

they would have had some reduction similar to other agencies that had none, but, anyway, this way it is free to do as the floor may wish. In the Foster Care Review Board, the committee amendment does not abolish that commission as would have been the probable result of the bill as introduced. What we did do, however, is make a reduction in the appropriation in an amount that was indicated by the agency as a possible reduction that could be made. It is in the amount of 10,000, as you look down a little way, it's \$10,083 from their current 170,000. The rest of the reductions as it is entitled under "C" by agencies, essentially they are half of the amount of the veto, and I can talk in any amount of detail you may like on them if you have questions. The aid programs, those are essentially 1 1/2 percent of the appropriation but also half of the veto. Now, on the back of the sheet there are some additional items which the committee has added that are included in the committee amendment. There would be a reduction in the Governor's appropriation of 41,276. One of the reasons for that is that there was a reappropriation of unspent balance from the preceding fiscal year, that is for '85-86, and the size of that reappropriation was higher than was anticipated and this amount of reduction could be made. The next one of 175,000 is Atkinson Dam. There was 225,000 appropriated. Some funds have been spent, but this, in effect, would defer any construction for this year. The State Treasurer is merely a shift reflecting the...in fact, it's a shift back to what we used to do where a portion of the...or half of the Deputy's salary in the State Treasurer's Office is paid out of the Unclaimed Property Fund. It was that way at one time and, in any event, returns it to that. DAS savings, part of that is one time for vacancy savings, and then the 15,000 for telecommunications is also a shift in funding to revolving fund rather than General Fund support which was a change that would have been made in any event in the next year's session. The processing of vendor payments is a savings which they would be processed three times a week instead of daily, and, of course, it raises the question in our minds if we did that, does that mean vendors are paid less frequently? It is our understanding where there is delay it occurs more likely at the agency level rather than at the DAS level and the fact that they process three days a week instead of five days a week it is still a savings in processing cost but would not have any significant impact on the timeliness with which vendors are paid. The Historical Society is out of a program that they may choose to do something else, but the amount of funds on there reflects what is considered to be the cost of the dredge that is located down there. The reason that