

 **07hr\_ab0446\_AC-Ag\_pt01**



Details:

(FORM UPDATED: 07/12/2010)

**WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE ...  
PUBLIC HEARING - COMMITTEE RECORDS**

**2007-08**

(session year)

**Assembly**

(Assembly, Senate or Joint)

**Committee on ... Agriculture (AC-Ag)**

**COMMITTEE NOTICES ...**

- Committee Reports ... **CR**
- Executive Sessions ... **ES**
- Public Hearings ... **PH**
- Record of Comm. Proceedings ... **RCP**

**INFORMATION COLLECTED BY COMMITTEE FOR AND AGAINST PROPOSAL**

- Appointments ... **Appt**
- Clearinghouse Rules ... **CRule**
- Hearing Records ... bills and resolutions  
(**ab** = Assembly Bill)                      (**ar** = Assembly Resolution)                      (**ajr** = Assembly Joint Resolution)  
(**sb** = Senate Bill)                              (**sr** = Senate Resolution)                              (**sjr** = Senate Joint Resolution)
- Miscellaneous ... **Misc**

## Vote Record Committee on Agriculture

Date: 9/16/07

Moved by: Ott

Seconded by: Nerison

AB 2446      SB \_\_\_\_\_      Clearinghouse Rule \_\_\_\_\_  
 AJR \_\_\_\_\_      SJR \_\_\_\_\_      Appointment \_\_\_\_\_  
 AR \_\_\_\_\_      SR \_\_\_\_\_      Other \_\_\_\_\_

A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Sub Amdt 1 \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_

Be recommended for:  
 Passage     Adoption     Confirmation     Concurrence     Indefinite Postponement  
 Introduction     Rejection     Tabling     Nonconcurrence

Committee Member	Aye	No	Absent	Not Voting
<b>Representative Alvin Ott, Chair</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Lee Nerison</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative John Murtha</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Jeffrey Mursau</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Mary Williams</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Gary Tauchen</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Barbara Gronemus</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Amy Sue Vruwink</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Louis Molepske</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Phil Garthwaite</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Andy Jorgensen</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Totals:</b>	<u>11</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>

Motion Carried       Motion Failed

## Vote Record Committee on Agriculture

Date: 9/16/07

Moved by: Gronemus

Seconded by: Williams

AB 2/16                      SB \_\_\_\_\_                      Clearinghouse Rule \_\_\_\_\_  
 AJR \_\_\_\_\_                      SJR \_\_\_\_\_                      Appointment \_\_\_\_\_  
 AR \_\_\_\_\_                      SR \_\_\_\_\_                      Other \_\_\_\_\_

A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_  
 A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Amdt \_\_\_\_\_ to A/S Sub Amdt \_\_\_\_\_

Be recommended for:  
 Passage       Adoption       Confirmation       Concurrence       Indefinite Postponement  
 Introduction       Rejection       Tabling       Nonconcurrence

Committee Member	Aye	No	Absent	Not Voting
<b>Representative Alvin Ott, Chair</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Lee Nerison</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative John Murtha</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Jeffrey Mursau</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Mary Williams</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Gary Tauchen</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Barbara Gronemus</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Amy Sue Vruwink</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Louis Molepske</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Phil Garthwaite</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Representative Andy Jorgensen</b>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Totals:</b>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>-</u>	<u>-</u>

Motion Carried

Motion Failed





**OFFICE OF THE CORPORATION COUNSEL**

SAUK COUNTY WEST SQUARE BUILDING  
505 BROADWAY STREET  
BARABOO, WISCONSIN 53913  
TELEPHONE: (608) 355-3267  
FAX: (608) 355-3469  
E-MAIL: [tliebman@co.sauk.wi.us](mailto:tliebman@co.sauk.wi.us)

TODD J. LIEBMAN  
CORPORATION COUNSEL

ASSISTANT CORPORATION COUNSEL  
WENDY J.N. BROMLEY  
CHAD A. HENDEE  
TORI A. VESELY

Support Enforcement Stat. 3238

December 7, 2006

Mr. John Schultz  
Ms. Betty Schultz  
S3259 Co. Hwy T  
Baraboo, Wisconsin 53913

AB 446?

RE: Claim for Dog Damage

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Schultz:

This office has been directed by the Executive & Legislative Committee of the Sauk County Board of Supervisors to respond to you regarding your claim for dog damage. Please be advised that no action will be taken on your claim.

Wis. Stat. § 174.11 does provide for the payment of dog damage claims, however, Wis. Stat. § 174.11(3) limits the County's liability to the dog license fund. Wis. Stat. § 174.09 provides for the disbursement of the dog license fund, and provides that funds are first disbursed for administration of the dog license fund, and second, to a humane society that operates a county pound. Only after these expenses are paid shall money be paid for dog damage claims. Sauk County disburses the proceeds of the dog license fund to the Sauk County Humane Society for the operation of the county pound (animal shelter), and thus, no funds exist from which to pay your claim.

Your claim may have other deficiencies as well, such as timeliness and the requirement for investigation by your town. However, such jurisdictional issues are moot because no funds exist from which to pay your claim.

You may be interested to know that our office assisted the Sheriff's Department in having these dogs declared vicious and said declaration was issued on October 26, 2006.

Although Sauk County cannot grant you any relief, you may wish to consult with an attorney regarding a private cause of action against the keeper of these dogs.

I trust this letter satisfactorily explains the position of Sauk County.

Sincerely,

Todd J. Liebman  
Corporation Counsel

TJL:kk

cc: Martin F. Krueger, County Board Chairperson  
Beverly J. Mielke, County Clerk  
Thomas Kriegl, County Board Supervisor, Dist. #2





A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "J.A. Hines", is located in the upper right corner of the page.

---

# J.A. HINES

STATE REPRESENTATIVE • 42ND ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

August 6, 2007

Representative Ott  
Room 323 North  
State Capitol

Dear Representative Ott,

As the chairperson of the Assembly Committee on Agriculture, I would like to request that at your next public hearing you please include Assembly Bill 446 relating to dog damage claims. Please feel free to contact me with any questions that you may have regarding this bill. Again, thank you in advance.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "J.A. Hines", is located below the word "Sincerely,".

J.A. "Doc" Hines  
State Representative  
42<sup>nd</sup> Assembly District





Betty Schultz  
S3259 Co. Hwy. T.  
Baraboo, WI 53913

Rep. J.A. Hines  
Wisconsin State Assembly  
Room 10 West  
State Capitol  
P.O. Box 8952  
Madison, WI 53708

AB 446?

August 16, 2007

To Whom It May Concern and to Rep. Hines,

My name is Betty Schultz. I farm with my son John in the Township of Fairfield in Sauk County. We raise sheep and beef cattle. We recently underwent a great tragedy and to our grave disappointment, the help and protection we had expected from our local governments was not there.

As background, ewes in our flock start giving birth in early March. In late July, we take the lambs away from the ewes and move them from our home farm to a large barn we own up the road. There they are confined and fed. Some females will be saved as replacement ewes in our flock, but most of the lambs are sent to market at around Easter time.

On the morning of September 10, 2006, my son John went to do his chores at the lamb's barn and found a bloody scene. There were 65 dead sheep in the pen. Two dogs were in with the lambs. We were in shock and disbelief. Two more lambs had to be shot the next day, from injuries in the massacre, bringing the total dead to 67 lambs. An additional dozen lambs who were injured and never fully regained their health.

We called the Sauk County Sheriff's Department, deputies came, investigated and wrote up a report. We quickly notified Town of Fairfield officials. We did everything that should have been done. Our loss was huge.

In compliance with the dog statues we made a claim to Sauk County for compensation of damages based on the fees sent by our township to the county. Our claim to Sauk County was denied, even though the county receives dog license fee money annually from the Township. State statutes say these funds can be legally used to reimburse for dog damages. I even appeared before the Sauk County Board, but it made no difference. I was told that Sauk County gives all its dog license funds to the Humane Society and that after expenses for the license program, no money is retained for situations such as ours. But it doesn't have to be that way.

This is so unfair and wrong to the average county citizen, that has been victimized by dogs, causing a loss. I've farmed here for 55 years, and always paid dog tax to our

township government. I thought it was to be used for dog damages, but evidently that isn't the case anymore.

This bill being introduced by Rep. J.A. Hines will not help me, but may help the next person when a tragedy such as ours occurs again.

I feel the solution to the problem is for a certain percentage of the annual collection of dog license funds to be set aside annually for damage claims. If there are no damage claims, those monies could be transferred back into the dog license fund at a certain time each year. This is the only justifiable way of handling reimbursement for dog damages in each county.

As a final note, you may wonder why we have not filed a civil suit in order to receive compensation for our loss. Sauk County has filed 18 counts against the dog's keeper. That case is scheduled to go to court in September. The owner of the dogs is in prison and apparently neither the dogs' owner nor its keeper have the financial resources that make a civil action against them a logical step for us to take. The dogs were declared vicious but were returned to their keeper.

Thank you for hearing my story. Although I know any actions taken will not affect my situation, I ask you to consider a change in the dog statutes to protect others in the future.

Sincerely,

  
Betty Schultz



**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Members of the Assembly Committee on Agriculture

FROM: Matthew Stohr, Legislative Associate *MS*

DATE: August 22, 2007

SUBJECT: 2007 Assembly Bill 446

The Wisconsin Counties Association (WCA) opposes 2007 Assembly Bill 446 (AB 446). AB 446 mandates a county to set aside twenty-five percent of dog license fees into a separate dog damage reimbursement fund. In addition, AB 446 shifts the oversight and responsibility for reviewing dog damage claims from municipalities to counties.

This bill, if enacted into law, will require counties to potentially insure the claimed losses incurred by private individuals. This change in law will undoubtedly amount to a staggering increase in dog damage claims, which will in return necessitate a substantial increase in resources at the county level to receive, review and process the claims. WCA feels that damages between private individuals are matters that should be resolved between those individuals, their insurance coverage and the judicial system, not through a separate county fund and process.

An unintended consequence of AB 446 is the likely diversion of funds from animal shelters, public health operations and humane societies to private individuals. Counties could turn to the property tax to address the shortfall created by the diversions; however, that option is not practical with levy freezes and the escalating cost of providing services on behalf of the state.

WCA feels that various sections of state statute ch.174 relating to animal claims are antiquated and in need of modification. AB 446 attempts to build on an out of date system. WCA respectfully requests the Committee not act favorably on AB 446 and consider a more comprehensive overhaul of chapter 174.

I apologize that I will not be able to attend tomorrow's hearing. Thank you in advance for considering our comments. Please do not hesitate to contact me at the WCA office if you have any questions.





---

# J.A. HINES

---

STATE REPRESENTATIVE · 42ND ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

**Testimony Before the Assembly Committee on Agriculture  
In Support of Assembly Bill 446  
August 23, 2007**

Good morning everyone. First, I would like to thank Chairman Ott and fellow committee members for allowing me the opportunity to testify in favor of Assembly Bill 446, which relates to reimbursement for damages done by dogs.

I am here today testifying on a bill that was drafted at the request of Betty Schultz, a constituent from Baraboo. But before I go into the specifics of her situation, I would like to give you a brief explanation of how counties spend the money they collect from the dog license fund (dog tag fees). Under current law, a county must first use the money collected for quarantine and laboratory costs when a person is bitten by a dog and the owner of a dog is unknown. The remaining money can be used to pay for dog damage claims and expenses incurred by a county pound or a humane society designed to provide a pound to collect, care for, and dispose of dogs.

The original intent of the dog tax statutes was to provide relief for damages done to private property by dogs, however, in Betty's situation, her county failed her. On September 10<sup>th</sup>, Betty went to check in on her lambs and found 65 of them dead with 2 strange dogs in the pen with the dead animals. After an investigation by the Sheriff's Department, it was determined that the strange dogs had destroyed Betty's property. Per state statute, Betty contacted the Sauk County Board for reimbursement for damages incurred by the dogs. The Board responded by stating they had no money available since they had already distributed all the funds collected from the dog license fund directly to the county pound, and that since no money existed, no action would be taken on her claim.

The actions taken by Sauk County run contrary to the intent of dog license fees. Other counties have chosen to follow the intent and in FY 2006, over \$17,000 was distributed statewide in dog damage claims. The intent of the dog license fees was to help reimburse owners for damages to private property by dogs, and then if any funds were remaining, to help local pounds or county humane societies.

This bill will address the dog statutes in two ways to resolve the dog damage fund process to bring it back in line with its original intent. First, it will require that counties place 25% of the money collected from the dog licenses into a segregated fund for one year. This money can only be used to pay for dog damage claims, and if at the end of the year, any money remains in the fund, that money could be spent for county pounds or county humane societies.



Secondly, this bill would simplify the process in which ones files a claim. First, the individual would be required to notify their county sheriffs department of the incident. Secondly, the claim time to file with their county clerk would be extended from 3 days to 5 business days. Finally, the individual would now file their claim directly with the county, as opposed to their local town representative since the county controls the dog license fees and to whom and under what circumstance any damages are to be awarded.

The intent of this legislation is not to deprive county pounds and humane societies from money, it to make it possible for individuals to get reimbursed from funds specifically collected for that purpose. This bill will adjust the dog license statutes to protect the intent of the original legislation and protect those to whom the statues are designed for. I appreciate this opportunity to testify and I urge the committee to pass Assembly Bill 446.



## Ruby, Erin

---

**From:** Rep.Hines  
**Sent:** Monday, August 27, 2007 4:27 PM  
**To:** Rep.Ott; Rep.Nerison; Rep.WilliamsM; Rep.Mursau; Rep.Murtha; Rep.Tauchen;  
Rep.Gronemus; Rep.Molepske; Rep.Jorgensen; Rep.Vruwink; Rep.Garthwaite  
**Cc:** Patronsky, Mark; Ruby, Erin; Tradewell, Becky  
**Subject:** Substitute Amendment for AB 446 - Dog Tax Reimbursement

**Attachments:** Hines Memo AB 446.doc

In response to the concerns of the Committee on Agriculture regarding Assembly Bill 446, Dog Tax Reimbursement, I would like to distribute a memo (drafted with the aid of Legislative Council) that will address the concerns of the committee. The actual substitute amendment cannot be drafted till later in the week as the drafter is unavailable. Please email or call me back as soon as possible with any concerns you may have before Friday.



Hines Memo AB  
446.doc (34 KB)

Sincerely,

Representative J.A. "Doc" Hines  
Room 10 West  
State Capitol  
PO Box 8952  
Madison, WI 53708  
Phone: (608) 266-7746  
<http://www.legis.state.wi.us/assembly/asm42/news/>

TO: MEMBERS OF THE ASSEMBLY COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE

FROM: Representative J. A. Hines

RE: Amendment to Assembly Bill 446, Relating to Reimbursement for Damages Caused by Dogs

DATE: August 27, 2007

I have submitted drafting instructions for an amendment to Assembly Bill 446, relating to reimbursement for damages caused by dogs. The amendment reflects the discussion of Assembly Bill 446 by members of the Assembly Committee on Agriculture at its August 23, 2007 meeting. I hope that the amendment will be ready for distribution and executive action by the committee at its September 6, 2007 meeting.

The amendment will delete provisions of the bill that shift the responsibility for investigating a dog damage claim to the county sheriff. (Currently, this is the responsibility of the town supervisors, board of trustees of a village, or the common council of a city.)

The amendment will retain the provision of the bill that extends the time limit for submitting a claim from three days to five business days.

There was some concern among committee members that the provision in the bill which requires the county treasurer to set aside 25% of the dog license taxes into a separate account, the "dog damage reimbursement fund," would place a limit on the amount of money that could be paid for dog damages. This is not the case, and the amendment makes no change in this provision of the bill. Except for the 25% set aside for dog damages, the remainder of the dog license tax revenues are made available to the county for the following expenses: administering the dog license law, expenses incurred by a county pound or humane society, and expenses related to the rabies program. If any funds are available annually in the dog license fund after these expenses, the amount remaining may be used for paying dog damage claims. This provision is on page 3, lines 17 to 20 of the bill.

Thank you for your suggestions.



## Ruby, Erin

---

**From:** Ruby, Erin  
**Sent:** Wednesday, September 05, 2007 1:26 PM  
**To:** Rep.Garthwaite; Rep.Gronemus; Rep.Jorgensen; Rep.Molepske; Rep.Mursau; Rep.Murtha; Rep.Nerison; Rep.Tauchen; Rep.Vruwink; Rep.WilliamsM  
**Cc:** Arrowood, Craig; Cross, William; Gillis, George; Hoelter, Jon; Houdek, Nathan; Junck, Linda; Kent, Christopher; Kraak, Maureen; Langan, Casey; McKinny, Chris; Palese, Tony; Patronskey, Mark; Peterson2, Ilsa; Pettack, Deanna; Potts, Andrew; Rausch, Scott; Smith-Loomans, Sandra; Sweeney, Rebekah; Wolkomir, Jon  
**Subject:** Amendments for Thursday's Agriculture Committee Executive Session  
**Attachments:** LRB a0678\_1; LRB a0678/1; 07s01301.pdf; Hines Memo AB 446.doc

Members,

Please find attached two amendments for the committee's consideration during tomorrow's executive session.

The first is an amendment to Assembly Substitute Amendment 1 to AB 381, as well as a drafter's note. This amendment has not been introduced.



07a06781.pdf (6 KB)



07a06781dn.pdf (6 KB)

The second is Assembly Substitute Amendment 1 to AB 446, offered by Rep. Hines, along with a memo from Rep. Hines regarding the intent of the amendment. You should have received both of these documents directly from his office as well.



07s01301.pdf (26 KB)




Hines Memo AB 446.doc (30 KB)

Hard copies of these materials will be provided at tomorrow's meeting.

Feel free to let me know if you have any questions.

*Erin Ruby*  
*Research Assistant*  
*Clerk, Assembly Committee on Agriculture*  
*Office of State Representative Al Ott*  
608.266.5831  
[erin.ruby@legis.wisconsin.gov](mailto:erin.ruby@legis.wisconsin.gov)



DOG TAG YEAR 05 (FY06 Activity) (Orders for 2007)

COUNTY	Calculated Maximum Eligible Fee Collected	State Imposed Tax to GF	What a 25% Imposed Seg Fund Would be	Dog Damages Claimed FY2006	After All Claims, What Would Be Left in the 25% Seg Fund
ADAMS	\$8,750.00	\$437.50	\$2,078.13	\$218.00	\$1,860.13
ASHLAND	\$4,145.00	\$207.25	\$984.44	\$0.00	\$984.44
BARRON	\$17,138.00	\$856.90	\$4,070.28	\$0.00	\$4,070.28
BAYFIELD	\$6,588.00	\$329.40	\$1,564.65	\$0.00	\$1,564.65
BROWN	\$32,948.50	\$1,647.43	\$7,825.27	\$0.00	\$7,825.27
BUFFALO	\$9,400.00	\$470.00	\$2,232.50	\$0.00	\$2,232.50
BURNETT	\$10,645.00	\$532.25	\$2,528.19	\$0.00	\$2,528.19
CALUMET	\$21,691.50	\$1,084.58	\$5,151.73	\$0.00	\$5,151.73
CHIPPEWA	\$24,023.50	\$1,201.18	\$5,705.58	\$1,300.00	\$4,405.58
CLARK	\$30,590.00	\$1,529.50	\$7,265.13	\$1,575.00	\$5,690.13
COLUMBIA	\$26,768.00	\$1,338.40	\$6,357.40	\$0.00	\$6,357.40
CRAWFORD	\$7,933.00	\$396.65	\$1,884.09	\$800.00	\$1,084.09
DANE	\$91,233.00	\$4,561.65	\$21,667.84	\$0.00	\$21,667.84
DODGE	\$39,833.50	\$1,991.68	\$9,460.46	\$0.00	\$9,460.46
DOOR	\$9,549.00	\$477.45	\$2,267.89	\$0.00	\$2,267.89
DOUGLAS	\$4,081.00	\$204.05	\$969.24	\$0.00	\$969.24
DUNN	\$18,305.00	\$915.25	\$4,347.44	\$0.00	\$4,347.44
EAU CLAIRE	\$26,579.50	\$1,328.98	\$6,312.63	\$0.00	\$6,312.63
FLORENCE	\$1,078.00	\$53.90	\$256.03	\$85.00	\$171.03
FOND DU LAC	\$31,960.00	\$1,598.00	\$7,590.50	\$90.00	\$7,500.50
FOREST	\$1,411.00	\$70.55	\$335.11	\$0.00	\$335.11
GRANT	\$19,818.00	\$990.90	\$4,706.78	\$3,205.00	\$1,501.78
GREEN	\$12,145.00	\$607.25	\$2,884.44	\$400.00	\$2,484.44
GREEN LAKE	\$14,124.00	\$706.20	\$3,354.45	\$202.00	\$3,152.45
IOWA	\$11,803.50	\$590.18	\$2,803.33	\$204.92	\$2,598.41
IRON	\$1,425.00	\$71.25	\$338.44	\$0.00	\$338.44
JACKSON	\$9,395.00	\$469.75	\$2,231.31	\$0.00	\$2,231.31
JEFFERSON	\$40,430.00	\$2,021.50	\$9,602.13	\$80.00	\$9,522.13
JUNEAU	\$9,720.00	\$486.00	\$2,308.50	\$0.00	\$2,308.50
KENOSHA	\$24,223.00	\$1,211.15	\$5,752.96	\$495.30	\$5,257.66
KEWAUNEE	\$13,293.00	\$664.65	\$3,157.09	\$0.00	\$3,157.09
LA CROSSE	\$54,323.50	\$2,716.18	\$12,901.83	\$0.00	\$12,901.83
LAFAYETTE	\$6,654.00	\$332.70	\$1,580.33	\$0.00	\$1,580.33
LANGLADE*	\$8,219.00	\$410.95	\$1,952.01	\$0.00	\$1,952.01
LINCOLN	\$19,118.50	\$955.93	\$4,540.64	\$0.00	\$4,540.64
MANITOWOC	\$39,391.50	\$1,969.58	\$9,355.48	\$1,806.30	\$7,549.18

AB 446 ? Date ?

COUNTY	Calculated Maximum Elig Fee Collected	State Imposed \$0.05 Tax to GF	What a 25% Imposed Seg Fund Would be	Dog Damages Claimed FY2006	After All Claims, What Would Be Left in the 25% Seg Fund
MARATHON	\$53,909.50	\$2,695.48	\$12,803.51	\$1,000.00	\$11,803.51
MARINETTE	\$8,303.00	\$415.15	\$1,971.96	\$1,510.02	\$461.94
MARQUETTE	\$10,150.00	\$507.50	\$2,410.63	\$0.00	\$2,410.63
MENOMINEE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MILWAUKEE	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00	\$0.00
MONROE	\$23,795.50	\$1,189.78	\$5,651.43	\$0.00	\$5,651.43
OCONTO	\$18,896.00	\$944.80	\$4,487.80	\$0.00	\$4,487.80
ONEIDA	\$8,355.00	\$417.75	\$1,984.31	\$0.00	\$1,984.31
OUTAGAMIE	\$47,439.00	\$2,371.95	\$11,266.76	\$60.00	\$11,206.76
OZAUKEE*	\$19,513.00	\$975.65	\$4,634.34	\$0.00	\$4,634.34
PEPIN	\$5,943.00	\$297.15	\$1,411.46	\$0.00	\$1,411.46
PIERCE	\$17,329.50	\$866.48	\$4,115.76	\$784.62	\$3,331.14
POLK	\$24,532.00	\$1,226.60	\$5,826.35	\$600.00	\$5,226.35
PORTAGE	\$25,905.00	\$1,295.25	\$6,152.44	\$15.00	\$6,137.44
PRICE	\$9,918.00	\$495.90	\$2,355.53	\$0.00	\$2,355.53
RACINE	\$55,328.00	\$2,766.40	\$13,140.40	\$0.00	\$13,140.40
RICHLAND	\$6,836.00	\$341.80	\$1,623.55	\$0.00	\$1,623.55
ROCK	\$25,592.50	\$1,279.63	\$6,078.22	\$1,000.00	\$5,078.22
RUSK	\$16,967.00	\$848.35	\$4,029.66	\$600.00	\$3,429.66
SAUK	\$24,402.00	\$1,220.10	\$5,795.48	\$0.00	\$5,795.48
SAWYER	\$7,030.00	\$351.50	\$1,669.63	\$0.00	\$1,669.63
SHAWANO	\$29,634.00	\$1,481.70	\$7,038.08	\$140.00	\$6,898.08
SHEBOYGAN	\$44,898.50	\$2,244.93	\$10,663.39	\$323.00	\$10,340.39
ST CROIX	\$23,430.50	\$1,171.53	\$5,564.74	\$0.00	\$5,564.74
TAYLOR	\$15,608.00	\$780.40	\$3,706.90	\$0.00	\$3,706.90
TREMPEA*	\$12,179.00	\$608.95	\$2,892.51	\$180.00	\$2,712.51
VERNON	\$15,118.00	\$755.90	\$3,590.53	\$0.00	\$3,590.53
VILAS *	\$5,120.00	\$256.00	\$1,216.00	\$0.00	\$1,216.00
WALWORTH	\$19,534.00	\$976.70	\$4,639.33	\$0.00	\$4,639.33
WASHBURN	\$12,867.00	\$643.35	\$3,055.91	\$0.00	\$3,055.91
WASHINGTON	\$43,733.00	\$2,186.65	\$10,386.59	\$0.00	\$10,386.59
WAUKESHA	\$68,835.00	\$3,441.75	\$16,348.31	\$0.00	\$16,348.31
WAUPACA	\$23,380.00	\$1,169.00	\$5,552.75	\$243.45	\$5,309.30
WAUSHARA	\$12,678.00	\$633.90	\$3,011.03	\$0.00	\$3,011.03
WINNEBAGO	\$44,404.00	\$2,220.20	\$10,545.95	\$0.00	\$10,545.95
WOOD	\$33,317.00	\$1,665.85	\$7,912.79	\$757.50	\$7,155.29
TOTAL	\$1,523,613.50	\$76,180.68	\$361,858.21	\$17,675.11	\$344,183.10