

**HIGHLIGHTS OF 2009 LEGISLATURE ACTIONS TO
LEGISLATIVE BRANCH BUDGET**

Prepared by Susan Fox and Karen Berger

June 2009

Branchwide Reductions from Legislative Branch budget as approved by LC, LFC, LAC

Reductions (orig in lieu of vacancy savings)	(\$ 360,000)
Reduced DP - 3 - TVMT \$180,000 ¹	
Reduced Legislator Tech Allowance \$180,000 ²	
2% Vacancy Savings	(\$ 424,754)
2% General Fund across-the-board reduction	(\$ 478,251)
(SB 429 Fund transfers:)	
Disapproval of LAWS/IT upgrades, 5-11-407 (orig \$5m)	(\$1,800,000)
Disapproval of Retirement Fund Repl, 5-11-120	(\$ 70,000)
Total	(\$3,371,609)

¹ Statewide contract provided savings to allow this reduction

² Will need to be placed in the 2011 Feed Bill

Conference Committee/restored funding and additional funding

NCSL participation - stricken from HB2, amended into HB 645 FCC	\$ 238,604
Funding for Water Policy Committee (SB 22) addition to HB 2, Program 20	\$ 35,914

Other Budget Issues of Note

- Kept running tally of additional interim committee activities. Separate actions of subcommittee/committees added 2 FTE for LSD and 2 FTE for LFD for interim staffing, succession planning, and fiscal note activities.
- SB 241 - Right-to-know/transparency in government. Significant issues were: which branch was the appropriate branch to administer website; extent of information required; and the fiscal impact or need to accomplish what the bill required.
- Application of vacancy savings - the Legislative Branch has in the recent past been protected from applying vacancy savings as the majority of the branch budget is in personal services. Branch directors proposed and were granted, initially, the opportunity to find the equivalent operating reductions in lieu of vacancy savings. However, by session end, the branch provided the \$360,000 in operational reductions and the 2% vacancy savings and 2% across-the-board General Fund budget cut.
- Comparison to Governor's budget. The Budget Director continually raised a comparison between the Legislative Branch budget and the budget for the Governor's Office. Branch Directors believe that the comparison was an apples to oranges comparison. The Governor's office had applied a reduction to its own budget prior to finalizing the Governor's budget proposal, but included that initial reduction in all comparisons to reductions made by the Legislature. Branch directors were not asked to provide information discussing the issues with the comparison.