

out, you could just put it all in finance and then they would work together in the implementation and disburse the monies.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Okay, so as a point of clarification then, you're not indicating that the entire budgeting process would go through...

SENATOR WESELY: No, uh-huh.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...one agency. So you're indicating that for a temporary basis that the A bill would start out all with one and then after it got sorted out then it would go to where it ought to be, or how would that, you know, when we get down to the next time we have to budget how would we separate out...

SENATOR WESELY: Right.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: ...what actually ought to go with the right department if we did that?

SENATOR WESELY: Well, it would...I could see several scenarios play out. You could decide with the bill and the A bill and you could decide I want so much to go here, so much to go there. I mean that's our prerogative. The other one that I was suggesting was if you weren't sure you could just put it all over in finance and let the partnership work it out. I'm just suggesting all of those decisions are ours to make as to how we allocate the funds through the appropriations process.

SENATOR MAURSTAD: Would you think as you have your vision for how this arrangement will work, do you think that that would be the preferred route to go with A bills is to do...put it all into the finance and then let the partnership determine it, or how do you see....

SENATOR WESELY: Well, it would depend. I mean if you had a very clear idea of what costs were involved and entailed by each of the entities and you wanted to simply make sure the money got directly there, that would be preferable...that would be...I would suspect, from some people, others who may not have as clear an idea and simply want the agency to work out the problem and come up with a program, then you'd have more of a flexible approach to the finance department.