

**LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD**  
**Austin, Texas**

**FISCAL NOTE, 78TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION**

**April 15, 2003**

**TO:** Honorable Rodney Ellis, Chair, Senate Committee on Government Organization

**FROM:** John Keel, Director, Legislative Budget Board

**IN RE: SB1828** by Averitt (Relating to the transfer of the State Soil and Water Conservation Board to the Department of Agriculture.), **As Introduced**

<b>Estimated Two-year Net Impact to General Revenue Related Funds</b> for SB1828, As Introduced: a positive impact of \$2,134,391 through the biennium ending August 31, 2005.
--

**General Revenue-Related Funds, Five-Year Impact:**

Fiscal Year	Probable Net Positive/(Negative) Impact to General Revenue Related Funds
2004	\$1,067,195
2005	\$1,067,196
2006	\$1,067,196
2007	\$1,067,196
2008	\$1,067,196

**All Funds, Five-Year Impact:**

Fiscal Year	Probable Savings/(Cost) from <i>GENERAL REVENUE FUND</i> 1	Change in Number of State Employees from FY 2003
2004	\$1,067,195	(11.5)
2005	\$1,067,196	(21.0)
2006	\$1,067,196	(21.0)
2007	\$1,067,196	(21.0)
2008	\$1,067,196	(21.0)

**Fiscal Analysis**

This bill transfers the functions of the State Soil and Water Conservation Board to the Department of Agriculture. These functions include: Brush Control, Technical Assistance to Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) Districts, Pollution Abatement, and Statewide Management Planning. The board would function under the direction of the Agriculture Commissioner, who would designate one of the board members as the chairman. The board would develop and implement policies that clearly separated the respective responsibilities of the state board and the staff of the board.

**Methodology**

According to the Department of Agriculture (TDA) the transfer of the State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) functions to TDA would result in a biennial savings to General Revenue of \$2,134,391. This savings would be realized through a reduction in FTEs and the associated administrative costs needed to implement TSSWCB's Brush Control and Pollution

Abatement functions.

TDA has had prior experience in administering Brush Control grants and anticipates being able to distribute these grants without needing any of the four FTEs currently associated with the program, resulting in a biennial savings of \$150,947 in General Revenue. TDA also proposes to combine Pollution Abatement with the Technical Assistance to SWC Districts function. According to the agency, this action would be phased in beginning in fiscal year 2004 and would result in a total reduction of 15 FTEs in fiscal year 2005 and an associated \$1,983,444 biennial savings in administrative costs.

TDA also anticipates a reduction to the FTEs associated with Statewide Management Planning. This function is primarily funded from federal dollars. TSSWCB originally requested six FTEs to implement this program in the upcoming biennium. It is anticipated that because TDA already has established relationships with EPA and an infrastructure to handle EPA grants, TDA could operate this program with only four FTEs resulting in a further reduction of two FTEs.

### **Technology**

No significant fiscal impact to technology.

### **Local Government Impact**

No fiscal implication to units of local government is anticipated.

**Source Agencies:** 304 Comptroller of Public Accounts, 551 Department of Agriculture, 592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

**LBB Staff:** JK, WP, GO, MS, TL, JF