

STATE OF WISCONSIN  
**Assembly Journal**  
 Ninety-First Regular Session

WEDNESDAY, May 4, 1994

The chief clerk makes the following entries under the above date:

**ADMINISTRATIVE RULES**

Read and referred:

**Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 93-124**

Relating to the design and construction of public buildings and places of employment to provide accessibility for people with disabilities.

Submitted by Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations.

To committee on Labor and Job Training.

Referred on May 2, 1994.

**Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 94-25**

Relating to participation of aid to families with dependent children recipients in learnfare.

Submitted by Department of Health and Social Services.

To committee on Children and Human Services.

Referred on May 2, 1994.

**Assembly Clearinghouse Rule 94-28**

Relating to practices or procedures provided to the administrator for approval.

Submitted by Office of the Commissioner of Banking.

To committee on Financial Institutions.

Referred on May 2, 1994.

**EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS**

State of Wisconsin  
 Office of the Governor  
 Madison

To the Honorable, the Assembly:

The following bills, originating in the assembly, have been approved, signed and deposited in the office of the Secretary of State:

Assembly Bill	Act No.	Date Signed
167 -----	443 -----	April 27, 1994
819 (partial veto)-----	444 -----	April 27, 1994
900 (partial veto)-----	445 -----	April 27, 1994
905 -----	446 -----	April 27, 1994
1219 -----	447 -----	April 27, 1994
540 (partial veto)-----	450 -----	April 28, 1994
783 -----	451 -----	April 28, 1994
796 (partial veto)-----	452 -----	April 28, 1994
821 -----	455 -----	April 28, 1994

994 (partial veto)-----	456 -----	April 28, 1994
21 (partial veto)-----	457 -----	April 28, 1994
69 (partial veto)-----	458 -----	April 28, 1994
349 -----	459 -----	April 28, 1994
558 -----	460 -----	April 28, 1994
545 -----	462 -----	April 28, 1994
1075 -----	463 -----	April 28, 1994
498 -----	464 -----	April 28, 1994
100 -----	465 -----	April 28, 1994
539 -----	466 -----	April 28, 1994
690 -----	467 -----	April 28, 1994
930 -----	468 -----	April 28, 1994
1055 -----	469 -----	April 28, 1994
1060 -----	470 -----	April 28, 1994
608 (partial veto)-----	477 -----	April 28, 1994

Respectfully submitted,  
 TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
 Governor

**GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE**

April 27, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have approved **Assembly Bill 819** as 1993 Wisconsin Act 444 and have deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I have exercised my partial veto authority in sections 1g, 18, 20m and 22m.

AB 819 creates the Right From the Start program to be administered by the Child Abuse Neglect Prevention Board (CANPB). I am a strong supporter of prevention activities which will help reduce the incidence and costs of physical and emotional abuse and neglect of children. However, I have partially vetoed provisions in AB 819 which restrict the flexibility of the CANPB in awarding grants for the program and provisions which reduce the flexibility of organizations receiving grants in providing child abuse prevention services. In addition, I have made several technical modifications to remove inconsistencies in the bill.

Section 1g appropriated \$110,000 GPR in FY94 and \$460,000 GPR in FY95 for Right From the Start grants and \$10,000 GPR in FY94 and \$25,000 GPR in FY95 for general program operations and technical assistance for the Right From the Start program. I am vetoing the funding for FY94 because it is inconsistent with legislative intent of the bill as shown by the bill's effective date of July 1, 1994 and by the non-statutory provision contained in the bill which allocates grant funding only for FY95.

Section 18 details the activities required of the CANPB in administering the Right From the Start program. Included is the requirement that the CANPB award not less than one grant to an organization in a county with a population of 500,000 or more, not less than one grant to an organization in a county with a population of more than 60,000 but less than 500,000 and not less than two grants to organizations in counties with populations of 60,000 or less. The CANPB is also required to submit a report to the Joint Committee on Finance by December 1 of each year on the Right From the Start Program. I am vetoing the requirement that the grants be awarded to counties based on population because I believe it to be too rigid. The CANPB should have the flexibility to look at proposals statewide and award grants based on the merits of the application. The CANPB is required to distribute grants in all its programs throughout all geographic areas of the state and in other rural and urban communities. I am also vetoing the annual December 1 report requirement because the CANPB should not be overburdened with reporting requirements, given its limited staff. The requirements of the bill that the CANPB submit an interim report to the legislature by September 1, 1995 and a report on an evaluation of the Right From the Start program by January 2, 1997 are sufficient for the Legislature to monitor the effectiveness of the program.

Section 18 also details the activities required of organizations receiving Right From the Start grants. Included is the requirement that these organizations provide outreach and family visiting services in homes and other locations, either prenatally or shortly after an infant's birth, to persons who are either expecting a newborn infant or are the parents of a newborn infant. I am vetoing the requirements that organizations must provide prenatal outreach services and family visiting services to persons who are expecting a newborn infant because their requirements are too rigid and inflexible and may preclude organizations in rural communities from receiving grants, as such services may not be readily available in these communities. Given the limited funding that will be available, organizations should not be unnecessarily restricted in the type of services they must provide. This veto, however, does not imply that organizations receiving a grant cannot provide these services. Organizations will have the flexibility to provide the services which best reflect the needs in their communities, which may include family visiting and prenatal services.

Section 20m requires the CANPB to distribute \$10,000 in FY94 and \$25,000 in FY95 for general program operations for the Right From the Start Program and for technical assistance to grant recipients. I am partially vetoing section 20m(1) because the distribution language implies that the CANPB must contract out for these functions and the legislative intent is to have the CANPB administer the program.

Section 22m provides that the effective date of this bill is July 1, 1994, except for the birth certificate fee increases.

I am vetoing the effective date of the birth certificate fee increase because the Right From the Start program, as passed by the legislature, will be funded with GPR and not by revenues generated by birth certificate fee increases as was proposed in the original bill.

Respectfully submitted,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

---

#### GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 27, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have approved **Assembly Bill 900** as 1993 Wisconsin Act 445 and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I have exercised my partial veto authority in sections 1, 4, 10, 11, 13, 18, 19, 24, 29, 30, 56, 9126(5), 9226 and 9400.

AB 900 modifies provisions relating to the community mental health system to give consumers of community mental health services a greater voice in their care and treatment, to establish a proactive approach to the delivery of mental health services and to increase the accountability of the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) in overseeing community programs. I strongly support efforts to enhance and protect the rights of the mentally ill in the community. However, I have partially vetoed sections in AB 900 to ensure that counties and DHSS have the flexibility needed to implement provisions in the bill.

Section 19 requires counties to conduct a survey of mental health program clients every 36 months in advance of developing their local community mental health plans and requires that the results be submitted to the county human services or community program boards, county consumer and advocacy groups and mental health providers. Section 18 requires counties to use the survey results in developing their local community mental health plan, section 29 requires that the prototype survey developed by DHSS be made available to counties and section 9400 specifies January 1, 1995 as the effective date for the client survey requirement. I am vetoing sections 18, 19 and 9400 and partially vetoing the reference to counties receiving the survey prototype in section 29, because the client survey requirement is an unfunded mandate which could have a potential annual cost of at least \$500,000 and because I want counties to have flexibility in evaluating their community mental health programs. However, I recognize that client surveys are one of many effective tools that can be used in evaluating the quality of community programs. Thus, I am retaining the provision in this bill which requires the DHSS to contract with an institution of higher education or a private nonprofit organization to develop a client survey prototype and am directing the Secretary of DHSS to provide technical assistance to counties that wish to

survey clients and use the results in formulating their community mental health plan.

Section 10 defines community mental health services, requires the Council on Mental Health to develop a request for proposals for a pilot advocacy program, establishes the parameters of the program and requires the Council on Mental Health to evaluate the program by January 1, 1997. Section 4 provides \$50,000 GPR in FY94 and \$50,000 GPR in FY95 to fund the program and section 1 exempts the Council on Mental Health from the part-time body provision for councils in general. Sections 13 and 56 allow the grantee of the program to have access to confidential patient treatment and health care records without the permission of the patients. I am vetoing sections 1, 10, 13 and 56 and partially vetoing section 4 because it is normally not the function of an advisory council to administer programs. This function correctly rests with the agency to which the Council is attached. However, I feel that the proposed advocacy program may be an added tool in protecting the rights of the mentally ill in the community and thus I am directing the Secretary of DHSS to administer the program with the advice of the Council.

Section 11 requires the Council on Mental Health to employ a director and staff necessary for the performance of its duties. Section 9126(5) provides 1.5 FED FTE positions funded by the Community Mental Health Block grant for the purpose of services for the Council on Mental Health. I am vetoing these sections because advisory councils normally do not employ their own staff but rather receive support assistance from the agency to which they are attached. I am also vetoing section 9126(5) because no Community Mental Health Block grant funds are available to fund the 1.5 FTE positions without reducing the block grant funding currently allocated to counties. However, I am sensitive to the concerns of the Council on Mental Health relating to the need for support staff to perform their duties and am thus directing the Secretary of DHSS to ensure that adequate staff is made available to the Council.

Section 30 requires DHSS to develop a model community mental health plan for use by counties by January 1, 1995. In developing the plan, the department is required to select 6 counties to submit plans by September 30, 1994 and revise the model plan, if necessary, considering the comments of the 6 selected counties. I am vetoing the reference to completion of the model plan by January 1, 1995 and the reference to the 6 counties submitting plans by September 30, 1994 because these time limits are too rigid. I want DHSS to have enough time to develop a quality model plan that can easily and efficiently be used by the counties.

Section 9226 provides \$25,000 GPR in FY 95 to increase the position authority for DHSS by 1.0 GPR FTE attorney position to hear appeals of final decisions for the new grievance procedures contained in this bill. I am vetoing this section because I object to increasing the position authority when it has not been clearly

established that current staff cannot absorb the potential caseload increase.

Section 24 deletes the requirement that DHSS periodically review and evaluate county departments of community services and requires DHSS to review community mental health programs every 36 months. The effect of this change is to remove DHSS' statutory requirement to review and evaluate programs for the developmentally disabled and alcohol and other drug abuse programs. I am vetoing the portion of this section which deletes the review and evaluation of county departments of community services because this is a technical error as the intent was not to delete DHSS' current law responsibilities for county departments of community services.

AB 900 is the product of a tremendous undertaking by the members of the Wisconsin Legislative Council-Special Committee on Oversight of Community Mental Health Services. The members are to be commended for their work in advancing the rights and well being of the mentally ill.

Respectfully submitted,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

#### GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 28, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have approved **Assembly Bill 540** in part and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I exercised the partial veto authority in sections 38, 42, 45, 54, 56 and 62.

#### Reporting the Results of Lead Screening Tests

Section 38 requires that the results of blood screenings for the presence of lead are to be reported to the Department of Health and Social Services (DHSS) within five business days after the test was administered. I am vetoing the five day time period for reporting because it appears to be an unreasonable timeline. For example, it is unlikely that the screening test could be performed, sent to the laboratory for analysis, results reported back to the doctor and the results forwarded to DHSS all within five working days. DHSS is also required to develop an administrative rule establishing the permanent standard for the time period in which test results must be reported and could establish a longer reporting period by rule.

#### DHSS Evaluation

Section 42 requires DHSS to report to the standing committees annually on the effectiveness of the lead poisoning prevention program authorized by the bill. I am vetoing this section in part because this report is not necessary. Under the bill, the Legislative Council is also requested to prepare a much longer term, broader study

of the implementation of this act which should be sufficient. DHSS will be providing information to the Legislative Council for their study. Therefore, the Legislature's objective will be accomplished without a duplicative reporting requirement.

Delegation to Local Health Departments

Section 45 prohibits DHSS from designating a local public health agency as its agent unless the Department provides a grant for lead poisoning prevention authorized in this bill under s. 254.151. If these funds are depleted that agency could not perform these duties. I am vetoing this section because DHSS indicates that there are other sources of funding for lead poisoning prevention, such as block grants, which could be allocated to the local agency. This veto insures services will not be interrupted.

Lead Hazard Reduction Rules

Section 54 allows DHSS to develop administrative rules regarding lead hazard reduction after June 30, 1997. The rules may include a requirement that the owner or operator of any dwelling eliminate an imminent lead hazard, which is the most serious type of threat, within five days after discovery. The bill has similar provisions regarding the five day elimination period which are applicable now. However, there are exemptions under which DHSS may extend the time period for cleanup. The rules for future standards do not have such exemptions with the result that the five day period would apply without exception. As a result, I am vetoing the reference to the five day period for rules applicable after June 30, 1997 to allow DHSS to establish an exception process to extend cleanup orders beyond the five day period when administrative rules are developed.

Certification Requirements

Section 56 defines who must and need not be certified to conduct lead hazard reduction activities. The bill specifies that any person conducting certain lead control activities, which are funded directly or indirectly by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), must be certified by DHSS. HUD funds a number of types of grants indirectly, such as weatherization grants, which would not be related to lead abatement and workers would not require certification. Therefore I am vetoing the words "or indirectly" because the language implies that workers on such other types of non lead related projects would also require certification. This veto clarifies that certification is required only for those associated with direct grants from HUD for lead abatement.

Inspections for Certification

Section 62 strengthens DHSS's authority to enter a dwelling where lead abatement is being performed to ensure that all the workers are properly certified. Under the bill, owners or occupants are prohibited from preventing an inspector on the premises to verify

certification of staff as long as the agent has proper identification. I am vetoing this section in part because I believe there is a potential for misuse of this broadened authority by others who are not representatives of DHSS for unlawful entry into people's homes.

Respectfully submitted,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

---

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 28, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have approved **Assembly Bill 796** in part and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I have exercised the partial veto in section 4.

AB 796 establishes a stronger means of financing and supporting the State Uniform Commercial Code Lien System. I am partially vetoing a lapse provision in section 4 of the bill which would go into effect in January 1996 because it will limit the ability of this program to remain fiscally self sustaining over the longer term.

In my 1991-93 budget I proposed and the Legislature concurred in, the lapsing to the general fund of \$851,100 of fees collected locally and deposited in the UCC Lien System appropriation. I did that because the Lien System did not immediately need the moneys accumulated and because the money was needed at the time to help balance the budget and pay for increases in local assistance. At this time the UCC Lien System does need some start up funding and a stable source of financing in the future. I object to the permanent lapse provision which would create continuing financing problems for this program.

As vetoed, this bill will enable the Secretary of State to implement and maintain the statewide system that is a useful resource to the financial community.

Respectfully submitted,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

---

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 28, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I approved **Assembly Bill 994** in part and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I exercised my partial veto authority in sections 34 and 41.

AB 994 is a major revision and update of the statutes governing the organization and operation of drainage districts and drainage boards. It relieves the circuit courts of most of an undesired supervisory responsibility and makes drainage boards operate much like comparable governmental units. I fully support the

intent of this bill and commend the Legislative Council's Special Committee on Drainage Districts for their work on this legislation. However, I believe two provisions of the bill are not well conceived and will produce public policy problems if enacted and I used my partial veto authority to modify those provisions.

Section 34 establishes procedures by which the court appoints members of a county drainage board. The board is to consist of three persons who are resident landowners of the county. An exception is created in the case of a board representing a drainage district with territory in another county, in which case one of the three members is to be a resident landowner from the other county. If a drainage board exercises its authority to increase its size to five members and it represents a drainage district which has territory in another county, the court is required to appoint two members who are resident landowners of the other county. Consequently, if a drainage board represents drainage districts with responsibility for many thousands of acres of drained land in a county and one of those drainage districts has any territory in another county, even a single 5 acre plot, the board would be required to reserve one or even two of its seats for landowners from that other county. I do not disagree with the apparent intent to provide representation to landowners of adjacent counties when their land is affected. However, I am partially vetoing section 34 because it may lead to an inequitable overrepresentation. My partial veto removes the restrictions regarding drainage board member residency and will permit the court to appoint persons regardless of residence. In this way, the court may exercise its discretion to appoint a member from another county in those cases where it is justified but will not be required to do so.

Section 41 establishes procedures for the handling, distribution, retention and destruction of drainage board records. Among these provisions is one requiring the state drainage engineer and the county zoning administrator to record the name of each person who examines or requests copies of drainage board records. This requirement is contrary to the spirit of the open records law which guarantees privacy for those who request records [s. 19.35(1)(i)]. I am partially vetoing section 41 because it attempts to create an exception to the open records law, it serves no major purpose and I believe it may have a chilling effect on the willingness of individuals to review public records. My veto will preserve the intent of the open records law and make drainage board records available to all, whether they wish to identify themselves or not.

AB 994 is a good piece of legislation which will make the governance of drainage districts more effective and streamline their operations. I support the intent of this

legislation. The partial vetoes I have made will serve to make a good bill better.

Respectfully submitted,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

---

#### GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 28, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I have approved **Assembly Bill 21** in part and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I exercised the partial veto in sections 1 and 16.

AB 21 makes the following changes to the Academic Excellence Scholarship Program: expands eligibility to alternate scholars if they have the same grade point average as an initial recipient and the recipient turns down the award; creates a sum sufficient appropriation for the program; transfers all remaining administrative authority for the program from the Department of Public Instruction to the Higher Educational Aids Board; grants schools with enrollments of 2,500 or more an additional scholarship; transfers authority for selection and nomination of scholars in the case of ties from school boards to faculty and grants the executive secretary of the Higher Educational Aids Board certain waiver authority. While I initiated rewarding the academic achievement of our state's top high school seniors, the implications of creating a sum sufficient appropriation to fund the expansion must be considered.

Section 1 creates a sum sufficient appropriation for the program. I am vetoing this provision because creating a sum sufficient appropriation sets an unwanted precedent for statewide programs of similar priority. While I realize that it is not possible to guarantee full funding of the program in FY 95 without sum sufficient language, the nature of the Academic Excellence Scholarship Program does not warrant changing the appropriation to a sum sufficient. Instead, I believe the appropriation should remain sum certain in FY 95 and, if needed, additional funding could be considered in the 1995-97 biennial budget. Even if the current sum certain appropriation is not sufficient to fund all the program's scholars in FY 95, the effect on the amount of the awards would be relatively small. It is unlikely that student awards would decrease by more than 5%.

Section 16 of AB 21 deletes language related to prorating scholarships if the amount in the appropriation is insufficient to fully fund each scholarship awarded. I am vetoing this language because by restoring the sum certain appropriation, full funding for the program may not always be available. To address this possibility equitably, the Higher Educational Aids Board needs the authority to prorate awards.

I strongly support the Academic Excellence Scholarship Program and believe it is an excellent means by which to

reward the hard work and achievement of the state's top scholars. All of Wisconsin benefits from our best scholars attending higher educational institutions in the state.

Sincerely,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

---

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 28, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I approved **Assembly Bill 69** in part and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I exercised the partial veto in sections 1, 2, 7 and 8.

AB 69 expands the Environmental Education Grant program in the Department of Public Instruction. I am in favor of increasing the amount of money available for grants for the development, dissemination and presentation of environmental education programs. However, AB 69 also contains several changes which I do not believe benefit the program or the state.

Section 1 changes the existing environmental education grant appropriation, s. 20.255 (1) (cp), from annual to continuing. I am vetoing these provisions because most appropriations should remain annual in nature in order to establish a budget for the program each year and to maintain sufficient control over state finances. 1993 Act 16 modified the existing grant program to extend the awards from 12 to 18 months because of programmatic concerns over problems in awarding and distributing grant funds. That modification should accomplish the same effect as the one I am vetoing while keeping the appropriation annual.

Section 2 creates a continuing appropriation, s. 20.255 (1) (r), to be funded by 50% of the environmental assessment imposed on violators of chapters 144, 147 or 162 or s. 146.20 and paid from the environmental fund. These funds would be used for environmental education grants or administrative costs related to the environmental education program. I am vetoing the word "imposed" in section 2 because the imposition of an assessment does not determine if and when it will be paid by the violator. The appropriation should be equal to 50% of the environmental assessments collected under s. 144.992 (1) and that is the intent of this veto. In section 2, I am also vetoing the authorization to use the appropriation to fund administrative costs related to the program because the additional funds collected by the increased assessment should be used for environmental education grants and the appropriation should not fund both grants and state operations.

Section 7 authorizes 1.0 FTE for the Department of Public Instruction, funded from the appropriation under 20.255 (1) (r), for the performance of services for the environmental education board. I am vetoing this

provision because I object to providing an additional position for the environmental education board and because a 0.5 FTE GPR staff position and a 1.0 FTE environmental education consultant position currently exist in the department. Using the limited funds raised by the increased assessment for this purpose is excessive.

Section 8 increases the appropriation for the Department of Public Instruction under s. 20.255 (1) (a) by \$17,100 in fiscal year 1994-95 to provide funds to the Center for Environmental Education at the University of Wisconsin-Stevens Point for the continued development of the environmental literacy assessment project. I object to this earmarking of funds because the Center has been successful in competing for grants under the environmental education grant program. In 1993-94, the Center received a grant of \$19,400 for this project. It should continue to compete for grant funds with other eligible parties.

I have been a proud supporter of Wisconsin's environmental education program since I signed it into law with 1989 Act 299. I believe that AB 69, as I have approved it, will strengthen the program and provide increased funding for environmental education grants to corporations and public agencies for environmental education programs.

Sincerely,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

---

GOVERNOR'S VETO MESSAGE

April 28, 1994

To the Honorable Members of the Assembly:

I approved **Assembly Bill 608** in part and deposited it in the Office of the Secretary of State. I exercised my partial veto authority in Section 1m.

AB 608 creates the State Capitol Restoration Fund, a segregated trust fund for monetary gifts, grants and bequests for the maintenance, restoration, preservation and rehabilitation of the State Capitol and Executive Residence. The bill also authorizes the State Capitol and Executive Residence Board (SCERB) to establish a private foundation to support restoration and maintenance of the Capitol and Executive Residence.

Under current law, the Building Commission can accept gifts and authorize expenditure for specific projects subject to the approval of SCERB. My partial veto of section 1m will eliminate this redundancy and clarify possible confusion regarding the use of contributions to the fund created by the bill.

Respectfully submitted,  
TOMMY G. THOMPSON  
Governor

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [May 4, 1994]

COMMUNICATIONS

April 29, 1994

Honorable Douglas LaFollette  
 Secretary of State  
 State of Wisconsin  
 30 W. Mifflin Street  
 Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Dear Mr. LaFollette:

I am hereby depositing 1993 Assembly Bill 320 in the Office of the Secretary of State as an act of the 1993 legislative session pursuant to Article V, Section 10 of the Wisconsin Constitution. The Assembly presented the bill to the Governor on April 21, 1994 and he did not take action "within 6 days (Sundays excepted)" as required by the constitution.

Therefore, under section 35.095 of the Wisconsin Statutes, I have numbered Assembly Bill 320 to be 1993 Wisconsin Act 478 with April 29, 1994 as the date of enactment.

If you have any questions about this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,  
 THOMAS T. MELVIN  
 Assembly Chief Clerk

State of Wisconsin  
 Department of State  
 Madison

To Whom It May Concern:

Acts, joint resolutions and resolutions, deposited in this office, have been numbered and published as follows:

Bill or Res. No.	Act No.	Publication date
Assembly Bill 147	314	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 544	315	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 650	316	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 666	317	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 676	318	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 735	319	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 766	320	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 793	321	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 860	322	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 917	323	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 920	324	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 960	325	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 1179	332	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 218	333	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 291	334	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 1151	335	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 135	342	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 598	344	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 836	345	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 944	348	April 29, 1994
Assembly Bill 154	350	May 2, 1994

Assembly Bill 179	351	May 2, 1994
Assembly Bill 612	352	May 2, 1994
Assembly Bill 779	353	May 2, 1994
Assembly Bill 986	354	May 2, 1994
Assembly Bill 204	359	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 518	360	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 856	361	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 1108	362	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 280	363	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 915	365	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 802	367	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 883	368	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 1009	369	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 1082	370	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 406	375	May 3, 1994
Assembly Bill 235	379	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 405	380	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 528	381	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 750	382	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 768	383	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 780	385	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 1163	386	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 1012	388	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 1105	389	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 461	391	May 4, 1994
Assembly Bill 1147	392	May 4, 1994

Sincerely,  
 DOUGLAS La FOLLETTE  
 Secretary of State

State of Wisconsin  
 Revisor of Statutes Bureau  
 Madison

May 1, 1994

Honorable Donald J. Schneider  
 Honorable Thomas T. Melvin

Dear Sirs:

The following rules have been published:

Clearinghouse Rule 92-101	effective 5-1-94 (part)
Clearinghouse Rule 92-101	effective 5-1-95 (part)
Clearinghouse Rule 93-62	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-79	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-102	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-141	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-142	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-146	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-149	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-151	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-160	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-166	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-168	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-173	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-181	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-182	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-189	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-191	effective 5-1-94
Clearinghouse Rule 93-192	effective 5-1-94

JOURNAL OF THE ASSEMBLY [May 4, 1994]

Clearinghouse Rule 93-201 effective 5-1-94  
Clearinghouse Rule 93-210 effective 5-1-94  
Clearinghouse Rule 93-213 effective 5-1-94  
Clearinghouse Rule 93-216 effective 5-1-94  
Clearinghouse Rule 93-231 effective 5-1-94

Sincerely,  
GARY L. POULSON  
Deputy Revisor

Assembly to appoint you to the State Historical Society of Wisconsin Board of Curators, pursuant to Section 15.70 of the Wisconsin Statutes.

This appointment is effective immediately.

Sincerely,  
WALTER KUNICKI  
Assembly Speaker

SPEAKER'S APPOINTMENTS

May 4, 1994

May 4, 1994

Representative Doris Hanson  
100 N. Hamilton, Room 301,  
P.O. Box 8952  
Madison, WI 53708

Dear Doris:

Due to the resignation of Rep. Lary Swoboda from the Assembly, it is my pleasure as Speaker of the Assembly to appoint you Co-Chair of the Joint Committee for Review of Administrative Rules, pursuant to Section 13.56 of the Wisconsin Statutes. This appointment is effective immediately.

I know that with your experience and current membership on this committee, you will be able to make the transition between chairs a smooth one.

Sincerely,  
WALTER KUNICKI  
Assembly Speaker

Representative Antonio Riley  
100 N. Hamilton, Room 311  
P.O. Box 8953  
Madison, WI 53708

Dear Antonio:

Due to the resignation of Rep. Lary Swoboda from the Assembly, it is my pleasure as Speaker of the Assembly to appoint you to the State of Wisconsin Building Commission, pursuant to Section 13.48 (2) of the Wisconsin Statutes. This appointment is effective immediately.

I know that you will do an outstanding job as a commission member and I wish you continued success.

Sincerely,  
WALTER KUNICKI  
Assembly Speaker

May 4, 1994

Representative Richard Grobschmidt  
111 North, State Capitol  
P.O. Box 8952  
Madison, WI 53708

Dear Rick:

Due to the resignation of Rep. Lary Swoboda from the Assembly, it is my pleasure as Speaker of the