

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SSA1-SB55)

Received: 06/15/2001

Received By: traderc

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Senate Democratic Caucus

By/Representing: Keckhaver

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: traderc

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Environment - water quality

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: NO

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

SDC:.....Keckhaver - CN7010,

Topic:

Land spreading reduction, Elcho

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	traderc 06/16/2001	jdyer 06/17/2001	jfrantze 06/17/2001	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/17/2001		

FE Sent For:

<END>

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SSA1-SB55)

Received: 06/15/2001

Received By: traderc

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Senate Democratic Caucus

By/Representing: Keckhaver

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: traderc

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Environment - water quality

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: NO

Requester's email:

Pre Topic:

SDC:.....Keckhaver - CN7010,

Topic:

Landspreading reduction, Elcho

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?	traderc	1 6/17 jld	6/17	Sellb 6-1-17			

FE Sent For:

<END>

LANDSPREADING REDUCTION INCENTIVE PILOT PROJECT

CN7010

This amendment would provide state support for the Village of Elcho Wastewater Treatment plant to increase its acceptance of truck hauled and holding tank waste. This facility, which currently has the capacity to accept a significantly larger amount of this waste is also located in a concentrated area of landspreading activities. The grant of \$25,000 annually over the biennium would be intended reduce charges to septic haulers to encourage them to utilize the services of the wastewater treatment plant. The grants made under this program would be conditioned upon the Elcho Wastewater Treatment Plan maintaining charges of \$30/thousand gallons for septic and \$6/thousand gallons for holding tank waste.

Given the exceptionally low tax base in the Town and Village of Elcho, these high water costs, coupled with existing high property taxes, have created a severe financial strain on local residents.

STATUS: Not drafted.

DEPARTMENT(S): Department of Natural Resources
Department of Commerce

FISCAL IMPACT: \$50,000

FUNDING SOURCE(S): General Purpose Revenue
Alternative: Earmarked dollars from the Wisconsin Fund

INTRODUCTION: SDC

RCF

287.74
20-370(1)(dc)

Tradewell, Becky

From: Keckhaver, John
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 9:47 AM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: RE: Environmental items for SDC

Becky,
There is a village of elcho and that is who should get the \$. I'm still waiting for confirmation on the other item of where the 1.0 position added \$ goes into. (My sentence structure is starting to falter.)
Thanks.
John

-----Original Message-----

From: Tradewell, Becky
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 6:04 PM
To: Keckhaver, John
Cc: Burnett, Douglas
Subject: Environmental items for SDC

I am the LRB drafter for environmental drafts. I understand that the caucus voted to include the recycling motion offered in the Joint Committee on Finance, motion 1075, in the natural resources package. I believe that this is caucus number 1051. Is the draft supposed to incorporate the modifications to that motion which I have been provided in the form of a memo prepared by John Stolzenberg at the request of Senator Decker? Also, I have received something from the SDC indicating that the number of positions provided to DNR under item 6 of the motion should be changed from 17.5 to 18.5. Should that be done? If so, I need to know how much money to provide for the additional position, into which appropriation the money should be added, and whether any other appropriation should be reduced.

On another matter, Caucus number 7010, relating to a landspreading reduction pilot project, seems to indicate that money should be provided to the Village of Elcho. As far as I can tell, there is no Village of Elcho. There is a Town of Elcho in Langlade County. There may also be an Elcho Sanitary District. How should I proceed? To whom should the money be provided?

Becky Tradewell
6-7290

Tradewell, Becky

From: Keckhaver, John
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 2:06 PM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: RE: Environmental items for SDC

Let's give the \$ to the san district.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tradewell, Becky
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 2:05 PM
To: Keckhaver, John
Subject: RE: Environmental items for SDC

I have just looked again at the description for this item. It indicates that the grant is intended to reduce charges to septic haulers, to encourage them to use the treatment plant. If the funds are to go to the town, which does not operate the treatment plant, I am not sure how this is supposed to work. Perhaps the town would pass the money along to the sanitary district?

-----Original Message-----

From: Keckhaver, John
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 1:59 PM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: RE: Environmental items for SDC

What I was told is that they know about the san. District existing too, and that if the town can't get it, it should go to the san. District. Does that work?

-----Original Message-----

From: Tradewell, Becky
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 1:45 PM
To: Keckhaver, John
Subject: RE: Environmental items for SDC

That's OK. I had our researchers do some looking into this and they found a list on the DNR Web site of holders of water pollution discharge permits. On that list, it shows that the Elcho Sanitary District no. 1, in Langlade County, holds a permit for a wastewater treatment facility. I am sorry to ask this, but do you want to check to ensure that the town, rather than the sanitary district, should get the funds?

-----Original Message-----

From: Keckhaver, John
Sent: Friday, June 15, 2001 1:40 PM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: RE: Environmental items for SDC

I am very sorry!!! I was misinformed, you are right, there is no village of elcho, as you rightfully noted, the town should receive the funds.

-----Original Message-----

From: Tradewell, Becky
Sent: Thursday, June 14, 2001 6:04 PM
To: Keckhaver, John
Cc: Burnett, Douglas
Subject: Environmental items for SDC

I am the LRB drafter for environmental drafts. I understand that the caucus voted to include the recycling motion offered in the Joint Committee on Finance, motion 1075, in the natural resources package. I believe that this is caucus number 1051. Is the draft supposed to incorporate the modifications to that motion which I have been provided in

the form of a memo prepared by John Stolzenberg at the request of Senator Decker? Also, I have received something from the SDC indicating that the number of positions provided to DNR under item 6 of the motion should be changed from 17.5 to 18.5. Should that be done? If so, I need to know how much money to provide for the additional position, into which appropriation the money should be added, and whether any other appropriation should be reduced.

On another matter, Caucus number 7010, relating to a landspreading reduction pilot project, seems to indicate that money should be provided to the Village of Elcho. As far as I can tell, there is no Village of Elcho. There is a Town of Elcho in Langlade County. There may also be an Elcho Sanitary District. How should I proceed? To whom should the money be provided?

Becky Tradewell
6-7290



State of Wisconsin
2001 - 2002 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0855/1

RCT:.....

SOON
LPS - Fix request sheet

JL

SDC:.....Keckhaver - CN7010, Landspreading reduction, Elcho

FOR 2001-03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

CAUCUS SENATE AMENDMENT

TO SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,

TO 2001 SENATE BILL 55

Note

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

2 1. Page 170, line 18: after that line insert:

3 (dc) Land spreading reduction pilot

4 ~~project~~ program GPR A 25,000 25,000 ✓

5 2. Page 334, line 25: after that line insert:

6 "SECTION 615t. 20.370 (6) (dc) of the statutes is created to read:

7 20.370 (6) (dc) Land spreading reduction pilot program. The amounts in the
8 schedule for the land spreading reduction pilot program under s. 281.74."

9 3. Page 1055, line 6: after that line insert:

10 "SECTION 3207v. 281.74 of the statutes is created to read:

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRBb0855/1dn

RCT:.....

date

Jld

It is possible that a Wisconsin court would find that this amendment is a "private or local law" which, under art. IV, sec. 18, of the Wisconsin Constitution, must be enacted as single-subject legislation. If so, this amendment cannot validly be enacted as part of the budget bill, which clearly encompasses more than one subject. Under *Milwaukee Brewers Baseball Club v. Wisconsin Dept. of Health and Social Services*, 130 Wis. 2d 79, 115 (1986), "a legislative provision which is specific to any person, place or thing is a private or local law within the meaning of art. 4, sec. 18, unless: 1) the general subject matter of the provision relates to a state responsibility of statewide dimension; and 2) its enactment will have direct and immediate effect on a specific statewide concern or interest." As it is difficult to predict the potential for and outcome of any court action on this amendment, you may wish to consider introducing this proposal as a separate bill. *

Rebecca C. Tradewell
Managing Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-7290
E-mail: becky.tradewell@legis.state.wi.us

DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRBb0855/1dn
RCT:jld:jf

June 17, 2001

It is possible that a Wisconsin court would find that this amendment is a "private or local law" which, under art. IV, sec. 18, of the Wisconsin Constitution, must be enacted as single-subject legislation. If so, this amendment cannot validly be enacted as part of the budget bill, which clearly encompasses more than one subject. Under *Milwaukee Brewers Baseball Club v. Wisconsin Dept. of Health and Social Services*, 130 Wis. 2d 79, 115 (1986), "a legislative provision which is specific to any person, place or thing is a private or local law within the meaning of art. 4, sec. 18, unless: 1) the general subject matter of the provision relates to a state responsibility of statewide dimension; and 2) its enactment will have direct and immediate effect on a specific statewide concern or interest." As it is difficult to predict the potential for and outcome of any court action on this amendment, you may wish to consider introducing this proposal as a separate bill.

Rebecca C. Tradewell
Managing Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-7290
E-mail: becky.tradewell@legis.state.wi.us

SDC:.....Keckhaver – CN7010, Land spreading reduction, Elcho
FOR 2001-03 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION
CAUCUS SENATE AMENDMENT
TO SENATE SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT 1,
TO 2001 SENATE BILL 55

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

2 1. Page 170, line 18: after that line insert:

3 “(dc) Land spreading reduction pilot

4 program GPR A 25,000 25,000”.

5 2. Page 334, line 25: after that line insert:

6 “SECTION 615t. 20.370 (6) (dc) of the statutes is created to read:

7 20.370 (6) (dc) *Land spreading reduction pilot program*. The amounts in the
8 schedule for the land spreading reduction pilot program under s. 281.74.”.

9 3. Page 1055, line 6: after that line insert:

10 “SECTION 3207v. 281.74 of the statutes is created to read:

