

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Questions to All Departments:

- 1. Please identify your department's three most effective programs and your department's three least effective programs, and explain why you identified them as such. How do your most effective programs further the department's goals? What recommendations would you would make to increase the effectiveness of the three least effective programs?*

Response: Nearly 60 unique programs are administered by the Department for the benefit of Colorado's agriculture industry and, in many instances, for the benefit of all Coloradans. The origin for these programs arises either directly from statute relating to the functions, powers and duties of the Department or from specific legislative actions establishing the programs.

The Department takes its responsibility seriously to evaluate, on an ongoing basis, the programs it has been charged to implement. In late 2009 and early 2010, the Department conducted a survey of industry leaders to gain insight into the relative importance of the strategic priorities being pursued by the Department and by inference, the programs which support those priorities. The survey also assessed how effective the Department was in delivering against its stated strategic priorities. For the most part, the survey found that industry believed the Department's strategic priorities and programs were all highly important and that the Department was highly effective in working toward the strategic priorities. A summary of the survey is attached which fully describes the Department's various programs and the strategic priorities which each program supports.

More specific to the question, the Department has in its budget submission (i.e., Commissioner's Letter) identified and described three programs which have proven to be highly effective and serve to support the Department's strategic priorities and overall mission. These programs include:

Highly Effective Programs	How the Program Furthers the Department's Goals
Animal Disease Eradication and Control Programs	The livestock industry is central to the health and well being of Colorado's agriculture industry. Livestock generally contributes about 60 percent of total farm and ranch cash receipts – an estimated \$3.5 billion in 2010. Early detection and control and/or eradication of animal diseases is essential to maintaining overall herd health and the ability for Colorado's livestock producers to market their animals in local, regional, national, and international markets. Colorado is currently considered to have Tuberculosis and Brucellosis free status and Class V Pseudorabies status.
Colorado Proud	Since its inception in 1999, Colorado Proud has helped consumers, retailers, and chefs to more easily identify food and agricultural products that have been grown, raised or processed in Colorado. More than 1,400 Colorado companies are currently licensed to participate in the program. By assisting Colorado's food and agricultural suppliers to expand marketing and sales opportunities, Colorado Proud supports the Department's rural and economic development goals. Consumer surveys have reported consistent increases in program awareness and consumer purchases of Colorado products.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Highly Effective Programs	How the Program Furthers the Department's Goals
Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS)	The CAPS program provides early detection of exotic pests that have potential to threaten Colorado's agriculture industry, horticultural landscape, and environment. Through annual surveys, the Department is able to identify potential threats and develop appropriate action plans for control and/or eradication of the pest(s). For example, a population of Japanese beetles was detected in the town of Palisade in 2002. Through aggressive intervention, the population has been effectively eliminated as trappings in 2009 and 2010 failed to capture even a single beetle. Three years of no detections will enable Colorado to claim the population as eradicated in Palisade. Such designation will help to facilitate increased market opportunities for fruit and vegetable crops grown in and around Palisade.

While each and every program administered by the Department contributes to the health and long-term well being of the agriculture industry, some programs might nonetheless be considered to be less effective simply because they have limited impact in terms of size or scope. Three such programs might include:

Less Impactful or Effective Programs	Description of Program and Recommendation to Increase Program Effectiveness
Apiary Program	This cash funded program exists for the purpose of inspecting, upon request, apiaries for bee diseases and provides certification for bees from Colorado to be shipped to other states. The program also issues permits enabling out-of-state beekeepers to import bees to Colorado upon certification that their apiaries are disease-free. While the number of inspections or certifications requested in recent fiscal years has been extremely small (i.e., only one inspection has been requested in the past two fiscal years), it remains important that Colorado beekeepers have the opportunity to ship bees to other states should they choose to do so. As the program is demand-driven, increased utilization of the program will be dependent upon broad industry dynamics.
Home Food Service Plan Seller Program	This cash funded program exists to license sellers of Home Food Service Plans containing frozen meat or meat products. Licensing is primarily dependent upon the prospective seller posting a surety bond and providing evidence that they are a company qualified to do business in Colorado. The number of sellers seeking licensure has decreased in recent years with only 17 such licenses issued in FY11. While the program remains effective in providing consumers a minimal level of assurances of the legitimacy of the sellers, business watchdogs such as the Better Business Bureau and local media have also contributed significantly to protecting consumers by reporting on unscrupulous business practices and/or sellers.
Seal of Quality Program	This cash funded program enables the Department to work with industry to establish minimum standards of quality for agricultural products to be marketed under a " <i>Seal of Quality</i> ". In recent years, only one industry segment (i.e., apples) has utilized the program. Even so, the Department believes potential exists for other industry segments to utilize the program as a means of assuring consumers of the quality standards of the agricultural or food product. Enhanced communication of the program and benefits to industry could perhaps enhance utilization and effectiveness.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

2. *For the three most effective and the three least effective programs identified above, please provide the following information:*
 - a. *A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*
 - b. *A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*
 - c. *A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*
 - d. *A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*
 - e. *The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.*

Response: See following pages for responses pertaining to specific programs.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Animal Disease Eradication and Control Programs:

- a. A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*

USDA - Animal Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS) – Veterinary Services (VS) works cooperatively with states to control, eradicate, and treat the state-federal program diseases which are identified in the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). The field and administrative cooperation and collaboration between the Colorado Department of Agriculture and USDA-APHIS-VS are vital to successful disease control and eradication programs in Colorado.

- b. A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*

Statutory authority is located at §35-50-102 C.R.S. The Department is responsible for the diagnosis, control, and eradication of livestock diseases. Livestock disease eradication and control are essential to the livestock industry, the Colorado economy, animal health, and helps protect the public health, safety, and welfare. The Commissioner of Agriculture through the State Veterinarian designates diseases to control, establishes animal health rules and regulations, monitors disease levels through surveillance, and takes appropriate action to ensure animal and public health.

- c. A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*

Activities involved for accomplishing our program objectives are the development and implementation of rules to regulate livestock diseases, enforcement of regulations, education of livestock producers and public, livestock disease investigations (epidemiology) to find diseased livestock and premises, conducting field testing for disease surveillance, diagnostic laboratory testing, controlling disease outbreaks through depopulation, disinfection of premises, issuing quarantines, and restricting livestock movement when necessary. Maintaining disease free status is one measure of effectiveness. Another measure is the freedom for livestock producers to move and ship livestock without the economic implications of additional testing and movement restrictions imposed by USDA or other states.

- d. A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*

All of the components of disease control and eradication are important to effectively accomplish the goals of the Department of Agriculture, Animal

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Industry Division. Some of the critical components are prevention, education of the livestock industry and producers, preparedness to respond to disease outbreaks, field activities related to disease control and eradication which includes testing, surveillance, quarantine, and removal of infected animals.

e. The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.

There are 17.0 General Fund FTE in Animal Industry that are associated with animal disease control and eradication. These FTE consist of veterinarians, technicians, and support staff. There are an additional 4.0 FTE that are funded through cooperative grants from USDA-APHIS. The Animal Industry Division General Fund budget is approximately \$1,400,000.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Colorado Proud:

- a. A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*

There are a few regional, private programs that promote local products (e.g. Be Local Northern Colorado, Northwest Colorado Products, Mile High Business Alliance) which complement Colorado Proud. No other State or federal agencies administer similar programs.

- b. A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*

Per authority found at §35-28-103, C.R.S., the Marketing Act of 1939 shall “provide methods and means for the development of new and larger markets for agricultural commodities produced in Colorado.”

- c. A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*

Colorado Proud promotes food and agricultural products that are grown, raised or processed in the state. The logo is promoted to consumers primarily through advertising and public relations efforts. The program works closely with chef organizations, retailers and school districts to encourage the promotion and use of local products at restaurants, grocery stores, farmers’ markets and schools.

Colorado Proud and participating partners aired 1,313 ads between August and October 2010. The 30-second Colorado Proud television ad was also honored with a Heartland Emmy nomination. According to our most recent research, 68% of consumers are very or somewhat familiar with the Colorado Proud logo, which is up from 59% in 2008. Of those surveyed, 84% indicated that they buy at least some Colorado products when shopping and 57% look for the logo more often now when shopping than they used to. Currently there are more than 1,400 members in the program, including producers, processors, retailers, restaurants and associations.

- d. A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*

1) Television Advertising; 2) Public Relations Efforts; and 3) Foodservice and Retail Merchandising

- e. The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.*

The program is managed by one Gen. Prof. V and accounts for 45% of 1.0 FTE.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Cooperative Agricultural Pest Survey (CAPS) Program:

- a. A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*

The CAPS program is a cooperative program funded by the USDA Animal Plant Health Inspection Service Plant Protection and Quarantine (PPQ). USDA provides the funding, provides a list of pests of national significance, assists with developing a list of state significance, provides trapping and other detection methodology and in some instances, the equipment. Other State and local agencies such as Colorado State University and local pest control districts may help with trapping and pest detection.

- b. A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*

Statutory authority is contained in §35-4-104(d), C.R.S. Early detection of exotic pests that have potential to threaten Colorado's agriculture industry, horticultural landscape, and environment is the most effective and efficient means to manage these pests. Through annual surveys, the Department is able to identify potential threats and develop appropriate action plans for control and/or eradication of the pest(s).

- c. A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*

Lists of exotic pests (insects, plant diseases, nematodes, etc.) are developed to determine the most important pests to target. Surveys are conducted for these pests to determine if they exist in Colorado. If found, an action plan would be developed to control or eradicate the pest.

- d. A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*

1) Identify pests of concern; 2) Conduct survey for the pests; and 3) Perform any needed control or eradication activities.

- e. The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.*

The federal funding provides for one FTE to administer the program. Depending on the type of surveys to be conducted, on average about \$400,000 is also provided to perform the surveys. The \$400,000 is used to contract with various agencies to conduct the surveys and perform any analysis needed.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Apairy Program:

- a. A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*

No other state, federal or local agencies have a similar program. However, almost all states have discontinued the requirement for hive inspection as a prerequisite to the hives crossing state lines.

- b. A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*

The statutory authority is in §35-25 C.R.S. The statute provides authority for the Department to conduct inspection of bee hives for contagious diseases when requested to facilitate interstate movement. The statute also requires anyone moving bee hives into Colorado to secure an entry permit from the Commissioner. However as stated above most states no longer require inspection. Over the last three fiscal years only two inspections have been performed. No entry permits have been issued in the last three years.

- c. A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*

A field inspector with knowledge of bees would conduct the inspection. The inspector would open several hives and inspect them for contagious diseases. An inspection certificate stating the findings of the inspection would be completed. For the entry permit, office staff would complete a memo authorizing the entry permit if the beekeeper provided the correct supporting documents.

- d. A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*

There are so few activities and they are performed so infrequently that prioritization is not necessary.

- e. The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.*

When an inspection is requested, it takes on average four hours of staff time. If an entry permit were requested, it would take approximately 30 minutes of staff time.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Home Food Service Plan Seller Program:

- a. A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*

The Federal Trade Commission and the Colorado Attorney General's Consumer Protection Section provide limited regulatory oversight of this type of business.

- b. A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*

Statutory authority can be found at §35-33.5-101 through 307, C.R.S. The Department regulates sellers of home food service plans to protect consumers from fraud and other dishonest business practices. The regulation adds specificity concerning sales of home food service plans that are not present in the Colorado Consumer Protection Act.

- c. A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*

Home food service plan sellers are licensed, which gives the State the regulatory ability to monitor the industry's practices generally and the individual operators specifically. Licensees are inspected on a limited basis for compliance with sales contract requirements.

- d. A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*

Inspection services are performed on a limited basis.

- e. The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.*

The program that regulates of home food service plan sellers has 0.25 FTE assigned to it, with associated program cost equal to roughly \$23,000.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Seal of Quality:

- a. A statement listing any other state, federal, or local agencies that administer similar or cooperating programs, and outline the interaction among such agencies for each program;*

No other agencies manage programs similar to the Seal of Quality program within Agriculture.

- b. A statement of the statutory authority for these programs and a description of the need for these programs;*

Statutory authority is in §35-29-101 C.R.S. “The purposes of this article are to provide a means whereby the general public purchasing certain Colorado agricultural products may be assured of the quality and grade of such products; to assure Colorado producers a better return from the sale of higher quality products; to establish a method of labeling and identification of such Colorado products so that purchasers may easily recognize them; to set up standards for quality, condition, packaging, and distribution of Colorado agricultural products so that the highest quality will be maintained until the product reaches the consumer; and to extend in every practicable way the production and sale of higher quality Colorado-produced agricultural products.”

- c. A description of the activities which are intended to accomplish each objective of the programs, as well as, quantified measures of effectiveness and efficiency of performance of such activities;*

See response above for an outline of intentions related to the program. As Department involvement is minimal – limited to review and approval of applicable standards, and approval of the design of the seal – no significant measures exist for evaluating the program.

- d. A ranking of the activities necessary to achieve the objectives of each program by priority of the activities; and*

Not applicable based on limited Department involvement in the program.

- e. The level of effort required to accomplish each activity associated with these programs in terms of funds and personnel.*

A Programs Management Specialist oversees the budget of the program, but it accounts for less than one percent of 1.0 FTE.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

3. *Detail what could be accomplished by your Department if funding for the department is maintained at the fiscal year 2009-10 level.*

Response: Department funding requested for FY 2011-12 reflects a reduction of \$904,783 General Fund compared to its FY 2009-10 appropriation.

	Total Funds	General Fund	Cash Funds	Reappropriated Funds	Federal Funds
FY 2009-10	\$38,843,498	\$6,055,836	\$27,018,443	\$1,800,473	\$3,968,746
FY 2011-12	\$38,671,956	\$5,151,053	\$28,478,175	\$1,042,750	\$3,999,978

Given current economic pressures present in Colorado, the Department doesn't anticipate that resources will be returned to FY 2009-10 levels in the immediate future. However, if General Fund resources were able to be restored, the Department would recommend reversing refinancing of the Markets Division, to free up Agriculture Management Funds and allow these cash fund resources to be utilized for additional projects benefiting both industry and Colorado, as can be demonstrated from the list of past and present projects below:

- Promote and market Colorado agriculture products both locally through Colorado Proud and through establishment of Colorado Pavilions at regional and national trade shows, as well as through greater export development activities;
- Enhance State support and leverage additional local and federal funds for conservation;
- Addressing noxious weed and predator control issues throughout the State;
- Fund agriculture-related studies such as climate preparedness and manure management;
- Improve Department oversight efforts through increased trainings for Department staff (for instance, large animal investigations and homeland security trainings) and purchase necessary and updated equipment (mass spectrometer for lab, ion and liquid chromatographs, handheld devices for livestock disease control).

Questions Specific to the Department:

4. *How large is the agricultural industry in Colorado? How does Colorado's agricultural industry impact Colorado's economy? Over the past ten years, how much revenue has the agricultural industry generated?*

Response: Colorado's agriculture industry generates more than \$20 billion of economic activity annually and helps support more than 100,000 jobs. During the past ten years (2000 through 2009) net income attributable to farming and ranching operations has averaged just over \$1 billion annually. During that same time, net farm and ranch income has ranged from a high of \$1.4 billion in 2001 to the low of \$743 million in 2009. In recent years, higher input costs for fertilizer, fuel, livestock feed, and pesticides have largely offset any advances in prices received by Colorado farmers and ranchers. The Department is in the early stages of developing a study to more fully assess the overall economic impact of Colorado's food and agriculture industry, examining multiplier effects and tax revenues generated.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

5. *On page 16 of the FY 2011-12 JBC Staff Agricultural briefing document staff recommends “the Committee sponsor legislation to remove all statutory caps on indirect costs for the Brand Board, Alternative Livestock, Chemigation Program, and the Agricultural Products Inspection Program.” Does the Department support this recommendation? Please explain the reasons for the Department’s position on this recommendation.*

Response: Both Chemigation and the Agricultural Products Inspection Program receive full support from Commissioner’s Office oversight in the areas of accounting, budgeting, human resources, payroll, purchasing, cashier services, and Commissioner and executive leadership. Given current budgetary pressures present in Colorado, it seems reasonable that these two programs no longer receive a limiting requirement on indirect allocations. However, if adopted in legislation, the removal of limiting factors on indirect costs charged to these programs will result in reduced profitability for both the fruit and vegetable industry and for farmers utilizing chemigation technology – and will ultimately have an adverse effect on State income tax collections.

Unlike Chemigation and Agricultural Products Inspection, the Brand’s Division has its own dedicated staff for various support functions, and therefore only utilizes a portion of the Commissioner’s Office and Administrative Services Division resources. For instance, Brands has internal staff to handle its collection of receipts, thereby using negligible accounting support and cashier services. As such, the Department is still supportive of continuing the statutory limitation on indirects charged to this Division, as it would be inappropriate to charge industry for overhead costs not directly benefiting the Brand Board.

6. *Joint Budget Committee staff has recommended that the Committee not sponsor legislation to continue the transfer of funds from Operational Account of the Severance Tax Trust Fund to the Conservation District Grant Fund. What is the Department’s response to this recommendation? Please explain the reasons for the Department’s position on this recommendation.*

Response: As stated during the Department’s Briefing on November 10th, due to the current law sunset provisions associated with Fund #19N (the Conservation Grant Fund), the Department did not include a continuation budget request for the Matching Grants to Districts line item as part of its base budget. Contrary to possible perceptions that the absence of a Department-initiated request constitutes a lack of support this program, the Department can exhibit that it has actually enhanced State resources for the local conservation districts with sizable allocations from the Agriculture Management Fund, equal to \$200,000 for each of the last two fiscal years, to further the program accomplishments. The Department is a strong advocate for the benefits that this program has provided to the local districts in Colorado, and strongly believes that severance tax resources have been appropriately directed to conservation purposes.

However, given to the upcoming change in Executive leadership, the Department did not

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

believe it was appropriate to recommend a legislative change without first discussing it with the new Administration.

7. *The JBC staff has recommended the reorganization of certain divisions and line items. What is the department's response to this recommendation? Please explain the reasons for the Department's position on this recommendation.*

Response: The Department is an advocate for improving both the transparency associated with funding in the Agricultural Services Long Bill group, and for aligning the Department's various Special Purpose Long Bill appropriations under respective managing divisions. Given some disconnect exists between the current Long Bill structure and Department's operational subdivisions, the proposed restructuring would enhance the usefulness of the Department's budget to industry and the public, to the Legislature, and even to Department management regarding funding allowances specific to their programs. As separation of Agricultural Services funding only exists in the Department's budget submission for reporting on actual expenditures for prior fiscal years, the proposed re-organization would allow for a prospective glance on resources for these various programs. While internal tracking and reporting on actual utilization of resources has always been available, the above proposal would make this internal level of detail more visible to external, interested parties.

Given the upcoming change in Executive leadership, the Executive branch would however appreciate an opportunity to work through an assessment of this proposal with new leadership before providing additional feedback. Understanding that there would not normally be allowances for a restructuring request, perhaps the Committee will allow the new Administration to make a Budget Amendment recommendation to address this proposal in the near future.

8. *Does the Department have concerns regarding fiscal flexibility if certain portions of the Department's Long Bill are reorganized?*

Response: As stated above in response to question #7, the Department is an advocate for improving the transparency and usefulness of Agriculture's budget. However, the Department's advocating opinion hinges on continued flexibility for current operating practices. It is believed that structuring the Department's Long Bill to include additional detail regarding personnel and operating costs for each subdivision of the current Agricultural Services Long Bill group need not force strict limiting expenditure authority for these various programs.

While the Department cannot take a specific position on the above proposal at this time (see comments in response to #7 above), perhaps there are existing allowances within other areas of the State's budget that could offer possible solutions, which would not bestow additional flexibility to the Department beyond what is currently provided.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Addendum Questions:

1. *Please provide the actual number of department FTEs in FY 2000-01 by division and the requested number of department FTEs in FY 2011-12 by division.*

Response: The following table details the Department’s full-time equivalent (FTE) usage in FY 2000-10 and the requested number of FTE in FY 2011-12. Note that due to the structure of the Department’s budget, resources are appropriated and requested based on the Long Bill structure, and does not provide Division-level detail for funding or FTE. One noteworthy perspective to highlight from the table below is the marginal increase of FTE during the last twelve years relative to the continued growth of Colorado’s agricultural industry and demand for State oversight during the same period.

Department of Agriculture Full-Time Equivalent (FTE) FY 2000-01 to FY 2011-12		
	FY 2000-01	FY 2011-12
Long Bill Appropriation	Utilized	Requested
(1) Commissioner’s Office, Personal Services	22.5	14.7
(1) Commissioner’s Office, Grants	0.0	13.0
(2) Agricultural Services Division, Program Costs	151.6	150.3
(3) Agricultural Markets Division, Program Costs	10.6	4.7
(3) Agricultural Markets Division, Agricultural Development Board	N/A	0.5
(4) Brand Board, Brand Inspection	64.5	66.3
(5) Special Purpose, Agriculture Management Fund	N/A	3.0
(5) Special Purpose, Wine Promotion Board	1.0	1.5
(5) Special Purpose, Vaccine and Service Fund	0.0	1.0
(6) Colorado State Fair, Program Costs	22.9	26.9
(7) Conservation Board, Personal Services	5.6	5.2
Department Totals	278.7	287.1

* Utilized FTE come from the Department’s FY 2001-02 Budget Request; FY 2011-12 requested FTE come from the November 1, 2010 Department submission.

2. *Please provide the actual number of FTEs by division in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 as compared to the appropriated level of FTE for each of those fiscal years.*

Response: The following table details the Department’s full-time equivalent (FTE) usage in FY 2008-09 and FY 2009-10 as compared to appropriated levels in those fiscal years. As FTE are appropriated at the specific line item level and not at the Division level, the Department cannot compare appropriated FTE at the Division level as sought by the question above. Also note that due to furloughs, FTE utilization in FY 2009-10 are artificially low when comparing to the appropriated amounts, as employees did not work the full 2,088 hours for the most recent fiscal year. Given 8 furlough days, an otherwise full-time employee would appear as a 0.97 FTE for FY 2009-10.

Department of Agriculture

Hearing Responses to Joint Budget Committee

November 16, 2010

Department of Agriculture Full-Time Equivalent (FTE)				
	FY 2008-09		FY 2009-10	
	Appropriated	Utilized	Appropriated	Utilized
(1) Commissioner's Office, Personal Services	15.1	17.4	18.7	16.7
(1) Commissioner's Office, Grants	8.0	16.8	13.0	13.7
(2) Agricultural Services Division, Personal Services	152.3	141.6	152.3	137.7
(3) Agricultural Markets Division, Personal Services	5.2	4.7	5.2	4.2
(3) Agricultural Markets Division, Agricultural Development Board	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
(4) Brand Board, Brand Inspection	66.3	56.9	66.3	54.2
(5) Special Purpose, Agriculture Management Fund	6.0	0.0	3.0	0.0
(5) Special Purpose, Wine Promotion Board	1.5	1.0	1.5	1.3
(5) Special Purpose, Vaccine and Service Fund	0.0	0.0	0.9	0.7
(6) Colorado State Fair, Program Costs	26.9	24.3	26.9	22.7
(7) Conservation Board, Personal Services	5.5	5.5	5.2	5.2
Department Totals	287.3	268.7	293.5	256.9

** Utilized FTE come from the Department's FY 2011-12 Budget Request*