

# MICROFILM DIVIDER

OMB/RECORDS MANAGEMENT DIVISION  
SFN 2053 (2/85) 5M



ROLL NUMBER

DESCRIPTION

1125

2007 HOUSE EDUCATION

HB 1125

# 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1125**

## House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **9 January 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **769**

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

**Chairman Kelsch** opened the hearing on HB 1125.

**Peggy Wipf, director of Financial Aid, of the ND University System,** introduced the bill.

**(Testimony Attached.)** The intent is to encourage new optometry and veterinary medicine graduates to return to North Dakota to practice in underserved areas. She enclosed a proposed amendment. **(Attached.)**

**Representative Mueller:** Can you talk about the loan forgiveness. What is the community expected to do? The amendment you attached sets that in motion?

**Wipf:** Some communities use Chamber of Commerce dollars or individuals get together and put up the matching money. Yes, the amendment does.

**Representative Mueller:** In your testimony you mentioned Kansas State program. Are those students coming from that program to be involved in a matching community program?

**Wipf:** For those who receive state support, they must return to the state to practice.

**Representative Hunskor:** This says that professionals may receive up to \$80.0 to repay student loans. What's the criteria determining the \$80. Does one get \$40.0? \$60.0? \$20.0?

**Wipf:** It's based on their debt when they come out of school.

**Nancy Kopp, representing the state optometric and veterinarian associations:** It is a rare occasion that I get to testify on behalf of organizations for the same bill. Peggy's testimony

outlined why we would support this bill; however, I just became aware that the amendment as proposed requires a community match program. We do not believe that this community match program would not be doable at this time because of the economic restraints in some of our communities. I also have some amendments prepared that would delete the use of the word "specialties." Neither optometrist nor veterinarians specialize.

**Chairman Kelsch:** Is there a shortage in the larger communities: Bismarck? Minot?

**Kopp:** Yes:

**Kopp** went through the amendments she presented. (Attached.) We do not feel comfortable that this program be housed with the Department of Health; we suggest it be placed with the Bank of North Dakota or Higher Education, as veterinary services should not be placed with human health.

**Gary Garland, director of the Office of Community Assistance for the ND Department of Health,** provided information to the Committee on the bill. (Testimony Attached.) He discussed the cost to the department in administering this program. The state match issue is currently being discussed by agencies.

**Representative Herbel:** Are you aware of any communities in ND that presently are funding someone in the health services? I'm concerned that if a match is required, communities may have difficulty finding the resources.

**Garland:** The may be but not that I am aware of.

**Wade Mosher, ND Stockman's Assn,** testified in favor of the bill. The Stockman's Association likes the concept and spoke to the part of the bill for veterinarians. He also agreed that that program should be placed with the Bank of ND. They have concern about the matching grant. They are not sure how that would work as some veterinarians serve a large area and the burden cannot be placed on one community when they serve several

communities. There are other provisions that make it pretty restrictive such as entering into a four-year contract. What happens if you have an opportunity to buy into a practice in another community or area? There needs to be some discussion on that. On page 7 of the bill, lines 2 through 9, we see restrictions. For example, to someone who has left ND and may want to come back. We need to recruit veterinarians and get them back by making it financially acceptable to them. We discussed the idea of a sliding scale based on years of practice in ND. They have a large debt loan and low payback so they need help. The Kansas State is the only program that requires you to move back. Keep in mind that even if you move back you still have debt as that program only makes up the difference between in-state and out-of-state tuition. We think this bill is a good idea and good concept but the mechanics need work.

**Woody Barth, representing the ND Farmers Union,** testified on behalf of the bill.

**(Testimony Attached.)** We agree with the concept and also agree that the bill needs work. I have spoken to many vets and they are working 24x7. They are overworked and we need more vets. The community match is a problem to us. There are not a lot of resources available in communities to fund that match.

**Representative Solberg:** Do you have a number in mind as far as how many vets we would need.

**Barth:** Our policy asks for 5, but that is just basic. I don't know if there's a magic number but we are willing to work with the Committee to work on this.

**Representative Herbel:** Do you know how many students from ND apply for positions? How many are actually going out there.

**Barth:** I don't.

**Wipf:** Seventeen for the current academic year. They apply a year in advance for our particular program.

**Representative Herbel:** Are we guaranteed a number of spaces per year at Iowa State, Kansas State, and Colorado? How many different places are there?

**Wipf:** For vet medicine we have three options. We have Kansas State and that legislation allows for up to five slots. The board felt because of the budget source for that we weren't sure if the students we put in the pipe line if the students would be funded for their last two years. In good faith effort, they chose to fund two with hopefully the option for carry-over authority to fund them for four years. For Iowa State they will accept up to 10 students under our current arrangement. Traditionally according to our funding source, we put in 3-4 a year.

**Representative Herbel:** If we have ten slots and are only funding two, are others funding themselves?

**Wipf:** That's true others are funding themselves.

**Representative Hunskor:** Ms. Kopp, you have indicated you prefer the Bank of ND to administer this problem. The Department of Health administers the physicians and dentist's program. Is there a problem?

**Kopp:** Veterinarians deal with livestock rather than human health issues. Also, this is a loan program and loan forgiveness—perhaps this whole program should be coordinated by the bank of ND. That's just a thought.

**There was no opposition testimony for HB1125.**

**Chairman Kelsch Closed the Hearing of HB1125** and appointed a subcommittee to research past records of this type of bill and bring recommendations to the full Committee. Serving on the Subcommittee are: Vice Chairman Meier, Chair, Representative Wall, and Representative Mueller.

## 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1125**

House Education Committee **Subcommittee on HB 1125**

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **10 January 2007**

Recorder Job Number: **875**

Committee Clerk Signature



Minutes:

**Subcommittee: Representative Lisa Meier (chair), Representative Wall, Representative Mueller.** Also invited and present were: **Nancy Kopp**, representing the ND optometric and veterinarian associations; **Peggy Wipf** and **Laura Glatt**, ND university system; **Gary Garland** of the ND department of health, **Woody Barth** of the ND Farmers Union; **Wade Mosher**, ND Stockman's Association.

**Chairman Meier:** It is our intent, through informal discussions, to make this the best bill possible to present to the full Education Committee. Nancy, you opposed the community match. Could you give us your thoughts on that?

**Nancy Kopp:** I just had a conference call with my board of directors and we don't feel that the smaller communities have the resources to support a professional in their community. Some of these small communities cannot even support a grocery store. Would it be fair for that community to support a veterinarian in their community and not be able to make the kind of investment to keep a retail grocery store? I just don't think it's workable. When we first had the draft of this bill the match was not there. Yesterday we saw the amendments Ms. Wipf presented and there was the match. We recommend the optometry model be administered by the Department of Health; however, we feel strongly that the veterinarian program which deals

with animal health issues not be placed with the Department of Health which deals with human health.

**Representative Mueller:** This is different than physicians and a hospital. They make available those dollars for incentive to come back. Veterinarians, optometrists, dentists are different. There is no organization to which they are coming. They are independent businessmen and it makes a difference. A problem is that if this is in the governor's budget and, if there is a match required there, we run into problems. Whose interpretation is it that we are required to do a match in these areas? What would happen if we do not adopt this proposed amendment?

**Laura Glatt:** There is \$200.0 in the higher education system budget for this bill. It was the intent of the state board of higher education that the match be included in this bill. I cannot speak to their wishes if it were deleted.

**Representative Wall:** This question is for Larry Mosher. Larry if there were a need for a match, could the Stockman's Association provide any dollars.

**Larry Mosher:** No. We do not have any funds for this project. Our funding is basically dues driven. Other funds are through legislation such as brand inspection and brand recording which are earmarked specifically for those purposes. So we would not have funds available to put into those kinds of things. The other source of dollars that everyone looks at is the beef check off and that is specifically for beef promotion and wouldn't qualify based on the federal law.

**Representative Wall:** I would like to raise the point that if a community is not viable to raise a match, is it then viable enough to support an optometry practice?



**Kopp:** I think yes; but, I do believe a new or recent graduate in optometry or veterinarian medicine is going to weigh that against the investment of the equipment and instruments that it takes to run either practice. I think those decisions are made on an individual basis.

**Representative Meier:** I would like to discuss the issue of funding for the veterinarian program going through the Bank of ND.

**Wade Mosher:** I talked to Eric Hardmeyer at the Bank of ND. He is very interested in handing this loan program. He is interested and the Ag Department, Department of Commerce, etc., is looking at trying to increase more animal agriculture in the state in all species. It folds into all the goals that everyone has. The bank is also sensitive to the fact that they get blasted for making too much money off of student loans. This would be an opportunity for them to set up a loan forgiveness for a specific educational requirement and run it through their program. This veterinarian program is a vehicle we could use. Another thought is that we create a sliding scale repayment program that rewards those that come back who come back for any length of time. I would like to see this loan forgiveness extended to even those who have graduated several years ago, gone to another state, and who would now come back to ND to practice. Our intent is to recruit in any way possible for veterinarians I don't think it will be expensive. Let's just get them to ND.

**Woody Barth:** I work closely with the Bank of ND on farm loan programs. They like to keep the profits high, get the profits back into the general fund and have the legislature appropriate general funds back to causes. They would probably want to run it through the legislature and have it as a student loan buy down program and keep the interest rates at market rate.

**Representative Mueller:** Why move just one program to the Bank. Why would not all the groups want to do that? You could do the same for all. It could be done but, there would probably be more strings attached.

**Gary Garland:** The department of health administers, has experience with, has the processes in place, and has all the materials we need to implement several programs of this type and that is the reason we were approached to administer these. However, the Department is neutral as to the placement of the loan program. If the Bank of ND is more logical, we would not object. We do involve ourselves in the designation of shortage areas. It's a federal designation. There is a direct connection in designating shortage areas and setting up priorities for the placement of physicians and dentists in ND. That is the Health Department's connection. We do connect frequently with the disease control program with the state veterinarian personnel on disease management issues to animal health.

**Representative Wall:** Wade, on page 7, community selection criteria, would you be interested in the placement by the size of the community? It says that first consideration would be a community of 2500. Would you feel that we not give priority by the size of the community at all?

**Mosher:** It may be difficult especially when you look at the trade area that these veterinarians need to practice in. I understand the reason we want to try to get them scattered out but at the same time it's going to be difficult when you are dealing with Fargo and Bismarck who have an opportunity to pay more. Even vets in these areas serve customers 50, 75, and 100 miles out. I'm not quite sure how you would do that. I think you get into some logistic problems and that gets complicated.

**Laura Glatt:** Part of the reason our board looked at this issue was that there were a couple of things we had been hearing repeatedly for years. One was that there was a concern that the state was investing a significant amount of annual funding in these students basically to subsidize their education out of state. It's not intended to be a financial aid program; it's to buy access to programs out of state. There is a belief by some that if the student doesn't

return to the state they should have some financial obligation. That was one issue. The other issue is one we have been hearing from the industry that there is a significant shortage in the rural areas. The struggle is the shortages we have been told about in each of these occupational fields. We have do not concrete data about what the shortage is or what the workforce demands are. We have more student demand by way of student applications in some fields than we do others. So the question becomes do you fund the fields that the students are really interested in or do you fund the areas where the state has the shortage and is the shortage urban vs. rural. We have understood that there is a significant rural shortage and the challenge was getting them to the rural areas. The question is how is do we structure a program that uses a program rather than a stick. A stick would be where the student is repay the support fee if they do not return to the state as they do in the Kansas State program. We used to operate all those programs under that premise years ago. We want an incentive program that the state is supporting through their education to return to the state. The questions is do we also want to give students another incentive to return to the rural areas. It's an industry question as to where the need is in the state. We are not hung up on who administers the program. If your preference is the Bank of ND we are fine with that.

**Representative Meier:** Peggy, there were amendments attached to bill when it was presented today. I wanted to find out if the community match in those. Why were they presented?

**Peggy Wipf:** It was an oversight on our part. It was the intent of the Board of Higher Ed that they wanted to have a community match program in place. When we looked at the program we assumed that all the mid-level professional incentive programs were all community match programs. Knowing the Board's intent, we drafted the amendments.

**Laura Glatt:** Part of the reason the Board supported the community match approach is that we would be able to help a larger number of practitioners to return to state. You are taking state money and doubling it, thereby helping a larger number of folks or increasing the dollar amount of the loan forgiveness.

**Representative Meier:** We just received some pretty good feedback from the individuals here on why they felt that the towns could not be able to come up with a match.

**Barth:** The concern is, is that money there? I just don't think that's a major concern and why we are opposed to the community match portion.

**Kopp:** I'd like it confirmed whether or not the dentistry program is a community match.

**Garland:** The dental loan repayment program is not a community match program. When it was worked on by the ND Dental Association, the reasons were the same as mentioned here—the ability of smaller communities to pay came into question. With the physician loan payment, there is a natural employer for these individuals. The hospitals and clinics were all looking for personnel and they were willing to provide that match. With dentists there was not a logical hiring entity.

**Representative Mueller:** I think you could make the same case for veterinarians and optometrists. These two groups are similar to dentists so that's why we have a concern about the match. Peggy, help me understand the \$200.0 to be applied to this program. Is that in the budget and gone through? Or is it required?

**Glatt:** Our budget includes this and several other programs in one line item. That appropriation is more than \$200.0. The bulk of it is used to purchase out of state slots for educational purposes. When our Board submitted their budget request, they submitted a request for funding those PCEP (Professional Student Exchange Program Study) slots which includes \$200.0 for this new program. The governor's budget endorsed to the dime the

Board's request for PSEP. In the appropriation bill is a lump sum in that line item. There is no specific intent in the bill that says \$200.0 of that line item has to be used for this program. If this legislation passes and the appropriation stays intact, we would use \$200.0 for this program whether it's a matching program or not. There is nothing that I see that prohibits you from taking out the matching requirement.

**Garland:** One thing we learned in the physician loan repayment program is the 4-year service obligation was seen as a major issue with many medical students who were not willing upon immediately graduating to commit to a community for a period of four years. So what the legislature did in the last session was reduce that obligation from four to two years. That made it more palatable. I bring that to the committee's attention as you are considering ways to get them to communities in ND that need their help.

**Mosher:** Good point. You have to realize that all these people are human and if something doesn't match right in the community for whatever reason, you have to bail out. How do you bail out without creating a lot of hassle for every one? There may be a better opportunity down the road, an opportunity to buy into another practice, etc. Four years might be a strong commitment. It's better to give them an incentive.

**Representative Mueller:** That makes sense. We should change that. Make it two years and if they continue to stick around add further incentives.

**Representative Wall:** Just for my information, why did you quit requiring students in these programs to return to the state?

**Wipf:** There was strong feeling that since we do not require physicians, engineers and those programs to stay in the state after they receive their education and the state subsidizes their education out of state, we were penalizing other professions by making them come back.

**Glatt:** We also had a problem collecting. We were actually going out of state to litigate.

**Representative Meier:** If we didn't use the community match in this bill would you be in favor of the bill. As a subcommittee we would like to have everyone's concerns addressed in the bill.

**Glatt:** We cannot speak for our Board. I cannot say they would or would not support it. Again, I think their purpose was to have an incentive to bring people back to the state to practice to meet the workforce demands and given that I would not anticipate they would have any major problems with dropping the community match.

**Representative Meier:** There was some discussion on opening up opportunities to individuals out of state. Let's discuss how members feel about that.

**Glatt:** One of the reasons that drove us to this study, in addition to the shortage we've been hearing about, was the concern by some that we're investing all of this money in sending students out of state, subsidizing the cost of their education and then not having return to the state. If you follow that path, what we are doing now is putting in place a program where we are not only paying for our students to go out of state; we are creating another program to bring back nonresidents. Some might view it as a double cost. Does that balance with the workforce shortage area so if the primary driver here is to create the workforce then does it matter what state they are residents of? You just need to know that's another criticism we have been hearing.

**Mosher:** One of the problems we have had is that ND up until the Kansas State program was put in, has never had any input as to who gets those dollars. Some one else ranks those students. We could have 18 vet students come in and apply for this money at these various schools and the school tells us which ones they will accept and they rank them. You could have a student say they want a vet degree and have no intention of ever coming back to ND and someone else is going to say: you are ranked number 1 and you are the one that's going

to get the money. I think we have a better opportunity if we were on an interview committee to ask the question. If a student intends to come back to ND, you get an opportunity to rank those higher where they do get ND money. I would not have a problem requiring these kids to pay it back if their intention was to not come back. It's a difficult thing when you turn the reins over to someone else and say here are the slots, you decide who gets it, and we'll pay. I wish we could say we need so many FTEs and we've lost this many FTE so we need this many FTE. It's a hard target to hit.

**Representative Meier:** Has there ever been any thoughts on repayment of these if a student does not come back to ND? Any legislation?

**Glatt:** As far as selection of students, a committee may make a recommendation but in the end it's the academic dean of that institution that's going to make the selection. You may have students that feel passionately about returning to the state to practice but if the institution does not feel they meet their academic criteria for success in all likelihood they will not put the student into their program. Our preference is to use the incentive to get them to return. We went the next step further and said if we are not successful in getting an incentive program in place we will look at a repayment program. Essentially taking the money from those students that have to repay and investing that in additional slots. The only leverage we have is by funding more slots. Hopefully you are increasing your odds.

**Wipf:** A repayment was in effect from 1977 to 1983. It was repealed in 1983. Since then it has been reintroduced and passed on one side and failed on the other side of the legislature. It is a really passionate topic. We do really have a dilemma right now in that the Kansas State program requires repayment and the other don't. In our opinion, it needs to be one way or the other across the program. We need to be consistent.

**Representative Mueller:** The two standards thing is not fair and it needs to be fixed.

Regarding the community selection criteria, I think that may be a good idea. The reason I say that is that this is a priority thing. I still think we need some emphasis on putting those people into rural areas where we think we have a more critical need. We have two things going on: we have slots bought, and with \$200.0 for optometrists and veterinarians have incentives to come back to ND.

**Kopp:** We've always linked the three programs of dentistry, optometry and vet med together and we try to treat them equally. Each profession has different needs. Maybe it's time to separate them and maybe this is the vehicle to use. Optometry has about the same needs as dentistry. Vet med has different needs. I cannot say that we should spend the same amount of money on optometry as vet med. I'm suggesting that we follow the same model for optometry as for dentistry. I see there is another senate bill coming that further amends the dentistry program with parameters that a dentist does not receive loan repayment if he practices within 15 miles of an urban area such as Fargo, Bismarck, Grand Forks, etc. That would work for optometry also. So with numerous amendments, we can fix this bill. I would like to see it pass in some form.

**Representative Mueller:** The amendments presented need fixing in some small items.

Were there any major issues? For instance I see no reason not to adopt the amendments Nancy brought in. A bigger issue is some of those others we talked about.

**Woody Barth:** From the Farmer's Union perspective: 1. we do not like the community match, 2. we like working through the Bank of ND, 3. we like the year by year buy down, and 4. the communities having some input in order to get the vets out to the rural areas. We think the bill should be passed and get some student loan forgiveness.



**Glatt:** The only thing that gives me some pause relative to the discussion today, is the rural versus urban. Based upon what we are hearing from the professionals, there is a shortage in the rural areas. That's where we can't attract these folks to practice. If that gets stripped and I don't know if Nancy is suggesting that or not. If it's different for the vets, then it's open to everyone that essentially changes the bill which is to get folks to return to the rural areas.

**Representative Meier:** That is the content of the bill

**Kopp:** What I'm trying to get across is the workforce needs are different. I did testify that we are looking for 6 veterinarians in Fargo, Grand Forks and Bismarck. So that's a different need.

**Representative Mueller:** Nancy, do you have problems with the criteria for selection.

**Kopp:** Not necessarily using it as a priority. But then what happens if the vacancy is in a smaller community, do they have to go to that small community or nothing. How does it work in the dental program?

**Garland:** That's pretty much the case. In this next go around we are going to have more applicants than I have slots. The Legislature at one time was very firm on the community size that would be able to provide loan repayment for dentists. There was one slot given to each of one small, one medium, and one large community. That backfired to the extent that we did not receive enough applicants for the small community so we basically lost those slots and some dentists that ended up working in large communities did not receive funding at all. This coming spring I'm probably going to have 10 applications for 3 slots. The legislature amended its initial bill to not require that one be in each of these community sizes but to give priority to the small rural communities. So when we review applications this summer community size will make a big difference.

**Representative Meier:** We certainly have a lot to digest. The subcommittee's goal is to have some thoughts put together by the end of the week and look at finalizing it by Tuesday for action on Wednesday. If you have any further comments that you want to visit about, you can certainly visit with me or any of the members.

**Wipf:** We did quite an extensive study on the PSEP program and I would like to share a copy with you as it has some history and data that may be useful to you.

**Glatt:** The other thing it has is that we also feedback from the pre-vet program at NDSU who take a real interest in this program. We captured some of their comments.

**Representative Meier:** We also have some information about previously introduced legislation on this subject that we need to review. We would like to that.

**Representative Meier closed the subcommittee meeting of HB 1125.**

# 2007 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Bill/Resolution No. **HB 1125**

## House Education Committee

Check here for Conference Committee

Hearing Date: **23 Jan 07**

Recorder Job Number: **1698**

Committee Clerk Signature

*Jan Prindle*

Minutes:

**Chairman Kelsch** opened discussion of HB 1125. Loan repayment for optometrists and veterinarians.

**Vice Chairman Meier:** Here is amendment 78152.0101 prepared for this bill. She went through the changes made by this amendment. There are three main themes to the bill that the amendment makes:

- 1.) Page 3, line 7: change the number of years an optometrist or veterinarians must stay in a community to two or three. The committee felt four years was too long to mandate someone to stay in a community.
- 2.) Changes the size of the community priority for selection to begin with five thousand. We felt that realistically it would be hard to make a living in a community of 2500.
- 3.) Changes the language to clarify the loan repayment details.

**Representative Mueller:** The other thing we were asked to look at was the administration of the granting program. We determined it would be best left at the Health Department.

**Vice Chairman Meier:** I move we accept the amendment.

**Representative Wall:** I second.

A voice vote was taken: Yea: 12, Nay: 0, Absent: 0

The amendment was accepted.

23

**Representative Mueller:** I move Do Pass as Amended and Rerefer to Appropriations.

**Vice Chairman Meier:** I second.

**Representative Herbel:** I am going to vote NO on this bill because I am not convinced the program works. I am not convinced this should apply to optometrists.

**A roll call vote was taken: Yes: 12, No: 1, Absent: 0**

**HB 1125 passed as amended and will be rereferred to appropriations.**

# FISCAL NOTE

Requested by Legislative Council

03/15/2007

Amendment to:            Reengrossed  
                                      HB 1125

**1A. State fiscal effect:** *Identify the state fiscal effect and the fiscal effect on agency appropriations compared to funding levels and appropriations anticipated under current law.*

	2005-2007 Biennium		2007-2009 Biennium		2009-2011 Biennium	
	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
<b>Revenues</b>						
<b>Expenditures</b>						
<b>Appropriations</b>						

**1B. County, city, and school district fiscal effect:** *Identify the fiscal effect on the appropriate political subdivision.*

2005-2007 Biennium			2007-2009 Biennium			2009-2011 Biennium		
Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts	Counties	Cities	School Districts

**2A. Bill and fiscal impact summary:** *Provide a brief summary of the measure, including description of the provisions having fiscal impact (limited to 300 characters).*

The amendment to this bill allows the department of health and the state veterinarian to receive funds for the administration of the veterinarian loan repayment program. It also puts a cap on the amount of funds each applicant is allowed to receive.

**B. Fiscal impact sections:** *Identify and provide a brief description of the sections of the measure which have fiscal impact. Include any assumptions and comments relevant to the analysis.*

The amendment to this bill allows the department of health to receive up to 7% of the appropriated funds and the state veterinarian to receive no more that 3% of the appropriated funds for administration of the loan repayment program. Included in the ND university system budget is an appropriation of \$100,000 to carry out this program.

**3. State fiscal effect detail:** *For information shown under state fiscal effect in 1A, please:*

**A. Revenues:** *Explain the revenue amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each revenue type and fund affected and any amounts included in the executive budget.*

**B. Expenditures:** *Explain the expenditure amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency, line item, and fund affected and the number of FTE positions affected.*

The department of health and the state veterinarian are allowed to receive monies for the administration of this program. The department of health may receive no more than 7% or \$7,000 and the state veterinarian may receive no more than 3% or \$3,000 of the funds appropriated. The department of health anticipates our costs to administer the program to be approximately \$7,000.

**C. Appropriations:** *Explain the appropriation amounts. Provide detail, when appropriate, for each agency and fund affected. Explain the relationship between the amounts shown for expenditures and appropriations. Indicate whether the appropriation is also included in the executive budget or relates to a continuing appropriation.*

General funds of \$100,000 are included in the ND university system appropriation for the veterinary loan repayment program.

