



GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF
BUDGET AND PROGRAM PLANNING

Fiscal Note 2017 Biennium

Bill #	HB0553	Title:	Generally revise aquatic invasive species laws
---------------	--------	---------------	------------------------------------------------

Primary Sponsor:	Noland, Mark	Status:	As Introduced
-------------------------	--------------	----------------	---------------

- Significant Local Gov Impact
 Needs to be included in HB 2
 Technical Concerns
 Included in the Executive Budget
 Significant Long-Term Impacts
 Dedicated Revenue Form Attached

FISCAL SUMMARY

	<u>FY 2016 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2017 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2018 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2019 Difference</u>
Expenditures:				
General Fund	\$251,504	\$208,604	\$208,604	\$208,604
State Special Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Revenue:				
General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Net Impact-General Fund Balance:	<u><u>(\$251,504)</u></u>	<u><u>(\$208,604)</u></u>	<u><u>(\$208,604)</u></u>	<u><u>(\$208,604)</u></u>

Description of fiscal impact: HB553 will result in additional watercraft inspection stations being established by local entities and at additional Montana Department of Transportation (MDOT) locations. Establishing agreements with the local entities and providing coordination and staffing at the additional MDT locations will require added general fund support.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

Assumptions:

Section 1 – 80-7-1006(6), MCA Local entities operating check stations

1. Section 1 of the bill states that the department shall authorize another entity to operate a check station if requested.
2. The Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) would work with other entities to establish agreements to operate additional Watercraft Inspection Stations.
3. FWP would require in the agreements that all operating costs and additional staff be paid for by the other entity, including law enforcement.
4. The actual number of additional inspection stations that would be established is not known, but for purposes of this fiscal not, it is assumed that one per year would be established.

5. Each new inspection station operated by another entity will need to have some level of FWP supervision based on the agreement.
6. The cost for FWP supervision of each additional inspection station would include time to develop the agreement, supervision of compliance with the agreement, coordination and conducting training, response to fouled boats discovered at the check stations, and other coordination with FWP staff. These activities are estimated to require an additional 904 hours of staff time would be performed by temporary staff at a cost of \$16,724. These costs would be funded by the general fund.

Section 2 – 80-7-1015(2), MCA MDT locations

7. The bill states that to the greatest extent possible, the Department of Transportation shall utilize ports of entry or adjacent facilities for check stations.
8. MDT will identify locations for additional Watercraft Inspection Stations. However, MDT staff does not run the stations and will not do so under this bill.
9. Based on the cost to run current inspection stations, FWP estimates the cost for temporary staff, operating expenses, and equipment to establish new stations at MDT locations would be \$54,000 per station.
10. Based on the cost to run current inspection stations, FWP estimates the ongoing annual cost for temporary staff and operating expenses to be \$43,300 per station.
11. FWP assumes four additional MDT locations will be identified to cover more highway entrances into the state (3 ports of entry and one weigh station).
 - a. Year 1: 4 additional locations at \$54,000 per site = \$216,000
 - b. Years 2-4: 4 additional locations at \$43,300 per site = \$173,200
12. Law enforcement efforts by existing game wardens are approximately 100 hours/location. This will require overtime expenses for the 4 locations estimated to be \$18,680.
13. General Fund authority required for the additional costs would be \$234,680 for the first year and \$191,880 for subsequent years.

	<u>FY 2016 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2017 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2018 Difference</u>	<u>FY 2019 Difference</u>
<u>Fiscal Impact:</u>				
FTE	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
<u>Expenditures:</u>				
Personal Services	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Operating Expenses	\$208,604	\$208,604	\$208,604	\$208,604
Equipment	\$42,800	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL Expenditures	\$251,404	\$208,604	\$208,604	\$208,604
<u>Funding of Expenditures:</u>				
General Fund (01)	\$251,404	\$208,604	\$208,604	\$208,604
State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL Funding of Exp.	\$251,404	\$208,604	\$208,604	\$208,604
<u>Revenues:</u>				
General Fund (01)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
TOTAL Revenues	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
<u>Net Impact to Fund Balance (Revenue minus Funding of Expenditures):</u>				
General Fund (01)	(\$251,404)	(\$208,604)	(\$208,604)	(\$208,604)
State Special Revenue (02)	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0

Sponsor's Initials

Date

Budget Director's Initials

Date