

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Summary

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Department of Agriculture and Food

The Department of Agriculture and Food is responsible for the administration of Utah's agricultural laws as outlined in Titles 3 and 4 of the Utah Code. The laws mandate a wide variety of activities including inspection, regulation, information, rulemaking, loan issuance, marketing and development, pest and disease control, improving the economic position of agriculture, and consumer protection.

While maintaining strong inspection, regulatory, and marketing priorities, the Department has emphasized the importance of pest control in the past year. The infestation of grasshoppers and crickets last summer was a major concern. Africanized bees were recently spotted in southern Utah. Alien noxious weeds continue to spread and make segments of Utah's land agriculturally unproductive.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$9,204,400		\$9,204,400
Federal Funds	1,986,700		1,986,700
Dedicated Credits	837,500		837,500
GFR - Ag Resource Dev	530,500		530,500
GFR - Brand Inspection	638,300	\$80,000	718,300
GFR - Horse Racing	50,000		50,000
GFR - TB & Bangs Disease	10,000		10,000
GFR - Wildlife Damage	496,500		496,500
Designated Sales Tax	500,000		500,000
Utah Rural Rehab Loan	18,000		18,000
Transfers	590,800		590,800
Closing Nonlapsing	(3,700)		(3,700)
Pass-Through	33,000		33,000
Total	\$14,892,000	\$80,000	\$14,972,000
Programs			
General Administration	\$7,535,300		\$7,535,300
Marketing and Development	842,900	-	842,900
Brand Inspection	1,020,600	\$80,000	1,100,600
Predatory Animal Control	1,114,300	-	1,114,300
Auction Market Vets	60,000	-	60,000
Sheep Promotion	50,000	-	50,000
Soil Conservation	10,300	-	10,300
Grain Inspection	401,600	-	401,600
Environmental Quality	1,470,500	-	1,470,500
Insect Infestation	205,800	-	205,800
Resource Conservation	1,138,600	-	1,138,600
Agricultural Loans	814,100	-	814,100
Building O&M	228,000	-	228,000
Total	\$14,892,000	\$80,000	\$14,972,000

2.0 Issues: Department of Agriculture and Food (Summary)

2.1 Noxious Weed Control

The Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Environment Interim Committee has recommended that the Department of Agriculture and Food be allocated \$150,000 to implement an integrated pest management program in which biological and chemical means would be used to control noxious weeds. Although the Analyst recommends \$150,000 for this item, limited General Funds prohibit funding it at this time. Therefore the Analyst recommends consideration of this item should funding become available at a later date. See Administration line item.

2.2 Brand and Earmark Renewal

The Department is mandated by law (UCA 4-24-5 and 4-24-7) to renew every livestock brand and earmark on record every five years and produce a brand book for general distribution. During the year 2000 the Department will see that every livestock person be given the opportunity to renew his/her brand or mark for an additional five years. At the end of the renewal process, a "brand book" will be published. See Brand Inspection line item.

GFR - Brand Inspection \$80,000

2.3 Insect Infestation

The Analyst will discuss an appropriation for insect infestation in the Supplemental section.

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Administration

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Administration

The Administration line item encompasses seven programs: Administrative Services, Meat Inspection, Chemistry Lab, Animal Health, Plant Inspection, Food and Dairy, and Weights and Measures. Except for Administrative Services, which provides financial and other support to the Department, the programs in this line item administer inspections and regulations. More detail on each program can be found in Section 3.0.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$5,775,700		\$5,775,700
Federal Funds	1,321,600		1,321,600
Dedicated Credits	375,900		375,900
GFR - Brand Inspection	5,600		5,600
GFR - TB & Bangs Disease	10,000		10,000
GFR - Wildlife Damage	13,500		13,500
Pass-through	33,000		33,000
Total	\$7,535,300	\$0	\$7,535,300
Programs			
Administration	\$1,169,800		\$1,169,800
Meat Inspection	1,462,400		1,462,400
Chemistry Laboratory	698,600		698,600
Animal Health	685,800		685,800
Agriculture Inspection	1,540,900		1,540,900
Regulatory Services	1,233,200		1,233,200
Weights and Measures	744,600		744,600
Total	\$7,535,300	\$0	\$7,535,300
FTE	129.6		129.6

2.0 Issues: Administration

2.1 Noxious Weed Control

Following intent language from last session (HB 1, 1999 General Session), the Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Environment Interim Committee has recommended that the Department of Agriculture and Food be allocated \$150,000 to implement an integrated pest management program in which biological and chemical means would be used to control noxious weeds. Although the Analyst recommends \$150,000 for this item, limited General Funds prohibit funding it at this time. Therefore the Analyst recommends consideration of this item should funding become available at a later date. See Item 3.5.

3.0 Programs: Administration

3.1 Administrative Services

Recommendation The Analyst recommends \$1,169,800 for this program, funded almost entirely from the General Fund. Personal Services comprise 74% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$1,035,000	\$1,184,600	\$1,136,400	(\$48,200)
Federal Funds	114,500	23,800	4,300	(19,500)
Dedicated Credits	7,400	11,900	10,000	(1,900)
GFR - Brand Inspection	5,600	5,600	5,600	
GFR - Wildlife Damage	2,000	13,500	13,500	
Transfers	11,400			
Beginning Nonlapsing	102,400	211,700		(211,700)
Closing Nonlapsing	(211,700)			
Total	\$1,066,600	\$1,451,100	\$1,169,800	(\$281,300)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$821,000	\$885,600	\$863,600	(\$22,000)
In-State Travel	5,600	5,800	5,800	
Out of State Travel	3,600	8,700	8,700	
Current Expense	134,300	199,800	108,900	(90,900)
DP Current Expense	69,200	111,900	72,800	(39,100)
Capital Outlay	32,900	19,300		(19,300)
Pass Through		220,000	110,000	(110,000)
Total	\$1,066,600	\$1,451,100	\$1,169,800	(\$281,300)
FTE	16.5	17.5	17.5	

Purpose The Administrative Services program provides budgetary support for the 26 organizational programs, the internal service fund, and two loan funds. This program performs fiscal transactions for over 200 employees, 10,000 licenses, and 30,000 brands and earmarks. Others services the program offers are related to personnel, payroll, contracts, federal grants, purchasing, accounting, travel, establishment of policies and procedures, Geographical Information System processing, and support of the eleven-member advisory board established in UCA 4-2-7.

Intent Language The 1998 Legislature appropriated \$100,000 in on-going General Funds for grants to counties to purchase conservation easements. The Analyst recommends continuing the following intent language:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the appropriation for grants to charitable organizations specified under Section 57-18-3 be used for purchase of conservation easements for agricultural protection and be considered nonlapsing.

**Performance
Measures**

1. Administrative costs as a percentage of total departmental costs.
2. Ensure financial and department data are accurate and available in a timely manner.
3. Identify and implement operational improvements.
4. Maintain optimal staff size for maximum efficiency.

**Previous Building
Block Report**

Last session the Legislature appropriated \$59,000 in on-going General Funds for a Geographical Information System (GIS) FTE. This position has serviced several areas of the department, including processing information on land preservation, water usage and availability for agricultural lands, insect infestation, and others.

The Legislature also authorized the Department to use \$10,000 in prior year nonlapsing funds for the "Agriculture in the Classroom" program. This money was used to partner with Utah State University to fund a full-time project coordinator and part-time student assistant. Program activities included teacher workshops and a field guide that gives teachers some suggested classroom activities.

3.2 Meat Inspection

Recommendation

The Analyst's recommendation of \$1,462,400 represents a 53% federal/47% state funding split. This program has typically been funded at approximately a 50% federal/50% state split. The reason for the 53% federal portion is that the federal government is paying 100% of the costs of one inspector doing USDA grading. Personal Services comprise 85% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$669,600	\$693,600	\$691,000	(\$2,600)
Federal Funds	799,300	776,300	771,400	(4,900)
Beginning Nonlapsing	43,900	82,800		(82,800)
Closing Nonlapsing	(82,800)			
Total	\$1,430,000	\$1,552,700	\$1,462,400	(\$90,300)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$1,222,800	\$1,279,800	\$1,246,000	(\$33,800)
In-State Travel	18,200	28,500	21,000	(7,500)
Out of State Travel	9,900	24,100	14,100	(10,000)
Current Expense	134,000	191,400	170,400	(21,000)
DP Current Expense	45,100	28,900	10,900	(18,000)
Total	\$1,430,000	\$1,552,700	\$1,462,400	(\$90,300)
FTE	27.2	27.2	27.2	

Purpose

The Department is required by the Utah Meat and Poultry Products Inspection and Licensing Act (UCA 4-32-1 to 4-32-22) to provide inspection programs at least equal to those proscribed by the federal government. In order to prevent unwholesome livestock or poultry from entering commercial channels, the Department maintains a staff of inspectors to enforce the laws and regulations pertaining to the meat packing industry. Inspectors perform day by day inspections of establishments, including ante-mortem and post-mortem inspections. All slaughter plants are required to have one meat inspector present at all times when slaughtering. There are 24 licensed slaughter plants, 28 processing plants, and 46 custom-exempt (non-federally inspected and product can't leave state boundaries) plants under state inspection. A veterinarian is required to supervise the meat inspector's activities in the slaughter plants at least two hours each month.

Performance Measures

1. Random program audits.
2. Number of sanitation deficiencies and process deviations noted by inspectors.

**Previous Building
Block Report**

Last session the Legislature appropriated \$7,500 in federal funds and authorized the use of \$7,500 in nonlapsing funds to implement a pathogen sampling and analysis program. The Department is currently testing for Salmonella, has established a baseline for industry, and has confirmed that Utah's meat packers and processors have done a good job in controlling this pathogen.

3.3 Chemistry Laboratory

Recommendation

Total funding is recommended at \$698,600. This program receives the major portion of its funding from the General Fund. Some funding is supplied by the federal government to pay for half of the salaries of two chemists. The federal funds pay for monitoring of pesticides in groundwater and inspection of meat samples. Personal Services comprise 88% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$629,200	\$652,200	\$646,300	(\$5,900)
Federal Funds	109,100	52,900	52,300	(600)
Dedicated Credits	1,600			
Pass-through	100			
Beginning Nonlapsing	163,300	52,000		(52,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(52,000)			
Total	\$851,300	\$757,100	\$698,600	(\$58,500)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$611,500	\$627,900	\$614,300	(\$13,600)
In-State Travel	200	1,100	1,100	
Out of State Travel	8,600	6,300	6,300	
Current Expense	66,100	66,700	63,600	(3,100)
DP Current Expense	21,500	18,200	13,300	(4,900)
Capital Outlay	143,400	36,900		(36,900)
Total	\$851,300	\$757,100	\$698,600	(\$58,500)
FTE	11.5	11.5	11.5	

Purpose

The Chemistry Laboratory provides analytical support and services for the various divisions of the Department. Analysis may be performed for other agencies as long as it does not interfere with work required by the Department. Certification programs ensure testing methods give accurate results. Contents are examined to ensure products are safe and accurately represented on the label. Chemical, physical and bacteriological testing methods are used.

Performance Measures

1. Provide analysis to assure safe products are made available to the public.

3.4 Animal Health

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$685,800. This program receives some Dedicated Credits from the sale of health certificates, books, and Coggins testing (for Equine Infectious Anemia). The Analyst estimates that \$23,200 will be collected from these sources. Personal Services comprise 66% of the recommended appropriation. Per diem and other costs for the seven-member Livestock Market Committee (UCA 4-30-2) are included in the Current Expense line.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$620,500	\$636,800	\$639,900	\$3,100
Federal Funds	18,400	12,800	12,700	(100)
Dedicated Credits	23,800	23,300	23,200	(100)
GFR - TB & Bangs	10,000	6,800	10,000	3,200
Beginning Nonlapsing	29,200	2,900		(2,900)
Closing Nonlapsing	(2,900)			
Lapsing Balance	(10,000)			
Total	\$689,000	\$682,600	\$685,800	\$3,200
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$466,000	\$455,800	\$449,900	(\$5,900)
In-State Travel	5,000	5,400	5,400	
Out of State Travel	9,600	10,000	10,000	
Current Expense	71,000	80,900	82,600	1,700
DP Current Expense	22,700	15,800	23,200	7,400
Pass Through	114,700	114,700	114,700	
Total	\$689,000	\$682,600	\$685,800	\$3,200
FTE	8.0	8.0	8.0	

Purpose

The aim of the Animal Health program is to prevent, or at least minimize, the transmittal of animal diseases to man and to the domestic animal population. This is done through maintaining adequate sanitation of livestock markets, feedlots and packaging plants, and cooperating with federal and private parties. Utah contains approximately 2.5 million head of livestock and six million chickens and turkeys. A severe outbreak of diseases such as scabies or brucellosis could cause large losses to the industry. A qualified staff is necessary to enforce the laws and check animals coming into the state; such a program should not be left to voluntary compliance. Tuberculosis and bangs disease have been continuing problems in the United States for some time. Utah has been tuberculosis free since 1957 and brucellosis free since 1981.

Performance Measures

1. Continuation of specific disease free programs.
2. Early detection of diseases that may become problems.

**Previous Building
Block Report**

Last session the Legislature passed an FY 1999 Supplemental appropriation of \$1,500 in Dedicated Credits and authorized the use of \$3,000 in nonlapsing funds to cover expenses from an unexpected outbreak of Equine Infectious Anemia in the Uintah basin. Funds were used to offset the additional laboratory expenses that arose from the testing of over 1,360 free-roaming horses. Over 1,000 animals were removed from the area and more than 129 positive carriers were identified and eliminated. The BLM intends to follow up on the project by gathering all the horses in the area for a second round of testing.

3.5 Agricultural Inspection

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$1,540,900. The major funding source continues to be the General Fund. When parties require state licensing/approval for registration, testing, applying, or distributing agricultural chemicals, a fee is charged (must be approved by the Legislature). Fee revenues are considered Dedicated Credits and are established to offset the program's costs.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$990,800	\$1,034,400	\$1,019,700	(\$14,700)
Federal Funds	266,800	378,800	375,200	(3,600)
Dedicated Credits	109,000	147,000	146,000	(1,000)
Pass Through	36,600			
Beginning Nonlapsing	97,600	226,200		(226,200)
Closing Nonlapsing	(226,200)			
Total	\$1,274,600	\$1,786,400	\$1,540,900	(\$245,500)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$1,021,700	\$1,148,800	\$1,119,500	(\$29,300)
In-State Travel	19,300	22,600	22,600	
Out of State Travel	8,900	10,500	10,500	
Current Expense	147,600	331,300	223,400	(107,900)
DP Current Expense	52,900	70,200	41,900	(28,300)
DP Capital Outlay	2,800			
Capital Outlay		40,000		(40,000)
Pass Through	21,400	163,000	123,000	(40,000)
Total	\$1,274,600	\$1,786,400	\$1,540,900	(\$245,500)
FTE	26.9	26.9	26.9	

*Building Block:
Noxious Weed
Control*

It is estimated that alien weeds cost Utah farmers some \$30 million to \$50 million a year. These weeds include the morning glory, Scotch thistle, medusa rye grass, leafy spurge, tamarisk, and others. The Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Environment Interim Committee has recommended that the Department of Agriculture and Food be allocated \$150,000 to implement an integrated pest management program in which biological and chemical means would be used to control noxious weeds. Although the Analyst recommends \$150,000 for this item, limited General Funds prohibit funding it at this time. Therefore the Analyst recommends consideration of this item should funding become available at a later date. (See intent language below.)

Purpose

This program performs a wide scope of activities and laws, including the Utah Feed Act, Utah Fertilizer Act, Utah Pesticide Act, Utah Nursery Act, Utah Seed Act, and Utah Noxious Weed Act (UCA 4-12 through 4-17). Fourteen district field representatives perform inspections and regulatory functions throughout the state. Seasonal personnel are employed during heavy periods of harvesting and marketing. Office personnel are utilized to handle the registrations for pesticide, fertilizer, and feed.

The EPA has adopted a groundwater protection strategy which will deny registration of certain high-risk pesticides in states without on-going groundwater management programs. Denial of these pesticides would harm Utah's agricultural producers. This program manages pesticide application to protect groundwater from contamination.

**Intent
Language**

The Analyst recommends maintaining the following intent language from HB 1, 1999 General Session, with changes as shown:

It is the intent of the Legislature that any unexpended funds from the appropriation for pesticide disposal amnesty be considered nonlapsing.

It is the intent of the Legislature that the proceeds from fertilizer assessments authorized in UCA 4-13-3 be held as nonlapsing dedicated credits, ~~to be used by the department for education about and promotion of proper fertilizer distribution, handling, and use.~~ (Deleted portion already stated in code.)

It is the intent of the Legislature that ~~funds~~ license fees collected from pesticide applicators for educational and testing materials be nonlapsing.

It is the intent of the Legislature that the funds for the Pesticide Control program be considered nonlapsing.

It is the intent of the Legislature that, ~~if House Bill 254 passes,~~ the Utah Department of Agriculture and Food apply rule making authority granted in UCA 4-16-4(1)(i) after consultation with the seed industry, the Utah Seed Council, and the Utah Crop Improvement Association. (HB 254 passed and its language has been incorporated into 4-16-4(1)(i).)

HB 1, 1999 General Session, also contained the following intent language:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Natural Resources, Agriculture and Environment Interim Committee study whether an appropriation should be made to the Department of Agriculture and Food to establish a program for biological control of weeds, and report its findings to the 2000 Natural Resources Appropriations Subcommittee.

The Interim Natural Resources, Agriculture and Environment Committee has submitted a letter to the Appropriations Subcommittee, formally requesting a \$150,000 appropriation. [A copy of the letter is attached.](#)

Performance Measures

1. Number of pesticide applicators trained and certified.
2. Percentage change in violation rates.
3. Number of processing plants utilizing product grading services of the Department.

3.6 Regulatory Services

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$1,233,200. Personal Services comprise 89% of the recommended appropriation. Per diem and other costs for the five-member Dairy Advisory Board (UCA 4-3-15) are included in the Current Expense line. Federal dollars are used for the poultry grading program. Dedicated Credits come from fees charged for inspections of any operation where food or dairy products are handled, and are used to offset the costs of inspections.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$950,200	\$968,700	\$965,200	(\$3,500)
Federal Funds	106,900	106,000	105,700	(300)
Dedicated Credits	135,500	131,200	129,300	(1,900)
Pass Through	31,000	33,000	33,000	
Beginning Nonlapsing	74,900	82,600		(82,600)
Closing Nonlapsing	(82,600)			
Total	\$1,215,900	\$1,321,500	\$1,233,200	(\$88,300)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$981,500	\$1,129,100	\$1,096,500	(\$32,600)
In-State Travel	19,600	11,400	11,400	
Out of State Travel	7,700	6,600	6,600	
Current Expense	77,400	62,400	49,300	(13,100)
DP Current Expense	93,000	49,000	36,400	(12,600)
Capital Outlay		30,000		(30,000)
Pass Through	36,700	33,000	33,000	
Total	\$1,215,900	\$1,321,500	\$1,233,200	(\$88,300)
FTE	22.5	24.5	24.5	

Purpose

Also commonly referred to as the "Food and Dairy" program, this program's prime responsibility is to ensure that Utah consumers receive a safe, wholesome, and properly labeled supply of food, fiber and other agricultural commodities. The division sponsors training, reviews labels, resolves consumer complaints, and administers an inspection program. Ten compliance officers regularly check 3,100 food establishments, 576 dairy farms, 125 milk haulers, and 40 dairy plants for compliance with laws and rules. Another seven inspectors perform egg and poultry grading functions. The division is also responsible for enforcement of Utah meat laws at the retail level. The Department's hearing officer is in this division. One inspector is assigned to administer Utah's laws relative to verification of upholstered furniture, bedding, and quilted clothing.

Performance Measures

1. Percentage change in violation rates.
2. Number of establishments and individuals in compliance with state laws and rules.

**Previous Building
Block Report**

Last session the Legislature appropriated \$20,000 in Dedicated Credits and \$50,000 in federal funds for two egg inspectors to handle increased demand for voluntary inspections in the industry. The new Delta Egg Farm pushed back their request a few months, but has now installed the equipment and is due to begin requesting inspection on a seven-day, eight-to-ten hours per day operation.

3.7 Weights and Measures

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$744,600. Personal Services comprise 76% of the recommended appropriation. The majority of funding comes from the General Fund. When an establishment requests more than one inspection over the course of one year, the Department charges for the additional inspections. Inspection fees are deposited as Dedicated Credits.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
Financing				
General Fund	\$652,700	\$675,500	\$677,200	\$1,700
Dedicated Credits	33,500	67,800	67,400	(400)
Beginning Nonlapsing	36,200	67,200		(67,200)
Closing Nonlapsing	(67,200)			
Total	\$655,200	\$810,500	\$744,600	(\$65,900)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$521,000	\$578,200	\$562,300	(\$15,900)
In-State Travel	12,700	17,500	17,500	
Out of State Travel	4,100	4,300	4,300	
Current Expense	86,300	171,300	145,900	(25,400)
DP Current Expense	31,100	19,200	14,600	(4,600)
Capital Outlay		20,000		(20,000)
Total	\$655,200	\$810,500	\$744,600	(\$65,900)
FTE	14.0	14.0	14.0	

Purpose

This program inspects weights and measure devices of nearly every kind. Areas covered include: General Inspection (e.g. scales from 0 to 999 lbs., gas pumps, package checking, scanner inspections); Large Capacity Scales (1,000 lbs. and up); LP Gas Meters; Large Capacity Petroleum and Water Meters; and the Metrology and Motor Fuel Labs.

Challenges facing the program include the increased number of gas pumps and scanners associated with population growth. The Department has tried to handle these challenges through efficiency measures.

Performance Measures

1. Percentage change in violation rates.
2. Number of establishments and individuals in compliance with state laws and rules.

4.0 Additional Information: Administration

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$5,166,400	\$5,233,000	\$5,548,000	\$5,845,800	\$5,775,700
Federal Funds	1,252,900	1,342,900	1,415,000	1,350,600	1,321,600
Dedicated Credits	252,900	258,900	310,800	381,200	375,900
GFR - Brand Inspection			5,600	5,600	5,600
GFR - TB & Bangs Disease	10,000	6,800	10,000	6,800	10,000
GFR - Wildlife Damage	7,600	7,600	2,000	13,500	13,500
Transfers	5,400	2,800	11,400		
Pass-through	56,300	52,400	67,700	33,000	33,000
Beginning Nonlapsing	573,800	429,800	547,500	725,400	
Closing Nonlapsing	(429,800)	(547,600)	(725,400)		
Lapsing Balance	(278,800)	(40,800)	(10,000)		
Total	\$6,616,700	\$6,745,800	\$7,182,600	\$8,361,900	\$7,535,300
% Change		2.0%	6.5%	16.4%	-9.9%
Programs					
Administration	\$957,300	\$965,700	\$1,066,600	\$1,451,100	\$1,169,800
Meat Inspection	1,330,700	1,382,800	1,430,000	1,552,700	1,462,400
Chemistry Laboratory	633,900	728,700	851,300	757,100	698,600
Animal Health	607,800	617,600	689,000	682,600	685,800
Agriculture Inspection	1,331,900	1,265,200	1,274,600	1,786,400	1,540,900
Regulatory Services	1,135,100	1,087,300	1,215,900	1,321,500	1,233,200
Weights and Measures	620,000	698,500	655,200	810,500	744,600
Total	\$6,616,700	\$6,745,800	\$7,182,600	\$8,361,900	\$7,535,300
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$5,135,200	\$5,331,800	\$5,645,500	\$6,105,200	\$5,952,100
In-State Travel	127,200	137,600	80,600	92,300	84,800
Out of State Travel			52,400	70,500	60,500
Current Expense	695,200	740,600	716,700	1,103,800	844,100
DP Current Expense	212,900	192,400	335,500	313,200	213,100
DP Capital Outlay		57,700	2,800		
Capital Outlay	193,900	117,000	176,300	146,200	
Pass Through	252,300	168,700	172,800	530,700	380,700
Total	\$6,616,700	\$6,745,800	\$7,182,600	\$8,361,900	\$7,535,300
FTE	126.6	126.6	126.6	129.6	129.6

4.2 Federal Funds

			FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
			Actual	Estimated	Analyst
Program:	Administration	Federal	10,186	10,400	4,300
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	4,295	4,560	4,300
Purpose:	Loan Mediation	Total	14,481	14,960	8,600
Program:	Administration	Federal	104,349	13,400	0
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Meat Inspection	Total	104,349	13,400	0
Program:	Meat Inspection	Federal	799,304	776,300	771,400
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	797,557	776,300	771,400
Purpose:	Meat Inspection	Total	1,596,861	1,552,600	1,542,800
Program:	Chemistry	Federal	85,857	46,900	46,700
Fed Agency:	EPA	State Match	85,857	46,900	46,700
Purpose:	Pesticide Enforcement	Total	171,714	93,800	93,400
Program:	Chemistry	Federal	23,200	6,000	5,600
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	23,200	6,000	5,600
Purpose:	Meat Inspection	Total	46,400	12,000	11,200
Program:	Animal Health	Federal	18,368	12,800	12,700
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	31,760	29,800	28,700
Purpose:	Meat Inspection	Total	50,128	42,600	41,400

Federal Funds (continued)

			FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
			Actual	Estimated	Analyst
Program:	Plant Industry	Federal	115,149	155,000	154,000
Fed Agency:	EPA	State Match	115,149	155,000	154,000
Purpose:	Pesticide Enforcement	Total	230,298	310,000	308,000
Program:	Plant Industry	Federal	31,221	20,000	38,800
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	7,800	5,000	9,500
Purpose:	Record Keeping	Total	39,021	25,000	48,300
Program:	Plant Industry	Federal	94,224	163,800	147,400
Fed Agency:	EPA	State Match	16,634	29,000	26,100
Purpose:	Pesticide Initiative	Total	110,858	192,800	173,500
Program:	Plant Industry	Federal	26,291	40,000	35,000
Fed Agency:	EPA	State Match	4,644	7,050	6,200
Purpose:	Pesticide Certification	Total	30,935	47,050	41,200
Program:	Food and Dairy	Federal	13,549	12,000	15,000
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Dairy Grading	Total	13,549	12,000	15,000
Program:	Food and Dairy	Federal	48,327	9,000	38,700
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	48,327	9,000	38,700
Purpose:	Meat Inspection	Total	96,654	18,000	77,400
Program:	Food and Dairy	Federal	1,690	2,000	2,000
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Egg & Poultry	Total	1,690	2,000	2,000
Program:	Food and Dairy	Federal	5,684	5,000	5,000
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Shell Egg Surveillance	Total	5,684	5,000	5,000
Program:	Food and Dairy	Federal	37,681	78,000	45,000
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Egg Products	Total	37,681	78,000	45,000
Federal Total			1,415,080	1,350,600	1,321,600
State Match Total			1,135,223	1,068,610	1,091,200
Total			\$2,550,303	\$2,419,210	\$2,412,800

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Marketing and Development

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Marketing and Development

The Marketing and Development line item encompasses seven programs: Administration, Resource Conservation Administration, Marketing and Promotion, Utah Horse Commission, Market News, Public Affairs, and Research. More detail on each program can be found in Section 3.0.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$791,200		\$791,200
GFR - Ag Resource Devel	5,400		5,400
GFR - Horse Racing	50,000		50,000
Closing Nonlapsing	(3,700)		(3,700)
Total	\$842,900	\$0	\$842,900
Programs			
Administration	\$148,000		\$148,000
Resource Conserv Admin	116,700		116,700
Marketing and Promotion	150,400		150,400
Utah Horse Commission	50,000		50,000
Market News	127,400		127,400
Public Affairs	79,400		79,400
Research	171,000		171,000
Total	\$842,900	\$0	\$842,900
FTE	7.5		7.5

3.0 Programs: Marketing and Development

3.1 Administration

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$148,000, funded entirely from the General Fund. Personal Services comprise 78% of the recommended appropriation. Current Expense includes the printing of the annual statistical report and contracts with the USDA Statistical Reporting Service. The decrease in General Funds between FY 99 and FY 00 is due to a transfer of \$260,000 in pass-through costs to the Resource Conservation program.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$404,700	\$144,400	\$148,000	\$3,600
Beginning Nonlapsing	19,800	1,000		(1,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(1,000)			
Total	\$423,500	\$145,400	\$148,000	\$2,600
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$143,700	\$116,700	\$115,100	(\$1,600)
In-State Travel	6,700	2,300	2,200	(100)
Out of State Travel	6,200	4,900	4,900	
Current Expense	12,700	6,200	9,200	3,000
DP Current Expense	18,000	5,300	6,600	1,300
Pass Through	236,200	10,000	10,000	
Total	\$423,500	\$145,400	\$148,000	\$2,600
FTE	2.0	2.0	2.0	

Purpose

This program has several responsibilities:

- Provide department-level direction to the soil and water conservation functions (Soil Conservation Commission / Districts, Environmental Quality, and Loan Programs);
- Serve as staff to the Agricultural Advisory Board;
- Serve as Department liaison to the Resource Development Coordination Committee (RDCC);
- Serve as Department liaison to the Office of Comprehensive Emergency Management;
- Manage the Agricultural Related Resource Inventory and Monitoring System (RIMS); and
- Administer the Department's research grant program.
- Furnish statistical data to the Federal government and other interested parties about Utah agriculture.

Intent Language

The Analyst recommends maintaining the following intent language from HB 1, 1999 General Session:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the appropriation of \$100,000 for Agribusiness be nonlapsing.

This one-time appropriation was made in FY 1993. Approximately \$79,000 remain unexpended, although most of these funds have been committed.

**Performance
Measures**

1. Keep non-performing loans to a minimum
2. Maintain a high level of accuracy of information in statistical reports.

3.2 Resource Conservation Administration

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$116,700. Funding from the General Fund Restricted - Resource Development fund is used to cover costs of technical support to the Agricultural Resource Development Loan (ARDL) program. Personal Services comprise 80% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$111,700	\$114,600	\$115,000	\$400
GFR - Ag Res Devel	5,400	5,400	5,400	
Beginning Nonlapsing		4,000		(4,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(4,000)		(3,700)	(3,700)
Total	\$113,100	\$124,000	\$116,700	(\$7,300)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$93,600	\$94,300	\$93,100	(\$1,200)
In-State Travel	3,500	4,400	4,400	
Out of State Travel	1,700	2,400	2,400	
Current Expense	8,300	17,600	10,200	(7,400)
DP Current Expense	6,000	5,300	6,600	1,300
Total	\$113,100	\$124,000	\$116,700	(\$7,300)
FTE	2.0	2.0	2.0	

Purpose This program complies with the Department's mandate (UCA 4-2-2(1)(o)) to "assist the Soil Conservation Commission in the administration of [the Soil Conservation Commission Act] and administer and disburse any funds which are available for the purpose of assisting soil conservation districts." In other words, this program provides accounting and technical support to the Soil Conservation Commission.

Intent Language In all even-numbered years elections are held in each of the 38 conservation districts. Funds are provided each year, but are held during non-election years in a nonlapsing account. The Analyst recommends continuing the following intent language from HB1, 1999 General Session:

It is the intent of the Legislature that funding approved for Soil Conservation District elections be considered nonlapsing and be spent only during even-numbered years when elections take place.

Performance Measures 1. Adequate support and coordination at the quarterly commission meetings.

3.3 Marketing and Promotion

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$150,400, funded entirely from the General Fund. Personal Services comprise 35% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$148,700	\$150,300	\$150,400	\$100
Beginning Nonlapsing	93,000	96,000		(96,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(96,000)			
Total	\$145,700	\$246,300	\$150,400	(\$95,900)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$50,900	\$55,900	\$52,200	(\$3,700)
In-State Travel	1,200	1,200	1,100	(100)
Out of State Travel	2,000	2,200	2,200	
Current Expense	82,900	83,000	80,600	(2,400)
DP Current Expense	6,700	8,600	3,300	(5,300)
Capital Outlay		5,000		(5,000)
Pass Through	2,000	90,400	11,000	(79,400)
Total	\$145,700	\$246,300	\$150,400	(\$95,900)
FTE	1.0	1.0	1.0	

Purpose This program is charged with promoting Utah agricultural products. Utah's agricultural industries benefit from expanded presence in domestic and foreign markets. There is also a potential for increased usage of Utah grown or fabricated products as raw ingredients in Utah's businesses.

- Performance Measures**
1. Number of Utah agribusinesses receiving federal matching funds to develop international markets.
 2. Number of companies participating in the "Product of Utah" program.

3.4 Utah Horse Commission

Recommendation The Analyst recommends an appropriation of \$50,000 from the General Fund Restricted - Horse Racing Account. This is the same amount as appropriated in prior years

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
GFR - Horse Racing	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	
Lapsing Balance	(22,400)			
Total	\$27,600	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$800	\$1,300	\$1,300	
In-State Travel	2,200	2,200	2,200	
Current Expense	900	900	900	
Pass Through	23,700	45,600	45,600	
Total	\$27,600	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0

Purpose The five-member Utah Horse Racing Commission was created under the Utah Horse Regulation Act (UCA 4-38). The commission provides a regulatory structure, administers rules and regulations, issues licenses, collects license fees, sanctions tracks and pays for approved expenses such as:

- Stewards (Commission may delegate three Stewards at each race meet to enforce rules);
- Veterinarians;
- Blood and urine testing;
- Assistance with insurance and other items mandated by the Act.

License fees are paid by participants in racing and other activities associated with racetracks. Collections are deposited into the GFR - Horse Racing Account and are dedicated to financing mandated regulatory responsibilities

- Performance Measures**
1. Instances of illegal substances used in horse races.
 2. Number of accident-free races for both horse and jockey.

3.5 Market News

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends an appropriation of \$127,400, funded entirely from the General Fund. Personal Services comprise 47% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$125,900	\$128,000	\$127,400	(\$600)
Beginning Nonlapsing		400		(400)
Closing Nonlapsing	(400)			
Total	\$125,500	\$128,400	\$127,400	(\$1,000)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$59,700	\$60,800	\$59,600	(\$1,200)
In-State Travel	1,100	1,100	1,100	
Out of State Travel	500	600	600	
Current Expense	16,500	18,900	19,100	200
Pass Through	47,700	47,000	47,000	
Total	\$125,500	\$128,400	\$127,400	(\$1,000)
FTE	1.5	1.5	1.5	

Purpose

This program assists farmers and ranchers in Utah to obtain higher prices by providing the latest prices on livestock, hay, and grain from several markets throughout the state through radio, newspapers, and newsletters. It also provides prices from other states throughout the nation to compare with Utah. It provides the latest in futures prices. The information obtained from the office is sent to other offices throughout the nation for dissemination, as well as kept on file in the Department for reference by farmers and ranchers in Utah.

Subscribers to the newsletter pay \$18 per year for the service. These funds are considered reimbursement of expenses (mainly postage), and in the past have not been part of the revenue coming into the program. However, the Analyst recommends the Department begin reporting these funds as Dedicated Credits for next year's budget cycle.

Performance Measures

1. Number of subscribers.
2. Year-round coverage of Utah's major livestock auctions.

3.6 Public Affairs

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends an appropriation of \$79,400, funded entirely from the General Fund. Personal Services comprise 67% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$77,700	\$79,300	\$79,400	\$100
Beginning Nonlapsing	3,600	8,100		(8,100)
Closing Nonlapsing	(8,100)			
Lapsing Balance	(3,600)			
Total	\$69,600	\$87,400	\$79,400	(\$8,000)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$53,300	\$54,300	\$53,500	(\$800)
In-State Travel	100	1,500	1,500	
Out of State Travel	800	1,500	1,500	
Current Expense	12,300	21,500	19,600	(1,900)
DP Current Expense	3,100	8,600	3,300	(5,300)
Total	\$69,600	\$87,400	\$79,400	(\$8,000)
FTE	1.0	1.0	1.0	

Purpose

The Public Affairs program serves as a liaison between Agriculture and the general public, through such media as news releases, publications, speeches, radio and television, annual reports, exhibits, World-Wide Web, etc. They seek to recognize and promote the positive aspects of Utah agriculture. Public Information also coordinates educational programs about agriculture throughout the State in schools and at fairs. The "Agriculture in the Classroom" program is coordinated under this program. "Utah Agriculture and Me" is a handbook used in elementary schools to teach children the sources of food, as well as provide other agricultural information.

Performance Measures

1. Timely release of information to the public.
2. Number of individuals provided "Ag in the Classroom" information.

3.7 Research

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends an appropriation of \$171,000 for the Department's research projects.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
Financing				
General Fund	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$171,000	
Total	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$0
Expenditures				
Pass Through	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$171,000	
Total	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$171,000	\$0

Purpose

Historically, the Department has been allocated funding which it has used to finance its research priorities at the state's major universities, provide seed money for research projects, and match research dollars provided by others.

Performance Measures

The following is a list of current research projects:

Project	Agency	Length Expected	Amount Requested	Department Funded
Ag in the Classroom	USU	Ongoing	\$5,000	\$5,000
Ag Enhancement	Box Elder Co.	1 year	13,300	13,500
Bird Monitoring	USU	3 years	1,000	1,000
Codling Moth	Horticulture	1 year	4,000	4,000
Crayfish	USU	2 years	19,300	18,000
CRP Maintenance	USU	1 year	6,200	6,200
Enterprise Budget	USU	Ongoing	4,000	4,000
Horse Ova/Eva	USU	2 years	20,000	20,000
Rabbit Production	Kenerex Farm	1 year	9,500	9,500
Round Heart	BYU	1 year	18,600	10,000
Swainsonine	USU	2 years	20,000	18,000
Utah Fruit Research	USU/BYU	10 years	15,000	15,000
Vesicular Stomatitis Virus	USU	1 year	14,000	No
Tolerance Biocontrol Fung	USU	2 years	13,700	On Hold
Open Space	USU	Unknown	7,500	On Hold
Lactating Cows	BYU	1 year	10,500	No
Holstein Cows	BYU	1 year	20,000	No
			\$201,600	\$124,200

4.0 Additional Information: Marketing and Development

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$1,014,900	\$1,029,500	\$1,039,700	\$787,600	\$791,200
Federal Funds	1,300				
Dedicated Credits	100				
GFR - Ag Resource Dev	1,200	4,500	5,400	5,400	5,400
GFR - Horse Racing	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
Transfers	16,400				
Beginning Nonlapsing	149,300	134,500	116,400	109,500	
Closing Nonlapsing	(134,500)	(121,600)	(109,500)		(3,700)
Lapsing Balance	(28,700)	(48,300)	(26,000)		
Total	\$1,070,000	\$1,048,600	\$1,076,000	\$952,500	\$842,900
		-2.0%	2.6%	-11.5%	-11.5%
Programs					
Administration	\$448,500	\$403,600	\$423,500	\$145,400	\$148,000
Resource Conserv Admin	104,300	114,900	113,100	124,000	116,700
Marketing and Promotion	137,000	143,000	145,700	246,300	150,400
Utah Horse Commission	31,100	23,600	27,600	50,000	50,000
Market News	118,100	124,000	125,500	128,400	127,400
Public Affairs	60,000	68,500	69,600	87,400	79,400
Research	171,000	171,000	171,000	171,000	171,000
Total	\$1,070,000	\$1,048,600	\$1,076,000	\$952,500	\$842,900
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$350,200	\$353,200	\$402,000	\$383,300	\$374,800
In-State Travel	27,400	27,200	14,800	12,700	12,500
Out of State Travel			11,200	11,600	11,600
Current Expense	135,000	136,500	133,600	148,100	139,600
DP Current Expense	58,000	44,000	33,800	27,800	19,800
Capital Outlay				5,000	
Pass Through	499,400	487,700	480,600	364,000	284,600
Total	\$1,070,000	\$1,048,600	\$1,076,000	\$952,500	\$842,900
FTE	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Agricultural Loans

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Agricultural Loans

The Department administers two types of loans:

- The Agriculture Resource Development Fund.** Funding comes primarily through sales tax receipts, but other funding sources include loan repayments, interest, and money appropriated by the Legislature. Loans may be made for rangeland improvement, watershed protection, flood prevention, soil and water conservation, and energy efficient farming projects. The Agriculture Resource Development Loan (ARDL) provides low-interest (3 percent annual interest plus a one-time four percent technical assistance fee) loans.
- The Utah Rural Rehabilitation Fund.** Established from a one-time federal appropriation in 1937, this revolving loan fund is replenished by repayments and low interest rates. Interest rates are set by the Agricultural Advisory Board (4-10-3). This fund received a \$1 million supplemental appropriation in 1993. In essence, the Rural Rehabilitation Program is a lender of last resort to farmers who represent too high a risk to acquire financing from conventional lending institutions. Assets may be used for real estate loans, farm operating loans, youth loans, educational loans, and irrigation / water conservation loans.

During the 1999 legislative session, SB 85 authorized the Department to transfer up to \$2 million from the Agriculture Resource Development Fund to the Rural Rehabilitation Fund. The entire \$2 million has been transferred.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
GFR - Ag Resource Devel	\$296,100		\$296,100
Designated Sales Tax	500,000		500,000
Utah Rural Rehab Loan	18,000		18,000
Total	\$814,100	\$0	\$814,100
Programs			
ARDL Fund	\$500,000		\$500,000
Agriculture Loan Program	314,100		314,100
Total	\$814,100	\$0	\$814,100
FTE	5.0		5.0

3.0 Programs: Agricultural Loans

3.1 Agriculture Resource Development Loan (ARDL) Fund

Recommendation UCA 59-12-103(5)(b) requires that sales and use tax revenue generated by a 1/8% rate be used to deposit \$500,000 annually into the Agriculture Resource Development Fund. The statute creates annual growth for the fund. The Rural Rehabilitation Fund does not have a similar source of outside revenue for growth.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
Designated Sales Tax	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	
Total	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0
Expenditures				
Pass Through	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	
Total	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$0

Purpose This diverted sales tax is deposited directly into the ARDL fund.

Performance Measures The following two pages contain accounting information for the two loan funds.

Previous Building Block Report During the 1999 legislative session, SB 85 authorized the Department to transfer up to \$2 million from the Agricultural Resource Development Fund to the Rural Rehabilitation Fund. The entire \$2 million has been transferred. There are loan applications in process in the amount of \$1 million to date, and other applications are being reviewed to utilize the remaining funds.

Agriculture Resource Development Loan (ARDL) Fund			
Operating Revenues and Expenses	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimated	FY 2001 Analyst
Revenues:			
Interest on Loans	\$493,600	\$490,000	\$490,000
Other Revenue	908,600	900,000	900,000
Total Operating Revenues	<u>\$1,402,200</u>	<u>\$1,390,000</u>	<u>\$1,390,000</u>
Expenses:			
Personal Services	\$202,700	\$214,500	\$213,000
Travel	5,200	8,600	8,600
Current Expense	18,700	61,300	62,800
Data Processing	1,300	9,000	9,000
Depreciation	2,700	2,700	2,700
Total Expenses	<u>\$230,600</u>	<u>\$296,100</u>	<u>\$296,100</u>
Total Operating Profit (Loss)	<u>\$1,171,600</u>	<u>\$1,093,900</u>	<u>\$1,093,900</u>
Transfer to Resource Conser. and Devel.	(5,400)	(5,400)	(5,400)
Transfer to Resource Conservation	(227,700)	(229,000)	(229,000)
Net Income	<u>\$938,500</u>	<u>\$859,500</u>	<u>\$859,500</u>
Balance Sheet			
Assets:			
Cash	\$270,200	\$1,157,400	\$222,000
Accounts Receivable	16,222,100	17,500,000	17,500,000
Accrued Interest	253,800		
Due from Other Funds	6,500		
Other Investments	6,265,600	5,207,800	7,005,400
Fixed Assets	10,800	8,100	5,400
Total Assets	<u>\$23,029,000</u>	<u>\$23,873,300</u>	<u>\$24,732,800</u>
Liabilities:			
Accounts Payable	\$15,200		
Contributed Working Capital (Equity)*	15,782,600	15,782,600	15,782,600
Retained Earnings (Equity)	7,231,200	8,090,700	8,950,200
Total Liabilities	<u>\$23,029,000</u>	<u>\$23,873,300</u>	<u>\$24,732,800</u>
New Loans Closed	\$3,093,300		
Anticipated Principal Payments		\$3,009,000	
*FY 1999 reflects a \$2 million decrease over FY 1998 due to SB 85.			

Rural Rehabilitation Loan Fund			
Operating Revenues and Expenses	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimated	FY 2001 Analyst
Revenues:			
Interest on Loans	\$141,400	\$145,000	\$145,000
Other Revenue	49,900	35,000	35,000
Total Operating Revenues	<u>\$191,300</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>	<u>\$180,000</u>
Expenses:			
Personal Services	\$15,700	\$14,100	\$14,100
Travel		600	600
Current Expense	2,200	2,300	2,600
Data Processing	100	1,000	700
Total Expenses	<u>\$18,000</u>	<u>\$18,000</u>	<u>\$18,000</u>
Total Operating Profit (Loss)	<u>\$173,300</u>	<u>\$162,000</u>	<u>\$162,000</u>
Transfers Out	0	0	0
Net Income	<u>\$173,300</u>	<u>\$162,000</u>	<u>\$162,000</u>
Balance Sheet			
Assets:			
Cash	\$215,700	\$266,800	\$249,400
Accounts Receivable	3,685,700	3,617,200	3,480,700
Accrued Interest	50,800		
Other Investments	1,871,000	2,100,000	2,415,900
Total Assets	<u>\$5,823,200</u>	<u>\$5,984,000</u>	<u>\$6,146,000</u>
Liabilities:			
Accounts Payable	\$1,300		
Contributed Working Capital (Equity)*	4,254,600	4,254,700	4,254,700
Retained Earnings (Equity)	1,567,300	1,729,300	1,891,300
Total Liabilities	<u>\$5,823,200</u>	<u>\$5,984,000</u>	<u>\$6,146,000</u>
New Loans Closed	\$585,000		
Anticipated Principal Payments		\$416,400	
*FY 1999 reflects a \$2 million increase over FY 1998 due to SB 85.			

3.2 Loan Programs

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$314,100, which does not include any new state funds. This program is funded by repayment of interest to the two loan funds. All expenditures are exclusively for the administration expenses of the loans. Personal Services comprise 73% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
GFR - Ag Resource Dev	\$296,100	\$296,100	\$296,100	
Utah Rural Rehab Loan	18,000	18,000	18,000	
Lapsing Balance	(65,500)			
Total	\$248,600	\$314,100	\$314,100	\$0
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$218,200	\$229,800	\$228,200	(\$1,600)
In-State Travel	4,100	5,400	5,400	
Out of State Travel	1,200	2,900	2,900	
Current Expense	21,000	63,400	65,100	1,700
DP Current Expense	1,400	9,900	9,800	(100)
DP Capital Outlay	2,700	2,700	2,700	
Total	\$248,600	\$314,100	\$314,100	\$0
FTE	5.0	5.0	5.0	

Purpose

This program is responsible for the administration of the two loan fund programs.

4.0 Additional Information: Agricultural Loans

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
GFR - Ag Resource Dev	\$250,900	\$296,100	\$296,100	\$296,100	\$296,100
Designated Sales Tax			500,000	500,000	500,000
Utah Rural Rehab Loan	16,900	18,000	18,000	18,000	18,000
Lapsing Balance		(71,500)	(65,500)		
Total	\$267,800	\$242,600	\$748,600	\$814,100	\$814,100
% Change		-9.4%	208.6%	8.7%	0.0%
Programs					
ARDL Fund			\$500,000	\$500,000	\$500,000
Agriculture Loan Program	267,800	242,600	248,600	314,100	314,100
Total	\$267,800	\$242,600	\$748,600	\$814,100	\$814,100
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$197,900	\$208,200	\$218,200	\$229,800	\$228,200
In-State Travel	3,900	4,600	4,100	5,400	5,400
Out of State Travel			1,200	2,900	2,900
Current Expense	54,900	18,700	21,000	63,400	65,100
DP Current Expense	9,700	9,800	1,400	9,900	9,800
DP Capital Outlay	1,400	1,300	2,700	2,700	2,700
Pass Through			500,000	500,000	500,000
Total	\$267,800	\$242,600	\$748,600	\$814,100	\$814,100
FTE	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Brand Inspection

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Brand Inspection

The Brand Inspection Program administers the Utah Livestock Brand and Anti-theft Act (UCA 4-24) under guidance of the seven-member Livestock Brand Board. This line item consists of just one program.

The primary funding source is the General Fund Restricted - Utah Livestock Brand and Anti-Theft Fund. Revenue to the account comes from fees on brand inspections, certificates, recordings, transfers, travel permits, the sale of brand books, and other fees charged under provisions of this Act and the Domesticated Elk Act (UCA 4-39). Traditionally, during the brand renewal year (every fifth year), the account has grown, then been drawn down during non-renewal years.

New to the program is the responsibility of licensing, monitoring and regulating the elk farming laws. Currently, there are 22 elk farms and thee hunting parks (\$300 fee) that are licensed throughout the state. The 1999 Legislature passed SB 45 which legalized the hunting of domesticated elk and required the Department to make rules governing the possession and transportation of carcasses.

The General Fund has also been used to finance this program.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$387,900		\$387,900
GFR - Brand Inspection	632,700	80,000	712,700
Total	\$1,020,600	\$80,000	\$1,100,600
Programs			
Brand Inspection	\$1,020,600		\$1,020,600
<i>Brand Renewal</i>		\$80,000	80,000
Total	\$1,020,600	\$80,000	\$1,100,600
FTE		22.5	22.5

2.0 Issues: Brand Inspection

2.1 Brand and Earmark Renewal

The Department is mandated by law (UCA 4-24-5 and 4-24-7) to renew every livestock brand and earmark on record every five years and produce a brand book for general distribution. During the year 2000 the Department will see that every livestock person be given the opportunity to renew his/her brand or mark for an additional five years. At the end of the renewal process, a "brand book" will be published. See Item 3.1.

GFR - Brand Inspection \$80,000

3.0 Programs: Brand Inspection

3.1 Brand Inspection

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends this program's funding level at \$1,100,600 funded from two sources: the General Fund and the General Fund Restricted - Utah Livestock Brand and Anti-Theft Fund. Personal Services comprise 74% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$383,300	\$396,500	\$387,900	(\$8,600)
GFR - Brand Inspection	626,400	675,600	712,700	37,100
Beginning Nonlapsing	13,200	16,200		(16,200)
Closing Nonlapsing	(16,200)			
Lapsing Balance	(26,500)			
Total	\$980,200	\$1,088,300	\$1,100,600	\$12,300
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$761,700	\$804,500	\$812,200	\$7,700
In-State Travel	36,700	48,100	48,100	
Out of State Travel	4,000	5,300	5,300	
Current Expense	167,300	201,600	215,100	13,500
DP Current Expense	10,500	28,800	19,900	(8,900)
Total	\$980,200	\$1,088,300	\$1,100,600	\$12,300
FTE	22.5	22.5	22.5	

*Building Block:
Brand and Earmark
Renewal*

The Department is mandated by law (UCA 4-24-5 and 4-24-7) to renew every livestock brand and earmark on record every five years and produce a brand book for general distribution. During the year 2000 the Department will see that every livestock person be given the opportunity to renew his/her brand or mark for an additional five years. At the end of the renewal process, a "brand book" will be published.

GFR - Brand Inspection \$80,000

Purpose

The Brand Inspection program was established to keep the loss of livestock through theft and stray to a minimum. This is accomplished through enforcement of the brand and stray laws by field inspectors who check all cattle and horses prior to sale, slaughter, or movement across state lines. The program maintains an effective brand recording system so that ownership of animals can be readily determined through a master brand identification book.

Most of the FTEs in the program are part-time employees. There are 53 individuals who work at various parts throughout the state. Their combined hours represent 20.5 FTEs. The other two FTEs include the program director and a technician. Part-time inspectors drive their own vehicles and have their mileage reimbursed.

**Performance
Measures**

1. Number of inspections issued.
2. Number of strays returned to their owners.
3. Timely issuance of registration certificates, renewals, and books.

**Previous Building
Block Report**

As the year 2000 is a brand renewal year (every fifth year is), the 1999 Legislature authorized the use of an additional \$30,000 in revenue from the GFR - Brand Inspection account. The Department started the brand renewal process in January 2000.

4.0 Additional Information: Brand Inspection

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$365,000	\$371,800	\$383,300	\$396,500	\$387,900
Dedicated Credits	100				
GFR - Brand Inspection	568,200	607,900	626,400	675,600	712,700
Beginning Nonlapsing	33,900	9,300	13,200	16,200	
Closing Nonlapsing	(9,300)	(13,200)	(16,200)		
Lapsing Balance	(19,500)	(21,600)	(26,500)		
Total	\$938,400	\$954,200	\$980,200	\$1,088,300	\$1,100,600
% Change		1.7%	2.7%	11.0%	1.1%
Programs					
Brand Inspection	\$938,400	\$954,200	\$980,200	\$1,088,300	\$1,100,600
Total	\$938,400	\$954,200	\$980,200	\$1,088,300	\$1,100,600
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$716,200	\$742,400	\$761,700	\$804,500	\$812,200
In-State Travel	45,300	45,200	36,700	48,100	48,100
Out of State Travel			4,000	5,300	5,300
Current Expense	167,300	145,100	167,300	201,600	215,100
DP Current Expense	9,600	21,500	10,500	28,800	19,900
Total	\$938,400	\$954,200	\$980,200	\$1,088,300	\$1,100,600
FTE	21.9	22.5	22.5	22.5	22.5

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Predatory Animal Control

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Predatory Animal Control

The Predatory Animal Control Program administers the Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Act (UCA 4-23) under guidance of the nine-member Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Board. The Commissioner and the Director of the Division of Wildlife Resources serve as the board's chair and vice chair. This line item consists of just one program.

The primary funding source is the General Fund, although a significant amount of funding comes from the General Fund Restricted - Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Fund. Revenue to the account comes from annual predator control fees imposed on sheep, sheep fleece, goats, cattle and turkeys owned by people the program is designed to protect. However, some of the revenue from sheep and fleece goes to fund the Sheep Promotion program (see Sheep Promotion Line Item).

UCA 4-23-9 requires the Department to request General Funds equal to 120% of the money deposited in the Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Account during the previous fiscal year. Deposits during FY 1999 totaled \$261,243. However, the Legislature has been appropriating approximately 240% in recent years. In addition, the Division of Wildlife Resources must request General Funds equal to 25% of the money deposited in the restricted account. Those funds are transferred to the Department of Agriculture.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$616,000		\$616,000
GFR - Wildlife Damage	433,000		433,000
Transfers	65,300		65,300
Total	\$1,114,300	\$0	\$1,114,300
Programs			
Predatory Animal Control	\$1,114,300		\$1,114,300
Total	\$1,114,300	\$0	\$1,114,300
FTE	17.0		17.0

3.0 Programs: Predatory Animal Control

3.1 Predatory Animal Control

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$1,114,300 funded from three sources: the General Fund, the General Fund Restricted - Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Fund, and a transfer from the Division of Wildlife Resources. Personal Services comprise 55% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$606,600	\$619,600	\$616,000	(\$3,600)
Dedicated Credits	32,000			
GFR - Wildlife Damage	426,000	435,200	433,000	(2,200)
Transfers	75,000	94,500	65,300	(29,200)
Beginning Nonlapsing	133,200	203,400		(203,400)
Closing Nonlapsing	(203,400)			
Lapsing Balance	(216,800)			
Total	\$852,600	\$1,352,700	\$1,114,300	(\$238,400)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$631,000	\$648,600	\$611,900	(\$36,700)
In-State Travel	40,600	49,000	49,000	
Out of State Travel		2,000	2,000	
Current Expense	181,000	558,100	441,400	(116,700)
DP Current Expense		20,000	10,000	(10,000)
Capital Outlay		75,000		(75,000)
Total	\$852,600	\$1,352,700	\$1,114,300	(\$238,400)
FTE	17.0	17.0	17.0	

Purpose This program is a joint effort between the USDA and the state Department of Agriculture and Food. Funds appropriated by the Legislature have never reflected federal expenditures, but the program works closely with the Federal Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).

The objective of the program is to minimize livestock losses to predators on private, state and federal land. Offending predators are removed. Every year Utah wool growers lose about 10 percent of their animals to predators. Cattle ranchers suffer losses to coyotes, mountain lions, bears, and other predators. Annual livestock losses to predators cost an estimated \$3 million even with the program in place

Intent Language The Analyst recommends maintaining the following two items of intent language from HB 1, 1999 General Session:

It is the intent of the Legislature that funds appropriated to Predatory Animal Control be nonlapsing.

It is the intent of the Legislature that the additional \$20,000 of revenue provided from the Division of Wildlife Resources' General Fund may be disbursed to county predator control programs, only as a one-to-one match with county funds. It is also the intent of the Legislature that these funds be nonlapsing.

The Department is in the process of establishing contracts since they verified the counties were able to meet the matching requirement.

**Performance
Measures**

1. Number of domestic animals killed by predatory animals.
2. Amount of money lost due to damage by predatory animals.
3. Timely issuance of registration certificates, renewals, and books.

4.0 Additional Information: Predatory Animal Control

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$771,000	\$593,000	\$606,600	\$619,600	\$616,000
Federal Funds	1,100				
Dedicated Credits	51,000		32,000		
GFR - Wildlife Damage	410,600	416,900	426,000	435,200	433,000
Transfers		39,300	75,000	94,500	65,300
Beginning Nonlapsing		51,000	133,200	203,400	
Closing Nonlapsing	(51,100)	(133,200)	(203,400)		
Lapsing Balance	(271,700)	(70,700)	(216,800)		
Total	\$910,900	\$896,300	\$852,600	\$1,352,700	\$1,114,300
% Change		-1.6%	-4.9%	58.7%	-17.6%
Programs					
Predatory Animal Control	\$910,900	\$896,300	\$852,600	\$1,352,700	\$1,114,300
Total	\$910,900	\$896,300	\$852,600	\$1,352,700	\$1,114,300
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$556,200	\$584,800	\$631,000	\$648,600	\$611,900
In-State Travel	42,100	42,100	40,600	49,000	49,000
Out of State Travel				2,000	2,000
Current Expense	224,500	187,400	181,000	558,100	441,400
DP Current Expense	3,200			20,000	10,000
DP Capital Outlay	84,900				
Capital Outlay		82,000		75,000	
Total	\$910,900	\$896,300	\$852,600	\$1,352,700	\$1,114,300
FTE	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0	17.0

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Auction Market Veterinarians

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Auction Market Veterinarians

The Department pays veterinarians to test all animals that pass through livestock markets. Funds come from fees paid by livestock sellers and are deposited as Dedicated Credits to cover the expenses of the program. Benefits to the livestock industry in selling through an inspected market more than offset the cost of operating the program. If the Utah markets were put on unapproved status, more field work would be required on the farm, feed lots and slaughter plants, as well as increasing industry costs in meeting interstate regulations. As a side benefit, when cattle are brought to livestock markets, an opportunity is provided to survey the health conditions of the marketing area.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
Dedicated Credits	\$60,000		\$60,000
Total	\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000
Programs			
Auction Market Vets	\$60,000		\$60,000
Total	\$60,000	\$0	\$60,000

3.0 Programs: Auction Market Veterinarians

3.1 Auction Market Veterinarians

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$60,000 funded entirely from Dedicated Credits. These funds are used to pay for the services of veterinarians. There are no FTEs in the program.

	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimated	FY 2001 Analyst	Est/Analyst Difference
Financing				
Dedicated Credits	\$78,200	\$60,000	\$60,000	
Beginning Nonlapsing	300	1,600		(1,600)
Closing Nonlapsing	(1,600)			
Total	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000	(\$1,600)
Expenditures				
Current Expense	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000	(\$1,600)
Total	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000	(\$1,600)

Purpose There are ten auction markets held throughout the state each week. The markets include the following: Smithfield, Weber, Ogden, Roosevelt, Spanish Fork, Utah Livestock Auction, Delta, Cedar City, Richfield, and Salina. All animals which pass through the market are inspected by a veterinarian. The veterinarian receives \$170 from the Department of Agriculture and Food for performing this service. The auction pays this fee to the Department. In addition, the veterinarian is paid directly by the livestock producers for blood tests, pregnancy tests, and Bangs vaccinations.

Intent Language The Analyst recommends maintaining the following intent language from HB 1, 1999 General Session:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Auction Market Veterinarian collection be nonlapsing.

4.0 Additional Information: Auction Market Veterinarians

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
Financing					
Dedicated Credits	\$80,300	\$86,100	\$78,200	\$60,000	\$60,000
Beginning Nonlapsing	3,700	2,900	300	1,600	
Closing Nonlapsing	(2,900)	(300)	(1,600)		
Total	\$81,100	\$88,700	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000
% Change		9.4%	-13.3%	-19.9%	-2.6%
Programs					
Auction Market Vets	\$81,100	\$88,700	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000
Total	\$81,100	\$88,700	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000
Expenditures					
Current Expense	\$81,100	\$88,700	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000
Total	\$81,100	\$88,700	\$76,900	\$61,600	\$60,000

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Sheep Promotion

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Sheep Promotion

This program administers the provisions of UCA 4-23-8. Like the Predatory Animal Control Program, the program is funded through the General Fund Restricted - Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Account. The Commissioner is authorized to expend an amount up to \$0.16 per head each year from fee proceeds. Currently the expenditure rate is set at \$0.16. Funds must be used to promote, advance, and protect sheep interests in the state.

All costs to promote sheep interests must be deducted from the total revenue collected before calculating the annual budget request to be made by Wildlife Resources (see Predatory Animal Control line item).

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
GFR - Wildlife Damage	\$50,000		\$50,000
Total	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000
Programs			
Sheep Promotion	\$50,000		\$50,000
Total	\$50,000	\$0	\$50,000

3.0 Programs: Sheep Promotion

3.1 Sheep Promotion

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a budget of \$50,000 funded entirely from the General Fund Restricted - Agricultural and Wildlife Damage Prevention Account. The Department will be authorized to spend up to the appropriated amount, but will be limited to the actual amount collected. There are no FTEs in the program.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
GFR - Wildlife Damage	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	
Lapsing Balance	(26,100)			
Total	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0
Expenditures				
Pass Through	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000	
Total	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$0

Purpose

The Department, by law, contracts with the Utah Woolgrowers Association to conduct promotional and educational programs. Adult and youth "Make it With Wool" contests are held throughout the state to promote the use of wool as a clothing product. Statistical data and market information are presented to all wool growers comparing market price of lambs in Utah with other areas of the country so that the best market decisions might be made. Department representatives meet with wool growers at regular meetings to help stimulate and strengthen sheep and wool producer programs by discussing problems facing the industry and the alternatives necessary to solve them.

4.0 Additional Information: Sheep Promotion

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
Financing					
GFR - Wildlife Damage	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000	\$50,000
Lapsing Balance	(14,900)	(1,000)	(26,100)		
Total	\$35,100	\$49,000	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000
% Change		39.6%	-51.2%	109.2%	0.0%
Programs					
Sheep Promotion	\$35,100	\$49,000	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000
Total	\$35,100	\$49,000	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000
Expenditures					
Pass Through	\$35,100	\$49,000	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000
Total	\$35,100	\$49,000	\$23,900	\$50,000	\$50,000

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Soil Conservation Commission

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Soil Conservation Commission

The purpose of this line item is to provide funding for the per diems of seven Soil Conservation District supervisors who sit on the Soil Conservation Commission (UCA 4-18-4).

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$10,300		\$10,300
Total	\$10,300	\$0	\$10,300
Programs			
Soil Conserv Commission	\$10,300		\$10,300
Total	\$10,300	\$0	\$10,300

3.0 Programs: Soil Conservation Commission

3.1 Soil Conservation Commission

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a budget of \$10,300 funded entirely from the General Fund. The funding will pay for seven Soil Conservation District supervisors to attend six meetings of the Soil Conservation Commission. There are no FTEs in the program.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	
Total	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$0
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$2,600	\$3,200	\$3,200	
In-State Travel	7,500	6,900	6,900	
Current Expense	200	200	200	
Total	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$0

Purpose There are 38 Soil Conservation Districts in Utah, each having five private, locally elected, individuals serving as supervisors, whose purpose is to help ensure the wise development, utilization, and protection of the state's soil and water resources. These 38 districts are political subdivisions of the state, as established in UCA 17A-3-805.

4.0 Additional Information: Soil Conservation Commission

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300
Total	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300
% Change		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Programs					
Soil Conserv Commission	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300
Total	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$2,600	\$3,800	\$2,600	\$3,200	\$3,200
In-State Travel	7,000	6,300	7,500	6,900	6,900
Current Expense	700	200	200	200	200
Total	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300	\$10,300

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Grain Inspection

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Grain Inspection

Grain inspection services are provided under authority of UCA 4-2-2, and under designated authority by the Federal Grain Inspection Service. The volume of work is influenced each year by a number of factors among which are weather conditions, governmental crop programs, and marketing situations. For example, in FY 1999, because of low market demand, this program experienced a shortfall in Dedicated Credits. To compensate, the Legislature authorized intent language allowing unrestricted funds to be transferred from other line items. The Department transferred \$8,000 in General Funds and \$5,200 in nonlapsing funds from the Marketing and Development line item.

Normally the program is funded completely from Dedicated Credits paid by the grain industry.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
Dedicated Credits	\$401,600		\$401,600
Total	\$401,600	\$0	\$401,600
Programs			
Grain Inspection	\$401,600		\$401,600
Total	\$401,600	\$0	\$401,600
FTE	10.0		10.0

3.0 Programs: Grain Inspection

3.1 Grain Inspection

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a budget of \$401,600 funded entirely from Dedicated Credits. Personal Services comprise 76% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimated	FY 2001 Analyst	Est/Analyst Difference
Financing				
General Fund	\$8,000			
Dedicated Credits	264,100	\$403,400	\$401,600	(\$1,800)
Beginning Nonlapsing	8,900			
Total	\$281,000	\$403,400	\$401,600	(\$1,800)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$242,600	\$306,100	\$303,400	(\$2,700)
In-State Travel	900	1,200	1,200	
Out of State Travel	100	2,100	2,100	
Current Expense	28,000	44,000	44,900	900
Pass Through	9,400	50,000	50,000	
Total	\$281,000	\$403,400	\$401,600	(\$1,800)
FTE	10.0	10.0	10.0	

Purpose

The program is required to establish standards and grades for grain products and collect reasonable fees to cover expenses. Being funded entirely by Dedicated Credits, the program has some flexibility to adjust its expenditures to meet the demands of the industry according to production during the year. As a result, there may be a fluctuation between the amount appropriated and the amount expended during the year. The Legislature has authorized the program to carry unused balances forward as nonlapsing funds.

Intent Language

The Analyst recommends maintaining the following intent language from HB 1, 1999 General Session:

It is the intent of the Legislature that Dedicated Credits received by the Grain Inspection program be nonlapsing.

The 1999 Legislature approved the following item of FY 1999 Supplemental intent language (SB 3, 1999 General Session), which the Analyst does not recommend continuing for FY 2001:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Department of Agriculture and Food transfer any lapsing unrestricted balances from FY 1999 appropriations to the FY 2000 Grain Inspection Program.

At the end of FY 1999, \$8,000 was transferred from other line items to this line item due to low collections of Dedicated Credits.

**Previous Building
Block Report**

Last year the Legislature authorized the Department to use \$12,000 in prior-year nonlapsing balances to provide for contractual custodial and maintenance services at the Grain Exchange Building in Ogden. However, there were no nonlapsing funds available.

4.0 Additional Information: Grain Inspection

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
Financing					
General Fund			\$8,000		
Dedicated Credits	\$323,900	\$288,700	264,100	\$403,400	\$401,600
Beginning Nonlapsing	11,600	35,500	8,900		
Closing Nonlapsing	(35,400)	(3,700)			
Total	\$300,100	\$320,500	\$281,000	\$403,400	\$401,600
% Change		6.8%	-12.3%	43.6%	-0.4%
Programs					
Grain Inspection	\$300,100	\$320,500	\$281,000	\$403,400	\$401,600
Total	\$300,100	\$320,500	\$281,000	\$403,400	\$401,600
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$250,600	\$272,300	\$242,600	\$306,100	\$303,400
In-State Travel	1,500	2,100	900	1,200	1,200
Out of State Travel			100	2,100	2,100
Current Expense	34,200	33,300	28,000	44,000	44,900
DP Current Expense	1,100	2,300			
Pass Through	12,700	10,500	9,400	50,000	50,000
Total	\$300,100	\$320,500	\$281,000	\$403,400	\$401,600
FTE	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0	10.0

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Agricultural Environmental Quality

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Agricultural Environmental Quality

This program undertakes to improve the quality of Utah's agricultural soil and watershed quality through studies, education, and cooperative agreements with other parties. Other parties include Department programs, other state departments, federal agencies, and private sources. The program is divided into three components:

1. Watershed management
2. Groundwater monitoring
3. Information and education

The largest source of funds is the federal government. One measure of the program's success is its ability to compete with other states for federal funds.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$292,700		\$292,700
Federal Funds	652,300		652,300
Transfers	525,500		525,500
Total	\$1,470,500	\$0	\$1,470,500
Programs			
Environmental Quality	\$1,470,500		\$1,470,500
Total	\$1,470,500	\$0	\$1,470,500
FTE	7.0		7.0

3.0 Programs: Agricultural Environmental Quality

3.1 Agricultural Environmental Quality

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$1,470,500. The revenue transfer comes from the Division of Water Quality in the Department of Environmental Quality. Personal Services comprise 21% of the recommended appropriation.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$276,200	\$306,000	\$292,700	(\$13,300)
Federal Funds	215,000	651,400	652,300	900
Transfers	550,700	524,700	525,500	800
Beginning Nonlapsing	21,000	24,000		(24,000)
Closing Nonlapsing	(24,000)			
Lapsing Balance	(3,600)			
Total	\$1,035,300	\$1,506,100	\$1,470,500	(\$35,600)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$285,800	\$321,100	\$313,600	(\$7,500)
In-State Travel	9,400	10,100	10,100	
Out of State Travel	4,100	7,500	7,500	
Current Expense	60,200	48,800	51,800	3,000
DP Current Expense	31,900	53,000	36,900	(16,100)
Capital Outlay		15,000		(15,000)
Pass Through	643,900	1,050,600	1,050,600	
Total	\$1,035,300	\$1,506,100	\$1,470,500	(\$35,600)
FTE	6.0	7.0	7.0	

Purpose Much of this program is accomplished using cooperative agreements. These are used for contracts with the Soil Conservation Districts to conduct necessary ground water tests, or other projects which the districts feel are important. An example of such a project in this area would be a district contracting with a consultant to design a project to eliminate non-point pollution sources from a stream. A district may combine these funds with funds received from the Resource Conservation and Development program if the project has multiple purposes.

- Performance Measures**
1. Success in obtaining competitive federal grants with other states.
 2. Number of private cooperators involved in the program.

4.0 Additional Information: Agricultural Environmental Quality

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$210,700	\$280,800	\$276,200	\$306,000	\$292,700
Federal Funds		15,000	215,000	651,400	652,300
Dedicated Credits		100			
Transfers	840,500	637,600	550,700	524,700	525,500
Beginning Nonlapsing			21,000	24,000	
Closing Nonlapsing		(21,000)	(24,000)		
Lapsing Balance	(6,300)	(2,000)	(3,600)		
Total	\$1,044,900	\$910,500	\$1,035,300	\$1,506,100	\$1,470,500
% Change		-12.9%	13.7%	45.5%	-2.4%
Programs					
Environmental Quality	\$1,044,900	\$910,500	\$1,035,300	\$1,506,100	\$1,470,500
Total	\$1,044,900	\$910,500	\$1,035,300	\$1,506,100	\$1,470,500
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$205,100	\$261,600	\$285,800	\$321,100	\$313,600
In-State Travel	5,600	9,200	9,400	10,100	10,100
Out of State Travel			4,100	7,500	7,500
Current Expense	61,000	45,900	60,200	48,800	51,800
DP Current Expense	29,600	32,500	31,900	53,000	36,900
DP Capital Outlay	11,700				
Capital Outlay				15,000	
Pass Through	731,900	561,300	643,900	1,050,600	1,050,600
Total	\$1,044,900	\$910,500	\$1,035,300	\$1,506,100	\$1,470,500
FTE	6.0	6.0	6.0	7.0	7.0

4.2 Federal Funds

			FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimated	FY 2001 Analyst
Program:	Environmental Quality	Federal	182,049	556,400	555,900
Fed Agency:	Dept of Interior/Bureau of Rec	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Salinity Grant	Total	182,049	556,400	555,900
Program:	Environmental Quality	Federal	32,900	95,000	95,000
Fed Agency:	EPA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Special Projects	Total	32,900	95,000	95,000
		Federal Total	214,949	651,400	650,900
		State Match Total	0	0	0
		Total	\$214,949	\$651,400	\$650,900

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Insect Infestation

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 2.0 Issues
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Insect Infestation

Much publicity has been given to the problem of crickets and grasshoppers in Utah last Summer. By some estimates, last year's infestation caused \$22 million of crop damage in Box Elder and Tooele Counties alone. There was also damage in 16 other counties. A moderate Winter could exacerbate the problem next Summer.

The purpose of this program is to prevent insects from wiping out Utah's billion dollar agricultural industry. A base budget was appropriated to the program in FY 1993. The Insect Infestation Emergency Control Act was initiated in 1985. The Department assists property owners on an evenly split cost share basis.

For problems beyond regular operations, the Department has requested, and received, additional funding in the past.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$193,000		\$193,000
Federal Funds	12,800		12,800
Total	\$205,800	\$0	\$205,800
Programs			
Insect Infestation	\$205,800		\$205,800
Total	\$205,800	\$0	\$205,800
FTE	7.5		7.5

2.0 Issues: Insect Infestation

The Analyst will discuss an FY 2000 Supplemental General Fund increase in the Supplemental section.

3.0 Programs: Insect Infestation

3.1 Insect Infestation

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a budget of \$205,800, funded entirely by the General Fund. Personal Services comprise 82% of the recommended appropriation. There are two permanent FTEs in this area, with an additional 5.5 FTEs which are temporary seasonal employees.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$190,300	\$195,900	\$193,000	(\$2,900)
Federal Funds	104,400		12,800	12,800
Dedicated Credits	24,900			
Beginning Nonlapsing	542,100	470,800		(470,800)
Closing Nonlapsing	(470,800)			
Total	\$390,900	\$666,700	\$205,800	(\$460,900)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$246,900	\$271,000	\$169,000	(\$102,000)
In-State Travel	10,200	13,000	9,400	(3,600)
Out of State Travel	2,000	2,300	1,500	(800)
Current Expense	106,100	67,800	22,600	(45,200)
DP Current Expense	5,000	12,600	3,300	(9,300)
Pass Through	20,700	300,000		(300,000)
Total	\$390,900	\$666,700	\$205,800	(\$460,900)
FTE	7.5	7.5	7.5	

Purpose

Through this program many damaging insects are controlled, such as:

- Apple maggot
- Gypsy moth
- Grasshopper
- Mormon cricket
- Africanized honey bee

The Department is helping growers in the state to contain these pests by:

- Establishing insectaries to rear natural predators for distribution.
- Trapping and monitoring insect movement.
- Supporting research for better control methods.

Performance Measures

1. Success in controlling harmful insects.
2. Success in identifying harmful insects before major damage occurs.

4.0 Additional Information: Insect Infestation

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$179,100	\$184,900	\$190,300	\$195,900	\$193,000
Federal Funds	43,800	102,500	104,400		12,800
Dedicated Credits	25,300	10,200	24,900		
Beginning Nonlapsing	464,800	543,800	542,100	470,800	
Closing Nonlapsing	(543,800)	(542,000)	(470,800)		
Total	\$169,200	\$299,400	\$390,900	\$666,700	\$205,800
% Change		77.0%	30.6%	70.6%	-69.1%
Programs					
Insect Infestation	\$169,200	\$299,400	\$390,900	\$666,700	\$205,800
Total	\$169,200	\$299,400	\$390,900	\$666,700	\$205,800
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$144,200	\$192,400	\$246,900	\$271,000	\$169,000
In-State Travel	6,400	8,600	10,200	13,000	9,400
Out of State Travel			2,000	2,300	1,500
Current Expense	14,400	81,200	106,100	67,800	22,600
DP Current Expense	4,200	14,600	5,000	12,600	3,300
Pass Through		2,600	20,700	300,000	
Total	\$169,200	\$299,400	\$390,900	\$666,700	\$205,800
FTE	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5	7.5

4.2 Federal Funds

			FY 1999 Actual	FY 2000 Estimated	FY 2001 Analyst
Program:	Insect Infestation	Federal	630	0	0
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Karnal Bunt	Total	630	0	0
Program:	Insect Infestation	Federal	2,932	0	0
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Grasshopper/Mormon Cricket	Total	2,932	0	0
Program:	Insect Infestation	Federal	100,851	0	12,900
Fed Agency:	USDA	State Match	0	0	0
Purpose:	Gypsy Moth	Total	100,851	0	12,900
		Federal Total	104,413	0	12,900
		State Match Total	0	0	0
		Total	\$104,413	\$0	\$12,900

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Resource Conservation (Soil Conservation Districts)

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Resource Conservation (Soil Conservation Districts)

Soil and water conservation is a local, state, and national partnership effort. The state delivers most of its soil and water conservation programs through the 38 Soil Conservation Districts (SCDs). An SCD is a dependent (has no taxing authority, thus depends on state appropriations) special-service district established under UCA 17A-3 Part 8. They depend on the Soil Conservation Commission for their board of directors, elections, and accountability.

The Districts do not have taxing authority because agricultural resources are usually not in the same districts as property tax resources. In other words, districts with a great need for soil and water conservation programs are usually counties with small property tax bases. Therefore the state oversees the collection and disbursement of revenues amongst the districts.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$909,600		\$909,600
GFR - Ag Resource Devel	229,000		229,000
Total	\$1,138,600	\$0	\$1,138,600
Programs			
Resource Conservation	\$1,138,600		\$1,138,600
Total	\$1,138,600	\$0	\$1,138,600

3.0 Programs: Resource Conservation (Soil Conservation Districts)

3.1 Resource Conservation (Soil Conservation Districts)

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends a total budget of \$1,138,600, funded from the General Fund and the General Fund Restricted - Agriculture Resource Development Fund. Financing from the GFR - Agriculture Resource Development Fund comes from interest on loan repayments. Growth in General Funds between FY 1999 and FY 2000 is due to a transfer in pass-through costs of \$260,000 from the Resource Conservation Administration.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
General Fund	\$648,400	\$909,600	\$909,600	
Dedicated Credits	900			
GFR - Ag Resource Dev	229,000	229,000	229,000	
Beginning Nonlapsing		900		(\$900)
Closing Nonlapsing	(900)			
Lapsing Balance	(5,300)			
Total	\$872,100	\$1,139,500	\$1,138,600	(\$900)
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$52,900	\$50,500	\$50,400	(\$100)
In-State Travel	36,700	36,700	36,700	
Out of State Travel	8,900	8,900	8,900	
Current Expense	9,600	7,500	7,600	100
DP Current Expense	14,900	10,000	10,000	
Pass Through	749,100	1,025,900	1,025,000	(900)
Total	\$872,100	\$1,139,500	\$1,138,600	(\$900)

Purpose

The purpose of this program is to channel funds (pass-through) by direct payments of contracts to individual Soil Conservation Districts or their state association (Utah Association of Conservation Districts - UACD) to fulfill SCD statutory duties relative to soil and water conservation.

Intent Language

The Analyst recommends maintaining the following intent language from HB 1, 1999 General Session:

It is the intent of the Legislature that the Soil Conservation Districts submit annual reports documenting supervisory expenses to the Legislative Fiscal Analyst, the Office of Planning and Budget, and the Soil Conservation Commission. It is also the intent of the Legislature that these documents be reviewed and reported to the Governor and the 2001 Legislature.

The Utah Association of Conservation Districts submitted a written report on supervisory expenses in November. They also reported on their use of state appropriated funds to the October 1999 Interim Committee.

4.0 Additional Information: Resource Conservation (Soil Conservation Districts)

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$244,500	\$244,300	\$648,400	\$909,600	\$909,600
Dedicated Credits			900		
GFR - Ag Resource Dev	229,000	229,000	229,000	229,000	229,000
Beginning Nonlapsing				900	
Closing Nonlapsing			(900)		
Lapsing Balance	(5,700)	(8,400)	(5,300)		
Total	\$467,800	\$464,900	\$872,100	\$1,139,500	\$1,138,600
% Change		-0.6%	87.6%	30.7%	-0.1%
Programs					
Resource Conservation	\$467,800	\$464,900	\$872,100	\$1,139,500	\$1,138,600
Total	\$467,800	\$464,900	\$872,100	\$1,139,500	\$1,138,600
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$46,900	\$38,100	\$52,900	\$50,500	\$50,400
In-State Travel	28,700	33,600	36,700	36,700	36,700
Out of State Travel			8,900	8,900	8,900
Current Expense	5,300	5,700	9,600	7,500	7,600
DP Current Expense			14,900	10,000	10,000
Pass Through	386,900	387,500	749,100	1,025,900	1,025,000
Total	\$467,800	\$464,900	\$872,100	\$1,139,500	\$1,138,600

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Building Operation and Maintenance

Contents:

1.0 Summary

3.0 Programs

4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Building Operation and Maintenance

The Agriculture Building is located at 350 North Redwood Road. Management of the building is handled by the Division of Facilities and Construction Management (DFCM).

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
General Fund	\$228,000		\$228,000
Total	\$228,000	\$0	\$228,000
Programs			
Building O&M	\$228,000		\$228,000
Total	\$228,000	\$0	\$228,000

3.0 Programs: Building Operation and Maintenance

3.1 Building Operation and Maintenance

Recommendation The Analyst recommends a budget of \$228,000, funded entirely from the General Fund. The funding level has remained constant since FY 1996.

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
Financing				
General Fund	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	
Total	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$0
Expenditures				
Current Expense	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	
Total	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$0

Purpose The purpose of this program is to contract with the Division of Facilities and Construction Management (DFCM) for maintenance of the Agriculture Building.

4.0 Additional Information: Building Operation and Maintenance

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
Financing	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
General Fund	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000
Total	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000
% Change		0.0%	0.0%	0.0%	0.0%
Programs					
Building O&M	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000
Total	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000
Expenditures					
Current Expense	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000
Total	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000	\$228,000

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Data Processing Internal Service Fund

Contents:

- 1.0 Summary
- 3.0 Programs
- 4.0 Additional Information

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

1.0 Summary: Data Processing Internal Service Fund

The Department created an internal service fund (ISF) in 1986 for its own data processing. Each division that uses data processing services pays its "fair share" of computer costs by the ISF. The Fund covers the personal services expenses, current expenses, depreciation expense, capital acquisitions, and the Division of Finance's overhead charge. Funds are all pooled into one division which provides the necessary data processing for the other divisions. This avoids unnecessary duplication of expenses by the individual programs.

In the 1988 session, the Legislature passed HB 81 which provides budgetary controls over ISFs. The law does not allow an ISF to bill another agency unless the Legislature has:

- Reviewed and approved the ISF agency's budget request;
- Reviewed and approved the ISF's rates, fees, and other charges and included those rates, fees and charges in an appropriations act;
- Approved the number of employees;
- Appropriated the estimated revenue based on the rates and fee structure.
- Separately reviewed and approved the capital needs and related capital budget.

No new ISF agency may be established unless reviewed and approved by the Legislature.

	Analyst FY 2001 Base	Analyst FY 2001 Changes	Analyst FY 2001 Total
Financing			
Premiums	\$251,600		\$251,600
Total	\$251,600	\$0	\$251,600
Programs			
ISF - Agri Data Processing	\$251,600		\$251,600
Total	\$251,600	\$0	\$251,600
Net Operating Income	\$0	\$0	\$0
FTE	3.0		3.0
Authorized Capital Outlay	\$38,000		\$38,000
Retained Earnings	\$18,600		\$18,600

3.0 Programs: Data Processing Internal Service Fund

3.1 Data Processing Internal Service Fund

Recommendation

The Analyst recommends:

- Approved revenues of \$251,600
- Approved operating expenses of \$251,600
- The rate and fee schedule shown below
- 3 FTEs
- Capital purchases in the amount of \$38,000 with a five-year depreciation schedule

	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001	Est/Analyst
Financing	Actual	Estimated	Analyst	Difference
Premiums	\$232,700	\$251,600	\$251,600	
Total	\$232,700	\$251,600	\$251,600	\$0
Expenditures				
Personal Services	\$166,000	\$167,000	\$165,800	(\$1,200)
In-State Travel	1,100	1,500	\$2,000	500
Current Expenses	5,800	9,000	\$8,400	(600)
DP Current Expenses	96,500	53,600	\$48,400	(5,200)
Pass Through	2,300			
Depreciation	22,400	20,500	\$27,000	6,500
Total	\$294,100	\$251,600	\$251,600	\$0
Net Operating Income	(\$61,400)	\$0	\$0	\$0
FTE	3.0	3.0	3.0	
Authorized Capital Outlay		\$30,800	38,000.0	7,200.0
Retained Earnings	\$18,600	\$18,600	18,600.0	

Rate Schedule

Programmer, per hour	\$50.00
Programmer, per hour overtime	75.00
LAN: Port charges per year/per port (connection)	3,310.00
Port charges per year/per PC	500.00
Technical assistance/consultation, per hour	50.00
Installation	Negotiable
GIS rate, per hour	50.00
GIS rate, per hour overtime	75.00
Portable PC daily rental	15.00

Revenue by Agency

<u>Line Item</u>	
General Administration	\$215,200
Marketing and Development	19,900
Environmental Quality	13,200

Insect Infestation	<u>3,300</u>
Total	<u>\$251,600</u>

Capital Expenditures	Document Imaging Upgrade	\$5,000
	Internet Business Software	5,000
	PC Upgrades	10,000
	Sun System	<u>18,000</u>
	Total	<u>\$38,000</u>

Purpose Provides consolidated computer services to all divisions and programs in the Department.

4.0 Additional Information: Data Processing Internal Service Fund

4.1 Funding History

	FY 1997	FY 1998	FY 1999	FY 2000	FY 2001
	Actual	Actual	Actual	Estimated	Analyst
Financing					
Premiums	\$202,600	\$237,300	\$232,700	\$251,600	\$251,600
Total	\$202,600	\$237,300	\$232,700	\$251,600	\$251,600
% Change		17.1%	-1.9%	8.1%	0.0%
Programs					
ISF - Agri Data Processing	\$223,000	\$232,900	\$294,100	\$251,600	\$251,600
Total	\$223,000	\$232,900	\$294,100	\$251,600	\$251,600
Expenditures					
Personal Services	\$147,500	\$161,500	\$166,000	\$167,000	\$165,800
In-State Travel		400	1,100	1,500	2,000
Current Expenses	8,100	5,200	5,800	9,000	8,400
DP Current Expenses	46,700	54,700	96,500	53,600	48,400
Pass Through		1,900	2,300		
Depreciation	20,700	9,200	22,400	20,500	27,000
Total	\$223,000	\$232,900	\$294,100	\$251,600	\$251,600
Net Operating Income	(\$20,400)	\$4,400	(\$61,400)	\$0	\$0
FTE	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0
Authorized Capital Outlay				\$30,800	38,000.0
Retained Earnings	\$75,600	\$80,000	\$18,600	\$18,600	18,600.0

Office of the
Legislative Fiscal Analyst

FY 2001 Budget Recommendations

Joint Appropriations Subcommittee for
Natural Resources

Utah Department of Agriculture and Food
Agricultural Fees

Contents:

Agricultural Fees

This Page Intentionally Left Blank

Agricultural Fees

In accordance with Section 4-2-2(2) the following fees are proposed for the services of the Department of Agriculture and Food for FY 2001.

	FY 2000 Current	FY 2001 Proposed	Difference	FY 2001 Units	Revenue Change
General Administration:					
Produce Dealers					
Produce Dealer	25.00	25.00			
Dealer's Agent	10.00	10.00			
Broker/Agent	25.00	25.00			
Produce Broker	25.00	25.00			
Livestock Dealer	25.00	25.00			
Livestock Dealer/Agent	10.00	10.00			
Livestock Auctions					
Livestock Auction Market	50.00	50.00			
Auction Weigh Person	10.00	10.00			
Registered Farms Recording Fee	10.00	10.00			
Meat Inspection					
Meat Packing					
Meat Packing Plant	50.00	50.00			
Custom Exempt	50.00	50.00			
Chemistry Laboratory					
Feed and Meat					
Moisture, 1 sample	15.00	15.00			
Moisture, 2-5 samples, per sample	10.00	10.00			
Moisture, over 6 samples, per sample	5.00	5.00			
Fat, 1 sample	30.00	30.00			
Fat, 2-5 samples, per sample	25.00	25.00			
Fat, over 6 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00			
Fiber, 1 sample	45.00	45.00			
Fiber, 2-5 samples, per sample	40.00	40.00			
Fiber, over 6 samples, per sample	35.00	35.00			
Protein, 1 sample	25.00	25.00			
Protein, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00			
Protein, over 6 samples, per sample	15.00	15.00			
NPN, 1 sample	20.00	20.00			
NPN, 2-5 samples, per sample	15.00	15.00			

Legislative Fiscal Analyst

NPN, over 6 samples, per sample	10.00	10.00
Ash, 1 sample	15.00	15.00
Ash, 2-5 samples, per sample	10.00	10.00
Ash, over 6 samples, per sample	5.00	5.00
Fertilizer		
Nitrogen, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
Nitrogen, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
Nitro, over 6 samples, per sample	15.00	15.00
P ₂ O ₅ , 1 sample	30.00	30.00
P ₂ O ₅ , 2-5 samples, per sample	25.00	25.00
P ₂ O ₅ , over 6 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
K ₂ O, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
K ₂ O, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
K ₂ O, over 6 samples, per sample	15.00	15.00
Trace Elements (Atomic Absorption)		
Iron	20.00	20.00
Copper	20.00	20.00
Zinc	20.00	20.00
Manganese	20.00	20.00
Molybdenum	40.00	40.00
Trace Elements (In Water)		
Iron	10.00	10.00
Copper	10.00	10.00
Zinc	10.00	10.00
Manganese	10.00	10.00
Molybdenum	10.00	10.00
Vitamins		
Vitamin A, 1 sample	60.00	60.00
Vit. A, 2-5 samples, per sample	55.00	55.00
Vit. A, over 6 samples, per sam	50.00	50.00
Vitamin B, 1 sample	60.00	60.00
Vit. B, 2-5 samples, per sample	55.00	55.00
Vit. B, over 6 samples, per sam	50.00	50.00
Vitamin B2, 1 sample	60.00	60.00
Vit. B2, 2-5 samples, per sample	55.00	55.00
Vit. B2, over 6 samples, per sam	50.00	50.00
Vitamin C, 1 sample	60.00	60.00

Vit. C, 2-5 samples, per sample	55.00	55.00
Vit. C, over 6 samples, per sam	50.00	50.00
Minerals		
Calcium, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
Calcium, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
Calcium, over 6 samples, per sam	15.00	15.00
Sodium Chloride, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
Sodium Chl., 2-5 samples, per sam	20.00	20.00
Sodium Chl., over 6 sams, per sam	15.00	15.00
Iodine, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
Iodine, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
Iodine, over 6 samples, per sam	15.00	15.00
Drugs and Antibiotics		
Sulfamethazine Screen, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
Sulfamethazine Screen, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
Sulfamethazine. Screen, over 6 samples, per sample	15.00	15.00
Aflatoxin-Elisamethod, 1 sample	25.00	25.00
Aflatoxin-Elisamethod, 2-5 samples, per sample	20.00	20.00
Aflatoxin-Elisamethod, over 6 samples, per sample	15.00	15.00
Pesticides/Herbicides		
Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Screen, 1 sample	70.00	70.00
Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Screen, 2-5 samples, per sample	65.00	65.00
Chlorinated Hydrocarbon Screen, over 6 samples, per sample	60.00	60.00
Organo Phosphate Screen, 1 sample	70.00	70.00
Organo Phosphate Screen, 2-5 samples, per sample	65.00	65.00
Organo Phosphate Screen, over 6 samples, per sample	60.00	60.00
Chlorophenoxy Herbicide Screen		
Reports for the following components:		

Legislative Fiscal Analyst

2-4D, 1 sample	150.00	150.00
2-4D, 2-5 samples, per sample	140.00	140.00
2-4D, over 6 samples, per sample	130.00	130.00
2,4,5-T Screen, 1 sample	150.00	150.00
2,4,5-T, 2-5 samples, per sam	140.00	140.00
2,4,5-T, over 6 samples, per sample	130.00	130.00
Silvex, 1 sample	150.00	150.00
Silvex, 2-5 samples, per sample	140.00	140.00
Silvex, over 6 samples, per sample	130.00	130.00
Individual components from screens:		
1 sample	75.00	75.00
2-5 samples, per sample	70.00	70.00
over 6 samples, per sam	65.00	65.00
Certification Fee - Milk Laboratory Evaluation Program		
Basic Lab Fee	50.00	50.00
Number of Certified Analyst		
(3 x \$10.00)	30.00	30.00
Number of Approved Test		
(3 x \$10.00)	30.00	30.00
Total Yearly Assessed Fee	90.00	90.00
Standard Plate count	5.00	5.00
Coliform Count	5.00	5.00
Test for Inhibitory Substances		
(antibiotics)	5.00	5.00
Phosphatase Test	15.00	15.00
WMT Screening Test	5.00	5.00
DMSCC (Confirmation)	10.00	10.00
DSCC (Foss Instrumentation)	5.00	5.00
Coliform Confirmation	5.00	5.00
Container Rinse Test	10.00	10.00
H ₂ O Coli Total Count		
(MF Filtration)	5.00	5.00

	FY 2000 Current	FY 2001 Proposed	Difference	FY 2001 Units	Revenue Change
H ₂ O Coli Confirmation Test	5.00	5.00			
Butterfat % (Babcock Method)	10.00	10.00			
Added H ₂ O in Raw Milk (Cryoscope Instr)	5.00	5.00			
Reactivated Phosphatase Confirmation	15.00	15.00			
Antibiotic Confirmation Tests	10.00	10.00			
All Other Services, per hour	30.00	30.00			
Animal Health					
<u>Inspection Service Fee</u>		<u>39.00</u>	39.00	50	1,950.00
Commercial Aquaculture Facility	150.00	150.00			
Commercial Fee Fishing Facility	30.00	30.00			
Citation, per violation	75.00	75.00			
Citation, per head	2.00	2.00			
If not paid within 15 days 2 times citation fee					
If not paid within 30 days 4 times citation fee					
Feed Garbage to Swine	25.00	25.00			
Hatchery					
Hatchery Operation (Poultry)	25.00	25.00			
Health Certificate Book	8.00	8.00			
Coggins testing	4.00	4.00			
Service fee					
(Dog food and Brine shrimp, misc.), per day	225.00	225.00			
Service fee					
(Dog food and Brine shrimp, misc.), per mile	State Rate	State Rate			
Agricultural Inspection					
Shipping Point					
Fruit					
Packages, 19.lb. or less, per package	0.020	0.020			
20 to 29 lb. package, per package	0.025	0.025			
Over 29 lb. package,					

Legislative Fiscal Analyst

per package	0.030	0.030
Bulk load, per cwt.	0.045	0.045
Vegetables		
Potatoes, per cwt.	0.055	0.055
Onions, per cwt.	0.060	0.060
Cucurbita family includes:		
Watermelon, muskmelon, squash (summer, fall, & winter), pumpkin, gourd & others		
per cwt	0.045	0.045
Other vegetables		
Less than 60 lb. package,		
per package	0.035	0.035
Over 60 lb. package,		
per package	0.045	0.045
Phytosanitary Inspection, per insp.	25.00	25.00
With grade certification	15.00	15.00
Minimum charge per grade certificate		
for one commodity (except regular rate at continuous grading facilities)		
	21.00	21.00
Minimum charge per commodity for mixed loads, (not to exceed \$45.00 per mixed load)		
	21.00	21.00
Hourly charge for inspection of raw products at processing plants		
	21.00	21.00
Hourly charge for inspectors' time more than 40 hours per week (overtime), plus regular fees		
	31.50	31.50
Hourly charge for major holidays and Sundays (four-hour minimum), plus regular fees		
	31.50	31.50
Holidays include:		
New Year's Day		
Memorial Day		
Independence Day		
Labor Day		
Thanksgiving Day		
Christmas Day		

All Inspections shall include mileage which will be

	charged according to the current mileage rate of the State of Utah	
Export Compliance Agreements	50.00	50.00
Nursery		
Nursery	50.00	50.00
Nursery Agency	25.00	25.00
Nursery Outlet	50.00	50.00
Feed		
Commercial Feed	25.00	25.00
Custom Formula Permit	50.00	50.00
Pesticide		
Commercial Applicator Certification		
Triennial (3 year) Certification and License	45.00	45.00
Annual License	15.00	15.00
Replacement of lost or stolen Certificate/License	15.00	15.00
Failed examinations may be retaken two more times at no charge		
Additional re-testing (two more times)	15.00	15.00
Triennial (3 year) Examination and educational materials fee	20.00	20.00
Product Registration	60.00	60.00
Dealer license		
Annual	15.00	15.00
Triennial	45.00	45.00
Fertilizer		
Blenders License	50.00	50.00
Annual Assessment, per ton	0.15	0.15
Minimum annual assessment	20.00	20.00
Fertilizer Registration	25.00	25.00
Beekeepers		
License	10.00	10.00
Inspection fee, per hour	30.00	30.00
Salvage Wax Registration fee	10.00	10.00
Control Atmosphere	10.00	10.00

Seed Purity		
Flowers	10.00	10.00
Grains	6.00	6.00
Grasses	15.00	15.00
Legumes	6.00	6.00
Trees and Shrubs	10.00	10.00
Vegetables	6.00	6.00
Seed Germination		
Flowers	10.00	10.00
Grains	6.00	6.00
Grasses	10.00	10.00
Legumes	6.00	6.00
Trees and Shrubs	10.00	10.00
Vegetables	6.00	6.00
Seed Tetrazolium Test		
Flowers	20.00	20.00
Grains	12.00	12.00
Grasses	20.00	20.00
Legumes	15.00	15.00
Trees and Shrubs	20.00	20.00
Vegetables	12.00	12.00
Embryo Analysis (Loose Smut Test)	11.00	11.00
Cutting Test	8.00	8.00
Mill Check	Hourly Charge	Hourly Charge
Examination of Extra Quantity for		
Other Crop or Weed Seed	Hourly Charge	Hourly Charge
Examination for Noxious		
Weeds Only	Hourly Charge	Hourly Charge
Identification	No Charge	No Charge
Hourly Charges	21.00	21.00
Additional Copies of Analysis Reports	1.00	1.00
Hourly charge for any other inspection		
service performed on an hourly basis		
(one hour minimum)	21.00	21.00
Mixtures will be charged based on the sum		
for each individual kind in excess of 5 percent.		
Samples which require excessive time, screenings,		

low grade, dirty, or unusually difficult sample will be charged at the hourly rate.

Charges for tests or kinds of seeds not listed will be determined by the Seed Laboratory.

Hourly charges may be made on seed treated with "Highly Toxic Substances" if special handling is necessary for the Analyst's safety.

Discount germination is a non-priority service intended for carry over seed which is ideal for checking inventories from May through August.

The discount service is available during the rest of the year, but delays in testing may result due to high test volume of priority samples. Ten (10) or more samples receive 50 percent discount off normal germination fees.

Emergency service, per sample, single component only	42.00	42.00
--	-------	-------

Hay & Straw Weed Free Certification

Certificate

Bulk loads of hay up to		
10 loads	25.00	25.00
If time involved is 1 hr or less	21.00	21.00
If time involved is 1 hr &		
30 min.	25.00	25.00
If time involved is more than		
1 hr & 30 min.	21.00/hour	21.00/hour
Charge for each hay tag	0.10	0.10

Citations, maximum per violation	500.00	500.00
----------------------------------	--------	--------

Regulatory Services

Bedding/Upholstered Furniture

Manufacturers of bedding and/or upholstered furniture	55.00	55.00
Wholesale Dealer	55.00	55.00
Supply Dealer	55.00	55.00
Manufacturers of Quilted Clothing	55.00	55.00
Upholsterer with employees	40.00	40.00
Upholsterer without employees	25.00	25.00

Dairy		
Test milk for payment	25.00	25.00
Operate milk manufacturing plant	50.00	50.00
Make butter	25.00	25.00
Haul farm bulk milk	25.00	25.00
Make cheese	25.00	25.00
Operate a pasteurizer	25.00	25.00
Operate a milk processing plant	50.00	50.00
Special Inspection Fees		
Food and Dairy Inspection fee, per hour	26.50	26.50
Food and Dairy Inspection fee, overtime rate	34.40	34.40
Certificate of Inspection	10.00	10.00
Citations, maximum per violation	500.00	500.00
Weights and Measures		
Weighing and measuring devices/ individual servicemen	10.00	10.00
Weighing and measuring devices/ agency	50.00	50.00
Special Scale Inspections		
Large Capacity Truck		
Per man hour	20.00	20.00
Per mile	1.50	1.50
Per hour equipment use	25.00	25.00
Pickup truck		
Per man hour	20.00	20.00
Per mile	0.75	0.75
Per hour equipment use	15.00	15.00
Overnight Trip	Per Diem and Cost of Motel	Per Diem and Cost of Motel
Petroleum Refinery Fee		
Gasoline		
Octane Rating	120.00	120.00
Benzene Level in Gasoline	80.00	80.00
Pensky-Martens Flash Point	20.00	20.00
Overtime charges, per hour	30.00	30.00

	FY 2000 Current	FY 2001 Proposed	Difference	FY 2001 Units	Revenue Change
Metrology services, per hour	22.00	<u>32.00</u>	10.00	250 hrs	2,500.00
Gasoline - Gravity	10.00	10.00			
Gasoline - Distillation	25.00	25.00			
Gasoline - Sulfur, X-ray	35.00	35.00			
Gasoline - Reid Vapor Pressure (RVP)	25.00	25.00			
Gasoline - Aromatics	50.00	50.00			
Gasoline - Leads	20.00	20.00			
Diesel - Gravity	25.00	25.00			
Diesel - Distillation	25.00	25.00			
Diesel - Sulfer, X-ray	20.00	20.00			
Diesel - Cloud Point	20.00	20.00			
Diesel - Conductivity	25.00	25.00			
Diesel - Cetane	20.00	20.00			
Citations, maximum per violation	500.00	500.00			
Utah Horse Commission					
Owner/Trainer, not to exceed	100.00	100.00			
Owner, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Organization, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Trainer, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Assistant Trainer, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Jockey, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Jockey Agent, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Veterinarian, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Racing Official, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Racing Organization Manager or Official, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Authorized Agent, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Farrier, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Assistant to the Racing Manager or Official, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Video Operator, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Photo Finish Operator, not to exceed	75.00	75.00			
Valet, not to exceed	50.00	50.00			
Jockey Room Attendant or Custodian,					

Legislative Fiscal Analyst

not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Colors Attendant, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Paddock Attendant, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Pony Rider, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Groom, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Security Guard, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Stable Gate Man, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Security Investigator, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Concessionaire, not to exceed	50.00	50.00
Application Processing Fee	25.00	25.00
Brand Inspection		
Farm Custom Slaughter	50.00	50.00
Estray Animals	varies	varies
Beef Promotion (Cattle only), per head	1.00	1.00
Citation, per violation	75.00	75.00
Citation, per head	2.00	2.00
If not paid within 15 days 2 times citation fee		
If not paid within 30 days 4 times citation fee		
Brand Inspection Fee, Special Sales	100.00	100.00
Brand Inspection (cattle), per head,		
maximum	0.50	0.50
Brand Inspection (horse), per head	0.65	0.65
Brand Inspection (sheep), per head	0.05	0.05
Brand Book	25.00	25.00
Show and Seasonal Permits		
Horse	5.00	5.00
Cattle	5.00	5.00
Lifetime Horse Permit	20.00	20.00
Duplicate Lifetime Horse Permit	10.00	10.00
Lifetime Transfer Horse Permit	10.00	10.00
Brand Recording	50.00	50.00
Certified copy of Recording		
(new Brand Card)	5.00	5.00
Minimum charge per certificate		
(Cattle, Sheep, Hogs, and Horses)	3.00	3.00
Brand Transfer	30.00	30.00
Brand Renewal (five-year cycle)	30.00	30.00

Elk Farming		
Elk Inspection New License	300.00	300.00
Brand Inspection per elk	5.00	5.00
Service Charge (per stop per owner)	15.00	15.00
Horn Inspection per set	1.00	1.00
Elk License Renewal	300.00	300.00
Elk License Late Fee	50.00	50.00
Grain Inspection		
Regular hourly rate	21.00	21.00
Overtime hourly rate	31.50	31.50
Official Inspection Services: (Includes sampling except where indicated)		
Hopper car, per car or part car	18.50	18.50
Boxcar car, per car or part car	11.00	11.00
Truck or trailer, per carrier or part carrier	9.50	9.50
Submitted sample, per sample	6.25	6.25
Reinspection, basis file sample	6.25	6.25
Protein test, original or file sample retest	4.25	4.25
Protein test, basis new sample, plus sample hourly fee	4.25	4.25
Factor only determination, per factor, plus sampler's hourly rate, if applicable	2.75	2.75
Stowage examination services, per certificate	22.00	22.00
Additional fee for applicant requested analysis, (malting barley analysis of non-malting class barley, HVAC or DHV percentage determination in durum or hard spring wheats, etc., per request)		
	.25	3.25
Extra copies of certificates, per copy	1.00	1.00
Insect damaged kernel, determination (weevil, bore)		
	2.25	2.25
Sampling only, same as original carrier fee,		

except hopper cars, 4 or more	12.50	12.50
Mailing sample handling charge	2.00+	2.00+
	Actual Charge	Actual Charge

Request for services not covered by the above fees will be performed at the applicable hourly rate stated herein, plus mileage and travel time, if applicable. Actual travel time will be assessed outside of a 50 mile radius of Ogden.

Non-official Services

Safflower Grading	10.00	10.00
Class II weighing, per carrier	4.50	4.50
Determination of DHV		
percentage in Hard Red Wheat	3.50	3.50
Determination of hard kernel percentage		
in soft white wheat	3.50	3.50
Other requests	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate

All Agriculture Divisions

Administrative costs for making copies of files, per hour	10.00	10.00
Administrative costs for making copies of files, per copy	0.07	0.07
Late Fee	25.00	25.00
Returned check fee	15.00	15.00
Mileage	State Rate	State Rate