

Revised Legislative Branch FY21 Budget

Joint Fiscal Office

23-Aug-20

	A FY20 Appropriation	Original FY21 request			New FY21 request (full-year)					
		B FY21 Appropriation request	C Base-to-Base \$ Increase (B - A)	D Base-to-Base % Increase	E Revised FY21 Appropriation request	F % change from previous request	G Base-to-Base \$ Increase (E - A)	H Base to Base % increase	I FY21 Reversion	J Total FY21 new GF need (E + I)
Legislative Branch	\$ 16,196,942	\$ 16,849,410	\$ 652,468	4.0%	16,344,030	-3.00%	\$ 147,088	0.9%	(375,000)	15,969,030
Legislature	8,119,372	8,163,482	44,110	0.5%	7,933,578	-2.82%	\$ (185,794)	-2.3%	(350,000)	7,583,578
Legislative Counsel	3,772,167	4,040,210	268,043	7.1%	3,187,533	-2.36%	\$ 172,877	4.6%	-	3,187,533
Legislative Ops					757,511					757,511
Legislative IT	1,412,146	1,463,731	51,585	3.7%	1,419,819	-3.00%	\$ 7,673	0.5%	-	1,419,819
Sergeant at Arms	870,204	1,023,461	153,257	17.6%	951,819	-7.00%	\$ 81,615	9.4%	-	951,819
Joint Fiscal Office	2,023,053	2,158,526	135,473	6.7%	2,093,770	-3.00%	\$ 70,717	3.5%	(25,000)	2,068,770

Talking Points:

1) Overview

Revised FY21 budget requests for the branch are \$505,380 (-3.0%) less than what was presented in January, due to expense reductions and one-time money
Branchwide carry-forward is quite strong, due to money from prior years, less spending in FY20 once the pandemic hit, and CRF reimbursements
Revised FY21 budget now proposes a \$375,000 cumulative reversion, \$350,000 from the Legislature and \$25,000 from JFO

2) Legislative Council split

Legislative IT is now a separate appropriation unit as of FY2020
Legislative Counsel and Legislative Operations are now two separate appropriations on this sheet
Our hope is that Legislative Operations will be built into the Legislature's budget in FY21 and the future
We will need some language in the budget bill so that the Administration will take actions to "administratively" split these offices: new BU and dept IDs, Vantage/VISION/VTHR adj.

3) Coronavirus Relief Fund (CRF)

We received two appropriations from CRF to cover FY20 expenses in Act 109 (H.953). We hope to have JFC approp language amended so that we can use funds for FY21 expenses
We also received \$2 million of CRF in Act 120 (H.961) for the Aug-Sep session. We would like this language amended so that funds can be used for any eligible costs through the CRF deadline
CRF reimbursements are part of reason why legislative carry-forward is significant. We will make a plan for much of this money in FY22 budget proposal
Some CRF, and potentially other carry-forward, will be used in the event that the General Assembly and staff expand into 133 State St, or other office space

4) Expense Reductions

All offices reduced travel budgets and internal service fund (FFS, VISION, etc.) budgets
Legislature budget reductions assume fewer interim meetings, no changes to federal per diem rates and less travel to Montpelier, and delayed hiring of HR person
Sgt at Arms will no longer request a new position in FY21, but will now request some additional funding for overtime and sheriffs, which had been planned for FY22.
Other offices may delay or reduce hiring of new full-time or session positions, and/or will reduce misc. operating costs

4) Other Note(s)

The Governor's budget request for the Legislature is \$5,000 higher than what is presented on this sheet. The difference is due to a mistake when the budget was originally entered into the Vantage Budget System. The lower number on this sheet reflects the actual budget need.