000 acation 6	ate lands 25,300 0.000 ate lands 50,000 50,000 provements 100,000 100,000 roject 100,000 100,000 senter 50,000 50,000 senter 50,000 50,000 restlands 50,000 50,000 restlands 35,494 0 100,000 tuning devices 50,000 50,000 trestlands 35,494 0 100,000 tuning devices 50,000 50,000 tuning devices 50,000 50,000 trestlands 39,812 0 1100,000 of Missouri River 7,318 47,318 188,340 70,672 100,000 of Missouri River 7,000 50,000 100,000 of Missouri River 7,000 7,000 100,000 tenents 50,000 7,000 100,000 tenents 31,569 14500 100,000 tenents 50,000 7,000 100,000	ate lands 25,300 0,000 470,300 (\$25,30 o) recipient 25,300 0,000 100,000 470,300 \$38,00 o) recipient 100,000 100,000 770,300 \$38,00 o) recipient 100,000 100,000 0 570,300 \$38,00 o) recipient 100,000 0 50,000 650,300 (\$100,00 o) 50,000 650,300 (\$50,00 o) 50,000 0 50,000 (\$50,00 o) 736,205 o) recipient 50,000 50,000 736,205 (\$50,00 o) 736,205 o) recipient 50,000 50,000 736,205 (\$50,00 o) 736,205 o) recipient 50,000 0 0 736,205 (\$50,00 o) 736,205 o) recipient 50,000 0 0 736,205 (\$50,00 o) 736,205 o) recipient 50,000 0 0 0 736,205 (\$50,00 o) 736,205 o) recipient 50,000 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0

WATER DEVELOPMENT & RENEWABLE RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS

Fiscal Years 1994-95

RECLAMATION AND DEVELOPMENT GRANTS Fiscal Years 1994-95

	Applicant	Project Name	Recommended Funding	Comm. Action	Cumulative	Comm. Cumulative Over/(Under) Recommended
	1 Board of Oil & Gas Conservation	Kevin-Sunburst Plugging & Reclamation	\$299,000	\$299,000	\$299,000	0\$
	2 Board of Oil & Gas Conservation	Cat Creek Plugging & Reclamation	214,810	214,810	513,810	0
	3 Governor/Lt. Governor's Office	The Montana Office of Public Policy	127,667	127,667	641,477	0
	4 Town of Walkerville	Walkerville Reclamation Project	75,569	50,000	691,477	(25,569)
	5 Dept. of State Lands	Well Assessment & Abandonment	211,800	0	691,477	(211,800)
	6 Broadwater Conservation Dist.	Whites Gulch Placer Mine Reclamation	296,300	296,300	777,786	0
	7 Toole County	North Toole County Oil Field Rec.	298,284	273,284	1,261,061	(25,000)
	8 Dept. of Fish, Wildlife, & Parks	Elk Creek Placer Mined Channel Reconstr.	72,850	72,850	1,333,911	0
	9 Town of Columbus	Waste Stream Reduction	41,172	41,172	1,375,083	0
	10 Montana Salinity Control Assoc.	Soil & Water Nonpoint Source	172,250	172,250	1,547,333	0
	11 Carbon Cons. District	RC&D's Affecting Change	300,000	300,000	1,847,333	0
	12 DHES	Nonpoint Source Pollution Control	300,000	300,000	2,147,333	0
	13 Bureau of Mines & Geology	Acid-mine drainage prevention	148,623	148,623	2,295,956	0
	14 Jefferson Valley Cons. District	Crystal Mine Remediation Tech.	150,000	0	2,295,956	(150,000)
S	15 Deer Lodge Valley Cons. District	Developing Acid/Heavy Metal-Tolerant Cultivars	137,700	120,000	2,415,956	(17,700)
1	16 Glacier County Cons. District	Comprehensive Evaluation of Groundwater Conta	214,059	150,000	2,565,956	(64,059)
	17 Valley County	Fort Peck Reservoir	300,000	100,000	2,665,956	(200,000)
	18 DNRC	Arsenic Transport & Mobility	20,000	50,000	2,715,956	· o
	19 Ravalli County	A Lake for Better Water Quality	300,000	300,000	3,015,956	0
	20 Butte-Silver Bow	Mitigation of Mining/Smelting damage	150,000	150,000	3,165,956	0
	21 Town of Hot Springs	Camas Therapy Center	150,000	150,000		01
	TOTAL					(\$694,128)

#B

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES VISITOR'S REGISTER

Long Range Planning DATE 2/19/93 SPONSOR(S)	COMMITTEE	BILL NO.			
PLEASE PRINT P		PLEA	PLEASE PRINT		
NAME AND ADDRESS	REPRESENTING		SUPPORT	OPPOSE	
Debra Fulton	Dept. oz adm	in'			
Jr. hoh 6 order Davidu	′ (
I m Romell	Á				
Jim GHALEY	A+±				
John Toliks	PNV.C				
			·		
·					
·					
·					

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