

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

STD. 399 (REV. 12/2008)

See SAM Section 6601 - 6616 for Instructions and Code Citations

DEPARTMENT NAME Department of Conservation	CONTACT PERSON Tim Shular	TELEPHONE NUMBER (916) 323-5432
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400 SB 4 Well Stimulation Treatment Regulations		NOTICE FILE NUMBER Z 2013-1105-01

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.)

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:

- a. Impacts businesses and/or employees
- b. Impacts small businesses
- c. Impacts jobs or occupations
- d. Impacts California competitiveness
- e. Imposes reporting requirements
- f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance
- g. Impacts individuals
- h. None of the above (Explain below. Complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.)

h. (cont.) _____

(If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.)

2. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: 550 Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits.): Oil and gas production operations.

Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: unknown

3. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: 0 eliminated: 0
Explain: The Department has determined that the proposed regulations will not affect the creation or elimination of businesses.

4. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: Statewide Local or regional (List areas.): _____

5. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 or eliminated: 0 Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: _____

6. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here?

Yes No If yes, explain briefly: _____

B. ESTIMATED COSTS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.)

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? \$ _____

a. Initial costs for a small business: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____

b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____

c. Initial costs for an individual: \$ _____ Annual ongoing costs: \$ _____ Years: _____

d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: See attached.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: Only oil and gas production operations would be impacted.

3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. (Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted.): \$ See attached

4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? Yes No If yes, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: _____ and the number of units: _____

5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? Yes No Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: See attached.

Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: \$ n/a

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS (Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)

1. Briefly summarize the benefits that may result from this regulation and who will benefit: See attached.

2. Are the benefits the result of : specific statutory requirements, or goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?
Explain: The benefits are the result of the specific requirements PRC sec. 3160 and the broad authority of PRC sec. 3106.

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? \$ _____

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: See attached.

2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

Regulation:	Benefit: \$ _____	Cost: \$ _____
Alternative 1:	Benefit: \$ _____	Cost: \$ _____
Alternative 2:	Benefit: \$ _____	Cost: \$ _____

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: _____
The benefits of the proposed regulations include accomplishment of statutory goals; protection of health, safety, and the environment; and increasing openness and transparency of business and government.

4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs? Yes No

Explain: Where the use of technology is integral to compliance, the proposed regulations establish performance standards and do not prescribe the use of specific technologies or equipment.

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.) Cal/EPA boards, offices, and departments are subject to the following additional requirements per Health and Safety Code section 57005.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises exceed \$10 million ? Yes No (If No, skip the rest of this section.)

2. Briefly describe each equally as an effective alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1: _____

Alternative 2: _____

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

Regulation: \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 1: \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

Alternative 2: \$ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: \$ _____

FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

1. Additional expenditures of approximately \$ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code. Funding for this reimbursement:

a. is provided in _____, Budget Act of _____ or Chapter _____, Statutes of _____

b. will be requested in the _____ (FISCAL YEAR) Governor's Budget for appropriation in Budget Act of _____

2. Additional expenditures of approximately \$ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year which are not reimbursable by the State pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code because this regulation:

a. implements the Federal mandate contained in _____

b. implements the court mandate set forth by the _____ court in the case of _____ vs. _____

c. implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. _____ at the _____ election; (DATE)

d. is issued only in response to a specific request from the _____, which is/are the only local entity(s) affected;

e. will be fully financed from the _____ (FEES, REVENUE, ETC.) authorized by Section _____ of the _____ Code;

f. provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each such unit;

g. creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in _____

3. Savings of approximately \$ _____ annually.

4. No additional costs or savings because this regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

5. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any local entity or program.
6. Other.

B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

1. Additional expenditures of approximately \$ 0 in the current State Fiscal Year. It is anticipated that State agencies will:
- a. be able to absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.
- b. request an increase in the currently authorized budget level for the 2014-2015 fiscal year.
2. Savings of approximately \$ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year.
3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any State agency or program.
4. Other.

C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

1. Additional expenditures of approximately \$ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year.
2. Savings of of approximately \$ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year.
3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.
4. Other.

FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE 	DATE 11/5/13
AGENCY SECRETARY ¹ APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE 	DATE 11/5/13
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE ² APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE 	PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER DATE

1. The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD.399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or department not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.

2. Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD.399.

ATTACHMENT 1

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (STD. 399)

SB 4 WELL STIMULATION TREATMENT REGULATIONS

ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

B. 1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime?

Senate Bill 4 (Pavley, Chapter 313, Statutes of 2013), effective January 1, 2014, requires the Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (Division) to adopt regulations effective January 1, 2015 that will ensure integrity of wells, well casings, and the geologic and hydrologic isolation of the oil and gas formation during and following well stimulation treatments, and full disclosure of the composition and disposition of well stimulation fluids, including, but not limited to, hydraulic fracturing fluids, acid well stimulation fluids, and flowback fluids.

The following compliance requirements are projected to result from the proposed action:

- Radial cement evaluation, or other cement evaluation approved by the Division.
- Well stimulation radius analysis.
- Pressure testing prior to the well stimulation treatment.
- Monitoring during a well stimulation treatment.
- Storage and handling of well stimulation fluids.
- Monitoring after a well stimulation treatment.
- Post well stimulation reporting.

The Department estimates that statewide the proposed regulations will result in initial and ongoing costs between \$4,384,000 and \$8,728,000 annually.

The Department estimates that for a representative operator the proposed regulations will result in initial and ongoing costs between \$216,000 and \$504,000 annually. This estimate is based upon an assumed representative operator that performs approximately 72 well stimulation treatments a year,

complies with existing laws and regulations, and adheres to common and best practices in the oilfield.

The bases for the above estimates are discussed in the Economic Impact Analysis that is incorporated into the rulemaking record.

B. 3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. (Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted.):

The costs created by the reporting requirements established by the proposed regulations would be marginal or speculative for the following reasons:

- *The proposed regulations specify the contents of a well stimulation permit application, including the results of the cement evaluation, the results of the well stimulation treatment radius analysis, the well stimulation treatment design, and specified chemical information.*

Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 3160, subdivision (d), requires an operator to apply for and obtain a permit from the Division prior to conducting a well stimulation treatment on a well. There may be costs incurred by operators as a result of the statutorily required well stimulation permit. However, the proposed regulations do not create this requirement, and the proposed regulations implementing this requirement do not create a new cost. The proposed regulations establish procedures that seek to clarify and streamline the permit process. It is the intent of the Department that the proposed regulations regarding well stimulation treatment permitting will reduce costs to a representative operator and statewide costs to comply with the statutory permitting requirements.

- *The proposed regulations require operators to report specified diagnostic testing results obtained from monitoring during a well stimulation treatment.*

In the event that a well is breached an operator would incur costs for staff to report the breach and collect specified information to provide to the Division and the Regional Water Quality Control Board. Also, costs would be associated with the operator's required work with the Division and the Regional Water Quality Control Board to identify the appropriate response to the incident. The extent of these costs would depend on the nature of the incident, the amount of staff time, and any necessary testing performed. Although the Department does not have comprehensive information regarding well failures during well stimulation treatment, the Department believes that it is not a common

occurrence. For this reason costs to a representative operator would be negligible. Statewide costs would be speculative and dependent on how often well stimulation treatments result in well failures.

- *The proposed regulations require operators to provide the Division a specified written report in the case of an unauthorized release of well stimulation fluids.*

In the event of an unauthorized release of fluids associated with a well stimulation treatment an operator would incur costs for staff to prepare the required report. Although the Department does not have comprehensive information regarding the number of unauthorized releases that specifically involve fluids associated with a well stimulation treatment, the Department believes that it is not a common occurrence. For this reason costs to a representative operator would be negligible. Statewide costs would be speculative and dependent on how often fluids associated with well stimulation treatments are spilled.

- *The proposed regulations require operators to submit specified information obtained from monitoring after a well stimulation treatment.*

The proposed regulations create requirements for monitoring a well after a well stimulation treatment, and the Department estimates that the monitoring requirements will create annual costs of \$216,000-\$504,000 for a representative operator and \$2,400,000-\$5,600,000 on a statewide basis. In addition, operators are required to periodically report on the results of the well monitoring. Costs associated with transmitting monitoring data to will be minimal.

- *The proposed regulations require an operator to submit a specified report after the well stimulation treatment.*

The proposed regulations require an operator to collect information through the entire well stimulation treatment; this portion of the regulation is simply a report of that information. Costs associated with this requirement will be minimal.

B. 5. Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations:

Senate Bill 4 (Pavley, Chapter 313, Statutes of 2013), effective January 1, 2014, requires the Department of Conservation, Division of Oil, Gas, and Geothermal Resources (Division) to adopt regulations effective January 1, 2015 that will ensure integrity of wells, well casings, and the geologic and hydrologic isolation of the oil and gas formation during and following well stimulation treatments, and

full disclosure of the composition and disposition of well stimulation fluids, including, but not limited to, hydraulic fracturing fluids, acid well stimulation fluids, and flowback fluids.

C.1. Briefly summarize the benefits that may result from this regulation and who will benefit:

The proposed regulations satisfy the Division's statutory mandate to prevent damage to life, health, property, and natural resources by ensuring that wells are properly drilled, operated, repaired, and plugged and abandoned; and to allow, with Division approval and oversight, the oil and gas industry to utilize all methods and practices known to the oil industry for the purpose of increasing the ultimate recovery of underground hydrocarbons. Also, the proposed regulations satisfy the statutory goals of SB 4 by addressing the well stimulation permit application process, acid concentration thresholds, construction of wells and well casings to ensure integrity of wells, well casings, and the geologic and hydrologic isolation of the oil and gas formation during and following well stimulation treatments, and full disclosure of the composition and disposition of well stimulation fluids, including hydraulic fracturing fluids, acid well stimulation fluids, and flowback fluids, and the distinction between well stimulation and underground injection projects. Further, the Department has determined that the proposed regulations will result in nonmonetary benefits such as protection of public health and safety, worker safety, environmental safety, and transparency in business and government. Specifically, the benefits are as follows:

- Clarity for the Division, operators, and the public regarding which set of regulations oversee a specified oil and gas operation.
- A better informed public who know when and where well stimulation is occurring, and be able to obtain information specific to a completed well stimulation treatment.
- The Division will receive comprehensive information regarding the integrity of a well, information regarding the integrity of wells near a well stimulation treatment, and geologic information regarding the area around the well prior to a well stimulation treatment, which will result in assurances that well stimulation will be completed safely.
- Operators will be provided with clear directives regarding when to terminate a well stimulation treatment, how to respond in the case of a well failure, and what information must be collected to ensure that future well failures are preventable.
- Assurances that all well stimulation fluids will be handled safely and that spills and incidents will be responded to effectively and proactively.

D.1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not:

The proposed regulations are the result of a lengthy process of public engagement and consideration of a wide range of public concerns and suggestion. During the summer of 2012 the Department conducted a statewide listening tour to better understand public concerns about hydraulic fracturing. In December 2012, the Department released an initial set of draft regulations for discussion purposes and, during spring of 2013, the Department conducted a statewide series of day-long public workshops to solicit input on the draft regulations. Throughout this process, the Department has been meeting and discussing this area of regulation with the regulated industry, other public agencies, environmental groups, concerned members of the public, and members of the Legislature.

With the passage of SB 4, the Department has built upon this work to ensure that the proposed regulations accomplish each of the express rulemaking mandates of the new legislation. In particular, the scope of the Department's regulations has been expanded so that they address not only hydraulic fracturing, but other forms of well stimulation treatment as well.

In the course of developing the proposed regulations, the Department considered and rejected various alternative approaches. No alternative considered by the Department would be more effective in carrying out the purposes of the proposed regulations or would be as effective but less burdensome to affected private persons than the proposed regulation.

- The Department considered but rejected requiring a radial cement evaluation log as part of the evaluation for every well stimulation treatment. The Department determined that the purposes of the regulation could be achieved without prescribing a specific technology. Although a radial cement evaluation log is an effective method for determining the adequacy of cement in the well, other equally effective technologies are available. In addition, where there is extensive geologic knowledge of area from past experience drilling and constructing wells, the adequacy of cement can be demonstrated through adherence to well construction techniques that have been proven to be successful in that area.

- The Department considered but rejected various alternative approaches to well monitoring after well stimulation treatment, some requiring less monitoring and some requiring more. Well monitoring after a well stimulation is the most effective way to verify continuing well integrity and geologic and hydrologic isolation. At the same time, such monitoring requires an investment by operators in new equipment and additional staff time. The proposed regulations require a minimum level of well monitoring that will effectively verify well integrity and geologic and hydrologic isolation.

- The Department considered but rejected requiring operators to employ micro-seismic monitoring equipment during hydraulic fracture treatments. Although micro-seismic monitoring equipment during hydraulic fracture

treatment, prescribing the use of this expensive technology is not necessary to achieve the purposes of these regulations.

- The Department considered but rejected both lesser and greater safety factors for the well stimulation treatment radius analysis. A safety factor of two is used for the analysis of potential conduits within the treatment area. This provides an ample margin of error without requiring a review that extends well beyond the area influenced by the well stimulation treatment. A safety factor of five that is used for determining whether adjacent formations must be evaluated. This large safety factor will ensure that adjacent formations are evaluated for all but the most contained well stimulation treatments, effectively ensuring geologic and hydrologic isolation.

The Department considered but rejected allowing fluids associated with well stimulation treatment to be stored in lined pits or sumps. This alternative would not have been as effective because it is difficult to verify the efficacy of the lining in a pit or sump, and because fluids stored in sumps or pits are more exposed to the environment.

ATTACHMENT 2

ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (STD. 399)

SB 4 WELL STIMULATION TREATMENT REGULATIONS

**FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT
WORKSHEETS**

Fiscal Worksheet
SB 4 Regulations Fiscal Impact

Fiscal Year 2016-17 and on-going

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V	W	X	Y	Z	
ENTER INFORMATION IN YELLOW HIGHLIGHTED AREAS.										OPERATING EXPENSES AND EQUIPMENT														TOTAL		
1	PERSONAL SERVICES		Class #	Pos.	Min.	Mid	Max.	Std Comp Adjusted	Amount	Gen'l Exp	Print	Comm.	Post	In/State Travel	Out/State Travel	Training	Facility	Util.	Constg & Prof External	Data Chr.	Data Proc.	Equip.	Other	Veh. Ops.	TOTAL	
2	Petroleum Production Engineer		3775	1.0	9,344	10,521	11,698	126,252	0	3,400	350	0	0	0	0	500	15,650	0	0	0	4,100	0	0	0	0	27,700
3	Supervising Oil and Gas Engineer		3777	1.0	9,339	10,517	11,695	126,204	0	3,400	350	1,550	100	1,000	1,000	500	15,650	0	0	0	4,100	0	0	0	1,050	27,700
4	Senior Oil and Gas Engineer (Spec)		3727	2.0	9,350	10,529	11,708	252,696	0	6,800	700	3,100	200	2,000	2,000	1,000	15,650	0	0	0	8,200	0	0	0	2,100	55,400
5	Senior Engineering Geologist		3751	1.0	8,122	9,144	10,166	109,728	0	3,400	350	1,550	100	1,000	1,000	500	15,650	0	0	0	4,100	0	0	0	1,050	27,700
6	Associate Oil and Gas Engineer		3783	9.0	8,115	9,135	10,155	986,580	0	30,600	3,150	13,950	900	9,000	9,000	4,500	140,850	0	0	0	36,900	0	0	0	9,450	249,300
7	Staff Service Manager I		4800	1.0	5,079	5,695	6,311	68,340	0	3,400	350	1,550	100	1,000	1,000	500	15,650	0	0	0	4,100	0	0	0	1,050	27,700
8	Research Program Specialist I		5742	4.0	4,833	5,442	6,050	261,192	0	13,600	1,400	6,200	400	4,000	4,000	2,000	62,600	0	0	0	16,400	0	0	0	4,200	110,800
9	Associate Enviro Planner		4711	2.0	4,619	5,202	5,784	124,836	0	6,800	700	3,100	200	2,000	2,000	1,000	31,300	0	0	0	8,200	0	0	0	2,100	55,400
10	Engineering Geologist		3756	20.0	4,608	6,642	8,675	1,593,960	0	68,000	7,000	31,000	2,000	20,000	20,000	10,000	313,000	0	0	0	82,000	0	0	0	21,000	554,000
11	AGPA		5393	2.0	4,400	4,954	5,508	118,896	0	6,800	700	3,100	200	2,000	2,000	1,000	31,300	0	0	0	8,200	0	0	0	2,100	55,400
12	Program Tech II		9928	5.0	2,638	2,972	3,305	178,290	0	17,000	1,750	7,750	500	5,000	5,000	2,500	78,250	0	0	0	20,500	0	0	0	5,250	198,500
13	Office Assistant (I)		1379	2.0	2,143	2,527	2,911	60,648	0	6,800	700	3,100	200	2,000	2,000	1,000	31,300	0	0	0	8,200	0	0	0	2,100	55,400
14	Office Technician (I)		1139	3.0	2,686	3,024	3,362	106,864	0	10,200	1,050	4,850	300	3,000	3,000	1,500	46,950	0	0	0	12,300	0	0	0	3,150	83,100
15									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
16									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
17									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
18									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
19									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
20									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
21									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
22									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
23									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
24									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
25									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
26									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
27									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
28									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
29									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
30									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
31									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
32	Overtime							23,850	180,200	18,550	82,150	5,300	53,000	0	0	26,500	829,450	0	0	0	217,300	0	0	0	55,650	1,468,100
33	TOTAL Sal. & Wages						4,140	4,140,336	180,200	18,550	82,150	5,300	53,000	0	0	26,500	829,450	0	0	0	217,300	0	0	0	55,650	1,468,100
34	Salary Savings @ 0%								0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
35	NET TOTAL S & W							4,140,336	180,200	18,550	82,150	5,300	53,000	0	0	26,500	829,450	0	0	0	217,300	0	0	0	55,650	1,468,100
36	Staff Benefits						1,656,134	1,656,134	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
37	TOTAL PERSONAL SERVICES						5,796,470	5,796,470	180,200	18,550	82,150	5,300	53,000	0	0	26,500	829,450	0	0	0	217,300	0	0	0	55,650	1,468,100
38									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
39									0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
40	201 - Gen Exp						180,200	180,200	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
41	241 - Printing						18,550	18,550	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
42	251 - Communications						82,150	82,150	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
43	261 - Postage						5,300	5,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
44	291 - Travel - In State						53,000	53,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
45	311 - Travel - Out of State						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
46	331 - Training						26,500	26,500	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
47	341 - Facilities Operations						829,450	829,450	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
48	361 - Utilities						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
49	382 - C & P Interdeptl						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
50	402 - C & P External						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
51	428 - Consolidated Data Center						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
52	431 - Information Technology						217,300	217,300	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
53	451 - Equipment						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
54	601 - Other Items of Expense						0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
55	Vehicle Ops. & Insurance						55,650	55,650	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
56							0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
57	TOTAL OPERATING EXPENSES AND EQUIPMENT						1,468,100	1,468,100	180,200	18,550	82,150	5,300	53,000	0	0	26,500	829,450	0	0	0	217,300	0	0	0	55,650	1,468,100
58	TOTAL STATE OPERATIONS EXPENDITURES						7,264,570	7,264,570	180,200	18,550	82,150	5,300	53,000	0	0	26,500										