

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION

SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1002

2007 HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS

HB 1002

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 1002

House Appropriations Committee  
Government Operations Division

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 1/15/07

Recorder Job Number: 1136

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Chairman Carlson called the budget hearing on House Bill 1002 to order.

Chief Justice Gerald W. VandeWalle spoke in support of the bill.

Sally Holewa, State Court Administrator, gave an overview of the budget process for the

Supreme Court. See attached testimony 1002.1.15.07A.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Are all FTEs listed in the budget none of them are listed as optional?

**Sally Holewa:** Yes they are all in our budget.

**Representative Kempenich:** Is this voluntary mediation or required?

**Sally Holewa:** We are looking at sending every case through mediation at first.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Would there be a reporting system for the mediation cases?

**Sally Holewa:** We are in the process of developing a way to track custody specific agreements. As we get the mediation project in place, we would send out performance measures that would specifically look at what indicator was a satisfactory agreement.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Is there any opposition to the mediation program?

**Sally Holewa:** No specific objectives, but the State Bar Association has some concerns.

**Representative Kroeber:** Is this based on any other states or projects

**Sally Holewa:** It is a combination of other mediation projects.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Are there other Midwestern states that have this kind of mediation program?

**Sally Holewa:** I will have that information for the subcommittee.

**Representative Kempenich:** How have the Rolette County Clerks been funded up until now?

**Sally Holewa:** They are contract employees.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** How many counties are still under contract?

**Sally Holewa:** There are 42 counties that are still under contract. Of those 42, ten still have the option to become state employees.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Are the judges still looking for a different salary package other than the 4 & 4 increase?

**Sally Holewa:** Yes.

Vice Chairman Carlisle requested a summary of the mediation project for the subcommittee.

**Representative Glassheim:** Where are the FTEs for the Adult Drug Court in the budget?

**Chief Justice VandeWalle:** The Department of Corrections has the Drug Court. The treatment portion is in the Department of Human Services.

Justice Dale V. Sandstrom spoke in support of the bill. See attached testimony 1002.1.15.07B.

**Representative Kempenich:** Does your IT people go out into the counties?

**Justice Dale V. Sandstrom:** They try to maintain support from the Bismarck office. They do have to travel for upgrades on the system.

**Representative Kempenich:** How will the CJIS System work with your current system?

**Justice Dale V. Sandstrom:** It should plug in and work correctly.

Justice May Muehlen Maring spoke in support of the bill. See attached testimony 1002.1.15.07C.

**Representative Skarphol:** The \$200,000 federal grant, had that been received previously?

**Justice May Muehlen Maring:** We have received this in the past but not that much.

**Representative Skarphol:** What will you do in the event that this doesn't go through?

**Justice May Muehlen Maring:** We will look for money elsewhere. We are pretty confident that we will get that.

Judge Douglas Herman spoke in support of the bill. See attached testimony 1002.1.15.07D.

Susan Sisk, Director of Finance, spoke in support of the bill. See attached testimony 1002.1.15.07E.

**Representative Kempenich:** You said that you use bulk ordering to save money. Does that include IT equipment?

**Susan Sisk:** We use ITD's contract unless we find it cheaper somewhere else.

**Representative Skarphol:** Credit cards typically require 4% or some kind of percentage in fees. Is that the \$92,000?

**Susan Sisk:** Yes.

**Representative Skarphol:** We don't get better rate than that?

**Susan Sisk:** We actually get 1.9% and I believe there is a thirty cent transaction fee per item. So if we say roughly that 10% of everything will be paid by credit card we should be right on.

Chairman Carlson requested a summary of any programs that have had federal funding in the past but are now funded by General Funds.

Ms. Sisk continued her testimony.

**Chairman Carlson:** How do you know if the counties will allow you to house the offices in their courthouse?

**Susan Sisk:** We can't contract with them until we know whether we are going to get the money to do so.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Are there any other bills that will affect your budget?

**Susan Sisk:** We will provide the subcommittee with that list.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Does the \$82,000 in the salary line include the 4 & 4?

**Susan Sisk:** Yes.

**Representative Thoreson:** Are you working on a formal proposal for more space?

**Chief Justice VandeWalle:** Not really. We have claimed all of the space that we have in the Judicial Wing.

**Representative Skarphol:** How much space do you have now and how much do you envision that you will need?

**Chief Justice VandeWalle:** We have 23,000 square feet now. (poor audio)

Hearing Closed.

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. 1002

House Appropriations Committee  
Government Operations Division

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: 1/30/07

Recorder Job Number: 2312

Committee Clerk Signature

Minutes:

Chairman Carlson opened the discussion on House Bill 1002.

Vice Chairman Carlisle handed out amendment 78002.0102.

The changes this amendment makes is adding \$2,000 and the 4/4 package to the salary line.

It also removes five FTEs from the mediation project. They will utilize these FTEs through contract basis.

**A motion was made by Representative Thoreson, seconded by Representative Kroeber and carried by voice vote to adopt amendment 78002.0102 to House Bill 1002.**

Vice Chairman Carlisle reviewed the green sheet.

**Chairman Carlson:** Where are they going to use the digital recorders?

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** In the District Courtrooms.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Sally can you come up and explain number 9 for us?

**Sally Holewa:** Number nine is our case management replacement. What we are looking for is \$1.275million. That will get us through the first two years of planning for the replacement. The

planning includes doing analysis for all of our practice and getting bids on a vendor. The second phase will be the actual purchase of the hardware and software.

**Representative Skarphol:** What I am assuming is that this is comparable to what we are doing with the Legislative Assembly this time.

**Chairman Carlson:** What I am having trouble with is how do you call it one time funding when it is just the first planning stage?

**Representative Skarphol:** That is the first step in any of these major IT projects.

**Chairman Carlson:** I understand the steps but this is wasted unless you keep going. So how do you call it one time funding? I am not blaming you I am just telling you that this is a problem we have seen in numerous budgets.

**Representative Skarphol:** The question I really have is not about number nine being one time but about number eighteen being one time. It says it adds funding for operating costs related to the enhanced records management system. How are operating costs one time funding?

**Sally Holewa:** We did not designate that to be one time?

**Representative Skarphol:** I would as that if we are going to amend this and I think we should that we only include the \$1.3million and not the \$115million.

**Representative Thoreson:** Who decided that was one time funding?

**Sally Holewa:** OMB. This however is not actually operating costs like it says on the green sheet. This is for the purchase of scanners and software that will only be asked for one more time.

At the request of the committee Don Wolf from Legislative Council read the language that will be added to most of the budget bills regarding one time funding.



**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** Can you also run through number eleven?

**Sally Holewa:** We are adding and expanding programs.

**Representative Thoreson:** Number twelve deals with the Minot and Williston drug courts.

Please refresh us, how was the determination made on these locations?

**Sally Holewa:** They were chosen because we didn't have a drug court presence there.

**Chairman Carlson:** Are we expecting a large growth in that cost over time?

**Sally Holewa:** We have budgeted the same amount for drug court in the last three bienniums.

We did increase it by three percent this biennium because we now have to pay for half of the attorneys involved in drug court. In the past they were in the indigent defense budget.

**Chairman Carlson:** How does the Rolette County thing work? (Number 16 on green sheet)

**Sally Holewa:** From my understanding is some of the larger counties wished to divest themselves. If the county had five or more employees you had to go state funding, if you had between one and five it was optional. If you are under one you can't at all. We pay for services through contract with those counties that either don't qualify or have decided not to opt in.

**Chairman Carlson:** So there is a potential of ten more counties becoming state employees.

Who is paying them now?

**Sally Holewa:** We are paying them.

**Chairman Carlson:** So we are paying them. Why does go up if we are paying them and now adding them as a state employee?

**Sally Holewa:** It goes up because of the benefits and the fact that we only paid one plus a portion of their other FTE.

**Chairman Carlson:** What is the liability out there in front of us if they all decide to opt in?

**Sally Holewa:** I believe there are 32 or 33 more FTEs.

**Vice Chairman Carlisle:** You still have an \$800,000 turn back is that correct?

**Sally Holewa:** Yes.

**Representative Thoreson:** Are there any other bills floating around that would impact this budget?

**Susan Fisk:** House Bill 1387. This bill would allow the counties to charge us rent on the office space we use.

**A motion was made by Representative Kempenich, seconded by Vice Chairman Carlisle to adopt the amendment regarding one time funding. Motion carried by voice vote with Representative Glassheim in opposition.**

**A motion was made by Representative Thoreson, seconded by Vice Chairman Carlisle for a DO PASS AS AMENDED recommendation to the House Appropriations Full Committee. The committee vote was 8 Yeas, 0 Nays and 0 Absent and Not Voting. The bill will be carried by Vice Chairman Carlisle.**

# 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. HB 1002

House Appropriations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: February 5, 2007

Recorder Job Number: 2857

Committee Clerk Signature

*Holly N. Sund*

Minutes:

**Chm. Svedjan** opened the hearing on HB 1002.

**Rep. Carlisle** motioned to adopt amendment .0103 (Attachment A). **Rep. Thoreson**

**seconded the motion.** Rep. Carlisle pointed out that the amendment changes the salary

increases for Supreme Court justices from a 6 percent increase the first year and a 7 percent increase for the second year of the biennium to providing a \$2,000 increase plus a 4 percent increase, effective July 1, 2007, and a 4 percent increase for the second year of the biennium.

The amendment makes the same type of change for the district court judges. The amendment removes five of the six FTE position for the mediation pilot project and transfers funding from the salaries and wages line item to the operating line item.

**Rep. Carlisle** also reviewed the Department 180 – Judicial Branch budget green sheet. The only changes to the budget were the changes mentioned in amendment .0103.

**Chm. Svedjan:** Re: item 9 of the budget – this is a two-phase, one-time, but you're approaching it as ongoing?

**Rep. Skarphol:** We are spending some money to make sure we fully understand what's needed. That will take a substantial amount of time. Once we fully understand what's needed, then there will be a request for the development and implementation of that system.

**Chm. Svedjan:** But you would treat this as ongoing?

2-5-07  
HB 1002

**Rep. Skarphol:** I would treat this as one-time. It's just the first phase of the fully implemented system.

**Rep. Carlisle** continues his discussion of the executive budget highlights.

**Chm. Svedjan:** The total adjustment to this budget is \$294,000.

**Rep. Carlisle:** That's correct.

**The motion to adopt amendment .0103 carried by voice vote and the amendment was adopted.**

**Rep. Carlisle motioned a Do Pass as Amended. Rep. Skarphol seconded the motion.**

**The motion carried by a roll call vote of 24 ayes, 0 nays and 0 absent and not voting.**

**Rep. Carlisle was designated to carry the bill.**

**FISCAL NOTE**  
 Requested by Legislative Council  
 03/27/2007

Amendment to:           Engrossed  
                                   HB 1002

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues						
Expenditures			\$990,547		\$990,547	
Appropriations			\$990,547		\$990,547	

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill provides funds for the operation of the Judicial Branch of government. It includes proposed statutory salary changes for judges salaries. The amounts shown above are the proposed judicial salary increases.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

The amended salary increases for judges and justices are \$2,000 on July 1, 2007, and an additional 4% beginning July 1, 2007 (computed after the \$2,000 increase) and 4% beginning July 1, 2008 for a total cost of \$990,547.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

The amended salary increases of \$2,000 July 1, 2007, 4% on July 1, 2007 and 4% on July 1, 2008 are as follows:

Supreme Court - 5 justices     \$ 114,600  
 District Court - 42 judges     \$ 875,947

Total Cost                     \$ 990,547

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

The entire cost of the increases are general fund and are included in the judicial budget request.

<b>Name:</b>	Susan Sisk	<b>Agency:</b>	ND Supreme Court
--------------	------------	----------------	------------------

Phone Number: 328-3509

Date Prepared: 03/27/2007



**FISCAL NOTE**  
**Requested by Legislative Council**  
02/14/2007

Amendment to: HB 1002

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues						
Expenditures			\$876,835		\$876,835	
Appropriations			\$876,835		\$876,835	

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill provides funds for the operation of the Judicial Branch of government. It includes proposed statutory salary changes for judges salaries. The amounts shown above are the proposed judicial salary increases.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

The amended salary increases for judges and justices are \$2,000 on July 1, 2007, and an additional 4% beginning July 1, 2007 (computed after the \$2,000 increase) and 4% beginning July 1, 2008 for a total cost of \$876,835.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

The amended salary increases of \$2,000 July 1, 2007, 4% on July 1, 2007 and 4% on July 1, 2008 are as follows:

Supreme Court - 5 justices     \$ 102,503  
District Court - 42 judges     \$ 774,332

Total Cost                     \$ 876,835

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

The entire cost of the increases are general fund and are included in the judicial budget request.

<b>Name:</b>	Susan Sisk	<b>Agency:</b>	ND Supreme Court
<b>Phone Number:</b>	328-3509	<b>Date Prepared:</b>	02/14/2007

**FISCAL NOTE**  
 Requested by Legislative Council  
 01/02/2007

Bill/Resolution No.: HB 1002

1A. **State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
Revenues						
Expenditures			\$1,171,303		\$1,171,303	
Appropriations			\$1,171,303		\$1,171,303	

1B. **County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

2A. **Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

This bill provides funds for the operation of the Judicial Branch of government. It includes proposed statutory salary changes for judges salaries. The amounts shown above are the proposed judicial salary increases.

B. **Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

The proposed salary increases for judges and justices are 6% beginning July 1, 2007 and 7% beginning July 1, 2008 for a total cost of \$1,171,303.

3. **State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

A. **Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

B. **Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

The proposed salary increases of 6% and 7% are as follows:

Supreme Court - 5 justices      \$ 138,260  
 District Court - 42 judges      \$1,033,043

Total Cost                      \$1,171,303

C. **Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

The entire cost of the increases is general fund and are included in the judicial budget request of \$69,468,372.

<b>Name:</b> Susan Sisk	<b>Agency:</b> Supreme Court
-------------------------	------------------------------



Phone Number: 328-3509

Date Prepared: 01/03/2007

Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
Roll Call Vote #: \_\_\_\_\_

**2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES**  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1002

House Appropriations- Government Operations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken Approval of Amendment

Motion Made By Kem Seconded By Carlisle

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Al Carlson			Vice Chairman Ron Carlisle		
Rep Keith Kempenich			Rep Bob Skarphol		
Rep Blair Thoreson			Rep Eliot Glassheim		
Rep Joe Kroeber			Rep Clark Williams		
<u>Passed</u>					

Total Yes 7 No 1

Absent \_\_\_\_\_

Floor Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

1 time expenses

January 24, 2007

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE BILL NO. 1002

Page 2, line 18, replace "580,001" with "544,244"

Page 2, line 22, replace "879,725" with "843,968"

Page 2, line 23, replace "879,725" with "843,968"

Page 2, line 26, replace "5,353,145" with "4,432,566"

Page 2, line 27, replace "3,412,776" with "4,074,644"

Page 3, line 2, replace "10,112,876" with "9,854,165"

Page 3, line 4, replace "9,431,155" with "9,172,444"

Page 3, line 11, replace "10,409,469" with "10,115,001"

Page 3, line 13, replace "11,103,025" with "10,808,557"

Page 3, line 21, replace "7,102,912" with "7,067,155"

Page 3, line 25, replace "9,470,328" with "9,434,571"

Page 3, line 26, replace "9,470,328" with "9,434,571"

Page 3, line 29, replace "42,305,433" with "41,384,854"

Page 3, line 30, replace "14,635,431" with "15,297,299"

Page 4, line 5, replace "59,280,090" with "59,021,379"

Page 4, line 7, replace "57,378,412" with "57,119,701"

Page 4, line 14, replace "67,267,338" with "66,972,870"

Page 4, line 16, replace "69,468,372" with "69,173,904"

Page 4, line 30, replace "six" with "five" and replace "forty-two" with "seventy-eight"

Page 4, line 31, replace "twenty-one" with "eighteen" and replace "five" with "one"

Page 5, line 1, replace "ninety-seven" with "twenty-one"

Page 5, line 2, replace "three" with "two" and replace "twenty-four" with "sixty-two"

Page 5, line 3, replace "five" with "three" and replace "fifty-seven" with "ninety-two"

Page 5, line 8, replace "three" with "four", remove "nine", overstrike "hundred", and replace "fifty-four" with "seventy-three"

Page 5, line 9, replace "eleven" with "eight"

Page 5, line 10, replace "thirty" with "thirty-six"

Page 5, line 14, replace "sixty-three" with "five"

Page 5, line 15, replace "two" with "one" and replace "seventy-eight" with "twenty-six"

Renumber accordingly

**STATEMENT OF PURPOSE OF AMENDMENT:**

**House Bill No. 1002 - Summary of House Action**

	EXECUTIVE BUDGET	HOUSE CHANGES	HOUSE VERSION
Supreme Court			
Total all funds	\$9,470,328	(\$35,757)	\$9,434,571
Less estimated income			
General fund	\$9,470,328	(\$35,757)	\$9,434,571
District Courts			
Total all funds	\$59,280,090	(\$258,711)	\$59,021,379
Less estimated income	1,901,678		1,901,678
General fund	\$57,378,412	(\$258,711)	\$57,119,701
Judicial Conduct Commission			
Total all funds	\$717,954	\$0	\$717,954
Less estimated income	299,356		299,356
General fund	\$418,598	\$0	\$418,598
Bill Total			
Total all funds	\$69,468,372	(\$294,468)	\$69,173,904
Less estimated income	2,201,034		2,201,034
General fund	\$67,267,338	(\$294,468)	\$66,972,870

**House Bill No. 1002 - Supreme Court - House Action**

	EXECUTIVE BUDGET	HOUSE CHANGES	HOUSE VERSION
Salaries and wages	\$7,102,912	(\$35,757)	\$7,067,155
Operating expenses	2,149,185		2,149,185
Capital assets	96,000		96,000
Judges' retirement	122,231		122,231
Total all funds	\$9,470,328	(\$35,757)	\$9,434,571
Less estimated income			
General fund	\$9,470,328	(\$35,757)	\$9,434,571
FTE	45.00	0.00	45.00

**Dept. 181 - Supreme Court - Detail of House Changes**

	CHANGES SALARIES FOR SUPREME COURT JUSTICES <sup>1</sup>	TOTAL HOUSE CHANGES
Salaries and wages	(\$35,757)	(\$35,757)
Operating expenses		
Capital assets		
Judges' retirement		
Total all funds	(\$35,757)	(\$35,757)
Less estimated income		
General fund	(\$35,757)	(\$35,757)
FTE	0.00	0.00

<sup>1</sup> Changes the salary increases for Supreme Court justices from a 6 percent increase the first year and a 7 percent increase for the second year of the biennium to providing a \$2,000 increase plus a 4 percent increase, effective July 1, 2007, and a 4 percent increase for the second year of the biennium.

The table below provides salary information for the Supreme Court justices:

	2005-07 BIENNIUM SALARY	SALARY INCLUDED IN HB 1002	SALARY AS AMENDED
Supreme Court justices			
First year of biennium	\$103,087	\$113,642	\$113,578
Second year of biennium	\$107,210	\$121,597	\$118,121
Chief Justice (amount in addition to justice salary)			
First year of biennium	\$3,015	\$3,324	\$3,262
Second year of biennium	\$3,136	\$3,557	\$3,392

### House Bill No. 1002 - District Courts - House Action

	EXECUTIVE BUDGET	HOUSE CHANGES	HOUSE VERSION
Salaries and wages	\$42,305,433	(\$920,579)	\$41,384,854
Operating expenses	14,635,431	661,868	15,297,299
Capital assets	458,583		458,583
Judges' retirement	703,819		703,819
UND - Central legal research	80,000		80,000
Alternative dispute resolution	20,000		20,000
Mediation	1,076,824		1,076,824
Total all funds	\$59,280,090	(\$258,711)	\$59,021,379
Less estimated income	1,901,678		1,901,678
General fund	\$57,378,412	(\$258,711)	\$57,119,701
FTE	294.00	(5.00)	289.00

### Dept. 182 - District Courts - Detail of House Changes

	CHANGES SALARIES FOR DISTRICT COURT JUDGES 1	CHANGES MEDIATION PILOT PROJECT TO CONTRACT BASIS 2	TOTAL HOUSE CHANGES
Salaries and wages	(\$258,711)	(\$661,868)	(\$920,579)
Operating expenses		661,868	661,868
Capital assets			
Judges' retirement			
UND - Central legal research			
Alternative dispute resolution			
Mediation			
Total all funds	(\$258,711)	\$0	(\$258,711)
Less estimated income			
General fund	(\$258,711)	\$0	(\$258,711)
FTE	0.00	(5.00)	(5.00)

1 Changes the salary increases for district court judges from a 6 percent increase the first year and a 7 percent increase for the second year of the biennium to providing a \$2,000 increase plus a 4 percent increase, effective July 1, 2007, and a 4 percent increase for the second year of the biennium.

The table below provides salary information for the district court judges:

	2005-07 BIENNIUM SALARY	SALARY INCLUDED IN HB 1002	SALARY AS AMENDED
District court judges			
First year of biennium	\$94,298	\$103,954	\$104,073
Second year of biennium	\$98,070	\$111,230	\$108,236
Presiding judges (amount in addition to judges' salary)			
First year of biennium	\$2,779	\$3,063	\$3,005
Second year of biennium	\$2,890	\$3,278	\$3,126

2 Removes 5 of the 6 FTE positions for the mediation pilot project and transfers funding from the salaries and wages line item to the operating line item. Contract mediators will be used for this project rather than adding employees. The one remaining position will serve as the program coordinator.

The executive budget included 2 new FTE clerk positions for Rolette County which opted to be state-employed, pursuant to North Dakota Century Code Chapter 27-05.2. The total salaries and wages for the new positions is \$222,677, which is an overall budget increase of \$87,626. The clerks were previously paid \$135,051 under a contract basis.



Date: 1/30/07

Roll Call Vote #: 1

**2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES**  
**BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1002**

House Appropriations- Government Operations Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number \_\_\_\_\_

Action Taken Do Pass As Amended

Motion Made By THOR Seconded By CAR

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Al Carlson	✓		Vice Chairman Ron Carlisle	✓	
Rep Keith Kempenich	✓		Rep Bob Skarphol	✓	
Rep Blair Thoreson	✓		Rep Eliot Glassheim	✓	
Rep Joe Kroeber	✓		Rep Clark Williams	✓	

Total Yes 8 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Carlisle

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

Date: 2/5/07  
Roll Call Vote #: ①

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1002

House Appropriations Full Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 78002.0103

Action Taken Adopt Amendment 0103

Motion Made By Carlisle Seconded By Thoreson

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Svedjan					
Vice Chairman Kempenich					
Representative Wald			Representative Aarsvold		
Representative Monson			Representative Gulleson		
Representative Hawken					
Representative Klein					
Representative Martinson					
Representative Carlson			Representative Glassheim		
Representative Carlisle			Representative Kroeber		
Representative Skarphol			Representative Williams		
Representative Thoreson					
Representative Pollert			Representative Ekstrom		
Representative Bellew			Representative Kerzman		
Representative Kreidt			Representative Metcalf		
Representative Nelson					
Representative Wieland					

Total (Yes) \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Absent \_\_\_\_\_

Floor Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent:

*Motion carries by voice vote*



Date: 2/5/07  
 Roll Call Vote #: (2)

2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES  
 BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 1002

House Appropriations Full Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Legislative Council Amendment Number 72002.0103

Action Taken Do Pass as Amended

Motion Made By Carlisle Seconded By Skarphol

Representatives	Yes	No	Representatives	Yes	No
Chairman Svedjan	✓				
Vice Chairman Kempenich	✓				
Representative Wald	✓		Representative Aarsvold	✓	
Representative Monson	✓		Representative Gulleon	✓	
Representative Hawken	✓				
Representative Klein	✓				
Representative Martinson	✓				
Representative Carlson	✓		Representative Glassheim	✓	
Representative Carlisle	✓		Representative Kroeber	✓	
Representative Skarphol	✓		Representative Williams	✓	
Representative Thoreson	✓				
Representative Pollert	✓		Representative Ekstrom	✓	
Representative Bellew	✓		Representative Kerzman	✓	
Representative Kreidt	✓		Representative Metcalf	✓	
Representative Nelson	✓				
Representative Wieland	✓				

Total (Yes) 24 No 0

Absent 0

Floor Assignment Carlisle

If the vote is on an amendment, briefly indicate intent: