

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
51st LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By Vice Chairman Gerry Devlin, on January  
12, 1989, at 8:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present: All with exception of Chairman Spaeth

Members Excused: Chairman Spaeth

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Carl Schweitzer, LFA  
Jane Hamman, OBPP  
Donna Grace

HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Forestry Division 12:A (001)

List of Proponents and Group they Represent:

Gary Brown, State Lands  
Jim Williams, State Lands  
Howard W. Gipe, Flathead County Commissioners  
Gene Vuckovich, City/Co. Manager, Anaconda/Deer Lodge  
Peggy Haaglund, Montana Assoc. of Conservation  
Districts  
Rep. Bob Marks, House District No. 75  
Connie Daniels, Anaconda IRL Commissioner

Testimony:

Mr. Brown continued with his presentation, beginning with  
"Other Services" under the Forest Management Program.  
Mr. Brown's comments are contained in Exhibit 4  
attached to the January 11, 1989 minutes.

Mr. Brown discussed at some length the proposal being  
brought before the legislature, referred to as "Block  
IV" which would reduce the amount of contracted  
wildfire protection acreage by assuming wildfire  
protection for 672,852 acres of forested land from the  
contractor (USDA Forest Service) beginning July 1,  
1990. Mr. Brown's comments are outlined in Exhibit 1.

This item is referred to as Issue No. 1 in the Fiscal Analyst's analysis.

12 B (165) Representative Bob Marks stated that he represented District 75, a part of which is included in Block IV. He said he had talked with Mr. Brown from time to time about the relationship between the state and federal agencies in relation to firefighting. Representative Marks said these talks peaked last summer during the Warm Springs Creek fire which was in his district. He expressed his concerns over the poor management by the federal people on that fire. It was Mr. Marks' opinion that had the state lands people been in control, the fire with the assistance of the local fire departments could have been extinguished the first day. However, because of the policies of the federal land managers, that the area was a "sensitive" area, the local fire departments were not allowed on the fire. Rep. Marks' final comment was that he felt the state was picking up 1/6 of the costs of a program over which the state had no control. He urged the committee to adopt the Block IV proposal.

In answer to a question, Mr. Brown stated that the funds to take over Block IV would be general funds. He also stated that if the state were to take the responsibility for Block IV, approximately \$56,000 a year would be saved starting in 1991, if Block V was also added. If only Block IV is added, the savings would be \$42,000 per year.

Mr. Brown then discussed the request for a modification to the budget being requested by the Forestry Division for the Western Montana County Cooperative. This proposal is outlined in Exhibit 2.

Mr. Brown introduced a letter from Ravalli County supporting the Western Montana County Cooperative Modification. The letter is attached. Exhibit 3. (438)

Connie Daniels, from the City/County Planning, Anaconda/Deer Lodge County, stated that they had a problem for years in providing fire protection to various rural areas. They have consolidated their government but not for fire protection. There are five rural fire districts and the city fire department as well as one other rural fire department that is not a district. They have established a fire coordinating council with the main goal of entering into a cooperative agreement with State Lands to provide a plan for county-wide fire protection. She urged adoption of this budget modification.

Mr. Vuckovich, City/County Manager for Deer Lodge County and the City of Anaconda also spoke in support of the modification.

Mr. Howard Gipe, Flathead County Commissioner, stated that the State Lands Department had stepped in during the fires in Flathead County and it was his opinion that no one could have done a better job. He said the State Lands people work very closely with the County and Flathead County would like to be included in the program.

Mr. Brown summarized that if all three counties became a part of the cooperative, and the Legislature approved it, it would be financed with general fund money and include .5 FTE and the cost for the first year would be \$65,525. The second year would require 1 FTE and the cost would be \$64,000.

Mr. Brown explained that the next modification requested by the Forestry Division involved the Prescribed Fire-Range Improvement Modification, Exhibit 4, which Mr. Brown said he preferred to call the "Prescribed Burn" and is used as a tool in range land management.

Peggy Haaglund, representing the Montana Association of Soil Conservation Districts, spoke in support of this proposal. Her comments are contained in Exhibit 5.

Mr. Brown continued his narrative on modifications to the Forestry Budget by describing the Hazard Reduction Agreements and Inspection, Exhibit 6. Mr. Brown stated that he was aware that the timber industry was coming in with a bill on this subject and new figures would be provided for this modification. He did ask for consideration, recognizing that this will not mean an increase in spending of state dollars but, rather, the program was to be funded by income generated by the program itself.

13:A (088)

Mr. Brown then explained the State Land Water Quality Modification, Exhibit 7. This modification would be funded with federal funds through the U. S. Forest Service. The money will become available July 1 and will take care of added demands. The agreement for these funds is with the Director of Water Sheds and Range Management and funds will be available as long as they are needed.

Mr. Schweitzer handed out worksheets for the Forestry Division. Exhibit 8.

Executive Action: 13:A (220)

Budget Modification: Mr. Schweitzer explained that the adoption of the State Land Water Quality modification would include the addition of one FTE forest hydrologist and one FTE soils/hydrology technician to handle the increased workload in water quality and soils monitoring.

MOTION: Representative Swift made the motion that the modification be approved with the understanding that the U. S. Forest Service would furnish the fund, \$48,000 per year, for this program.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

The next budget modification discussed by Mr. Brown was the Wildlife Support Program, Exhibit 9. He stated that there is more and more interest by the public relative to wildlife so he had requested a wildlife biologist through the Inter Agency Personnel Act which provides that a federal agency can transfer an individual from federal to state government and this has been accomplished. A part of the funding comes from the FW&P Department and the remainder from the Forest Service and state contracted services. FW&P would like to continue this program and they have agreed to fund one/half of the costs with the Forest Service providing the other half. This would not be general fund money, it would simply be a shift from contracted services.

Executive Action:

MOTION: Senator Jergeson made a motion that the modification for the Wildlife Support Program be approved.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted in favor.

The final budget modification for this division was the Wildlife Seedlings program, Exhibit 10, which would allow the Forestry Division to produce an additional \$25,000 worth of trees and shrubs for wildlife plantings under the Federal Conservation Reserve Program. The program would be funded with money received from the FW&P Department.

Executive Action:

MOTION: Representative Swift made a motion that the Wildlife Seedlings budget modification be adopted.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All members present voted yes.

The Chairman stated that the next thing to come before the committee would be consideration of the issues outlined by the Legislative Fiscal Analyst.

Issue No. 3. Landowner Assessment (479). Carl stated that the landowner assessment is a property tax assessment levied on private forest landowners for fire protection. By statute the maximum assessment is 17 cents per acre with a minimum assessment of \$14,00 per landowner. The past legislative practice has been to determine the amount by taking the forest fire bureau appropriation and dividing it by three. The forest fire bureau budget for fiscal 1990 is \$3,666,323 and one-third of that would be \$1,222,018. The landowner assessment is only \$1,125,685, or \$96,423 less than one-third of the bureau's fiscal 1990 current level appropriation.

Mr. Brown stated that it would take a statutory change to do anything about changing the assessment. He said they had not made an issue of this because Block IV is primarily federal lands and it was not fair to increase rates to the private landowner simply because the forestry division took on an additional block that is all federal lands. This matter was primarily informational and no action was taken.

Executive Action: (676)

Budget Modification: Prescribed Burn. This issue does not involve general fund money and involves granting of spending authority.

MOTION: Senator Jergeson made the motion that the prescribed burn modification be adopted with the understanding that it would be funded with federal funds.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

13:B (027)

Issue No. 1. Fire Bureau: Increased Fire Protection Payments. Mr. Schweitzer stated that Mr. Brown had outlined the Block IV proposal. The LFA's recommendation was that the Block not be accepted; however, this decision was based on information

obtained prior to the 1988 fire season and on figures from the Block III takeover. Since he did that analysis he received information that the cost per acre had risen and therefore his analysis was not correct. His recommendation would concur with that of the executive recommendation which was to accept Block IV.

**MOTION:** Representative Swift made a motion to adopt the executive recommendation which would provide for the acceptance of Block IV.

**VOTE:** MOTION PASSED. All present voted in favor.

**Issue No. 2. Fire Equipment.** The LFA current level contains a three year average expenditure for fire equipment. The executive recommendation is for less. The Bureau has requested an additional \$83,326 for the biennium. Mr. Brown explained that the division had 775 vehicles and some of them were very high mileage. He would like to replace 29 vehicles and the OBPP budget would allow for the purchase of 12. Mr. Brown stated that he had discussed this with the Budget Office and his understanding was that they were not bound by the executive budget. The present administration has indicated that they could make a presentation to the Committee if the prior administration's budget was inadequate but they could not indicate that it was a recommendation of the prior administration. Ms. Hamman stated that she could state that in final negotiations of the budget there was \$100,000 that could be added which would approach the LFA level. Therefore, the new recommendation of the OBPP would be to add \$100,00 each year to the figures currently appearing in the executive budget.

**MOTION:** Senator Jenkins made the motion that the new OBPP figures, \$260,895 in 1990 and \$299,450 in 1991 be adopted.

**VOTE:** MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

**Issue No. 4. Fire Protection Assessment Computer.** The Forestry Division has requested \$15,000 to continue system development work on fire production assessment. This item was not included in the LFA or executive budgets. Mr. Brown stated that \$50,000 in aircraft repair had been dropped from their budget and they hoped to shift some of that money to this project.

**MOTION:** Representative Swift made a motion that \$15,000 be provided to complete the computer system during the coming biennium. This expenditure will not be included

in the base.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

Issues 5 and 6. Brush Disposal and Timber Stand Improvement. The LFA current level reflects continuation of fiscal 1988 expenditure levels. The executive budget reflects anticipated growth in brush disposal revenues and timber stand improvement revenues resulting from increased timber sales.

MOTION: Senator Jergeson moved the adoption of the executive budget recommendation.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

Other Services. This item includes \$14,900 per year increase in a fund passed through to local governmental units.

MOTION: Senator Jergeson made a motion to accept the executive recommendation.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

Computer Supplies and Photocopier Rental. These are one-time expenditures and will not be built into the base. Mr. Brown stated that they would like to tie the Missoula Office, the Northwest Land Office and the Southwest Land Office into the main frame computer system in Helena. The photocopier that is being used for printing manuals will not last another two years.

MOTION: Representative Kimberley made a motion that the expenditures for computer supplies and the photocopier lease/purchase agreement be approved with the stipulation that this expenditure is not to be built into the base.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. Representative Iverson voted no; all others voted yes.

Computer Maintenance. Mr. Schweitzer stated that this item would be built into the base as it will be an ongoing expenditure.

MOTION: Senator Jergeson made the motion that the computer maintenance budget in the amount of \$20,000 be approved.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

Forest Management 14:A (130)

Issue No. 1. Equipment. The executive recommendation is less than the LFA. The bureau has requested an additional \$23,327 over the LFA current level. Mr. North stated that this is an important item; however, he hadn't had an opportunity to present it to the budget office again. Vice Chairman Devlin stated that the committee had no objections and this item could be postponed until a later date.

Other Adjustments. Mr. Schweitzer explained that this was a combination of several minor differences between the executive and the LFA.

MOTION: Representative Swift made a motion that the LFA recommendation be adopted.

VOTE: MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes.

Boilerplate Language. Item 1. The OBPP and the bureau have requested language to the appropriation bill. They will allow the department to have an open-ended appropriation for special revenue accounts. Currently they are limited by how much is actually appropriated. If more revenue is received than has been appropriated, they don't have the authority to spend it. Mr. Brown stated that they were requesting this language for brush, timber stand improvement, nursery and slash because they are all earmarked accounts and they do fluctuate with market conditions. The committee was sympathetic but felt it would set a precedent.

MOTION: Representative Swift made a motion that the proposed language not be accepted.

VOTE; MOTION PASSED. All present voted yes. Mr. Iverson commented that perhaps this was an item that the full appropriations committee should look at.

Boilerplate Language. Items 2 and 3. Mr. Schweitzer stated that these two changes had been requested by the OBPP. Mr. Schweitzer stated that he had some questions and would like to discuss them with Mr. North and Ms. Hamman. Mr. North stated that his current recommendation was that a bill that amends the budget amendment law would be coming up and these items would be taken care that way.

Cooperative Fire Program

Budget Modification. This modification would expand the

State-County Cooperative Fire Program to allow Deer Lodge, Flathead and Ravalli counties to enter into cooperative fire control agreements with the state.

MOTION: Representative Swift made a motion that the modification be approved. The Chairman called for a roll call vote.

VOTE; MOTION PASSED. Representatives Iverson and Swift, Senators Jenkins and Jergeson voted yes; Representatives Spaeth and Kimberley and Senator Devlin voted no.

Announcements/Discussion: Chairman Spaeth stated that the committee would finish hearings on the Department of State Lands on Thursday morning and the Department of Natural Resources would begin their presentation.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment At: 12:15 P.M.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
REP. GARY SPAETH, Chairman

GS/DG

1026.MINA





TESTIMONY  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

BLOCK IV FIRE PROTECTION PROPOSAL

Introduction: The Department of State Lands proposes to reduce the amount of contracted wildfire protection acreage by assuming wildfire protection for 672,052 acres of forested land from the contractor (USDA Forest Service) beginning July 1, 1990.

Introduction & Background: In the early 1900's Montana Landowners were faced with a series of devastating fires which caused them to recognize the need for organized forest fire protection. The legislative branch of government also recognized that protection of the wildland resources from fire was a benefit to the people of the State and nation as a whole. These events resulted in a cooperative effort between private landowners and the State to form forest fire districts and affidavit units to provide fire protection to the forest lands of Montana. (MCA 76-13-201 and MCA 76-13-201.) The State was given the responsibility of providing fire protection for the State and private forest lands. (MCA 76-11-101.) Federal involvement has included both the direct protection of federal lands as well as contracting with the State for protection of some State and private lands.

An assessment for forest fire protection is collected by the State from private landowners within forest fire districts and affidavit units. These funds are forwarded to the agency designated by the Montana State Land Board as the protection agency. The recognized agencies for Montana include: the Department of State Lands, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The federal agencies are contracted by the State for the fire protection, and are paid by the landowners through the forest fire assessment system.

Under Montana law, the protection of private and State lands within forest fire districts and affidavit units are a State responsibility. As protection costs have continued to rise, the U.S. Forest has become increasingly insistent that the State pick up a greater share of the protection load and move towards fulfilling the State's responsibility in total. The alternative to their request would be to pay the Forest Service their full fire protection costs; a cost which normally exceeds the State's cost to provide equal services. As a result, significant changes in assessment would occur.

In 1975 the State assumed the direct wildland fire protection responsibility for the Thompson River district north of Plains, in 1984 for the Fisher River -Wolf Creek district near Libby, in 1986 the Lincoln/BLM area, and in 1988 the Swan/Missoula area. These districts are primarily private and State-owned lands. This 1,500,000 acre change in protection responsibility partially off-

set a 2.2 million acre imbalance in acres of State and private land protected by the U.S. Forest Service compared with acres of Federal lands protected by the State. In order to correct the imbalance, the State needs to protect more State, private or Federal lands.

In 1982, USFS Region 1, notified the State that as of July, 1983, they intended to charge the State their actual costs of protection for all acres of State and private land they were currently protecting, unless progress was made towards eliminating imbalance. Presently, this would be a charge of approximately \$384,585 (672,852 acres x \$.5903 - \$12,600 assessment subsidy = \$384,585).

As a result of a study completed by the State in 1981, the Fisher River/Wolf Creek area (Block I) was assigned to the State for protection starting July 1, 1984. Effective July 1, 1986 the Lincoln/BLM area (Block II) became a State responsibility. On July 1, 1988 the Swan/Missoula jurisdiction (Block III) became State protection, reducing the USFS/DSL imbalance to approximately 672,852 acres. Further joint efforts by the State and Forest Service resulted in the selection of 2 additional units (South of Dillon, and North of Boulder) for fire protection exchange. These units are known collectively as Block IV. These selections have been reviewed and approved by local DSL, Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Supervisors and have been approved by the USFS Regional Forester and the Commissioner, Department of State Lands. The decision was based primarily on the following factors:

1. A Dillon office will enable the DSL to reduce travel costs and provide better public service to southwestern Montana.
2. The block is composed largely of scattered Bureau of Land Management lands.
3. The State can provide a comparable level of wildfire protection, at less cost than contracting with the Forest Service under the new rates.
4. The block units will provide a higher level of protection to approximately 130,000 acres of State-owned land, at minimal cost.
5. Private landowners within the block units can choose a higher level of protection through the State affidavit program.

Proposal: By assuming Block IV the State will save approximately \$3,640 in Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991. An annual savings of \$56,097 will begin in 1992 if the 1991 Legislature finalizes the block program by accepting Block V. If Block V is not accepted, the acceptance of Block IV alone will result in an annual savings

EXHIBIT 1  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

of \$42,006, beginning in 1992, when compared to paying the Forest Service actual cost.

A total imbalance of approximately 35,000 acres will remain after Block IV, which will either be offset in the Gallatin Valley or through boundary adjustments in existing protection. General Fund request for FY 90 is \$336,000 and \$306,000 in FY 91.

Included in this modification to increase State fire protection are 12.25 FTEs which constitute four full time employees and 8.25 seasonal firefighters and support personnel. Included in operating expenses are:

<u>Expense</u>	<u>Item</u>
Contracted Services	Vehicle insurance
Supplies & Materials	Fire tools, engine and pump fuel, prevention items
Communication & Transportation	Phone service at one fire station, one interagency dispatch center and one office
Travel	Training of fire crews and work project travel
Rent	Office rent--Dillon, aerial patrol and shared air tanker contract
Utilities	Fuel for heat and cooking
Repairs & Maintenance	Repair fire trucks, saws, radios, tools

Capital equipment expenditures would include the purchase of firefighting engine units, pumps, chainsaws and portable radios.

The LFA has taken exception to this modification, but utilized out-of-date figures \$0.51/acre vs. present \$0.5903/acre. The LFA also incorporated contract figures for the Bureau of Land Management and Bureau of Indian Affairs, which is not an issue with the Forest Service/Department of State Lands contract reduction modification. These two issues result in an annual error of \$60,100 in the LFA's exception.

EXHIBIT 1  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

# FOREST SERVICE FULL COST OF PROTECTION

USFS PROTECTION OF STATE & PRIVATE LANDS BY FOREST	*	DSL PROTECTION OF FEDERAL LANDS	*	BALANCE	USFS RATE/ACRE	USFS TOTAL C
BEAVERHEAD	46,355	BEAVERHEAD	0	46,355		
BITTERROOT	135,133	BITTERROOT	0	135,133		
CUSTER	6,692	CUSTER	0	6,692		
DEER LODGE	60,849	DEER LODGE	109,073	(48,224)		
DEER LODGE (BLM)	0	DEER LODGE (BLM)	31,619	(31,619)		
FLATHEAD	99,434	FLATHEAD	168,852	(69,418)		
GALLATIN	331,472	GALLATIN	0	331,472		
HELENA	96,860	HELENA	23,125	73,735		
HELENA (BLM)	0	HELENA (BLM)	106,619	(106,619)		
KOOTENAI	369,388	KOOTENAI	190,690	178,698		
LEWIS & CLARK	58,990	LEWIS & CLARK	0	58,990		
LOLO	389,600	LOLO	211,653	177,947		
LOLO (BLM)	0	LOLO (BLM)	80,290	(80,290)		

TOTALS	1,594,773 acres	921,921 ac.	672,852 ac. x \$0.5903 = \$397,185
			LESS ASSESSMENT SUBSIDY - 12,600
			NET AMOUNT DUE FOREST SERVICE \$384,585

EXHIBIT 1  
 DATE 1-12-89  
 HB \_\_\_\_\_

## BLOCK IV ALTERNATIVES

1. DO NOT TAKE BLOCK #4 AND PAY FOREST SERVICE THE FULL COST. PAY FOREST SERVICE FULL COST OF PROTECTION BEGINNING IN FY90. AT CURRENT RATES THE STATE WOULD OWE \$384,585 NET PER YEAR.
2. TAKE BLOCK #4 AND CONTINUE IN BLOCK REDUCTION PROGRAM.

FY90:	ASSESSMENT				
	<u>CONTRACT</u>	<u>OFF-SET</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>	<u>SUBSIDY</u>	<u>NET OWED</u>
ACRES:	708,022	(35,170)	672,852		
RATE:			x \$0.1900		
TOTAL:			\$127,842	(\$12,600)	\$115,242

FY91:	ASSESSMENT				
	<u>CONTRACT</u>	<u>OFF-SET</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>	<u>SUBSIDY</u>	<u>NET OWED</u>
ACRES:	708,022	(672,822)	35,200		
RATE:			x \$0.1900		
TOTAL:			\$6,688	(\$8,400)	(\$1,712)

*FY92:	ASSESSMENT				
	<u>CONTRACT</u>	<u>OFF-SET</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>	<u>SUBSIDY</u>	<u>NET OWED</u>
ACRES:	708,022	(672,822)	35,200		
RATE:			x \$0.1900		
TOTAL:			\$6,688	(\$4,200)	\$2,488

3. TAKE BLOCK #4 BUT DECIDE NOT TO TAKE ANY ADDITIONAL BLOCKS.

FY92:	ASSESSMENT				
	<u>CONTRACT</u>	<u>OFF-SET</u>	<u>BALANCE</u>	<u>SUBSIDY</u>	<u>NET OWED</u>
ACRES:	708,022	(672,822)	35,200		
RATE:			x \$0.5903		
TOTAL:			\$20,779	(\$8,400)	\$12,379

\* ASSUMES THAT A BLOCK 5 IS APPROVED BEGINNING IN FY 92.

EXHIBIT 1  
 DATE 1-12-89  
 HB \_\_\_\_\_

WE CAN NOW COMPARE THE COST BETWEEN THE THREE ALTERNATIVES AS FOLLOWS:

COST COMPARISON (FY 90-92)

FY90

ALTERNATIVE	FS PAYMENT	ADDITIONAL GEN. FUND	ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL ANNUAL COST
1	\$384,585	\$0	\$0	\$384,585
2	\$115,242	\$336,000	\$0	\$451,242
3	\$115,242	\$336,000	\$0	\$451,242

FY91

ALTERNATIVE	FS PAYMENT	ADDITIONAL GEN. FUND	ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL ANNUAL COST
1	\$384,585	\$0	\$0	\$384,585
2	(\$1,712)	\$306,000	\$10,000	\$314,288
3	(\$1,712)	\$306,000	\$10,000	\$314,288

FY92

ALTERNATIVE	FS PAYMENT	ADDITIONAL GEN. FUND	ADDITIONAL SUPPLEMENTAL	TOTAL ANNUAL COST
1	\$384,585	\$0	\$0	\$384,585
*2	\$ 2,488	\$306,000	\$20,000	\$328,488
3	\$ 16,579	\$306,000	\$20,000	\$342,579

\* ASSUMES BLOCK 5 IS APPROVED IN FY 92.

EXHIBIT 1  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Region 1

Federal Building  
P.O. Box 7669  
Missoula, MT 59807

Reply to: 3170

Date: January 4, 1989

Gary G. Brown, State Forester  
Division of Forestry  
Department of State Lands  
2705 Spurgin Road  
Missoula, MT 59801

Dear Gary:

In recent discussions with Tim Murphy, we discussed the Forest Service's reaction should the State withdraw from the joint program to eliminate the fire protection imbalance.

In this situation, or in the event that the mutually developed schedule is not followed, the Forest Service would begin charging the State the full protection costs rather than the current rates of \$0.16/acre for private lands and \$0.19/acre for State land. The charges would be on a state-wide Regional average. They would be based on the combination of the Forest's FFP expenditures for the previous year and an amount for FF costs determined by using expenditures for the last seven years, dropping the high and low years, and averaging the remaining five. These rates would include Forest Service administrative costs, I.H. crews, smokejumper crews, and warehousing and aircraft costs, but charges for land management planning, fuels, management and reimbursements would not be assessed. This calculation process has been in place for several years, and although guarantees are impossible, it is not expected to change.

The fire protection rate for Montana, as last determined, is \$0.5903/acre. This is a close approximation of the cost the State would pay for full protection. The Forest Service is gradually withdrawing from its protection of private lands throughout the nation, and the Northern Region will continue this process in Montana. I hope we can do this under the terms of our present arrangement.

Our organizations have made significant reductions in the imbalance over the past several years and are well on their way to zeroing out by our agreed date of 1992. The present block reduction we have agreed upon will narrow the imbalance to less than 100,000 acres. I appreciate the State's cooperation and involvement to this point, and we need only look at the situations at Libby and on the Helena and Flathead Forests to see that what we have done is mutually beneficial and a viable approach for providing wildland fire protection. I hope our progress can be continued and encourage both your support and your efforts to build an understanding within the State.

  
JOHN W. MUMMA  
Regional Forester



EXHIBIT 1  
DATE 1-12-89  
UB

TESTIMONY  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

WESTERN MONTANA COUNTY COOPERATIVE MODIFICATION

**Introduction:** Deer Lodge, Flathead, and Ravalli Counties are proposing to enter into the State-County Cooperative Fire Protection Program within the DSL, effective July 1, 1990.

**Background:** A county enters the State-County Cooperative Fire Protection Program upon acceptance of its entry proposal by the Legislature. The program is designed to provide the basic level of wildland fire protection to all State and privately owned lands in the county that are not covered by a higher level of protection.

The County-State Cooperative Program currently includes forty-six counties (see map no. 1) and covers 44,229,269 acres of State and private lands. The program began in 1967 with the entrance of Meagher County and was brought to its present state when the 1985 Legislature approved eleven counties.

The county provides the basic level of fire protection through a system of volunteers, county personnel, rural and volunteer fire departments. The county is supported by the State in matters of organization, planning, equipment, training, and fire suppression support. Landowners in cooperating counties meet the basic requirements for adequate protection as specified in State Statutes. In addition to raising the level of protection in the three proposed counties, approximately 350,000 acres of non-protected land will fall under the basic protection.

**Proposal:** This modification requests \$65,000 per year of general fund including 1 FTE. The full time employee would be involved in developing, organizing, training ranchers and firefighters and providing direct assistance to county firewardens on potentially dangerous fires. Capital equipment expenditures include the purchase of fire pumps, tanks, hose reels, communications and command equipment to equip fire engines and related support equipment, at a rate of one unit per county per year of the biennium.

Other operational costs include:

<u>Expense</u>	<u>Item</u>
Contracted Services	Insurance on equipment
Supplies and Materials	Engine fire tools, gasoline, tool caches
Communication	Phone service to work with counties
Travel	Procure and deliver equipment, training
Repairs and Maintenance	Major repairs to equipment



TESTIMONY  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Prescribed Fire-Range Improvement Modification

The purpose of this modification is allow DSL to hire a fire-use specialist to coordinate a program of prescribed burning to improve rangelands and wildlife habitat. DSL's role in this program will be one of technical assistance to landowners qualifying for federal cost-sharing through the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP), a USDA program.

DSL employees participated in a feasibility study of this practice from 1979 to 1982, when nine burn projects were completed with great success. First-year forage production was increased by an average factor of 2.2 times. Other potential benefits were erosion control and, in some cases, wildlife habitat improvement. Public and agency support for this practice has been registered at the past two annual meetings of the USDA conservation review group. It is anticipated that the state committee of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) will approve this practice for federal cost-sharing at its meeting later this month.

We request authorization for 1.0 FTE fire specialist and operating expenses at a cost of \$42,516 in FY90 and \$27,013 in FY91. This request was developed with the expectation that federal funds from USDA would provide 100% of the support required by DSL. At this date, it is uncertain whether we will receive federal support. We have chosen to provide this testimony, anyway, due to the proven benefits of, and public demand for, this service. If federal funds are not secured, however, DSL will not hire the needed fire specialist.

If the committee chooses to not support this modification due to the uncertainty of federal funding, DSL will submit a budget amendment at a future date if federal funds are secured.

	FY90	FY91
Personal services		
1.0 FTE specialist, grade 13/step 2	\$23,458	\$23,458
Operating	4,709	3,555
Capital	14,349	
TOTALS	\$42,516	\$27,013

EXHIBIT 2  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

# RAVALLI COUNTY FIRE COUNCIL

706 SO. 3RD  
HAMILTON, MT. 59840

RECEIVED

JAN 10 1989

STATE LANDS

7 JAN. 1989

THE RAVALLI COUNTY FIRE COUNCIL WOULD LIKE TO VOICE ITS SUPPORT OF THE ADOPTION INTO THE MONTANA STATE LANDS COOPERATIVE.

RAVALLI COUNTY IS MADE UP OF ELEVEN VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENTS THAT ARE COMPRISED OF ALL VOLUNTEERS.

WE HAVE A CONSIDERABLE AMOUNT OF LAND WITHIN OUR JURISDICTION OWNED BY STATE AND FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

OUR INCLUSION INTO THE STATE LANDS COOPERATIVE PROGRAM WOULD ALLOW US TO PARTICIPATE IN THE SURPLUS EQUIPMENT PROGRAM AND WOULD PROVIDE EQUIPMENT AND ASSISTANCE FOR FIGHTING FIRES ON STATE LANDS WITHIN OUR DISTRICTS. IT ALSO WOULD GIVE US ACCESS TO FURTHER TRAINING PROVIDED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS.

YOUR SUPPORT OF THE INCLUSION OF RAVALLI COUNTY INTO THIS PROGRAM WILL BE GREATLY APPRECIATED.

*Philip M Meis*

PHILIP M. MEIS  
SEC.-TREASURE

EXHIBIT 3  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT 4  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

TESTIMONY  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Prescribed Fire-Range Improvement Modification

The purpose of this modification is allow DSL to hire a fire-use specialist to coordinate a program of prescribed burning to improve rangelands and wildlife habitat. DSL's role in this program will be one of technical assistance to landowners qualifying for federal cost-sharing through the Agricultural Conservation Program (ACP), a USDA program.

DSL employees participated in a feasibility study of this practice from 1979 to 1982, when nine burn projects were completed with great success. First-year forage production was increased by an average factor of 2.2 times. Other potential benefits were erosion control and, in some cases, wildlife habitat improvement. Public and agency support for this practice has been registered at the past two annual meetings of the USDA conservation review group. It is anticipated that the state committee of the Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS) will approve this practice for federal cost-sharing at its meeting later this month.

We request authorization for 1.0 FTE fire specialist and operating expenses at a cost of \$42,516 in FY90 and \$27,013 in FY91. This request was developed with the expectation that federal funds from USDA would provide 100% of the support required by DSL. At this date, it is uncertain whether we will receive federal support. We have chosen to provide this testimony, anyway, due to the proven benefits of, and public demand for, this service. If federal funds are not secured, however, DSL will not hire the needed fire specialist.

If the committee chooses to not support this modification due to the uncertainty of federal funding, DSL will submit a budget amendment at a future date if federal funds are secured.

	FY90	FY91
Personal services		
1.0 FTE specialist, grade 13/step 2	\$23,458	\$23,458
Operating	4,709	3,555
Capital	14,349	
TOTALS	\$42,516	\$27,013

EXHIBIT 4  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

EXHIBIT 5  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_



**MONTANA**

**Association of Conservation Districts**

1 South Montana  
Helena, MT 59601

443-5711

**SUPPORT FOR THE DSL FORESTRY DIVISION MODEL FOR SAGEBRUSH BURNING  
AND ACP MONIES**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

For the record, I am Peggy Haaglund, Executive Vice President of the Montana Association of Conservation Districts.

The Montana Association of Conservation Districts would like to go on record as being in support of the proposal Gary Brown presented to you on January 12, 1989 to include money in his budget for sagebrush control through burning. He is looking for money from the Federal Government to fund this project.

The Soil Conservation Service is responsible for the technical advise to farmers/ranchers and recognize that sagebrush burning is a necessary practice sometimes to return the range to good or excellent condition.

We prefer proper grazing as a management tool for sagebrush control, but when this fails, burning is preferred to chemical control.

DSL's Forestry Division is the agency with the expertise to give the necessary information to farmers/ranchers on the proper procedure for burning sagebrush.

If the DSL, SCS, CD's and ASCS work hand in hand with this type of program, Montana will definitely see a benefit.

We ask your support of this budget request.

Thank you.

*Peggy Haaglund*

EXHIBIT 5  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

TESTIMONY  
 DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Hazard Reduction Agreements and Inspections

The purpose of this modification is to provide DSL with the additional resources necessary to administer the Fire Hazard Reduction or Management Law, given a significant increase in workload. This law is commonly referred to as the "slash law", because it deals with the fire hazards created when harvesting, clearing or thinning occurs on private forest lands in Montana. DSL's job is to certify that slash fire hazards are reduced to a level that would allow firefighters to suppress wildfires in these areas, should they occur. This job is accomplished by writing hazard reduction agreements with private landowners and logging contractors. Our foresters inspect cutting operations and issue certifications of compliance when necessary hazard reduction work has been completed. The agreements are bonded for compliance.

In the Governor's budget, we requested 4.0 FTE foresters to handle the additional workload in slash administration caused by a significant increase in logging activity on private lands. At this point, I would like to bring the committee up to date on events affecting that request.

Last spring, I assembled a task force to address several issues related to DSL's slash program. The task force included representatives of industrial forest landowners, logging contractors, sawmills, our department and others. Issues included standards for hazard reduction, DSL procedures for inspections and enforcement work, resources to administer the program, and equity in funding the program. The task force met eight times in 1988 and completed its mission last month. As a part of this process, my staff made an in-depth analysis of our operations and produced a streamlined proposal for resources to administer the program. This revised proposal represents the most efficient ways we know of to handle the increased workload of inspections and enforcement.

Therefore, my revised request is for 2.0 FTE foresters and .81 FTE program specialist, to be funded by earmarked revenues. The revised costs are \$104,670 in FY90 and \$71,670 in FY91, as follows:

	FY90	FY91
Personal services		
2.0 foresters, grade 12/step 2	\$43,472	\$43,472
0.81 specialist, grade 15/step 2	22,578	22,578
Operating	5,620	5,620
Capital	33,000	
TOTALS	\$104,670	\$71,670

For the committee's information, I expect that separate slash legislation, supported by the forest products industry, will be introduced. This legislation would provide a more equitable basis for the administrative fees charged by DSL.

If passed, these changes would increase the share of funding provided by the private parties in slash agreements, and would insure that no additional general fund is required to support the requested FTEs.

EXHIBIT 6  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

TESTIMONY  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

State Land Water Quality

Background

The Department of State Land's hydrologist and soil scientist are responsible for providing recommendations to ensure that State land management activities do not significantly degrade water quality or decrease on-site soil productivity. Historically, they have been able to provide effective and timely recommendations.

In recent years, there has been a renewed emphasis on water quality. The public has requested more monitoring and greater consideration of the cumulative effects of management activities. With this renewed emphasis has come increased demands on both the Department's hydrologist and soil scientist. These demands are threatening their ability to meet what has been their primary responsibility, that is, recommending mitigation measures for proposed State land management activities.

Specifically, there workload has increased because of:

1. The growth of the Cumulative Effects Cooperative into an ongoing program with significant data handling requirements.
2. An increase in the need for post-treatment monitoring and evaluation of the effectiveness of soil and watershed recommendations.
3. Increased water monitoring to satisfy needs of various local and regional organizations such as the Flathead River Basin Commission and the Whitefish Sewer and Water District.

Some of the recent increase in workload for the hydrologist and soil scientist has been handled by hiring temporary interns from the University of Montana. However, as the workload has continued to increase, it has become apparent that it is necessary to maintain greater continuity from project to project and year to year. That continuity cannot be achieved with the annual hiring of new student interns.

Proposal

It is proposed to add one full time, forest hydrologist and one full time soils/hydrology technician to the Forestry Division staff. The primary responsibilities of the hydrologist will be to:

1. Manage the Cumulative Effects Cooperative;
2. Assist in reviewing and making water quality mitigation recommendations for proposed management activities.

The primary responsibilities of the soils/hydrology technician will be to:

1. Complete all the field work necessary to maintain the soil and water quality monitoring program;
2. Complete all required analysis of the monitoring data;
3. Draft reports of monitoring results as necessary.

The U. S. Forest Service has committed funding for these positions. FTE and budget requirements are:

FTE: 1 FTE, Forest Hydrologist, Grade 13  
1 FTE, Forest Technician, Grade 11

<u>Budget:</u> Personal Services:	\$ 43,000.00
Operating:	\$ 5,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 48,000.00

Funding Source: U. S. Forest Service.

EXHIBIT 7  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

AGENCY: Department of State Lands  
 LEGISLATIVE ACTION  
 PROGRAM: Forestry Division

BUDGET ITEM	Fiscal 1990			Fiscal 1991		
	Executive	LFA Curr Lvl	Difference	Executive	LFA Curr Lvl	Difference
FTE	211.26	211.26	0.00	211.26	211.26	0.00
Personal Services	\$5,048,259	\$4,942,266	\$105,993	\$5,062,747	\$4,956,209	\$106,538
Operating Expenses	2,801,065	2,540,370	260,695	2,709,552	2,550,933	158,619
Equipment	353,500	527,136	(173,636)	353,500	527,136	(173,636)
<b>TOTAL EXPENSES</b>	<b>\$8,202,824</b>	<b>\$8,009,772</b>	<b>\$193,052</b>	<b>\$8,125,799</b>	<b>\$8,034,278</b>	<b>\$91,521</b>
<b>FUNDING</b>						
General Fund	\$4,929,132	\$5,192,105	(\$262,973)	\$4,848,810	\$5,216,439	(\$367,629)
State Special Rev	1,712,356	1,259,125	453,231	1,713,567	1,257,216	456,351
Federal Revenue	1,561,336	1,558,542	2,794	1,563,422	1,560,623	2,799
Other Revenue	0	0	0	0	0	0
<b>TOTAL FUNDING</b>	<b>\$8,202,824</b>	<b>\$8,009,772</b>	<b>\$193,052</b>	<b>\$8,125,799</b>	<b>\$8,034,278</b>	<b>\$91,521</b>

General Fund Gross

1. Fire Bureau: Increased Fire Protection Payments

By statute, the State of Montana has forest fire protection responsibility for all state and private lands. Currently, the state provides this forest fire protection through the Forestry Division and through contracts with the U.S. Forest Service and other federal agencies. The U.S. Forest Service also has responsibility for protecting federally-owned land. Over the years there have been cooperative agreements between the state and federal governments as to specific geographic areas for which each has responsibility.

EXHIBIT 8  
 DATE 1-12-89  
 HB

Until the 1985 biennium, the U.S. Forest Service was protecting approximately 2,000,000 more acres of state and private lands than federal lands which the state was protecting. In 1985, the U.S. Forest Service indicated that the acreage discrepancy was costing them more than the 19.45 cents per acre that the state was paying. The Forest Service threatened to charge the state the full cost of fire protection on the 2,000,000 acres unless the state embarked on a schedule of equalizing the acreage protected.

Believing it was cheaper for the state to protect the land than to pay the cost of federal protection, the state legislature approved the Forestry Division's assumption of approximately 400,000 acres per biennium since the 1985 biennium. Today the imbalance in acreage protected has been reduced to approximately 688,000 acres, and if the legislature were to continue to assume additional acreage for state fire protection the state would be assuming the fourth block of land in the 1991 biennium.

The LFA current level does not contain funding for the assumption of Block 4 but rather includes funding to contract with the U.S. Forest Service for forest fire protection. The basis for the LFA's recommendation was that based upon a 51 cent per acre cost for fire protection it was cost effective to contract rather than have the state assume responsibility. According to the Forestry Division's more recent information, the cost of contracting with the U.S. Forest Service will be 59 cents per acre rather than 51 cents per acre. Table D contains a cost comparison based upon the revised per acre cost of assuming and not assuming Block 4. As Table D indicates, both options have similar costs for the biennium.

EXHIBIT 8

DATE 1-12-89

HB \_\_\_\_\_

General Fund      Gross  
 \$(545,764)      \$(545,764)

\$(301,388)      \$(301,388)

The executive budget recommends that Block 4 be assumed and that recommendation appears as the first budget modification.

2. Fire Equipment

The LFA current level contains a three-year expenditure average for equipment. The executive recommendation is less than the three-year average. The Bureau has requested an additional \$83,326 for the biennium. Table F details the executive, LFA, and Bureau equipment budgets.

Table F  
Fire Bureau Equipment

	<u>OBPP</u>	<u>LFA</u>	<u>Bureau</u>
Fiscal 1990	\$160,859	\$338,400	\$382,143
Fiscal 1991	199,450	323,297	362,880

3. Landowner Assessment

The landowner assessment is a property tax assessment levied on private forest landowners for forest fire protection. By statute the maximum assessment is 17 cents per acre with a minimum assessment of \$14 per landowner. The fire protection costs from private landowners, and the past legislative practice has been to determine the one-third amount by taking the Forest Fire Bureau appropriation and dividing it by three. The Forest Fire Bureau budget for fiscal 1990 is \$3,666,323 and one-third is \$1,222,108. The landowner assessment is only \$1,125,685, or \$96,423 less than one-third of the bureau's fiscal 1990 current level appropriation. The maximum assessment is currently being assessed and the income from the assessment is less than one-third of the bureau's appropriation.

Because the statutory maximum produces less than one-third of the Forest Fire Bureau's appropriation, \$96,423 of general fund in fiscal 1990 and \$93,980 in fiscal 1991 has been added to the budget to offset the lack of assessment income.

EXHIBIT 8  
 DATE 1-12-89  
 HB \_\_\_\_\_

Using the amounts recommended in the executive budget, the landowner assessment produces \$88,161 less than the one-third amount.

4. Fire Protection Assessment Computer

The Forestry Division has requested \$15,000 to continue system development work on fire production assessment. Neither the LFA nor the Executive budget contains this item.

5. Brush Disposal

The LFA current level reflects continuation of fiscal 1988 expenditure levels. The executive budget reflects anticipated growth in brush disposal revenues resulting from increased timber sales.

\$ -0- \$ 587,950

6. Timber Stand Improvement

The LFA current level reflects continuation of fiscal 1988 expenditure levels. The executive budget reflects anticipated growth in timber stand improvement revenues resulting from increased timber sales.

\$ -0- \$ 283,377

Other Services

1. Federal Pass Through - The executive budget includes a \$14,900 per year increase in the fund passed through to local governmental units.

\$ 24,207 \$ 29,800

2. Computer Expansion (Fiscal 1990 only)

\$ 11,838 \$ 11,838

3. Photocopier Rental

\$ 28,800 \$ 28,800

4. Computer Maintenance

\$ 20,000 \$ 20,000

Forest Management

1. Equipment - The executive has recommended less than the LFA. The bureau has requested an additional \$23,327 over LFA current level. Table G details the three equipment budgets.

\$(60,618) \$(60,618)

EXHIBIT 8  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

Table G  
Forest Management Equipment

	<u>OBPP</u>	<u>LFA</u>	<u>Bureau</u>
Fiscal 1990	\$69,752	\$ 69,895	\$ 78,930
Fiscal 1991	56,250	116,725	131,017

Other Adjustments

\$ 12,502 \$ 24,411

Boilerplate Language

OBPP and the bureau have requested that three boilerplate sections be added to the appropriation bill.

1. The Department requests that language be inserted into the general appropriations act that would allow s to increase our authority to spend in our brush, timber stand improvement, nursery and slash state special revenue accounts. The language would state that this it necessary because revenues in brush, timber stand improvement, nursery and slash are based on market conditions which can fluctuate greatly from year to year.

2. Because of the cooperative mutual-aid agreements between the Department, the U.S. Forest Service and other federal agencies, we request that the general appropriations act include language stating that:

The Department of State Lands has authority to increase appropriations by the amount of federal rebate received for FTE and expenses from loaning personnel to federal agencies to assist in fire suppression actions.

3. The Department further requests that the general appropriations act include the following:

The Department has language appropriation authority for the funds necessary to pay for fire suppression costs. The Department may increase its appropriation after approval of the budget office and review by the Legislative Finance Committee.

EXHIBIT 8  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

Budget Modifications

The executive budget contains seven budget modifications. Table H contains the seven budget modifications.

Table H  
Forestry Division Budget Modifications

<u>Budget Modifications</u>	Fiscal 1990		Fiscal 1991	
	<u>FTE</u>	<u>General Fund</u>	<u>FTE</u>	<u>General Fund</u>
		<u>Total</u>		<u>Total</u>
<u>Forestry Division Block 4 Assumption</u>	6.62	\$329,472	12.25	\$300,570
<u>Hazard Reduction</u>	4.00	-0-	4.00	-0-
<u>Wildlife Support</u>	1.00	14,900	1.00	14,900
<u>Water Quality</u>	2.00	-0-	2.00	-0-
<u>Wildlife Seedings</u>	0.50	-0-	0.50	-0-
<u>Prescribe Burn</u>	1.00	-0-	1.00	-0-
<u>Coop. Fire Program</u>	0.50	64,524	1.00	64,044
<u>Total Budget Modifications</u>	<u>15.62</u>	<u>\$408,896</u>	<u>21.75</u>	<u>\$379,514</u>
		<u>\$671,502</u>		<u>\$586,515</u>

There are seven budget amendments recommended in the Forestry Division. The Block 4 budget modification would provide funding for the state to assume the fourth block of land from the U.S. Forest Service for fire protection. The executive proposal would add 6.62 FTE in fiscal 1990 and 12.25 FTE in fiscal 1991. The cost of the budget modification is \$329,472 general fund in fiscal 1990 and \$300,570 in fiscal 1991.

LFA current level does not include funding for assumption of the fourth land block, but rather, contains funding to contract with federal agencies for continued fire protection. LFA current level is \$114,855 less than the executive proposal for fiscal 1990 and \$30,577 more in fiscal 1991. For the biennium, LFA current level is \$84,278 less than the executive modification.

The hazard reduction budget modification would add 4.00 FTE to administer the state's timber slash and debris statutes. The wildlife support budget modification is to match a like amount of funds from the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks to hire a wildlife biologist to ensure that wildlife standards and legal responsibilities are met on state lands.

EXHIBIT 6

DATE 1-12-89

HAB

The water quality budget modification is to add 1.00 FTE forest hydrologist and 1.00 FTE soils/hydrology technician to handle the increased workload in water quality and soils monitoring which has resulted from the growth of the Cumulative Effects Cooperative over the last three years. The wildlife seedings budget modification is for the department to provide trees and shrubs for the purpose of improving wildlife habitat on private lands through the federal Conservation Reserve Program (CRP). Fish, Wildlife, and Parks will purchase these trees and shrubs from the forestry nursery for planting on qualified private lands.

The prescribed burn budget modification proposes to utilize an agriculture conservation program special prescribed rangeland improvement practice with the Montana Agriculture Conservation and Stabilization Service (ASCS) to improve rangeland and wildlife habitat. The cooperative fire program budget modification would expand the State-County Cooperative Fire Program to allow Deer Lodge, Flathead, and Ravalli counties to enter into cooperative fire control agreements with the state.

CSS:kj:sifd

EXHIBIT 6

DATE 1-12-89

HB

EXHIBIT 9  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

TESTIMONY  
DEPARTMENT OF STATE LANDS

Wildlife Support

Background

The Department of State Lands has routinely considered wildlife and fisheries concerns when planning any management activity on State Lands. Wildlife biologists from the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks have routinely provided us with needed recommendations for protecting wildlife habitat during our planning for State Land management activities.

Concern over DSL's responsibility under the Threatened and Endangered Species Act and the Montana Environmental Policy Act suggested the need for standards and guidelines to manage wildlife and fisheries on State Lands. It was clear that although the DFW&P could provide project specific input for DSL activities, they could not develop and maintain standards and guidelines for wildlife and fisheries management.

In August of 1986, a USDA Forest Service wildlife biologist was hired for a three year term under an interagency personnel action to draft policy, standards and guidelines for wildlife management on State Lands. The wildlife biologist has not only begun to develop standards and guidelines for several wildlife species, but he has also helped identify other work items that should be completed as part of a more comprehensive wildlife and fisheries management program on State Lands. Several of those work items will not be completed prior to the end of the biologist's three year term, such as:

1. Identify and map habitat for grizzly bear, white tail deer, elk and bull trout;
2. Develop site specific plans for Bald Eagle nest sites;
3. Revise White tail deer guidelines based on information regarding stand characteristics, etc.;
4. Develop and implement a monitoring process for wildlife impacts;
5. Develop standards and guidelines for cavity nesters;
6. Provide training to interpret and implement standards and guidelines either developed by the DSL or others;
7. Provide biological input from State Lands to Interagency Grizzly Bear Committee, as needed;
8. Address cumulative effects issues for wildlife and fisheries.

Proposal

EXHIBIT 9  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

It is proposed to add one full time wildlife/fisheries biologist to the Forestry Division staff that will be co-funded by both DSL and DFW&P. The primary responsibilities of the biologist will be to:

1. Develop and maintain wildlife standards and guidelines for State Land Management;
2. Perform the monitoring and habitat mapping necessary to implement and maintain standards and guidelines;
3. Provide training in wildlife management;
4. Serve as DSL's wildlife liaison with other resource management agencies.

FTE and budget requirements are:

FTE: 1 FTE, Wildlife Biologist, Grade 14

<u>Budget:</u> Personal Services:	\$ 25,000.00
Operating:	\$ 5,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 30,000.00

Funding Source: Position co-funded between DSL and DFW&P

Current-level Forestry Division Budget	\$ 15,000.00
From DFW&P	\$ 15,000.00
TOTAL	\$ 30,000.00

EXHIBIT 9  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB\_

EXHIBIT 10  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

CONSERVATION RESERVE PROGRAM

WILDLIFE SEEDLINGS

Summary:

The Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks has requested the Department of State Lands, Forestry Division, to produce an additional \$25,000 worth of trees and shrubs for wildlife plantings under the Federal Conservation Reserve Program. Additional authority for .50 FTE and operating and capital will be required.

Background:

The Conservation Reserve Program was authorized under the 1975 Farm Bill to remove highly erodible farm lands from production and to install conservation practices to further reduce erosion on those lands. The Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP), in cooperation with the Agriculture, Stabilization and Conservation Service (ASCS), using license fee income and federal cost share funds are providing free trees and shrubs for wildlife habitat improvement plantings on reserved lands. The Department of State Lands (DSL) has provided most of those trees and shrubs under contract with FWP. Over 450,000 trees or shrubs have been planted under this program in its first two years.

Initially \$20,000 worth of trees were provided in the 1987 Fiscal Year. The DSL received authorization to grow \$25,000 worth of trees annually for this program during the 1988-89 biennium. This modification increases that authorization from \$25,000 to \$50,000 per year for the 1990-91 biennium. Total funding for this modification is from earmarked revenues.

Proposal:

The Department intends to increase production of trees and shrubs to meet the needs of the Conservation Reserve Wildlife habitat Program. Increased funding would be budgeted as follows:

	<u>FY90</u>	<u>FY91</u>
1. Personal Services		
FTE (Seasonal)	.50	.50
Wages	\$13,300	\$13,300
2. Operating	4,000	4,000
3. Capital	<u>7,700</u>	<u>7,700</u>
TOTAL	\$25,000	\$25,000

EXHIBIT 10  
DATE 1-12-89  
HB \_\_\_\_\_

