MINUTES

MONTANA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES 53rd Legislature - Regular Session

JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Call to Order: By CHAIRMAN ROGER DEBRUYCKER, on January 13, 1993, at 8:30 A.M.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:

Rep. Roger DeBruycker, Chairman (R) Sen. Cecil Weeding, Vice Chairman (D) Sen. Gerry Devlin (R) Sen. Greg Jergeson (D) Rep. John Johnson (D) Rep. William Wiseman (R)

Members Excused: None

Members Absent: None

Staff Present: Roger Lloyd, Legislative Fiscal Analyst Florine Smith, Office of Budget & Program Planning Theda Rossberg, Committee Secretary

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

Committee Business Summary: HEARINGS: DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK EXECUTIVE ACTION: DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK Inspection & Control Program Predator Animal Control Program Diagnostic Laboratory Program

HEARING ON DEPARTMENT OF LIVESTOCK

Inspection & Control Program:

Roger Lloyd, Legislative Fiscal Analyst reviewed the budget differences with the subcommittee. EXHIBIT 1

He explained he had made a typographical error in Insurance, so \$270 would need to be added to FY 95. He suggested the committee not do anything to that difference and make the adjustment in the Centralized Services Program. John Skufca, Administrator, Centralized Services, Department of Livestock reviewed the budget with the subcommittee.

Overtime:

He stated the department would be willing to accept the LFA's recommendation on overtime. He noted that the department had historically budgeted about \$100,00 per year for overtime. He said the LFA had allowed an increase for benefits as well.

Consulting & Professional Services:

Mr. Skufca explained if the Brands Division investigator picks up a carcass or a portion of one, the head can be taken to a local veterinarian and the charge is about \$30 to \$35 each. He said the department has a few of those each year and \$753 per year is what we have estimated. He then declared the division would like to request the executive budget.

Brand Re-Record:

He said if the division had a portion of the \$23,852, it would help with operating costs.

SEN. JERGESON asked if there was a balance remaining in the Brand Re-Record. Mr. Skufca said yes, that the net at the end of the two fiscal years was approximately \$2 million and the division is allowed to spend 10% of that per year which amounts to approximately \$218,000. That money is transferred into the operating fund. In the initial re-record year the funds are spent on that process. In subsequent years 10% is used for operating expenses.

SEN. DEVLIN asked whether the \$23,852 was in addition to the 10%. Mr. Skufca said the \$23,852 is the actual expenses for the Re-Record process that was spent in FY 92. If the subcommittee would allow some of that amount it would help the department get through the end of the year. This authority would not be spent on Re-Record activities.

He stated that if the department received half of the \$23,852 it could split it \$6,000 each year for travel and repair and maintenance.

SEN. DEVLIN asked where the money for those expenses was obtained before. Mr. Skufca said the department has to take the expenses out of the operating budget which is where they get squeezed.

REP. JOHNSON asked where is the 10% the department was allowed to take from the re-record each year. Mr. Skufca explained it was not in here, it is part of the revenue.

Mr. Lloyd referred to Page C-62 of the LFA budget book, the second line from the bottom with the double star states "Total of \$2,416,464 collected, net \$233,551 of expenses leaves \$2,182,913,

930113JN.HM1

10% of which \$218,291 can be used in 1991 and each of the succeeding nine years.

Mr. Skufca said at the end of 10 years the balance in Re-Record is zero and you start over and collect for Re-Record again.

SEN. DEVLIN said he believed the department was going to look into a staggered system of Re-Record fees to have some come due in five years, two years, etc. Mr. Skufca said the department has looked into a staggered system but have not come up with a plan to implement it. One method considered was using the alphabet for staggering.

If you re-record a brand today, it will still become due in year 2001 and the cost is still \$50 per re-record. If the brand is transferred to someone else there is another \$50 charge. If you lose it we replace it for \$2.50 and an address change is done for nothing.

<u>Clothing</u>:

Mr. Skufca said the department ordered some uniform shirts in FY 92.

Jack Sedgwick, Administrator, Brands Enforcement Division, Department of Livestock, said employees are furnished with outer garments for the winter weather and also shirts and hats. In 1992 the department went with a dressy type of clothing and that is what the \$5,385 is for.

Ammunition:

Mr. Skufca said the reason for the Executive Budget request was because the department updated revolvers and the ammunition for them is part of the base. It was necessary to equip the law enforcement officers with shotguns and buy ammunition for them.

One-Time Costs:

Mr. Skufca said One-Time Costs does include some telephone costs also, so the department would go with the LFA budget.

<u>Rent</u>:

Mr. Skufca said the rent was for a new facility in Billings. The committee provided us with an additional FTE for this district to help with investigations.

Cork Mortensen, Executive Secretary, Board of Livestock, said the department needed the Billings office to do supervisory work. The office is also used for animal health inspection purposes. We need to monitor the overtime and this position will help with that. This person is a trained investigator who works in coordination with the Helena office. Billings is the concentration of the livestock market in Montana.

Repair & Maintenance:

Mr. Skufca said the LFA reduced Repair and Maintenance in one category because they allowed the department spending authority for maintenance contracts for PC's. The department has the majority of the PC's which access the brand information on the mainframe here in Helena.

Training:

Mr. Sedgwick said the department was anticipating some retirements in the next biennium and will want to send some of the replacements to the Law Enforcement Academy. There are 20 district stock inspectors that are classified as Peace Officers and the department would like to train them in survival techniques.

SEN. JERGESON asked if the committee didn't approve this how would the department cover that training cost? Mr. Sedgwick replied they would try to keep up with the training with a younger person. Training is mandatory when you put a person into law enforcement. If the department doesn't personnel it would have to recruit from the outside for someone who has had law enforcement training.

Mr. Lloyd said in the LFA base there is \$1,200 for education and training costs each year.

SEN. WEEDING said if you go outside the department for people with a law enforcement background you will have to pay more.

REP. WISEMAN asked when someone retires, how are they replaced. **Mr. Skufca** said they advertise within the department and the individual would be promoted to the law enforcement ranks. The \$1,200 in the budget will be used for staff training of individuals who have been promoted into supervisory positions. The department would have to pay \$60 to \$85 per day for classes.

<u>Budget Modifications:</u> <u>Brand Inspectors and Auditor</u>:

Mr. Lloyd said there is one auditor in the base which was approved by the last legislature.

Mr. Skufca said the department transferred one FTE in from another program in order to reduce the modification request by one FTE.

Tape 1, B.

Mr. Mortensen said the need for the auditor is in 2 areas: 1) market custodial accounts and the use of them that concerns the

Board of Livestock. A number of years ago a market in South Dakota went bankrupt and the livestock producers were out a lot of money. Recently a market closed in northwestern Montana and bankruptcy proceedings were initiated. The department discovered that the producer's money was listed in the proceedings as assets of that market. Those funds belong to producers. We don't know the reason those checks were not picked up, they were left in the custodial account. The Board of Livestock doesn't have a problem. We have the authority to audit those procedures and licenses by our department.

We license livestock dealers and require them to be bonded. Occasionally we have problems or pending problems and the Board may wish to look into them.

SEN. DEVLIN asked if the department has investigated contracting this service. Mr. Mortensen replied not to his knowledge, but it could be considered. The auditor would be traveling and other times working in Centralized Services. He said he didn't know how long it takes to audit these accounts.

SEN. DEVLIN asked when did that auditor left. Mr. Mortensen stated the individual was never hired because the position was kept open for vacancy savings.

Mr. Lloyd stated the subcommittee heard similar justifications for an auditor two years ago and the legislature approved the position.

SEN. WEEDING asked if the two brand inspectors in the modification came in as a budget amendment. Mr. Skufca said that was correct. These are not two new brand inspectors this is to continue those through FY 93 because of the budget amendment.

Ms. Smith said the FTE tape that was used was as of June 30, 1992, so if this position was not on board until July 1, 1992 it would not show up. On June 30th it was a .47 FTE but in July it went to a full position. The SWYSGOOD amendment only took the .47 FTE.

Mr. Skufca said this program is funded with State Special Revenue from Bank Inspection fees, interest income from the investments, and licensing, mortgage fees and reimbursement from surplus property which is sold.

REP. WISEMAN asked how many brand inspectors work for the department. Mr. Skufca replied there are about 50 FTE brand inspectors including law enforcement and market inspectors. The department has 11 FTE in the office for a total of 61 FTE.

SEN. WEEDING asked which one of the Special Revenue accounts took the \$250,000 hit in July 1992. Mr. Skufca said it was divided between the inspection control and the animal health control. HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE January 13, 1993 Page 6 of 16

REP. WISEMAN said before cattle can be moved they must have a brand inspector present and asked how many inspectors would be needed if they only worked the sales. **Mr. Skufca** said there are 630 deputy inspectors who are citizens scattered throughout the state that are not salaried. They inspect cattle for a fee of thirty-five cents per head. We have a total of 682 brand inspectors across the state who are deputy inspectors and state employee inspectors.

SEN. WEEDING stated that the justification for the amendment in July was the drought and so a lot of cattle were moved out of the state. He questioned the justification of this modification. Mr. Skufca replied that the cattle numbers have been increasing each year.

Mr. Sedgwick said in 1985 because of the drought the department laid off a lot of employees. We were pretty slim as far as FTE were concerned. We were hit with two unexpected injuries which put a strain on the whole system and so I took the two full-time employees and put them into four grade A, half-time employees.

REP. WISEMAN asked if the 630 deputy inspectors couldn't pick up some of the slack. Mr Sedgwick said the 630 deputy inspectors only work 4-6 weeks a year when cattle are shipped. There are areas of expertise that they do not have and most of them are not interested in full-time employment.

SEN. WEEDING asked if the part-time cattle inspectors answer complaints. Mr. Skufca replied they do not. The department has about 20 law enforcement who answer complaints. The department is also trying to handle the game farm inspections.

EXECUTIVE ACTION INSPECTION & CONTROL PROGRAM

<u>Repairs & Maintenance:</u>

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. JERGESON moved to approve \$11,915 each year for Repairs and Maintenance. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

<u>Training</u>:

SEN. DEVLIN inquired about how much is currently in the training budget. Mr. Lloyd replied that \$1,222 is the actual FY 92 expenditures for training.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. DEVLIN moved to approve a total of \$2,000 per year for training. Motion FAILED 3-3.

<u>Motion</u>: SEN. JERGESON moved to reduce the \$6,000 per year request to \$2,000 per year for a total of \$3,222 per year for training.

<u>Discussion</u>:

SEN. DEVLIN asked how much it costs to send a employee to school. Mr. Skufca replied that the cost was about \$1,500 per person, including board and room at the University.

SEN. WEEDING asked how many employees have not had the training. Mr. Skufca said there are about 22 employees that have not had the training. Only the certified employees are allowed to carry arms.

Vote: Motion CARRIED unanimously.

<u>Rent</u>:

Mr Skufca said the \$2,700 for renting the Billings office started July 1st. Mr. Lloyd stated the \$2,700 was the amount of increase over the base of zero.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. WEEDING moved to approve the Executive Budget of \$2,700 each year for rent. Motion CARRIED 5-1 with CHAIRMAN DEBRUYCKER voting no.

<u>Budget Modifications:</u> <u>Brand Inspectors & Auditor</u>:

Mr. Lloyd stated that if the subcommittee doesn't want the additional auditor he would like to be given direction to remove the one 1.0 FTE and the dollars will take care of themselves. He also asked if there are some operating costs in the modification which should be addressed separately.

Mr. Skufca said there are operating expenses for travel and gas; with \$7,229 of the \$80,000 being operating costs which the department would need.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. WEEDING moved to approve the modification for two livestock inspectors and the operating costs for a total of \$80,000 each year of the biennium. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

<u>Motion/Vote:</u> SEN. WEEDING moved to close the hearing on Inspection & Control Program. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Predatory Animal Control Program:

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the budget differences in the Predatory Animal Control Program with the subcommittee. EXHIBIT 2

He said on page C-61 of the budget analysis book it explains this program: "Nearly half of the Predator Control Program is funded by hunting and fishing license revenue granted by the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks. From fiscal 1977 through 1993, \$1.45 million of FWP funds have been provided to the Department of Livestock for predator control. The remainder of the program is funded by the per capita livestock tax." HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE January 13, 1993 Page 8 of 16

Cattle producers pay about 88% of the program's per capita funding. The sheep producers pay only 5.3% but receive approximately 70% of the services.

Mr. Skufca said the department would prefer the Executive Budget on all items.

Section 8 of Rangeland Improvement Act:

He said the department was designated as a Section 8 coordinator to negotiate between federal, BLM, Forest Service and ranchers that have leases.

Mr. Mortensen said Dr. Sheets is our Section 8 Representative designated by the governor's office. Memorandums of understanding have been signed by the Forest Service, BLM and the governor. At present resource management plans are used by the federal agencies to prepare grazing formulas for grazing permittees. In most cases program planning will proceed without incident. If concerns or conflicts develop that process comes into play. The federal agency or the grazing operator can request the governor's representative, Dr. Sheets, be involved in consultation with all concerned parties.

Mr. Skufca said in the last session \$20,000 was appropriated to cover expenses of the Section 8 process. The department has to pay expert witnesses and consultants and spent \$4,626 for court costs and the LFA continued that as the base. The department would like to have the Executive Budget.

<u>Contracts:</u>

Mr. Skufca stated that last year the department spent \$68,000 in contracted services mostly in eastern Montana. There was a total of \$100,000 budgeted. In FY 93 the Board authorized an additional \$30,000 of contracted services in the Billings area due primarily to increased numbers of coyotes.

<u>Helicopter:</u>

A. Fuel - Mr. Skufca said the department negotiated with the budget office to lower the maintenance request and increase the fuel request. The department does not have access to as much bulk gasoline as in the past. The helicopter pilot anticipates an increase from 500 hours to 600 hours in flying time.

Bob Gilbert, Montana Woolgrowers Association, (MWGA), said this is a very important program for the sheep industry. There has been a tremendous loss of people in the state raising sheep because coyotes have made it unprofitable to stay in business. These are not general funds, but are fees assessed on people represented by MWGA, as well as cattle producers. There is a five-cent per cow assessment for predator control which stockgrowers do not believe is too much. The stockgrowers are interested in raising more money because of the losses around calving time. At a recent Stockgrowers Association Convention held in Billings with over 900 in attendance, a resolution was passed to raise more money to address the predator issue. The funding is approved by the five member Fish & Game Commission. There is another tax on sheep, a per capita assessment in each county. The sheep producers are assessed fees ranging from thirty-five cents to as high as \$1.00 in some counties. There is also a federal program that puts in between \$700,000 and \$800,000 for the coyote program.

Mr. Gilbert noted there is between \$250,000 and \$350,000 in reserve funds from these fees which the department has been reluctant to discuss with the subcommittee. He stated that he believed the money should be used for more, much needed, contracted services.

Mr. Lloyd said Mr. Gilbert mentioned the federal program as well as the county tax levy. Those revenues are entirely separate from this program. There is no specific tax levy for predator control, it is a per capita tax and the Board decides how that tax is divided up.

A year ago, the department contacted Fish, Wildlife and Parks and have an agreement which states "the Department of Livestock shall consult with FWP concerning predator control on wildlife". The biologists of FWP claim that predators are not a problem with wildlife.

He said in contracts the legislature has historically approved the base of \$68,000 and the Executive is requesting \$100,000 which results in the \$32,000 more per year.

Mr. Gilbert said the LFA said there is no correlation between the federal and the state. That is not correct, the federal takes a look at what the state is going to put into this program. They are going to say if the state doesn't put up 50% they will cut back on their federal funds. There is a formula that the amount the state puts up affects the amount received from the federal government.

Mr. Mortensen said the problem will increase because the coyote pelts are not worth anything. You can only get between \$10 to \$30 for a stretched pelt, so the hunters are not interested.

Mr. Skufca said the department received between \$350 to \$400 at \$50 per license fee from aerial hunters, whereas in the past it used to license about 1,000 to 1500 hunters. The hides won't even pay for the gas now.

The department provides the helicopter and the pilot for the aerial hunters. He stated the department works closely with animal control and use their trappers as the gunners; the pilots must be certified to fly federal employees.

This subcommittee has historically appropriated \$100,000 for contracted services. This year the department is spending an additional \$32,000.

EXECUTIVE ACTION PREDATOR ANIMAL CONTROL PROGRAM

Section 8 Of Rangeland Improvement Act:

Motion/Vote: SEN. DEVLIN moved to approve the \$15,374 each year for the Section 8 Of Rangeland Improvement Act. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Contracts:

Motion: SEN. WEEDING moved to approve \$32,000 each year for Contracts.

Discussion:

SEN. DEVLIN said that since there are excess funds, perhaps the committee should look at an increase over the \$32,000. In the last session the money which was collected was not spent for killing coyotes. Because of the special session some of these funds were put into the general fund, we should try to reduce that special revenue account and get more action on the coyote problem.

Motion/Withdrawn: SEN. WEEDING withdrew his motion.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. DEVLIN moved to increase the Executive Budget by \$32,000 each year which would make it \$64,000 each year for Contracts. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

<u>A - Helicopter Fuel:</u>

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. JERGESON moved to approve the Executive Budget for \$5,200 each year for helicopter fuel. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

<u>B - Maintenance:</u>

Motion/Vote: SEN. WEEDING moved to approve the Executive Budget of \$1,597 in FY 94 and \$3,052 in FY 95. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. WEEDING moved to close the hearing on the Predatory Animal Control Program. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

HEARING ON DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY PROGRAM

Mr. Lloyd reviewed the budget differences with the subcommittee. EXHIBIT 3 He said there would be energy savings in the Marsh Laboratory and if a three year average is taken, the increase would be \$1,860 above the actual FY 92 base.

Personal Services:

Mr. Skufca stated the department needs the one FTE for data processing and would like to move that FTE to the Centralized Services to be under my supervision. The committee will see this FTE in the Centralized Services Program.

Data Network Fees:

This is the data network link between Helena and the Diagnostic Laboratory in Missoula.

MSU Recharges:

There have been significant increases in MSU's charges. The LFA allowed the FY 92 base and the division added 10% per year. Last year MSU was paid \$13,500 and will be paid \$18,000 by the end of June.

MSU Mice Storage Charge:

Mr. Stackhouse stated mice are used for animal testing at the laboratory. There are very stringent federal laws for storage of laboratory animals. There is a single building on campus for housing these animals; this charge is for room and board.

MSU Charge For Marsh Laboratory Retro-Fit:

Mr. Skufca reminded the committee there was testimony on this program yesterday. It is necessary for the department to pay the costs to retro-fit the building, therefore, the amount in the Executive Budget is being requested.

Marsh Laboratory Energy Savings:

Mr. Skufca said the department would like to have the Executive Budget and hopefully see some savings since the remodeling has been completed.

Equipment Maintenance:

Mr. Skufca said this item is related to the list on the bottom of the budget page. If the subcommittee approves the equipment, a maintenance contract will be needed.

Minor Differences:

Mr. Skufca said these are due to a variety of things such as dues and training costs, etc.

Equipment:

<u>A. Serum chemistry analyzer</u>: Mr. Stackhouse said this is the main piece of equipment in the laboratory and is constantly breaking down. Parts are unavailable due to age of the machine.

<u>B. Charm 11 Milk antibiotic test system</u>: This system will be a requirement by the Food and Drug Administration in 1994 or 1995.

<u>C. Bench-top cryostat</u>: This piece of equipment is about 20 years old and is used for testing tissue.

<u>D. Medical autoclave and preparation</u>: This item is used to decontaminate equipment, and also for bacteria disposal. The department has two units: one in fairly good shape; and the other one is old and leaks on the floor.

SEN. DEVLIN asked if these are mostly replacement items. Mr. Stackhouse replied yes. He said he couldn't give an exact age, but he had been there for 13 years and the equipment preceded him.

REP. JOHNSON asked if is there also an autoclave in the Long-Range Planning Subcommittee? **Ms. Smith** replied no, there is not a second piece of equipment in that committee. In Long-Range Planning are plans to do some remodeling in the Laboratory.

BUDGET MODIFICATION

Diagnostic Lab Workload:

Mr. Skufca said the modification includes an additional two FTE in FY 94 to handle the increased workload at the Laboratory. There would be an additional 1.50 FTE in FY 95 for a total of 3.50 FTE.

The department has not been able to keep up with increased costs and maintenance. There has been \$11,000 added for contract testing done for the chemical analysis for milk and water samples. He noted there has not had an increase in this area for three years and the plan is to negotiate for an increase in FY 95. There is a request for about \$5,000 for out-of-state travel which includes transportation, meals and lodging. Also, there is \$8,000 per year for equipment maintenance. This modification is funded from State Special Revenue.

EXECUTIVE ACTION DIAGNOSTIC LABORATORY PROGRAM

<u>Personal Services:</u>

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. WEEDING moved to accept the Executive Budget on Personal Services for \$30,460 per year. Motion CARRIED unanimously. Mr. Lloyd said there may be some general fund impact depending upon how this subcommittee wishes to fund this program and the transfer of the one FTE to Centralized Services.

Data Network Fees:

Motion/Vote: SEN. JERGESON moved to approve the Executive Budget on Data Network Fees for \$6,000 each year. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

MSU Recharges:

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: REP. WISEMAN moved to approve the Executive Budget for the MSU Recharges of \$1,914 in FY 94 and \$4,019 in FY 95. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

MSU Mice Storage Charge:

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: REP. JOHNSON moved to approve the Executive Budget for the MSU Mice Storage Charge for \$4,000 each year. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

MSU Charge for Marsh Laboratory Retro-Fit:

Mr. Lloyd said MSU stated it would be satisfied with \$16,376 each year. He stated his recommendation would be for the subcommittee to add some language stipulating "this fee is for a set period of time", so it does not go into the base and carried forward forever. He also said he was not sure if this would be for four or five years.

Mr. Skufca said the department has requested a budget amendment for the laboratory for FY 93 which includes the 1993 payment. If that is not approved the department will have to delay the first two payments until next year. Maybe the language could say "until the total amount is paid". He advised that he and Mr. Lloyd will get together to work out the language.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: REP. JOHNSON moved to approve \$16,376 for FY 94 and \$16,375 in FY 95 with language stating, "the full amount will be paid in five payments," for the Marsh Laboratory Retrofit. Motion CARRIED unanimously. EXHIBIT 4

Marsh Laboratory Energy Savings:

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. WEEDING moved to approve the Executive Budget of \$8,212 each year for Marsh Laboratory Energy Savings. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Equipment Maintenance & Equipment:

SEN. JERGESON asked if the Charm 11 milk antibiotic test system would be general fund, since the Milk and Egg Program is general fund. He also wondered if, a fee system is established to pay for inspections, will this piece of equipment become special revenue. Mr. Skufca said the Executive Budget was funded at \$41% general fund and 59% state special revenue. Due to the special session the LFA made it about 15% general fund and \$85% special revenue.

Mr. Lloyd said he would offer some options as to how to fund this program. He said the Executive funds it at 41% general fund. Under the LFA budget it is funded at 15% general fund. However, in the Milk and Egg Program it is entirely general fund. You could put in language saying, "if proposed legislation passes the general fund will be eliminated and special revenue increased by the same amount".

Mr. Skufca noted that if the LFA budget was adopted, \$85,000 of the \$126,000 would be special revenue and a small amount of general fund.

SEN. DEVLIN asked if the department can along without some of the equipment until the next biennium. Mr. Stackhouse said the Serum chemistry analyzer cannot be repaired any more, and doubted if it will last two more years.

The Bench-top cryostat is currently working and hopefully will last until the next biennium.

Mr. Skufca said \$25,000 was budgeted for equipment but due to vacancy savings only \$6,600 was spent.

Please Note: Tape 3, A unwound!

Medical autoclave and preparation:

SEN. WEEDING asked if there was a possibility to dispose of waste at the hospital or somewhere else? **Mr. Skufca** said it would not be advisable to transport contaminated waste.

<u>Motion</u>: SEN. DEVLIN moved to approve the Executive Budget on all equipment items except the Charm 11 milk antibiotic test system. If the bill to increase fees in the Milk and Egg Program is passed, these fees would be used to fund the Charm 11 milk antibiotic test system.

Discussion: REP. WISEMAN asked if the motion should be to spend the \$129,590 figure. **Mr. Lloyd** said the motion could be to approve the Executive Budget but if the bill did not pass, the Charm 11 milk antibiotic test system would not be funded.

Motion/Vote: SEN. DEVLIN moved to approve the Executive Budget for \$50,000 in FY 94 and \$79,590 in FY 94 with language stating that, "if legislation passes establishing milk fees, the Charm 11 milk antibiotic test system would be funded with state special revenue". Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Ms. Smith said in the Long-Range Building Program there is

930113JN.HM1

HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE January 13, 1993 Page 15 of 16

\$47,520 in the budget for equipment and \$7,500 for the air conditioning system.

Motion/Vote: SEN. JERGESON moved to approve the Executive Budget of \$2,750 each year for equipment. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Funding:

Mr. Lloyd noted, as stated by the Department, if the legislation passes \$85,000 could be deducted from the Executive Budget.

<u>Motion/Vote</u>: SEN. JERGESON moved to approve the Executive Budget for funding with language that says "contingent upon the passage of the milk fees the general fund would be reduced by \$85,000 and special revenue increased by the same amount. Motion CARRIED unanimously.

Budget Modifications:

Diagnostic Lab Workload:

Mr. Lloyd said the Executive proposes an increase of two FTE in the Diagnostic Laboratory due to the increased work load. He said the difference in the amounts is two FTE for FY 94 and 1.5 FTE for FY 95.

SEN. JERGESON asked what about approving one FTE for the first year and one FTE for the second year. Mr. Skufca said that would be better than nothing.

REP. JOHNSON asked if these positions were funded with state special revenue. Mr. Lloyd replied they are 100% state special revenue funded.

<u>Motion</u>: SEN. WEEDING moved to approve the addition of one FTE in FY 94 and one FTE in FY 95 for a total of two FTE and instruct the Fiscal Analyst to adjust the figures accordingly.

Discussion: Ms. Smith said the committee would need to clarify the grades and what the duties would be. Mr. Stackhouse replied that one FTE would be a veterinarian and one FTE would be the Laboratory Technician. It would be a grade 8 in FY 94/FY 95, and an additional grade 19 in FY 95.

<u>Substitute Motion</u>: SEN WEEDING moved to approve a grade 8 FTE in FY 94 and a grade 19 FTE in FY 95 with operating costs adjusted for the salaries. Motion CARRIED 5-1 with CHAIRMAN DEBRUYCKER voting no.

HOUSE NATURAL RESOURCES SUBCOMMITTEE January 13, 1993 Page 16 of 16

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 12:00 P.M.

ROGER DEBRUYCKER, Chairman

ーア ROSSBERG, THEDA Secretary *.* . \sim 7

RD/tr

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NATURAL RESOURCES SUB-COMMITTEE

ROLL CALL

DATE 1-13-94

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
REP. ROGER DEBRUYCKER, CHAIRMAN	\checkmark		
SEN. CECIL WEEDING, VICE CHAIRMAN		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
SEN. GERRY DEVLIN	/		
REP. WILLIAM WISEMAN			
REP. JOHN JOHNSON			
SEN. GREG JERGESON			
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

HR:1993 wp:rollcalls.man CS-10

DATE 1- 13-93

						DATE.	1-13-	72
5603 06 00000		<u> </u>			Dentes! D	St_		
DEPARTMENT OF LIV Program Summary	ESTOCK			Inspection & C	Control Program		343	
	Current Level	Current Level	Executive	LFA	Difference	Executive	LFA	Difference
Budget Item	Fiscal 1992	Fiscal 1993	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1994	Fiscal 1995	Fiscal 1995	Fiscal 1995
FTE	63.21	61.21	61.21	61.21	0.00	61.21	61.21	0.00
Personal Services	1,779,331	1,793,611	1,872,238	1,879,973	(7,735)	1,877,362 361,247		(7,742
Operating Expenses Equipment	337,716 <u>87,084</u>	333,549 <u>83,319</u>	361,700 <u>89,722</u>	317,544 <u>89,722</u>	44,156 <u>0</u>	<u>87,497</u>	328,179 <u>87,497</u>	33,068 <u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$2,204,132	\$2,210,479	\$2,323,660	\$2,287,239	\$36,421	\$2,326,106	\$2,300,780	\$25,326
Fund Sources								
State Revenue Fund	2,204,132	<u>2,210,479</u>	<u>2,323,660</u>	<u>2,287,239</u>	<u>36,421</u>	<u>2,326,106</u>	2,300,780	25,326
Total Funds	\$2,204,132	\$2,210,479	\$2,323,660	\$2,287,239	\$36,421	\$2,326,106	\$2,300,780	\$ 25,326
Page References							Exec. Over(U Fiscal 1994	Jnder) LFA Fiscal 1995
LFA Budget Analysis, Vo	l. II. nage C-71							
Executive Budget, page C		,			$_{1}+2\omega_{1}^{2}t^{2},$			
Current Level Diffe	rences							
OVERTIME - The LFA cu	irrent level incl	udes funding f	or benefits ass	ociated with o	vertime.		(7,735)	(7,742)
CONSULTING AND PROFESSIONAL SERVICES – The LFA current level does not include an increase for livestock autopsies or unjustified amounts in agency's request.								753
INSURANCE – Minor adjustments to the LFA current level can be made in the Centralized Services Division to bring the agency up to the level in DofA schedules. $270 \swarrow 200$								(132)
							23,852	
CLOTHING-The LFA reduces clothing costs in fiscal 1994 because historical expenditures indicate this is an 5,385 cyclical expense.							0	
AMMUNITION-LFA includes funding for ammunition at fiscal 1992 actual expenditure level.							968	(1,532)
ONE-TIME COSTS – The executive considers telephone changes and repairs to vehicles due to accidents as one-time costs.							(1,530)	(1,530)
RENT-The executive inc								(2,700)
REPAIR & MAINTENAN computer contract mainte	CE-The LFA r		and maintnea:	nce for comput	ers since fundi	ng for	11 913 -2,915 -2,915	2,915
TRAINING – The executiv			•	cement and su	urvival training		2000	2000
MINOR DIFFERENCES	خ	inges	on qu	ned 120	2 122		5	. 5
NFLATION (Non-voting	item)				· 22 /	N/	175	37
TOTAL CURRENT LEVE	,	ES					33,421	25,326
Budget Modification	<u>IS</u>							
BRAND INSPECTORS & brand inspectors and one by the 1991 Legislature.			for an auditor				80,000	80,000
Language			0					
						•		

						DATE	1-13-9	3
5603 08 00000 DEPARTMENT OF LIVI	ESTOCK			Predatory Ani	imal Control P	gm		
Program Summary Budget Item	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	1.25	1.25	1.25	1.25	0.00	1.25	1.25	0.00
Personal Services Operating Expenses Equipment	67,493 281,273 <u>350</u>	61,094 235,211 <u>0</u>	60,260 218,729 <u>0</u>	60,260 164,261 <u>0</u>	0 54,468 <u>0</u>	61,373 222,489 <u>0</u>	61,375 166,172 <u>0</u>	(2) 56,317 <u>0</u>
Total Costs	\$349,117	\$296,305	\$278,989	\$224,521	\$54,468	\$283,862	\$ 227,547	\$56,315
Fund Sources							and a start of the second s The second se The second se	
State Revenue Fund	349,117	296,305	<u>278,989</u>	<u>224,521</u>	54,468	283,862	227,547	56,315
Total Funds	\$349,117	\$296,305	\$278,989	\$224,521	\$54,468	\$283,862	\$227,547	\$56,315
Page References							Exec. Over(I Fiscal 1994	Jnder) LFA <u>Fiscal 1995</u>
LFA Budget Analysis, Vol Executive Budget, page C								
Current Level Diffe	rences							
PERSONAL SERVICES		,					(1)	(1)
SECTION 8 OF RANGEL mprovement Act (Federa year modification for this	l) at fiscal 1992	actual expend	litures. The 1	991 Legislatu	of the 1978 Range approved a 1	ngeland 20,000 per	15,374	15,374
year modification for this item. Wseedury proved CONTRACTS-The executive includes increases above the base to contract with counties and Animal Damage Control for aerial killing of coyotes. Scolin proved							64.000 32,000	64,00 32,00 0
HELICOPTER A. Fuel-The LFA bases B. Maintenance-The Li ive 100 hour inspections to hr.	FA bases maint	enance on 500	hours per yea and one annu	ir, \$68/hr. for al inspection t	unscheduled m aking 40 hours	aintenance,	1,597	<u>5.200</u> 3,052
MINOR DIFFERENCES				ding	Jussed		74	217
NFLATION (Non-voting	item)						224	473
TOTAL CURRENT LEVE	· .	CES					54,468	56,315
Budget Modification			-					
Jone	_							
anguage								
Jone	•							
						·		

Page 1

5603 03 00000 DEPARTMENT OF LIV								and the second se
DEPARTMENT OF LIV						DATE	1-12-	- 93
	ESTOCK	alore, Mari Antonia		Diagnostic I al	oratory Progra	SB		
Program Summary				L'INGHORIG LA		- • • •		- of Water and South States
<u>Budget Item</u>	Current Level Fiscal 1992	Current Level Fiscal 1993	Executive Fiscal 1994	LFA Fiscal 1994	Difference Fiscal 1994	Executive Fiscal 1995	LFA Fiscal 1995	Difference Fiscal 1995
FTE	18.00	• 18.00	17.00	18.00	(1.00)	17.00	18.00	(1.00)
Personal Services Operating Expenses Equipment Capital Outlay	577,418 212,022 6,584 <u>0</u>	549,601 215,530 24,500 <u>0</u>	583,097 250,628 60,250 <u>17,769</u>	613,555 224,074 10,250 <u>0</u>	(30,458) 26,554 50,000 <u>17,769</u>	584,705 262,224 82,590 <u>17,769</u>	615,201 233,058 3,000 <u>0</u>	(30,496) 29,166 79,590 <u>17,769</u>
Total Costs	\$796,025	\$ 789,631	\$ 911,744	\$ 847,879	\$63,865	\$ 947,288	\$ 851,259	\$ 96,029
Fund Sources								
General Fund State Revenue Fund	277,190 <u>518,835</u>	116,123 <u>673,508</u>	373,801 <u>537,943</u>	126,927 <u>720,952</u>	246,874 <u>(183,009</u>)	388,374 <u>558,914</u>	127,433 <u>723,826</u>	260,941 (<u>164,912</u>)
Total Funds	\$796,025	\$789,631	\$ 911,744	\$847,879	\$63,865	\$947,288	\$851,259	\$ 96,029
<u>Page References</u> LFA Budget Analysis, Vo Executive Budget, page C							Exec. Over(U Fiscal 1994	nder) LFA <u>Fiscal 1995</u>
Current Level Diffe	rences		\~~:					
PERSONAL SERVICES – Services Program for data	-The executive a processing. A	transfers 1.00 Nexam	FTE (position Sy ace	#35 grade 14)	to the Centrali	zed Passed	(30,460)	(30,494)
DATA NETWORK FEES Helena and the Diagnosti Centralized Services Divi	ic Laboratory in	Bozeman. Th	e executive rea	uests equipm	ent funding in	the	6,000	6,000
MSU RECHARGES-The				0				
1990 to 1991 and 27% from	m fiscal 1991 to	1992. M	al 1992 levels.	These charges	increased 219		1,914	4,019
1990 to 1991 and 27% from MSU MICE STORAGE C laboratory testing.	m fiscal 1991 to HARG E, The er	1992. M	les a new char	- ges	increased 219	6 from fiscal	4,000	4,000
1990 to 1991 and 27% from MSU MICE STORAGE C laboratory testing. MSU CHARGE FOR MAR capital outlay over the base retro-fit of the Marsh Lab Energy (through DNRC) a department \$17,769 per y	m fiscal 1991 to HARGE-The ex Juture RSH LABORAT se to fund non-se toratory in Boze and Montana Po year for 5 years.	1992. M recutive incluc M - G ORY RETRO- grant costs (inc man. The pro- ower with MSI Because the l	les a new char FIT-The exec cluding cost ov ject consisted of J paying the d egislature was	ge by MSU for utive includes er-run) incurre of grants from ifference. MSU a not aware of t	a increased 219 storage of mice additional fun- d by MSU in t the U.S. Depar J plans to bill t he cost over-ru	6 from fiscal e used in ding in he energy tment of he j uns, the LFA		4,000 6,37 17,769
1990 to 1991 and 27% from MSU MICE STORAGE C laboratory testing. MSU CHARGE FOR MAR capital outlay over the base retro-fit of the Marsh Lab Energy (through DNRC) a department \$17,769 per y does not include these chase MARSH LABORATORY F	m fiscal 1991 to HARGE-The ex Jums RSH LABORAT se to fund non-f ioratory in Boze and Montana Po year for 5 years. arges in the curr ENERGY SAVII	1992. M recutive inclus CORY RETRO- grant costs (inc man. The pro- ower with MSU Because the l rent level. NGS-The LFA	EIT-The exect cluding cost ov ject consisted of J paying the di egislature was the sector of the di egislature was	ge by MSU for utive includes er-run) incurre of grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants for a set to reflect e	tincreased 219 storage of mice additional fun- d by MSU in t the U.S. Depar U plans to bill t he cost over ru $(\in g \ \omega g)$	6 from fiscal e used in ding in he energy tment of he) uns, the LFA ren (%)	4,000 () 6, 37 17,769	4,000 6,37 17,769
1990 to 1991 and 27% from MSU MICE STORAGE C laboratory testing. MSU CHARGE FOR MAR capital outlay over the base retro-fit of the Marsh Lab Energy (through DNRC) a department \$17,769 per y does not include these chase MARSH LABORATORY H the energy retro-fit of the EQUIPMENT MAINTEN	m fiscal 1991 to HARGE-The ex Jumms RSH LABORAT se to fund non-g toratory in Boze and Montana Po year for 5 years. arges in the curr ENERGY SAVI Marsh Laborat	1992. M recutive inclus CORY RETRO- grant costs (inc man. The pro- prover with MSI Because the l rent level. NGS-The LFA ory. Week FA does not inc	FIT-The exect cluding cost ov ject consisted of J paying the di egislature was it main of A adjusts the b clude funds to p	ge by MSU for utive includes er-run) incurre of grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants from ifference.	increased 219 storage of mice additional fun- d by MSU in t the U.S. Depar J plans to bill t he cost over-ru $(\in \mathcal{O} \ \mathcal{W} \mathcal{V})$ nergy savings	from fiscal e used in ding in he energy tment of he) ins, the LFA مندرانی) realized by	4,000 (16,37 17,769 (374 76)	4,000 4,000 5,37 17,769 375
1990 to 1991 and 27% from MSU MICE STORAGE C laboratory testing. MSU CHARGE FOR MAH capital outlay over the bas retro-fit of the Marsh Lab Energy (through DNRC) a department \$17,769 per y does not include these cha MARSH LABORATORY H the energy retro-fit of the EQUIPMENT MAINTEN analyzer (see Equipment 1	m fiscal 1991 to HARGE-The ex Jumms RSH LABORAT se to fund non-g toratory in Boze and Montana Po year for 5 years. arges in the curr ENERGY SAVI Marsh Laborat	1992. M recutive inclus CORY RETRO- grant costs (inc man. The pro- prover with MSI Because the l rent level. NGS-The LFA ory. Week FA does not inc	FIT-The exect cluding cost ov ject consisted of J paying the di egislature was it main of A adjusts the b clude funds to p	ge by MSU for utive includes er-run) incurre of grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants from ifference.	increased 219 storage of mice additional fun- d by MSU in t the U.S. Depar J plans to bill t he cost over-ru $(\in \mathcal{O} \ \mathcal{W} \mathcal{V})$ nergy savings	from fiscal e used in ding in he energy tment of he) ins, the LFA مندرانی) realized by	4,000 (16,37 17,769 (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (18,37) (17,769) (18,37) (18,3	4,000 4,000 5,37 17,769 375 8,212
1990 to 1991 and 27% from MSU MICE STORAGE C laboratory testing. MSU CHARGE FOR MAR capital outlay over the bas retro-fit of the Marsh Lab Energy (through DNRC) a department \$17,769 per y does not include these cha	m fiscal 1991 to HARGE-The ex Jumms RSH LABORAT se to fund non-g oratory in Boze and Montana Po rear for 5 years. arges in the curr ENERGY SAVIT Marsh Laborat (ANCE-The LF below) and ther	1992. M recutive inclus CORY RETRO- grant costs (inc man. The pro- prover with MSI Because the l rent level. NGS-The LFA ory. Week FA does not inc	FIT-The exect cluding cost ov ject consisted of J paying the di egislature was it main of A adjusts the b clude funds to p	ge by MSU for utive includes er-run) incurre of grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants from ifference. MSU in not aware of to grants from ifference.	increased 219 storage of mice additional fun- d by MSU in t the U.S. Depar J plans to bill t he cost over-ru $(\in \mathcal{O} \ \mathcal{W} \mathcal{V})$ nergy savings	from fiscal e used in ding in he energy tment of he) ins, the LFA مندرانی) realized by	4,000 (16,37 17,769 (374 76) (8,212) 2,750	4,000 4,000 17,769 3 7 5 8,212 2,750

Ì.

.

FUNDING-The executive is \$246,874 higher in general fund in fiscal 1994 and \$260,941 higher in fiscal 1995 than the LFA. The LFA continues the funding switch enacted by the July special session and replaces general fund with state special revenue. The LFA is \$183,009 higher in state special revenue in fiscal 1994 and \$164,912 higher in fiscal 1995. See the Issues section in the LFA Budget Analysis (pages C 62-64) for further analysis of this funding issue for the department.

Budget Modifications

DIAGNOSTIC LAB WORKLOAD—The executive proposes an increase of 2.00 FTE and operating expenses for an increase in laboratory workload. The modification also provides \$16,000 for the biennium in maintenance contracts even though no funds are provided in the modification for equipment.

μ,

T 67W 3.5

120,000

180.000

Language

None

Diagnostic Laboratory Program

Page 2

Exhibit 4 DATE 1-12-93 1 All parties (i.e., AES, Livestock Board, MSU) have agreed that these numbers are fair and appropriate. 1989-Original design estimate by 1991-Actual contract costs including \$329,596.56 Total Project Cost Less DNRC/DOE Grant 65,783.69 Less MPC Grant 36,000.00 <u>\$227,812.87</u> = MSU "Capital" Utilized Payment Schedule A. MSU portion at 36.73% of <u>\$83,675</u> - (paid) Marsh Lab Space B. AES portion at 27.33% of \$14,261-Marsh Lab Space FY'93 = FY'94 = 12,000 FY'95 =12,000 to be paid FY'96 =12,000 <u>FY'97 =</u> 12,000-<u>\$62,261</u> C. Livestock Board portion at 35.94% of Marsh Lab Space \$16,376-FY'93 = 16,375 FY'94 =FY'95 = 16,375 to be paid FY'96 =16,375 16,375 FY'97 =\$81,876

Summary = $A. + B. + C. = \frac{$227,812}{}$

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES VISITOR REGISTER

NATURAL RESOURCES BUBCOMMITTEE	DATE 1-13-93
--------------------------------	--------------

DEPARTMENT (S)

DIVISION

PLEASE PRINT

PLEASE PRINT

NAME	REPRESENTING	
JACK SEDGWICK	DEPT of LIVESTOCK	
John Skufen	19	
LORRANE DRESSLER	1 1 <i>1</i> 1	
Larry Stackhouse	e 1	
Jork Mortensen	· • · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	•
bob Gilbert	RIT Noolgrowen	
Dawn Allen	Mont. Liner. Syst.	
	· ·	

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