LRBb0273

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: **05/7/99**

Received By: **traderc**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Schug**

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

Drafter: **traderc**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Agriculture - miscellaneous**

Extra Copies:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Schug -

Topic:

DATCP electronic processing

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

Vers.	Drafted	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/?	traderc 05/7/99	jgeller 05/7/99		_____ _____			
/1			mclark 05/11/99	_____ _____	lrb_docadmin 05/11/99		

FE Sent For:

<END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: **05/7/99**

Received By: **traderc**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Schug**

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

Drafter: **traderc**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Agriculture - miscellaneous**

Extra Copies:

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Schug -

Topic:

DATCP electronic processing

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

Vers.	Drafted	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/?	traderc	1 5/7 jlg	5/10 mrc	mrc/~~nh~~ 5/10			

FE Sent For:

<END>

Tradewell, Becky

From: Schug, David
Sent: Friday, May 07, 1999 3:07 PM
To: Tradewell, Becky
Subject: RE: DATCP amendments

You are correct-- here goes...

Paper 210	Drainage	Alt 5 and Alt 6
Paper 211	AgChem	Alt 4
Paper 212	Pesticide	Motion 216 and Motion 216
#213	Export	Motion 444 The wording in the motion is misleading and is based on alternative 3, which discusses Federal revenues in addition to the amount provided in Chapter 20.115(3)(m). Thus, $1 of marketing GPR 115(3)(a) should lapse for every $1 in federal funding received above the amount of funding provided in 20.115(3)(m). (We are thinking of a two-line appropriation with GPR and PR-F listed as well as a net amount provided).
#214	price reform	Alt 1
#215	nursery	Alt 2c (includes technical changes in Alt 1), Motion 214, Motion 231 (I made an error in calculating Alt 2c. The position total change to base is really 1.00 and not 2.00 as written.
#216	weights	Alt 2 and Alt 3, Motion 215 (add towns with cities and villages)
#217	LPG	Alt 5
#218	grain	Alt 2 and Alt 3
#219	web page	Alt 2
#220	electronic	Alt 3
#221	fair aids	Alt 1

All summary items for which no papers were written were approved, excpept for #20, consumer protection assessment. That item is still outstanding.

Motion 661 also was approved.

I am faxing over the above motions. Besides the pending consumer protection assessment item, that should do it for DATCP.

David

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

May 4, 1999 | Joint Committee on Finance | Paper #220

Electronic Processing (DATCP)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 106, #32]

CURRENT LAW

DATCP administers a wide variety of licenses and registrations and provides numerous inspections, testing and certification services on a user fee basis. These registrations and payments for services are not conducted electronically.

GOVERNOR

Allow the Department to electronically process applications and payments for goods and services as well as DATCP-issued licenses, permits, registrations and certificates. The Department could also charge additional fees to cover the electronic processing costs. Fees would be deposited into a new, continuing PR appropriation to be used for electronic processing.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. DATCP believes that in many cases, electronic filing and payment may be more efficient for both applicants and the Department. Efficiencies in electronic processing could save the Department time in processing, compiling and storing information, as well as lowering response times to applicants. The time saved by authorizing electronic transactions may offset any costs of providing the electronic processing services authorized under the Governor's recommendation.

2. The recommendation also allows the Department to charge a fee for electronic processing. However, the Department does not know whether the costs of providing electronic processing will be more than the savings. The Committee could allow DATCP to electronically process applications and payments, without authorizing the Department to charge a fee for electronic processing costs. Charging fees could discourage users from electronically processing

applications and payments. Further, higher volumes of electronic processing may create larger economies of scale, reduce the cost per transaction and maximize efficiencies.

3. Initial costs of providing electronic services may be prohibitively high and ongoing credit card processing fees would also have to be absorbed by the Department's current budget. DATCP has not estimated either the costs or benefits of providing electronic processing. Nonetheless, allowing the agency to provide electronic processing would let the agency determine the costs and benefits of electronic processing and decide whether to accept items electronically.

4. If the Department is allowed to collect fees for electronic processing, the Committee may wish to ensure that these fees are reasonable and cover only the actual cost of electronic processing. Some legislative oversight would be provided if DATCP were required to set electronic processing fees by rule.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to allow the Department to electronically process applications and payments for goods and services as well as DATCP-issued licenses, permits, registrations and certificates and allow the Department to charge additional fees for electronic processing to cover the processing costs.

2. Approve the Governor's recommendation to allow the Department to electronically process applications and payments for goods and services as well as DATCP-issued licenses, permits, registrations and certificates. (DATCP would not be allowed to charge additional fees for electronic processing.)

3. Approve the Governor's recommendation. In addition, require the Department to set fees by administrative rule for the actual cost of electronic processing, if the Department chooses to collect such fees.

4. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: David Schug

1999 **Date (time) needed** SOON **LRB b** 0273 / 1

LFB BUDGET AMENDMENT [ONLY FOR LFB]

RCT :JLG :

See form **AMENDMENTS — COMPONENTS & ITEMS.**

LFB AMENDMENT TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45

>>FOR JT. FIN. SUB. — NOT FOR INTRODUCTION<<

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

#. Page 938, line 1: delete "Charge" and substitute "Promulgate rules specifying".

#. Page . . . . , line . . . . :

(End)

#. Page . . . . , line . . . . :

#. Page . . . . , line . . . . :

#. Page . . . . , line . . . . :

#. Page . . . . , line . . . . :

State of Wisconsin
1999 – 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0273/1
RCT:jlg:mrc

LFB:.....Schug – DATCP electronic processing

FOR 1999–01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45

At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

1. Page 938, line 1: delete "Charge" and substitute "Promulgate rules specifying".

(END)