

MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 52nd LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON LONG-RANGE PLANNING

Call to Order: By CHAIR MARY ELLEN CONNELLY, on January 21, 1991, at 8 a.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Mary Ellen Connelly, Chair (D)
Sen. Bob Hockett, Vice Chairman (D)
Rep. Francis Bardanouve (D)
Sen. Ethel Harding (R)
Sen. J.D. Lynch (D)
Rep. Bob Thoft (D)

Staff Present: Jim Haubein, Principal Fiscal Analyst (LFA)
Jane Hamman, Senior Budget Analyst (OBPP)
Claudia Montagne, Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF LABOR AND INDUSTRY

Tape No. 1:A:000

Informational Testimony: Rod Sager, Centralized Services Division, Dept. of Labor and Industry, reviewed the one project they had in the bill, the renovation and expansion of the Job Service in Great Falls, priority 51. **EXHIBIT 1, 1/14/91** In addition, he proposed an amendment on the Department's major maintenance projects. Through a misunderstanding, the projects did not make it into the bill, although they were listed on page 72 of the Major Maintenance Plan. **EXHIBIT 2, 1/14/91** Mr. Sager distributed the amendment, **EXHIBIT 1**, which corrected this omission in the bill. All of the money would be provided by Federal Special Revenues.

Mr. O'Connell explained that any project identified in the Major Maintenance Plan had to be requested in the Long Range Building Program. These particular projects had not been requested, but had A&E reviewed them, they would have been approved.

Questions from the Subcommittee:

REP. BARDANOUVE asked if the projects had to be itemized, or could they be added in a lump sum. **Mr. Whaley** said they could be added as a lump sum, similar to what happened with the Dept. of Highways maintenance projects.

SEN. HARDING asked about the project. **Mr. Whaley** described the fluctuating water table in the area, and the lifting of the floor slab of the basement. The initial plan provided for a cushion beneath the basement floor so that the movement would not affect the floor and walls of the building. However since this was not cost-effective, the basement was being abandoned except for storage, and an addition was planned on ground with better slopes and drainage.

REP. THOFT asked which projects the \$209,000 was funding. **Mr. Whaley** said they were all in the Major Maintenance Program book on page 72.

HEARING ON THE DEPARTMENT OF FAMILY SERVICES

Tape 1:A:270

Informational Testimony:

Bill Unger, Superintendent of Mountain View School, presented the roof replacement for the Cottonwood Cottage, the DFS project for the Mountain View School as outlined in the Capital Construction Program, page 52. **EXHIBIT 1, 1/14/91**

Al Davis, Superintendent, Pine Hills School, presented the projects for Pine Hills School, the first of which was the expansion of a security fence, executive priority 3, page 40. He described the change in the composition of the Pine Hills population over the past few years towards a more difficult, disturbed, unpredictable population. They pose a more serious threat to others, necessitating the upgrading of the classification process to identify the high-risk students, and increasing the security on one part of the campus. The other options would be to fence the entire institution, or to re-design the entire facility.

Questions from Subcommittee Members:

REP. BARDANOUVE asked where the fence would go. **Mr. Davis** said all the high-risk youth would be located at the north end of the campus where Range Rider and Sundance Lodges and the school building are. This would reduce the risk of boys escaping.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked if this was brought about by the rape that had occurred there. **Mr. Davis** said that event did have an impact on this plan, but the change in composition of the population as well as the sheer numbers were the primary indicators for security enhancement measures.

REP. THOFT asked if the school had become liable in that rape case. **Mr. Davis** said there was litigation pending. **REP. THOFT** suggested fencing the entire facility. **Mr. Davis** said that nationally not many facilities were fully fenced. Concentrating on the high risk young people, who comprise 25 to 35% of the

total population, within the institution is the best Pine Hills School could do. Many of the boys are to be released quickly and need to develop self control and the ability to function in society.

REP. THOFT commented that the high risk youth were not fenced in with this proposed project. Mr. Davis said this project would enhance the security of those two lodges that house the high risk students, and provide the potential to contain those individuals without any intermingling with the rest of the population. He acknowledged that there was a double door entrance to those lodges, and thus was not totally fenced. REP. BARDANOUVE said he would oppose the concept of fencing the entire complex.

Mr. Davis addressed the roof replacement project as described on page 52 of the Capital Construction Program. He said they could repair the Range Rider roof with moneys left over from another project. The project at Sundance Lodge could be repaired with flashing. A discussion followed about roof replacements, techniques, and the projected lifespans of roofs. Mr. O'Connell said he would bring in a statewide prospective on the 3000 roofs for which the state was responsible. The report would indicate those roofs that had failed prematurely, and that overall, the state was getting good service from its roofs.

REP. THOFT asked if any more flat roofs were being built. Mr. O'Connell said no. The terminology "flat roof" was a misnomer in that slope is built into any roof of 1/4 inch to one foot to provide for drainage. He explained that pitched roofs for large expanses were cost prohibitive in most cases.

SEN. HOCKETT said he had noticed pitched roofs on the new Fish and Game building in Kalispell. Mr. O'Connell said it depended upon the size of the facility, and that the smaller the facility, the more construction options you would have. He mentioned the problem of snow sliding off of pitched roofs, citing the example of the P.E. building at MSU.

HEARING ON THE DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

Tape 1:A:930

Informational Testimony:

Bill Sykes, Business Manager, Montana School for the Deaf and Blind (MSDB), described their project, presented on page 54 of the Capital Construction Program. The \$339,000 request would cover a roof replacement on the academic building and drainage improvements on the cottage complex and gymnasium.

Questions from the Subcommittee:

REP. BARDANOUVE asked if this project had been removed from the Department's budget before the Education Subcommittee. Mr. Sykes said the one project they had submitted to the Long Range

Building Program was the repair of the interior of the cottage complex, damage caused by settling of the building, and repair of the gymnasium caused by leaking, at a cost of \$20,000. REP.

BARDANOUE said this project should be brought before this committee as well, because no General Fund money would be used for such projects.

REP. BARDANOUE asked if this roof replacement request was for an entire roof, and if they had considered a pitched roof, either now or 20 years ago when the roof was originally installed. Mr. Whaley said it was a replacement of the entire roof, and that given the nature of the building, it was not feasible to build a pitched roof. He added that the asphalt roof technology was standard at that time (1971). He did say that the technology for such roofs was different now, but emphasized the impact of Montana weather on roofs, causing inevitable degradation.

Mr. O'Connell assured the committee that the state was getting good service from its roofs, hundreds of which were flat and had lasted more than 20 years. The average life of Montana's roofs is 40 to 50 years. Still, some roofs would come in each biennium for repair or replacement.

SEN. LYNCH asked if other projects could be picked up with money left over, or if that money would revert to the Long Range Building Fund. Mr. O'Connell gave the example of the University System's roof replacement project, saying many roofs system-wide were included in that request for monies. Thus they had limited flexibility in administering the funds within the University System. With regards to the MSDB request, the money would have to be spent on those specific roofs.

HEARING ON THE DEPARTMENT OF MILITARY AFFAIRS

Tape 1:B:020

Adjutant General Gary Blair presented the Department of Military Affairs, and specifically the Army National Guard, Long Range Building Program. He gave an overview of the National Guard with the assist of a 12 minute video, a "who we are" show produced one year ago. He inserted the appropriate numbers inclusive of increases since that time: 895 full time federal employees at the end of federal FY 90; 4600 in the military population; a \$72,326,900 budget for the National Guard portion of the Department budget, \$71,062,400 of which was the federal share.

General Blair said 60% of the requests in the Capital Construction Program made it into the Executive priority listing, while the cost of the projects represent only 10% of the state funds requested. He said two other construction bills were before the Legislature: the Armory at Libby, for which they had the federal share of over \$700,000 for over two years; and the Aviation Attack Battalion Armory in Helena.

General Blair said the federal building program had been under a moratorium which would be lifted April 15, 1991. However, with the recent events in the Middle East, he doubted that would occur.

Lt. Col. Ken Cottrill, Construction and Facilities Officer, introduced **Chris Denning, Director of Facilities Maintenance,** and **Major Al Stricker,** who implements the building program. **Lt. Col. Cottrill** presented a slide show covering three areas: the projects approved last session; the projects in the Capital Construction book this session; and a brief discussion of the two building projects mentioned previously.

Lt. Col Cottrill showed slides of the Livingston Armory, the Abrams M-1 tank, and the maintenance bays and shops needed to repair it completed or planned in Kalispell, Billings, Belgrade, Chinook, Missoula, and Culbertson. Regarding expenditures, \$500,800 had been appropriated for the Livingston Armory, and \$412,310 of this has been spent with additional work going on. \$798,000 had been appropriated for the federal share, and \$784,000 has been spent. For the M-1 projects, \$30,000 was appropriated, of which \$5,499 has been spent with some work still to be done including the construction of the Chinook M-1 bays. The federal share was \$1,340,000, of which \$1,070,000 has been spent to date. Regarding other expenditures authorized during the last session the planning money for the Missoula army rehabilitation was suggested to be rolled into the total rehabilitation project before the committee this session. The contracts for the armory remodel studies had not been awarded yet.

745

Lt. Col. Cottrill reviewed the projects included in the Capital Construction Program, **EXHIBIT 1, 1/14/91.** These are the Kitchen Upgrade, Statewide, page 79; the Rifle Range Rehabilitation, Statewide, page 94; Armory Additions and Alterations, Statewide, page 105; Acquisition of land and Preplanning for Billings Armory, page 108; Expansion of the Military Vehicle Compounds, page 111; and Expansion of Spending Authority, page 161.

Questions from the Subcommittee:

1084

REP. BARDANOUVE asked about the land cost for the Billings Armory. **Lt. Col. Cottrill** said they needed committee support before they progressed to this stage.

Lt. Col. Cottrill said that two bills would be before the Legislature for projects that did not make the priority listing. One was the new facility in Libby, for which land had been given with the covenant that it be used for the National Guard Armory. He said that despite the fact that the facility was federally funded in 1989, the money was still available.

REP. BARDANOUE asked if money from the Long Range Building Program Fund (LRBPF) would be needed. **Lt. Col. Cottrill** said that the bill requested \$495,000 from the LRBPF to be used in addition to the \$704,000 in federal spending authority. He said the building was designed and ready to go out for bid.

Lt. Col. Cottrill said the other bill would authorize the Aviation Support facility, a \$10,000,000 to \$15,000,000 construction project which was needed for the Apache aircraft. It would be located at the Helena Airport where 45 acres were needed and available. Companion to this is the Attack Battalion Armory, currently under design by the Federal Government and estimated to cost \$3,300,000.

Tape 2:A:000

REP. BARDANOUE asked what the cost to the state would be. **Lt. Col. Cottrill** said the Aviation Support Facility was 100% federally funded, while the Attack Battalion Armory was possibly 100% federally funded. The land would be given to the Dept. of Military Affairs by the Airport Commission.

SEN. LYNCH asked about the federal/state funding ratio for the Libby facility. **Lt. Col. Cottrill** said 75%/25% was the normal federal/state formula; however, for this facility, it is 60%/40%. The federal government does not support some design features which he believes crucial to the operation of the building. Examples are some painted areas, benches in the locker rooms, mirrors.

SEN. HARDING asked where the Libby Armory request could be found. **Lt. Col. Cottrill** said the request would be in a separate bill sponsored by Mary Lou Peterson. **Mr. Whaley** said it could be found as a Department request on page 216 of the Capital Construction Program book, but was not an executive priority.

REP. BARDANOUE commented that the dollars are tight, and that it would be difficult to get this money. He mentioned that \$19,000,000 had been lost over the weekend for additional welfare expenditures.

Lt. Col. Cottrill made a personal plea for the additional projects, citing his daughter's difficulty in getting a job and the fact that these projects bring jobs to the state.

SEN. HARDING asked about if the new armory in Billings was above the executive projection for available funding. **Mr. Whaley** said A & E had recommended \$150,000 for land purchase and \$200,000 for preliminary authority to design the facility instead of the \$1,300,000 requested. **SEN. HOCKETT** asked for the projected job impacts of the new armory at Libby. **Gen. Blair** said in 1987 they had reorganized and increased their numbers without the facility. The contribution to Libby runs from \$500,000 to \$1,000,000 per year.

REP. BARDANOUVE asked which would be the Department's first priority if there was not enough money. Lt. Col. Cottrill said it was difficult to answer because of the different issues involved. Although the Libby armory is very important, the National Guard has 400 people in Billings without a satisfactory place to drill. REP. BARDANOUVE said the Billings project was the most important for this biennium, but Lt. Col. Cottrill said the aviation project was the first priority this session in order to maintain aviation in the state, with the second priority being Billings.

REP. BARDANOUVE acknowledged that last session the prioritizing of Livingston over Libby was difficult for them, which was why he was asking for the long range priorities. Gen. Blair said the reorganization from a regiment to a heavy separate brigade had created tremendous needs for facilities and told of their attempts to break the federal dollars loose. The department had asked for a congressional add-on, but missed the opportunity.

SEN. HARDING sympathized with the Department, noting that about \$300,000 LRBPF would drive over \$17,000,000 in federal money. Lt. Col. Cottrill said that was correct, but that \$16,000,000 of that total was riding on Secretary Cheney's decision to release construction money for the military. That \$17,000,000 represents the optimum proposal, and could drop as plans and square footage change.


470

Gen. Blair, in closing, expressed appreciation for the committee's action during the last session.

Mr. O'Connell distributed his roof report and reviewed it with the committee. EXHIBIT 2

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 10 a.m.



MARY ELLEN CONNELLY, Chair

CLAUDIA MONTAGNE, Secretary

MEC/cm

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
LONG-RANGE PLANNING SUBCOMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE 1-21-91

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. FRANCIS BARDANOUVE	✓		
SEN. ETHEL HARDING	✓		
SEN. BOB HOCKETT, VICE-CHAIRMAN	✓		
SEN. J.D. LYNCH	✓		
REP. BOB THOFT	✓		
REP. MARY ELLEN CONNELLY, CHAIR	✓		

HR:1991
CS10DLRLCALONGRP.MAN

DATE

1-21-91

HB

*Long Range Buells
Program*

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE BILL NO. 5

Requested by the Department of Labor & Industry

On page 5 following line 22 insert:

"Various major maintenance projects ----- 209,450
Federal Special Revenue"

EXHIBIT

2

DATE

1-21-91SUMMARY OF ROOFING PROJECTS

1969-71 - thru - 1989-91

HB

Long Range
Building Program
HB 05

<u>Biennium</u>	<u>Total Roofs</u>	<u>Low Pitch Roofs</u>	<u>Shingled Roofs</u>	<u>Metal Roofs</u>	<u>Total Project Costs</u>	<u>C.P.F. Portion</u>
1969-71	2	1	1	---	\$ 46,000	\$ 37,750
1971-73	6	6	---	---	141,850	141,850
1973-75	10	9	---	1	222,600	166,100
1975-77	26	22	4	---	1,056,300	441,650
1977-79	15	11	4	---	495,600	446,750
1979-81	62	40	20	2	1,977,600	1,548,000
1981-83	24	20	2	2	941,000	619,000
1983-85	40	30	8	2	1,557,059	970,800
1985-87	22	18	1	3	947,886	377,000
1987-89	42	31	10	1	2,031,960	1,442,200
<u>1989-91</u>	<u>25</u>	<u>20</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>2,432,980</u>	<u>1,259,100</u>
TOTALS:	274	208	54	12	11,850,835 (100%)	7,450,200 (62.8%)

Average project cost (\$/roof) = \$43,251.

Per the State Property Listing, published by Tort Claims, there were 3,046 state-owned buildings. 274 of those buildings (8.9%) were re-roofed during the 22 year period reviewed (above).

Per the State Property Listing, the value of all state-owned buildings was \$1,059,085,419 (not including contents). The total re-roofing cost (from above) was \$11,850,835., or, 1.11% of the total building value for the 22 year period, or 0.0555%/year. This would be the equivalent to one \$832 roofing project on a building (residence?) valued at \$75,000 during a 22 year period.

Note: Seven (7) buildings have been converted from "flat" to "pitched" roofs during the 22 year period shown above.

Long Range Planning SUBCOMMITTEE DATE 1-21-91
 DEPARTMENT (S) Military Affairs DIVISION _____
Abn + Industry

DIVISION _____

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED TESTIMONY WITH SECRETARY. WITNESS STATEMENT FORMS ARE AVAILABLE IF YOU CARE TO SUBMIT WRITTEN TESTIMONY.