

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-ASA1-AB133)

Received: 06/23/99

Received By: **olsenje**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Senate Democratic Caucus**

By/Representing: **Walter**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **olsenje**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - int sanct**

Extra Copies: **MGD**

Pre Topic:

SDC:.....Walter - Caucus #2766,

Topic:

Intensive sanctions program reduction

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/1	olsenje 06/24/99	chanaman 06/24/99	hhagen 06/26/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/26/99		
/2	olsenje 06/26/99	chanaman 06/26/99	mclark 06/28/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/28/99		
/3	olsenje 06/29/99	ygeller 06/29/99	jfrantze 06/29/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/29/99		

FE Sent For:

<END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-ASA1-AB133)

Received: **06/23/99**

Received By: **olsenje**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Senate Democratic Caucus**

By/Representing: **Walter**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **olsenje**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - int sanct**

Extra Copies: **MGD**

Pre Topic:

SDC:.....Walter - Caucus # 2766,

Topic:

Intensive sanctions program reduction

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/1	olsenje 06/24/99	chanaman 06/24/99	hhagen 06/26/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/26/99		
/2	olsenje 06/26/99	chanaman 06/26/99	mclark 06/28/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/28/99		

13 6/29 jlg
6/26/99
ML 6/29
RNP

FE Sent For:

<END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-ASA1-AB133)

Received: **06/23/99**

Received By: **olsenje**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Senate Democratic Caucus**

By/Representing: **Walter**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **olsenje**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - int sanct**

Extra Copies: **MGD**

Pre Topic:

SDC:.....Walter - Caucus # 2766,

Topic:

Intensive sanctions program reduction

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/1	olsenje 06/24/99	chanaman 06/24/99	hhagen 06/26/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/26/99		

FE Sent For:

Chm 4
6/24
11
 MRC
 6/27
 MRC/MGD
 6/28
 <END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-ASA1-AB133)

Received: 06/23/99

Received By: **olsenje**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Senate Democratic Caucus**

By/Representing: **Walter**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **olsenje**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - int sanct**

Extra Copies: **MGD**

Pre Topic:

SDC:.....Walter - Caucus # 2766,

Topic:

Intensive sanctions program reduction

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/1	olsenje	cmw 6/24 h		<i>[Handwritten Signature]</i> 6/24			

FE Sent For:

<END>

yes

b(125/1) SDC

Agency: Corrections - Adult Community Corrections

caucus number 1501

duplicate flag:

duplicate with:

Other reference numbers:	LFB Sum #:
FM 419	
bill number/amendment number:	
LRB draft #	LRB P-draft:

description: FM 419. Court-ordered support of a prisoner's dependents would be the second draw on Huber wages after necessary travel expenses to and from work. Third draw on wages would be board of the prisoner and 4th draw would be incidental expenses. Effect 1/1/00

other notes

drafting instructions: FM 419. See above.

more instructions:

caucus number 2766

duplicate flag:

duplicate with:

Other reference numbers:	Paper 350 alt. 1, alt a2 and a3c	LFB Sum #:
bill number/amendment number:		
LRB draft #		LRB P-draft:

description: Delete alt. A1 to Paper 350. Adopt alt. A2 and A3c. Relating to Intensive Sanctions Program Recution.

other notes

drafting instructions: Delete alt. A1 to Paper 350, Adopt alt. A2 and A3c.

more instructions:

Agency: **Corrections - Adult Community Corrections**

Number of Amendments: 2

+

CN 2766

Corrections-Intensive sanctions Program-Paper #350

Delete the Governor's recommendation, alternative A1. Adopt alternative A2 and A3c.
Please see Paper #350 attached as reference.



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 27, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #350

Intensive Sanctions Program Reduction (DOC -- Adult Community Corrections)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 175, #2 and #4]

CURRENT LAW

Base funding for the intensive sanctions program is \$7,280,300 GPR and 38.25 GPR positions and \$526,200 PR.

GOVERNOR

Delete \$2,991,800 GPR in 1999-00 and \$3,260,300 GPR in 2000-01 and 19.0 GPR positions annually to reflect the reduction in usage of the intensive sanctions program. Delete \$164,400 GPR annually associated with the temporary lockup of offenders in the intensive sanctions program.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The intensive sanctions program is a community-based correctional program which is an intermediate correctional level between prison, and probation and parole. The program is designed to provide the following: (a) punishment that is less costly than ordinary imprisonment and more restrictive than ordinary probation or parole supervision; (b) component phases that are intensive and highly structured; and (c) component phases for each participant that are based on public safety considerations and the participant's needs for punishment and treatment. Inmates in intensive sanctions are considered prisoners, not probationers or parolees. As a result, the Department of Corrections has more authority over individuals in the program. Intensive sanctions supervision is provided by both agents and correctional officers.

2. The intensive sanctions program is administered in four phases. Each phase

becomes progressively less restrictive. In general, the first phase is the initial confinement period (either in a state prison or other secured confinement) that every inmate must serve at the beginning of his or her intensive sanctions sentence. The maximum amount of confinement time is two years. The last three phases place an inmate in the community. In phase two, an inmate's movements are electronically monitored. In addition, there are at least 18 personal contacts monthly and activities (work/education, recreation and finances) are closely monitored by intensive sanctions staff. At least three random urine and/or alcohol screenings are required per month. Phase three is less restrictive than phase two, with fewer personal contacts, optional electronic monitoring, inmate control of their own finances and at least two random urine and/or alcohol screenings per month. Phase four is the least restrictive, requiring only two monthly face-to-face visits and random urine and/or alcohol screenings at staff discretion. In phase four of the program, inmates prepare for parole or discharge.

3. In September, 1997, the Department administratively discontinued the use of the intensive sanctions program. As a result, Corrections no longer administratively transfers offenders to the program, uses the program as an alternative to the revocation of probation or parole, or recommends a sentence of intensive sanctions in the presentence reports prepared by its agents for judges. In addition, offenders are no longer paroled to the program. Judges may, however, continue to sentence offenders to intensive sanctions and since September, 1997, 52 offenders have been sentenced to the program. The program currently has 82 sentenced offenders.

4. On June 23, 1998, the Joint Committee on Finance approved the Department's request to transfer \$8,185,200 GPR in 1998-99 from the intensive sanctions program to fund an increased number of contract prison beds. The Committee also eliminated 123.75 GPR positions from the program.

5. In September, 1997, a review panel was appointed by the Governor to evaluate the intensive sanctions program. The panel expressed a number of concerns and criticisms of the program related to program administration, uses of the program and its mission. The panel's recommendations, generally, would have shifted the focus of the program to the supervision of high risk offenders after completion of their prison sentence. This proposal would have changed the statutory focus of the program from punishment that is less costly than ordinary imprisonment and more restrictive than ordinary probation or parole supervision, to an intensive probation and parole supervision program for high risk offenders at mandatory release from prison.

6. From January, 1996, to August, 1997, monthly releases to intensive sanctions averaged 126 offenders. Subsequent to September, 1997, monthly admissions to the program have averaged 10 offenders. As a result of decreased releases to intensive sanctions since September, 1997 and concurrent decreases in parole releases and increases in the number of probation and parole violators being held in prison instead of county jails, prison populations have increased from 14,294 offenders on September 5, 1997, to 18,613 on May 14, 1999. This represents a 30.2% increase in the prison population over approximately 20 months.

7. The number of offenders in the intensive sanctions program has decreased from a

high of 1,628 offenders in the community on September 5, 1997, to 503 on May 14, 1999. Current intensive sanctions offenders in the program include those sentenced by the courts (82) and those placed in the program by Corrections or the Parole Commission (421). For 1997-98, the average daily community population was 921.

8. To the extent that inmates are placed in the program and are subsequently placed in the community, institutional prison populations are reduced. The decision to discontinue the administrative use of intensive sanction, therefore, has increased both the correctional facilities populations and correctional costs. The annual cost per offender in the intensive sanctions program in 1997-98 was \$8,400 compared with the average cost of a correctional facility placement of \$20,300 annually.

9. The Department estimates that the intensive sanctions program will have a population of approximately 200 offenders by the end of 1998-99. As a result, the Governor recommends that the program be reduced by \$3,156,200 in 1999-00 and \$3,424,700 in 2000-01 and 19.0 positions annually to reflect this reduction in usage. The reduction is related to three factors: (a) staff reductions (-\$801,800 in 1999-00 and -\$1,070,300 in 2000-01 and -19.0 positions annually); (b) a reduction in purchase of services associated with the intensive sanctions program (-\$2,190,000 annually); and (c) a reduction associated with the temporary lockup of inmates (-\$164,400 annually).

10. Under AB 133, the intensive sanctions program would be funded at \$3,366,500 (\$2,840,300 GPR and \$526,200 PR) in 1999-00 and \$3,099,600 (\$2,573,400 GPR and \$526,200 PR) in 2000-01 and 12.0 GPR positions annually. Of the total funding, \$1,571,000 (\$1,044,800 GPR and \$526,200 PR) in 1999-00 and \$1,304,100 (\$777,900 GPR and \$526,200 PR) in 2000-01 would support staff and program costs and \$1,795,500 GPR annually would be provided for purchase of services.

11. If base funding for the program were maintained, a total of 475 offenders could be placed in the community. Since the Governor deletes 19.0 positions annually (7.0 supervisor positions and 12.0 correctional officers), some these positions would need to be restored to appropriately staff the program. In total, 36.0 staff (19.0 agents, 7.0 correctional officers, 3.0 supervisors and 7.0 program assistants) would be necessary to supervise 475 offenders. If funding is restored, an additional 5.0 positions would be required. This staffing level would provide supervision of one agent for every 25 offenders and approximately \$8,500 annually for the purchase of services for offenders. This alternative would result in an increase to AB 133 of \$2,991,800 in 1999-00 and \$3,260,300 in 2000-01 and 24.0 GPR positions annually (the restoration of 19.0 positions plus 5.0 additional positions). In addition, \$138,900 annually would be provided for temporary lockups of intensive sanctions offenders. However, the Committee should note that if an additional 275 offenders are placed in the program and since any inmates in addition to those that can be housed in state correctional facilities are placed in contract beds, prison contract costs could be reduced by \$4,516,900 annually. In total, if the intensive sanctions program supervises 475 offenders annually instead of 200 offenders, a savings of \$2,503,900 over the biennium would result.

12. If the Committee wishes to expand the utilization of intensive sanctions beyond base resources which would allow the placement of 475 offenders in the community, a number of alternatives are possible. Alternatives presented below would expand the program by 200, 400 or 600 offenders. Each of the alternatives assumes that offenders are placed in the program over the period of a year beginning in October, 1999. In addition, increased costs of the expanded program are offset by reduced prison contract costs. The table identifies the net cost and positions associated with each alternative.

<u>Expansion</u>	<u>1999-00</u>		<u>2000-01</u>	
	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Positions</u>	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Positions</u>
200 Community Placements	- \$600,300	12.75	- \$523,800	15.00
400 Community Placements	- 1,100,800	25.50	- 1,072,000	30.00
600 Community Placements	- 1,849,000	32.75	- 1,712,200	45.00

13. To date, the reductions in the intensive sanctions populations have been the result of administrative actions taken by the Department. No statutory language related to the current program has been modified. The Committee should note, however, that under the recently adopted truth-in-sentencing law, a person sentenced for a felony occurring on or after December 31, 1999: (a) may not be sentenced to the intensive sanctions program; (b) is not eligible for the program while serving the confinement portion of a bifurcated sentence; and (c) may be placed in the program as a condition of extended supervision.

14. While Corrections may continue to place offenders in the program if they were convicted of an offense occurring on or before December 30, 1999, the provisions of the truth-in-sentencing law eliminate the concept of intensive sanctions as a prison placement and the Department's ability to administratively transfer prisoners to the program if the offenders are convicted of an offense that occurs on or after December 31, 1999. As a result, Corrections' costs in the future may be higher without the intensive sanctions program than if the program remained as a sentencing option.

15. The Committee should note that while the truth-in-sentencing law prohibits the use of the intensive sanctions program as part of the confinement portion of a bifurcated sentence, a person serving a bifurcated sentence may be eligible for the challenge incarceration program ("boot camp") if the sentencing court specifies that he or she is eligible. If an eligible person successfully completes the challenge incarceration program, a judge is required to reduce the prison portion of the sentence so the person is released to supervision, while the supervision portion of the sentence is increased by a corresponding amount, resulting in the same total sentence length.

16. If the Committee wishes, the intensive sanctions program could be modified in a manner similar to the challenge incarceration program to permit intensive sanctions to be used as an alternative to a prison placement. The following modifications could be made:

- a. Delete the requirement that a judge may not sentence an individual to the intensive

sanctions program for an offense that occurs on or after December 31, 1999.

b. Delete the provision that an offender convicted of an offense that occurs on or after December 31, 1999 is not eligible for the program while serving the confinement portion of a bifurcated sentence.

c. Allow a judge at sentencing to determine if an offender is eligible for the program. Allow a sentencing judge to determine the date at which an offender may be eligible for release to the community portion of the program but specify that this may be no sooner than one year (the minimum amount of time an offender must serve in prison under a bifurcated sentence). Under this provision, the current law maximum two-year confinement time under the intensive sanction program would not apply to sentences for offenses occurring on or after December 31, 1999.

d. Require that the determination to place a person in the community portion of the intensive sanctions program is solely the discretion of the sentencing court, based on a recommendation from the Department of Corrections at the time of the potential placement decision.

e. If a judge decides to hold a hearing regarding a potential intensive sanctions community placement, require the courts to provide victim notification and allow victim statements at the hearing.

f. If a judge decides to hold a hearing regarding a potential intensive sanctions community placement, require the courts to notify the district attorney in the county that originally prosecuted the case.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Intensive Sanctions Program Funding

gov/fin
1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to: (a) delete \$2,991,800 in 1999-00 and \$3,260,300 in 2000-01 and 19.0 positions annually to reflect the reduction in usage of the intensive sanctions program; and (b) delete \$164,400 annually associated with the temporary lockup of inmates in the intensive sanctions program.

Alternative A1	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base) [Change to Bill]	- \$6,580,900 \$0]
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Base) [Change to Bill]	- 19.00 0.00]

2. Delete \$25,500 annually for temporary lockup of intensive sanctions offenders, provide 5.0 GPR positions annually for the intensive sanctions program and reduce funding for prison contract beds by \$4,516,900 annually. This alternative would: (a) restore \$2,991,800 in

1999-00 and \$3,260,300 in 2000-01 and provide 24.0 positions annually to increase the estimated number of offenders in the intensive sanctions program from 200 annually to 475 annually; (b) provide an additional \$138,900 annually for an average of seven temporary lockup beds per day; and (c) reduce prison contract bed funding by \$4,516,900 annually.

Handwritten: 161
 138,900
 475
 24.0
 4,516,900

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$9,084,800
[Change to Bill]	- \$2,503,900]
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	5.00
[Change to Bill]	24.00]

3. In addition to Alternative A2, expand the utilization of the intensive sanctions program beyond base resources as follows (each of the following alternatives are mutually exclusive):

a. Expand the intensive sanctions program by an additional 200 offenders. Provide \$1,183,200 and 12.75 positions in 1999-00 and \$1,933,200 and 15.0 positions in 2000-01 for program staffing and operations. Reduce funding for prison contract beds by \$1,783,500 in 1999-00 and \$2,457,000 in 2000-01.

<u>Alternative A3a</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$1,124,100
[Change to Bill]	- \$1,124,100]
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	15.00
[Change to Bill]	15.00]

b. Expand the intensive sanctions program by an additional 400 offenders. Provide \$2,466,200 and 25.5 positions in 1999-00 and \$3,842,000 and 30.0 positions in 2000-01 for program staffing and operations. Reduce funding for prison contract beds by \$3,567,000 in 1999-00 and \$4,914,000 in 2000-01.

<u>Alternative A3b</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$2,172,800
[Change to Bill]	- \$2,172,800]
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Base)	30.00
[Change to Bill]	30.00]

c. Expand the intensive sanctions program by an additional 600 offenders. Provide \$3,501,500 and 32.75 positions in 1999-00 and \$5,658,800 and 45.0 positions in 2000-01 for program staffing and operations. Reduce funding for prison contract beds by \$5,350,500 in 1999-00 and \$7,371,00 in 2000-01.

items (i), (j),

Increase (1)(b)

19.0	}	GPR positions
5.0		
		2,991,800 / 3,260,300
		<u>3,501,500 / 5,658,800</u>
		6,493,300 / 8,919,100
		+ 32.75
		37.75 / 45.00
		GPR 37.75 / 50.00

reduce (a)

865 (4)	(a)	4,516,900 / 4,516,900
		<u>5,350,500 / 7,371,800</u>
		9,867,400 / 11,887,900

Handwritten signature or scribble



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb1125/1

JEO:.....
cmw

Soon!

SDC:.....Walter – Caucus # 2766, Intensive sanctions program reduction

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

CAUCUS AMENDMENT

TO ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 1. Page 185, line 7: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
3 \$138,900 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$138,900 for the
4 purpose of increasing funding for temporary lockup beds for intensive sanctions
5 participants.

6 2. Page 185, line 8: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
7 \$6,493,300 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$8,919,100 for
8 the purpose of increasing funding for the intensive sanctions program and for the
9 purpose of increasing the FTE positions of the department of corrections by 37.75
10 GPR correctional officer positions in fiscal year 1999-00 and by 50.00 GPR

1 correctional officer positions in fiscal year 2000-01 to staff the intensive sanctions
2 program.

3 **3.** Page 275, line 5: decrease the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
4 \$9,867,400 and decrease the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$11,887,900
5 for the purpose of decreasing funding for contracts for the confinement of prisoners
6 in other states.

7 (END)

6/12/99

Prepared By: Jere M. Bauer, Jr.
 Saved As: SDC Alternative

6/24/99 6:56 PM

Senate Democratic Caucus Amendment For 1,075 Offenders in ISP

Intensive Sanctions

Alternative A2	Appropriation	Funding 99-00	Positions 99-00	Funding 00-01	Positions 00-01
Lockup Gov	1 ab	164,400	-	164,400	-
Lockup JFC	1 ab	-25,500	-	-25,500	-
ISP Gov	1 b	801,800	19.00	1,070,300	19.00
ISP JFC	1 b	-42,800	5.00	-57,700	5.00
POS GOV	1 d	2,190,000	-	2,190,000	-
POS JFC	1 d	25,700	-	53,300	-
One-time	1 a	13,200	-	0	-
One-time	1 a	600	-	0	-
Internal Services	1 a	1,800	-	2,400	-
Internal Services	1 b	1,500	-	2,000	-
Prison Contracts	20.865 (4)(a)	-4,516,900	-	-4,516,900	-
Total		-1,386,200	24.00	-1,117,700	24.00
Alternative A3c					
ISP 600	1 b	649,900	32.75	1,696,600	45.00
ISP 600	1 d	2,644,200	-	3,715,800	-
ISP 600	1 a	34,800	-	7,200	-
ISP 600	1 a	1,500	-	400	-
ISP 600	1 a	3,800	-	6,500	-
ISP 600	1 b	3,200	-	5,600	-
ISP 600	1 ab	164,100	-	226,700	-
ISP 600	20.865(4)(a)	-5,350,500	-	-7,371,000	-
Total		-1,849,000	32.75	-1,712,200	45.00
Total with 1,075 Offenders in ISP		-3,235,200	56.75	-2,829,900	69.00
ISP Total		6,632,200	56.75	9,058,000	69.00
Contract Beds Total		-9,867,400	-	-11,887,900	-

Post-it Fax Note	7671	Date	6/24	# of pages	1
To	Jeferson Wilson	From	Jere Bauer		
Co./Dept.	LRB	Co.	LFB		
Phone #	36-8906	Phone #	6-3847		
Fax #		Fax #			



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb1125/1
JEO:cmh:ksh

Soon D-Note

2
redraft
maker
ruh

SDC:.....Walter - Caucus # 2766, Intensive sanctions program reduction

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

CAUCUS AMENDMENT

TO ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133

INS
1-1

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 **1.** Page 185, line 7: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
3 302,000 ~~\$128,900~~ and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by 365,600 ~~\$120,000~~ for the
4 purpose of increasing funding for temporary lockup beds for intensive sanctions
5 participants.

6 **2.** Page 185, line 8: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
7 1,413,600 ~~\$1,413,600~~ and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by 2,716,800 ~~\$2,716,800~~ for
8 the purpose of increasing funding for the intensive sanctions program and for the
9 purpose of increasing the FTE positions of the department of corrections by 26.75 ~~30.00~~
10 GPR correctional officer positions in fiscal year 1999-00 and by 69.00 ~~30.00~~ GPR

1 correctional officer positions in fiscal year 2000-01 to staff the intensive sanctions
2 program.

JNS
2-2

3 **3.** Page 275, line 5: decrease the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
4 \$9,867,400 and decrease the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$11,887,900
5 for the purpose of decreasing funding for contracts for the confinement of prisoners
6 in other states.

7 (END)

1999-2000 DRAFTING INSERT
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRBb1125/2ins
JEO:.....

1 **INSERT 1-1:** ✓

2 **1.** Page 185, line 3: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
3 \$55,700 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$16,500 for the
4 purpose of funding expenses associated with expansion of the intensive sanctions
5 program.

6 **INSERT 2-2:** ✓

7 **2.** Page 186, line 2: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
8 \$4,859,900 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$5,959,100 for
9 the purpose of funding the purchase of services for participants of the intensive
10 sanctions program.

LR 361125/2 du
JEO: cmj :

D-Note

Redrafted with corrected dollar
✓
amounts per Jere Bauer at LFIS.
✓ ✓ ✓

JEO

**DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU**

LRBb1125/2dn
JEO:cmh:mrc

June 28, 1999

Redrafted with corrected dollar amounts per Jere Bauer at LFB.

Jefren E. Olsen
Legislative Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-8906
E-mail: Jefren.Olsen@legis.state.wi.us



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

Today

LRBb1125/2
JEO:cmh:mrc

+ jlg
3
r.m.r.

SDC:.....Walter - Caucus # 2766, Intensive sanctions program reduction

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

CAUCUS AMENDMENT

TO ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 **1.** Page 185, line 3: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
3 \$55,700 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$16,500 for the
4 purpose of funding expenses associated with expansion of the intensive sanctions
5 program.

6 **2.** Page 185, line 7: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
7 \$303,000 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$365,600 for the
8 purpose of increasing funding for temporary lockup beds for intensive sanctions
9 participants.



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb1125/3
JEO:cmh:jf

SDC:.....Walter – Caucus #2766, Intensive sanctions program reduction

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

CAUCUS AMENDMENT

TO ASSEMBLY SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133

1 At the locations indicated, amend the substitute amendment as follows:

2 **1.** Page 185, line 3: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
3 \$55,700 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$16,500 for the
4 purpose of funding expenses associated with expansion of the intensive sanctions
5 program.

6 **2.** Page 185, line 7: increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 1999-00 by
7 \$303,000 and increase the dollar amount for fiscal year 2000-01 by \$365,600 for the
8 purpose of increasing funding for temporary lockup beds for intensive sanctions
9 participants.

