To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Funding for Planning and Design of Projects (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.9, #9]

CURRENT LAW

Planning and design funds are currently provided from the building trust fund. Revenues to the building trust fund are any GPR funds provided by the Legislature as well as interest earnings which are retained by this segregated fund. Balances from the building trust fund are allocated by the Building Commission for advanced planning, among other activities, and the fund is reimbursed from bond proceeds for funds advanced for project planning and design once the projects are built.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Provide $390,000 GPR in 1997-98 in an annual GPR appropriation that would be created for this purpose for transfer to the building trust fund. Modify an existing continuing SEG appropriation from the building trust fund to specify that the GPR funds transferred could be used for the advanced planning, preliminary studies and design or be transferred to other accounts within the building trust fund.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Including the WISTAR and Healthstar projects, for which much of the bonding could not be released until the 1999-2001 biennium, the recommended 1997-99 state building program would enumerate approximately $641.3 million in projects to be funded from all

sources. If enumerated, these projects (excluding out-year WISTAR and Healthstar projects), with the Building Commission approval, could be planned for and constructed during the 1997-99 biennium.

2. Planning funds are generally advanced from the building trust funds, and when a project is constructed, a portion of the bonding proceeds or other funds used to finance the project are reverted back to the building trust fund to cover the costs of planning and design. DOA Division of Facilities Development (DFD) staff indicate that approximately $8.7 million in planning funds would be needed for planning and design associated with proposed project enumerations for the 1997-99 biennium.

3. Although the Building Commission is requesting $390,000 in planning funds to be deposited to the building trust fund and used for project planning and design purposes, DFD staff indicate a need of approximately $1.9 million in additional planning funds in the biennium. However, DFD staff indicate that approximately $1.7 million of this amount is attributable to advance planning for projects that are recommended to be, or may be, enumerated in the next biennium.

4. DFD staff indicate that current planning cost estimates and bonding reversions to the fund are only estimates and they believe that the Commission could have sufficient funds to plan for all the projects recommended for enumeration in the 1997-99 state building program. However, if the Commission would advance plan for projects not yet enumerated, the fund would likely end the biennium in a negative cash position.

5. Generally, the highest priority for the release of planning funds is for a building project that has been enumerated for construction in the current biennial state building program. Further, similar to concerns over enumerating projects in the out years, planning for projects in the next biennium could limit the ability of the 1999 Legislature to establish its priorities for the 1999-2001 building program. This could occur because once a project is planned for, there may be pressure on the subsequent Legislature to enumerate and construct the facility.

6. Advanced planning of future projects offers potential advantages to the state. Project implementation in the 1999-2001 biennium could be significantly accelerated if advanced planning funds would be released in the 1997-99 biennium. In addition, the Building Commission would have more detailed design and cost information available to it when considering these projects for the 1999-2001 building program.

7. If the $390,000 in funding would not be provided, the Commission could likely meet its planning needs for projects enumerated in previous biennia and those proposed for enumeration in the 1997-99 state building program. However, providing no additional funding would limit the ability of DFD and the Commission to conduct advanced planning for projects yet to be enumerated or those proposed for enumeration in the 1999-2001 building program.

8. One other factor that warrants consideration is that the Commission currently has approximately $490,000 available to it in the Joint Committee on Finance's GPR supplemental appropriation from the sale of surplus lands. If the Commission requests release of these monies before the end of the fiscal year, they would be deposited to the building trust fund and could be used to support advanced planning, or for other Commission activities.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to provide $390,000 GPR in 1997-98 in an annual GPR appropriation that would be created for this purpose for transfer to the building trust fund. Further, modify an existing continuing SEG appropriation from the building trust fund to specify that the GPR funds transferred could be used for the advanced planning, preliminary studies and design or be transferred to other accounts within the building trust fund.

Alternative 1	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$390,000
[Change to Bill	*$390,000*

2. Default Maintain current law (no additional funding would be provided, however, the Commission and DOA could advance plan for projects to extent revenues in building trust fund allow).

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#_____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE_____ NO_____ ABS_____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

WISTAR Funding (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.7, #5]

CURRENT LAW

The Wisconsin Initiative for State Technology and Applied Research (WISTAR), was created in 1991 Act 39 (the 1991-93 budget), as an eight-year statewide program to fund research and technology projects. The program includes projects relating to the construction of new research facilities, renovation and remodeling of existing research facilities, upgrading the infrastructure supporting research facilities and renovation of facilities which house applied research programs. Under current law, the amount of general obligation bonding authorized for the program increases from $130 million in 1996-97 to $150 million on July 1, 1997, which is the full amount of funding identified at the time the program was created in 1991. In addition, Act 39 created an enumeration for $75 million of gifts and grants related projects for the WISTAR program.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Decrease the amount of general fund supported borrowing authorized for the Wisconsin Initiative for Technology and Applied Research (WISTAR) program prior to July 1, 1998, from $150 million to $130 million. Restore the amount of bonding authorized for the WISTAR program to $150 million between July, 1 1998 and June 30, 1999, and increase the WISTAR bonding to $170 million thereafter. Currently, $150 million in bonding is available for the program as of July 1, 1997, and thereafter. The overall amount authorized for the program would be increased by $20 million to $170 million.

Specify that the general fund borrowing authorized ($170 million after July 1, 1999) could be used for either WISTAR or the proposed Healthstar program. Further, provide that the Building Commission could authorize projects under WISTAR without specific enumeration in the state building program.

Provide that the Building Commission could adjust the amount enumerated for any WISTAR project listed in 1991 Act 39, provided the total amount of general fund supported borrowing for all WISTAR projects does not exceed the authorized amount. Further, require the Building Commission to determine, before authorizing any WISTAR project, that there are sufficient gifts, grants and other receipts received for the project so that those receipts account for at least 50% of the total funding for all WISTAR projects enumerated as partially funded from gifts and grants.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Building Commission's recommendations would extend the WISTAR program into a ninth year and would provide an additional $20 million of general obligation bonding, which could be used for WISTAR or Healthstar projects. In addition, the Commission could authorize other WISTAR and Healthstar projects without enumeration in the state building program.

2. Summaries relating to WISTAR indicate that there would be the need for an additional $12.5 million of general obligation bonding to fund remaining projects in this area. In addition, $7.5 million would be utilized for a project that is currently viewed as part of the Healthstar proposal. Further, the UW has indicated that it believes it can generate additional gift and grant funding for WISTAR projects, and needs an increase to the project enumeration to allow these monies to be utilized. The Building Commission recommendations represent one approach to accommodate this program expansion.

3. The Legislature uses project enumerations to maintain a degree of legislative oversight over the state building program. The recommendation which would allow the Commission to authorize WISTAR projects without enumeration would significantly reduce the role of the Legislature in reviewing these projects. Using this language, the Commission could build any project categorized as WISTAR or Healthstar, subject to the limit of available funding.

4. An alternative that would utilize project enumerations would be to: (a) establish a project enumeration for WISTAR projects with $12.5 million of GPR supported bonding and specify that the bonding would be created on July 1, 1999; (b) establish a project enumeration for Healthstar projects with $7.5 million of GPR supported bonding and specify that the bonding would be created on July 1, 1999; and (c) create a project enumeration for $25 million of WISTAR projects with gift and grant funding. This alternative would provide project enumerations that are general in nature, so that the Commission would have flexibility in

implementing these WISTAR projects, but that would be more specific than providing Commission authority to build any WISTAR or Healthstar project without enumeration.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation.

2. Delete the Building Commission's recommendation and, instead: (a) establish a project enumeration for WISTAR projects with $12.5 million of GPR supported bonding and specify that the bonding would be created on July 1, 1999; (b) establish a project enumeration for Healthstar projects with $7.5 million of GPR supported bonding and specify that the bonding would be created on July 1, 1999; and (c) create a project enumeration for $25 million of WISTAR projects with gifts and grants funding.

3. Take no action.

Prepared by: Dave Loppnow

MO# AH #2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 1 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Healthstar Funding (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.8, #6]

CURRENT LAW

As part of the 1995-97 building program, $15 million of GPR-supported borrowing and $15 million of gifts and grants supported borrowing was enumerated for the UW-Madison School of Pharmacy to fund the construction of a new pharmacy building.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Create a Healthstar program for the purpose of providing financial support to attract federal and private funds to construct health science facilities and to facilitate interdisciplinary education and research activities at UW-Madison. Projects financed under the program would have to be designed to provide interdisciplinary health sciences and research facilities, ancillary systems and supporting infrastructure. Provide $64.5 million in general obligation bonding under the Building Commission's other public purposes bonding authorization. The debt authorization could not exceed the following amounts on the following dates:

a. $14.5 million through the 1997-99 biennium;
b. $49.5 million through the 1999-2001 biennium; and
c. $64.5 million on July 1, 2001, or thereafter.

Further, allow that the general fund borrowing authorized for the WISTAR program ($170 million after July 1, 1999) to be used for either WISTAR or the proposed Healthstar program.

Allow the Building Commission to authorize projects under Healthstar without specific enumeration in the state building program. Require that projects funded under the Healthstar program include a pharmacy building, health sciences learning center, interdisciplinary research center, parking ramps, related utility expansions, ancillary systems and supporting infrastructure projects at the UW-Madison.

The Building Commission would be allowed to authorize changes in the sources of funds for Healthstar projects if all of the following conditions are met: (a) the total adjusted cost of Healthstar would not exceed $87 million for general fund supported borrowing; and (b) the Building Commission determines that the total project funding from gifts, grants and other receipts for all Healthstar projects to be at least $120 million.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In its 1997-99 building program budget request, the UW requested: (a) $15 million of WISTAR, GPR-supported borrowing in 1997-99 to complete funding for the School of Pharmacy building; (b) $14,950,000 of GPR-supported borrowing in 1997-99 for electrical and water utility upgrades to maintain continued support of current functions and increase heating and cooling capacities to meet the requirements of facilities currently in design or construction; (c) $3,426,000 of PR-supported borrowing in 1997-99 for a parking ramp addition at the Clinical Science Center on west campus; and (d) $50 million of GPR-supported borrowing and $100 million gifts and grants funding over the 1997-99, 1999-01 and 2001-03 biennia for the Healthstar project, which would include an interdisciplinary health sciences research facility and a health sciences learning center on the west campus.

2. In its recommendations for the Healthstar project, the Building Commission combined these four UW requests and would provide: (a) $22 million GPR-supported borrowing (including $7.5 million WISTAR borrowing), $25 million gifts and grants funding and $18 million PR-supported borrowing in 1997-99; (b) $35 million GPR-supported borrowing and $50 million gifts and grants funding in 1999-01; and (c) $15 million GPR-supported borrowing and $30 million gifts and grants funding in 2001-03. Additionally, the $30 million GPR-supported borrowing/gifts and grants funding approved in 1995-97 for the pharmacy building would be included in the Healthstar project.

3. The Building Commission indicates in its budget documents that because construction has not yet begun on the pharmacy building, the pharmacy project could be folded into the Healthstar proposal as well as plans to join the pharmacy building to the health sciences learning center, creating a shared library facility and circular node connecting the two buildings as well as the Clinical Sciences Center and interdisciplinary research center. This would avoid the construction of two separate health sciences libraries, allow for shared facilities and promote the goal of interdisciplinary health sciences research and instruction. This proposal was not included in the original pharmacy building request because the Medical School had not completed

plans for its new research and instructional facilities, and the timeline for completion was unknown.

4. The utilities and parking facilities that would be included in the Healthstar proposal include upgrades to the UW-Madison heating and cooling facilities in order to support recently-constructed or nearly completed research facilities, and parking facilities to support the pharmacy and learning center expansions at the west campus Clinical Sciences Center location. Staff at UW-Madison indicate that the facilities funding provided through the Healthstar proposal would not be sufficient to support future utility expansions that would be necessary once the Healthstar buildings are constructed. Therefore, UW would need to request GPR-supported borrowing in future biennia to fund Healthstar utilities expansion.

5. Staff from the UW indicate that the construction of new health sciences facilities is critical to maintaining the quality of the medical school and related programs. The current medical school facilities were generally constructed during the 1920s and have received few renovations over the past several decades. The laboratory and instruction facilities are unable to support modern or interdisciplinary teaching and research methods which combine perspectives and techniques from various health sciences. The current facilities often do not meet health, safety and fire codes, and may pose problems for the Medical School when seeking re-accreditation. Further, the Medical School indicates that the current facilities prevent them from being competitive with other medical schools when recruiting top-notch research and teaching faculty as well as highly ranked students.

6. While the Healthstar proposal appears to provide a reasonable approach to the long-term building needs of the UW-Madison Medical School, it may desirable to require the Building Commission to specifically enumerate the project in the state building program as well as provide for borrowing commitments only in the 1997-99 biennium, rather than provide for an overall budget with commitments over the next six years. This would allow for biennial legislative oversight of state borrowing for the Healthstar proposal and a specific budgeted amount in each biennium.

7. On the other hand, the UW argues that without a longer-term commitment from the state, the Medical Foundation will have difficulty attracting gifts and grants for such a large project. Often, large federal grants require a long-term state commitment and individual donors may not wish to commit funds to a project that is not securely funded throughout the entire project. Additionally, the WISTAR program, which allows for eight-year borrowing commitments for UW research facilities, provides a precedent for funding projects of this kind over a longer time period. Further, the bill provides for an $87 million cap on GPR-supported borrowing and a floor of $120 million gifts and grants funding. This may provide some assurance that if the costs of Healthstar increase, these increases would be funded through gifts and grants, rather than GPR.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to provide $64.5 million in general obligation bonding over the next three biennia, including: (a) $14.5 million through the 1997-99 biennium; $49.5 million through the 1999-01 biennium; and (c) $64.5 million on July 1, 2001, or thereafter for the Healthstar project at UW-Madison.

Alternative 1	BR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$64,500,000
[Change to Bill	*$64,500,000]*

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to provide $14.5 million in general obligation bonding in 1997-99 for the Healthstar project at UW-Madison.

Alternative 2	BR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$14,500,000
[Change to Bill	*$14,500,000]*

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Ruth Hardy

MO# Alt #1

2 JENSEN	Y	N	A
1 OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Moveable Equipment Master Lease (Building Program)

CURRENT LAW

An exception to the requirement that individual projects be enumerated by the Legislature is the category of projects known as "all agency" projects. These broad types of projects are enumerated under titles that indicate a general category of work and that establish an overall budget for a biennium for that purpose. One of the all agency project categories is capital equipment acquisition, which generally includes moveable or special equipment.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Although no change to current law is needed, the Building Commission recommendations indicate that moveable and special equipment purchases for seven projects recommended for enumeration in the 1997-99 state building program would be done through a master lease purchase program rather than through general obligation borrowing. These projects include two major Corrections projects, three smaller UW projects and two DNR projects.

DISCUSSION POINTS

State's Equipment Master Lease Program

1. Moveable equipment for building projects includes expenditures for furnishings not provided as part of the construction work such as chairs, tables and desks. The average moveable equipment budget for an office building project is 5% to 6% of the building cost for new construction. However, the percentage will vary depending on the type of project. The

useful life of moveable equipment is generally at least ten years. To the extent possible, agencies generally make use of existing equipment in new or remodeling building projects.

2. Special equipment includes special program equipment such as electron microscopes, automated filing equipment, computers and start-up software. Special equipment generally has a useful life of less than ten years. For some projects, special equipment is purchased directly from a manufacturer or distributor and not included in the construction contracts.

3. The state created a master lease program in September, 1992, for the purpose of acquiring equipment for state departments through installment payments. In 1994, the program was expanded to include, in limited circumstances, the acquisition of prepaid services. Examples of current leased items include the state's accounting system, expansion of the state's central mainframe computer and various information technology items.

4. The program implements a two-phased financing structure: (a) the financing of all leased items initially financed with proceeds from a revolving line of credit for which the state pays interest based on a variable taxable interest rate; and (b) the state, at various times, issues certificates of participation to refinance the revolving credit with a fixed rate and most often tax exempt financing. The state is required to make master lease payments, subject to annual appropriation, sufficient to pay semiannual principal and interest payments on the certificates. The state's obligation to make lease payments is not a general obligation of the state and lease payments due under the master lease are not higher in priority than payments on outstanding general obligation bonds.

5. The master lease program is administered through the Department of Administration and is available for all state agencies, including 18 state departments and any association, society or other body of the State which is entitled to expend appropriated funds, including the Legislature and courts. Through October 1, 1996, 15 of the 18 state departments have used the program to acquire nearly $98 million in equipment or service items.

6. Under the master lease program, state agencies submit requests to DOA for approval. DOA's review includes a determination as to whether lease financing is the best alternative for acquiring the equipment and the state agency has the resources to make the required lease payments. An agency's master lease payments are not included in the state budget as a separate line item, but rather are included with other expenditures in one or more of an agency's existing operating budget lines.

1997-99 State Building Program -- Capital Equipment

7. In past state building programs, necessary moveable and special equipment have been, for the most part, included in the cost of projects enumerated in the state building program. Further, if a project was funded from general obligation bonds, those bonds have been used to

purchase any needed moveable or special equipment related to that project. Approximately $22.7 million in identifiable moveable or special equipment requests are contained in the projects enumerated under the recommended the 1997-99 state building program.

8. In its deliberations on the building program, the Commission had as a goal a limit of $250 million on the amount of GPR supported bonding it would authorize. As part of the effort to achieve this goal, the Commission recommended that approximately $11.2 million of moveable and special equipment requests associated with seven building program projects be funded through master lease financing rather than with bond proceeds.

9. The debt service payments on state building projects are generally made from a sum sufficient appropriation and therefore, whatever amount needed to fund the debt obligation is made available to the agency. However, master lease payments are not provided on a sum sufficient basis, but rather require an agency to make the payments out of their existing budgets or available revenues. Therefore, the effect of requiring an agency to make master lease payments on equipment that would have otherwise been purchased with general obligation bonds would be that the agency would have to fund the lease payments out of their operating budgets. That is, instead of paying for the equipment from a sum sufficient appropriation an agency may have to: (a) make the lease payments from unspent appropriated base funds; (b) request additional GPR funding to cover the cost of the equipment lease payments; or (c) generate additional program or segregated revenues and request additional expenditure authority to cover the lease payments.

10. The University of Wisconsin Center's requested $6.0 million associated with the acquisition of movable and other equipment. DFD recommended to the Building Commission that the funding be provided under the master lease program, which would have required the UW-Centers to fund the financing of the $6.0 million in equipment from their operating budgets. The UW-Centers had not requested additional GPR funding to cover the cost of financing the equipment under master lease in their 1997-99 budget request. As a result, recognizing the difficulty of the UW-Centers to fund the equipment from their existing budget, and that the Centers had been unable to request additional funding to cover the master lease financing costs, the Building Commission provided $6.0 million in general fund supported general obligation bonding for the acquisition of the equipment.

11. It could be argued that the Department of Corrections, Natural Resources and other campuses of the University of Wisconsin System, also submitted their requests with the understanding that the equipments purchases associated with their projects, if funded, would be funded with general obligation bonds. Similar to the UW-Centers, these agencies would have to fund the master lease payments from their operating budgets and would not have had the opportunity to request the funding necessary to cover the lease payment costs. Therefore, it could be argued that the equipment associated with these projects should be funded from general obligation bonds, similar to the UW-Center's $6.0 million equipment request, and to the other

$3.9 million in 1997-99 equipment requests recommended by the Commission to be funded from general obligation bonding.

12. Because of the size of the prison facilities and University building projects, it is unlikely that the equipment would be purchased until the latter part of the biennium and therefore, the lease costs in the biennium would be minimal. The agencies would then have the opportunity to request the funding in the next biennium to cover the lease costs associated with the equipment.

13. DOA staff indicate that requiring an agency to pay equipment related to state building projects from their operating budgets may encourage agencies to use additional scrutiny in compiling their equipment requests. They note that the current system of paying for the equipment from sum sufficient appropriations provides no incentive for agencies to thoroughly review their equipment requests.

14. Conversely, it could be argued that agency requests for equipment related to a building project are currently being reviewed by the DOA's Division of Facilities Development (DFD) and the requesting agency. DFD staff, as staff to the Building Commission, review and analyze each project to determine whether the equipment is necessary and make recommendations to the Building Commission on those requests. Further, DFD's 1997-99 agency capital budget request guidelines state that agencies should utilize existing equipment for a new or remodeled facility to the extent possible.

15. One question relating to the Building Commission's recommendation to use the master lease program for project equipment relates to a comparison of financing costs associated with using general obligation debt versus master lease. In general, the costs associated with either approach revolves around the interest rates and repayment periods used to finance the equipment. Payments under the master lease program, because the repayment obligation under the program is not a general obligation debt of the state, will likely carry a higher interest rate cost. However, under the master lease program, the equipment would be financed under an accelerated amortization schedule (generally a maximum of seven years). As a result, despite a higher interest rate, because of the shorter repayment period, the interest costs incurred under the master lease program may not be higher. However, if the amortization period is shorter, the near-term cash outlay may be increased using the master lease program, which could put pressure on the agencies' operating budgets.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to authorize the use of master lease to acquire the movable and special equipment for projects authorized in the 1997-99 state building program: (a) $8,700,000 associated with projects enumerated under the Department of Corrections; (b) $157,800 associated with projects enumerated under the Department of

Natural Resources; and (c) $2,324,500 associated with projects enumerated under the University of Wisconsin System (the agencies would be required to fund the acquisition of the equipment from base funds or future appropriation requests).

2. Delete the Building Commission's Recommendations and provide: (a) $8,700,000 in general fund supported general obligation bonding associated with equipment for the Department of Correction's prison expansion program; (b) $157,800 in segregated general obligation bonding associated with projects enumerated under DNR ($47,800 associated with the Antigo ranger station project and $110,000 associated with the Winnebago County/Oshkosh Cooperative Service Center; and (c) $2,324,500 associated with projects enumerated under the University of Wisconsin System ($589,000 associated with remodeling UW-Milwaukee's Sabin Hall, $13,500 associated with UW-Parkside's physical education building addition and $1,722,000 associated with UW-Stout's communication center replacement).

Alternative 2	BR-GPR	BR-SEG	TOTAL
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$11,024,500	$157,800	$11,182,300
[Change to Bill	*$11,024,500*	*$157,800*	*$11,182,300]*

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO# A/ #2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
2 GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Local Inducements for State Building Projects (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.18, #34]

CURRENT LAW

Any town, village, or city is prohibited from making an appropriation or bonus, incurring a liability or levying a tax, in order to provide a consideration or make an inducement to the state to locate a public educational, charitable, reformatory or penal institution.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Eliminate the current law prohibition on offering inducements to the state.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The current law provision has been in effect for approximately 100 years (established in Chapter 19, Laws of 1897). The law appears to have been enacted to prevent local communities influencing state decisions in locating public educational, charitable, reformatory or penal institutions.

2. Eliminating the current law prohibition could result in communities bidding against each other to receive state projects. It could be argued that it would be undesirable for the state to allow communities to bid against each other in siting a state project.

3. Deleting the current law prohibition could have the effect of placing poorer communities at a disadvantage in site selection. These communities may not have the finances or assets to offer to the state, for favorable consideration in locating a project in their community, when compared with a more wealthy community.

4. An argument for deleting the current prohibition is that the state costs associated with building a facility could be reduced if a local community were to provide funds, land or other assets in return for having a project located in their community. Locating a state project involves several concerns, including safety, environmental, transportation, as well as the operational costs associated with locating facility in a particular area. A local inducement, if offered, may only be a minor consideration in site selection.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to delete the municipal law provision that prohibits any town, village, or city from making an appropriation or bonus, incurring a liability or levying a tax, in order to provide a consideration or make an inducement to the state to locate a public educational, charitable, reformatory or penal institution.

2. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO# Alt #1

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 3 NO 13 ABS

Representative Jensen

BUILDING PROGRAM

Local Inducements for State Building Projects
(Paper #203)

Motion:

Move to allow any town, village or city to donate land to the state as a consideration for the location of a public, educational, charitable, reformatory or penal institution.

MO# 7042

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Construction Contract Bids (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.15, #22]

CURRENT LAW

DOA must obtain the Attorney General's approval for all settlements related to construction contract bid errors.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Delete the current requirement that the Department of Administration obtain the approval of the Attorney General before settling cases relating to bid guarantee settlements when a bid contains an error, omission or mistake, if the settlement amount is less than $100,000. For settlements in excess of $100,000, DOA would still have to obtain the Attorney General's approval to settle a bid error.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Contracts offered on a competitive basis are required to be factual and without omission or mistakes and contractors are often required to submit a bid guarantee to ensure that their contract bid is a valid bid. If a bid offered is in error, and that bid is the lowest qualified offer, the contract could then be awarded to the next lowest qualified bidder. Further, the contractor whose bid is in error could lose any guarantee submitted with their bid.

2. The proposed change would allow DOA full authority to settle contract bid settlements that are less than $100,000. For settlements in excess of $100,000, DOA would still have to obtain the Attorney General's approval to settle a bid error.

3. Staff from the Division of Facilities Development (DFD) in DOA indicate that deleting the Attorney General's review of bid error settlements would expedite the process of settling the cases. Staff at DFD believe that expediting the process would reduce amount of time before it is determined whether or not to award the contract to the next lowest qualified bidder. Further, staff at DFD indicate that DOA has its own legal staff that are involved in any bid guarantee settlements and therefore, the Attorney General's review is not necessary. However, they indicate that DOA could still request assistance from the Attorney General's Office if needed.

4. Under the Building Commission's recommendation, the Attorney General's Office would continue to be involved in the reviewing bid guarantee settlements over $100,000. Therefore, while the change may expedite settlements for small contracts, bid settlements over $100,000 would be subject to the current settlement process.

5. Department of Justice (DOJ) officials indicate that only a few cases require their approval each year. Further, they indicate that the review is not time consuming and DOJ approval is often provided within a matter of days. Further, the Department generally agrees with DOA's settlement. Therefore, according to DOJ officials, the current bid settlement system is working.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to delete the current requirement that the Department of Administration obtain the approval of the Attorney General before settling cases relating to bid guarantee settlements when a bid contains an error, omission or mistake, if the settlement amount is less than $100,000.

2. Maintain current law.

Default

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#_____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

per #204)

AYE_____ NO _____ ABS_____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Bid Requirements for Projects Less Than $100,000

[LFB Summary: Page 98.12, #19]

CURRENT LAW

Projects that cost less than $30,000 are currently exempt from the lowest qualified responsible bidder and public notice contracting requirements if the project would be constructed in accordance with procedures established by the Building Commission. Contractors for such projects are also exempt from various DOA requirements relating to minority contracts and other reporting requirements.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Provide that projects that cost between $30,000 and $100,000 would be exempt from the lowest qualified responsible bidder and public notice contracting requirements if the project would be constructed in accordance with procedures established by the Building Commission. Also exempt such projects from other contracting requirements such as: (a) the requirement that DOA attempt the ensure that 5% of the total amount of expended for contracts be awarded to minority contractors; (b) the requirement that contractors report to DOA on the amount of any contracted that was subcontracted to a minority business; (c) the requirement that DOA maintain and annually publish data on contracts awarded to minority businesses; (d) the requirement that DOA approve all subcontractors in writing; and (e) the requirement that DOA ensure that the specification of each construction project require the use of recovered or recycled materials to the extent to which is technically and economically feasible.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Building Commission is required to approve all those in excess of $100,000 and, in general, the Legislature must approve construction projects in excess of $250,000.

2. Chapter 497, Laws of 1969, established the lowest qualified responsible bidder and public notice contracting requirements for all contracts exceeding $15,000. Chapter 39, Laws of 1975, increased the requirement to the current $30,000 level.

3. The type of project that could be built in 1975 for $30,000 differs from the type of project costing $30,000 today. If the $30,000 amount were adjusted by the change in the consumer price index since 1975, it would be equivalent to approximately $89,000 in 1997.

4. However, it could be argued that it was not intended that the $30,000 threshold increase with inflation. The change in the type of project that may be constructed for $30,000 may accurately reflect the type of projects that the Legislature views should meet the lowest qualified responsible bidder, public notice and other contracting requirements.

5. It could be argued that the public announcement requirements and the lowest responsible qualified bidder were established to open the process to as many contractors as possible and to foster competition among potential bidders which could potentially reduce the state's costs. By requiring that projects be publicly announced, more potential bidders are made aware of the projects and are able to bid on the project. Further, by requiring that a contract be awarded to the lowest responsible qualified bidder, DOA could encourage competition between bidders that could result in lower prices being paid by the state for the projects. The Building Commission's recommendation would eliminate any potential benefits to state from the existing requirements for projects between $30,000 and $100,000.

6. Currently, the Building Commission must approve each project that costs $100,000 or more. The Commission recommended that the bid requirements for projects should match that $100,000 requirement level. Further, staff from the Division of Facilities Development (DFD) in DOA indicate that increasing the bid requirements threshold to $100,000 would be reduce the administrative requirements for DFD and potential contractors.

7. Staff from DFD believe that the current public notice and lowest qualified bidder requirements can deter small and minority contractors from bidding on state projects. They indicate that the process can be time consuming, involving administrative and paperwork complexity, which can deter some contractors from bidding on contracts.

8. However, eliminating the public notice requirement, and other bidding requirements could make it difficult for bidders who may be deterred from the current bidding process, from ever knowing about the projects, although presumably the Commission would establish some notice requirements in its procedures.

9. Eliminating the requirement that DOA attempt to ensure that 5% of contracts between $30,000 and $100,000 be offered to minority contractors, as well as the 5% leeway on low bids and the reporting requirements on the number of minority contractors and subcontractors involved in such projects, could potentially impact the number of state contracts issued to minority contractors.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendations to provide that projects that cost between $30,000 and $100,000 would be exempt from the lowest qualified responsible bidder and public notice contracting requirements if the project would be constructed in accordance with procedures established by the Building Commission. Further eliminate various DOA contracting requirements relating to minority contracts, subcontractors and recyclable materials and other reporting requirements.

2. Maintain current law.

All motion #1041

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#_____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE_____ NO _____ ABS_____

Representative Jensen

BUILDING PROGRAM

Bid Requirements for Projects Less Than $100,000
(Paper #205)

Motion:

Move Alternative 1 in Legislative Fiscal Bureau paper #205 as modified to continue the reporting and contracting requirements relating to minority contracts.

MO# 7041

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS ____

Representative Albers

BUILDING PROGRAM

Contracting

Motion:

Move to require that the Building Commission may waive the requirements for projects between $30,000 and $100,000 if the Commission opts to do so, shall post those projects on its WEB$ page.

MO# 5058

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Percent-for-Art Program (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.13, #20]

CURRENT LAW

Under the percent-for-art program, at least two-tenths of one percent of the cost of new state building projects exceeding $250,000 must be used to purchase original works of art to be incorporated into the structure of the building project or for display in or around the project and to pay for the program's administrative costs. The statutes define "work of art" as any original creation of visual art, and specify that a work of art does not include any decorative, ornamental, functional or landscape element of a state building, unless an artist is specifically commissioned to create such an element.

After an architect is selected for a project, the Arts Board is required to convene an advisory committee to review and recommend works of art to be incorporated into the structure. The advisory committee must consist of at least five members including: (a) one member of the Board; (b) at least two persons who are arts professionals; and (c) at least two persons who are project managers, architects, users of the building or members of the Building Commission. After reviewing the recommendations of the advisory committee, the Board makes the final selection of the artist and the work of art. The Board is required to ensure that a work of art is maintained and displayed for at least 25 years, unless the Board finds that earlier removal is in the public interest. If it is determined that the work of art should be removed, the Board is required to loan the work of art to an accredited museum in the state or to an educational or other appropriate public institution capable of maintaining and exhibiting the work of art.

BUILDING COMMISSION

The Building Commission recommended a number of changes to the percent-for-art program. This paper focuses on three of those recommendations, which are summarized as sections d., e., and g. under entry #20 in the LFB summary of the building program. These items follow:

1. Specify that "work of art" may include any distinctive architectural features containing artistic value;

2. Allow the Arts Board, prior to convening an advisory committee to review and recommend works of art, to select the artist for a project in coordination with selection of the architect if the work of art will be incorporated into the design of the project and the total cost of the project is $10,000,000 or more; and

3. Change the number of advisory committee members from at least five members to not more than seven members and require that the advisory committee include at least one person who is a resident of the area in which the work of art will be located, to represent the interests of the public in that area.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Definition of Work of Art

1. Current law specifically excludes from the definition of "work of art," any decorative, ornamental, functional or landscape element of a state building, unless an artist is specifically commissioned to create such an element. The Commission's proposal would retain this exclusion but would change the definition to include any distinctive architectural features containing artistic value. DFD staff indicate that this change is intended to encourage the integration of the art work into the design of the building. As an example of the type of architectural feature which could be used as the art work, DFD staff cite a decorative plaza outside of a UW-Madison building which was funded through the percent-for-art program. Since such architectural features have been considered as eligible works of art in the past, one could argue that the proposed modification is unnecessary.

2. Opponents of the definition change argue that it could permit percent-for-art funds to be used for architectural elements which otherwise would have been included in the design of the building. In addition, concerns have been raised that the architect could also be designated as the artist. However, DFD staff indicate that it is not the intent of the provision to allow the work of art to be created by an architect. In addition, it is unlikely that this would occur, since the Board would still be responsible for the selection of the artist. However, to clarify this point,

the Committee may wish to specify that the artist selected for a project could not also be an architect assigned to the project.

Selection of Artist

3. Under the percent-for-art program, the artist and work of art are recommended by an advisory committee, with the final selection made by the Arts Board. The statutes specify that the committee be convened after selection of the architect. Under the proposed modification, the Board would be permitted to bypass the advisory committee in the selection of an artist for a building project costing $10 million or more, if the work of art is to be incorporated into the design of the building.

4. Staff from the Division of Facilities Development (DFD) within the Department of Administration indicate that the proposed change is intended to allow the artist to be selected earlier in the process in order to facilitate coordination between the architect and the artist so that the work of art may be incorporated into the design of the project rather than added to the project after it has been completed. Because an artist's fee would be higher for such a project due to the time commitment and level of collaboration involved, the provision would only apply to projects with a percent-for-art budget of at least $20,000. In support of the proposal, DFD staff cite instances in which certain buildings did not have the structural capability to support the works of art which were created for them. In addition, it has been argued that the art work for some projects appears to have been "added on" to the building, rather than incorporated into it.

5. The process of convening an advisory committee and selecting an artist and a work of art can take nine to 12 months, depending on the size and scope of the project. According to Arts Board staff, the percent-for-art program currently has a backlog of over 100 projects, which is primarily due to staffing limitations and the length of time required to select a work of art. For these reasons, it is often the case that the artist is not selected until after the design of the building has been completed and construction has begun. In addition, Arts Board staff indicate that the Board is not usually notified of an eligible building project until after the architect has been selected.

6. In April of 1997, the Arts Board approved a proposal under which the artist would become involved in a project beginning with the preliminary design stages, for projects costing $15 million or more. To hasten the selection of an artist, the Board would convene an advisory committee to select a pool of pre-screened artists whose work would be appropriate for integration into a building and who are interested in working collaboratively with an architect throughout the project. The Board's proposal appears to be similar to the Building Commission's recommendation except that it would apply to building projects costing at least $15 million, rather than $10 million and the advisory committee, rather than the Board, would select the artist. Given that the Board has proposed these program modifications be accomplished under current law, one could argue that the recommended statutory change is unnecessary.

7. Current law requires that the 15 members of the Arts Board, who are appointed by the Governor, be state residents who are known for their concern for the arts. One could argue that the advisory committee, which would include at least two persons involved in the design, construction and/or use of the building, would be better suited to selecting the artist whose work would be incorporated into the building. The proposed bill provision could be modified to remove the current requirement that the advisory committee be convened after selection of the architect. This would permit an advisory committee to establish a pool of pre-approved artists who could be considered for such collaborative projects. The Board would retain the authority to make the final selection of the artist, but would be able to do so in a shorter period of time.

Number of Advisory Committee Members

8. There is currently a minimum, but no maximum, number of members which can be appointed to an advisory committee. The proposed modification would change the required number of members from at least five, to not more than seven members and would add the requirement that a committee include at least one member be a resident of the community in which the art would be located. Arts Board staff indicate that in the past, advisory committees have consisted of five to 15 members, depending on the size of the project. The larger committees have generally been convened for particularly large projects, projects which involve more than one state agency, or when one committee is convened for two contiguous projects.

9. Board staff argue that limiting the number of members to seven would not allow for sufficient representation of building users and persons involved in the project. DFD staff, however, argue that larger committees are unwieldy and difficult to coordinate due to scheduling conflicts among the various members. An option which would limit the number of members while allowing some flexibility for particularly large, or combined projects, would be to specify that a committee could consist of not more than nine members.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Definition of Work of Art

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation that "work of art" may include any distinctive architectural features containing artistic value.

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to specify that the artist selected for a project could not be an architect assigned to the project.

3. Maintain current law.

B. Selection of Artist

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to allow the Arts Board to select the artist for a project prior to convening an advisory committee if the total cost of the project is $10 million or more and the art will be incorporated into the design of the building.

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to also delete the current law requirement that an advisory committee be convened after selection of the architect and provide that the Board could convene an advisory committee to recommend a pool of artists whose work would be appropriate for integration into a building and who would be willing to work collaboratively with an architect.

3. Maintain current law.

C. Number of Advisory Committee Members

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to change the number of advisory committee members from at least five members to not more than seven members.

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendation to provide that an advisory committee could consist of not more than nine members.

3. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Merry Larsen

MO# A/I #A2 1B2

2 JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
1 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS ___

MO# A/I #C1

2 JENSEN	Y	N	A
1 OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS ___

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

State Fair Park Capital Budget (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.1, 98.2 and 98.3 #1 and Page 98.12 #18]

CURRENT LAW

State Fair Park Board is provided $13.0 million in general fund supported bonding for the construction of housing facilities at State Fair Park and $27.85 million in self amortizing general obligation bonding to construct or improve facilities at the Park. To date, $11 million in GPR supported bonding and $20.55 million in PR supported bonding have been authorized for release by the Building Commission.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Delete $755,500 in general fund supported bonding by: (a) deleting $2.0 million GPR supported bonding associated with the construction of a dormitory facility at the Park; and (b) providing $1,244,500 GPR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings.

Further, provide $4,292,500 in self amortizing general obligation bonding as follows: (a) $1,244,500 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services to Park buildings; and (b) $3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements at the Park.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Program Revenue and Capital Improvement Account

1. Any surplus revenue from State Fair Park activities, and lease payments from the race track contractor (Haas Racing Team) and the for the Pettit National Ice Center after operation costs are paid, is transferred to the Park Board capital improvements continuing appropriation account. Any reduction in revenues or increases in debt service or other operating costs effectively reduces the amount of funds that are available for capital improvements.

2. Historically, the capital improvement fund has been used to finance renovation and repair projects related to the existing facility. However, the balance in the fund has declined from $3.0 million in 1990-91 to approximately $200,000 available currently. With such a limited balance the capital improvement fund is likely to have difficulty funding even small projects or meeting the immediate needs of the Park.

3. In January, 1997, the State Building Commission approved the use of $1.0 million in funding from the Park Board's capital improvement fund for utility improvements and repairs related to the dormitory facility. Prior to the Building Commission action to transfer funds, the Park's capital improvement fund had a balance of $1.2 million. In approving the transfer of funds, the Commission indicated that the Park Board had to repay the funds with interest from gifts and grants donations to the Park. When the dormitory facility was approved by the Legislature in 1995, Park Board officials indicated that approximately $5.0 million in gifts and grants would be raised to offset the costs of the facility. To date, only minimal gifts and grants have been received.

4. DOA officials indicated that State Fair Park originally requested the $1.0 million that was borrowed from the capital improvement account for the dormitory facility from their $5.0 million in gifts and grants. The Commission determined that the Park Board did not have the needed gifts and grants to assist in funding the project. Despite having $2.0 million in general fund supported borrowing available, the Commission decided to borrow from the Park's capital improvement fund. DOA indicated that it was decided that borrowing from the Park's capital improvement fund rather than using the available GPR supported bonding may encourage Park officials to generate a portion of the $5.0 million in gifts and grants funds they indicated could be realized when the dormitory project was authorized. In a related action, in May, 1997, the Building Commission released $550,000 of PR supported bonding to construct office space at the dormitory facility.

5. A March, 1996, Legislative Audit Bureau report indicated that the State Fair Park's ability to finance additional program revenue debt was limited because the availability of sufficient revenues is questionable. The audit indicated that it would be particularly difficult to finance any major construction or major renovation projects from Park revenues.

6. The proposed 1997-99 building program would provide the Park an additional $2,489,000 in bonding: $1,244,500 GPR supported bonding and $1,244,500 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings. State Fair Park had requested all $2,489,000 GPR supported bonding borrowing (GPR debt service costs) for the improvements at the Park. DOA and the Governor have also indicated that the general fund supported borrowing is needed. However, they indicate that a 50/50 split between program revenue supported and general fund supported borrowing would establish a compromise position in which the state provides some assistance in repairing and upgrading the Park while requiring the Park to make an investment in its infrastructure.

7. Prior to the authorizing of $13.0 million GPR supported bonding for the dormitory facility, State Fair Park had been a self sufficient program revenue supported entity. While the general fund supported borrowing built a dormitory facility which was needed to safely house the state's youth during the State Fair, the current proposal would provide general fund supported borrowing for general improvements at the Park. Park officials and DOA indicate that the improvements are needed to address safety issues and lessen the risk of events being disrupted at the Park.

8. Given the concerns over the likelihood that the Park would be able to fund the additional program revenue supported debt, it could be argued that the all of the $2.0 million GPR supported bonding should be retained to assist the Park in meeting its infrastructure demands. Under this alternative, the $2.0 million GPR supported bonding authorized for the dormitory facility would be used to fund the repair and renovation of facilities at the Park, which would provide an additional $755,500 GPR supported bonding (over the $1,244,500 provided in the amendment) for such activities.

Existing Program Revenue Bonding Authority

9. State Fair Park Board has $27.85 million PR supported bonding, to make improvements at State Fair Park and including the race track and Pettit National Ice Center of which approximately $7.3 million remains available.

10. 1995 Act 27 provided $8.55 million PR supported bonding for the following purposes: (a) $5.0 million for the enclosure and renovation of the coliseum facility; (b) $2.3 million for Park maintenance projects; and (c) $1.25 million for improvements at the racetrack (the racetrack bonding has been released by the Building Commission).

11. The coliseum facility is currently used primarily during the summer months for horse and livestock shows. Park officials have indicated that enclosing the facility could allow the facility to be used for concerts, trade shows, home ice for a semi-professional hockey team or a practice facility for an arena football team.

12. No bonding has been released related to the project to renovate and enclose the coliseum facility. State Fair Park officials indicate that while the renovation and enclosure of the coliseum facility is still a project the Park is hoping to proceed with, it is unlikely that the project would be started during the 1997-99 biennium. While the coliseum appears adequate to serve its present purpose, Park officials indicate that enclosing the facility would allow for the hosting of events year-round in the coliseum which would increase the Park's ability to generate non-fair revenue.

13. When the bonding for the coliseum facility was authorized, the Legislature required that an independent analysis of the financial viability of the dormitory facility and the enclosure of the Park's coliseum facility be approved by the Building Commission prior to the release of the bonds for the facilities. A draft of an Ernst and Young study on the financial viability of the dormitory facility was submitted to the Building Commission in February, 1996, prior to the release of the bonding for the dormitory facility. However, to date, no study on the financial viability of enclosing the Coliseum facility has been submitted to the Commission.

14. The March, 1996, Legislative Audit Bureau report indicated that completion of the coliseum project, as envisioned by Park Board officials, would likely cost $11.3 million, which is more than twice the amount of bonding that is currently authorized. Further, the audit indicated that the plans envisioned for the coliseum facility would expand State Fair Park beyond its traditional purpose and put the Park in competition with other multi-purpose event facilities.

15. At this time, it is doubtful that State Fair Park would make use of the $5.0 million authorized for the coliseum renovation and enclosure project because: (a) the project appears to be only in the conceptual phase of planning; (b) it is unlikely that the $5.0 million in bonding would be sufficient to cover the costs of the project; and (c) it is uncertain that the improved facility would generate the additional revenues needed to cover the debt service costs. Therefore, the Committee could consider deleting the project and bonding authorization from the 1995-97 state building program or provide that a portion of the bonding be used to cover the costs of the Park's 1997-99 building program request.

Race Track Contract

16. The current contract with the promoter at State Fair's racetrack requires that the contractor make $640,000 in improvements to the track facilities. The improvements may be made with state general obligation program revenue bonds provided the contractor makes additional rent payments to cover State Fair Park's debt service costs associated with the bonds. Approximately $1.3 million in general obligation bonding has been used to fund improvements at the race track.

17. The March, 1996, Legislative Audit Bureau report indicated that State Fair Park officials had not verified the costs or that the installation of the improvements at the track have

been completed by the contractor as required by the contract. Further, the audit indicated that Park officials conduct only a limited review of the contractors accounting practices and financial information.

However, Park officials indicate that future projects containing general obligation bonding will be reviewed by DOA's Division of Facilities Development. Further, Park officials indicate that the audit's concerns related to review of annual financial information are being addressed.

18. The audit indicated that State Fair Park's revenues from racing events held at the Park have declined by 36.9% from 1990-91 through 1994-95. However, the audit also indicates that some of the decline in racing revenues appears to be related to the current contractor's buy-out of the previous contractor's racing contract. Further, the audit indicated that while State Fair Park officials believed that, over the long term, the current racing contract would benefit the Park financially, several of the current contract provisions favor the current contractor rather than the Park.

19. The current racing contract is due to expire in 1998, however the contractor can unilaterally extend the contract for up to three, seven-year terms if the contractor remains current on the payments required under the contract. If the contract is not renewed or if the contractor does not make payments sufficient to cover the debt service cost on the bonds used to fund improvements at the track (approximately $270,000 annually associated with bonding under the Commission's recommendations), State Fair Park, or if the Park is unable, the State would be required to pay off the bonds.

20. State Fair Park indicated to the Building Commission that the additional bonding is needed for the race track facility because race sanctioning bodies such as CART and NASCAR have identified safety improvements (such as replacing the crashwall and infield lighting) and other track improvements (such as replacing sections of bleachers) that are necessary to ensure that existing races at the track will be able to continue and to increase the potential for additional races to be held at the Park.

21. However, it could be argued that the state should not provide additional bonding for the race track until the existing contract is renewed and State Fair Park receives a more favorable contract position.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Dormitory Facility and Services to Park Buildings

1. Approve the Building Commission's recommendations to delete $755,500 in general fund supported bonding by: (a) deleting $2.0 million GPR supported bonding associated with the construction of a dormitory facility at the Park; and (b) providing $1,244,500 GPR

supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings.

Further, provide $4,292,500 in self amortizing general obligation bonding as follows: (a) $1,244,500 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services to Park buildings; and (b) $3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements at the Park.

Alternative 1	BR-GPR	BR-PR	TOTAL
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	-$755,500	$4,292,500	$3,537,000
[Change to Bill	*-$755,500*	*$4,292,500*	*$3,537,000]*

2. Modify the Building Commission's recommendations as follows: (a) delete $2.0 million GPR supported bonding associated with the construction of a dormitory facility at the Park; and (b) providing $2.0 million GPR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services (sewer, water, storm sewer and electrical services) to Park buildings.

Further, provide $3,537,000 in self amortizing general obligation bonding as follows: (a) $489,000 PR supported bonding to upgrade and replace main services to Park buildings; and (b) $3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements at the Park.

Alternative 2	BR-PR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$3,537,000
[Change to Bill	*$3,537,000*

3. Maintain current law.

B. Enclosure and Renovation of the Coliseum Facility

1. Delete the current law enumeration and $5.0 million in program revenue supported borrowing associated with the renovation and enclosure of the coliseum facility at State Fair Park.

Alternative 1	BR-PR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	-$5,000,000
[Change to Bill	*-$5,000,000]*

2. Maintain current law.

C. Approval of Racing Contract

1. Require that prior to the release of $3,048,000 PR supported bonding for additional racetrack improvements by the Building Commission, the renewal of the racing contract would have to be reviewed and approved by the Joint Legislative Audit Committee.

2. Take no action.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO# A1 #A2 B1 C2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Nash Automobile Museum (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.2 thru Page 98.4, #1, Page 98.8, #7]

BUILDING COMMISSION

Enumerate the project in the 1997-99 state building program with $1 million in general fund supported borrowing along with $7 million in gifts and grants funding to construct an automobile museum. Provide $1 million of general fund supported, general obligation bonding for this purpose.

Require the Building Commission, if it approves the Nash Auto Museum project (enumerated under the recommendation with $1 million in general fund supported borrowing and $7 million gifts, grants and other receipts funding) to authorize the bonding and make payments to the Kenosha Historical Society for the maintenance, storage and display of its collection of Nash automobiles and other historical materials. The Building Commission would be required to determine the total amount of payment, which would not be allowed to exceed the lesser the $1 million in bonding enumerated in the building program or 12.5% of the total project cost. The Building Commission would not be allowed to make payments to the Kenosha Historical Society unless the DOA has reviewed and approved the plans for the project; however, DOA would be prohibited from supervising any services or work or contracting for the project. Further, the Governor or the DOA Secretary would not have to approve any contract for work on the project.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The current owner of the Nash automobiles is offering to donate the collection of automobiles to the Kenosha Historical Society for preservation and display. With the Nash automobiles having been manufactured in Kenosha, the proposed museum would display the automobiles as part of the city's and the state's automobile history.

2. The proposed $8 million project, which would consist of two $4 million structures, would be funded as follows: (a) $1 million in state, general fund supported general obligation bonding; (b) $3 million in donations from the City of Kenosha; (b) $3 million in gifts, grants or other receipts funding; and (d) $1 million in contributions from the Museum Board.

3. The state's $1 million in general obligation bonding would provide the state with a 25% interest in the museum structure, which would be one of the two proposed structures. At this time, as indicated by Building Commission documents, the funding and staffing associated with the operation and maintenance of the facility would not require additional state funds, but rather would be the responsibility of the Kenosha Historical Society.

4. DOA staff indicate that at this time a limited amount of gifts and grants funds have been received for the project.

5. It could be argued that the providing state funds for projects such as the proposed Nash automobile museum could establish a precedent for such projects. That is, other local governmental units and nonprofit organizations with similar projects could request state general obligation borrowing to assist with the financing of their projects.

6. However, the current owner of the Nash automobile collection is not interested in maintaining the automobile collection. Therefore, if deleting the state's share of the project would not allow for the construction of the museum facility, the automobile collection would likely be sold off and divided among various owners. However, with the state's share being only one-eighth of the overall project cost, it could be argued that the project could be built in some fashion regardless of the state's funds.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. FAIL Approve the Building Commission's recommendation to provide $1 million in general fund supported borrowing along with $7 million in gifts and grants funding to construct an automobile museum enumerated under other projects in the 1997-99 state building program. Provide that the Commission would be required to determine the total amount of payment, which could not exceed the lesser of $1 million or 12.5% of the total project cost.

Alternative 1	BR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$1,000,000
[Change to Bill	*$1,000,000]*

2. Take no action.

Default

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO# Alt #1

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS ____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Thompson Correctional Center Fence (Building Program/Corrections)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.1, #1]

CURRENT LAW

The Thompson Correctional Center in Deerfield is a minimum-security correctional center. The facility currently does not have a fence.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Provide $200,000 in general fund supported borrowing to install a perimeter fence at the Thompson Correctional Center.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In connection with the Community Confinement and Control (CCC) pilot program, the Commission recommended the construction of a perimeter security fence around the Thompson Correctional Center in Deerfield. Under the CCC program, the Thompson Center was to serve as the confinement location for inmates sentenced to the program. On May 29, 1997, the Committee removed the CCC pilot program from Senate Bill 77.

2. Other than the Ellsworth Correctional Center in Union Grove, no other minimum-security correctional center has a perimeter fence. The correctional centers generally provide work release, education, treatment and/or job preparation programs for minimum-security inmates prior to release on parole.

3. Given that the CCC pilot program has been removed from the budget and that only one correctional center has a perimeter fence, funding for the perimeter fence at the Thompson Center should be removed from the amendment.

MODIFICATION TO BASE

Remove $200,000 in general fund supported borrowing for a perimeter fence at the Thompson Correctional Center and the enumeration of this project.

Modification	BR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Base)	$0
[Change to Bill	*- $200,000]*

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

MO# Modification 2

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS ____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Submission of the Capital Budget (Building Program)

CURRENT LAW

The statutes require that the Governor's biennial budget recommendations be submitted to the Legislature by the last Tuesday in January, unless an extension if granted by joint resolution of the Legislature.

There is no date by which the Building Commission is required to submit its recommendations regarding the state's biennial capital budget.

BUILDING COMMISSION

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Historically, the state's capital budget is submitted to the Joint Committee on Finance for inclusion in the biennial budget bill at some point after introduction of the Governor's biennial budget. The capital budget recommendations of the Building Commission are typically drafted and transmitted to the Finance Committee as an amendment to the biennial budget.

2. Upon submission of the capital budget, the Legislative Fiscal Bureau prepares a summary of the provisions of the capital budget and, following distribution of that document, the

Joint Committee on Finance conducts a briefing and public hearing on the Building Commission's recommendations. The Fiscal Bureau then prepares issue papers relating to the capital budget and the Committee meets in executive session to deliberate on the Commission's recommendations. The Finance Committee's recommendations are then incorporated into its version of the biennial budget.

3. The Division of Facilities Development (DFD) of the Department of Administration serves as staff to the Building Commission and is responsible for preparation of the capital budget. In January, 1996, DFD issued capital budget instructions to all agencies and required that agency requests be submitted to DFD by September 3, 1996. The September 3 date is approximately two weeks earlier than the required September 15 date for submittal of agency operating budget requests.

Similar to the Budget Office's role in preparing the Executive budget document for the Governor, DFD prepares its recommendations for the capital budget and presents them to the Building Commission. Following action by the Building Commission, the capital budget is then forwarded to the Legislature via the Joint Committee on Finance.

4. Because the Finance Committee generally attempts to complete its work on the budget at the end of May or early June, it is important that the capital budget be submitted in a timely fashion. In the past, this document has been generally submitted in mid-April. Recently, however, the date of submission has gone well beyond mid-April. The submission date of the capital budget to the Finance Committee over the past four biennia is shown below:

Biennium	Date of Submission
1991-93	April 25
1993-95	April 28
1995-97	May 8
1997-99	May 20*

* Corrective amendment submitted May 23.

5. The Building Commission is composed of the Governor (Chair), six legislators and one public member (appointed by the Governor). The legislative members are not seated until the beginning of each session (January of the odd-numbered years) and thus, it is not reasonable to expect that the Commission could thoroughly review all requested projects, make decisions, draft their recommendations and submit them to the Legislature at the time of submittal of the biennial budget. However, delaying submittal of the building program until May (especially late-May) significantly reduces the time that the public and Legislature have to review and analyze the recommendations of the Commission.

6. To address this, a submittal date could be placed in the statutes. This is consistent with the requirements placed upon the Governor for submittal of the biennial budget. It would seem reasonable that the Commission complete its work and submit its recommendations and drafted language by the third Tuesday in April. Depending on the year, the third Tuesday in April would be between April 15 and April 21. If, for some reason, the Commission sought additional time, it could seek an extension by joint resolution of the Legislature.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Require, by statute, the Building Commission to submit its recommendations and drafted language on the state's building program to the Joint Committee on Finance by the third Tuesday in April of the odd-numbered years.

2. Adopt Alternative 1 and provide that, if requested, an extension to that date could be granted by joint resolution of the Legislature.

3. Take no action. Thus, no date for submittal of the building program would be required.

MO#_____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE_____ NO _____ ABS_____

Senator Cowles

BUILDING PROGRAM

Submission of Capital Budget
(Paper #211)

Motion:

Move to modify Alternative 1 in Legislative Fiscal Bureau paper #211 and require that the Building Commission submit its recommendations and drafted language on the state's building program to the Joint Committee on Finance by the first Tuesday in April of the odd-numbered years. Further, allow that an extension may be granted with approval of the Joint Committee on Finance.

MO# 5002

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

Motion #5002

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Adjustments to a Project Enumeration and Bonding Amounts (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.1, #1, Page 98.5, #2 and Page 98.7, #4]

BUILDING COMMISSION

Enumerate the UW-Platteville Russell Hall Remodeling project with a project budget of $7,927,000. Provide $433,992,200 in 1997-99 and $58,885,000 in 1999-2001 of new general obligation bonding authority.

MODIFICATIONS TO BASE

1. Modify the 1995-97 building program to increase the project enumeration for the UW-Platteville Russell Hall remodeling project by $630,000, rather than creating a new enumeration in the 1997-99 building program.

Explanation: The UW-Platteville Russell Hall Remodeling project was enumerated in 1995 Act 27 (the 1995-97 budget) with a project budget of $7,297,000. The Commission is recommending that the project budget be increased by $630,000. Usual practice when adjusting the enumeration for a project in a previous building program is to amend the previous building program, rather than creating a new enumeration and leaving the old enumeration still in effect.

2. Make minor adjustments to the bonding amounts in the recommended building program so that the bonding authorization amounts would add exactly to the total project enumerations funded from bonding.

Explanation: There are minor differences between the amount of bonding shown in the project enumerations and the total bonding authorized in the building program. This modification would allow LFB staff, in consultation with staff from the Division of Facilities Development in DOA, to make any needed adjustments.

Prepared by: Dave Loppnow

in Paper #
212
213
214
215
216

MO# Modifications

JENSEN	X	N	A
OURADA	X	N	A
HARSDORF	X	N	A
ALBERS	X	N	A
GARD	X	N	A
KAUFERT	X	N	A
LINTON	X	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
BURKE	X	N	A
DECKER	X	N	A
GEORGE	X	N	A
JAUCH	X	N	A
WINEKE	X	N	A
SHIBILSKI	X	N	A
COWLES	X	N	A
PANZER	X	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Minor Policy and Technical Modifications -- Debt Service on UW-Madison Athletic Facilities Maintenance (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.15, #23]

BUILDING COMMISSION

Decrease the GPR share of debt service associated with maintenance of UW-Madison athletic facilities from 80% to 70% and make a corresponding increase in the program revenue share of debt service from 20% to 30%, effective July 1, 1998.

MODIFICATION TO BASE

Require that the 70/30 debt service split apply only to UW-Madison athletic facilities maintenance projects that are authorized for construction by the Building Commission after July 1, 1998.

Explanation: Staff from DOA indicate that the amendment does not fully capture the intent of the Building Commission, which is that the 70/30 debt service split on maintenance of UW-Madison athletic facilities would be effective only on those maintenance projects approved by the Commission after July 1, 1998. As drafted, the share of debt service would change for all projects, effective July 1, 1998.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#_____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE_____ NO_____ ABS_____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Minor Policy and Technical Modification - - Ethan Allen Gatehouse (Building Program)

[LFB Summary: Page 98.2 thru Page 98.4, #1 (All Agency Projects)]

CURRENT LAW

As part of the state building program, certain minor repair and renovation projects are not subject to the enumeration requirement. These broad types of projects are listed are generally enumerated as "all agency" projects and are classified in several different categories: (a) facilities repair and renovation; (b) utilities repair and renovation; (c) health, safety and environment; (d) preventative maintenance; (e) capital equipment allocation; and (f) land and property acquisition.

BUILDING COMMISSION

Provide $990,000 in general fund supported general obligation bonding to construct a new gatehouse facility at the Ethan Allen School enumerated as a facilities renovation and repair -- all agency project.

MODIFICATION TO BASE

As described, the project would involve the construction of a new gatehouse facility at Ethan Allen and the demolition of the existing facility. Therefore, the project should be enumerated under Department of Corrections facilities and a $990,000 increase should be made to the Department of Corrections general fund supported borrowing authority with a

corresponding decrease in the Building Commission's other public purposes (all agency) bonding authority.

Prepared by: Al Runde

MO#_____

JENSEN	Y	N	A
OURADA	Y	N	A
HARSDORF	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
LINTON	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
GEORGE	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
WINEKE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

AYE_____ NO _____ ABS_____

Re paper 212