

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: **05/19/99**

Received By: **nelsorp1**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Zabawa (DS)**

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

Drafter: **olsenje**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Courts - miscellaneous
Criminal Law - miscellaneous**

Extra Copies: **RPN**

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Zabawa (DS) -

Topic:

Penalty assessment fees to be used for circuit court automated computer system

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	nelsorp1 05/19/99 olsenje 05/20/99	chanaman 05/21/99	ismith 05/21/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 05/21/99		
/2	olsenje 06/4/99	chanaman 06/7/99	martykr 06/7/99	_____	lrb_docadmin 06/7/99		

FE Sent For:

<END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: **05/19/99**

Received By: **nelsorp1**

Wanted: **Soon**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Legislative Fiscal Bureau**

By/Representing: **Zabawa (DS)**

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

Drafter: **olsenje**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Courts - miscellaneous**
Criminal Law - miscellaneous

Extra Copies: **RPN**

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Zabawa (DS) -

Topic:

Penalty assessment fees to be used for circuit court automated computer system

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	nelsorp1 05/19/99 olsenje 05/20/99	chanaman 05/21/99 <i>cmr 6/7 /2</i>	ismith 05/21/99 <i>ism 6/7</i>	_____ _____ _____ <i>True ism 6/7</i>	lrb_docadmin 05/21/99		

FE Sent For:

<END>

1999 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AB133)

Received: 05/19/99

Received By: nelsorp1

Wanted: Soon

Identical to LRB:

For: Legislative Fiscal Bureau

By/Representing: Zabawa (DS)

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: olsenje

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: Courts - miscellaneous

Extra Copies: RPN

Pre Topic:

LFB:.....Zabawa (DS) -

Topic:

Penalty assessment fees to be used for circuit court automated computer system

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	nelsorp1	CMH	IS 5/24/99	IS/CMH 5/21/99			

FE Sent For: 1
5/21

<END>



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

Date: 5-18-99

DELIVER TO:

Bob Nelson

Addressec Fax #:

4-8522

Addressec Phone #:

of Pages, Including Cover:

2

Sender's Initials:

BZ

From:

Barbara Zabawa - LFB

Message:

Representative Gard

SUPREME COURT

CCAP Funding
[Paper #895 - Addition to Alternative #1]

1512200

Motion:

Move to provide an additional \$950,000 PR and 6.0 PR positions in 1999-00 and \$1,200,000 PR and 10.0 PR positions in 2000-01 in penalty assessment revenues, of which \$500,000 annually would be one-time funding. Create an annual appropriation under the Director of State Courts to receive the penalty assessment revenues.

Note:

Under Alternative #1, LFB Paper #895, the justice information fee would increase from the current \$7 to \$9. This motion would provide \$950,000 in 1999-00 and \$1,200,000 in 2000-01 in penalty assessment revenues (\$500,000 PR annually of which would be one-time) appropriated to a newly-created annual appropriation under the Director of State Courts Office for CCAP.

[Change to Alternative: \$2,150,000 PR]

↳ 10.0 PR positions

Alt. 1's motion 672
adjusted 10-6
12558

MO# 1	
Burke	Y
Decker	Y
Jauch	Y
Moore	Y
Shiblski	Y
Plache	Y
Cowles	Y
Panzer	Y
Gard	Y
Porter	Y
Kaufert	Y
Albers	Y
Duff	Y
Ward	Y
Huber	Y
Riley	Y



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 5, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #895

Circuit Court Automation Program (CCAP) Funding Increases (Supreme Court)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Pages 561-62, #2, 3 & 4]

CURRENT LAW

The Circuit Court Automation Program (CCAP) receives revenues from a \$5 to \$15 filing fee on most civil actions, which are deposited into a sum certain, annual appropriation. In addition, a \$7 justice information fee is collected from: (a) persons filing a civil action, including garnishment, small claims, wage earner actions, third-party complaints and appeals from a municipal court; and (b) persons paying a fee in a forfeiture action. Currently, four-sevenths of the justice information fee revenue is deposited to the Department of Administration's Bureau of Justice Information Systems (BJIS) appropriation, two-sevenths is deposited to the CCAP appropriation and one-seventh is deposited to the general fund. The adjusted base for CCAP is \$6,224,200 PR and 39.0 PR positions.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$1,000,000 PR annually to CCAP and change CCAP's appropriation from annual to continuing. In addition, increase the justice information fee by \$2, from \$7 to \$9, and deposit the revenue from the \$2 increase to the CCAP appropriation. The fee increase would take effect on the effective date of the bill. The Governor estimates that the increased fee would generate \$1,200,000 in program revenue annually.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Circuit Court Automation Program (CCAP) was created under 1987 Act 27 to provide networked personal computers and uniform software programs to circuit courts for case management functions. CCAP has expanded to include financial management, court calendaring

and jury management functions. To date, CCAP has fully or partially implemented the case management function in 70 counties, the financial management function in 63 counties, and the jury management function in 64 counties. (Two counties, Outagamie and Walworth, have received reimbursement for their own operating systems instead of joining the CCAP network). In total, CCAP currently has more than 2,600 users in 73 locations across the state.

2. The Governor's recommendation would provide the following funds for the new judgeships created in 1997 Act 203, effective August 1, 1999: (a) \$205,800 in one-time funds in 1999-00 for computer workstations, accompanying software licenses, printers, cables and other peripherals, at a cost of \$34,300 per judgeship; and (b) \$21,000 annually for ongoing computer support and maintenance, at a cost of \$3,500 per judgeship. The bill would also provide \$753,200 in 1999-00 and \$979,000 in 2000-01 annually without specifying the use of the funds. The Executive Budget book indicates that the increased funds could be used to upgrade telecommunications and software needs, and continue implementation of the automation program. In addition, the Governor's recommendation would change CCAP's appropriation from annual to continuing. Under a continuing appropriation, appropriated amounts are considered estimates and agencies are allowed to expend all accumulated revenue in the appropriation without further legislative approval. The bill does not provide increased position authority. To fund appropriation increases, the Governor would increase the justice information fee from \$7 to \$9, increasing CCAP's portion of the fee from \$2 to \$4.

3. In her testimony to the Joint Committee on Finance on March 25, 1999, Chief Justice Shirley Abrahamson stated that the Supreme Court's top priority for this biennial budget is acquiring adequate funding for CCAP. Her testimony indicated that trial courts are totally dependent on CCAP to perform their functions and underfunding "threatens to bring down the system." According to the Chief Justice, the Governor's recommendation fails to meet the circuit court system's minimum needs in two respects: (a) most of its requests, which are necessary to meet current operational standards, were denied; and (b) projected revenues will not meet the expenditure authority proposed by the Governor.

4. In its 1999-01 budget request for CCAP, the Director of State Courts Office requested the following:

a. Telecommunications Costs. CCAP requested \$336,400 in 1999-00 and \$308,000 in 2000-01 (now re-estimated to \$656,400 in 1999-00 and \$554,400 in 2000-01) to fund increased telecommunication costs. CCAP officials indicate that funding the telecommunications costs is non-discretionary. Currently, CCAP pays no fees for the use of a router network that was set up for KIDS (a router helps remote networks communicate with one another); instead, CCAP provides KIDS with technical assistance. This agreement is ending in 1999 as all KIDS staff functions move off of CCAP local area networks and into county child support offices. Therefore, CCAP must pay for the use of a router network. CCAP intends to share some costs with the Department of Administration (DOA) and Department of Justice (DOJ), where possible.

b. Staffing Increase. CCAP requested \$226,500 and 6.0 positions in 1999-00 and

\$409,900 and 10.0 positions in 2000-01 to add 4.0 technical support positions, 4.0 computer support analysts, and 2.0 programmers to CCAP's current 39.0 staff. (CCAP also contracts for 6.5 programmers.) The 4.0 technical support positions would be responsible for supporting and maintaining CCAP networks statewide, responding to technical questions, and installing and maintaining software products and communication systems. The 4.0 computer support analysts would provide telephone support, assist with county implementations, customer training services and new software release testing. The CCAP support line currently receives over 2,000 calls per month. The 2.0 programmers would develop computer software and change software as the need arises. For example, whenever laws change that affect circuit courts (such as truth in sentencing), CCAP programmers must change the software programs to reflect the new laws.

CCAP has not received any staff increases since 1993-94 (during the 1997-99 biennial budget, 23 project positions were made permanent). From 1993 to 1999, CCAP's user base has doubled, from 1300 to 2600. Consequently, CCAP officials indicate that current staff cannot respond adequately to user needs. As a result, in March, 1998, the CCAP steering committee instituted a moratorium that prohibited all new implementations, which delayed CCAP implementations in ten counties (Marinette, Winnebago, Marquette, Wood, Ozaukee, Rock, Milwaukee juvenile court, Waukesha, Columbia, and Menominee). The CCAP steering committee lifted the moratorium on March 1, 1999 and CCAP hopes to have all counties implemented by April 1, 2000.

Of its 39.0 staff, 25.3 positions provide direct support to CCAP users (the remaining 13.7 positions perform supervisory functions or other indirect support). CCAP has 2,600 users (and is projected to have 2,800 users once all implementations are complete). CCAP's information technology (IT) support staff to user ratio currently is 1:103 and, under the Governor's recommendation, would be 1:111, or double the DOA standard of 1:55.

c. Equipment Replacements. CCAP requested \$1,000,000 in 1999-00 to replace aging IT equipment to allow most of its equipment to be on a four-year replacement cycle, the DOA standard. Currently, CCAP's IT equipment is on a six-year replacement cycle. As of July 1, 1998, 44% of CCAP's workstations were at least five years old, as were 57% of its servers, 38% of the monitors and 63% of its printers. As a result, CCAP receives over 400 calls per month to its support line related to hardware problems. According to CCAP officials, replacing old equipment would: (a) replace equipment no longer supported by vendors; (b) reduce the number of calls to the CCAP support line to allow staff to focus on needed improvements to the CCAP system; and (c) allow users to have access to applications offered by CCAP that need newer equipment. CCAP's request of \$1,000,000, plus its base funding for equipment replacement (approximately \$2,010,000), would be sufficient to upgrade all of its servers, all of its PCs that need replacement, and half of its laser printers requiring replacement. CCAP would also use some of the funds for required maintenance and software upgrades.

d. Network Management Tools. CCAP requested \$132,000 in 1999-00 for a set of software applications to enable CCAP to monitor and modify software from Madison. Currently, CCAP staff are unable to update software or solve network performance problems without traveling

to the counties, which further strains staff resources. CCAP's request for a network management software package would reduce staff time and travel in maintaining the CCAP network system, allow CCAP staff to perform timely software updates and monitor the network system, and increase hardware and software standardization.

e. Windows Migration. CCAP requested \$1,049,300 in 2000-01 for Microsoft terminal server and licenses (\$556,200) and Microsoft Office Suite licenses (\$485,900) to enable users to run Windows applications at the server level, and migrate to Microsoft Office products (the DOA standard). CCAP's current software, which includes back versions of Wordperfect and Lotus 123, does not allow CCAP users to open or read Microsoft Office products, which are used by other state and county government agencies. This request does not reflect a full conversion to a Microsoft Windows environment, but represents a less expensive approach to reach the DOA standard.

f. Other Requests. CCAP requested \$67,100 in 1999-00 for equipment to implement its disaster recovery plan, such as workstations, servers, and software, to allow CCAP to rapidly replace equipment in the event of a disaster, such as flood, fire, or theft. CCAP requested \$31,100 in 2000-01 for a court document imaging feasibility study in two counties to determine the usefulness of integrating a document imaging subsystem within CCAP's court management system.

5. According to the Office of the Director of State Courts, the Governor's recommendation not only prohibits CCAP from adequately serving its users, but also places CCAP far behind the staffing levels and equipment standards of other comparable agencies, such as DOA's Bureau of Justice Information Systems (BJIS), which is developing a similar system for county district attorney offices. The attachment details various IT items between CCAP and BJIS under the Governor's recommendation.

6. Prior to 1995 Wisconsin Act 27, CCAP received funding from a \$3 court automation fee on all forfeiture judgments and most civil actions (of which \$1 was deposited into the state's general fund). Under 1995 Act 27, the \$3 automation fee was renamed the justice information fee and was increased to \$5, with \$4 deposited to BJIS and \$1 deposited to the general fund (CCAP therefore lost this fee as a program revenue source). In the 1997-99 biennial budget, the justice information fee was increased to \$7, with the additional \$2 going to fund CCAP operations.

7. The bill would increase the justice information fee from \$7 to \$9 on the effective date of the bill. The Governor estimates this increase would result in \$1,200,000 of additional revenue annually. However, if one assumes that the increased fee would not be assessed beginning July 1, 1999, but by September 15, 1999, it is estimated that revenue in 1999-00 would be \$950,000, rather than \$1.2 million.

8. Since the IT resources listed in the attachment for BJIS under the bill exceed and more closely meet DOA standards than the resources provided to CCAP, an option to divert to CCAP a portion of the justice information fee revenue currently given to BJIS could be considered appropriate. However, because BJIS is also funded with penalty assessment revenues, which under the Governor's proposal would have a \$4.069 million deficit, this is not considered a viable

alternative at this time.

9. Under the bill, CCAP would be appropriated \$7,452,500 PR annually. However, it is estimated that, with its estimated opening balance in 1999-00, revenues will total \$7,064,700 in 1999-00 and \$7,250,000 in 2000-01. As a result, under the bill, CCAP's expenditure authority would exceed available revenues by \$437,800 in 1999-00 (which consists of a \$250,000 shortfall due to the delayed effective date and \$187,800 in 1999-00 and \$348,200 in 2000-01 due to revenue reestimates), or a total of \$786,000 by the end of the 1999-01 biennium. Consequently, if the Governor's recommendation is accepted, CCAP's expenditure authority could be reduced by \$437,800 PR in 1999-00 and \$348,200 PR in 2000-01 to more accurately reflect estimated revenues and reserves. Under this alternative, CCAP could fund equipment for the six new judgeships that start on August 1, 1999, and half of its required telecommunication costs.

10. CCAP officials indicate that if the Governor's recommendation is adopted, the moratorium on new implementations may have to be reimposed. As a result, Waukesha County and Milwaukee County juvenile court may face additional implementation delays and may have to return to paper systems because those systems are not Year 2000 compliant.

11. In order to address a larger portion of CCAP's identified needs, the Committee may wish to increase the justice information fee by an additional \$1, to \$10. The increased revenue could be used to support 3.0 positions (2.0 technical support engineers and 1.0 computer support analyst) at a cost of \$125,600 in 1999-00 and an additional 1.0 position (computer support analyst) at a cost of \$181,300 in 2000-01, as well as equipment for the new judgeships and full funding of telecommunication costs. In addition, this alternative would provide \$35,000 in 1999-00 and \$494,500 in 2000-01 to help CCAP replace some of its equipment on its current six-year cycle. Under this alternative, CCAP's IT staff to user ratio would be 1:96.

12. Alternatively, the Committee may wish to increase the justice information fee to \$11. This would provide CCAP with sufficient revenues to fund, in addition to the new judgeship equipment and telecommunications costs: (a) 6.0 PR positions in 1999-00 and 10.0 PR positions in 2000-01 at a cost of \$189,100 in 1999-00 and \$310,100 in 2000-01 (a portion of the staff cost would be affected by a reduction in consultant costs); (b) \$500,000 annually for equipment replacement; (c) \$280,200 in 2000-01 to begin the Windows migration project; and (d) \$132,000 in 2000-01 for network management tools. This alternative would allow CCAP to complete its implementation schedule; reach the DOA four-year replacement cycle standard for most, but not all, of its equipment; reduce its IT staff to user ratio to 1:79; and begin to migrate to DOA-standard Microsoft Windows applications.

13. Courts officials have expressed concerns about increasing the justice information fee. One concern is that, as court fees increase, the public's access to the court system is reduced. A second concern is that increased fees may result in revenues falling short of projections because of lower rates of collection and possibly a reduction in cases to which the fees are imposed.

14. As a result, in its budget request, the Director of State Courts requested GPR

funding, which represents excess revenue generated from the court support services fee (a \$30 to \$100 fee on all forfeiture judgments and most civil court filings) that is deposited to the general fund. In 1997-98, excess revenues totaled \$3,276,700. The Director of State Courts office argues that this revenue was intended for court programs such as CCAP. Under this alternative, the justice information fee would remain at \$7, and \$2,000,000 GPR annually would be provided to CCAP in a newly-created GPR appropriation. This would provide funding for 6.0 GPR positions in 1999-00 and 10.0 GPR positions in 2000-01, and the majority of CCAP's other requests. This amount, while less than the agency requested, was the amount requested by the Chief Justice during her testimony before the Committee.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation, as modified to reflect revenue reestimates, to provide \$562,200 PR in 1999-00 and \$651,800 PR in 2000-01 to the Circuit Court Automation Program (CCAP), and change CCAP's appropriation from annual to continuing. In addition, increase the justice information fee by \$2, from \$7 to \$9, and deposit the revenue from the \$2 increase to the Circuit Court Automation Program (CCAP) appropriation. The fee increase would take effect on the effective date of the bill. It is estimated that the fee increase would generate \$250,000 less in revenues in 1999-00 than the Governor estimated.

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>PR</u>
1999-01 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	- \$250,000
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$786,000

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by: (a) providing an additional \$1 increase to the justice information fee, to \$10; and (b) providing an additional \$37,800 PR and 3.0 PR positions in 1999-00 and \$251,200 PR and 4.0 PR positions in 2000-01.

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>PR</u>
1999-01 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$825,000
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$289,000

3. Modify the Governor's recommendation by: (a) providing an additional \$2 increase to the justice information fee, to \$11; and (b) providing an additional \$566,300 PR and 6.0 PR positions in 1999-00 and \$797,700 PR and 10.0 PR positions in 2000-01.

<u>Alternative 3</u>	<u>PR</u>
1999-01 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$1,900,000
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$1,364,000
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	10.00

4. For any of the above alternatives, substitute a \$1 increase in the justice information fee with the \$1 of the justice information fee that is currently deposited to the general fund as GPR-Earned.

<u>Alternative 4</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	- \$1,200,000

5. Delete the Governor's recommendation. Instead, create a GPR appropriation for CCAP and provide \$2,000,000 GPR annually and 6.0 GPR positions in 1990-00 and 10.0 GPR positions in 2000-01.

<u>Alternative 5</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>PR</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	\$0	- \$2,400,000	- \$2,400,000
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	\$4,000,000	- \$2,000,000	\$2,000,000
2000-01 POSITIONS (Change to Bill)	10.00	0.00	10.00

6. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative 6</u>	<u>PR</u>
1999-01 REVENUE (Change to Bill)	- \$2,400,000
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Bill)	- \$2,000,000

Prepared by: Barbara Zabawa

ATTACHMENT

**Information Technology Items for CCAP and BJIS
Under the Governor's Budget Bill**

Items	CCAP	BJIS
Replacement Cycle	6 years	4 years
Software Package	Wordperfect and Lotus 123; OS/2 Operating System	Microsoft Office Suite; Windows Operating System
Network Management Tools	No	Yes
Internet/Email Access	Only judges, clerks of court, and registers in probate (14.6% of total users). Milwaukee, Kenosha, and Brown Counties have internal email only.	All users
Support Staff to User Ratio (at end of 1999-01 biennium)	1:111	1:61
Help Desk Hours	7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. M-F; on call 7:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. on Sat. (Milwaukee County only)	8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. M-F
Total Budget (Adjusted Base Plus Governor's Recommended Increases)	\$7,452,500 annually	\$6,482,000 annually
Revenue Sources	\$4 from justice information fee (\$2 increase); CCAP fee (a \$5 to \$15 filing fee on most civil actions)	\$4 from justice information fee; federal Byrne grant monies; penalty assessment surcharge
Implementation Schedule	Hopes to have all counties implemented by April 1, 2000 (11 years)	LANs installed in all counties by June 30, 2001 (3 years)
Number of Users (at end of 1999-01 biennium)	2,800	1,003.5



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0352/1

JEO:.....

cmv

Soon

LFB:.....Zabawa (DS) – Penalty assessment fees to be used for circuit court automated computer system

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 1. Page 459, line 12: after that line insert:

text
+reat

3 "16. The amount transferred to s. 20.680 (2) (kp) shall be the amount in the
4 schedule under s. 20.680 (2) (kp)."

5 2. Page 469, line 19: after that line insert:

6 "SECTION 605d. 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes is created to read:

7 20.680 (2) (kp) *Court information systems; penalty assessment receipts.* The

8 amounts in the schedule for the operation of circuit court automated ^{information} systems under
9 s. 758.19 (4). All moneys transferred from the appropriation account under s. 20.505
10 (6) (j) 16. shall be credited to this appropriation account."

11 3. Page 1297, line 21: after that line insert:

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14

“SECTION 3050[✓]p. 758.19 (4)[✓] of the statutes is amended to read:

758.19 (4) The director of state courts may develop, promote, coordinate and implement circuit court automated information systems that are compatible among counties using the moneys appropriated under s. 20.680 (2) (j) and (kp)[✓]. If the director of state courts provides funding to counties as part of the development and implementation of this system, the director of state courts may provide funding to counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges for a minicomputer system only up to the level of funding that would have been provided had the county implemented a microcomputer system. In those counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges, any costs incurred to implement a minicomputer system not funded under this subsection shall be paid by the county. Those counties may use that minicomputer system for county management information needs in addition to the circuit court automated information system use.”[✓]

History: 1971 c. 254 ss. 1, 2, 4 to 16; Stats. 1971 s. 257.19; 1975 c. 37, 189, 199; 1977 c. 29; 1977 c. 187 ss. 97, 135; 1977 c. 305 s. 64; 1977 c. 449; Stats. 1977 s. 758.19; Sup. Ct. Order, 88 W (2d) xiii (1979); 1981 c. 96; 1983 a. 27; 1985 a. 29, 340; 1989 a. 31; 1991 a. 32, 39; 1993 a. 16, 206, 437, 491; 1995 a. 27, 77, 201, 225, 417; 1997 a. 27, 237.

(END)



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0352/1
JEO:cmh:ijs

redraft
make
run

Seen

LFB:.....Zabawa (DS) – Penalty assessment fees to be used for circuit court automated computer system

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 1. Page 459, line 12: after that line insert:

3 "16. The amount transferred to s. 20.680 (2) (kp) shall be the amount in the
4 schedule under s. 20.680 (2) (kp). *See*

INS
1-4

5 2. Page 469, line 19: after that line insert:

6 "SECTION 605. 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes is created to read:

7 20.680 (2) (kp) *Court information systems; penalty assessment receipts.* The
8 amounts in the schedule for the operation of circuit court automated information
9 systems under s. 758.19 (4). All moneys transferred from the appropriation account
10 under s. 20.505 (6) (j) 16. shall be credited to this appropriation account. *See*

INS
1-10

11 3. Page 1297, line 21: after that line insert:

1 **SECTION 3050p.** 758.19 (4) of the statutes is amended to read:

2 758.19 (4) The director of state courts may develop, promote, coordinate and
3 implement circuit court automated information systems that are compatible among
4 counties using the moneys appropriated under s. 20.680 (2) (j) and (kp). If the
5 director of state courts provides funding to counties as part of the development and
6 implementation of this system, the director of state courts may provide funding to
7 counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges for a minicomputer system only up to the
8 level of funding that would have been provided had the county implemented a
9 microcomputer system. In those counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges, any costs
10 incurred to implement a minicomputer system not funded under this subsection
11 shall be paid by the county. Those counties may use that minicomputer system for
12 county management information needs in addition to the circuit court automated
13 information system use. *De*

INS
-13
13

14

(END)

1999-2000 DRAFTING INSERT
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU

LRBb0352/2ins
JEO:.....

1 **INSERT 1-4:**

2 SECTION 542f. 20.505 (6) (j) 16. of the statutes, as created by 1999 Wisconsin
3 Act (this act), is repealed.”.

4 **INSERT 1-10:**

5 SECTION 605h. 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes, as created by 1999 Wisconsin Act
6 (this act), is repealed.”.

7 **INSERT 2-13:**

8 SECTION 3050q. 758.19 (4) of the statutes, as affected by 1999 Wisconsin Act
9 (this act), is amended to read:

10 758.19 (4) The director of state courts may develop, promote, coordinate and
11 implement circuit court automated information systems that are compatible among
12 counties using the moneys appropriated under s. 20.680 (2) (j) and ~~(kp)~~. If the
13 director of state courts provides funding to counties as part of the development and
14 implementation of this system, the director of state courts may provide funding to
15 counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges for a minicomputer system only up to the
16 level of funding that would have been provided had the county implemented a
17 microcomputer system. In those counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges, any costs
18 incurred to implement a minicomputer system not funded under this subsection
19 shall be paid by the county. Those counties may use that minicomputer system for
20 county management information needs in addition to the circuit court automated
21 information system use.”.

History: 1971 c. 254 ss. 1, 2, 4 to 16; Stats. 1971 s. 257.19; 1975 c. 37, 189, 199; 1977 c. 29; 1977 c. 187 ss. 97, 135; 1977 c. 305 s. 64; 1977 c. 449; Stats. 1977 s. 758.19; Sup. Ct. Order, 88 W (2d) xiii (1979); 1981 c. 96; 1983 a. 27; 1985 a. 29, 340; 1989 a. 31; 1991 a. 32, 39; 1993 a. 16, 206, 437, 491; 1995 a. 27, 77, 201, 225, 417; 1997 a. 27, 237.

22 **1.** Page 1477, line 14: after that line insert:

(#)

*Effective
Date*

1
2
3

~~(2)~~^h PENALTY ASSESSMENT APPROPRIATION. The repeal of sections 20.505 (6) (j) 16. and 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes and the amendment of section 758.19 (4) (by SECTION 3050q) of the statutes take effect on July 1, 2000.”.



State of Wisconsin
1999 - 2000 LEGISLATURE

LRBb0352/2
JEO:cmh:km

LFB:.....Zabawa (DS) – Penalty assessment fees to be used for circuit court
automated computer system

FOR 1999-01 BUDGET — NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION

LFB AMENDMENT

TO 1999 ASSEMBLY BILL 133 AND 1999 SENATE BILL 45

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 **1.** Page 459, line 12: after that line insert:

3 “16. The amount transferred to s. 20.680 (2) (kp) shall be the amount in the
4 schedule under s. 20.680 (2) (kp).

5 **SECTION 542f.** 20.505 (6) (j) 16. of the statutes, as created by 1999 Wisconsin
6 Act (this act), is repealed.”.

7 **2.** Page 469, line 19: after that line insert:

8 “**SECTION 605g.** 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes is created to read:

9 20.680 (2) (kp) *Court information systems; penalty assessment receipts.* The
10 amounts in the schedule for the operation of circuit court automated information

1 systems under s. 758.19 (4). All moneys transferred from the appropriation account
2 under s. 20.505 (6) (j) 16. shall be credited to this appropriation account.

3 **SECTION 605h.** 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes, as created by 1999 Wisconsin Act
4 (this act), is repealed.”.

5 **3.** Page 1297, line 21: after that line insert:

6 “**SECTION 3050p.** 758.19 (4) of the statutes is amended to read:

7 758.19 (4) The director of state courts may develop, promote, coordinate and
8 implement circuit court automated information systems that are compatible among
9 counties using the moneys appropriated under s. 20.680 (2) (j) and (kp). If the
10 director of state courts provides funding to counties as part of the development and
11 implementation of this system, the director of state courts may provide funding to
12 counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges for a minicomputer system only up to the
13 level of funding that would have been provided had the county implemented a
14 microcomputer system. In those counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges, any costs
15 incurred to implement a minicomputer system not funded under this subsection
16 shall be paid by the county. Those counties may use that minicomputer system for
17 county management information needs in addition to the circuit court automated
18 information system use.

19 **SECTION 3050q.** 758.19 (4) of the statutes, as affected by 1999 Wisconsin Act
20 (this act), is amended to read:

21 758.19 (4) The director of state courts may develop, promote, coordinate and
22 implement circuit court automated information systems that are compatible among
23 counties using the moneys appropriated under s. 20.680 (2) (j) and (kp). If the
24 director of state courts provides funding to counties as part of the development and

1 implementation of this system, the director of state courts may provide funding to
2 counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges for a minicomputer system only up to the
3 level of funding that would have been provided had the county implemented a
4 microcomputer system. In those counties with 1 or 2 circuit court judges, any costs
5 incurred to implement a minicomputer system not funded under this subsection
6 shall be paid by the county. Those counties may use that minicomputer system for
7 county management information needs in addition to the circuit court automated
8 information system use.”

9 **4.** Page 1477, line 14: after that line insert:

10 “(2h) PENALTY ASSESSMENT APPROPRIATION. The repeal of sections 20.505 (6) (j)
11 16. and 20.680 (2) (kp) of the statutes and the amendment of section 758.19 (4) (by
12 SECTION 3050q) of the statutes take effect on July 1, 2000.”

13 (END)