COLORADO GENERAL ASSEMBLY
JOINT BUDGET COMMITTEE

SUPPLEMENTAL REQUESTS FOR FY 2011-12

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

(Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety, Colorado Geological Survey, Oil and Gas Conservation Commission, State Board of Land Commissioners)

JBC Working Document - Subject to Change
Staff Recommendation Does Not Represent Committee Decision

Prepared By:
Craig Harper, JBC Staff
January 13, 2012

For Further Information Contact:

Joint Budget Committee Staff
200 E. 14th Avenue, 3rd Floor
Denver, Colorado 80203
Telephone: (303) 866-2061
TDD: (303) 866-3472

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
FY 2011-12 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
FY 2011-12 SUPPLEMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS
JBC WORKING DOCUMENT - SUBJECT TO CHANGE

Prioritized Supplementals

Supplemental #1 - OGCC Local Government Liaisons

	Request	Recommendation
Total	$62,413	$62,413
FTE	0.5	0.5
Cash Funds	62,413	62,413

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	YES
This supplemental is the result of *data (the workload associated with local regulations) that was not available when the original appropriation was made*.	

Department Request: The Department requests an increase of $62,413 cash funds from the Oil and Gas Conservation and Environmental Response Fund (supported by a mil levy on oil and gas production statewide) and 0.5 FTE to hire two staff members to serve as liaisons to local (county and municipality) governments affected by oil and gas development. The request annualizes to $203,925 and 2.0 FTE and includes a budget amendment requesting that amount in FY 2012-13. The Department anticipates hiring the new staff by April 1, 2012, to work the last three months of the fiscal year.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Committee approve the Department's request for $62,413 cash funds and 0.5 FTE in FY 2011-12. The current and projected workload appears to warrant the additional FTE and the Department's anticipated revenues will support the requested positions (and 5.0 other new FTE requested in the FY 2012-13 budget) without an increase in the mil levy.

Staff Analysis:

Background - Concerns About Local Regulations: With oil and gas development moving into new areas, particularly along the Front Range but also elsewhere in Colorado, many local governments are dealing with oil and gas development for the first time. In response to public concern, a variety of counties and municipalities have moved forward with local regulations, ranging from moratoria on oil and gas development to specific regulations affecting issues such as well location and cement casing. Along the Front Range, Elbert, Arapahoe, Douglas, and El Paso counties have all taken steps to do so, as has the city of Longmont and the city and county of Broomfield. For example, El Paso County has implemented a four month moratorium on the issuance of most drilling permits. Outside of the Front Range, Gunnison and Routt counties have also discussed or moved forward with local regulations, as have Coal Creek (in Fremont County) and Craig (in Moffat County).

The OGCC, which is charged with fostering the responsible development of oil and gas resources in Colorado, and the industry are concerned about the potential impact of a "patchwork" of local regulations on oil and gas development. In response to local concerns, the OGCC staff have attended numerous public meetings with local governments and constituent groups to explain the statewide regulatory systems for oil and gas and listen to and attempt to address local concerns. The work activities range from single outreach meetings to longer-term negotiations, such as the development of a memorandum of understanding with Gunnison County over the course of a year (the memorandum was signed in October 2011).

Without dedicated staff to organize outreach efforts, attend, and present to local meetings, the agency's existing senior and technical staff has taken on the additional workload. That workload has increased in recent years, and various members of the senior staff have attended at least 37 such external meetings in thus far in FY 2011-12, with the Director of the OGCC attending the most of those meetings. The increased external workload has diverted senior and technical staff from other permitting and regulatory responsibilities, and the Department feels that the current situation is no longer sustainable.

Anticipated Outreach Workload: The following table shows the planned activities for the requested positions and the estimated hours required for each activity. The Department anticipates a total of 4,264 hours per year (4,160 hours would be the equivalent of 2.0 FTE).

Activity	Est. hours/week	Est. hours/year
Participate in local government meetings to discuss the oversight roles of relevant levels of government.	12	624
Educate local governments about the OGCC's Local Government Designee (LGD) program, which encourages local governments to designate a single individual as the contact and liaison to the OGCC, and how that process allows for local input into OGCC decisions.	10	520
Outreach and training to LGD's.	22	1144
Review local government comments on location assessment applications to the OGCC.	18	936
Prepare and maintain presentation materials for other OGCC staff members to use for external presentations.	2	104
Act as first point of contact and respond to inquiries.	18	936
Total	**82**	**4264**

Specifics of Request: The Department's request includes salaries and operating expenses for two Environmental Protection Specialist III positions that the OGCC expects to be located in the field with offices in their homes. The request includes the following components:

Expense	FY 2011-12 Supplemental (3 months)	FY 2012-13 Budget Amdt. (12 months)
Personal Services		
Salaries at 20.0 percent above the range minimum - $6,880 per month	$41,280	$165,120
PERA - 10.15 percent of salary by common policy	$4,190	$16,760
Medicare - 1.45 percent of salary by common policy	$599	$2,394
Total - Personal Services	$46,068	$184,274
Operating Expenses		
Laptop computers with upgraded processors to run GIS software - $1,800 per computer	$3,600	$0
Office suite software - $330 per FTE by common policy	660	0
Office supplies - $500 per FTE per year by common policy	250	1,000
Cell phones (required because of frequent travel) - $31.53 per FTE per month	189	757
Travel expenses - one overnight trip per month for each FTE at $220 per trip	1,320	5,280
Office Equipment - $3,473 per position in year 1 by common policy	6,946	0
Home-based office expenses (phone, fax, and internet)	1,105	3,514
Mileage reimbursement for an average of 175 miles per week for each FTE at $0.50 per mile	2,275	9,100
Total - Operating Expenses	16,345	19,651
Total Request	**62,413**	**203,925**

Salaries above the range minimum: The FY 2011-12 request includes three months of salaries (April, May, and June 2012) at 20.0 percent above the range minimum. The Joint Budget Committee common policy is to appropriate salaries for all new FTE at the range minimum. However, the OGCC often requests higher salaries because of competition with the oil and gas industry for suitable candidates. Staff filling the requested positions must be knowledgeable about the oil and gas industry and the OGCC and will need to be able to communicate effectively with local governments. Preferred candidates would have:

- technical education and training (e.g., engineering);

- the ability to communicate technical and regulatory information to government representatives that may have little or no technical background;
- experience with and the ability to manage highly contentious public meetings;
- work experience in, and direct knowledge of, the oil and gas industry; and
- knowledge of the oil and gas regulatory process in Colorado.

According to the Department, those same characteristics will make potential applicants attractive to the industry, increasing the level of competition with the industry and requiring a salary above the range minimum to effectively recruit staff that will be prepared to function quickly without additional technical training. Based on prior experience with offering range minimum salaries, the Department describes two likely scenarios if the General Assembly appropriates the range minimum for the new positions.

1. *Inability to fill both positions:* Based on previous experiences with other positions, the Department believes that recruiting candidates who are already prepared for the requested positions will require salaries above the range minimum. With an appropriation for both FTE at the range minimum, the Department would only be able to hire one such candidate (by paying above the range minimum for the hired position). This scenario has played out in the past, with the General Assembly approving multiple positions at the range minimum and the OGCC hiring significantly fewer staff at elevated salaries.

2. *Hiring staff that are not yet prepared for the positions:* Alternatively, the Department may be able to hire promising staff that will require additional training to function in the requested positions (for example, candidates with less technical background) that are less attractive to the industry. The training process is costly in terms of both external training costs and the internal staff time required to prepare new staff. The Department reports significant successes with "training up" new staff for a variety of positions. However, the Department and the industry both view the situation driving this request as too urgent to wait for extensive training for new staff. Finally, once the new staff members are sufficiently trained and are still paid at the range minimum, those individuals become increasingly attractive to the industry - and the Department has difficulty retaining staff in that situation.

Staff recommends that the Committee deviate from common policy to approve the new positions at salaries above the range minimum. The current and anticipated workload for the new positions appears to warrant 2.0 FTE, and both the Department and the industry (which pays the mil levy supporting the requested positions) agree that the situation is too urgent to wait for extensive training of new staff.

Operating Expenses: Because the Department does not yet know precisely where the positions would be located, the travel and mileage estimates are uncertain. However, staff agrees that the initial estimates for operating expenses look reasonable. The requested functions will require significant travel and time in the field.

Permanent FTE vs. Contract: Based on the ongoing increase in workload and the assumption that the workload will continue as development goes forward and local governments seek to provide input on specific applications and proposals, the Department argues that the requested positions will be necessary for the foreseeable future. The Department is seeking permanent FTE because of the anticipated long-term workload and a desire for stability in the positions rather than frequent turnover of contractors. The OGCC plans to build lasting relationships with local governments, and **staff agrees that the frequent turnover required by the use of contract personnel would undermine that goal and that permanent FTE are more appropriate for the requested positions.**

Industry Position: The industry, as represented by the Colorado Oil and Gas Association, supports the Department's request. The industry remains concerned about the potential for a patchwork of local regulations that would further complicate oil and gas development and strongly supports the OGCC's efforts to improve outreach to local governments. The industry also concurs with the OGCC's desire to hire staff that will be prepared to take over the liaison duties immediately - and supports the request for salaries above the range minimum. The industry believes that the OGCC needs 2.0 FTE and that the current situation is too urgent to wait for extensive training of candidates.

Local Government Position: Local governments, as represented by Colorado Counties Inc. (CCI) and the Colorado Municipal League (CML), are supportive of increased collaboration between the OGCC and local governments. However, both organizations are more concerned about a lack of adequate field enforcement staff at the OGCC than about inadequate communication. On that note, the Department's FY 2012-13 budget request does include 5.0 other new positions, including inspection, environmental, and hearings staff, and staff will present those requests at the Department's FY 2012-13 figure setting.

CCI staff expressed that adequate staffing for the OGCC is important, "as long as the staffing pattern emphasizes opportunities to cooperatively resolve real issues." According to CCI staff, the wording of the request implies that local governments are uninformed about the state's regulations and that the liaison positions are necessary to: (1) educate local governments about the regulations and (2) work with local governments going forward to ensure that local concerns are adequately addressed through the state process. The CCI staff "supports the goal of improved collaboration, which the liaison positions could foster, but, based on the statements in the request background, is concerned that the local liaison positions will primarily provide general education instead of meeting the real need for hands-on development of solutions to local concerns."

The Colorado Municipal League (CML) largely concurs with the CCI position. CML staff argue that local governments are aware of the state's oil and gas regulations and that local governments are concerned about inadequate field enforcement staff. Thus, local governments are not sure that the request addresses their highest priority problem. In effect, both CCI and CML argue that the push for local regulations is the result of concerns about inadequate enforcement rather than a lack of knowledge about the state rules or processes.

Staff understands the local governments' concerns about enforcement of the state rules but notes that a variety of local regulatory proposals have been more stringent than the state rules, indicating that those local governments may not have been satisfied with additional enforcement of the state rules. In addition, as discussed above, the request has two purposes: (1) to improve communication and collaboration with local governments; and (2) to alleviate some of the workload pressure that local regulatory discussions are placing on the existing OGCC staff and allow for more efficient OGCC operations (both in terms of collaboration with local governments and allowing existing staff members to focus on other responsibilities). The OGCC workload, which is not a primary concern of the local governments, will not decrease as long as local concerns about oil and gas development continue at the present level. The current workload does not appear to be sustainable and staff agrees with the OGCC that the workload justifies the additional FTE.

Supplemental #2 - Reversal of Coal Program Refinance

	Request	Recommendation
Total	$0	$0
Cash Funds	(273,306)	(273,306)
Federal Funds	273,306	273,306

Does JBC staff believe the request meets the Joint Budget Committee's supplemental criteria? [An emergency or act of God; a technical error in calculating the original appropriation; data that was not available when the original appropriation was made; or an unforseen contingency.]	**YES**
This supplemental is the result of *data (the federal grant amount for FY 2011-12) that was not available when the original appropriation was made*.	

Department Request: The Department requests a fund source adjustment for the Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety's coal regulatory program. The request includes: (1) a reduction of $273,306 cash funds spending authority from the Operational Account of the Severance Tax Trust Fund and (2) an increase of the same amount in federal grant funds from the U.S. Office of Surface Mining.

The request reverses (for one year) a FY 2011-12 decision item that increased cash funds spending authority by $273,306 in anticipation of reduced federal grant funds in FY 2011-12. Because the federal grant did not decrease in FY 2011-12, the additional cash funds spending authority is not necessary to sustain the program's operations.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends that the Committee approve the Department's request.

Staff Analysis: The General Assembly approved the increased cash funds spending authority for FY 2011-12 based on an anticipated reduction in federal grant funds for the Department's coal regulatory program. The President's Budget for the federal fiscal year beginning October 1, 2010, proposed a 15.0 percent reduction in grants to states for coal regulation as a budget balancing measure. Congress has not enacted the reduction, and the refinance is no longer needed for FY 2011-12. Approving the request would allow the coal program to continue with no change in operations. In addition, the request would (slightly) improve the status of the Operational Account by reducing Tier 1 spending by $273,506, which reduces the required Tier 1 reserve by the same amount.

Because the Department still anticipates a potential reduction in federal funds for FY 2012-13, the supplemental request would not change the Department's FY 2012-13 request, which continues the refinance enacted in the FY 2011-12 Long Bill. If the federal grant does not decline in FY 2012-13, staff would recommend a similar mid-year adjustment that year.

Update on the Status of the Operational Account: The requested refinance assists with Operational Account balancing in FY 2011-12 (by reducing Tier 1 expenditures and consequently the Tier 1 reserve). However, the status of the Operational Account remains uncertain in FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13. The following table displays the surplus/(deficit) in the Operational Account in FY 2011-12 and FY 2012-13 based on the December 2011 revenue forecasts from (1) Legislative Council Staff and (2) the Office of State Planning and Budgeting.

Unobligated Operational Account Balance After Accounting for Required Reserves (Based on December 2011 Revenue Forecasts)		
	FY 2011-12*	**FY 2012-13****
Legislative Council Staff Forecast	($2,647,290)	($18,104,325)
OSPB Forecast	3,391,889	(7,391,514)

*Estimates do include the requested refinance.
**Estimates do *not* account for proportional reductions expected to take place in FY 2012-13 under current law. Such reductions would be based on the December 2012 and March 2013 revenue forecasts and would take effect if the General Assembly has not selectively reduced spending to balance the Operational Account.

For additional detail relative to the Legislative Council Staff Revenue Forecast, see the Severance Tax Overview Table on page 9.

FY 2011-12: Based on the Legislative Council Staff December 2011 Revenue Forecast, the Operational Account is out of balance by $2.6 million in FY 2011-12 even with the requested refinance. That is, authorized expenditures would utilize $2.6 million of the $3.8 million Tier 2 reserve if the General Assembly does not take action to reduce spending in FY 2011-12. Conversely, based on the OSPB forecast, the Operational Account would end FY 2011-12 with a positive $3.4 million "unobligated" balance after accounting for all authorized expenditures and the required reserves.

The Department is not requesting any changes to FY 2011-12 authorizations. **Given the divergence in the December forecasts and that the potential deficit is relatively small, staff is not currently recommending reductions in FY 2011-12 but does recommend that the Committee discuss the issue with the Agriculture committees during the joint committee of reference meeting.**

FY 2012-13: Both the Legislative Council Staff and OSPB forecasts expect the situation to worsen in FY 2012-13. Both forecasts anticipate relatively minor declines in Operational Account revenues in FY 2012-13 but increases in Tier 2 expenditures authorized under current law (see the overview table on the following page) drive large imbalances under the forecasted revenue scenarios. Without reductions in spending for FY 2012-13, the Legislative Council Staff and OSPB forecasts anticipate FY 2012-13 deficits of $18.1 million and $7.4 million, respectively.

Both forecast scenarios would trigger proportional reductions in to Tier 2 programs in FY 2012-13, although those reductions would be based on the December 2012 and March 2013 Legislative Council Staff forecasts. Please note that the overview table on the following page, showing the Legislative Council Staff forecast, shows one column without the anticipated proportional reductions (to show increases in authorized expenditures under current law) and one column with the anticipated reductions. **Staff recommends that the Committee make balancing decisions for FY 2012-13 based on the March 2012 revenue forecasts. Barring major increases, however, staff expects to recommend reductions to balance the Operational Account in FY 2012-13.**

Severance Tax Trust Fund
Operational Account

	Statutory Cite	Actual FY 09-10		Actual FY 10-11		Estimated FY 11-12		Estimated FY 12-13 w/o reductions		Estimated FY 12-13 with reductions	
Beginning balance		$68,073,848		$31,181,533		$18,206,983		$14,814,238		$14,814,238	
Revenue		10,168,149		35,233,283		40,532,381 (est.)		39,305,691 (est.)		39,305,691	
Revenue to Refinance DOR STAX Collections								(401,181)		(401,181)	
Public School Energy Fund	39-29-109.5	(48,807)		($19,487)		TBD		TBD		TBD	
TOTAL Available for Expenditure		**$78,193,190**		**$66,395,329**		**$58,739,364**		**53,718,748**		**53,718,748**	
Roll-forwards		$0		$0		$1,007,687					
Tier 1	39-29-109.3 (1)										
Colorado Geological Survey	(b)	$2,432,751	3.1%	$2,457,218	3.7%	$2,400,175	4.1%	2,456,013	4.6%	2,456,013	4.6%
Oil and Gas Conservation Commission	(a)	2,958,240	3.8%	3,234,045	4.9%	3,182,569	5.4%	3,238,925	6.0%	3,238,925	6.0%
Division of Reclamation, Mining, and Safety	(c)	4,211,250	5.4%	4,222,288	6.4%	4,265,933	7.3%	4,635,960	8.6%	4,635,960	8.6%
Colorado Water Conservation Board	(d)	1,303,408	1.7%	1,285,999	1.9%	1,319,250	2.2%	1,319,250	2.5%	1,319,250	2.5%
Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation	(f)	3,659,838	4.7%	3,829,397	5.8%	2,498,440	4.3%	2,497,022	4.6%	2,497,022	4.6%
Division of Wildlife	(e)	1,345,098	1.7%	1,484,286	2.2%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	0	0.0%
SUBTOTAL Tier 1		$15,910,585	20.3%	$16,513,233	24.9%	$13,666,367	23.3%	14,147,170	26.3%	14,147,170	26.3%
Tier 2	39-29-109.3 (2)										
Water infrastructure development	(a)	$5,775,000		$6,000,000		$7,000,000		10,000,000		6,716,959	
Soil Conservation Districts matching grants	(b)	450,000		450,000		450,000		450,000		302,263	
Water efficiency grants	(c)	0		0		0		550,000		369,433	
Species Conservation Trust Fund	(d) & (e)	4,500,000		11,000,000		3,600,000		6,600,000		4,433,193	
Low income energy assistance	(f)	1,625,000		6,500,000 *		6,500,000		13,000,000		8,732,046	
Renewable energy - Agriculture	(h)	500,000		500,000		500,000		0		0	
Interbasin water compacts	(i)	745,067		745,067		745,067		745,067		500,458	
Forest restoration grants/ bark beetle	(k) and (n)	2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		2,500,000		1,679,240	
Aquatic Nuisance Species Fund	(m)	4,006,005		3,980,046		4,006,005		4,006,005		*2,690,817*	
SUBTOTAL Tier 2		$20,101,072	25.7%	$31,675,113	47.7%	$25,301,072	43.1%	37,851,072	70.5%	25,424,408	47.3%
TOTAL Expenditures		**$36,011,657**		**$48,188,346**		**$39,975,126**		**51,998,242**		**39,571,578**	
Transfer to General Fund	39-29-109.3 (6)	$11,000,000		$0		$3,950,000					
Ending Balance		$31,181,533		$18,206,983		$14,814,238		1,720,506		14,147,170	
Tier 1 Reserve	39-29-109.3 (3)	15,910,585		16,513,233		13,666,367		14,147,170		14,147,170	
Tier 2 Reserve	39-29-109.3 (3)	3,015,161		4,755,161		3,795,161		5,677,661		5,752,661	
Low income energy assistance reserve		0		0		0		0		0	
TOTAL Reserve Requirement		$18,925,746	24.2%	$21,268,394	32.0%	$17,461,528	29.7%	19,824,831	36.9%	19,899,831	37.0%
UNOBLIGATED BALANCE*		**$12,255,788**	15.7%	**($3,061,411)**	-4.6%	**($2,647,290)**	-4.5%	**(18,104,325)**	-33.7%	**(5,752,661)**	-10.7%

(est.) = estimate. Revenue estimates are based on the Legislative Council Staff's December 2011 Revenue Forecast and include $400,000 in estimated interest in FY 2011-12 and $350,000 in FY 2012-13 and FY 2013-14.

TBD = To be determined

*The "Unobligated Balance" reflects the surplus/(deficit) of funds available after accounting for expenditures and the required reserve. The FY 2012-13 estimate does not reflect proportional reductions that would take place under statute because the anticipated deficit exceeds the statutory reserve for Tier 2 programs. Based on the Legislative Council Staff's December 2011 Revenue Forecast and current law, staff would anticipate $12.9 million in automatic proportional reductions to Tier 2 programs in FY 2012-13, unless the General Assembly takes action to reduce authorized expenditures.

Non-prioritized Supplementals

Statewide Common Policy Supplemental Requests

These requests are not prioritized and are not analyzed in this packet. The JBC will act on these items later when it makes decisions regarding common policies.

Department's Portion of Statewide Supplemental Request	Total	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reapprop. Funds	Federal Funds	FTE
Operating Common Policy True-up (Capital Complex Leased Space)	$28,087	$7,012	$12,125	$5,508	$3,442	0.0
Annual Fleet True-up	(9,236)	7,284	(20,014)	0	3,494	0.0
Department's Total Statewide Supplemental Requests	18,851	14,296	(7,889)	5,508	6,936	0.0

Staff Recommendation: The staff recommendation for these requests is pending Committee approval of common policy supplementals. **Staff asks permission to include the corresponding appropriations in the Department's supplemental bill when the Committee approves common policy supplementals.** If staff believes there is reason to deviate from the common policy, staff will appear before the Committee later to present the relevant analysis.

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
Mike King, Executive Director

Supplemental #1 - OGCC Local Government Liaisons

(4) OIL AND GAS CONSERVATION COMMISSION

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change
Program Costs	5,858,020	5,812,371	62,413	62,413	5,874,784
FTE	63.2	67.0	0.5	0.5	67.5
Cash Funds	5,858,020	5,812,371	62,413	62,413	5,874,784
Total for Supplemental #1 - OGCC Local Government Liaisons	5,858,020	5,812,371	62,413	62,413	5,874,784
FTE	63.2	67.0	0.5	0.5	67.5
Cash Funds	5,858,020	5,812,371	62,413	62,413	5,874,784

Supplemental #2 - Reversal of Coal Program Refinance

(2) DIVISION OF RECLAMATION, MINING, AND SAFETY
(A) Coal Land Reclamation

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change
Program Costs	2,134,008	2,105,000	0	0	2,105,000
FTE	20.0	23.0	0.0	0.0	23.0
Cash Funds	447,548	714,771	(273,306)	(273,306)	441,465
Federal Funds	1,686,460	1,390,229	273,306	273,306	1,663,535
Total for Supplemental #2 - Reversal of Coal Program Refinance	2,134,008	2,105,000	0	0	2,105,000
FTE	20.0	23.0	0.0	0.0	23.0
Cash Funds	447,548	714,771	(273,306)	(273,306)	441,465
Federal Funds	1,686,460	1,390,229	273,306	273,306	1,663,535

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change
Totals *Excluding* Pending Items					
NATURAL RESOURCES					
TOTALS for ALL Departmental line items	21,233,699	242,541,965	62,413	62,413	242,604,378
FTE	181.2	1,465.6	0.5	0.5	1,466.1
General Fund	0	23,422,123	0	0	23,422,123
Cash Funds	16,837,217	191,031,122	(210,893)	(210,893)	190,820,229
Reappropriated Funds	926,446	8,480,565	0	0	8,480,565
Federal Funds	3,470,036	19,608,155	273,306	273,306	19,881,461

Non-prioritized Supplemental #1 - Annual Fleet True Up

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change
Vehicle Lease Payments	2,898,675	(9,236)	(9,236)	Pending	Pending
General Fund	293,114	7,284	7,284		
Cash Funds	2,553,410	(20,014)	(20,014)		
Federal Funds	52,151	3,494	3,494		
Total for Non-prioritized Supplemental #1 - Annual Fleet True Up	2,898,675	(9,236)	(9,236)	Pending	Pending
FTE	0.0	0.0	0.0		
General Fund	293,114	7,284	7,284		
Cash Funds	2,553,410	(20,014)	(20,014)		
Federal Funds	52,151	3,494	3,494		

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change

Non-prioritized Supplemental #2 - Capitol Complex Leased Space Adjustments

(1) EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S OFFICE

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change
Capitol Complex Leased Space	872,671	28,087	28,087	Pending	Pending
General Fund	217,856	7,012	7,012		
Cash Funds	376,772	12,125	12,125		
Reappropriated Funds	171,126	5,508	5,508		
Federal Funds	106,917	3,442	3,442		
Total for Non-prioritized Supplemental #2 - Capitol Complex Leased Space Adjustments	872,671	28,087	28,087	Pending	Pending
FTE	0.0	0.0	0.0		
General Fund	217,856	7,012	7,012		
Cash Funds	376,772	12,125	12,125		
Reappropriated Funds	171,126	5,508	5,508		
Federal Funds	106,917	3,442	3,442		

Totals *Including* Pending Items
NATURAL RESOURCES

	FY 2010-11 Actual	FY 2011-12 Appropriation	FY 2011-12 Requested Change	FY 2011-12 Rec'd Change	FY 2011-12 Total With Rec'd Change
TOTALS for ALL Departmental line items	21,233,699	242,541,965	81,264	81,264	242,623,229
FTE	181.2	1,465.6	0.5	0.5	1,466.1
General Fund	0	23,422,123	14,296	14,296	23,436,419
Cash Funds	16,837,217	191,031,122	(218,782)	(218,782)	190,812,340
Reappropriated Funds	926,446	8,480,565	5,508	5,508	8,486,073
Federal Funds	3,470,036	19,608,155	280,242	280,242	19,888,397