

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **University Police**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A2200**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	10-Year % Change
337,725	375,779	389,035	416,348	423,557	428,200	445,579	524,218	543,132	565,485	67.44%

Mission: The mission of the University Police Department is to provide the students, employees, and visitors at Montana State University-Bozeman with a safe and secure environment for living and learning.

Services & Impact: The University Police Department provides the following services: law enforcement, safety, security, first responder for fire, medical, and hazardous material incidents, public safety answering point (9-1-1), parking lot maintenance, traffic control, accident investigation, crime prevention, education, services to motorists, snow removal, key distribution, liaison with local, state, and federal law enforcement and security organizations, and oversight of the Emergency Operations Center (EOC). University Police has responsibility for first response in the event of an active shooter or similar incident and as such routinely trains to respond to such threats. Additionally, the department has responsibility for the security and protection of all University assets. Expansion of mandates under 20 U.S.C. 1092 (f) also known as the Clery Act and the Department of Education's role in enforcing these mandates has placed an increased level of responsibility on the law enforcement and administrative functions of the department.

Key Performance Indicators: The national standard for police staff on university campuses is one police officer per 650 people; MSU's ratio is one police officer per 716 people. All Universities are required to report their levels of reported crime through the U.S. Department of Education, these are referred to as Clery statistics. The number of Clery crimes reported to the police department is reported here in relation to the number of police officers and to the number of full time employees of the police department. For 2007, MSU had 26 Clery crimes, 17 police officers, and 33 total police department employees. The campus had a crime to police ratio of 1.53 and a crime to employee ratio of 0.79

UNIVERSITY POLICE Key Performance Indicators

FY09 Budgeted FTE: **11.42**

FY09 Budget: **\$565,485**

Relationship to University Mission	Productivity Benchmark					Source/Comment
	Description	Benchmark	2006 Measure	2007 Measure	MSU VP Target	
Mandated	Clery crimes per dept police FTE	N/A	2.65	1.53		26/17
Mandated	Clery crimes per dept. FTE	N/A	1.32	0.79		26/33
Mandated	# faculty, staff, & students per Police FTE	650	902	716		NACUBO 1996 Standard 12170/17

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Facilities Services Administration**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7010**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

Base Budgets:										10-Year % Change
2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
307,004	410,475	465,647	460,923	472,206	473,205	599,454	799,604	929,040	939,675	206.08%

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.

Facilities Services (FS) is charged with the maintenance and operations of all university buildings, grounds and infrastructure systems. FS employs approx 160 full-time employees and 60 temporary/student employees. FS is directly responsible for 2 million square feet of academic building space and over 130 acres of landscaped grounds. In addition, FS provides at-cost maintenance services for approx 2 million square feet of auxiliaries and residence life facilities.

FS consists of five service management areas: Environmental Services, Budget and IT, Campus Maintenance, Engineering and Utilities, and Campus Work Control. Functions include Custodial Services; Landscape and Grounds Maintenance; trash/recycling; snow removal; machine shop; accounting; budgeting; computer system operation; Motor Pool; Campus Stores; campus storage; Campus Maintenance; electrical, plumbing, carpentry, locksmith, painting, sheet metal and general contractor services; Engineering Services; utilities purchasing/mgmt; heating plant ops; Preventive Maintenance; HVAC; maintenance and renovation; energy grant mgmt; master planning; Capital Construction planning/project mgmt; contract admin; architectural services; work control mgmt; project scheduling; project estimating; work order mgmt; workforce planning; elevator repair; asbestos removal; building plan/ infrastructure records; and personnel records management.

Budgetary Variance Notes

The major cost increase in this budget area has been due to increased FTE. Since FY96, this increase has been 6.0 FTE (Fleet Manager, Budget Manager, Accountants, Facilities Archivist, AVP University Services, Personnel Officer). The past few years have seen significant increases in capital construction planning; increasing gross building square footage (~14% overall); increased regulatory compliance (both new and increased regulations and increased enforcement of existing regulations); increased construction project load; increased records management requirements; increased project accounting requirements and overall load; increased services provided to affiliated campuses, including uniform maintenance assessments (FCI) and consolidated capital projects planning responsibilities; increased requests for information from OCHE, Legislative Fiscal Division, Legislative Audit Division, OBPP – also many associated with affiliated campuses; and the addition of the university records storage responsibility.

FACILITIES SERVICES ADMINISTRATION						
Key Performance Indicators						
Relationship to University Mission	Productivity Benchmark					Source/Comment
	Description	Benchmark	2007 Measure	2008 Measure	MSU VP Target	
OFS NET COSTS - \$13,249,109						
Essential	OFS net costs percent of Gross Institutional Expenditures		10.5%	10.0%		
OFS FIXED COSTS - \$6,482,260						
Essential	OFS fixed costs percent of OFS		48%	49%		Utilities are budgeted significantly less than projected
OFS NON-FIXED COSTS - \$6,766,849						
Essential	OFS non-fixed costs percent of OFS		52%	51%		
EQUIPMENT - \$236,142						
Essential	Avg years equipment replacement cycle	10	14	14	12	Benchmark = the Industry standard
GENERAL						
Essential	Average age of facilities	35	44	45	n/a	Benchmark =FY96 NACUBO* + 1% per year
DEFERRED MAINTENANCE BACKLOG - \$37 million						
Essential	Deferred Maint backlog percent of CRV	5.00%	9.6%	9.4%	8.71%	Benchmark=NACUBO 5%=Fair, 10%=Poor
BUILDING, LAND IMPROVEMENTS & INFRASTRUCTURE MAINTENANCE - \$3.4 million						
Essential	Maint expenditure percent of CRV	1.88%	.96%	.82%	1.29%	Funding % req'd to attain DM goal in 5 years
CUSTODIAL - 75.46 FTE						
Essential	Custodial GSF/FTE	26,779	29,605	25,292	26,779	Benchmark = FY96 NACUBO*
LANDSCAPE & GROUNDS - 13.98 FTE						
Essential	Landscape & Grounds acres/FTE	7.67	10.67	9.74	9.70	Benchmark = FY96 NACUBO*
		*FY96 NACUBO Public Research Universities Median				

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Facilities Management**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7020**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

Base Budgets:										10-Year % Change
2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
334,629	337,785	350,863	374,796	373,675	526,346	769,547	762,321	850,301	942,427	181.63%

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.

Facilities Planning, Design & Construction develops and implements overall campus master planning, land use planning, the campus Capital Construction Program, and assists Facilities Operations & Maintenance with facilities renewal, renovation, and Major Maintenance projects for the University. In addition to planning the physical needs required for the University to meet its mission, this department provides construction project administration and inspection, maintenance of utility system records and building plans, management of the critical computer aided design and drafting (CADD) system, project authorities and consultant appointments, facilities space inventory, design project management, historic preservation, project budget management and administers the Facilities Condition Inventory (FCI). Many of these services are extended to MSU's affiliated campuses and the Ag Experiment Stations as well.

Budgetary Variance Notes

The increase in Facilities Management costs is due to an increase in FTE. Since FY96, this increase has been 6.0 FTE (Assistant Planner, Associate Planner, University Architect, Project Accountant, Data Analyst, Admin Associate). This increase was necessary to respond to the huge increase in campus building area (~14%), that resulted from a decade of projects that produced over **\$180 million** worth of construction. Even with the increased FTE, management of the additional space generated by the construction boom and the design and project administration re-appropriated existing resources to such an extent that no long-term planning was accomplished for several years. This period also covered the MUS consolidation that led to increased Facilities Planning responsibilities relative to MSU's affiliated campuses.

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Campus Custodial Services**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7035**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	10-Year % Change
1,474,050	1,557,426	1,626,097	1,739,125	1,753,517	1,749,821	1,868,834	1,944,568	2,200,661	2,322,981	57.59%

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.

The function of the Custodial Services Department is to provide and maintain the cleanest, safest and most aesthetically pleasing environment for teaching and research, within available resources, while safeguarding the capital investment in the University's inside building surfaces.

All services provided through this budget are mission critical. Custodial Services suffered cuts in 1987 and 1992 that amounted to 15.5 FTE or 21% of 1986 staffing levels. These positions have never been restored. As a result, currently no services are provided to research labs other than to empty trash bins placed in the hallways. Once-daily service to personal offices has been reduced to once per week; and services to departmental office suites have been reduced from daily to twice per week. According to the Association of Higher Education Facilities Officers' (APPA) Custodial Staffing Guidelines, cleanliness levels have dropped from Level 2 (Ordinary Tidiness) through Level 3 (Casual Inattention) to the beginnings of Level 4 (Moderate Dinginess). Such soil left on building surfaces abrades and increases wear on the materials and significantly shorten their life-cycles. This ultimately increases operating and maintenance costs for the facilities.

Budgetary Variance Notes

Despite this downward trend in quality due to earlier budget cuts, the overall base increased due to: 1) a 16% entry wage increase from a Group Pay Plan Exception (Rule 1829) for all Custodians issued in 1998 and a 25% increase from a Group Strategic Pay Increase in 2007; 2) significant increases in the cost of custodial supplies (driven by oil price increases) and equipment over the same time period; 3) a swap of old, low-cleaning-intensity space with low expectations for overall cleanliness, for new high-cleaning-intensity space with high expectations for overall cleanliness; and 4) the necessity to add 11 FTE to cover a significant increase in campus building area and partially recoup staffing lost in the two cutbacks. The two pay increases were absolutely essential to keep the operation viable because local market forces (unemployment rate of 1.7% and rapidly inflating wage rates due to shortages of potential workers) made it impossible to recruit and retain employees, with staffing levels sinking to almost 50% of the cutback staffing levels for a number of years. The combination of cutback level base staffing plus below market wage rates made it nearly impossible to fulfill the department's mission. At no time did the pay increase keep pace with local market wage rates. The addition of a minimum of 12 FTE phased in over a period of years, 1-3 FTE/year, is essential to achieve adequate staffing levels beyond the cut-back levels. To accomplish this would require a continuously competitive wage, implying the ability to adjust to local market forces as they change. The MUS pay plan's static pay brackets, changeable only by laborious and time-consuming statewide OCHE approval, makes it very difficult to adjust to local market pressures on a timely basis and is likely to soon result in a repeat of the same recruitment/retention difficulties experienced after the increase in 1998.

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department	Landscape & Grounds Maintenance	Executive	VP Administration & Finance							
Index	4A7040	Program	07							
Base Budgets:			10-Year % Change							
2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	
610,876	633,755	691,577	758,320	757,961	790,288	802,965	799,431	903,919	972,841	59.25%

**Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's
physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.**

The Landscape/Grounds Department provides a clean, safe and aesthetically pleasing outside environment for teaching and research, within available resources, while safeguarding the capital investment in the University's ornamental landscape. Responsibilities include: Turf management (mowing, trimming, fertilizing, top-dressing, cow-path repair, etc.) including athletic field maintenance; tree/shrub maintenance; street/sidewalk maintenance; landscape construction; production greenhouse; flowerbed maintenance; landscape/irrigation system maintenance; physical inventories; environmental safety; equipment repair; snow removal for sidewalks, streets/entryways; and construction support and remediation.

Budgetary Variance Notes

Many acres of campus have converted from low intensity to high intensity maintenance, and the expectations of the campus constituency have skyrocketed. The significant budget increase over the past few years has been primarily from: 1) the completion of the Centennial Mall and Engineering/Physical Sciences Building projects, which, with their densely planted and irrigated landscapes, has doubled the amount of maintenance required of the Department; 2) a classification upgrade of all the workers due to increased technical demands placed upon them and greater reliance on autonomous decision making and personal expertise; 3) supplies and materials inflation; 4) a large wage increase for student and temporary workers, to try to achieve a more competitive wage relative to local market conditions to entice them to hire on; and 5) the addition of one permanent position to try to keep up with the burgeoning workload. Many large and small construction projects in recent years have added considerably to the workload, as contractors damage irrigation lines, and leave poorly graded areas, trash and ruts in their wake. These projects have greatly increased the amount and quality of landscaping and the length and area of concrete sidewalks. Coping strategies have included modest increases in permanent and temporary staff, and mechanization. These methods have helped, but have largely failed to keep pace with the escalating workload. Underground irrigation system expansion has paid dividends by creating a more attractive campus, but has upped expectations, made more grass to mow and fertilize, and increased weed and pest control needs. Most of all, it has more than tripled the amount of staffing resources required to maintain and operate the system. In the winter season, additional permanent staff is required to handle snow shoveling of the entryways and docks, since student temps are unwilling and unreliable at this task. The combination of these two needs justifies 3 additional FTE.

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Refuse Collection**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7045**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	10-Year % Change
171,177	178,587	179,673	191,907	209,349	224,316	271,296	263,102	252,514	279,418	63.23%

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.

Refuse Collection and Hauling includes hand litter collection, recycling, surface debris removal, hauling of materials from demolition and general building trash. The use of an extensive container system and two compactor trucks is required for the collection and hauling of refuse to the landfill. Landfill fees account for a large portion of this budget.

Aside from the City of Bozeman waste collection operation, one private refuse contractor holds a monopoly for refuse hauling in Bozeman. Lack of competition in the local market makes an in-house refuse hauling operation essential to prevent uncontrolled cost escalation. For example, an RFP sent to the private contractor in 2006 generated a proposal that was twice the cost of MSU's in-house operation. Even without considering the cost-control dangers of contracting to a local monopoly, an in-house operation can apparently attend to needs unique to the campus environment that would not be serviced by the contractor without excessive additional cost.

Budgetary Variance Notes

Major areas of costs increases have occurred in surface debris removal, recycling, and the initiation of a capital equipment replacement fund. The increasing campus population is gradually producing more refuse; however the closing of the Bozeman Landfill and the resulting change to the Logan Landfill realized a \$10 per ton savings despite the longer hauling distance. Somewhat piecemeal recycling efforts have also offset tipping fees in ever increasing amounts. Consequently, actual pounds going to the landfill have remained relatively flat for the last five years despite the increase in overall production.

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department	Insurance					Executive	VP Administration & Finance				
Index	4A7060					Program	07				
Base Budgets:										10-Year % Change	
2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		
232,100	236,380	316,602	336,167	698,591	783,962	1,400,051	1,377,585	1,100,606	970,820	318.28%	

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.

This account pays for the University vehicle liability insurance, and building, building content, and boiler property insurance. These costs represent the actual cost billed to MSU by the State Risk Management and Tort Defense Division. These rates are set by RMTDD. We are obligated to pay the total bill. Insuring the University's physical assets is not only an obligation, but also a critical element in our mission as "caretaker" of the University's resources.

In FY06, MSU (Bozeman campus) began participating in RMTD's Property Loss Prevention Program. This program allows state government units to demonstrate internal performance in property loss prevention activities in exchange for a reduction in their property insurance premiums. So long as we continue to participate to RMTD's satisfaction, they will bill MSU at 90% of our budgeted property insurance premium, i.e., reduce our actual annual premium by a net 10%. For FY09, this reduction amounted to \$93k. Due to annual premium fluctuations, premium reductions are predicted to be in the \$80k-\$100k range.

While there are no mandatory guidelines, we believe it is appropriate and reasonable to use the resulting funds to offset costs associated with general property loss prevention activities as far as is practical. The program would be as follows:

- Utilize the funds to offset the Safety & Risk Management (SRM) Dept's costs associated with the program, including staff enhancements/additions and O&M necessary to effectively manage the program (personnel represents a majority of the costs). Beginning in FY07, SRM will offset its associated costs with excess Early-Return-to-Work (ERW) Program funds. SRM will then use the funds "freed up" by these two programs to hire additional Occupational & Safety staff.
- As would be the case in any future major budget-cut mandate, or if the program itself changes or discontinues, SRM would be forced to evaluate the services provided in view of the resources available and respond accordingly.

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Off Campus Rentals**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7150**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	10-Year % Change
285,352	287,693	309,668	325,989	335,891	396,267	413,521	423,685	430,398	472,940	65.74%

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.

The Off Campus Rental account includes rent paid for space used by the Nursing program on the Bozeman, Billings, Great Falls, and Missoula campuses; rent paid for space used by the Counseling Program in the Student Health Center, the lease paid for the Safety & Risk Management building at Tech Park; and a payment of state funds to the MSU Foundation for the Alumni space occupied in the Foundation Building.

Budgetary Variance Notes

The major budgetary cost increases are due to the addition of the SRM building at Tech Park in FY99, the Great Falls Nursing Program's increased rent/move to Benefits in FY05, and the addition of Flathead Valley Community College in FY 09, and annual rent inflationary increases.

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department	Utilities					Executive	VP Administration & Finance				
Index	4A7051, 4A7070, and 4A7080					Program	07				
Base Budgets:										10-Year % Change	
2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009		
3,197,087	3,638,239	3,465,414	3,453,753	3,474,956	3,855,002	4,683,083	4,656,532	5,562,401	5,729,673	79.22%	

**Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's
physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana.**

The utility budgets are mission-critical activities, without which MSU could not operate. These budgets include purchased utilities, the Heating Plant, and distribution O&M costs for steam, gas, electricity, outdoor lighting, instrument air, and water/sewer services. Staffing levels, driven by regulatory and licensure requirements, and workload, are currently at minimum levels to provide the services demanded by the campus.

MSU-Bozeman is one of the largest gas and electric customers on the NorthWestern Energy system, and is the largest single customer on the City's water/sewer systems. Consumption of utilities is largely influenced by activities beyond OFS control such as occupant habits, building operating hours, weather, water-cooled air conditioning usage, and comfort level tolerance of building occupants.

Water/sewer rates are set by the City of Bozeman without any regulatory oversight by the MT PSC on the setting of tariffs. Campus irrigation water is separate system using reservoir, not city-supplied, water. We expect the City to establish a new storm sewer utility soon (with attendant costs) to conform with Clean Water Act mandates. Unregulated natural gas pricing is subject to the volatility of free-market conditions, making analysis and timing financially imperative, but time consuming. The electric industry remains in a state of both evolution and recovery from the stresses of deregulation. House Bill no. 25 passed by the 60th legislative session essentially ended the electric deregulation experiment in Montana and moved the industry back towards the vertically regulated market model. Although NWE is now allowed to own and operate generation assets, it currently does not do so. Therefore, the cost of electricity will still be subject to open market pricing for the foreseeable future. MSU will continue to obtain ~70% of its electric supply from NWE and 30% from the Western Area Power Administration (WAPA). WAPA rates, while less than NWE are projected to increase due to the ongoing drought conditions in the Missouri River Basin.

Budgetary Variance Notes

The costs increases are due to increases in purchased utilities, utility system expansion and aging, and increases in expectation of system reliability necessary to sustain our increasingly sophisticated facilities and activities (specifically, research).

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Building & Major Maintenance**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7030, 4A7050, 4A7090, 4A7110, 4A7130, and 4A7140**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	10-Year % Change
2,558,571	2,329,556	2,233,707	2,768,583	3,386,282	3,545,064	3,983,664	4,019,967	3,675,482	3,554,413	38.92%

Facilities Services is committed to efficient stewardship of MSU's physical environment for the benefit of Higher Education in Montana

FY09 Budget

Bldg Maint	\$1,214,055
Prev Maint	\$854,566
Major Maint	\$802,765
Class Maint	\$78,698
Sched Maint	\$604,329
Total	\$3,554,413

These budgets are the funding source for normal, breakdown, preventive and schedulable maintenance of building components such as exterior walls, windows, and window coverings, roofs, doors, finishes, structural elements, elevators, and building plumbing, heating, cooling and electrical systems and for larger repairs and replacements of major building components, many of which have been deferred for years. In addition these budgets fund the larger repairs and replacements of streets, curbs, gutters, services drives, sidewalks, irrigation system and landscaping. These budgets are mission critical. As funding is reduced, the level of service must also be reduced.

Budgetary Variance Notes

\$1,635,947	FY96 Funding Level
\$ 886,560	New Programs (<i>EPS, AgBio, Grad Arts, Library Renovation, Stadium/Fldhse, Gardner House, Insect Res Labs, Culbertson Hall Agencies, Centennial Mall, City SIDS, Fire Protections, Marsh Lab Modular #1</i>)
<u>\$ 905,048</u>	Inflation required to maintain FY96 & new programs (<i>per ENR Construction Index</i>)
\$3,427,555	Sub-total
<u>\$3,554,413</u>	Current Funding Level
\$ 126,858	Increase to budget over the last 13 years (adjusted for inflation and new space)

Departmental Base Budget Overview

Department **Safety & Risk Management**

Executive **VP Administration & Finance**

Index **4A7500**

Program **07**

Base Budgets:

2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	10-Year % Change
357,243	391,505	397,321	435,332	438,877	451,393	459,287	471,521	649,845	640,442	79.27%

The Safety and Risk Management Program reflected in Index 4A7500 includes all departmental salaries (6.58 FTE) and operations costs consisting of; waste disposal, analytical costs, equipment calibration and maintenance, training programs, SRM facility custodial, some building maintenance costs, vehicle maintenance, travel costs and other costs of administering the various programs. The purpose of the Safety and Risk Management program is to provide for the safety of University faculty, staff and students and minimize the negative impact of adverse risks faced by the University.

The various programs that comprise the SRM department are the insurance management program, occupational safety and health program, medical surveillance program, biohazard safety and disposal program, fire/life safety program, hazardous material management program, chemical safety, and support of the University's radiation safety program. There are various components within each of the programs and each fulfills a service to the University community and provides the regulatory oversight within each respective area. Some of the services offered within the above programs include, but are not necessarily limited to the following: Safety and Health Training, Audiometric Testing and Training, Mandated Health Screening, Personal Protective Equipment, Respiratory Safety and Oversight, On Site Safety and Ergonomic Evaluations, Chemical Waste Disposal, Asbestos Management and Oversight, Laboratory Inspection and Consultation Program, Laboratory Fume Hood Testing, Fire Life Safety Equipment Inspection Testing and Maintenance Oversight, Fire Code Inspections, Fire Safety Training, Radiation Safety Training, Radiation Monitoring, Radioactive Materials Disposal, Emergency Program Management, Chemical Emergency Response, Evacuation Planning and Testing, Worker's Compensation Management, Insurance Portfolio Management, Claims Management, Risk Assessment Management and Risk Management Consultation and Training.

SRM's significant budget increase as indicated for FY 2008, generally was not due to funding increases provided via the MSU Administration, however the increase for FY 2008 and the increase for FY 2009 are due to the use of outside sources of revenue and some charges to designated accounts identified and utilized by SRM Administration. The FY 08 and 09 budgeting increases in this index may not extend beyond FY 09, thus reducing to approximately FY-07 levels. In order to maintain service levels without program cuts and limitations SRM will have to seek additional funding from the MSU Administration by at least the FY 2010 Fiscal year.

SAFETY AND RISK MANAGEMENT Key Performance Indicators				FY09 Budgeted FTE: 10.9185		FY09 Budget: \$640,442	
Relationship to University Mission	Productivity Benchmark						Source/Comment
	Description	Benchmark	FY 09 (08 data) Measure	FY 08 (FY 07 Data)	MSU VP Target		
SRM HAZARDOUS WASTE DISPOSAL - 1.50 FTE							
Essential/Mandated	3 year average #'s of haz waste disposed/FTE devoted to Hazardous Waste Disposal *(1)	None	53,562 lbs	39,901 lbs	10,000	Pounds	
SRM RADIATION WASTE DISPOSAL - 0.40 FTE							
Essential/Mandated	6 year average #'s of radiation waste disposed/FTE devoted to Radiation Waste Disposal	None	2,798 lbs	2,798 lbs	1,000	Pounds	
MSU OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY - 1.0 FTE							
Essential/Mandated	Total cost of Worker's Comp claims/total MSU payroll	None	0.36 %	0.259 %	0.25%		
Essential/Mandated	Number of individuals trained, formal setting. Beginning with Fiscal Year 2006 (FY 2007 Column) data this is changed to be the: TOTAL NUMBER OF INDIVIDUALS TRAINED / TOTAL NUMBER OF CONTACT HOURS OF TRAINING PROVIDED. (To only consider the number of individuals trained was not necessarily a good indicator of the complexity, nor the expertise, program development, time or resources required to provide training. As the data indicates, there are a number of multi hour trainings provided, however the majority are one hour training programs.)	None	1511/2017	1,388 / 2,687	500		