2011 SENATE HUMAN SERVICES

SB 2270

2011 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

Senate Human Services Committee

Red River Room, State Capitol

SB 2270 1-26-2011 Job Number 13445

1	Conference	Committee
1 1	Contelence	

Committee Clerk Signature	Moneon
Explanation or reason for intro	duction of bill/resolution:
Relating to county social service	board reporting.
Minutes:	Attachments included.

Senator Judy Lee opened the hearing on SB 2270.

Senator Dick Dever introduced SB 2270.

Aaron Birst, ND Association of Counties, gave supporting testimony. Attachment #1

Rep. Kathy Hogan, District 21, voiced her support.

Shari Doe, Burleigh County Social Services and ND Association of County Social Service Directors, spoke in support of SB 2270. Attachment #2

Debra McDermott, Dept. of Human Services, reported that since there has been no appropriation provided in this section of law they don't do much with that report. They would be in favor of using the information as provided by the Association of Counties. If there does become an appropriation in years to come they will produce the report and the mills to determine what the counties would be allocated out based on that information.

With no further testimony, the hearing on SB 2270 was closed.

Senator Tim Mathern moved a Do Pass.

Seconded by Senator Dick Dever.

Roll call vote 5-0-0. Motion carried.

Carrier is Senator Spencer Berry.

Date: _	1-26-11	
Roll Ca	ıli Vote#	

2011 SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES

BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2270

Senate HI	JMAN SERVIC	CES			Comr 	nittee
☐ Check here	e for Conference Co	ommitte	e			
Legislative Coul	ncil Amendment Num	ber _				
Action Taken:	🗓 Do Pass 🗌	Do Not	Pass	Amended Add	opt Amen	dment
	Rerefer to Ap	propria	tions	Reconsider		
Motion Made B	y Sen. Mach	Cerri	Se	conded By Sen. 2	ver	
S	enators	Yes	No	Senators	Yes	No
Sen. Judy Lo	ee, Chairman	V		Sen. Tim Mathern	V	
Sen. Dick De	ever	V				
Sen. Gerald	l Uglem, V. Chair	~				
Sen. Spence	er Berry	V				
Total (Yes)5		N	lo		
Absent	0					
Floor Assignm	ent <u>Sen</u>	. Be	ny			<u> </u>
If the vote is or	n an amendment, brie	efly indic	ate inte	ent:		

Com Standing Committee Report January 26, 2011 12:30pm

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

Module ID: s_stcomrep_16_003

Carrier: Berry

SB 2270: Human Services Committee (Sen. J. Lee, Chairman) recommends DO PASS (5 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 0 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2270 was placed on the Eleventh order on the calendar.

2011 HOUSE HUMAN SERVICES

SB 2270

2011 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE MINUTES

House Human Services Committee

Fort Union Room, State Capitol

SB 2270 March 16, 2011 Job #15495

Conference Committee

Committee Clerk Signature

Explanation or reason for introduction of bill/resolution:

A bill relating to county social service board reporting.

Minutes:

See Testimonies #1 - 2

Chairman Weisz: Opened the hearing on SB 2270.

Sen. Dick Dever: Sponsored and introduced the bill. This is a simple bill. It is to eliminate the requirement that the counties provide a report to the state on information that state already has. The counties want this bill and the state is ok with it. My name is the only one on the bill because it came to me at the time of the deadline.

Terry Traynor: Assistant Director of the ND Association of Counties testified in support of the bill. (See Testimony #1)

Shari Doe: Director of Burleigh County Social Services testified in support of the bill. (See Testimony #2)

NO OPPOSITION

Chairman Weisz: Closed the hearing on SB 2270.

(No recording for the vote.)

Chairman Weisz: What do you want to do with this?

Rep. Porter: I move a Do Pass.

Rep. Schmidt: Second.

VOTE: 12 y 0 n 1 absent - Rep. Kilichowski

DO PASS CARRIED

Bill Carrier: Rep. Anderson

Date:	3.	-16	-11
Roll Cal	II Vote #		/

2011 HOUSE STANDING COMMITTEE ROLL CALL VOTES BILL/RESOLUTION NO. 2270

ouse HUMAN SERVICES			Committee
Check here for Conference	Committee		
egislative Council Amendment N	lumber		
ction Taken: 🏻 💢 Do Pass [☐ Do Not Pas	s 🗌 Amended 🔲 Add	opt Amendment
Rerefer to	Appropriations	Reconsider	
Motion Made By Rep. 7	Porter	Seconded By Hep .	Sahmid
Representatives	Yes N	o Representatives	Yeş No
CHAIRMAN WEISZ	100	REP. CONKLIN	V/
VICE-CHAIR PIETSCH	V	REP. HOLMAN	
REP. ANDERSON	1	REP. KILICHOWSKI	A
REP. DAMSCHEN			
REP. DEVLIN	V		
REP. HOFSTAD			
REP. LOUSER	V		
REP. PAUR	V		
REP. PORTER			
REP. SCHMIDT	V		
Total (Yes)	12	No	
Absent			
Floor Assignment	ep. a	nderson	
If the vote is on an amendmer	nt, briefly indicat	e intent:	

Com Standing Committee Report Module ID: h_stcomrep_47_002
March 16, 2011 11:51am Carrier: Anderson

REPORT OF STANDING COMMITTEE

SB 2270: Human Services Committee (Rep. Weisz, Chairman) recommends DO PASS (12 YEAS, 0 NAYS, 1 ABSENT AND NOT VOTING). SB 2270 was placed on the Fourteenth order on the calendar.

Page 1 (1) DESK (3) COMMITTEE h_stcomrep_47_002 **2011 TESTIMONY**

SB 2270



Testimony To The SENATE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE Prepared January 26, 2010, by Aaron Birst, Legal Counsel North Dakota Association of Counties

REGARDING SENATE BILL No. 2270

Chairman Lee and members of the Senate Human Services Committee, the Association of Counties is in full support of SB2270, to restructure the current reporting requirement by county social service agencies.

The existing language essentially requires counties to duplicate information that is currently compiled by the Department of Human Services, and doesn't directly address the issue this subsection was created to examine.

The proposed language would direct counties to use existing information reported each year by county auditors to the Tax Department and compiled on the Tax Department's excellent website. The attached spreadsheet – essentially 14 years of the proposed reports, was easily compiled from that information.

Preparing the comparison in this manner more clearly shows the relative property tax impact of county social services, not from the budgets, but from the actual taxes levied – arguably a better measure of comparison for taxpayers.

As a point of reference, the county levies highlighted are those that exceed the statewide average by 10 mills.

The Association of Counties urges a "do pass" recommendation on Senate Bill 2270.

Total Dedicated Human Service Levies (In Mills) - Trends Over Time

	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002		2004	2005	2006	2007	2000	2000	
Adams	29 19	23.50	22.87	22 80	24.9	34.05	2	26 45	20 90	25 70	26.25	0007	2002	
Barnes	20.00	20.02	20.02	18 81	18.77	20.00	24.33	20.43	10 00	00.00	24.55	40.72	74.70	Adams
Benson	26.43	32.56	28.94	28.42	31.48	29.06	20.12 329.09	27.09	25.44	25.40	24.24	26.24	20.00	Berson
Billings	15.36	14.73	15.07	7.76	6.37	6.02	10.32	12.06	12.98	13.93	12.70	12.57	13.34	Billings
Bottineau	20.00	20.00	15.86	10.99	16.84	10.09	17.17	16.17	16.20	16.87	17.45	16.23	13.88	Bottineau
Bowman	14.44	12.27	12.90	11.86	9.84	15.49	4.23	18.09	18.62	20.00	15.27	13.73	12.59	Bowman
Burke	17.36	15.11	9.48	5.51	5.06	11.00	13.76	13.59	14.06	13.89	14.77	14.81	14.61	Burke
Burleigh	17.90	17.70	18.65	20.18	11.16	22.01	15.67	19.68	18.14	15.92	13.12	16.32	16.21	Burleigh
Cass	18.14	20.94	20.15	19.89	19.89	21.00	21.00	21.00	19.00	18.00	17.50	17.50	17.50	Cass
Cavaller	21.41	20.05	20.46	20.50	19.76	19.72	20.57	20.57	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Cavalier
Dickey	22.43	30.74	25.31	25.51	21.32	20.03	14.06	13.97	16.19	17.26	15.92	14.96	18.74	Dickey
Divide	17.12	15.47	15.49	15.11	15.54	14.99	15.49	16.76	22.94	21.03	18.07	17.82	20.00	Divide
Durin	27.73	19.70	23.35	17.42	16.71	22.89	22.11	23.12	23.43	22.54	28.01	21.39	15.40	Dum
Eddy	33.29	23.49	23.85	23.58	22.09	21.73	. 31-70	32.87	37.45	36.70	34.74	28.89	21.11	Eddv
Emmons	15.86	15.89	15.08	12.63	11.67	11.23	12.60	13.13	13.18	13.07	13.56	16.02	16.34	Emmons
Foster	19.60	15.94	13.28	20.00	18.00	14.00	14.28	13.43	14.50	15.93	16.50	17.80	18.00	Foster
Golden Valley	21.77	20.14	19.22	17.63	13.56	13.99	15.85	16.42	17.26	17.87	17.09	16.65	16.29	Golden Valley
Grand Forks	16.08	17.04	18.04	18.03	17.52	17.98	17.97	17.78	17.19	15.45	15.94	17.06	18.41	Grand Forks
Grant	20.22	24.11	23.44	25.18	22.52	20.00	20.00	21.15	20.42	20.68	19.78	23.77	25.00	Grant
Griggs	20.00	27.68	26.01	23.00	24.72	24.00	20.00	18.00	24.57	22.46	21.57	2104	20.02	Grings
Hettinger	29.00	26.80	22.59	20.00	16.00	11,45	11.55	18.55	20.00	27.00	24.50	24.78	24.41	Hettinger
Kidder	24.69	19.83	19.68	9.50	7.95	10.00	12.10	16.00	18.00	17.15	18.03	18.06	18.00	Kidder
LaMoure	17.72	16.47	12.11	14.39	15.08	4.82	19.53	17.31	17.26	13.34	8.01	16.39	17.56	LaMoure
Logan	22.18	22.17	20.00	20.00	17.99	16.51	14.00	14.00	14.50	18.00	20.00	18.00	14.93	Logan
McHenry	21.33	15.58	12.66	13.11	11.64	13.18	12.96	13.50	14.65	16.95	13.05	1391	13.33	McHenry
McIntosh	23.51	23.51	24.53	21.73	21.34	20.82	20.75	20.67	20.34	20.00	17.06	19.64	20.00	McIntosh
McKenzie	16.54	17:42	7.66	4.26	,	•	,	17.23	17.25	18.88	6.31		7 17	McKenzie
McLean	15.94	13.53	11.16	13.47	13.10	13.62	17.07	16.37	14.99	13.71	11.79	11.98	13.99	McLean
Mercer	,		,	1	,	,	•	,	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	10.00	Mercer
Morton	22.95	26.33	27.84	27.36	26.86	26.86	26.86	26.86	26.50	27.50	27.50	27.50	19.50	Morton
Mountrail	23.19	27.14	23.06	25.02	23.04	23.94	25.34	20.00	23.69	26.38	25.18	28.97	23.37	Mountrail
Nelson	22.10	22.35	17.32	18.89	14.40	16.63	17.59	18.82	18.20	20.00	20.00	21.82	20.38	Nelson
Oliver	17.21	18.45	20.00	19.39	20.00	16.62	16.97	20.00	20.00	18.51	15.17	15.00	20.00	Oliver
Pembina	20.00	20.00	16.38	16.10	16.76	16.28	18.88	20.00	15.72	14.85	16.88	15.28	13.97	Pembina
Pierce	25.59	22.38	21.58	20.50	20.24	12.51	18.44	20.00	21.22	18.05	14.51	11.74	18.48	Pierce
Ramsey	27.00	27.00	25.00	20.00	20.00	21.88	27.00 🖫	3491	33.88	35.69	34.99	37.36	37.37	Ramsey
Ransom	23.69	21.75	22.67	20.51	9.78	10.82	10.79	11.11	11.57	11.31	12.23	9.73	9.01	Ransom
Kenville	11.41	11.40	9.23	12.58	10.93	10.45	80'8	11.08	10.91	10.53	11.54	11.51	14.52	Renville
Kichland	20.00	18.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	Richland
	18 10	10.62	65.22	62.22	22.35	30.15	22.23	21.34	21.04	20.08	19.95	19.76	第32.91是	Rolette
	24.59	23.68	20.59	16.60	14.04	96.04	14.21	13.5	20 00	72.57	14.20	12.06	10.79	Sargent
	741.10 324.32	32.1	441.29	41.57	4.90	40.88	20.02	20.00	41377	21.00	15.70	8.48	13.99	Shendan
•	13.61	13.26	13.43	13.28	11.12	14 46	1445	14 44	15.38	8 26	200 a	7 95	7 04	Sloak
Stark	44.08 42.78	42.78	36.82	36.56	34.70	37.43	32.64	M37.573	36.67	37.20	72 G7	30.62	25.05	Stark
Steele	15.39	16.16	14.78	15.35	14.83	15.30	15.95	13.89	14.67	14.01	13.68	14.28	13.89	Steele
Stutsman	24.96	24.46	24.45	25.04	24.85	26.20	26.37	27.17	26.29	26.80	25.21	25.21	26.00	Stutsman
Towner	20.04	19.38	20.51	10.45	10.00	9.21	9.63	7.30	7.47	6.93	12.74	14.60	16.07	Towner
Irail	16.70	14.68	11.72	13.97	16.42	18.68	19.44	22.69	21.84	23.04	25.84	23.54	18.08	Traill
Walsh	21.81	20.75	22.43	22.25	21.70	24.86	24.86	24.86	26.08	26.08	22.83	22.83	22.83	Walsh
Ward	24.09	21.58	22.71	22.97	24.86	24.50	25.86	25.49	23.10	25.93	19.89	21.33	19.65	Ward
Wells	70.37	22.22	24.19	18.70	18.18	23.77	24.55	20.86	20.28	23.45	20.26	20.36		Wells
	17.47	77.50	34.97	30.00	34.32	33.07	30.05	37.69	42.85	43.27	38.17	36.92	12	Williams
HAMEIAGE	11.12	20.00	19.04	18.55	17.52	17.92	.53	19.71	20.27	20.38	19.16	18.93	18.67	Average

Note: Highlighted levies indicate those more than 10 mills higher than the statewide warrage.

TESTIMONY HUMAN SERVICE COMMITTEE Senate Bill 2270 Senator Judy Lee, Chairwoman January 22, 2011

Chairman Lee and members of the Senate Human Service Committee, my name is Shari Doe. I am the Director of Burleigh County Social Services and the President of the ND Association of County Social Service Directors. I am here today to speak in support of SB 2270.

County/district social services are required to prepare a report showing their expenses and receipts and send this report to the Department of Human Services every February. This report is a duplication of a report that the Department of Human Services does later in the year. The only difference is that the county/district report is based on the calendar year and the Department's report is based on the State's fiscal year. Both reports use the same data that is obtained from the counties/districts. It should be noted that the purpose of the report was to assist counties that are levying 10 mills or more than the county average for social services. This has rarely happened and this bill has not been given an appropriation thus no payments were made. If a county/district ever exceeds the ten mill average and an appropriation is given, the Department would have the data to produce the report.

Senator Lee, thank you for the opportunity and I'm happy to answer any questions.



Testimony To The HOUSE HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE Prepared March 16, 2011, by Terry Traynor, Assistant Director North Dakota Association of Counties

REGARDING SENATE BILL No. 2270

Chairman Weisz and members of the House Human Services Committee, the Association of Counties is in full support of SB2270, to restructure the current reporting requirement by county social service agencies.

The existing language essentially requires counties to duplicate information that is currently compiled by the Department of Human Services, and doesn't directly address the issue this subsection was created to examine.

The proposed language would direct counties to use existing information reported each year by county auditors to the Tax Department and compiled on the Tax Department's excellent website. The attached spreadsheet—essentially 14 years of the proposed reports, was easily compiled from that information.

Preparing the comparison in this manner more clearly shows the relative property tax impact of county social services, not from the budgets, but from the actual taxes levied – arguably a better measure of comparison for taxpayers.

As a point of reference, the county levies highlighted are those that exceed the statewide average by 10 mills.

The Association of Counties urges a "do pass" recommendation on Senate Bill 2270.

Φ	
=	
<u> </u>	
ē	
8	
Trends Over Time	
פַ	
ভূ	
<u> </u>	
IIs) - I	
Ξ	
_	
=	
Levies (In	
Ķ	
L	
Human Service Levies (In Mills)	
5	
e	
S	
au	
Ξ	
呈	
Dedicated	
Sa	
ä	
De	
otal Ded	
of:	
_	

Adams Barnes Benson Billings Bottineau Bowman Burke	1997	73 50	1999	2000	2301	2002	03	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	Section 2
dams Sames Senson Sillings Sottineau Sowman	20 10	23.50	- 10		•	31.96	7. 50	25.45		1	27.70	24.66		
lames Senson Sillings Sottineau Sowman Surke	20.10	2	22.87	22.80	24.91		74.38	70,10	26.86	25.70	24.33	,	24.26	מושטע
lenson Sillings Sottineau Sowman Surke	20.00	20.00	20.29	18.81	18.27	20.00	21 52	20.00	19.92	20.00	19.27	19.73	18.90	Barries
sillings Sottinezu Sowman Surke	26.43	32.56	28.94	28.42	31.48	29 06	29 09	27.09	25.44	25.40	24.24	26.24	20.00	Benson
Sowman Surke	15.36	14.73	15.07	7.76	6.37	6.02	10.32	12.06	12.98	13.93	12.70	12.57	13.34	Billings
Sowman Surke	20.00	20.00	15.86	10.99	16.84	10.09	17.17	16.17	16.20	16.87	17.45	16.23	13.88	Bottineau
Surfeigh	14.44	12.27	12.90	11.86	986	15.49	423	18.09	18.62	20.00	15.27	13.73	12.59	Bowman
3. releich	17.36	15.11	9.48	5.51	5.06	1.8	13.76	13.59	14.06	13.89	14.77	14.81	14.61	Burke
	17.90	17.70	18.65	20.18	11.16	22.01	15.67	19.68	18.14	15.92	13.12	16.32	16.21	Burleigh
Cass	18.14	20.94	20.15	19.89	19.89	21.00	21.00	21.00	19.00	18.00	17.50	17.50	17.50	Cass
Cavalier	21.41	20.05	20.46	20.50	19.76	19.72	20.57	20.57	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	20.00	Cavalier
Dickey	22.43	30.74	25.31	25.51	21.32	20.03	14.06	13.97	16.19	17.26	15.92	14.96	18.74	Dickey
Divide.	17.12	15.47	15 49	15.11	55.54	14 99	15.49	16.76	22 94	2103	18.07	17.82	20.00	Divide
	27.73	19.70	23.35	17.42	16.71	22 80	22.13	20.00	22.43	700	0.00	25. 20	1000	
	2000	5 6	50.00	24.7	- 20	22.03	7.7.	20.12	25.43	£0.77	10.07	65.12	0.40	= .
	33.29*	23.49	23.85	23.58	22.09	21.73	3.31.70	. 32.87	37.45	56.70	34.74	28.89	21.11	Eddy
Emmons {	15.86	15.89	15.08	12.63	11.67	11.23	12.60	13.13	13.18	13.07	13.56	16.02	16.34	Emmons
	19.60	15.94	13.28	20.00	18.00	14.00	14.28	13.43	14 50	15.93	16 50	17 RO	18.00	Foeter
Apple Valley	74.0			7 7 7	200		1 0	9 9	9 6	2 1	0 0	9 6	200	1000
Gorden valley	77.17	40.14	19.22	17.63	13.50	20.00	15.85	16.42	17.26	17.87	17.09	16.65	16.29	Colden Valley
Grand Forks	16.08	17.04	18.04	18.03	17.52	17.98	17.97	17.78	17.19	15.45	15.94	17.06	18.41	Grand Forks
Grant	20.22	24.11	23 44	25.18	22.52	20 00	20 00	21 15	20.42	20.68	19 79	23.77	25.00	J. 200
Grigos	00 00	27.68	26.01	22.00	27 72	24.00	00.00	78.00	24 57	72 AB	21.57	,	0000	ָ מָינָי מָינִי
2000	200	20.00	. 02.03	20.03	27.17	2017	20.07	0.00	10:47	42.22	21.01	71.04	20.00	eRhino.
нешизег	28.00	72.80	65.22	20.00	16.00	11.45	11.55	18.55	20.00	27.00	24.50	24.78	24.41	Hettinger
Kidder	24.69	19.83	19.68	9.50	7.95	10.00	12.10	16.00	18.00	17.15	18.03	18.06	18.00	Kidder
aMoure	17.72	16.47	12.11	14.39	15.08	4.82	19.53	17.31	17.26	13.34	8.01	16.39	17.56	LaMoure
Coan	22 18	22 17	20.00	20.00	17.00	16 5.	14.00	20.71	14 50	10.00	20.00	18.00	17.03	1000
- Contract	27.70		20.00	7,00		- (200	3 G	7	10.00	20.00	00.00	4.30	- COG
Mchenry	21.33	00.0	17.00	13.11	11.04	13.18	12.90	13.50	14.65	16.95	13.05	13.81	13.33	McHerry
McIntosh	23.51	23.51	24.53	21.73	21.34	20.82	20.75	20.67	20.34	20.00	17.06	19.64	20.00	Mcfriosh
McKenzie	16.54	17.42	7.66	4.26		:	1	17.23	17.25	18.88	6.31	``	71.7	McKenzie
McLean	15,94	13.53	11.16	13.47	43.10	13.62	70.73	16.37	14 99	13.71	11 79	11 98	13 99	Mcl ean
Morror) !	<u> </u>))			000		00.00	Morgan
1000					' ' '	000			00.00	00.00	00.0	00.00	00.00	i si
IMOREOFI	CK-77	20.33	10.72	27.30	70.00	20.02	70.00	70.00	0C.07	DG: / 7	00.72	06.77	19.50	Morron
Mountrail	23.19	27.14	23.06	25.02	23.04	23.94	25.34	20.00	23.69	26.38	25.18	28.97	23.37	Mountrail
Nelson	22.10	22.35	17.32	18.89	14.40	16.63	17.59	18.82	18.20	20.00	20.00	21.82	20.38	Neison
Oliver	17.21	18.45	20.00	19.39	20.00	16.62	16.97	20.00	20.00	18.51	15.17	15.00	20.00	Oliver
Pembina	20.00	20.00	16.38	16.10	16.76	16.28	18.88	20.00	15.72	14.85	16.88	15.28	13.97	Pembina
Pierce	25.59	22.38	21,58	20.50	20.24	12.51	18.44	20.00	21.22	18.05	14.51	11.74	18.48	Pierce
Ramsev	27.00	27.00	25.00	20.00	20.00	21.88	27.00	\$ 10 PC	32.00	435,80	124 GO	- 27.26°	27.97	Damcer
Rancom	23.60	77.75	22.62	20.00	0.03	20.00	20.72	14 14	11 57	11.04	1000	0.70	3 6	Dongey
			20.7	2 6		20.02	6.0	- 0	5.0	5 6	2.23		0. 4	
	1.4	11.40	9.23	2.38	10.93	10.45	80.8	17.08	10.91	10.53	11,54	11.5-1	14.52	Kerwille
_	20.00	18.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	17.00	15.00	15.00	15.00	Richland
	***36.02	23.01	22.35	22.29	22.35	30 15	22.23	21.34	21.04	20.08	19.95	19.76	32.91	Rolette
Sargent	18.10	10.77	12.74	10.20	9.37	10.98	12.41	13.51	11.90	12.57	14.20	12.06	10.79	Sargent
Sheridan	24.59	23.68	20.59	16.60	14 95	14.06	20.00	20.00	21.00	21.00	15.76	8.48	13.99	Sheridan
Sioux	41:10	41.32	41.29	4157	241.41	40.88	40.77	44.13	4177	43.72	44.13	4146		Sioux
	13.61	13.26	13 43	13.28		14 45	14.45	14 44	15.38	8.26	824	7.85		Slone
	44.08	A7.78	36.87	36 56	102 PC	S 22 43	22.64	2757	36.67	100 700	22007	Traces	25.02	Atort.
	15.30	16 16	14.78	15.35	4	15 30	15.05	13.80	14.67	14 01	13.68	14.00	12.80	Steple
Shitsman	24 06	24.46	24.45	25.04	24 85	26.20	26.37	27 17	26.20	26.80	25.21	25.24	26.00	Stratemon
Towner	20.04	10.38	20.51	10.45	000	500	0.63	7.30	7.47	000	10.77	1000	16.07	Tomor
T. 2011	16.04	200.00	11.72	1207	2 4	10.01	20.00	00.7	7. 7.	20.00	75.04	00.4-00	0.04	10 W R
Waleh		30.75	20.43	20.05	24.70	00.00	1000	24.05	20.00	1000	70.04	4 6	00.00	14/0101
Valori Variation	21.01	20.73	C+.77	C2.22	0/1/	74.00	24.50	24.00	20.00	20.08	22.83	77.93	77.33	wasn
Ward	24.09	86.12	77.77	76.77	74.86	24.50	25.86	25.49	23.10	25.93	19.89		19.65	Ward
	20.37	75.77	24.19	18.7U	18.18	23.77	24.55	20.80	20.28	23.45	20.26	12.2	20.25	Wells
STEED THE COLUMN ASSESSMENT ASSES	# 7.47 P. 1	27:17	76.40	100.00 G	26.95	10.00 m	20.04	37.09	60.24	25.CA	2000年1	22	501.10	vvillams
- Average	77.17	20.80	19.04	18.55	75.71	17.92	55	19.71	20.27	20.38	19.16	18.93	18.67	Average

#2

TESTIMONY HOUSE HUMAN SERVICE COMMITTEE Senate Bill 2270 Rep. Robin Weisz, Chairman March 16, 2011

Chairman Weisz and members of the House Human Service Committee, my name is Shari Doe. I am the Director of Burleigh County Social Services and the President of the ND Association of County Social Service Directors. I am here today to speak in support of SB 2270.

County/district social services are required to prepare a report showing their expenses and receipts and send this report to the Department of Human Services every February. This report is a duplication of a report that the Department of Human Services does later in the year. The only difference is that the county/district report is based on the calendar year and the Department's report is based on the State's fiscal year. Both reports use the same data that is obtained from the counties/districts. It should be noted that the purpose of the report was to assist counties that are levying 10 mills or more than the county average for social services. This has rarely happened and this bill has not been given an appropriation thus no payments were made. If a county/district ever exceeds the ten mill average and an appropriation is given, the Department would have the data to produce the report.

Chariman Weisz, thank you for the opportunity speak on SB 2270 and I'm happy to answer any questions.