MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE JOINT APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE FOR INSTITUTIONS - MONTANA STATE PRISON
February 13, 1981
EXECUTIVE SESSION

JACK K. MOORE, Chairman, called the meeting to order at 12:50
p.m. in Room l08, Capitol Building. All Committee members were present.

EXECUTIVE SESSION - MONTANA STATE PRISON.
SEN. THOMAS moved since there is no difference between the Executive Budget and the LFA on the Prison Ranch, he would like to accept the budget with the boiler plate language that the spending authority cannot increase over the amount of revenue derived.

THE CHAIRMAN asked not to discuss the boiler plate language at this time.

REP. ERNST asked if the FTEs were sufficient for security and with the meat cutters at the ranch.

MR. SOUTH stated that as of now there is only one supervisor on the kill floor and that is where the most deadly weapons are. The butcher shop currently has one supervisor, 4 civilian butchers, and 2 to 3 inmates on occasion. Originally, the Department's recommendation was that all 4 of the butchers go and leave only one supervisor. He is not requesting that 4 of the butcher positions go because he does not feel they can fill the 7 available positions with skilled enough prison labor, so the new proposal is to only delete 2 butchers.

MR. HOFFMAN stated it is his belief that unless there is some type of relief given to the ranch to bring the equipment up to an operating level, he feels anything done to the ranch would be pushing it back down. Many people operating the ranch are using their own equipment. If something is not done now, the equipment will be in the same condition two years down the road.

MR. SOUTH feels that the revolving fund cannot be tied directly to the appropriations given to the institutions for the food costs because these are based on food costs. He stated if market value goes above what has been estimated, the institutions will have to pay it. He stated in the equipment area the meat cutting equipment will have priority to increase efficiency.

SEN. THOMAS restated his motion to approve the Executive Budget for the revolving fund account for the operation of the ranch, and will discuss the appropriate boiler plate language at a later time.

SEN. JOHNSON stated the motion allows the ranch to go on.

SEN. THOMAS stated that unless the Committee can come up with a total industry program, that at this time it would be difficult to sell to the legislature. We cannot do away with such a vital link to the rehabilitation program because there would be riots. He feels the ranch would be looked at during the interim, and he feels confident in the current administration.

THE MOTION PASSED with 5 in favor and 1 opposed. Sen. Johnson opposed.

THE CHAIRMAN asked for the Department to provide the Committee with figures on the modified programs for the Industry Program without additional buildings, and also figures on the programs with the additional buildings. He did not feel the buildings could be built during the next biennium anyway.

MR. HUNTINGTON stated that the buildings in question were industrial buildings, and they can be erected with inmate labor quite rapidly.

THE CHAIRMAN felt it was best to go through each industry item and the committee could approve or disapprove each one.

SEN. THOMAS asked if the print shop would be used in the existing building.

MRS. HARRIS stated they could use the existing building. Printing at this time is a current activity, but not a current industry. They would set it up as an industry so that it could generate an income. The equipment cost to set this up as an industry would be $\$ 500$.

SEN. THOMAS moved to accept the Printing Industry which will include the $\$ 500$ for equipment.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to separate the existing programs from the new programs. He listed the existing programs as Printing, Sign Manufacturing, Metal and Wood, Refinishing and Reupholstery and Mattress Manufacturing. The only additional money for equipment in these areas would be the $\$ 500$ for the Printing Shop and $\$ 6,500$ for the Mattress Manufacturing.

REP. CONROY asked what the cost was for mattresses in relation to the competitive market.

MRS. HARRIS stated the estimate was based on the materials for the mattresses, and the price runs about $\$ 44$ each.

REP. CONROY moved to retain the present industry programs, and the dollar amount will be worked in to maintain these programs
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at a later date. THE MOTION PASSED.
REP. CONROY moved not to accept the ring binder manufacturing of office supplies. THE MOTION PASSED.

SEN. THOMAS moved to accept the validation tags modified program to include the $\$ 50,000$ equipment cost. THE MOTION PASSED.

SEN. THOMAS moved to accept the Furniture Manufacturing Program. He feels due to the fact this program employes so many inmates, the value of the FTE would be worth the work training program.

REP. CONROY stated if this program was started, there would be an inlaid cost for materials.

MRS. HARRIS stated at the present time they have funds for inventory start up costs, but there is not the money for complete inventory in the budget. The figures shown are equipment costs only.

THE CHAIRMAN asked how much money would be required to set up the Furniture Manufacturing. He stated before the Committee can agree on some of the new proposed industry programs, the Department and the LFA can work out the figures and give them to the Committee on Saturday. These figures will be regarding the Furniture Manufacturing, White Goods and Timber Industry.

THE CHAIRMAN asked what were the results of the fair housing hearing.

MR. SOUTH stated he would get the necessary handouts by Saturday's session, and gave a brief overview of where the Department stands. He stated they have union contracts at Warm Springs and Galen that restrict the ability to realize realistic rents. The last study was in 1976. In July 1978 , the union contract stated that you cannot raise rent any higher than the percentage of salary increase. Most of the housing is at Warm Springs and Galen. The policy has been written that no one pay less than $75 \%$ of fair market value rental. In order to do this, current appraisals need to be done on the property. He noted one of the problems is that the Institutions are being asked to do this whereas other state agencies are not.

THE CHAIRMAN asked about the patient account litigation.
MR. SOUTH stated he did have the staff lawyer present when the budget came up, but he is not present at the time. The lawyer stated this will not be resolved before the fiscal year. He stated as far as he understands the Department billed patients without using an itemized billing and was challenged. The accounts have since been itemized, but a court action has pre-
vented any type of money going from the trust accounts to the Department. He noted when a patient leaves an institution he is entitled to take his money with him, and they are checking into the fact that Warm Springs is being billed for $\$ 1,990,000$ but there is actually $\$ 799,000$ in the trust account. He stated they are trying to get an out of court settlement.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to discuss the Pay Plan. He noted when the Pay Plan was established a person at a certain grade would get a cost of living raise every July lst, plus a step increase. He stated people have been circumventing the system by upgrading people.

MR. SOUTH stated he feels in some casesupgrades have been used just for salary increases, in other cases they have been used to assist in filling positions difficult to fill. He stated it was necessary to look at how the upgrades were granted. He asked Mr. Blodgett to explain security officers upgrades.

MR. BLODGETT stated the system coming about from the classification bureau is one that he recommended approximately two years ago. It is a culmination of many years of frustration in administration to try and keep on board a certain number of qualified individuals. Over the years they have experienced problems in trying to train people, maintain continuity of service due to the high turn over rate. In some years there is 50\% turn over. This causes problems in emergency situations and he is quite concerned over staff lives. He stated they have taken a look of the experienced people that should be there on any given day. From that group a number has been derived that should be upgraded and trained. He noted there have been times they have had as high as $70 \%$ of their staff that has been there one year or less. These 55 positions proposed are designed around being able to upgrade them and develop a training program and review program for each officer. There is a controlled number eligible for upgrading. Since the classification system was developed, these people have always been a Grade 9. He stated at this time there are 158 Security Officers which includes the Correction Officers from Sergeants down, Security Captain, Correctional Specialists, and Armorer.

THE CHAIRMAN read from the Clark report that the consultants opinion was that salary was not the major factor in the attrition rate in the security staff, rather he was more inclined to feel a poor staff development and a failure to rotate staff and union contract emphasis on seniority was a major contributing factor. He noted in the prison contract, the 55 positions are classified as Security Officer I's, and asked if more money needed to be put in the budget to bring them up to Security Officer's II.
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MR. SOUTH stated as he understood it, it was already in the Executive Budget. The policy of the Department was they would not plug anything into the budget that had not been ruled on by the Personnel Division or the Board of Personal Appeals. At that time those 55 had not been ruled on. He stated they would not like to make any recommendation until a settlement is reached. He felt that by the meeting on Saturday, he would be able to give them the results of the settlement.

SEN. THOMAS stated there was a problem on the teacher's salaries in relation to the local school districts in the Mountain View, Pine Hills and Great Falls School for the Deaf and Blind.

MR. SOUTH asked to speak about the Pay Plan regarding the teachers. He noted he sponsored the Pay Plan 2 years ago and had been asked by the Mountain View teachers if they could attempt a parity with the Helena School districts and Miles City. At his request, an amendment was put into the bill that brought them all up to $95 \%$ of the pay scale of Pine Hills and Great Falls. The teachers still call him to buy off on that concept, but he told them as Director of the Department he can no longer do that because to bring them up to parity with the other school districts would be an $18 \%$ increase, and the Pay Plan allows only a $12 \%$ increase. He stated there would be a problem in tying the salaries of state governmental workers to decisions made in the public school system. He stated they are still negotiating but it does not make that much difference once the Pay Plan is introduced because that is where the action is.

REP. CONROY asked who the Board of Personal Appeals answers to.
MR. SOUTH stated the Board is a quasi-judicial function and answers to no one. It is attached administratively to one agency.

MR. HUNTINGTON stated they are appointed by the Governor and the statute states who they are to represent.

THE CHAIRMAN stated the Governor is aware of the Committee's concerns over the step increases and upgrades. He has asked 5 different members to get together and see how this can be controlled. The meeting recessed at $2: 30 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$. and reconvened on February 14, at 2:45 p.m. Senator Etchart was excused.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to discuss the reclassification of the 55 Correctional Officers.

MR. SOUTH presented Exinibit A, Memorandum of Agreement regarding the appeals of the Correctional Officer I.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to discuss the Industry Program.
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MR. SOUTH stated he sees problems with having the Committee deciding which programs to keep and which ones not to keep. He asked to have the Committee authorize the Department to do everything possible within the existing buildings, and not tie the Department to any specific program, but let the Department make the decision as to what goes. He would also like to have the option of which program goes if the buildings are authorized.

MR. HUNTINGTON stated he agreed with what Mr. South had to say. He feels the main problem is idle inmates, and keeping the inmates involved not only in the ranch area, but also in the industry program. He stated they are not sure how many jobs and profits will be introduced by the expanded industry program. He feels the Department needs the flexibility to see how many jobs and inmates can be kept busy plus not building any ongoing general fund support into the program.

THE CHAIRMAN stated the consensus of the Committee is they do not want to start a ring binder program and that was decided upon yesterday. He noted the committee went along with the validation tag and the other modified programs which result in 8 staffing positions and $\$ 73,000$ in equipment costs. He felt the Department would have some latitude to work within the existing framework.

MR. SOUTH noted they have pulled out of the Prison Budget 2 FTE that are now working at the Industry Program, but there were 3 FTE authorized.

MR. HOFFMAN asked Mr. South if he bought the validation: equipment was he assured of the contract.

MR. SOUTH stated he would not buy the equipment until he was assured of the contract.

MRS. HARRIS stated the equipment would not be that difficult to obtain since it is a standard type of equipment.

THE CHAIRMAN stated perhaps they could put into the language of the bill that the prison will provide these tags.

MR. HOFFMAN explained it depends on how much it will cost to have a private business do that and the amortization of the equipment would have to be built in to the contract.

MR. SOUTH stated one of the problems in working on these estimates is they do not have the concrete assurance of the market and thus it is difficult to order inventory at this time. He explained Exhibit 99, and noted the general fund money they would need for FY 82 and FY 83 not including the equipment purchases. When comparing the general fund requested, you need to take out the 3 FTE plus the utilities which are still in the base portion of

Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Appropriations
the Prison Budget. The general fund that is requested here would be built into the revolving fund rather than going directly into the operational portion of the Prison Budget.

SEN. THOMAS moved to allow the Department to expand the programs that could be housed in the present facility. He asked Mr. South what all programs this would include.

MR. SOUTH stated within the existing building they could do the following at somewhat a reduced level: Printing, Validation Tags, Signs, Mattresses, Reupholstery,Refinishing, Furniture and some Wood Products.

SEN. THOMAS stated this would exclude the ring binder manufacturing and would give enough variation and flexibility to come up with a workable program. THE MOTION PASSED.

MR. SOUTH stated the general fund that they would like to have in the revolving fund just for operations in the first two years would be $\$ 87,690$ and $\$ 78,660$. That would be for operations. The equipment would involve $\$ 50,000$ for the validation tag, $\$ 6,000$ for the additional sewing machines plus the $\$ 500$ for the Printing machine for a total of $\$ 56,500$ equipment money.

THE CHAIRMAN asked about the possibility of paying back any of this money.

MR. SOUTH stated there is a possibility they could begin paying back for the equipment. He noted he would prefer not to have to pay back the $\$ 87,690$ and $\$ 78,660$ because if everything was left at status quo there would still be $\$ 60,000$ going into the operational portion of the budget.

MR. HOFFMAN stated the Committee has two options before them. One option is to give direct general fund loans for $\$ 221,500$, or have the Department of Institutions get a general fund loan which needs to be paid back. The problem with the general fund loan is it can only go during fiscal years, so if the Department borrowed during one fiscal year, they would have to pay it back during the next fiscal year. He suggested there could be some language written that they could appropriate directly $\$ 221,000$ to the Department of Institutions but they must be required to deposit $x$ amount of funds back to the general fund out of any revenue they receive. He stated that the Department needs front end money and that front end in just the equipment alone would equate to $\$ 56,500$. The additional operating money needed in FY 82 and FY 83 would be difficult for the Department to assure revenue because they are uncertain of the market. He would suggest that the Committee appropriate the $\$ 221,500$ of general funds money and this would keep control of the amount of cash going into the operating reserve.

THE CHAIRMAN stated he would appropriate this under the Prison Industries and in FY $82 \$ 143,500$ and $F Y 83 \$ 78,000$ would be appropriated.

MR. HOFFMAN stated if it is the intent of the committee to establish work programs at the Prison, he would assume that the $\$ 221,500$ requested by the Department, be put as front end money so they can get the programs going. He stated another option is if they do not generate the additional funds, then the programs be stopped as of the time they discover enough money cannot be generated to cover the expenses.

MR. SOUTH stated the language could be put in, if the Committee wished, but they would terminate any program that did not appear to be self-supporting. He noted they are requesting 5 FTE, 4 FTE would be supervisors and 1 FTE would be the production manager.

REP. CONROY moved to provide the money for FY $82 \$ 143,500$ and FY $83 \$ 78,000$ out of general fund for the Industry Program without the building expansion. THE MOTION PASSED.

MR. HOFFMAN stated the only refiguring would be to come up with the exact dollar amount placed in the revolving account associated with the general fund that has just been approved. He asked Mr. Haubein to explain the money put into Personal Services, and the 2 FTE difference in the Executive Budget.

MR. HAUBEIN explained Exhibit 100 , page 3 regarding the footnote which reflects the adjustment in Personal Services for $\$ 62,744$ for the upgrades for 55 Correctional Officer I's. He noted on Page 4 in the original budget the Legislative Auditor fees were $\$ 15,000$. He has since allocated portions of that amount to the Ranch, License Plate factory and the Industry Program.

MR. HOFFMAN stated there was a difference in the original
Personal Service amount and the revised Personal Service amount and questioned the difference.

MR. HAUBEIN explained after recalculating the industry utilities the previous utility figure is overstated by $\$ 23,518$ in FY 82 and $\$ 26,799$ in FY 83. He stated he would like the new utility figures to read $\$ 239,486$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 267,766$ for $F Y 83$.

THE CHAIRMAN explained there was a new bill in process to change the license plates. He noted when the bill goes through, they will just go back and put in the additional materials funds, because there is no additional FTE requirement.

MR. HUNTINGTON stated he was concerned with the accounting entity of the license plate factory and a number of agencies spend off the money, and this will have to be watched when it goes through on the fiscal note.
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MR. HOFFMAN explained to the Committee that the License Plate factory, EXHIBIT l01, is all earmarked revenue and there is no general fund money associated, and that is why there is no variance between the Executive and the LFA.

REP. CONROY moved to approve the Montana State Prison License Plate Factory amounts of $\$ 491,242$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 529,718$ for FY 83. THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. ERNST moved to accept the Canteen Revolving Account for $\$ 250,469$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 250,521$ for $F Y$ 83. THE MOTION PASSED.

MR. HAUBEIN asked to discuss EXHIBIT 102 regarding the Substance Abuse Counselor at Grade 14. This does not include the pay plan.

REP. ERNST moved to accept the Substance Abuse Counselor modified program. THE MOTION PASSED, with 3 in favor and 1 opposed. Rep. Conroy opposed.

MR. HOFFMAN explained there were two areas to be discussed regarding the Prison Budget. The first one was the industry and ranch program which has been taken care of, the second area was the amount of food and the dollar amount for the food the Prison should have. He stated it was the LFA's recommendation that the food be comparable to the Swan River Youth Camp budget.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to take a short recess and the Executive and the LFA to come up with the same figures.

MR. HOFFMAN stated the corrected Personal Services amounts for FY 82 would be Executive Budget $\$ 4,551,389$, LFA Budget $\$ 4,518,777$ making a variance of $\$ 32,612$; for $F Y 83$ the Executive would be $\$ 4,552,309$ and the LFA would be $\$ 4,519,697$ making a variance of $\$ 32,612$. He stated the Supplies and Materials figures have not been changed until the wishes of the committee on the food costs are established.

MR. HAUBEIN stated he recomputed the Prison Food Budget as compared to the Swan Budget and if those figures were used the Prison Food cost would be for FY 82, $\$ 678,729$ making a difference of $\$ 52,470$; for FY 83 the cost would be $\$ 744,441$ and a difference of $\$ 57,411$.

REP. ERNST asked to discuss the food costs, and if they use the Swan River Youth Camp costs what this would do to the food quality.

MR. SOUTH asked to have Mr. Blodgett explain why the food costs are higher at the Prison than Swan River.

MR. BLODGETT stated he is not quite sure why the variance, and'
after looking in depth at the food costs, there is only $\$ 15,000$ each year that would be attributed to the differences in that there are some charges made against the Prison's food service cost that are not made in Swan River. He also feels there are a lot of differences between the food service departments because of size, and staff ratio and built in controls of food items at Swan. He felt they can find only $\$ 15,000$ each year that could be reasonably deducted from the amount budgeted, beyond that amount the quality would be lower.

REP. CONROY asked to have the Swan River Budget per meal costs amounts of $\$ 1.203$ for FY 82 and $\$ 1.311$ for $F Y 83$ be discussed. At the time their budget was discussed it was noted these were the highest food costs.

MR. HAUBEIN stated they had based the above costs on 56,462 meals served at the Swan River Youth Camp.

MR. HOFFMAN stated the anticipated Montana Prison food costs are 9.3 cents higher in FY 82 and 10 cents higher in FY 83.

MR. SOUTH stated another thing to be considered was the original projections were based on population levels lower than they are right now. The population levels were based on 632 for $F Y 82$ and 646 for FY 83.

THE CHAIRMAN asked the Committee to decide which food costs they would want to go with, the Prison food costs or Swan River food costs.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the prisons food cost. THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the Other Expenditure, Utilities, Rent and Contracted Services amounts which contained no variance between the Executive and the LFA. See EXHIBIT 100, page 1. THE MOTION PASSED.

MR. ROSTOCKI explained the main difference in the Repair and Maintenance figures is the LFA used the base and allowed $\$ 15,000$ for FY 82 for the repair of cars and paint, and for $F Y 83$ allowed $\$ 10,000$ just for car repair due to the large number of 'deadlined' vehicles.

REP. CONROY moved the LFA figures for Repair and Maintenance for $\$ 99,939$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 86,309$ for $F Y$ 83. THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. CONROY asked to discuss the tuition expense for the extension courses for the inmates, and if the Department was to provide the Committee with a breakdown on the tuition expenses.

MR. BLODGETT stated the average tuition expense per year for 3
quarters has been $\$ 10,000$. During the fiscal year, there have been a larger number of inmates who paid for tuition and books with VA benefits or by themselves, than were paid for by the state. The $\$ 10,000$ does not provide a great amount of tuition for a great amount of people. The average inmates per quarter has been 67 people. The inmates are well screened before being allowed in the program, and this program has been reviewed as one of the most worthwhile. He noted they have not followed the education training up after parole, but could do that in the future if needed.

REP. CONROY stated it seems to be a matter of concern to the public of an inmate taking courses while still in prison.

THE CHAIRMAN asked if he was speaking of someone taking extension courses while still in prison or someone like L. R. Bretz going to school. He asked who was paying for Bretz to go to school.

MR. RUSSELL stated the Department has not paid, nor will pay for any parolee, probationer, or if on furlough, to attend school while they were in the community. Mr. Bretz would be paying for his own education or would be getting funds from a federal program if his financial situation warranted that, but he is not getting money from the Department. He stated there is a provision in the statutes for the Department to pay that, and they have requested a change in the Furlough Law and other sections of the probation and parole statutes so that this can be pulled out in the coming biennium so there is no chance the Department could be ordered by a court to pay for education expenses. He stated this is solely for extension courses in the prison proper. He noted the papers were in total error in stating that Mr. Bretz was being paid by the state to go to school.

REP. CONROY stated this answered his question, so he does not wish to have the tuition money segregated from the budget.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the LFA amount for Travel for $\$ 17,343$ for FY 82 and $\$ 20,228$ for $F Y$ 83. THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. ERNST moved to accept the LFA amount for Communication for $\$ 37,115$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 40,269$ for $F Y$ 83. THE MOTION PASSED.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the LFA amount for Supplies and Materials for $\$ 1,158,185$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 1,245,266$ for FY 83. THE MOTION PASSED WITH 3 in favor and 1 opposed. Rep. Ernst opposed.

MR. ROSTOCKI explained the difference in the amounts for Equipment was the Executive had 4 passenger vans, LFA had l van. The LFA did not include a spare boiler which he felt should be added to the budget. He noted, however, that the LFA did not wish
to include a garden tractor or radios. In FY 83 there was a change in the sewer snake price from the Executive, plus the LFA had included an electric forklift for $\$ 22,000$. The corrected LFA figures would be $\$ 48,109$ for $F Y 82$ with a variance of $\$ 34,245$ and $\$ 47,291$ for $F Y 83$ with a variance of $\$ 16,226$.

REP. CONROY moved the LFA Equipment amounts for $\$ 48,109$ for FY 82 and $\$ 47,291$ for FY 83. THE MOTION PASSED.

THE CHAIRMAN asked to discuss the Personal Services.
MR. SOUTH stated the difference in the FTE's between the Executive and the LFA was 2 social workers.

MR. ROSTOCKI explained the positions added by the governor besides the security were 2 LPN's, 2 Social Workers and 1 Recreational Specialist for a total of 27 FTE. The LFA included the 2 LPN's and the 1 Recreational Specialist.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the LFA figures for Personal Services for $\$ 4,518,777$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 4,519,697$ for $F Y 83$.

MR. HOFFMAN asked Mr. South if the agreement regarding the 55 FTE upgrades had been signed by the union.

MR. SOUTH stated the agreement had been signed and asked Mr. Schram to explain EXHIBIT $A$ to the committee.

MR. SCHRAM stated the contract has been negotiated so that they will drop the present appeal and are satisfied with the 55 positions upgraded. The agreement states there will be no appeals for the next biennium. If the situation changes after FY 83 they could appeal, but he was uncertain about that at that time.

THE CHAIRMAN asked what effect this would have on the other institutions.

MR. SCHRAM stated this should have no direct effect since there are no other Correctional Officers in the other institutions. Other employees may say why you don't do the same thing for us, but his intention is to say absolutely no. He stated they are under no legal obligation to bargain about classification since the last session, and he feels this is a hybrid case due to the fact there was a need for a certain number of grade 10 officers. By this agreement the Correctional Officer I's gave up their rights to any back pay before this coming July. He explained paragraph 4, by stating in Paragraph 2 the Officers are not being grandfathered into any rights. He was aware of changes that may be coming, and he wanted it made clear that they are not grandfathering them with any rights they have now, in case the Committee changed them, so he felt this adequately protected them.
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MR. SOUTH stated they did not at any point in the hearings get to discuss the 2 social workers in the Personal Services.

MR. BLODGETT stated the 2 social workers being discussed have been filled and authorized since 1977. In 1979 after the move to the new prison an appeal was made to maintain these social workers as part of the 27 positions. These people were case managers at the old prison. The case load of each of these people is 110 prisoners and the workers being discussed are presently working in the close units. There are a total of 6 social workers at the prison, and these social workers are a very important person on the unit management team and the classification team for the inmates. He stated with the over population problem these teams would be greatly endangered if these two social workers were removed. The need for these 2 workers have been looked at over a period of 4 years. The Department of Institutions that reviewed them stated they did not have enough social workers; they have had 4 different reviews and each review stated these people were important. He further explained the other social workers and their duties. He stated there was a current population of 674 and this made 110 cases per social worker.

REP. CONROY's MOTION FAILED with 2 IN FAVOR AND 2 OPPOSED. Those opposed were REP. ERNST AND REP. MOORE.

A brief recess was taken to get the authorized votes of the Senators since they needed to be on the floor for debate.

REP. ERNST moved to accept the Executive Budget on Personal Services in the amounts of $\$ 4,551,389$ for FY 82 and $\$ 4,552,309$ for FY 83. THE MOTION PASSED WITH 4 IN FAVOR AND 2 OPPOSED. Those opposed were REP. CONROY and SEN. JOHNSON.

MR. SOUTH asked to discuss the retroactive pay for the Prison in the amount of $\$ 86,021$.

REP. ERNST moved that we do not accept the retroactive pay for the Montana State Prison in the amount of $\$ 86,021$.

THE MOTION PASSED.
The CHAIRMAN asked to discuss the remaining portion of the Director's Program. EXHIBIT 102, Page 1. He noted there were three items, rent, utilities and equipment with no variance.

REP. CONROY moved the LFA figures for rent, utilities and equipment in the Directors Program.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the Executive Budget for Other Expenses amounts of $\$ 1,112$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 912$ for FY 83.
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REP. CONROY moved to accept the LFA amounts in Repair and Maintenance for $\$ 1,357$ for FY 82 and $\$ 1,472$ for FY 83.

THE MOTION PASSED.
REP. ERNST moved to accept the Executive Budget for Travel for $\$ 8,522$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 9,798$ for $F Y 83$.

THE MOTION PASSED.
REP. CONROY moved to accept the LFA amount for Communications of $\$ 8,869$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 9,627$ for $F Y 83$.

THE MOTION PASSED.
REP. CONROY moved to accept the LFA amount for Supplies and Materials for $\$ 3,635$ for FY 82 and $\$ 3,954$ for FY 83.

THE MOTION PASSED.
REP. CONROY moved to accept the Executive Budget for Contracted Services of $\$ 9,082$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 9,392$ for $F Y 83$.

THE MOTION PASSED.
MR. HOFFMAN explained the difference in the Contracted Services amounts was based on the Executive initial request of having a Physicians Review Committee within the Department. Since that time the Department stated they did not wish to have that, and have requested some additional monies in other areas. He explained the difference in the Personal Services of the 1 FTE is basically the industry coordinator position that is within the Department. The LFA felt this position should be placed at the Prison.

MR. SOUTH stated he intends to run the ranch and the industry program and make the major decisions. He feels this position is an analytical position that he needs directly responsible to him, and the money has been built into the Contracted Services areas of the Ranch and the Industry Program.

REP. CONROY moved the Executive Budget for Personal Services for $\$ 226,892$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 226,892$ for $F Y 83$.

THE MOTION PASSED.
MR. HOFFMAN stated because some of the selections have been made between the Executive and the LFA he would suggest the only funding that be taken up at this time is the Institution Industry on Page 2.
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REP. ERNST moved to accept the Institution Industry funding for $\$ 25,036$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 25,161$ for $F Y 83$.

THE MOTION PASSED.
The CHAIRMAN asked to take action on ADAD.
MR. HOFFMAN stated the Subcommittee that has Justice has passed on the dollar amount of alcohol funds they wish included in the Justice and they are now the same figures shown on funding for $\$ 78,221$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 85,166$ for $F Y 83$. See EXHIBIT 96 Page 1.

REP. CONROY moved to accept the Justice amount for funding for $\$ 78,221$ for $F Y 82$ and $\$ 85,166$ for $F Y 83$.

MR. HOFFMAN explained the current figures for Galen were derived by the Department of Institutions. They determined the actual support that is currently being provided the alcohol treatment center at Galen. These are the figures requested by the Department and are included with the LFA recommendations. The initial LFA figures were higher than the figures presently listed, which means additional general fund support will have to be given to Galen unless the Committee would recommend that the Galen amount be increased and the county be decreased. The differences between Galen were $\$ 51,512$ in FY 82 and $\$ 112,312$ for FY 83. He explained that based on the bottom line at Galen, the LFA had previously recommended support going to Galen that had happened last year with a percent of increase for FY 82 and FY 83 associated with the increase in the alcohol funds. He noted if the Department of Institutions cost analysis is correct than this is the amount of alcohol funds that should be given to Galen, otherwise, what is being done is giving move alcohol funds to Galen to keep the level of general fund support.

MR. SOUTH stated the difference in the LFA's projection is not necessarily related to the cost of the alcohol program at Galen. The Department's recommendation is to bring the cost of the program to the Committee and based on those allocations the costs are $\$ 1,305,988$ for FY 82 and $\$ 1,365,719$ for FY 83. He noted whichever amount is adopted the Pay Plan has to be put in with the General Fund.

MR. HOFFMAN explained with the alcohol funds, the Executive has agreed with the LFA as far as the total amount available. All of the alcohol funds have been distributed at this time. The LFA had two options, they could have held back a certain percentage of alcohol funds and associated it with the Pay Plan. The LFA felt for the sake of simplicity, they would distribute the total alcohol funds and the Pay Plan would be strictly General Fund.

REP. CONROY moved to leave Galen funds as they are at $\$ 1,305,988$ for FY 82 and $\$ 1,365,719$ for $F Y 83$.

Minutes of the Meeting of the Joint Appropriations
Subcommittee for Institutions - Montana State Prison February 14, 1981 Executive Session

THE MOTION PASSED.
REP. CONROY moved to leave the County funds as indicated \$1,677,479 for FY 82 and $\$ 1,809,498$ for FY 83.

THE MOTION PASSED WITH 4 IN FAVOR AND 1 OPPOSED. REP. MOORE opposed.

There being no further discussion or comments, the meeting was adjourned at 5:30 p.m.


JĀCK K. MOORE, Chairman
mg

VISITORS' REGISTER
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MONTANA STATE PRISON RANCH


$$
\begin{array}{r}
17,973 \\
3,563 \\
17,973
\end{array}
$$

$$
58,595
$$

$$
65,627
$$

$$
\begin{array}{c|}
\hline \text { FY } 83 \\
\hline 12,636 \\
7,014 \\
65,627 \\
\hline
\end{array}
$$








Functional Area
Administration
II. Beef Production
III. Dairy
IV. Slaughterhouse
V. Hog Unit
V. Logging
VII. Delivery Relief

Functional Manager Requirement
(1) Ranch Superintendent
(2) Acctg. Supervisor
(1) Animal Nutritionist
(2) Ranch Foreman II
(3) Ranch Manager I
(4) Ranch Foreman II
(1) Ranch Foreman II
(2) Ranch Foreman III
(3) Dairy Process Equip. Operator
(4) Ranch Foreman II
(1) Butcher/Meatcutter
(2) Butcher Supervisors II
(1) Ranch Foreman II
(1) Soil Scientist III
(1) Truck Driver
(1) Ranch Foreman II

TOTAL

| 80 | 81 | 82 | 83 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| 5.0 | $5.0^{1}$ | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 2.0 |
| 7.0 | 7.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 |
| 1.0 | $1.0^{2}$ | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| 1.0 | $1.0^{3}$ | 0 | 0 |

$21.0 \quad 21.0 \quad 15.0 \quad 15.0$

14 positions filled in 82
2 * Not filled in 81
3 Vacant since September 1980


[^0]THPow-W
SUPPLIES \& MATERIALS

| Institution Montana Sta | Prison Ranch |  |  |  |  | Page 1 of 2 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Itam | Justiflcation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Expendituro } \\ \text { ID } \end{gathered}$ | Status | FY 80 Actual | FY 81 | FY 82 | FY 83 |
| Agricultural | Purchase;of seed, clean \& treat seed | 2201 |  | 2170 |  | 6000 | 6486 |
| Clothing \& personal | Gloves, mittens, warehouse items. | 2203 |  | 233 |  | 278 | 301 |
| Janitorial | Cleaning Supplies for | 2207 |  | 8601 |  | 9366 | 10125 |
| Mudical | Animal Vaccines \& Medicin¢ | 2209 |  | 3937 |  | 5264 | 5706 |
| Minor Tools | simall hand tools \& minor Equipment | 2210 |  | 244 |  | 266 | 288 |
| Office | Office supplies purchased from outslide source \& warehouse issue | 2211 |  | 7 |  | 9 | 10 |
| Gasoline | Ranch vehicles \& Machinery | 2216 |  | 29926 |  | 49094 | 58913 |
| Plumbing | Plumbing Supplies purchased \& warehouse | 2217 |  | 354 |  | 386 | 417 |
| Books | Parts Manuals on Farm Machinery | 2225 |  | 29 |  | 32 | 35 |
| Building Materials | Minor materials for any building warehouse issue Fencing/Rough lumber | 2227 |  | 421 |  | 458 18,600 | 495 |
| Shop, Plant \& Industrial | Shop supplies, minor tools \& minor equip. | 2229 |  | 13982 |  | 11,064 | 11,960 |

[^1]M - Modified
SUPPLIES \& MATERIALS
Institution Montana State Prison Ranch

| Institution Montana State | Prison Ranch |  |  |  |  | Pago 2 2 of 3 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Itero | Justification | $\mathrm{Expond}_{10}$ | Status | FY 80 Actual | FY 81 | FY 82 | FY 83 |
| Tire Chains | Chains for Ranch Vehicles | 2234 |  | 97 |  | 106 | 115 |
| Engineering supplies | Engineering Supplies purchased | 2235 |  | 82 |  | 89 | 96 |
| Diesel Fuel | For tractors \& farming machinery | 2242 |  | 10643 |  | 15326 | 18391 |
| Chemicals | Calcium Chloride for tractor tires \& chemica for dairy \& packing plant compressors | s 2244 |  | 540 |  | 589 | 637 |
| Weed Killer | Weed Killer spray to be used in arial spraying or ground mechanical spraying | 2243 |  | -0- | 1,000 | 1000 | 1081 |
| Shoes | Boots for cowboys \& Loggers | 2247 | - | 442 |  | 481 | 520 1363 |
| Dairy |  | 2252 |  | 1158 |  | 1261 | 1363 |
| Veterinary Supplies | Needles, Syringes, Hot Shots, Batteries, Thermometers | 2263 |  | 562 | - | 612 | 662 |
| Electrical | slectrical supplies purchased \& warehouse issue | 2266 |  | 500 | , | 545 | 587 |
| Paper products | Paperbags, towels, tape <br>  <br> Packing Plant | 2267 |  | 1135 | $\begin{gathered} \text { 2,702 Jan. } \\ \text { YTD } \end{gathered}$ | 3107 | 3412 |
| Manufacturing Supplie | Cures for meats, cottage cheese culture, ingredie for Ice cream. $\qquad$ | $\text { hts } 2274$ |  | 11719 | 13,876 J JTan. | 15,111 | 16,335 |
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Institution Montana State Prison Ranch


[^3]




[^4]

[^5]|  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |


| $\frac{8}{2}$ | สู9 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | \% | $\stackrel{8}{2}$ |
| \% |  |  |
| 年 |  |  |

thavel ?
Type/Purpose $\quad \ldots \quad . \begin{gathered}\text { Expenditure } \\ \text { ID }\end{gathered}$
Typu
REPAIRS \& MAINTENANCE


## 


-
i1lding and Grounds
10p plant \& Industrial Equipment




INDUSTRIES WITH BUILDING EXPANSION
FY 82
FY 83
\(\begin{array}{r}\$ <br>

\)| 18,476 |
| :--- |
|  |\(\quad 28,145 <br>

\hline \$ \quad 46,621\end{array}\)
25,201

INDUSTRIES WITH NO BUILDING EXPANSION
FY 82
FY 83
$\$ \quad 25,201 \quad \$ \quad 28,145$

| 14,513 | 16,219 |
| ---: | ---: |
| 3,500 | 2,436 |
| 1,600 | 1,757 |
| 1,200 | 2,624 |
| 500 | 575 |


| 20,204 | 22,629 |  |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 2,650 | 2,868 |  |
| 4,724 | 10,369 |  |
| 189 |  |  |
| $\$ 49,080$ |  |  |

$\$ \quad 74,281$
\$ 87,622

Requested

| Personal Services | $-0-$ | $18,976.00$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Operating Expense | $11,147.00$ | $25,544.00$ |
| Inmate Pay | $\underline{1,500.00}$ | $\underline{2,500.00}$ |
| TOTAL | $12,647.00$ | $47,020.00$ |

## Current Level

Personal Services
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified

| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |

12,647.00
47,020.00

Revenue
Current Level
Modified

Inmates Employed

## Current

Modified

Equipment Needs

$$
-0-\quad-0-
$$

$14,933.00$
51,088.00
$-0-\quad-0-$

6
10

35,000.00
-0-
FY 82
FY 83

Reauested
Personal Services
$-0-\quad-0-$
Operating Expense
Dnmate Pay
TOTAL

## Current Level

Personal Services
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified
$-0-\quad-0-$
2,984.00 $\quad 3,225.00$
$2,984.00 \quad 3,225.00$

20,829.00
$41,103.00$

## Revenue

Current Level
Modified

Inmates Employed
Current
Modified

Equipment Needs

| $5,831.00$ | $6,369.00$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $-0-$ | $-0-$ |

2
4
-0-
-0-

FY 83
Requested
Personal Services
Operating Expense
Inmate Pay
TOTAL

Current Level
Personal Services
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified

## Revenue

## Current Level

Modified

Inmates Employed

## Current

Modified

Equipment Needs
$18,976.00 \quad 18,976.00$
$41,441.00 \quad 66,415.00$
$\underline{5,000.00} \quad 7,500.00$
65,417.00
92,891.00

60,302.00
87,361.00
$11,748.00$
$12,700.00$
76,300.00 $132,830.00$
20.30

30
$5,115.00 \quad 5,530.00$
5,115.00
5,530.00

6,
,
.
-0-
-0-
FY 82
FY 83

Requested

| Personal Services | $18,976.00$ | $18,976.00$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Operating Expense | $14,085.00$ | $22,663.00$ |
| Inmate Pay | $\underline{2,500.00}$ | $5,000.00$ |
| TOTAL | $35,561.00$ | $46,639.00$ |

## Current Level

Personal Services
18,976.00 18,976.00
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified
16,585.00
27,663.00

## Revenue

Current Level
Modified
43,317.00
75,544.00

Inmates Employed
Current . 10
10
Modified . 20
20

Equipment Needs
$-0-$ -0-

## Requested

| Personal Services | $18,976.00$ | $18,976.00$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Operating Expense | $18,617.00$ | $19,748.00$ |
| Inmate Pay | $\underline{2,000.00}$ | $2,000.00$ |
| TOTAL | $39,593.00$ | $40,724.00$ |

## Current Level

Personal Services
Operating Expense
TOTAS. CURRENT LEVEL

Modified

Revenue
Current Level
Modified

## Inmates Employed

## Current

Modified
2

8

2
8

```
INDUSTRY White Goods - Mattresses - Upholstry
```

FY 82
FY 83
Requested

| Personal Services | $18,976.00$ | $18,976.00$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Operating Expense | $35,527.00$ | $50,099.00$ |
| Inmate Pay | $\underline{5,000.00}$ | $\underline{6,500.00}$ |
| TOTAL | $59,503.00$ | $75,575.00$ |

## Current Level

Personal Services
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified

## Revenue

Current Level
Modified

Inmates Employed
Current
Modified

Equipment Needs

| $1,703.00$ | $1,841.00$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $46,603.00$ | $84,511.00$ |


| $15,848.00$ | $15,848.00$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| $2,075.00$ | $2,244.00$ |
| $17,923,00$ | $18,092.00$ |
| $41,580.00$ | $57,483.00$ |

46,603.00
84,511.00
教

## INDUSTRY Validation Tags

## FY 82 <br> FY 83

Requested
Personal Services
Operating Expense
Inmate Pay
TOTAL

Current Level
Personal Services
$-0-\quad-0-$
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified

Revenue
Current Level
Modified
$14,988.00$
49,009.00

Inmates Employed
Current
Modified
-0-
-0-
4
8
$50,000.00$

## FY 82 <br> FY 83

Requested

| Personal Services | $18,976.00$ | $18,976.00$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Operating Expense | $14,840.00$ | $18,647.00$ |
| Inmate Pay | $\underline{5,000.00}$ | $5,000.00$ |
| TOTAL | $38,816.00$ | $42,623.00$ |

Current Level
Personal Services
Operating Expense
TOTAL CURRENT LEVEL

Modified

Revenue

Equipment Needs
Current Level
Modified
ares Employed

Current
Modified
$-0$
-0-
10-20 . 20
-0-
33,245.00 43,366.00

Inmates Employed
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The Montana Public Employees' Association (MPEA) and the State of Montana hereby agree:

1. MPEA, on behalf of all Montana State Prison employees presently classified as Correctional Officer I, irrevocably withdraws the classification appeal of these employees presently pending before the Board of Personnel Appeals.
2. In light of a Classification Bureau order to allocate a number of Correctional Officer I positions to the Correctional Officer II classification graded at grade 10, which based on staffing needs at the Prison shall contain no more than 55 FTE positions, and support from the Department of Institutions in seeking legislative funding for such a change, MPEA further agrees to waive any future right to appeal the number and allocation of these positions to the Board of Personnel Appeals, except as detailed in this paragraph. Should work conditions and practices change significantly the union may request that the Classification Bureau revise its order to accurately reflect the changed staffing needs of the institution. In no case may such a request be made prior to January 1, 1983. The response of the Classification Bureau may be appealed to the Board of Personnel Appeals subject to any procedures, rules, or statutes governing Classification Appeals at that time. The Board's decision shall be based on the intent and practice of the parties as expressed in this agreement, the February 1981 order of the Clissification Bureau, and the class specification as written and applied between now and the time of request to the Bureau. In no case may a decision result in a grade or allocation change prior to July 1, 1983.
3. No Correctional Officer I shall be entitled to the new Correctional Officer II, grade 10 classification before the start of the new fiscal year in July, 1981.
4. If the Correctional Sergeants via their appeal now pending are upgraded to grade 13 the union may request the Classification Bureau to re-examine the propriety of the grades 9 and 10 levels for Correctional Officer I and II positions in light of the newly created three grade differential. The Bureau shall issue its final decision on such a request within 90 days from the date of the request. The Bureau decision may be appealed to the Board of Personnel Appeals subject to the final three sentences of paragraph \#2.
5. Movement from Correctional Officer I to Correctional Officer II shall be considered a promotion under the collective bargaining agreem'nt now in existence between the parties.
6. Should the Legislature refuse to appropriate money to implement the aforementioned Classification Bureau order, MPEA may be excused from implementing the appeal withdrawal required by paragraph \#1, and this entire agreement becomes null and void including the Classification Bureau order of February 1981.

FOR THE STATE OF MONTANA:


FOR THE UNION:


DATED: February 13, 1981

- No adjustment for inflation.




COMPUTED REQUIREMENT
6.63
4.66
17.09
119.28
.70
148.35

FY 82-83


FY 82-83
JOB CLASSIFICATION CATEGORY
Security Administration
Correctional Lieutenant
Correctional Sergeant
Correctional Officer I
Special Requirements
(National Guard)
$11 \times 15=165$ Man Days
235
totals


| (*DESIGNATES FIVE (5) DAY POSTS) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { TOTAL } \\ & \text { POSTS } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | SEVEN (7) DAY/WEEK-EIGHT (8) HOUR POSTS |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Correctional Lieutenant | Shift Supervisor | 3 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  |  |  |  |  | Total Lieutenant-3 Seven |  |
| Correctional Sergeant | Housing Unit Super. Maximum Unit | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | Close Unit I | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | Close Unit II | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | Unit A | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | Unit B | 2 | 1 |  |  | 1 |
|  | Unit C | 1 |  | 1 |  |  |
|  | Unit Sergeant | 1 |  |  |  |  |

Maximum Unit
Control
Floor
Close Unit I
Control
Floor
Close Unit II
Control
Flor
Unit A
Control
Floor
Unit B
Control
Floor
Unit C
Control
Floor
Main Control
Yard Tower Correctional Officer I
 Unit Sergeant Housing Unit Super. Maximum Unit
Close Unit I
Close Unit II
Unit A
Unit B
Unit C
Unit Se
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