

LAWRENCE BLISS, District 7, Chair  
 BARRY J. HOBBS, District 5  
 DAVID R. HASTINGS III, District 13

O.F.P.R.



2009 MAR 13 AM 9:10

MARGARET J. REINSCH, Legislative Analyst  
 SUSAN M. PINETTE, Committee Clerk

CHARLES R. PRIEST, Brunswick, Chair  
 MARK E. BRYANT, Windham  
 CYNTHIA A. DILL, Cape Elizabeth  
 RICHARD C. CLEARY, Houlton  
 DAWN HILL, York  
 CHARLES B. KRUGER, Thomaston  
 SARA R. STEVENS, Bangor  
 JOAN M. NASS, Acton  
 MICHAEL G. BEAULIEU, Auburn  
 JARROD S. CROCKETT, Bethel  
 WAYNE T. MITCHELL, Penobscot Nation

State of Maine  
 ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOURTH LEGISLATURE  
 COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

March 13, 2009

TO: Sen. Bill Diamond, Senate Chair  
 Rep. Emily Cain, House Chair  
 Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations and Financial Affairs

FROM: Sen. Lawrence Bliss, Senate Chair  
 Rep. Charles R. Priest, House Chair  
 Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary

Re: FY10-FY11 Budget, LD 353 and Change Package

Thank you for the opportunity to report the conclusions of our budget discussions about the Office of the Attorney General, the Maine Human Rights Commission, the Judicial Branch, the Maine Indian Tribal-State Commission (MITSC) and Pine Tree Legal Assistance. Although we completed our voting on individual initiatives included in the LD 353 and Change Package, there are still a few outstanding issues that we would like to pursue. Our report to you consists of this memo and the worksheet. (Amended language included in this memo is indicated by shading.)

Overall, we want to thank the entities within our budget jurisdiction for their willingness to participate in the process to identify savings statewide. It is clear that reductions have to be made, and they have approached the work with that understanding. We agree that providing flexibility in meeting the reduction targets wherever appropriate is the right thing to do, and we support that in our recommendations.

We need to express our deep concern about the new statewide reduction in Personal Services to reflect the 5% Attrition Rate. As you know, this represents a 3.4% increase over the 1.6% attrition rate already incorporated into the baseline budget. We understand that how this will be applied is still under discussion and the interpretation of its meaning has been evolving for the past two or three weeks. This will be a significant reduction for the Maine Human Rights Commission, the Office of the Attorney General and the Judicial Branch. The Office of the Attorney General will see its Personal Services line reduced by \$345,550 and \$350,164 in FY10 and FY11 respectively.

Historically, the Office of the Attorney General has achieved the savings of the 1.6% attrition factor through a number of means; the four-year average of lapsed balances in the General Fund accounts attributed to attrition has been 0.19%. We understand that, in addition to the cuts specifically listed, the Judicial Branch's Personal Services line will be reduced by \$840,000 in each year to comply with the increased attrition rate requirement; this translates into about 17 positions if the reduction is made in July 2009. The Judicial Branch currently carries at least 40 vacancies to meet the cuts in this biennium; the additional 17 positions would result in layoffs. We believe this is simply untenable, and we do not believe this is an appropriate way to achieve the needed savings from the budget as a whole.

**Office of the Attorney General**

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass on:

- Initiative 499 (JUD-4)
- Initiative 459 (JUD-8)
- Initiative 515 (JUD-11)
- Initiative 524 (JUD-12)

We voted unanimously Ought Not To Pass on:

- Initiative 493 (JUD-3)
- Initiative 494 (JUD-3)

We rejected these initiatives but amended Initiative 498 to achieve the same dollar savings.

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass as Amended on:

- Initiative 498 (JUD-4) (*mentioned in Change Package, line 12. This amends that provision and corrects*)

**Administration - Attorney General 0310**

Initiative: Reduces funding from savings achieved by managing vacancies.

Ref. #: 498

<b>GENERAL FUND</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
Personal Services	(\$728,705)	(\$764,796)
<b>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$728,705)</b>	<b>(\$764,796)</b>

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass as Amended on

- Initiative 510 (JUD-11) - change wording of initiative to read:

Initiative: Reduces funding by eliminating merit increases in the 2010-2011 biennium for Assistant District Attorney positions as a result of merit raises not being granted in fiscal year 2008-09.

*(included in Change Package, line 14)*

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass as Amended to add a NEW INITIATIVE (insert on page JUD-11 before the Summary for the District Attorneys Salaries):

**District Attorney Salaries 0409**

Initiative: Transfers the remaining 25% allocation of the 7 Assistant District Attorney positions specializing in prosecutorial services related to juvenile offenders from Other Special Revenue Funds to the General Fund within the same program.

<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
Personal Services	(138,723)	(141,434)
All Other	(24,563)	(24,563)
<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE TOTAL</b>	<b>(163,286)</b>	<b>(165,997)</b>

This changes the allocation of the ADA positions to the General Fund. No additional dollars to accomplish this initiative are requested. The DA account will absorb this cost within the proposed appropriation.

**Maine Human Rights Commission**

We voted unanimously Ought Not To Pass on:

- Initiative 2029 (JUD-18)

We unanimously approve the replacement of Initiative 2029 with the proposal included in the Change Package (lines 43, 44 and 45)

(Keep Field Investigator in General Fund, move Paralegal Assistant (Intake Officer) from the General Fund to the Federal Expenditures Fund, eliminate

currently federally-funded Office Assistant II position. Adjust All Other to achieve the same General Fund savings as proposed in LD 353.)

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass on:

- Initiative 2030 (JUD-33)

### **Maine Indian Tribal-State Commission**

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass on:

- Initiative 2754 (JUD-20)

### **Judicial Branch**

1. We voted unanimously Ought To Pass on:

- Initiative 2984 (JUD-21)
- Initiative 2985 (JUD-22)
- Initiative 2996 (JUD-22)
- Initiative 2992 (JUD-23)
- Initiative 2986 (JUD-23)
- Initiative 2987 (JUD-23)
- Initiative 2990 (JUD-24)
- Initiative 2993 (JUD-24)
- Initiative 2997 (JUD-24)
- Initiative 2994 (JUD-25)
- Initiative 2998 (JUD-25)
- Initiative 3001 (JUD-27)
- Initiative 3003 (JUD-28)
- Initiative 3004 (JUD-28)
- Initiative 3005 (JUD-28)

2. We voted unanimously Ought To Pass as Amended on

- Part QQ-1 (JUD-34)

**Sec. QQ-1. General Fund savings; judicial branch.** Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the State Court Administrator shall adjust the Personal Services and All Other line categories to achieve the amount of projected savings in Part A in the judicial branch related to maintaining costs within available resources and shall transfer the amounts by financial order upon approval of the ~~Governor~~ Chief Justice. These transfers are considered adjustments to appropriations in fiscal year 2009-10 and fiscal year 2010-11.

Explanation: Our amendment addresses two issues.

- The Judicial Branch, as a separate and equal branch of government, should not have to have financial orders approved by the Governor. (We address the issue permanently below.)
- We do not think any savings that the Judicial Branch is able to achieve in the All Other line category should become the baseline for the next biennium's budget. If striking out the last sentence is not the way to achieve this, please amend it appropriately to carry out that intent.

3. When the Judiciary Committee approved the language in the Change Package designated as Part QQ-2, we did not realize that the Judicial Branch did not approve the language in its entirety. The Judicial Branch has serious concerns about the wording and the effect. As Chairs of the Judiciary Committee, we offer this amended version of Part QQ-2 to carry out the intent of the entire Committee based on discussions the Committee has had since the beginning of this session.

- Part QQ-2 (Change Package)

**Sec. QQ-2. Transfer authorized; judicial branch.** Notwithstanding the Maine Revised Statutes, Title 5, section 1585 or any other provision of law, for the fiscal years ending June 30, 2010 and June 30, 2011, the State Court Administrator is authorized to transfer, by financial order upon the recommendation of the State Budget Officer and approval of the Governor Chief Justice, identified Personal Services savings to the All Other line category in the Supreme, Judicial and Superior Courts, General Fund account for costs of indigent legal services. The State Court Administrator must ensure before presenting the financial order making any transfer under this section that all financial commitments have been met in Personal Services after assuming all costs for that program including collective bargaining costs.

Explanation: Our amendment addresses two issues.

- The Judicial Branch, as a separate and equal branch of government, should not have to have financial orders recommended by the State Budget Officer and approved by the Governor. (We address this issue permanently below.)
- Limiting this authority to transfer from Person Services to All Other to covering indigent legal services costs does not give the Judicial Branch the flexibility to address other significant needs.

4. For far too long, the Judicial Branch has suffered through the indignity of having its budget and budgeting processes overseen by the Executive Branch. We believe this completely unacceptable and most likely unconstitutional. We therefore recommend that the Judicial Branch be accorded the same respect as and its independent authority be

recognized as the Legislature insisted upon for itself in the 122nd Legislature. We modeled the following language on the existing laws that apply to the Legislature:

**Sec. 1.** 5 MRSA §1522 is enacted to read:

**5 §1522. Application to Judicial Branch**

Unless the language in this Part specifically states that it applies to the Judicial Branch, the Judicial Branch may not be required to comply with the provisions of this Part unless determined relevant and applicable by the Chief Justice, pursuant to Title 4, section 1.

**Sec. 2.** 4 MRSA §1 is amended to read:

**§1. Constitution of the court; administrative responsibilities of the court and the Chief Justice**

The Supreme Judicial Court, as heretofore established, shall consist of a Chief Justice and 6 associate justices and such Active Retired Justices as may be appointed and serving on said court, learned in the law and of sobriety of manners.

The Chief Justice shall be the head of the Judicial Department Branch of the State. In the event of his the Chief Justice's disability for any cause, the senior associate, not under disability, shall perform any and all of his the duties of the Chief Justice.

The Supreme Judicial Court shall have general administrative and supervisory authority over the Judicial Department Branch and shall make and promulgate rules, regulations and orders governing the administration of the Judicial Department.

The Chief Justice, as head of the Judicial Branch, shall prepare and approve the budget for the Judicial Branch. The Chief Justice has the authority to comply with the provisions of Title 5, Part 4 determined by the Chief Justice as relevant and applicable to the Judicial Branch and necessary for maintaining proper accounting controls and reporting. The Chief Justice may approve financial orders for transfers within the Judicial Branch. The Chief Justice shall provide a copy of each approved financial order to the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Fiscal and Program Review.

The Chief Justice, as the head of the Judicial Department Branch, shall, in accordance with the rules, regulations and orders of the Supreme Judicial Court, be responsible for the efficient operation of the Judicial Department Branch and for the expeditious dispatch of litigation therein and for the proper conduct of business in all courts. The Chief Justice may require reports from all courts in the State and may issue orders and regulations necessary for the efficient operation of the Judicial Department Branch and the prompt and proper administration of justice.

Explanation: Our amendments provide the appropriate recognition to the Judicial Branch's authority as an independent branch to control its budget within the total appropriation. The Chief Justice will provide copies of financial orders to the Bureau of the Budget and the Office of Fiscal and Program Review. *Please note that this is draft language and we would like to still have the opportunity to work with the Judicial Branch and the Office of Fiscal and Program Review to refine the language to carry out our intent.*

5. We recommend that the Judicial Branch's account balance not lapse at the end of each fiscal year. Currently, any unspent funds left in any accounts within the Judicial Branch lapse back into the General Fund. We note that the Legislature's balances do not lapse, and believe that is the appropriate treatment for the Judicial Branch as a separate branch of government. We therefore propose the following amendment:

**Sec. 3. Sec. 1. 5 MRSA §1591, sub-§3** is enacted to read:

**3. Judicial Branch.** The Judicial Branch must apply:

**A.** Any balance remaining in the General Fund accounts of the Judicial Branch at the end of any fiscal year to be carried forward for use by the Judicial Branch in the next fiscal year.

6. The Judicial Branch's capital expenditures line must also be addressed. LD 353 totally eliminates any funds for capital expenditures. This is completely unacceptable for a branch of government to be provided no funds to maintain its 40 facilities statewide. The Judiciary Committee voted unanimously to fund capital expenditures for \$300,000 per year of the biennium. The Judicial Branch is awaiting the recommendations of the Judicial Branch Advisory Committee on Fees (due in June) for specific recommendations, but projects an increase in the imposition and collection of court fees to be at least \$300,000 per year. Because it is important that these additional dollars be devoted to the capital needs of the Judicial Branch's facilities, we recommend that the additional dollars be collected in a dedicated fund and not be deposited in the General Fund as are all existing court fees. Our proposed amendments:

**Sec. 4. 4 MRSA §28** is enacted to read:

**§28. Additional fee revenue dedicated**

The Judicial Department may credit up to \$300,000 per fiscal year of fee revenue collected pursuant to administrative orders of the Court to a non-lapsing Other

Special Revenue Funds account to support the capital expenses of the Judicial Department.

**Sec. 5. Maine State Judicial Branch Advisory Committee on Fees.** The Maine State Judicial Branch Advisory Committee on Fees must include in its recommendations proposals to increase total fee revenue by at least \$300,000 annually above the revenue forecast of the Revenue Forecasting Committee as of May 1, 2009.

**Sec. 6. Appropriations and Allocations.** The following appropriations and allocations are made.

**JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT**

**Courts - Supreme, Superior and District 0063**

Initiative: Allocates funds to support Judicial Branch Capital Expenditures.

<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
Capital Expenditures	\$300,000	\$300,000
<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS TOTAL</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>
 <b>JUDICIAL DEPARTMENT</b>		
<b>DEPARTMENT TOTALS</b>	<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>
<b>DEPARTMENT TOTAL - ALL FUNDS</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>	<b>\$300,000</b>

7. We appreciate that many of the budget issues the Judicial Branch has been facing have been recognized. We applaud the separating out of the debt service lines and the indigent legal services line from the basic programs. We note, however, that the Judicial Branch has been required to absorb huge increases in constitutionally-required indigent legal services during the current biennium. This has required the Judicial Branch to solely shoulder the entire State's obligation to provide legal services. The consequences of this inequitable burden include the fact that the Judicial Branch has been operating with approximately 10% personnel vacancies. This is a real reduction in access to justice as the District Courts in Cumberland and York Counties have reduced public hours to allow



the remaining staff to catch up on the paperwork and administrative tasks. An extremely alarming effect is the status of court security, including entry screening at the courthouses where entry screening now takes place only 5% of the time that courthouses are open to the public. Although we are not proposing specific remedies, we think it is important to note significant challenges, in addition to court security issues, facing the Judicial Branch.

- **Interpreters:** The Judicial Branch has signed a memorandum of understanding with the United State Department of Justice recognizing the Branch's responsibility to provide interpreters for an increasingly diverse population. The current budget is not adequate for the Branch to fulfill its responsibilities in this area.
- **Technology:** The budget is inadequate to support the existing technology and the limitations mean any improvements - to increase efficient or increase access to justice - are impossible.
- **Juror remuneration:** The Judicial Branch identified the need for increased juror compensation but did not include a request for funding in its final budget submission. We currently have a bill before us to increase the mileage reimbursement paid to jurors above the miniscule 15¢/mile the current statute - and budget - authorize. We believe that jurors should be compensated sufficiently to pay for their out of pocket costs incurred by serving on jury duty.

#### **Pine Tree Legal Assistance**

We voted unanimously Ought To Pass on:

- Initiative 3356 (JUD-32)

We would like to note that we also support the Legal Assistance for Maine Military Personnel (LAMMP) Program that Pine Tree plans to initiate, and is seeking federal grant funds to implement.

Thank you for your consideration. We are happy to work with you to better implement our recommendations.

Natural Resources Division. The Natural Resources Division represents the following agencies and boards: Department and Board of Environmental Protection; Department of Conservation; Department of Agriculture; Food and Rural Resources; Department of Marine Resources; State Planning Office; Department of Inland Fisheries and Wildlife; Department of Economic and Community Development; Maine Emergency Management Agency; Department of Defense and Veterans' Services; Oil Fund Insurance Review Board; Land Use Regulation Commission; Pesticides Control Board; Maine Milk Commission; Board of Underground Storage Tank Installers; Land for Maine's Future Board; and Outdoor Heritage Fund Board.

Professional and Regulatory Division. The Professional and Regulatory Division represents the Department of Professional and Financial Regulation, which includes the Office of Licensing and Registration (OLR), Bureau of Banking, Bureau of Consumer Credit Protection, and Bureau of Insurance. The OLR includes the following in-house and affiliated boards: accountants, acupuncturists, alcohol and drug counselors, arborists, architects, landscape architects and interior designers, athletic commission, auctioneers, barbers and cosmetologists, boiler installer and operators, chiropractors, counseling professionals, dentists, dieticians, driver education, electricians, elevator and tramway, engineers, foresters, funeral service, geologists, harness racing, hearing aid dealers, land surveyors, manufactured housing, medical doctors, nurses, nursing home administrators, occupational therapists, oil and solid fuel, optometrists, osteopathic doctors, pharmacy, physical therapists, plumbers, podiatrists, propane and natural gas dealers, psychologists, radiologists, real estate appraisers, real estate commission, respiratory care practitioners, social workers, speech pathologists, and veterinarians. The Division also represents the Maine State Retirement System (MSRS) and the Harness Racing Commission (part of the Department of Agriculture).

Consumer Protection Division. The Consumer Protection Division enforces state antitrust and consumer protection laws, including the mini-Sherman Act, the state merger statute and the Unfair Trade Practices Act. The Division also discharges the Attorney General's mandate to oversee charities, and is responsible for the investigation and prosecution of the unauthorized practice of law. Housed within the Division is the Consumer Mediation Program, which uses trained volunteers to mediate consumer complaints, and the Lemon Law Arbitration Program, which administers the State's lemon law.

**Administration - Attorney General 0310**

Initiative: Eliminates one part-time Research Assistant position and one Attorney General Detective position, reorganizes one Assistant Attorney General position from full-time to part-time and reallocates the cost of one Assistant Attorney General position from 50% General Fund and 50% Other Special Revenue Funds to 100% Other Special Revenue Funds and one Deputy Attorney General position from 60% General Fund and 40% Other Special Revenue Funds to 100% Other Special Revenue Funds.

Ref. #: 493

Committee Vote: ONTP AFA Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL FUND	2009-10	2010-11
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	(4,000)	(4,000)
Personal Services	(\$258,173)	(\$268,847)
<b>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</b>	<u>(\$258,173)</u>	<u>(\$268,847)</u>

Ref. #: 494

Committee Vote: ONTP AFA Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS	2009-10	2010-11
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	1,500	1,500
Personal Services	\$49,871	\$52,629
All Other	\$18,551	\$19,580

OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS TOTAL

~~\$68,422      \$72,209~~

**Justification:**

This proposal eliminates the detective position responsible for investigating financial exploitation of elderly citizens and eliminates 1.5 attorney positions. These specific reductions, together with the reduction in funding from managing vacancies will mean a loss of nearly 25% of our General Fund attorneys, which will reduce our ability to prevent and defend lawsuits against state agencies, to generate settlement funds from consumer litigation and to prosecute homicides in the state.

**Administration - Attorney General 0310**

Initiative: Reduces funding from savings achieved by managing vacancies.

Ref. #: 498

Committee Vote: OTP-A

AFA Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

**GENERAL FUND**

Personal Services

*See Memo*

~~2009-10      2010-11  
(\$470,532)      (\$495,949)~~

**GENERAL FUND TOTAL**

~~(\$470,532)      (\$495,949)~~

**Justification:**

This proposal reduces funding based on managing vacancies. To achieve this savings together with the initiative to eliminate, reorganize and reallocate 1.5 attorney positions will mean a loss of nearly 25% of our General Fund attorneys, which will reduce our ability to prevent and defend lawsuits against state agencies, to generate settlement funds from consumer litigation and to prosecute homicides in the state.

**Administration - Attorney General 0310**

Initiative: Eliminates one Secretary Legal position in accordance with Public Law 2007, chapter 653, Part C, section 2.

Ref. #: 499

Committee Vote: OTP

AFA Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

**OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS**

POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT

Personal Services

2009-10      2010-11  
(1.000)      (1.000)

(\$54,310)      (\$57,555)

**OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS TOTAL**

(\$54,310)      (\$57,555)

**Justification:**

Public Law 2007, chapter 653, Part C, section 2, directed the Department of Administrative and Financial Services to review vacant positions throughout state government, regardless of funding source, and to identify positions to be eliminated. This initiative eliminates one position identified as part of that review and is a continuation of an initiative in Legislative Document 45, the fiscal year 2008-09 supplemental budget. This Other Special Revenue Fund position has been vacant for some time as there is no funding source to support it.

**District Attorneys Salaries 0409**

*note change*

Initiative: Reduces funding by eliminating merit increases in the 2010-2011 biennium for District Attorney positions and Assistant District Attorney positions.

Ref. #: 510

Committee Vote: OTP-A

AFA Vote: \_\_\_\_\_

GENERAL FUND	2009-10	2010-11
Personal Services	(\$269,000)	(\$318,000)
<b>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>(\$269,000)</b>	<b>(\$318,000)</b>

**Justification:**

Merit increases for all Assistant District Attorney positions have not been awarded in fiscal year 2008-09 in order to maintain costs within available resources. As a consequence of that fiscal year 2008-09 action the base salaries carried into the next biennium are lower, resulting in savings available in the 2010-2011 biennium. This initiative will have no impact on the 75 Assistant District Attorney positions in fiscal year 2009-10 and fiscal year 2010-2011.

**→ INSERT NEW INITIATIVE FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEYS - DISTRICT ATTORNEYS SALARIES 0409 PROGRAM SUMMARY (see memo)**

GENERAL FUND	History 2007-08	History 2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	83.000	83.000	83.000	83.000
Personal Services	\$8,148,629	\$8,248,811	\$8,875,273	\$8,962,631
<b>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$8,148,629</b>	<b>\$8,248,811</b>	<b>\$8,875,273</b>	<b>\$8,962,631</b>

FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FUND	History 2007-08	History 2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000
Personal Services	\$62,429	\$65,640	\$72,723	\$73,875
All Other	\$8,244	\$8,244	\$8,244	\$8,244
<b>FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$70,673</b>	<b>\$73,884</b>	<b>\$80,967</b>	<b>\$82,119</b>

OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS	History 2007-08	History 2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
Personal Services	\$118,883	\$125,447	\$138,723	\$141,434
All Other	\$30,708	\$30,708	\$30,708	\$30,708
<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS TOTAL</b>	<b>\$149,591</b>	<b>\$156,155</b>	<b>\$169,431</b>	<b>\$172,142</b>

**Sec. A-37. Appropriations and allocations.**

The following appropriations and allocations are made.

**HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION, MAINE**

**Human Rights Commission - Regulation 0150**

Initiative: BASELINE BUDGET

	History 2007-08	History 2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>GENERAL FUND</b>				
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	8.000	8.000	8.000	8.000
Personal Services	\$549,139	\$548,742	\$567,407	\$588,358
All Other	\$57,754	\$18,964	\$55,411	\$55,411
<b>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$606,893</b>	<b>\$567,706</b>	<b>\$622,818</b>	<b>\$643,769</b>
	History 2007-08	History 2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FUND</b>				
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT	5.000	5.000	5.000	5.000
Personal Services	\$315,802	\$344,081	\$322,735	\$338,073
All Other	\$130,717	\$111,951	\$111,951	\$111,951
<b>FEDERAL EXPENDITURES FUND TOTAL</b>	<b>\$446,519</b>	<b>\$456,032</b>	<b>\$434,686</b>	<b>\$450,024</b>
	History 2007-08	History 2008-09	2009-10	2010-11
<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</b>				
All Other	\$5,698	\$5,698	\$5,698	\$5,698
<b>OTHER SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS TOTAL</b>	<b>\$5,698</b>	<b>\$5,698</b>	<b>\$5,698</b>	<b>\$5,698</b>

**Justification:**

The Maine Human Rights Commission is the State agency charged with the responsibility of enforcing Maine's anti-discrimination laws. Pursuant to 5 MRSA, ss 4551 et seq., the Maine Human Rights Commission investigates complaints of unlawful discrimination in employment, housing, education, access to public accommodations, extension of credit, and offensive names. Also by statutory mandate, the Commission endeavors to resolve complaints by informal methods of persuasion, conciliation and negotiations prior to a determination of whether there are reasonable grounds to believe that unlawful discrimination occurred. The Commission pursues court remedy only when alternative solutions have failed.

**Human Rights Commission - Regulation 0150**

Initiative: Eliminates one Field Investigator position to meet target reductions.

Ref. #: 2029

Committee Vote:

*ONTIP*

AFA Vote:

<b>GENERAL FUND</b>		<b>2009-10</b>	<b>2010-11</b>
POSITIONS - LEGISLATIVE COUNT		(1.000)	(1.000)
Personal Services		(\$62,282)	(\$64,337)
<b>GENERAL FUND TOTAL</b>		<b>(\$62,282)</b>	<b>(\$64,337)</b>

*See Change Package*