

F

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

State Copy Center Equipment for Tourism (Administration -- Agency Services)

[LFB Summary: Page 59, #1 and Page 60, #2]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Administration's Division of State Agency Services administers the state copy centers which are utilized by agencies for document reproduction services. Costs of the copy centers are recovered through charges assessed to agencies for their use of the centers.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$194,000 PR in 1998-99 in one-time funding to purchase digital color printing equipment to print materials for the Department of Tourism and \$62,300 PR in 1998-99 for maintenance and supplies associated with the color printer. In addition, provide \$170,000 PR for the purchase of additional postage for mailing Tourism's informational brochures.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the Governor's recommendation, DOA is budgeted a total of \$426,300 PR in 1998-99 for the purchase and maintenance of color digital printing equipment, and the purchase of additional postage for resale to the Department of Tourism. Funding for the printing equipment is placed in unallotted reserve for release by the State Budget Office. According to DOA, Tourism plans to convert its tourist information data onto a database that could customize mailings sent to individuals requesting tourism information. DOA would then print and mail the requested brochures for Tourism.

2. DOA indicates that the equipment purchased will primarily target Tourism's needs and mailing volume plus any known volume of color printing from other agencies. It is DOA's expectation that based on Tourism's estimated volume and the current known demand of other agencies, a tentative per copy rate would be established, including equipment cost recovery, operational costs and overhead. Tourism would then be able to compare DOA's rates with private costs. If Tourism decided it wanted to utilize DOA to provide the services, the State Budget Office could release funds from unallotted reserve for the equipment purchase.

3. The bill does not provide any additional funding for Tourism for costs of DOA production or contracted production of tourism materials. Further, it is unclear if or when Tourism would decide whether to utilize the state copy centers for production of promotional materials.

4. Given the uncertainty about the proposal, it could be argued that an increase in expenditure authority is unnecessary at this time. DOA could, at any time, develop an estimate of the costs for providing color digital printing services for Tourism. If Tourism decided to utilize DOA's services, increased expenditure authority could be requested by DOA under s. 16.515 of the statutes.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$194,000 PR in 1998-99 in one-time funding to purchase a digital color printer to print materials for the Department of Tourism, \$62,300 PR in 1998-99 for maintenance and supplies associated with the color printer and \$170,000 PR for the purchase of additional postage for mailing Tourism's informational brochures.

2. Maintain current law.

Alternative 2	PR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$426,300

MO# Alt 2

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS 0

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Auditing Services Contract (Administration -- Agency Services and Program Supplements)

[LFB Summary: Page 62, #8 and Page 455, #5]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Administration is responsible for preauditing claims for expenditure of state funds. The State Controller's Office in DOA is assigned this preaudit responsibility along with responsibility for operation of the state accounting system, central payroll and other financial reporting duties. However, these preaudit functions may be delegated to state agencies. The cost of the Office is funded by assessments against state agencies. Program supplement funding is provided to state agencies' GPR appropriations to pay for any additional chargebacks for the costs of operating the State Controller's Office that are not already included in agencies' base budgets.

GOVERNOR

Provide one-time funding of \$100,000 PR in 1997-98 and 1998-99 for the State Controller's Office to contract with a private auditing firm to conduct additional financial audits of state agencies to alleviate a backlog in that office's audits of state agency transactions. In addition, provide \$35,000 GPR annually in program supplement funding associated with the increased costs that would be assessed state agencies.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Funding for the auditing services contract would be provided from charges assessed against state agencies for financial services provided by DOA. The funding provided would support a contract with a private auditing firm at \$50 per hour for 2,000 hours of auditing work per year. The work performed would entail the review of agency accounting transactions for compliance with statutory requirements and DOA accounting standards, rules and regulations.

2. The State Controller's Office (CSO) currently has a total of 42.0 FTEs. Within this staff, there is an audit section which currently has five auditors (including a section supervisor) who conduct audits of state agencies, develop state accounting procedures and analyze agencies' processing of financial transactions. DOA estimates that, on average, each staff member is only able to devote 600 hours per year to the auditing of agency financial transactions, with the remaining productive time (total annual hours less such things as vacation and sick leave) devoted to projects, annual reports, training and administrative activities. The Department wants to be able to audit each state agency (including the Legislature and the Courts) at least once every five years. Based on DOA's estimates of the amount of time each agency will take to audit, existing staff could audit each state agency only once every 5.7 years.

3. By hiring the contract auditor, DOA indicates that it could reduce the auditing frequency cycle by approximately one year (audit each state agency approximately once every 4.7 years). The Department argues that the contracted service would thus allow for the more timely review of agency transactions and, therefore, enable it to detect or identify problems in agency compliance with statutes and regulations. The Department states that without additional resources it believes that inconsistent interpretation of policy may occur, inappropriate transactions or activities may not be detected, and improvements to agency operations may be delayed.

4. The contract consultant funding has been identified as one-time funding. However, if DOA's intention is to reduce the number of years between agency audits, hiring a contract auditor on a one-time basis will only reduce the time between audits for those agencies which are planned to be audited in the next biennium. It could be argued that, to achieve the stated goal, the hiring of permanent staff rather than one-time contracted staff would be more appropriate. The funding required for salary and fringe benefit costs for an additional senior auditor would be \$33,900 PR in 1997-98 and \$45,200 PR in 1998-99. The Committee could authorize 1.0 additional position and reduce the funding level recommended by the Governor by \$66,100 PR in 1997-98 and \$54,800 PR in 1998-99.

5. Under current law, DOA may delegate its preauditing responsibilities to any agency. The Department may also withdraw the delegation of authority if it determines that the delegated function is not being performed according to standards. With the initiation of a new central state accounting system (WisMart) in June, 1993, all agencies were delegated authority for preaudit of claims for state expenditures. It can be argued that DOA's determination to

delegate authority to agencies is an indication of the Department's general satisfaction with the agencies' abilities to perform these functions. While agencies do need to be monitored for compliance with accounting rules, the fact that DOA has delegated preauditing authority to the agencies should reduce the need for more frequent auditing of all state agencies. Further, DOA argues that one of the reasons it has only 600 hours per auditor for the preauditing function is that it has been devoting resources to the development of good internal control structures in the agencies. As these are established, additional hours of existing staff should be available for examination of agencies' compliance with these internal control standards.

6. There is no specified or required frequency of preaudits. As one indication of the frequency of audits, the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) is generally required to examine each state agency at least once every five years. In addition, as part of its work in connection with DOA's preparation of the state's comprehensive annual financial report, the LAB also annually examines the accuracy of each agency's financial statements. The Department indicates that current employees will be able to conduct the necessary audits within 5.7 years. To the extent that current staff are able to spend more than 600 hours per year on audit activities and the actual amount of time required to conduct each audit is less than estimated, the time between agency audits may be reduced to closer to five years. The Committee could, on this basis, delete all funding (\$100,000 PR per year) for additional auditing services.

7. The costs of the SCO are funded by charges assessed against each state agency. The function appears as a program revenue funded activity in DOA. However, for an individual agency, the SCO charges are initially paid from the agency's base budget. Approximately 35% of SCO's total program costs are assessed against GPR-funded agencies or programs. While base costs for SCO charges are included in individual agency budgets, the funding for projected additional SCO costs for GPR-funded agencies are normally included in the program supplements appropriations.

8. The bill includes \$35,000 GPR annually in the program supplements appropriations for increased costs to GPR funded agencies as a result of additional assessments that would be made for the cost of the contracted auditing services. If the Committee chooses to modify the Governor's recommendation to provide 1.0 PR position, program supplements funding could be reduced by \$23,100 GPR in 1997-98 and \$19,200 GPR in 1998-99. If funding for the contractor auditing is not provided, \$35,000 GPR annually could be removed from the program supplements funding.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide one-time funding of \$100,000 PR in 1997-98 and 1998-99 for the State Controller's Office to contract with a private auditing firm to conduct financial audits of state agencies and \$35,000 GPR annually in program supplement funding associated with the increased costs.

2. Provide \$33,900 PR in 1997-98 and \$45,200 PR in 1998-99 and 1.0 PR position in the State Controller's Office for increased audit activities, and \$11,900 GPR in 1997-98 and \$15,800 GPR in 1998-99 in program supplement funding associated with the increased costs to state agencies of this staff.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$42,300	- \$120,900	- \$163,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	0.00	1.00	1.00

3. Maintain current law:

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$70,000	- \$200,000	- \$270,000

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

MO#

Alt 2

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
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

AYE

14

NO

2

ABS

0

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Performance Evaluation Unit (Administration -- Agency Services and Program Supplements)

[LFB Summary: Page 62, #9 and Page 455, #5]

CURRENT LAW

The Secretary of DOA is directed to periodically make management audits of state agencies to effectively appraise all management practices, operating procedures and organizational structures. The Legislative Audit Bureau is the state entity designated the responsibility for the conduct of financial and program audits of state agencies.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$261,700 PR in 1997-98 and \$366,400 PR in 1998-99 and 8.0 PR positions in the State Controller's office to conduct performance audits and assessments of state agencies and programs.

Increase base level funding by \$91,600 GPR in 1997-98 and \$128,200 GPR in 1998-99 in program supplements to provide funding to state agencies with insufficient funds in their GPR appropriations to pay for additional financial services chargebacks for the increased costs of operating the State Controller's Office due to these staff additions.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The State Budget Office and the State Controller's Office (SCO) are organizationally in a single division within DOA's Division of Executive Budget and Finance. The Budget Office: (a) provides fiscal and policy analysis to the Governor for development of executive budget proposals; (b) assists agencies in the technical preparation of budget requests; (c) reviews legislation and prepares or coordinates fiscal estimates; and (d) is responsible for general oversight and execution of the state budget. The SCO is responsible for: (a) state agency accounting policy and financial reporting; (b) operation of the state central accounting system; (c) generating state payrolls; (d) making payments to state vendors; (e) issuing monthly fiscal reports to agencies; and (f) preparing the annual state fiscal report.

2. The 8.0 positions (6.0 auditors and 2.0 policy analysts) recommended in the bill are intended to create a centralized review and evaluation unit in SCO to review and monitor the performance of state programs and agencies on a continual basis. Funds to support these positions would come from charges assessed by SCO against state agencies for financial services provided by SCO.

3. By statute, the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) is responsible for:

- conducting post-audits of the accounts of every state department at least once every five years;
- reviewing the performance and program accomplishments of state departments; and
- providing an annual audit opinion on the State's financial statements as prepared by DOA.

4. In addition, the LAB is required to conduct a number of specific audits, such as: auditing annually the Department of Employee Trust Funds, the Wisconsin Investment Board, the Capital Improvement Fund and the Bond Security and Redemption Fund and auditing biennially the books and accounts of the State Treasurer and the central accounting records of DOA. The Audit Bureau is also responsible for conducting a special examination of the accounts and financial transactions of any department or office as the Legislature, Joint Committee on Legislative Organization or Joint Legislative Audit Committee directs. The Governor may also direct that such special examinations be done but would be required to pay for the cost of the audit. Further, the LAB is authorized to provide audit services not required by law that are requested by state departments and the federal government, and charge a reasonable amount for such services.

5. The Department of Administration did not request the creation of a performance evaluation unit in its 1997-99 biennial budget request to the Governor. This item was included as a Governor's initiative.

6. DOA argues that the performance evaluation unit would provide the executive branch with a dedicated audit and evaluation capacity to monitor administrative and legal compliance with statutes, policies and procedures. It is indicated that the creation of this unit would "provide a centralized means, similar to LAB's state auditor, to review and monitor on a continual basis the efficiency and financial integrity of the state's programs." The performance evaluation could address both program and financial issues.

7. DOA further indicates that the performance evaluation unit is meant to complement the activities of the LAB by: (a) ensuring that LAB audit recommendations are implemented and are in place prior to future LAB audits; (b) assisting state agencies to eliminate future problems in transactions or inappropriate use or loss of state funds; and (c) evaluating and reviewing issues that the Joint Committee on Audit has not directed the LAB to examine.

8. Since 1959, DOA has had the authority to make management audits of agencies, utilizing teams of specialists in the fields of purchasing, personnel, accounting, budgeting, space utilization, forms design and control, records management, and any other specialties necessary to effectively appraise all management practices, operating procedures and organizational structures. Given its general authority in this area and the existing staff capabilities in the State Budget Office and SCO, it could be argued that DOA should use its existing resources to conduct any management audits that it believes are necessary under current law. Further, it may be noted that a total of 5.0 positions in SCO are currently allocated to audit functions. The principal auditing arm of the state, the LAB, would continue to be available to respond to audit needs.

9. SCO's costs are funded by charges assessed against each state agency. The function appears as a program revenue funded activity in DOA. However, for a GPR-funded agency, the SCO charges are initially paid from GPR funds that are then transferred to SCO to meet its operating costs. Approximately 35% of SCO's total program costs are assessed against GPR-funded agencies or programs. While base costs for SCO charges are included in individual agency budgets, the funding for projected additional SCO costs for GPR-funded agencies are normally included in the program supplements appropriations.

10. The bill provides an additional \$91,600 GPR in 1997-98 and \$128,200 GPR in 1998-99 in program supplements associated with the program evaluation unit. If additional staff for creation of a new program evaluation unit is not provided, the Committee could reduce the funding in the program supplements appropriation by \$91,600 GPR in 1997-98 and \$128,200 GPR in 1998-99.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$261,700 PR in 1997-98 and \$366,400 PR in 1998-99 and 8.0 PR positions to conduct performance audits and assessments of state agencies and programs, and \$91,600 GPR in 1997-98 and \$128,200 GPR in 1998-99 in

program supplements to provide funding to state agencies to pay for additional DOA financial services chargebacks associated with the performance evaluation unit.

2. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$219,800	- \$628,100	- \$847,900
1997-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	0.00	- 8.00	- 8.00

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

check vote

MO# Alt 2

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
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

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE**Graphic Design Service (Administration -- Agency Services)****CURRENT LAW**

The Department of Administration's graphic design service (WisComp) is budgeted at \$507,500 PR in 1996-97 with 12.6 PR positions.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Currently, DOA operates a graphic design service (WisComp) which provides typesetting, layout, design, desktop publishing and forms development services to state agencies. The WisComp unit is funded by charges to state agency "customers" utilizing its services.

2. On March 20, 1997, the Department of Administration announced that WisComp would be dissolved as of June 30, 1997, due to declining business. DOA indicated that due to technology improvements in state agencies, changes in agency business methods and approaches and a shrinking customer base, it could not afford to sustain this operation. Of the current 12.6 authorized positions in WisComp, 3.6 positions are vacant. The Department has indicated that the remaining employees are being provided with assistance to find other positions and/or retraining.

3. A determination has not yet been made as to what will happen to the 12.6 PR positions currently assigned to WisComp. However, the revenue source for the PR funding will end with the termination of the service on June 30, 1997. As a result, the Committee could delete \$507,500 PR annually and 12.6 PR positions from DOA's budget.

4. Because WisComp is part of a larger appropriation (base funding of \$16.5 million PR and 90.1 PR positions), if no action is taken by the Committee, DOA will have excess expenditure and position authority going into the next biennium.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Delete 12.60 PR positions and \$507,500 PR annually in expenditure authority associated with WisComp unit in DOA which is being terminated as of June 30, 1997.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>PR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$1,015,000
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 12.60

2. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

MO#			
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
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

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

ADMINISTRATION

Graphic Design Service
Paper #147 -- Substitute to Alternative #1

Motion:

Move to eliminate 12.6 PR positions effective September 30, 1997, and delete \$507,500 PR annually in expenditure authority, associated with the WisComp unit in DOA.

Note:

This motion would eliminate funding and positions associated with the WisComp graphic design unit.

[Change to Bill: -\$1,015,000 PR and -12.6 PR positions]

MO# 1632

BURKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
JENSEN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

ADMINISTRATION, DISTRICT ATTORNEYS AND EMPLOYEE TRUST FUNDS

**Granting Creditable Service under the Wisconsin Retirement System
to Certain District Attorney Employees in Milwaukee County**

Motion:

Move to include statutory language to:

(1) Provide additional creditable service under the Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) to state employees who meet all of the following criteria:

(a) They were prosecutors in the Milwaukee District Attorney's Office on December 31, 1989, and transferred to state service on January 1, 1990;

(b) They were participants in the Milwaukee County Employees' Retirement System, created by Chapter 201, Laws of 1937, but were not vested on December 31, 1989, for the purpose of qualifying for an annuity under that System;

(c) They exercised their option to become a WRS participant on January 1, 1990; and

(d) They are state employees on the general effective date of the biennial budget act.

(2) Specify that the amount of additional creditable service under the WRS granted to each state employee meeting all the above criteria shall be equal to the amount of creditable service accumulated as of December 31, 1989, under the Milwaukee County Employees' Retirement System, created by Chapter 201, Laws of 1937, for which the employee did not have vested pension rights.

(3) Require the Department of Employee Trust Funds to determine the amount of unfunded prior service liability for the WRS due to the additional creditable service granted to state employees meeting all the above criteria, and direct that the total amount of the additional unfunded prior service liability be added to the current unfunded prior service liabilities of the Department of Administration.

(4) Specify that commencing in the 1997-98 fiscal year, the Department of Administration shall annually pay to the WRS an amount equal to one-tenth of the total amount of unfunded prior service liability for all of the additional creditable service granted under this motion, plus annual interest computed at the WRS assumed rate (currently 8%).

(5) Specify that these annual payments shall be deducted from the gross annual payment amounts which otherwise would have been made to Milwaukee County for district attorney salaries and fringe benefits under s. 20.475(1)(d) of the statutes. Stipulate that these annual deductions shall continue until the unfunded prior service liability plus annual interest costs associated with the additional creditable service granted under this motion have been paid in full.

(6) Provide an additional \$50,000 GPR annually under s. 20.475(1)(d) of the statutes as one-time funding in 1997-99 and include session law language directing that this additional funding is to be provided for fringe benefits costs of state prosecutors in Milwaukee County.

(7) Finally, specify that for any state employe covered by this motion, Milwaukee County, would be prohibited from reducing the employe's salary or the employer's percentage contribution to the employe's existing fringe benefits in order to compensate the county either directly or indirectly for the reductions under (5).

Note:

Provisions of 1989 Wisconsin Act 31 made district attorneys and other state prosecutors state employes, first effective January 1, 1990, and established an appropriation under s. 20.475(1)(d) of the statutes to reimburse counties for the costs of salaries and fringe benefits payable to district attorneys and other state employes in county Offices of the District Attorney. Under 1989 Wisconsin Act 336, employes of the Milwaukee County District Attorney's office were given the option of either remaining as participants under the separate Milwaukee County Employes' Retirement System or converting to the WRS on January 1, 1990. For Milwaukee County prosecutors who had vested pension rights under the county retirement system (10 years of creditable service was required in order to be vested under the county system), current law allowed such employes full retirement benefit reciprocity, and no benefits were lost.

However, for Milwaukee County prosecutors who had not vested in the county retirement system and who elected to become participants under the WRS, Act 336 directed that the county system remit to the WRS an amount equal to the employer-required normal contributions, plus interest earned, for each nonvested employe, thereby allowing the employe to receive creditable service under the WRS. Subsequently, the Wisconsin Supreme Court in *Association of State Prosecutors v. Milwaukee* determined this provision to be an unconstitutional taking from the county retirement system and ruled it invalid.

This motion would grant WRS creditable service to current state employes who were originally nonvested county pension system employes in the Milwaukee County District Attorney's Office on December 31, 1989. ETF would be required to determine the total amount of unfunded prior service liability that would be due as a result of granting the additional WRS creditable service. This total additional liability would be added to DOA's unfunded prior service

liability amounts due the WRS and would be recovered by the state commencing in 1997-98 over a 10-year period, with interest, by applying a deduction to the amounts which would otherwise be remitted to Milwaukee County to reimburse it for the costs of state prosecutors' salaries and fringe benefits. For the 1997-99 biennium only, the motion would provide an additional \$50,000 GPR annually to reimburse Milwaukee County for state prosecutor fringe benefits costs.

ETF estimates that 40 state employees would be affected by this motion and that the total additional unfunded prior service liability would amount to approximately \$904,200. At the WRS assumed interest rate of 8%, estimated payments of \$162,800 in 1997-98 and \$155,500 in 1998-99 would be deducted from the amounts otherwise payable to Milwaukee County to reimburse the county for prosecutors' salary and fringe benefits costs. Under the motion, the County would be prohibited from offsetting the salaries and fringe benefits due the state employees covered by this motion in order to hold itself harmless from the reduced reimbursements.

[Change to Bill: \$100,000 GPR]

MO# 1614

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
2 GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
JENSEN	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
OURADA	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
HARSDORF	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
ALBERS	<input type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

AYE 10 NO 6 ABS

ADMINISTRATION

Agency Services

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
3	State Agency Services -- State Records Center Costs
4	State Facilities Development -- Convert Funding from GPR to PR
5	State Facilities Management -- Capitol Heat and Power Plant Fuel Costs
6	State Facilities Management -- Operational Costs of State Buildings
7	State Facilities Management -- Madison Parking Operations
10	State Transportation Services -- Additional Assigned Vehicles and Aircraft Equipment
11	State Transportation Services -- UW-Milwaukee Vehicle Fleet Consolidation
12	State Transportation Services -- Fuel and Maintenance Costs Increases
13	State Transportation Services -- Vehicle Replacement and Aircraft Overhaul
14	Risk Management -- Claims Payments Reestimates
16	Telecommunications Relay Service

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
15	Risk Management -- Disclosure of Individual Medical Records

ADMINISTRATIVE

MEMORANDUM

Administration

MEMORANDUM FOR THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Housing

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 64)

No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

DOA -- Housing

No issue papers prepared and no action needed on items which don't have a paper. Special note: the Urban Hope Project is included here. Make sure nobody messes with it.

Jensen motion to
work w/ for profits.

2 Albers motions

DOA -- Housing

No issue papers prepared and no action needed on items which don't have a paper. Special note: the Urban Hope Project is included here. Make sure nobody messes with it.

Housing - Jensen -
allow to work w/ for profits
Alfers - regional -
-

ADMINISTRATION -- DIVISION OF HOUSING

Community Development Block Grants Applications

Motion:

Move to require the Division of Housing to promulgate rules requiring that applicants, who submitted an application in the prior award year and were determined eligible to receive a grant but were not awarded a grant, to be automatically eligible for consideration for a grant in the following award year without having to reapply.

Note:

The Division of Housing administers the housing rehabilitation component of the federal small cities community development block grant (CDBG) program through a contract with the state Department of Commerce, which is the state agency designated by federal government for receipt of federal CDBG funds. Under the CDBG program federal funds are provided to municipalities for housing rehabilitation, acquisition, relocation, handicapped accessibility improvements, public facilities improvements and economic development. Grants are made by DOH to municipalities or county governments, which then provide deferred or low-interest loans to individuals applicants to conduct rehabilitation projects.

Under current law, funds allocated under the housing rehabilitation program are granted annually on a competitive basis by awarding points to each applications according to criteria enumerated in the administrative rules. The following criteria include those Division staff must consider when ranking applications to award grants; (1) the housing strategy of the applicant; (2) the extent to which benefits from proposed activities will be directed toward low- and moderate-income persons compared to other applications; (3) the amount of other funds to be combined with the requested funds; and (4) the applicant's efforts to further the availability of fair housing.

This motion would statutorily require the Division of Housing promulgate rules to require that it also allow applicants, who submitted an application in the prior award year and were determined eligible to receive a grant but were not awarded a grant, to be automatically eligible for consideration for a grant in the following award year without having to reapply.

2nd?

MO# _____

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
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

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

ADMINISTRATION -- DIVISION OF HOUSING

Small Cities Community Development Block Grants for Housing

Motion:

Move to provide that the Division of Housing shall be required to promulgate rules which establish additional evaluation criteria which must be used by the Division in evaluating applications for small cities community development block grants for housing. Provide that additional evaluation criteria categories be created to recognize and provide factor points for: (1) applications that consist of a multi-jurisdictional program area that includes more than one city, village or town units of government within one or more counties; and (2) applications for grants which would be designed to service program areas with a demand for affordable housing that is greater than the state average. Require the Division to include in the rules a procedure for determining the affordable housing demands in various areas of the state to allow the Division to consider and allocate points for applications for areas with a demand for affordable housing that is greater than the statewide average.

Note:

The Division of Housing administers the housing rehabilitation component of the federal small cities community development block grant (CDBG) program through a contract with the state Department of Commerce, which is the state agency designated by federal government for receipt of federal CDBG funds. Under the small cities CDBG program for housing, federal funds are provided by DOH to municipalities (cities, villages and towns with populations under 50,000 and all counties except Milwaukee and Waukesha) for various housing activities including: rehabilitation, acquisition, relocation, demolition, handicapped accessibility modifications and public facilities improvements. Grants are made by DOH to municipalities or county governments, which then provide deferred or low-interest loans to individuals applicants to conduct rehabilitation projects.

Under current law and administrative rules, funds allocated under the housing rehabilitation program are granted annually on a competitive basis by awarding points to each application according to criteria enumerated in the administrative rules. The following criteria include those Division staff must consider when ranking applications to award grants: (1) the condition of housing, income levels of households, and other data available for all applicants which provides a measure of the low and moderate income households housing needs; (2) the percentage of program benefit directed toward households with the lowest income; (3) the extent to which

program funds are directed to areas that are most in need and to communities that can most effectively use the funds; (4) the extent to which housing needs in the community and in the program area have been adequately documented; (5) the extent to which the proposed activities are completely and accurately described in the application; (6) the extent to which the proposed activities relate to and address the identified housing needs; (7) the extent to which the eligible applicant proposes to promote compliance with applicable state and federal fair housing laws and regulations; (8) the extent to which other resources will be used in conjunction with program funds; and (9) the extent to which the application is complete and in the format required by DOA.

This motion would create in the statutes a requirement that the Division of Housing promulgate rules to specify additional evaluation criteria under which DOH would be required to also consider and allocate points in evaluating each application for the following: (1) applications that consist of a multi-jurisdictional program area that includes more than one city, village or town units of government within one or more counties; and (2) applications for grants which would be designed to service program areas with a demand for affordable housing that is greater than the state average. The Division would also be required to include in the new rules a procedure for determining the affordable housing demands in various areas of the state to allow the Division to consider and allocate points for applications for areas with a demand for affordable housing that is greater than the statewide average.

MO# 2034

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
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

AYE 6 NO 10 ABS _____

ADMINISTRATION -- DIVISION OF HOUSING

For-Profit Organizations Eligibility for Grants

Motion:

Move to modify current law to allow for-profit organizations to qualify as eligible applicants and designated agents for all state housing programs administered by the Division of Housing, except where expressly prohibited by federal law.

Note:

This motion would provide that for-profit organizations would be eligible for state housing programs funding. Under current law, the statutes do not include for-profit organizations as eligible applicants or designated agents for state funded housing programs and for most federally-funded housing programs. This motion would modify the statutes to provide that for-profit organizations would be eligible for housing program funding administered by the Division of Housing, except where expressly prohibited by federal law.

The Division of Housing administers a number of state funded and federal funded housing loan and grant programs including: (1) local housing organization grants program; (2) housing cost grants and loans program; (3) transitional housing grants program; (4) state shelter subsidy grant program; (5) home investment partnerships program (HOME); (6) rental energy rehabilitation program; (7) emergency shelter grant program; and (7) the housing rehabilitation program (CDBG). Under current law, for-profit organizations are not eligible to directly receive funding from the state-funded housing program. For-profit organizations are, however, eligible to receive up to 75% of HOME funding.

MO#

2096

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
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

2nd?

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS 0

ADMINISTRATION

Housing

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Division of Housing -- Supplies and Services Funding
2	Combine Appropriations for Mobile Home Park Dealers
3	Urban Hope Project

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
4	Denial, Suspension and Revocation of Licenses

Administration

Attached Programs

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 67)

LFB Summary Item for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
6	National and Community Service Board -- Permanent Staff (Paper #157)
7a	Special and Executive Committees Appropriation -- Association Memberships (Paper #158)

DOA -- Attached Programs

Paper 157 -- Alternative 2

Brian

Comments: See paragraph 4.

Paper 158 -- Approve modification to bill

For items with no papers, no action needed.

DOA -- Attached Programs

Paper 157 -- Alternative 2 *BB*

Comments: See paragraph 4.

Paper 158 -- Approve modification to bill

For items with no papers, no action needed.

To: Joint Committee on Finance

From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

National and Community Service Board -- Permanent Staff (Administration -- Attached Programs)

[LFB Summary: Page 68, #6]

CURRENT LAW

The National and Community Service Board is responsible for providing an annual plan for the provision of national service programs in this state and for awarding grants (from federal funds received from the Corporation for National and Community Services) to persons providing national service programs in the state, with priority being given to youth corp programs. The agency has a base budget of \$293,700 FED and 4.0 project positions.

GOVERNOR

Provide a net increase of \$11,500 FED in 1997-98 and \$71,700 FED in 1998-99 and 2.0 FED permanent positions. The net funding adjustment consists of the following: (1) a reduction in supplies and services funding of \$50,000 FED annually; and (b) the provision of \$61,500 FED in 1997-98 and \$121,700 FED in 1998-99, to allow continuation of 2.0 project positions (program planning analyst and administrative officer) which will end on March 28, 1998, as permanent positions after that date and to authorize an additional position (program assistant) as a permanent position for one year (1997-98).

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. At the time it developed its original budget request, the National and Community Service Board had four, federally-funded project positions. Two of those positions, a program assistant and an administrative assistant, expired in October of 1996 and were removed as a standard budget adjustment. The remaining two project positions will expire on March 26, 1998.

2. The Governor's recommendation would provide that two of the project positions (program planning analyst and administrative officer) be converted to permanent positions and that the expired project program assistant position be reauthorized as a permanent position for one year, 1997-98.

3. The Board is federally funded and receives an annual administrative grant. Due to uncertainty regarding the amount of federal funding for the 1997-99 biennium that will be available for the administrative costs of the Board, the staffing and the supplies and services funding for the Board was adjusted to the total level (\$205,500 in 1997-98 and \$174,900 in 1998-99) that DOA currently estimates will be available.

4. One could question the rationale of authorizing a permanent position for just one year. Due to the time involved in hiring a permanent position, the position could not even be filled for all of 1997-98. A one-year project position, however, could be filled immediately in the same manner as an LTE is hired.

5. The Committee could modify the Governor's recommendation to authorize a program assistant position as a one-year project position.

6. Alternatively, the Committee could delete the proposed one-year permanent position and associated funding. Depending on the administrative funding that is finally determined to be available for the Board, the Governor can authorize additional federal funding and positions if it is subsequently determined that more federal funding than anticipated has become available. Under this alternative, \$31,000 FED in 1997-98 and 1.0 FED position (program assistant) in 1997-98 could be deleted from the bill.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendations to provide 3.0 FED permanent positions in 1997-98 and 2.0 FED permanent positions in 1998-99 and net increased funding of \$11,500 FED in 1997-98 and \$71,700 FED in 1998-99.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation to change the one-year permanent position to a one-year project position.

3. Modify the Governor's recommendation by deleting the one-year permanent position (1997-98) and associated funding of \$31,000 FED in 1997-98.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>FED</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$31,000

4. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>FED</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$83,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	- 2.00

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

MO# AH 2

1 BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GEORGE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WINEKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
2 JENSEN	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
OURADA	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HARSDORF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
LINTON	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE**Special and Executive Committees Appropriation -- Association Memberships
(Administration -- Attached Programs)**

[LFB Summary: Page 69, #7a]

CURRENT LAW

Base level funding for the special and executive committees dues and memberships appropriation is \$186,600 GPR, of which \$159,100 was allotted to association memberships.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$32,100 GPR annually for increased costs of dues and memberships for the following committees or commissions: (a) Educational Compact Commission (\$13,300); (b) Great Lakes Compact Commission (\$8,300); (c) Great Lakes Governor's Council (\$10,000); and (d) Governor's Council of Policy Advisors (\$500). The special and executive committees appropriation is used to fund both the costs of special committees created by statute or executive order and also to pay membership dues for state membership in a number of national or regional associations.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. From base level funds allocated for association memberships, \$7,000 annually has been utilized for payments to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations. The Commission was created under federal law and was comprised of members from the executive and legislative branches of federal, state and local governments plus citizen members. The

Committee was created to study the structural function of the federal, state and local governments and the financial relationships of the different levels of government. The federal government has terminated the Commission's existence and therefore, payments from the state will not happen.

2. Given that the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations has been terminated, the Committee could reduce the special and executive committees appropriation by \$7,000 GPR annually.

MODIFICATION TO BILL

Modify the Governor's recommendation by reducing funding by \$7,000 GPR annually associated with dues previously paid to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations.

Modification	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$14,000

Prepared by: Jere Bauer

MO# Modification

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
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

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

ADMINISTRATION

Attached Programs

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Badger State Games
2	Claims Board -- Claims Reestimate
4	College Tuition Prepayment Program
5	Division of Hearings and Appeals
7b	Special and Executive Committees Appropriation -- Special and Executive Committees Funding Reduction
9	Tax Appeals Commission -- Filing Fee
10	Tax Appeals Commission -- Supplies and Services Reduction
11	Waste Facilities Siting Board -- IT Infrastructure Support
12	Women's Council Funding Reduction

LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
3	Claims Board -- Payment of Claims
8	Tax Appeals Commission -- Definition of Small Claims

NOT FOR RELEASE

CONFIDENTIAL

Administration

Office of Justice Assistance

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 66)

No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

Budget Memo

Agency: DOA - Office Justice Assistance

Staff Recommendations:

No FB Paper have been prepared -- (no action needed)
working off gov's bill

ADMINISTRATION

Office of Justice Assistance

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Office of Justice Assistance -- Federal Funding Increases
2	Office of Justice Assistance -- Penalty Assessment
3	Office of Justice Assistance -- Infrastructure Support

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 72)

LFB Summary Item for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #

Title

2

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention, Pregnancy and Parenting Services (Paper #160)

To: Joint Committee on Finance
From: Bob Lang, Director
Legislative Fiscal Bureau

ISSUE

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention, Pregnancy and Parenting Services (APPPS Board and DHFS -- Children and Family Services and Supportive Living)

[LFB Summary: Page 72, #2 and Page 317, #15]

CURRENT LAW

The APPPS Board. The Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services (APPPS) Board is a 13-member Board that operates as an independent state agency, although it is attached to the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) for administrative purposes. The chairperson of the Board, who serves as a nonvoting member, is the Executive Director of the Women's Council. Six nonvoting members of the Board are state employees who are appointed for membership by the Women's Council. The remaining six members are appointed by the Governor for three-year terms, based on nominations by statewide organizations that together represent an equal balance of points of view on pregnancy prevention and pregnancy services.

The Board distributes grants for adolescent pregnancy prevention programs and pregnancy services projects that include health care, education, counseling and vocational training services. Each project must serve high-risk adolescents between the ages of ten and 18 years old. Grant recipients are required to provide a 20% match to funds received. The Board currently supports nine projects throughout the state, which are funded on a staggered, three-year basis.

Base funding for the Board includes grants to organizations (\$439,300 GPR) and state operations (\$107,600 GPR). State operations funding for the Board includes support for 1.5 GPR positions, including 1.0 administrative officer and 0.5 program assistant position. These staff positions provide administrative services to the Board, administer the grant program, provide

technical assistance for adolescent pregnancy prevention programs and, under the Board's general guidance, promote adolescent pregnancy prevention programs.

DHFS Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Parent Programs. DHFS currently administers five adolescent pregnancy prevention and parent programs: (a) adolescent self-sufficiency grant program; (b) adolescent pregnancy prevention services grant program; (c) the adolescent CHOICES project grants; (d) adolescent parent services; and (e) adolescent pregnancy counseling services. These programs, which are administered by the Division of Children and Family Services, are described briefly below.

Adolescent Self-Sufficiency Services. \$582,100 GPR in each fiscal year to provide services in counties or tribes for adolescent parents which emphasize high school graduation, vocational preparation, training, and strengthening the adolescent parent's capacity to fulfill parental responsibilities. In awarding grants, DHFS is required to give priority counties based on the following factors: (a) highest number of births to adolescent mothers; (b) highest rate of births to adolescents; (c) highest rate of participation in the AFDC or Wisconsin Works employment program; (d) highest percentage of births to adolescents. Of the total funding, \$50,100 is earmarked for Native American tribes.

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Services. \$340,000 GPR annually to provide high-risk adolescents pregnancy and parenthood prevention services to increase development of decision-making and communications skills, promote graduation from high school and expand career and other options. Except with respect to grants to Native American tribes or bands, DHFS is required to rank projects using the same factors it uses to distribute grants for adolescent self-sufficiency services. Of the total funding, \$35,000 is earmarked for tribes.

Adolescent CHOICES Projects. \$210,000 GPR annually to provide information to communities in order to increase community knowledge about problems of adolescents and information to and activities for adolescents, particularly female adolescents in order to: (a) reduce adolescent pregnancy and high school dropout rates; (b) increase economic self-sufficiency and expanding career options for adolescents; (c) enhance self-esteem, interpersonal skills and responsible decision-making; and (d) neutralize sex-role stereotyping and bias. DHFS is required to work closely with the Women's Council and the Department of Public Instruction on a continuing basis concerning the scope and direction of activities funded as CHOICES projects.

By statute, DHFS is required to allocate up to \$65,500 GPR annually to solicit applications from organizations and to provide technical assistance to grantees under this program.

Adolescent Parent Services. \$100,000 GPR annually to provide two \$50,000 grants to organizations that provide adolescent parenting skills development for members of racial minority groups in Milwaukee County.

Adolescent Pregnancy Counseling Services. \$275,000 GPR annually in the Division of Health (DOH) to make grants to individuals and organizations to provide pregnancy counseling services. Of this amount, DOH transfers \$197,400 annually to the Division of Children and Family Services (DCFS) under a memorandum of understanding. DCFS distributes one-third of the funding (\$65,800) to organizations in Milwaukee County to provide primary pregnancy prevention services for youth up to the age of 20. The remaining two-thirds of the funding (\$131,600) is awarded to organizations in Kenosha, Milwaukee, Racine and Rock counties to provide crisis pregnancy and parenting services for high-risk pregnant women under the age of 25, who are single, unemployed and economically disadvantaged. Awards are limited to \$50,000 per agency. Although not required by statute, applicants must provide a 25% cash or kind-kind match to the state funds.

Program requirements for the pregnancy prevention funding under this program is the same as the requirements for the other adolescent pregnancy prevention program administered by DCFS. Criteria for the crisis pregnancy and parenting services are the same as the criteria for the adolescent parent self-sufficiency criteria, except that young parents up to age 25 may be served.

DOH uses the remainder of funds (\$77,600 GPR) to provide grants to two organizations in Milwaukee County for services to address adolescent health issues.

This paper has four attachments. Attachments I and II identify current grant projects funded by the APPPS Board and DHFS, respectively. Attachment III compares state adolescent pregnancy rates for 1992, the most recent year such comparative information is available. Finally Attachment IV provides Wisconsin county data on birth rates to adolescents for calendar year 1995.

GOVERNOR

Transfer all funding and administrative support for the APPPS Board to DHFS and transfer the administrative responsibility for the adolescent self-sufficiency, pregnancy prevention services and CHOICES projects currently administered by DHFS to the APPPS Board, although funding for these programs would remain budgeted within DHFS. Funding and position authority for these transferred positions would be deleted in the 1998-99 fiscal year. Specify that the Board's operating expenses would be paid from a DHFS general program operations appropriation.

In addition, delete the requirement that DHFS allocate not more than \$65,500 annually to provide technical assistance to organizations receiving grants for adolescent services and current statutory references relating to: (a) grants for comprehensive, community-based adolescent demonstration projects, which were previously administered by the Board; (b)

allocations for adolescent pregnancy prevention and pregnancy services administered by the Board in the 1995-97 biennium.

The following table identifies the funding that would be administered by the APPPS Board, but budgeted in DHFS.

Program	Annual Amount
Current APPPS Board projects	\$439,300
Self-sufficiency services	582,100
Pregnancy prevention services	340,000
CHOICES projects	<u>210,000</u>
Total	\$1,571,400

DISCUSSION POINTS

This item involves two primary issues for the Committee to consider: (1) the appropriate role of DHFS and the APPPS Board in administering adolescent pregnancy prevention, pregnancy services and parenting programs; and (2) the extent to which current programs administered by these agencies should be consolidated, either by transferring the administrative responsibilities of similar programs to a single agency, as recommended by the Governor, or by replacing separate-grant programs that have similar objectives and project eligibility criteria with a single, broadly-defined program.

Role of DHFS and the APPPS Board in Administering Pregnancy Programs

1. The Governor's recommendation is intended to expand the role of the APPPS Board by increasing the number of programs and funds administered by the Board and achieve administrative efficiencies by drawing upon the staff resources of DHFS to assist the Board in the administration of these programs. This recommendation could be viewed as a first step to improve the administrative coordination between these programs.

2. However, both the Secretary of DHFS and the administrator of the APPPS Board have expressed concerns over the Governor's recommendations and would prefer the current division of responsibilities between the two agencies. DHFS expects that it will be held accountable for the programs that the APPPS Board would administer because funding for these programs would be budgeted in DHFS. Further, transferring administration of prevention programs from DHFS to the APPPS Board may be inconsistent with the administration's efforts to consolidate the state's prevention programs in DHFS.

3. The administrator of the APPPS Board has expressed several concerns over the Governor's recommendations. These concerns include: (a) increased levels of bureaucratic

approvals that would be needed to administer the current APPPS Board program; (b) the role of the APPPS Board would be reduced to approving requests-for-proposals and deciding which projects receiving funding, rather than to provide independent leadership on adolescent pregnancy issues; (c) uncertainty over whether administering staff would be primarily responsible to the Administrator of DCFS or the Chair of the Board (the Executive Director of the Women's Council); and (d) decreased visibility of adolescent pregnancy prevention as an issue.

4. Although the concerns expressed by the affected agencies may have merit, the Committee may wish to consider whether it is desirable to have both DHFS and the Board involved in administering these programs or whether a single agency should assume responsibility for these programs.

5. It is frequently argued that too many state agencies are involved in the administration of numerous, similar state prevention programs, including adolescent pregnancy prevention and substance abuse treatment programs and that it would be desirable to consolidate these programs by: (a) transferring all current programs to a single agency; or (b) replacing these programs with a single, broadly designed program; or (c) both.

6. In its September, 1996, report on the state's prevention programs, the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) identified certain advantages and disadvantages of consolidating prevention programs within one agency. Specifically the report indicated that:

- An integrated prevention program could produce a more comprehensive, consistent prevention policy and enhance long-term planning and administrative efficiencies.
- Consolidation of all prevention funds within a larger agency could produce changes in policy as the administration of that agency changes.
- Finally, most state and local staff interviewed for the report indicated that there was some benefit to maintaining multiple administrative agencies in providing prevention services. These staff suggest that having multiple and diverse approaches to prevention is more likely to result in multiple perspectives that lead to useful discussion and debate on prevention policy.

7. Currently, there are two formal structures in place that allow coordination between DHFS and the APPPS Board: (a) a DHFS staff person is a nonvoting member of the APPPS Board; and (b) the administrator of the APPPS Board sits on the DHFS prevention coordination committee which is currently reviewing the delivery of state prevention services.

In addition, DHFS and the APPPS Board have been able to coordinate their respective responsibilities through informal, cooperative efforts. For example, the APPPS Board administrator has participated in the review of DHFS pregnancy prevention program grants and DHFS staff and the APPPS Board administrator have coordinated site visits to grant recipients.

However, establishing formal structures for coordinating activities of the two agencies does not always result in real collaboration, which can only be achieved if both staff and management are committed to it.

8. One argument for retaining the APPPS Board and transferring DHFS programs to the Board is that one agency, with a single focus, would be responsible for administering these programs. Under DHFS administration, adolescent pregnancy prevention and parenting programs may not receive the same focus the Board currently provides for its program. The LAB report indicated that some state and local officials suggested that the consolidation of all prevention funds within one larger agency could result in inadequate attention to issues that may be controversial or exceptionally sensitive, such as adolescent pregnancy prevention.

In addition, the Board's voting members are nominated by statewide organizations that together represent an equal balance of points of view on pregnancy prevention and pregnancy services.

9. One argument that would favor transferring funding and administration of these programs to DHFS is that all prevention services, including adolescent pregnancy prevention, should be delivered in an integrated, community-based system, and that DHFS is the appropriate agency to administer such a system. This approach is based on the belief that a variety of factors influence behaviors in children, and that local communities are best able to assess their needs and target prevention funds towards those needs. Because DHFS serves as the lead state agency for providing services to children and families, it can best administer an integrated community-based prevention program.

10. The APPPS Board, as reviewed by the LAB in April, 1995, has been successful in reducing the number of pregnancies by adolescents participating in programs funded by the Board. The LAB review indicated that 96.8% of participants in APPPS Board-funded projects were able to avoid pregnancy, compared to 91.1% for adolescents in their community for calendar years 1990-1993.

No review has been done of pregnancy prevention programs administered by DHFS. However, in its March 31, 1997, report to the Joint Committee on Audit, DHFS outlined a plan for evaluating DHFS prevention programs. According to that plan, DHFS will be able to report, in 1999, on the effectiveness of its pregnancy prevention programs using data accumulated in 1998.

11. The APPPS Board has targeted its programs to meet needs for pregnancy prevention not served by other programs. For example, the APPPS Board has not targeted its funds to a geographic area based on need, since the programs administered by DHFS are targeted to counties with the greatest need for pregnancy prevention programs. Instead, its funds are available to programs throughout the state.

12. The APPPS Board indicates that an advantage to awarding grants by an independent board is that its award process is open to the public, as required by the open meetings law.

DHFS indicates that its award process is also open to interested parties, because a committee, made up of representatives of interested public and private organizations, reviews applications and makes recommendations to the Administrator of DCFS, who makes the final decision on awards.

13. Finally, there may be administrative cost savings that would result if the APPPS Board program were transferred to DHFS. In its 1997-99 biennial budget submission, DHFS requested that: (a) the APPPS Board funding and staff be transferred to DHFS in 1997-98; (b) administrative funding transferred from the APPPS Board (\$107,000 GPR and 1.50 GPR positions) be deleted in 1998-99; and (c) savings resulting from the elimination of administrative funding be used instead to increase project grants. In its request, DHFS argued that grants for pregnancy prevention and related services can be better coordinated, targeted and administered more efficiently in one agency.

14. If the Committee decides that DHFS should administer the state's pregnancy prevention programs, it could either retain the APPPS Board as an advisory board to DHFS, the Governor and the Legislature, or eliminate the Board entirely.

If the Committee decides that the APPPS Board should administer pregnancy prevention programs, it could either retain the APPPS Board as a separate state agency, attached to DHFS for specific administrative purposes only, or retain the APPPS Board as an independent Board but appropriate funds for grants and administrative support in DHFS, as recommended by the Governor.

Consolidation of Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Programs.

15. Under the Governor's bill, two agencies would continue to be involved in the administration of five separate adolescent pregnancy prevention and services programs, each with similar but different purpose and grant eligibility criteria. The Governor's bill would not make changes to these programs other than with respect to the roles of DHFS and the Board in administering them.

16. Under the bill, the adolescent CHOICES projects would be transferred to the APPPS Board. This program addresses adolescent health, sexual assault, substance abuse, career exploration and gender equity issues. These services could encourage avoidance of pregnancy, but the goals of the program are much broader goals than pregnancy prevention. In this way, this program is less similar to the other programs that would be affected under the bill.

In addition, the bill would not transfer the adolescent parent services program and adolescent pregnancy counseling and crisis-pregnancy services to the APPPS Board. These are programs currently administered in DHFS, but have goals and provide services consistent with the programs which would be transferred to the APPPS Board under the Governor's budget recommendations.

Consequently, the Committee could modify the Governor's recommendations by either: (a) retaining DHFS administration of the CHOICES program; or (b) transferring the adolescent parent services and adolescent counseling services program to the APPPS Board.

17. Finally, the Committee could decide to consolidate programs which focus on adolescent pregnancy prevention and adolescent parenting skills development, rather than only transferring the administration of these programs, as recommended by the Governor.

18. These programs could be consolidated by repealing statutory provisions and funding budgeted for the APPPS Board grants, the adolescent pregnancy prevention services grants, and self-sufficiency services into a single grant program. The Committee could require that the administering agency promulgate rules to determine eligibility criteria, but specify that these funds would be provided to public and private agencies to reduce the number of adolescent pregnancies, provide pregnancy counseling and services and adolescent parenting skills development, and require that all grant recipients identify desired outcomes and collect data to determine if those outcomes are achieved during the term of funding.

At its option, the administering agency could be authorized to require grant applicants to provide a match of up to 25% of total project costs, which could be provided as either cash or through in-kind services. Also, the administering agency could be required to stagger the award of grants under the new program to ensure that each year, new projects are funded under the grant cycle. To minimize the effect of these changes on projects that currently receive grants, provisions could be included to enable the administering agency to continue to fund current projects for the specified time periods under the current grant criteria.

Other Considerations

19. *Administrative Staff.* If the Committee chooses to adopt the Governor's recommendations, it could delete the 1.5 GPR positions for the APPPS Board and \$70,200 GPR beginning in 1997-98, rather than 1998-99 as provided in the Governor's budget. However, retaining funding for 1.5 positions in 1997-98 from the APPPS Board would ensure a smoother transition of programs from DHFS to the APPPS Board.

20. *Federal Welfare Legislation -- Incentive Funds.* Under the federal welfare legislation enacted in August, 1996, five states that experience the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock births during the prior two-year period will be eligible for a bonus grant, beginning in fiscal year 1999. The total amount available for these five states is \$20,000,000. States are

eligible for this bonus funding only if the number of abortions performed in the state does not increase above the rate of abortion in federal fiscal year 1994-1995.

21. *Cost Effectiveness of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Programs.* Providing prevention services to reduce adolescent pregnancies can produce long-term savings of public funds. A recent study by the Robin Hood Foundation indicates that, on average, the public costs of each birth to an adolescent mother is approximately \$3,400, which includes decreased tax revenue, increased costs for public assistance, health care for children, foster care, and criminal justice costs. The study suggests that these costs could be avoided if the mother had waited until she was 20 or 21 years of age before her first child was born.

22. The bill would delete a statutory requirement that DHFS budget \$65,500 annually for technical assistance to organizations that receive grants for adolescent services. This provision was created in legislation that transferred the Choices projects from the Women's Council to the Department, to ensure that DHFS provided technical assistance to providers of adolescent programs following the transfer. DHFS currently budgets 1.0 position and \$43,600 GPR to administer DHFS adolescent pregnancy prevention and parent programs and 0.5 position and \$37,600 GPR to administer the Choices projects and provide technical assistance to providers.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

Administration of Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting Programs

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendations to: (a) transfer funding and administrative support from the APPPS Board to DHFS and delete \$70,200 GPR and 1.5 GPR positions in 1998-99; (b) authorize the APPPS Board to administer the adolescent self-sufficiency, pregnancy prevention services and CHOICES programs; (c) specify that all incumbent employees holding positions in the APPPS Board be transferred on the bill's general effective date and that these employees would have all the employee rights in DHFS that they enjoyed in the APPPS Board immediately prior to the transfer; and (d) specify that the Board's operating expenses would be paid by a DHFS general program operations appropriation.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendations by adopting any or all of the following:

- a. Retain the adolescent CHOICES projects in DHFS.
- b. Transfer the adolescent parenting program and the pregnancy counseling, crisis-pregnancy services program from DHFS to the APPPS Board.
- c. Delete \$70,200 GPR and 1.5 GPR positions in 1997-98, rather than in 1998-99 as recommended by the Governor.

Alternative 2(c)	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$70,200

3. *Retain the APPPS Board as an Independent Agency and Transfer DHFS Adolescent Pregnancy and Parenting Programs to the APPPS Board.* Maintain current law as it relates to the status of the APPPS Board as an independent state agency. In addition, transfer the adolescent pregnancy prevention, pregnancy counseling and crisis-pregnancy, self-sufficiency and parent services programs and associated staff and funding (\$43,600 GPR annually and 1.0 GPR position, beginning in 1997-98) from DHFS to the APPPS Board.

Alternative 3	GPR
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$70,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.50

4. *Transfer all Pregnancy Prevention Programs to DHFS and Repeal the APPPS Board.* Adopt the Governor's recommendations to transfer funding from the APPPS Board to DHFS. However, authorize DHFS, rather than the APPPS Board, to administer these programs. Further, repeal the APPPS Board, effective with the bill's general effective date.

5. *Transfer all Pregnancy Prevention Programs to DHFS and Maintain the APPPS Board as an Advisory Board.* Adopt the Governor's recommendations to transfer funding from the APPPS Board to DHFS. However, authorize DHFS, rather than the APPPS Board to administer these programs. Maintain the APPPS Board as an advisory Board to the Secretary of DHFS, the Governor and the Legislature.

6. *Consolidate Grant Programs in DHFS and Repeal the APPPS Board.* Adopt the Governor's recommendations to transfer funding from the APPPS Board to DHFS but authorize DHFS, rather than the APPPS Board, to distribute grants. In addition, consolidate current adolescent pregnancy and parenting programs currently administered by both agencies by: (a) repealing statutory provisions and funding budgeted for the APPPS Board grants (\$439,300 GPR annually), the adolescent pregnancy prevention grant program (\$340,000 GPR annually), self-sufficiency services grants (\$582,100 GPR annually), adolescent parent services (\$100,000 GPR annually), pregnancy counseling and crisis-pregnancy services (\$197,400 GPR annually); (b) providing \$1,658,800 GPR annually in DHFS for an adolescent pregnancy prevention and services and parenting program; (c) require recipients of funding to target high-risk adolescents; (d) require that all grant recipients identify desired outcomes and collect data to report on the achievement of those outcomes during the term of funding provided; (e) require the administering agency to stagger the award of grants over three years to ensure that new funding is available each year; (f) require the administering agency to submit proposed rules by June 1, 1998, to establish the definition of a high-risk adolescent, eligibility criteria, restrictions on use of funds,

any cash or in-kind match requirements up to 25% and the process used to apply for funds and for awarding grants; and (g) specify that projects currently funded would not be subject to the new requirements as specified by rule. Further, repeal the APPPS Board, effective with the bill's general effective date.

7. *Consolidate Grant Programs in the APPPS Board and Retain the APPPS Board as an Independent State Agency.* Delete the Governor's recommendations relating to the transfer of funding and staff between DHFS and the APPPS Board. Consolidate current adolescent pregnancy and parenting programs currently administered by both agencies, as described in Alternative (6), except that the program would be administered by the APPPS Board, rather than DHFS. Delete the Governor's recommendation to reduce funding by \$70,500 GPR in 1998-99 to reflect the elimination of 1.5 GPR position, beginning in that year. Further, transfer \$43,600 GPR annually and 1.0 GPR position, beginning in 1997-98, from DHFS to the Board.

<u>Alternative 7</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$70,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.50

8. *Retain the APPPS Board as an Independent State Agency.* Delete the Governor's recommendations relating to the transfer of programs from DHFS to the APPPS Board. Consequently, the Board would continue to distribute grants for adolescent pregnancy prevention and DHFS would continue to administer the adolescent programs it currently administers. Provide \$70,500 GPR and 1.5 GPR positions in 1998-99 to fund staff for the Board that would have been deleted under the Governor's bill.

<u>Alternative 8</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1997-99 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$70,200
1998-99 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	1.50

DHFS Requirement to Allocate Funding for Technical Assistance

1. Adopt the Governor's recommendation to delete the requirement that DHFS allocate not more than \$65,500 annually to provide technical assistance to organizations receiving grants to adolescent services and obsolete references to previous funding allocations.

2. Delete provision.

Prepared by: Rachel Cissne

Paper # 160
MO# Alt 7

(part A)

2 BURKE	(Y)	N	A
DECKER	(Y)	N	A
GEORGE	(Y)	N	A
JAUCH	(Y)	N	A
1 WINEKE	(Y)	N	A
SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N	A
COWLES	Y	(N)	A
PANZER	Y	(N)	A
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

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS 0

Paper # 160

MO# Alt 8

(part A)

2 BURKE	(Y)	N	A
DECKER	(Y)	N	A
GEORGE	(Y)	N	A
JAUCH	(Y)	N	A
1 WINEKE	(Y)	N	A
SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N	A
COWLES	(Y)	(N)	A
PANZER	(Y)	N	A
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

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS 0

MO# Alt 1 (B)

2 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
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

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PREVENTION AND PREGNANCY SERVICES BOARD

Consolidation of Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention Programs

Motion:

Move to require the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) to submit a plan developed in consultation with the Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board, to the Joint Committee on Finance, on specific activities the state will conduct to reduce the state's out-of-wedlock births by federal fiscal year 1998-99 in order to receive federal funds that will be made available to five states that experience the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock births during the two previous years. Require DHFS to submit this plan no later than December 31, 1997.

Note:

Under federal welfare legislation enacted in August, 1996, the five states that experience the greatest decline in out-of-wedlock births during the prior two-year period will be eligible for supplemental federal funds, beginning in federal fiscal year 1998-99. The total amount available for these five states is \$20 million. States are eligible for this supplemental funding if the number of abortions performed in the state does not increase above the rate of abortion in federal fiscal year 1994-95.

[Change to Bill: None]

MO# 1006

2	BURKE		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
	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

Motion #1006

AYE 16 NO _____ ABS _____

ATTACHMENT I

The Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board 1996-97 Funded Projects

Hayward Community Schools	Hayward	\$55,770
Lac du Flambeau Public Schools	Lac du Flambeau	55,412
New Opportunities Program c/o Medical College of Wisconsin	Milwaukee	55,770
Community Action, Inc.	Rock and Walworth	67,846
Marshfield Medical Research and Education Foundation	Marshfield	69,193
Silver Spring Neighborhood Center	Milwaukee	69,200
Family Planning Health Services	Wausau	34,228
Family Resource Center	Fond du Lac	27,052
Wisconsin Coulee Region Community Action Program	Westby	<u>7,176</u>
Total		\$441,647

ATTACHMENT II

DHFS Adolescent Pregnancy and Parent Programs 1996-97 Funded Projects

<u>Agency</u>	<u>County or Tribe</u>	<u>Funding</u>
Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention		
New Opportunities Program	Milwaukee	\$66,116
c/o Milwaukee Medical College		
Milwaukee Indian Health Board	Milwaukee	43,884
Urban League of Racine and Kenosha	Racine	45,000
Menominee Tribe	Menominee	30,000
United Migrant Opportunity Services	Kenosha	45,000
Beloit Health Department	Rock	45,000
Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan	Sawyer	30,000
Tribal Consolidated Family Services		<u>35,000</u>
Total		\$340,000
Adolescent Parent Self-Sufficiency		
Family Services of Milwaukee	Milwaukee	\$100,178
Rosalie Manor	Milwaukee	82,500
Silver Spring Neighborhood Center	Milwaukee	82,728
Seeds of Health	Milwaukee	61,594
Kenosha County Department of Social Services	Kenosha	45,000
Menominee Tribe	Menominee	35,000
City of Racine Health Department	Racine	45,000
Beloit Health Department	Rock	45,000
Lutheran Social Services of Wisconsin and Upper Michigan	Sawyer	35,000
Tribal Consolidated Family Services		<u>50,100</u>
Total		\$582,100
Pregnancy Counseling and Crisis Pregnancy and Parenting		
Kenosha County Department of Social Services	Kenosha	32,904
Sixteenth Street Community Health Center	Milwaukee	32,904
Catholic Social Services	Racine	32,904
Beloit Health Department	Rock	32,904
Rosalie Manor	Milwaukee	36,845
Planned Parenthood	Milwaukee	<u>28,963</u>
Total		\$197,424
Adolescent Parent Services		
Milwaukee Urban League	Milwaukee	50,000
New Concepts	Milwaukee	<u>50,000</u>
Total		\$100,000

ATTACHMENT III

1992 Pregnancies Per 1,000 Adolescent Women By State

<u>State</u>	<u>Women Less Than 15 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Between 15 and 17 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Less Than 18 Years Old</u>	<u>State</u>	<u>Women Less Than 15 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Between 15 and 17 Years Old</u>	<u>Women Less Than 18 Years Old</u>
Mississippi	10.9	71.1	82.0	West Virginia	3.2	38.9	42.1
Georgia	10.6	69.6	80.2	Vermont	2.9	38.6	41.5
North Carolina	8.5	68.2	76.7	Wisconsin	3.9	35.3	39.2
New York	8.5	64.8	73.3	Nebraska	3.3	35.4	38.7
Nevada	7.3	65.5	72.8	Minnesota	3.1	31.7	34.8
Texas	6.5	65.7	72.2	Idaho	2.0	32.7	34.7
New Mexico	4.9	66.9	71.8	Maine	2.1	31.9	34.0
Louisiana	8.7	62.1	70.8	Utah	2.5	31.5	34.0
Arizona	5.5	64.5	70.0	Alaska	*	*	*
Alabama	9.1	60.8	69.9	California	*	*	*
Tennessee	7.9	58.8	66.7	Connecticut	*	*	*
South Carolina	7.6	57.7	65.3	Delaware	*	*	*
Arkansas	7.0	56.0	63.0	District of Columbia	30.6	*	*
Hawaii	6.6	56.4	63.0	Florida	*	*	*
Kansas	4.9	53.7	58.6	Illinois	*	*	*
Washington	4.3	54.3	58.6	Iowa	*	*	*
Maryland	7.2	51.3	58.5	New Hampshire	*	*	*
Kentucky	6.0	52.1	58.1	North Dakota	*	26.8	*
Colorado	4.6	52.1	56.7	Oklahoma	*	*	*
Rhode Island	6.2	49.6	55.8	South Dakota	*	36.1	*
Virginia	6.1	49.2	55.3	Wyoming	*	27.0	*
Michigan	5.1	48.1	53.2				
Oregon	4.0	48.8	52.8				
Pennsylvania	6.3	46.5	52.8				
Missouri	4.7	47.0	51.7				
New Jersey	5.8	44.0	49.8				
Ohio	4.5	44.3	48.8				
Massachusetts	4.9	42.4	47.3				
Montana	3.6	43.4	47.0				
Indiana	4.0	42.4	46.4				

*Data Unavailable

Source: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

ATTACHMENT IV

Births to Adolescents, By County, 1995

	Total Births	Births to Mothers Less Than 15 Years old	Births to Mothers Between 15 and 17 Years Old	Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old	Percent of Total Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old
Menominee	92	2	9	11	12.0%
Milwaukee	15,067	111	1,087	1,198	8.0
Langlade	228	-	16	16	7.0
Jackson	189	-	12	12	6.3
Vilas	205	1	12	13	6.3
Racine	2,512	12	135	147	5.9
Sawyer	196	2	9	11	5.6
Kenosha	2,040	4	104	108	5.3
Rusk	192	1	9	10	5.2
Waushara	240	1	11	12	5.0
Barron	550	-	27	27	4.9
Oconto	388	-	19	19	4.9
Juneau	308	-	14	14	4.5
Bayfield	135	-	6	6	4.4
Rock	1,963	8	78	86	4.4
Adams	167	-	7	7	4.2
Kewaunee	218	-	9	9	4.1
Marquette	121	-	5	5	4.1
Richland	196	1	7	8	4.1
Lafayette	176	-	7	7	4.0
Marinette	454	2	16	18	4.0
Douglas	493	-	18	18	3.7
Monroe	529	-	19	19	3.6
Pepin	83	-	3	3	3.6
Polk	470	1	16	17	3.6
Fond du Lac	1,119	-	39	39	3.5
Chippewa	633	1	19	20	3.2
Dodge	947	1	29	30	3.2
Eau Claire	1,118	2	34	36	3.2
Waupaca	619	1	19	20	3.2
Door	254	-	8	8	3.1
Green Lake	192	-	6	6	3.1
Wood	923	-	29	29	3.1
Portage	788	2	22	24	3.0
Brown	2,962	1	85	86	2.9
Dunn	444	-	13	13	2.9%
Forest	137	-	4	4	2.9
Sheboygan	1,336	2	37	39	2.9
Walworth	952	-	28	28	2.9
Florence	36	-	1	1	2.8

ATTACHMENT IV (continued)

**Births to Adolescents, By County
1995**

	<u>Total Births</u>	<u>Births to Mothers Less Than 15 Years old</u>	<u>Births to Mothers Between 15 and 17 Years Old</u>	<u>Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old</u>	<u>Percent of Total Births to Mothers Less Than 18 Years Old</u>
Marathon	1,585	4	41	45	2.8%
Manitowoc	898	2	21	23	2.6
LaCrosse	1,267	2	30	32	2.5
Lincoln	320	-	8	8	2.5
Shawano	456	-	11	11	2.4
Washburn	168	1	3	4	2.4
Winnebago	1,838	-	44	44	2.4
Burnett	171	1	3	4	2.3
Columbia	607	-	14	14	2.3
Dane	5,023	5	110	115	2.3
Sauk	670	-	15	15	2.2
Ashland	239	1	4	5	2.1
Outagamie	2,056	2	42	44	2.1
Oneida	352	-	7	7	2.0
Pierce	403	-	8	8	2.0
Jefferson	852	-	15	15	1.8
Taylor	221	1	3	4	1.8
Iowa	296	1	4	5	1.7
Vernon	351	1	5	6	1.7
Washington	1,440	-	24	24	1.7
Clark	448	-	7	7	1.6
Waukesha	4,120	2	63	65	1.6
St. Croix	725	3	8	11	1.5
Crawford	215	-	3	3	1.4
Green	390	-	5	5	1.3
Trempealeau	315	-	4	4	1.3
Grant	561	-	7	7	1.2
Calumet	488	-	4	4	0.8
Buffalo	165	-	1	1	0.6
Ozaukee	934	-	6	6	0.6
Price	184	-	1	1	0.5
Iron	<u>63</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0.0</u>
Total	67,493	182	2,549	2,731	4.0

Source: Wisconsin Births and Infant Deaths-1995, Center for Health Statistics, DOH.

**ADOLESCENT PREGNANCY PREVENTION
AND PREGNANCY SERVICES BOARD**

LFB Summary Item for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #

Title

1

Standard Budget Adjustments

Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 74)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
2,3	Agrichemical Cleanup Grants (Paper #165)
3	Agrichemical Cleanup Program -- Industrial Pesticides (Paper #166)
3	Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Discontinued Pesticide Products (Paper #167)
4	Agrichemical Cleanup Program Changes (Paper #168)
6	Animal Waste Management Grants (Paper #169)
8	Gypsy Moth Control Program Staff (Paper #170)
9	Food Inspection Program (Paper #171)
11	Weights and Measures Inspection Program -- Liquid Petroleum Gas (Paper #172)
15	Agricultural Investment Aids -- Sustainable Agriculture Grants (Paper #173)
16	County and District Fair Aids (Paper #174)
17	Aids for Federal Dairy Policy Reform Activities (Paper #175)
-	Program Revenue Reestimates (Paper #176)