

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
JOINT SUBCOMMITTEE  
ON EDUCATION APPROPRIATIONS  
MONTANA STATE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

February 22, 1985

Tape 70 Side A

The meeting of the Education Subcommittee was called to order by Chairman Gene Donaldson at 7:10 A.M. on Friday, February 22, 1985, in Room 104 of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All members were present.

The purpose of the meeting was further discussion of the University System Budget and EXECUTIVE ACTION on that budget.

Pam Joehler (70:A:029), Legislative Fiscal Analyst's office, discussed EXHIBIT 1. Subcommittee current level reflects total budget with the changes voted on by the Subcommittee in yesterday's meeting. It also includes those items which the Subcommittee specified. The total budget is \$114.8 million for fiscal year 1986 and \$115.8 million for fiscal year 1987. The tuition percentage is 21 percent for both years and the General Fund percentage is 64.8 percent for both years. There is \$1.2 million of unused tuition in 1986 and \$2.7 million of unused tuition in 1987. This means that the tuition revenue estimates actually exceed 21 percent of Subcommittee current level budget, Ms. Joehler said, so there are some tuition revenues that can be used for going to a higher percentage of instruction or support.

Ms. Joehler said the total tuition revenue figures submitted by the University System total \$25.3 million for 1986 and \$27.1 million in 1987. In figuring Subcommittee current level \$24.1 million was used in 1986 and \$24.3 million was used for 1987. That represents 21 percent of the total budget, she said.

Ms. Joehler answered questions from the Subcommittee (70:A:092).

Ms. Joehler (70:A:108) continued with her explanation of Exhibit 1. She discussed the cost to move to 100 percent instruction. It will cost \$1.8 million. In figuring this, the rest of the unused tuition was used, and the difference

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

between that and the amount required is General Fund--\$605,296 for 1986. For 1987 the cost is \$1.8 million. There is sufficient unused tuition to fund the full amount in the second year and still have \$933,848 in unused tuition left over.

The cost to move to 97 percent support in FY 86 and to 100 percent in FY 87 was discussed by Ms. Joehler. It would cost \$739,477 in 1986 and \$1.8 million in 1987. This reflects the move from 95 percent support in 1985 to 97 percent in 1986. There's no more unused tuition in FY 86, so it would be a direct cost to the General Fund of \$739,477. In 1987 there would be a move from 95 percent to 100 percent. It would cost \$1.8 million. The balance of the unused tuition, \$933,848, would be used and the rest would be \$932,759-worth of General Fund.

Chairman Donaldson pointed out that to go to 100 percent in support the first year would probably cost an additional \$1.1 million, which would be all General Fund.

Ms. Joehler (70:A:155) discussed the "Summary of Funding" (Exhibit 1). The total budget would increase to \$117.4 million in fiscal 1986 and to \$119.5 million in fiscal 1987. Percentage of General Fund is 64.5 percent in 1986 and 63.6 percent in 1987. Tuition percentage is 21.6 percent in 1986 and 22.7 percent in 1987.

Ms. Joehler said the cost of reducing indirect costs by five percent would be \$94,353 in 1986 and \$89,941 in 1987. A 10 percent reduction would cost \$188,706 the first year and \$179,882 the second year of the biennium.

Ms. Joehler answered questions from the Subcommittee (70:A:180).

Chairman Donaldson noted that in the support area the University System was at only about 60 percent of the peers before the formula was implemented in 1981.

Jack Noble (70:A:214), Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education, said on a biennium basis, in terms of General Fund with the formula moving to 100 percent in a two-year period, that's \$151,887,420 in General Fund for the next biennium versus \$147,181,451 in the current biennium. This reflects an additional \$4.7 million in General Fund and a 3.2 percent increase. He said tuition, on a biennium basis, is up about \$8.7 million. He said it still looks like there is about \$2-worth of tuition adjustment for each dollar of General Fund.

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

Ms. Joehler said total tuition revenue for the 1987 biennium would be \$52,472,645, contrasted with the current biennium total of \$43,892,661. There is a 19.5 percent increase in the 1987 biennium, she said.

Discussion of the funding levels continued (70:A:273).

Jeff Morrison (70:A:339), Chairman, Board of Regents, noted that tuition was set in much the same way as the total budget is being determined. It was based on the peers. Chairman Donaldson said he thinks the point must be made that part of the problem now results from the fact that tuitions were not raised earlier and did not keep up with what was done with General Fund during the last biennium. Senator Haffey said his concern is whether it is fair and just to have the absolute dollar increase from tuition higher than the absolute dollar increase from General Fund--in order to reach 100 percent funding. Mr. Morrison said there was a significant tuition increase in the last biennium, but in the period of 1977 through 1981 there were no increases.

Discussion of the General Fund versus tuition issue continued (40:A:454).

Chairman Donaldson said it would probably be a good idea for the people from the University System to give these new figures their consideration, and for the Subcommittee members to give them some thought, and then perhaps decisions could be made at the next day's meeting.

Discussion next turned to Montana Tech and the need to ease the phase-down at that school (70:A:488).

Representative Peck noted that adjustments of enrollments need to be justified. Chairman Donaldson said now that Tech has some figures to work with, the school should be able to provide that justification. He said he didn't think anyone was yet ready to take final action in this area. Senator Jacobson said over the last several years, nobody's enrollment was ever totally funded. Enrollments have always been under-estimated. Supplementals were given to the schools to make up for the unfunded enrollments. Now it's necessary to make an adjustment the other way. It won't be possible to fund Tech at a level that will take care of the school's problem; the school will have to lay off people, some of whom have contracts, she said.

Representative Francis Bardanouve, Chairman, Appropriations Committee, asked how many faculty members Tech will have to lay off. Chairman Donaldson said this depends to some

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

extent on what level of funding is decided upon for instruction. Dr. DeMoney, President, Montana Tech, said the school has been uncertain as to the overall funding levels.

Tape 70 Side B

Dr. DeMoney said with the numbers provided today, Tech will be able to come up with its own specific figures.

Senator Hammond asked what the cost is of rolling the critical area adjustments into the base salaries. Ms. Joehler said the cost, on a system-wide basis, is \$141,806 for each year.

Discussion of critical area adjustments continued between the Subcommittee members, Ms. Joehler and Mr. Noble (70:B:036).

Chairman Donaldson (70:B:158) asked Mr. Morrison when the University System will be able to respond regarding usage of land grant money. Mr. Morrison said there are three institutions that are affected by the money. WMC has already made its decision. Chairman Donaldson said it is information that should be available in time to make a presentation to the Appropriations Committee.

The Subcommittee next turned to Operations and Maintenance budgets (40:B:261).

Sib Clack, Office of the Budget and Program Planning, discussed EXHIBIT 2. This worksheet was prepared using figures that were provided by the Commissioner's Office.

Ms. Clack answered questions from the Subcommittee (70:B:316).

Representative Peck asked what the circumstances or conditions are that cause the wide variation in cost per square foot. Chairman Donaldson said the bases were established a long time ago, and now it's necessary to determine if they are still valid.

Discussion of the square footage issue continued (70:B:420).

Mr. Noble said some of the disparities are caused by using full-time, classified, labor-contract employees to maintain the physical plant. The ones that have the lower cost are using part-time people, maybe work study students. Mr. Noble noted that Montana Tech specifically has a high percentage of lab-type space, which is more costly in terms of maintenance.

The Subcommittee discussed Western Montana College's physical plant requirements (70:B:535).

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

Senator Jacobson (70:B:596) moved that \$163,649 be added to the physical plant base of WMC. The motion passed 6 - 0.

The Subcommittee next discussed the total budget for the plant operation programs of the University System (70:B:634) (EXHIBIT 3).

Tape 71 Side A

Ms. Clack noted that the difference between the LFA and Executive budgets in the area of plant operation and maintenance is caused by the Executive's taking 4 percent vacancy savings and using no inflation. The LFA's budget used no vacancy savings (EXHIBITS 4 and 5).

Chairman Donaldson said in other budgets, 4 percent vacancy savings was taken for operation and maintenance.

Representative Moore (71:A:032) moved that LFA current level (revised) for plant operation and maintenance be approved at \$14,784,076 for FY 86 and \$15,339,261 for FY 87.

There was discussion of the motion. Representative Moore said he didn't think it would be a good idea to address the vacancy savings issue. Chairman Donaldson noted that in every other budget vacancy savings was used for operation and maintenance. Representative Hand said in order to be consistent, the same thing should be done with this budget.

Following a short break, discussion of the motion resumed.

Representative Peck (71:A:076) offered an amendment to the motion. He moved that it be amended to add vacancy savings of 4 percent (if there are over 20 employees used by the facility).

Representative Moore said right now he feels vacancy savings should not be applied. Adjustments can be made later on, he said. Representative Peck said that it's a matter of fairness; vacancy savings was applied to other agencies, and it would be unfair to handle this particular situation in a different way.

There was a roll call vote on the amendment to add 4 percent vacancy savings to facilities with over 20 employees. The amendment passed 5 - 2 with Senator Jacobson and Representative Moore dissenting (71:A:116).

The motion to accept LFA current level for plant operation and maintenance, amended to reflect 4 percent vacancy savings in facilities with over 20 employees, passed 6 - 1, with Representative Moore dissenting.

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

The Subcommittee next discussed the budget for Research (71:A:130) (Exhibit 3).

Representative Moore (71:A:190) moved adoption of LFA current level for research in the amounts of \$1,043,305 for FY 86 and \$1,052,621 for FY 87. The motion passed unanimously.

Ms. Joehler noted that the scholarships and fellowships portion of the budget will be dealt with on the revenue side and suggested this area be postponed until revenue decisions are made.

The Subcommittee next discussed the sytem-wide modifications (71:A:275).

Senator Jacobson (71:A:306) moved that indirect costs recovery be moved from 15 percent to 20 percent, at a cost of \$188,706 for FY 86 and \$179,882 for FY 87. The motion passed unanimously.

A discussion of the Hazardous Materials modification followed (71:A:324) (EXHIBIT 6).

Dr. Tietz, President, MSU, noted that for MSU hazardous materials are a serious issue, and one that will become increasingly serious.

Representative Moore (71:A:402) moved adoption of the Hazardous Materials Modification. The motion passed unanimously.

A discussion of the Writing Across the Curriculum Modification followed (71:A:481).

Representative Moore (71:A:488) moved adoption of the Writing Across the Curriculum modification. There was a roll call vote and the motion failed 2 - 5 with Representative Moore and Representative Peck voting for the motion.

The modified requests of the individual units were discussed next; the first modified discussed was extension from 11 to 12 months' service at the Center for Handicapped Children at Eastern Montana College (71:A:589).

Representative Moore asked Dr. Carpenter, President, EMC, if it is mandatory that this be a 12-month program. Dr. Carpenter said at one time it was a 12-month program. It was funded through a variety of different agencies, but those funds dwindled, and it became necessary to cut back to 11 months. He said there are often five and six month delays at the center.

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

Senator Jacobson (71:A:629) moved adoption of the modified request for the Handicapped Childrens Center at EMC. The motion passed 4 - 3 with Representative Donaldson, Senator Hammond and Representative Peck dissenting.

The Subcommittee and Dr. DeMoney discussed the modified requests from Montana Tech (71:A:658)

NOTE: Due to recorder malfunction, there will be no further tape references.

Senator Jacobson moved adoption of the modified request from Montana Tech for Organized Research. There was a roll call vote and the motion failed 2 - 5 with Senator Haffey and Senator Jacobson voting for the motion.

The modifieds for Northern Montana College were discussed.

There were no motions.

UM's modifieds were discussed.

The modified request for a Masters of Business Administration at EMC was discussed. There was no motion on the request.

The modified request for Legal Education Development was discussed.

Senator Haffey moved approval of the modified request for funds for Legal Education Development at UM at \$36,000 in FY 86 and \$101,000 for FY 87. (This is one-half of what UM actually requested.) There was a roll call vote and the motion passed 4 - 3 with Senator Hammond, Representative Donaldson and Representative Peck dissenting.

There was discussion of the Yellow Bay Biological Station modified request. There was no motion.

There was discussion of the modified request from WMC for the Rural Education Center.

Representative Hand moved adoption of the modified request for the Rural Education Center at WMC. There was a roll call vote and the motion passed 4 - 3 with Representative Donaldson, Representative Moore and Representative Peck dissenting.

The Subcommittee returned to discussion of NMC's modifieds.

Representative Peck moved adoption of NMC's request for an additional grounds person at \$16,000 for each year. The motion passed 4 - 1.

Education Subcommittee  
Minutes  
February 22, 1985

ADJOURN: The meeting adjourned at 10:10 A.M.



Gene Donaldson, Chairman



VISITOR'S REGISTER

HOUSE Education Sub COMMITTEE

BILL \_\_\_\_\_

DATE February 22, 1985

SPONSOR \_\_\_\_\_

NAME	RESIDENCE	REPRESENTING	SUP-PORT	OP-POSE
Ken Hecker	Blgs	EMC	-	
Nic Burt		MT Tech Bult	✓	
Jack Harpster	Billings	EMC	✓	
Bill Tietz	Bozeman	MSU	✓	
Fred W DeMoney	Butte	Tech	✓	
Jim Erickson	Haure	NMC	✓	
Bill BYARS	HAURE	NMC	✓	
Scott Jourdonnais	<del>Butte</del> Missoula	UM	✓	
Phillip Sherman	Helena	Mont. Fed. of Teachers	✓	
Tom Moyer	Bozeman	MSU	✓	
Richard Mockler	MSLA	Int. College Coalition	-	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR LONGER FORM.

WHEN TESTIFYING PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

FORMULA WORKSHEETS

EXH 1-8  
2-22

	1	2	3	4	5
		Actual FY84	Approp FY85	FY86	FY87
<b>SUBCOMMITTEE CURRENT LEVEL</b>					
General Fund	\$ 72339745	\$ 74841706	\$ 74470391	\$ 75135491	
Tuition & Fees	21117661	22775000	24121799	24329947	
Charges	16483979	169149335	162735220	16387446	
Total	109941385	14536041	148657110	16592830	
% GF	65.8%	65.3%	64.8%	64.8%	
% Tuition	19.2	19.9	20.0	20.0	
"Unused" Tuition		\$ 1842635	\$ 2779224		
<b>COST TO MOVE TO 100% INSTRUCTION</b>					
Source of Funding					
Unused Tuition			\$ 1242635	\$ 1844416	
General Fund			605296	10-	
Total			1547931	1844416	
Unused Tuition				\$ 933848	

Subcommittee Current Level Includes:

① Subgrant Swallow

	85	87
NSU	10382	10211
MVA	2192	2014
EMC	2516	2404
NMC	1737	1727
WWD	879	873
TECH	1243	1127
S/Program	24536	24251

- ② Critical Area Acquisition of additional land resources from the state
- ③ New Space Adjustments will Base adjustments to plant programs
- ④ Phase down of TELLS ACCORD to FY85
- ⑤ Land Grant Revenue Revenue



FILE: SQFEET RANGE: A1..R32

REVISED

UNIT	SQFT UNRESTRICTED SPACE†	85 BIENNIUM (HB447) OPER. & MAINT. PHYS. PLANT		FY84 RATE/ SQFT	FY85 RATE/ SQFT	85 BIENNIUM AMOUNT IF	BIENNIAL DIFFERENCE
		FY84	FY85			CAPITOL COMPLEX "RENTAL" RATE‡ PER SQFT USED	
MSU	1,966,049	\$4,811,310	\$5,094,286	\$2.45	\$2.59	\$12,681,016	\$2,775,420
UM	1,311,026	\$4,683,837	\$5,120,573	\$3.57	\$3.91	\$8,456,118	(\$1,348,292)
ENC	554,917	\$1,716,867	\$1,839,053	\$3.09	\$3.31	\$3,579,215	\$23,295
NMC	341,722	\$839,266	\$882,680	\$2.46	\$2.58	\$2,204,107	\$482,161
WMC	270,459	\$605,654	\$632,838	\$2.24	\$2.34	\$1,744,461	\$505,969
TECH	349,884	\$1,089,886	\$1,124,164	\$3.11	\$3.21	\$2,256,752	\$42,702
4,794,057		\$13,746,820	\$14,693,594	\$2.87	\$3.06	\$30,921,669	\$2,481,255

† According to data from CHE 2-21-85.

‡ "Rent" for Capitol complex buildings during the 85 biennium was set at \$3.11 in FY84 and at \$3.34 in FY85. Biennial = \$6.45/sqft.

EXEC. PHYS		FY86	FY87	LFA PHYSICAL PLANT		FY86	FY87
FY86	FY87	RATE/ SQFT	RATE/ SQFT	FY86	FY87	RATE/ SQFT	RATE/ SQFT
\$4,551,161	\$4,551,450	\$2.31	\$2.32	\$5,036,211	\$5,223,430	\$2.56	\$2.66
\$4,462,686	\$4,463,439	\$3.40	\$3.40	\$5,155,434	\$5,374,551	\$3.93	\$4.10
\$1,901,097	\$1,913,151	\$3.43	\$3.45	\$1,876,335	\$1,949,126	\$3.38	\$3.51
\$861,129	\$861,438	\$2.52	\$2.52	\$909,448	\$939,324	\$2.66	\$2.75
\$568,010	\$562,227	\$2.10	\$2.08	\$610,314	\$628,052	\$2.26	\$2.32
\$1,149,546	\$1,149,653	\$3.29	\$3.29	\$1,196,334	\$1,224,778	\$3.42	\$3.50
\$13,493,629	\$13,501,358	\$2.81	\$2.82	\$14,784,076	\$15,339,261	\$3.08	\$3.20

		LFA PLUS SUBCOM			
		EDUC. SUBCOM 2-21 & 2-22		FY86	FY87
UNIT		FY86	FY87	RATE/ SQFT	RATE/ SQFT
	MSU	\$264,464	\$282,977	\$2.70	\$2.80
	UM	\$0	\$0	\$3.93	\$4.10
	EMC	\$54,174	\$33,677	\$3.48	\$3.57
	NMC	\$20,300	\$20,550	\$2.72	\$2.81
(MOD)	WMC	\$69,135	\$94,505	\$2.51	\$2.67
	TECH	\$0	\$0	\$3.42	\$3.50
		\$408,073	\$431,709	\$3.17	\$3.29

LFA Current Level Analysis--Revised\*  
Program Expenditures by Unit  
1987 Biennium

Program	MSU	UM	ENC	NMC	WMC	MCMST	Total
<u>Fiscal 1986</u>							
Instruction	\$25,461,078	\$18,411,039	\$ 6,757,063	\$3,904,124	\$2,028,117	\$ 5,264,127	\$ 61,825,548
Support	13,947,626	10,847,802	4,727,207	2,127,491	1,119,727	3,668,115	36,437,968
Plant Operations and Maintenance	5,036,211	5,155,434	1,876,335	909,448	610,314	1,196,334	14,784,076
Research	570,756	430,489	-0-	-0-	-0-	42,060	1,043,305
Public Service	10,140	198,514	213,286	9,151	-0-	-0-	431,091
Scholarships and Fellowships	1,149,686	940,260	301,205	188,493	64,597	253,943	2,898,184
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$46,175,497</b>	<b>\$35,983,538</b>	<b>\$13,875,096</b>	<b>\$7,138,707</b>	<b>\$3,822,755</b>	<b>\$10,424,579</b>	<b>\$117,420,172</b>
<u>LFA Current</u>							
Level Original	46,138,914	35,955,232	13,862,123	7,280,872	3,819,744	10,416,713	117,473,598
Difference	\$ 36,583	\$ 28,306	\$ 12,973	\$ (142,165)	\$ 3,011	\$ 7,866	\$ (53,426)
<u>Fiscal 1987</u>							
Instruction	\$25,629,937	\$18,516,612	\$ 6,791,535	\$3,923,830	\$2,039,598	\$ 5,289,700	\$ 62,191,212
Support	14,181,268	11,028,786	4,805,801	2,163,347	1,138,605	3,728,983	37,046,790
Plant Operations and Maintenance	5,223,430	5,374,551	1,949,126	939,324	628,052	1,224,778	15,339,261
Research	572,430	437,211	-0-	-0-	-0-	42,980	1,052,621
Public Service	10,278	200,795	215,044	9,304	-0-	-0-	435,421
Scholarships and Fellowships	1,218,950	996,707	321,104	199,877	69,201	269,408	3,075,247
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$46,836,293</b>	<b>\$36,554,662</b>	<b>\$14,082,610</b>	<b>\$7,235,682</b>	<b>\$3,875,456</b>	<b>\$10,555,849</b>	<b>\$119,140,552</b>
<u>LFA Current</u>							
Level Original	46,796,947	36,524,204	14,068,628	7,377,408	4,051,246	10,547,373	119,365,806
Difference	\$ 39,346	\$ 30,458	\$ 13,982	\$ (141,726)	\$ (175,790)	\$ 8,476	\$ (225,254)

\*Revised for the following corrections:

- (a) Reduced AY faculty salary @ WMC in fiscal 1987 from \$28,816 to \$25,934.
- (b) Increased student faculty ratio @ NMC from 14.23 to 14.89
- (c) Increased discretionary fee waiver rate on registration and resident incidental fees from 5.25 percent to 5.75 percent. This correction affected all units.

LFA Current Level Analysis--Revised\*  
Revenue Sources by Unit  
1987 Biennium

Revenue Source	MSU	UM	EMC	NMC	WMC	MCMST	Total	% of Total
<b>-Fiscal 1986-</b>								
General Fund	\$28,744,512	\$22,321,675	\$ 8,838,431	\$5,034,295	\$2,484,983	\$ 6,603,040	\$ 74,026,936	63.1
Tuition Fees	10,213,480	8,600,087	2,954,195	1,238,272	722,164	2,315,518	25,043,716	22.2
Millage	5,537,505	4,261,776	1,822,470	841,140	448,608	1,107,501	14,019,000	11.9
Land Grant	420,000	250,000	150,000	-0-	150,000	-0-	970,000	.8
Indirect Costs	960,000	450,000	80,000	20,000	15,000	150,000	1,675,000	1.4
Other	300,000	100,000	30,000	5,000	2,000	248,520	685,520	.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$46,175,497</b>	<b>\$35,983,538</b>	<b>\$13,875,096</b>	<b>\$7,138,707</b>	<b>\$3,822,755</b>	<b>\$10,424,579</b>	<b>\$117,420,172</b>	<b>100.0</b>
<b>-Fiscal 1987-</b>								
General Fund	\$28,662,593	\$22,293,626	\$ 8,811,343	\$5,031,579	\$2,478,056	\$ 6,553,578	\$ 73,830,775	62.0
Tuition Fees	10,904,055	9,159,132	3,171,637	1,330,043	777,568	2,473,896	27,816,331	23.3
Millage	5,589,645	4,301,904	1,839,630	849,060	452,832	1,117,929	14,151,000	11.9
Land Grant	420,000	250,000	150,000	-0-	150,000	-0-	970,000	.8
Indirect Costs	960,000	450,000	80,000	20,000	15,000	150,000	1,675,000	1.4
Other	300,000	100,000	30,000	5,000	2,000	260,446	697,446	.6
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$46,836,293</b>	<b>\$36,554,662</b>	<b>\$14,082,610</b>	<b>\$7,235,682</b>	<b>\$3,875,456</b>	<b>\$10,555,849</b>	<b>\$119,140,552</b>	<b>100.0</b>

\*Revised for expenditure corrections. All changes impacted general fund.

University Enrollment Projections  
1987 Biennium

	CHE 2/4/85 Estimate		-- LFA Original --		-- LFA Revised --	
	FY 85	FY 86	FY 86	FY 87	FY 86	FY 87
MSU	<del>10,397</del>	10,265	10,265	10,103	10,367	10,124
UM	8,174	8,349	8,349	8,157	8,273	8,013
EMC	3,515	3,533	3,533	3,597	3,441	3,444
NMC	1,710	1,668	1,668	1,624	1,744	1,745
WMC	879	800	800	793	840	851
MCMST	1,879	2,060	2,060	1,993	1,853	1,807
System	<del>26,554</del>	26,675	26,675	26,267	26,518	25,984

*Original*

Issue One: Expenditure and Revenue Impact Resulting from  
 Estimated Enrollment Changes

	<u>MSU</u>	<u>UM</u>	<u>EMC</u>	<u>NMC</u>	<u>WMC</u>	<u>MCMST</u>	<u>System</u>
<u>Fiscal 1986</u>							
Expenditure Impact:							
Instruction	\$ (766,124)	\$ (21,706)	\$ (290,021)	\$ 243,983	\$ (56,094)	\$ (1,113,683)	\$ (2,003,645)
Support	(423,359)	(12,986)	(201,256)	132,880	(30,962)	(797,810)	(1,333,493)
Scholarship & Fellowship	(27,701)	(942)	(8,366)	4,783	(1,436)	(47,989)	(81,651)
Total Expenditure Impact	<u>\$ (1,217,184)</u>	<u>\$ (35,634)</u>	<u>\$ (499,643)</u>	<u>\$ 381,646</u>	<u>\$ (88,492)</u>	<u>\$ (1,959,482)</u>	<u>\$ (3,418,789)</u>
Revenue Impact:							
Change in Tuition & Fees	\$ (307,722)	\$ (9,961)	\$ (125,303)	\$ 76,781	\$ (19,560)	\$ (504,994)	\$ (890,759)
Change in General Fund	(909,462)	(25,673)	(374,340)	304,865	(68,932)	(1,454,488)	(2,528,030)
Total Revenue Impact	<u>\$ (1,217,184)</u>	<u>\$ (35,634)</u>	<u>\$ (499,643)</u>	<u>\$ 381,646</u>	<u>\$ (88,492)</u>	<u>\$ (1,959,482)</u>	<u>\$ (3,418,789)</u>
<u>Fiscal 1987</u>							
Expenditure Impact:							
Instruction	\$ (1,346,177)	\$ (589,501)	\$ (285,910)	\$ 247,601	\$ (30,557)	\$ (1,218,300)	\$ (3,222,844)
Support	(751,364)	(356,535)	(200,728)	136,442	(17,055)	(882,904)	(2,072,144)
Scholarships & Fellowship	(51,393)	(27,040)	(8,822)	5,196	(837)	(55,506)	(138,402)
Total Expenditure Impact	<u>\$ (2,148,934)</u>	<u>\$ (973,076)</u>	<u>\$ (495,460)</u>	<u>\$ 389,239</u>	<u>\$ (48,449)</u>	<u>\$ (2,156,710)</u>	<u>\$ (5,433,390)</u>
Revenue Impact:							
Change in Tuition & Fees	\$ (573,845)	\$ (287,183)	\$ (132,142)	\$ 83,343	\$ (11,428)	\$ (587,441)	\$ (1,508,696)
Change in General Fund	(1,575,089)	(685,893)	(363,318)	305,896	(37,021)	(1,569,269)	(3,924,694)
Total Revenue Impact	<u>\$ (2,148,934)</u>	<u>\$ (973,076)</u>	<u>\$ (495,460)</u>	<u>\$ 389,239</u>	<u>\$ (48,449)</u>	<u>\$ (2,156,710)</u>	<u>\$ (5,433,390)</u>

Issue Two: General Fund Impact of Implementation Full Formula Funding  
1987 Biennium

	<u>MSU</u>	<u>UM</u>	<u>EMC</u>	<u>NMC</u>	<u>WMC</u>	<u>MCNST</u>	<u>System</u>
<u>Fiscal 1986</u>							
Expenditures Revised for Enrollment:	\$44,986,013	\$35,948,845	\$13,383,819	\$7,515,570	\$3,735,698	\$8,513,087	\$114,083,032
Expenditures Revised for Full Formula Funding:	\$46,461,578	\$37,082,459	\$13,822,039	\$7,762,829	\$3,853,992	\$8,792,520	\$117,775,417
General Fund Increase	<u>\$ 1,475,565</u>	<u>\$ 1,133,614</u>	<u>\$ 438,220</u>	<u>\$ 247,259</u>	<u>\$ 118,294</u>	<u>\$ 279,433</u>	<u>\$ 3,692,385</u>
<u>Fiscal 1987</u>							
Expenditures Revised for Enrollment:	\$44,738,752	\$35,608,626	\$13,595,971	\$7,619,725	\$3,827,845	\$8,454,646	\$113,845,565
Expenditures Revised for Full Formula Funding:	\$46,196,633	\$36,719,389	\$14,039,549	\$7,869,780	\$3,949,009	\$8,730,359	\$117,504,719
General Fund Increase	<u>\$ 1,457,881</u>	<u>\$ 1,110,763</u>	<u>\$ 443,578</u>	<u>\$ 250,055</u>	<u>\$ 121,164</u>	<u>\$ 275,713</u>	<u>\$ 3,659,154</u>

*Don't 3.6 x 10 - 1000000000*

Summary of Expenditure Impact on Current Level Budget (Revised)  
LFA Projected Enrollment, 100% Formula Funding, 100% Tuition Rates

Fiscal 1986	MSU	UM	EMC	NMC	WMC	MCMST	SYSTEM
Expenditures							
1) Enrollment Adjustment	\$ (1,217,184)	\$ (35,634)	\$ (499,643)	\$ 381,646	\$ (88,492)	\$ (1,959,482)	\$ (3,418,789)
2) 100% Funding for Enrollment Driven Formula	1,475,565	1,133,614	438,220	247,259	118,294	279,433	3,692,385
3) 100% Tuition Rate	36,454	23,999	18,149	13,055	3,062	5,097	99,816
Expenditure Impact	\$ 294,835	\$ 1,121,979	\$ (43,274)	\$ 641,960	\$ 32,864	\$ (1,674,952)	\$ 373,412
Tuition and Fees	\$ 265,587	\$ 255,618	\$ 93,387	\$ 185,741	\$ 28,529	\$ (411,252)	\$ 417,610
General Fund	29,248	866,361	(136,661)	456,219	4,335	(1,263,700)	(44,198)
Funding Impact	\$ 294,835	\$ 1,121,979	\$ (43,274)	\$ 641,960	\$ 32,864	\$ (1,674,952)	\$ 373,412
Fiscal 1987							
Expenditures							
1) Enrollment Adjustment	\$ (2,148,934)	\$ (973,076)	\$ (495,460)	\$ 389,239	\$ (48,449)	\$ (2,156,710)	\$ (5,433,390)
2) 100% Funding of Enrollment Driven Portion	1,457,881	1,110,763	443,578	250,055	121,164	275,713	3,659,154
3) 100% Tuition Rate	38,036	24,923	19,220	13,791	3,276	5,315	104,561
Expenditure Impact	\$ (653,017)	\$ 162,610	\$ (32,662)	\$ 653,085	\$ 75,991	\$ (1,875,682)	\$ (1,669,675)
Tuition and Fees	\$ 21,574	\$ (8,386)	\$ 100,636	\$ 199,287	\$ 40,383	\$ (490,223)	\$ (136,729)
General Fund	(674,591)	170,996	(133,298)	453,798	35,608	(1,385,459)	(1,532,946)
Funding Impact	\$ 653,017	\$ 162,610	\$ (32,662)	\$ 653,085	\$ 75,991	\$ 1,875,682	\$ (1,669,675)

4% Vacancy Savings in 07:

	<u>FY86</u>	<u>FY87</u>	<u>87B</u>
MSU	64,656	64,656	129,312
UM	50,530	50,530	101,060
EMC	25,473	25,473	50,946
NMC	15,969	15,969	31,938
WMC	13,286	13,286	26,572
TECH	26,000	26,000	52,000
	<u>195,914</u>	<u>195,914</u>	<u>391,828</u>

4% Vacancy Savings  
LFA Current Level  
Plant O+M

MSU	67,519	
UM	50,784	
EMC	23,380	
NMC	16,179	
WMC	13,105	
Tech	<u>28,230</u>	
Total	199,197	EACH YEAR

LFA

FACTS ABOUT

MONTANA STATE UNIVERSITY'S  
HAZARDOUS WASTE-CHEMICAL SAFETY PROGRAM

Under the Montana Hazardous Waste Act and the federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), Montana State University is required to monitor and control the generation, transport and disposal of its hazardous wastes. The long term goal of the program is to manage the purchase, storage and disposal of all chemicals -- regulated or not -- on the MSU campuses.

Costs:

The Hazardous Waste-Chemical Safety Program costs about \$55,000 each year. This includes approximately \$30,000 in salary and benefits and \$12,000 to ship approximately three tons of waste each year to licensed hazardous waste facilities. The remaining dollars are used for general operations of the program.

Sources:

About 70 percent of the chemical waste is generated by the multi-faceted research programs at MSU. The remainder comes from miscellaneous sources.

Responsibilities:

In addition to its on-campus responsibilities, the program works with the Agricultural Experiment Station farm management on appropriate chemical safety and waste disposal programs. It also provides for continuous monitoring of laboratory fume hoods,

investigates chemical safety concerns and complaints, works with the local fire departments concerning the location of chemicals on campus, and provides limited assistance to the public in the use and safe handling of chemicals. The program officers are receiving increasing numbers of phone calls from business people, high school teachers and local government officials who need general information on chemical make-up and disposal. Program officers try to answer as many of these questions as possible

Resources:

The program officers maintain a reference library concerning the handling, disposal and composition of chemicals as well as a complete inventory of some 5,000 chemicals currently in use on the campus. Program officers also have access to a computer program through the MSU Center for Data Systems and Analysis which relies on an Environmental Protection Agency data base to retrieve crucial information on chemicals. This system provides a backup for the reference library and general inventory data.

For more information, contact Paul Griffin, Chemical Safety Technician at 994-4801.

2/12/85

2-22-85  
(6)

*B. Dozette*  
*2-14-85*

# MSU's tainted waste spurs costly program

By **ROBERT EKEY**  
Gazette Bozeman Bureau

**BOZEMAN** — Disposal of some of the chemical wastes generated by laboratories at Montana State University sometimes costs more than the chemicals themselves, according to university officials.

Chemicals are no longer being pushed into corners or closets, put in the garbage or poured down the drain.

MSU has started a hazardous waste and chemical-safety program that disposes of all hazardous materials on campus.

Under the program, the university assumes responsibility for preparing the materials for transportation and storage in a certified landfill. The program costs \$57,000 a year and allows the university to comply with state and federal regulations concerning hazardous materials.

Under the regulations, the university is responsible for the chemicals even after they are stored in a federally approved landfill.

Paul Griffin, chemical safety officer, has begun to inventory the more than 5,000 chemicals on campus.

When professors and students no longer have a need for a chemical or generate a waste product, Griffin is called and he picks up the material and takes it to his Gaines Hall office where it is prepared for transportation and storage.

Griffin said that because there are no hazardous-waste disposal dumps in Montana, the transportation and landfill fees for the materials are high.

Chemicals are put in gallon bottles, which are placed into 55-gallon drums with insulating materials packed around them. The drums are suitable for transport and storage in landfills.

Griffin said the cost of disposing

of materials, including transportation and landfill fees is \$12 or \$13 a gallon. Some of the chemicals do not cost that much to buy, he said.

The closest hazardous waste dump sites are in Oregon, Idaho and Utah. But, materials hauled away from the university last October where shipped to San Jose for storage.

An inventory list must be kept of all materials stored in landfills and the university is responsible for the materials forever, according to Dr. Richard Geer, a chemistry professor who advises the chemical safety program.

Griffin's computerized inventory of the materials on campus will soon be passed along to security and fire officials, to help them cope with emergency situations on campus.

He said the chemical safety program for disposing of hazardous materials is not magic — just "good housekeeping and good management."

The materials are prepared for shipping in a basement office in Gaines Hall, in a room that has a separate ventilation system.

The room has been especially busy because the new program has been working to identify and remove many old chemicals that have been stored for years.

"There are chemical pack-rats on campus," Griffin said. He said the hardest situations were when professors had retired or died and could not be reached to identify hazardous chemicals.

"We're slowly whittling down the amount of stuff on campus," he said.

Griffin warned that while the university has recently had to take responsibility for the materials, "from the cradle to the grave," small businesses will soon have to comply with the same rules, including dry cleaning and paint stores.

# Tougher laws on hazardous waste to affect business

By PETER CAUGHEY  
Chronicle Staff Writer

Main Street businesses may soon confront the same problems in disposing of hazardous waste that Montana State University has made progress against, MSU officials said Tuesday.

MSU generates about 3 tons of hazardous waste annually in its teaching and research programs, the largest total among the six units of the University System.

MSU officials held a tour for local officials and the press to explain how the university's chemical safety and hazardous waste program operates.

Laws concerning the disposal of hazardous waste are getting stricter, said John Jutila, MSU's vice president for research. Congress may soon reduce the amount of wastes that can be collected before disposal to one-tenth of current levels, which could affect private businesses such as dry cleaners and paint shops.

In 1980, about 70,000 different kinds of commercial chemicals were produced by 115,000 companies resulting in 35 million metric tons of hazardous waste, Jutila said. Only about 10 percent of that waste was disposed of in accordance with Environmental Protection Agency standards in 1980 and the figure probably is only 20 percent today, he said.

State officials had criticized MSU for its chemical storage practices in June 1983 after a fire broke out at a hut used for temporary storage of hazardous waste.

Following the fire, MSU put into effect a plan that has been moving along well, Jutila said.

The university has a new chemical processing facility in the basement of Gaines Hall, a full-time chemical safety technician to handle hazardous waste and a five-member faculty committee to oversee the program.

Hazardous materials include solids, liquids and gases that are flammable, unstable, poisonous or corrosive, including some pesticides used by the Agricultural Experiment Station. They do not include radioactive waste, which is

handled under a separate program.

MSU plans to use a "cradle-to-the-grave management plan" in which chemicals will be tracked from the time they arrive on campus until the time some leave as hazardous waste, Jutila said.

Hazardous waste generated at MSU is taken to disposal sites in Idaho, Washington and Oregon. It is an expensive procedure.

"Sometimes the disposal cost is greater than the purchase price," said Paul Griffin, MSU chemical safety technician.

MSU has extended EPA rules to apply even to hazardous wastes on campus that may not be officially classified as such, Jutila said.

Wastes classified as hazardous now are carefully labeled and transported to the processing room in Gaines Hall, renovated at a total cost of about \$35,000. The room has its own \$20,000 ventilation system and can be isolated from the rest of the building in case of contamination.

Once wastes are brought to the room, they are put into gallon bottles which are packed in special pressure-tested 55-gallon drums. The drums are filled with vermiculite, a chemically inert insulation material.

A maximum of 13 gallons of waste is put into the drums. There is a four-to-one ratio of vermiculite to waste, so that in case of a spill the vermiculite can absorb spilled chemicals even if all the bottles broke, Griffin said.

The drum is lined with plastic and has a special tight-locking lid. The drums are grounded by wires to prevent the possibility of a spark of static electricity setting off a fire.

When a ton has been collected, or the equivalent of about 25 barrels, the drums are transported to a disposal site.

Materials classified as acutely hazardous waste must be shipped with 90 days after slightly more than 2 pounds has been collected. The cost of transporting each drum ranges from \$120 to \$200.

The careful labeling of chemicals on campus also is a priority. Typical identification charges for unknown chemicals are \$50 to \$100, Griffin said.



Photo by Ly  
Paul Griffin, Montana State University chemical safety technician, shows how chemical wastes are stored in the basement of Gaines Hall before shipment to a disposal site.

The processing laboratory cannot accept hazardous waste from private parties but it can offer general advice. Jutila said MSU

hopes to provide certain technical assistance in the future to producers of hazardous waste as high schools.