

M

(Base) Agency: TEACH - Ed. Telecommunications Access Program

Recommendations:

H. Palmer Motion

Paper #902: Alternatives A2, B1 and C2.

Comments: The gov proposes to spend an additional \$3.9 million SEG in 99-00 and \$6.5 million SEG in 00-01 to help install 120 new video links and 190 new data lines for schools, libraries and tech schools.

Alternative A. 2 goes with the flow, but allows JFC oversight for half of the additional funds.

Alternative B. 1 provides a potentially better way to account for federal discounts flowing into the states.

Alternative C. 2 maintains current law instead of switching TEACH funding from SEG to GPR in recognition of the significance of the Universal fund as a tax. *Alternative 1* would make TEACH compete with everything else for funding, a good idea, but perhaps a bit before its time.

Prepared by: Bob



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 27, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #902

Educational Telecommunications Access Program (TEACH Board)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 566, #6]

CURRENT LAW

The TEACH telecommunications access program provides eligible entities with subsidized access to new data lines and video links or grants for data lines and video links in existence prior to October 14, 1997. In the 1997-99 biennium, a total of \$9,875,000 SEG is budgeted to provide telecommunications access subsidies and grants to public school districts and technical college districts. A total of \$1,821,400 SEG is appropriated to provide access to new data lines and video links to private and tribal colleges and public library boards in those years. In addition, \$620,000 SEG is provided for private schools subsidies and grants in the 1997-99 biennium. Total expenditure authority for the telecommunications access program is \$12,316,400 SEG in the 1997-99 biennium. Funding for the program is provided through the segregated universal service fund (USF), which receives its funding through assessments on annual gross operating revenues from intrastate telecommunications providers. In addition, participants are required to pay DOA \$100 for data lines or video links that operate at speeds of 1.544 megabits per second and \$250 per month for data lines or video links that operate at different speeds.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$3,994,600 SEG in 1999-00 and \$6,534,100 SEG in 2000-01 for the educational telecommunications access program. Of this funding amount provide: (a) \$1,854,200 in 1999-00 and \$3,391,400 in 2000-01 for school districts and CESAs; (b) \$1,518,700 in 1999-00 and \$1,846,400 in 2000-01 for private colleges, technical colleges and libraries; and (c) \$621,700 in 1999-00 and \$1,296,300 in 2000-01 for private K-12 schools.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The TEACH Board indicates that, as of March 18, 1999, it has provided subsidies for 101 new video links and 367 new data lines under the access program for fiscal year 1998-99. In addition, TEACH provided grants for 116 video links and 16 data lines that were in existence prior to the passage of the 1997-99 biennial budget (1997 Act 27). Table 1 provides information, as reported by TEACH, regarding the number of data lines and video links that have been approved for each type of institution as of March 18, 1999, under both components of the access program.

TABLE 1

Number of Services Provided Institution Type - As of March 18, 1999

	New <u>Video Link</u>	New <u>Data Line</u>	Existing <u>Video</u>	Existing <u>Data</u>	<u>Total</u>
Public School Districts	69	165	112	9	355
CESAs	2	2	NA	NA	4
Technical College District	16	0	NA	NA	16
Public Library Boards	0	168	NA	NA	168
Private Colleges	8	10	NA	NA	18
Private K-12 Schools	5	22	2	7	36
Tribal School	<u>1</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>NA</u>	<u>1</u>
Total	101	367	114	16	598

2. The actual access to a data line or a video link is provided by telecommunications providers under contract with DOA. The TEACH Board submits its portion of the program's cost to DOA for payments to those providers under contracts with DOA to the extent that the amounts are not paid by the participating institutions. The amount of the subsidy that the TEACH Board provides for new data lines and video links varies due to a number of factors including: the types of data line or video link installed, the location of the institution and the contract amounts that DOA negotiates.

3. Based on the state contract amounts for telecommunications access, the total cost of a data line provided by DOA in 1998-99 operating at a speed of 1.544 megabits per second is \$640 a month. Therefore, under an annual contract term an institution would pay \$1,200 per year for the data line and the TEACH Board would pay the remaining \$6,480 per year. The current contract amounts for the data lines operating at a speed other than 1.544 megabits per second vary, but have a monthly average cost of approximately \$1,800. Using this average cost, an institution would pay \$3,000 per year and the TEACH Board would pay \$18,600 per year. In addition to these costs there is a one-time installation charge of \$350 for every data line that TEACH pays.

4. Video link prices are site-specific. The average video link cost in 1998-99 is

approximately \$2,300. Currently, every new video link is operating at a speed other than 1.544 megabits; therefore, using this average cost, an institution would have a yearly cost of \$3,000 and the TEACH Board would be responsible for \$24,600 annually for each video link. The TEACH Board has financed its video link costs through the state's master lease program.

5. The TEACH Board indicates that it has provided \$1,956,700 SEG in 1998-99 in grants to private schools (\$58,900) and public schools (\$1,897,800) that had data lines and video links in place prior to October 14, 1997. Grants are limited to the amount of the subsidy received by an institution under the new data line or video link component of the access program, but the grant may not be greater than the contract cost in effect on October 14, 1997. Districts and private schools that receive funding for existing contracts may not also receive support for new lines or links. The existing contracts grant component of the access program will sunset on June 30, 2002.

6. Staff from the TEACH Board estimate that 1998-99 expenditures for the access program will be the following: (a) \$9,817,100 SEG for school districts and technical college districts; (b) \$1,781,400 SEG for private colleges and libraries; and (c) \$609,900 SEG for private schools, for total program expenditures of \$12,231,400 SEG. These amounts include estimated prepayments on the seven-year master lease for video links in the amount of \$5,600,500. Staff indicate that any remaining funding (\$85,000) will also be used to make additional prepayments on its master lease, if possible.

1999-01 Telecommunications Access Funding Levels

7. The Governor recommended an additional \$3,994,600 SEG in 1999-00 and \$6,534,100 SEG in 2000-01 for total funding of \$10,941,000 SEG in 1999-00 and \$13,480,500 SEG in 2000-01. DOA estimates that this additional funding will cover the costs to install approximately 120 new video links and 190 new data lines during 1999-01. Table 2 provides the 1997-99 appropriated amounts and Governor's 1999-01 funding recommendations by appropriation for the access program. Funding for the program is provided through biennial appropriations. Due to the timing of the 1997-99 biennial budget, the TEACH Board did not expend any funding during the 1997-98 fiscal year.

TABLE 2**1997-98 Through 2000-01 Appropriated and Recommended
Telecommunication Access Funding**

	<u>1997-98</u>	<u>1998-99</u>	<u>1999-00</u>	<u>2000-01</u>
School District, CESAs and Technical College Districts	\$4,375,000	\$5,500,000		
School District and CESAs*			\$7,354,200	\$8,891,400
Private Colleges and Public Library Boards	730,000	1,091,400		
Private and Technical Colleges and Libraries*			2,610,100	2,937,800
Private Schools	<u>265,000</u>	<u>355,000</u>	<u>976,700</u>	<u>1,651,300</u>
Total	\$5,370,000	\$6,946,400	\$10,941,000	\$13,480,500

*In 1999-01, these appropriations would be modified to remove funding for technical college districts from the appropriation that is included in the calculation of the funding two-thirds of K-12 partial school revenues.

8. For purposes of its 1999-01 estimate, DOA budget staff projected the following cost components for the program. First, new data lines costs would remain at \$640 a month and continue to include a one-time installation charge of \$350. Second, new video link costs were estimated at \$3,000 a month per link with a \$4,000 installation charge per link and a \$50 Division of Technology Management (DTM) overhead charge per link. No price changes were included in DOA's estimate for those video links and data lines that were installed in 1998-99.

9. Staff from DOA's Division of Technology Management indicate that 1999-00 costs for the TEACH program will not be set until shortly before July 1, 1999. Currently, DTM staff is in the process of performing a detailed review of the costs of the program. Given that there is no new information currently available with which to estimate next year's costs, the Committee could approve the Governor's recommendation for funding the access program. If the costs are substantially higher than DOA projected, less institutions would be able to receive new access services. Conversely, if costs are less than estimated more institutions should receive access services during the biennium.

10. However, the Committee may wish to review the costs of the access program including administrative costs that will be charged by DOA to the TEACH Board. Actual costs for the program have increased significantly over the amounts estimated during legislative deliberations on the creation of the program under 1997 Act 27. At that time, based on the best information available from DOA staff, it was estimated that the data line rates would be approximately \$400 a month and video links rates would be approximately \$1,500.

11. If the Committee wishes to have more information on the actual costs of the

program before providing the full amount of additional expenditure authority, it could transfer one-half of the proposed funding increase to the Committee's appropriation, for release to the Board under a 14-day passive review process, after DOA's charges have been finalized. The Committee would then be able to review all of the cost components of the program and provide expenditure authority based on more current cost information. By approving one-half of the funding increase at this time, the Board could continue to provide services without delaying installation of new lines or links. Further, by allowing the Board to request the additional expenditure through a passive review process, the Board could submit its request to the Committee shortly after DOA sets its rates in June or July of each year, thereby minimizing any potential delays in the program.

Federal E-Rate Discounts

12. Another issue the Committee may wish to consider is the funding that is expected to be received by the state from the federal universal service fund under the federal E-Rate program. The federal E-Rate program provides eligible schools and libraries with federally funded discounts on telecommunications services, Internet access and internal connection (computer wiring, hubs and routers). Discounts, which range from 20 to 90 percent, are based in part on the number of students eligible for the federal free and reduced price school lunch program and the classification of the school or library as rural or urban. For the 1998 program year (January, 1998 through June 30, 1999), 948 applicants in Wisconsin received approximately \$37 million in total discounts. Of that amount, Milwaukee Public Schools received \$23 million.

13. Staff from the TEACH Board is currently in the process of identifying institutions that received a 1998 discount for TEACH provided services and trying to recoup any amounts it may have paid over the discounted cost of the service. In addition, the TEACH Board has filed the state's 1999 E-Rate application on behalf of current and anticipated future telecommunications applicants. As a result this filing, the TEACH Board indicates that it, rather than the schools and libraries, will receive the federal discount moneys from the telecommunications carriers; however, they do not know how much or when they would receive this funding.

14. It is unknown whether the TEACH Board will receive cash from telecommunications carriers. It is possible that the telecommunications carriers involved may decide to discount DOA's contract costs, rather than provide a cash grant to the state. The Executive Director of TEACH indicates that staff are currently working with the telecommunications carriers to ensure that the Board would receive cash; however, if an agreement is not reached, the carriers will discount the contract costs. The Executive Director also has indicated that if cash is received under the program it would be deposited into TEACH's federal appropriation and possibly used for network scheduling, a help desk or reducing program costs.

15. Under current law, the TEACH Board may administer and expend all federal monies received according to the provisions of the federal grant or program under which the monies were received. In addition, the Board can request that the Governor create or abolish positions to be funded from the appropriation. The Governor is required to report to the Committee, at least

quarterly, of any federal funds received in excess of those approved in the biennial budget process and of any federal positions created or abolished.

16. Due to the uncertainties regarding receipt and possible expenditure of E-rate moneys received by the TEACH Board, the Committee may wish to ensure that any discount received are directly applied to reduce the total costs of the telecommunications access program. In this regard, the Committee could consider creating two continuing PR appropriations under the TEACH Board for the receipt of any E-Rate funding from nonstate entities for school districts and libraries. The appropriations could specify that all monies received under the appropriation be used to offset the spending in the SEG appropriations that fund school districts and libraries. In addition, the Committee could require that Board report annually on the amount E-rate discounts received by the TEACH Board for schools and libraries.

Source of Telecommunications Access Funding

17. Funding for the TEACH telecommunications program is provided through the segregated universal services fund (USF), which receives its funding through assessments on annual gross operating revenues from intrastate telecommunications providers. These assessments also fund the costs of providing telecommunications access services through BadgerNet to UW-River Falls, UW-Stout, UW-Superior and UW-Whitewater. The monthly assessment for TEACH, effective October 1, 1998, will total \$12,316,400 in 1998-99. The UW-System assessment is set to recover \$1,872,000 during 1998-99.

18. As provided for under 1997 Act 27, the assessments for the TEACH access and UW BadgerNet programs may be passed through by the utilities to customers as an increase on their monthly telephone bill. Under the budget bill, \$11.86 million in 1999-00 and \$14.4 million in 2000-01 would be provided from these assessments. At \$14.4 million in 2000-01, this pass-through assessment would be larger than two separate general fund taxes (the occupational tax on beer--\$9.3 million, and tobacco products--\$9.1 million) and would equal 22% of the estimated general fund tax that is imposed on telecommunications companies in that year. As a matter of tax policy, the state does not earmark taxes for specific programs. Because the pass-through assessment affects millions of telephone customers and has reached a level similar to that of other general fund taxes, consideration could be given to eliminating this assessment and, instead, funding these programs from the general fund. This would have the advantage of placing these programs on a par with all general fund programs, so that they would compete for resources and receive the same level of oversight as other general fund activities.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. 1999-01 Telecommunications Access Funding Levels

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$3,994,600 SEG in 1999-00

and \$6,534,100 SEG in 2000-01 for the educational telecommunications access program.

<u>Alternative A1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$10,528,700
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by transferring half of the recommended increase in expenditure authority to the Joint Committee on Finance's appropriation (\$1,997,300 SEG in 1999-00 and \$3,267,100 SEG in 2000-01). Specify that the monies placed in reserve in the Committee's appropriation could be released to TEACH under a 14-day passive review process after receipt of information relating to estimated program demand and finalized annual costs.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$10,528,700
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

3. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative A3</u>	<u>SEG</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$10,528,700]

B. Federal E-Rate Discounts

1. Create two continuing PR appropriations under the TEACH Board for receipt of any funding from discounts provided under the E-Rate program for school districts and for libraries. Provide that all monies received under these appropriations would be used to offset spending in the SEG appropriations that fund school districts and libraries. In addition, require the TEACH Board to report by October 1 of each year on the federal E-rate discounts provided for TEACH telecommunication access services.

2. Maintain current law.

C. Source Of Telecommunications Access Funding

1. Delete \$11,860,200 SEG in 1999-00 and \$14,399,700 SEG in 2000-01 and provide \$11,860,200 GPR in 1999-00 and \$14,399,700 GPR in 2000-01 to fund the TEACH access program and UW BadgerNet services currently funded with USF pass-through assessments. In addition, delete all statutory language associated with these assessments.

<u>Alternative C1</u>	<u>GPR</u>	<u>SEG</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$26,259,900	-\$15,620,800	\$10,639,100
[Change to Bill]	\$26,259,900	-\$26,259,900	\$0]

2. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

MO# A-2

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 9 ABS 0

MO# B-1

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 9 ABS 0

TEACH BOARD

Report of Federal E-Rate Discounts

[Modification to Alternative B1 of Paper #902]

Motion:

Move to modify Alternative B1 of Paper #902 to specify that the TEACH Board submit its report to the Department of Administration, Joint Committee on Finance and the Public Service Commission.

Note:

This motion would clarify Alternative B1 by specifying which agencies the TEACH Board is required to submit its annual report on the federal E-rate discounts provided for TEACH telecommunications access services.

MO# _____

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

(Base) Agency: TEACH -- Access for State Residential Schools

Recommendations:

Paper #903: Governor's proposal with modifications

Comments: This, with modifications specified, helps the state's two residential schools participate in TEACH telecommunications access funding.

Prepared by: Bob



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 27, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #903

Educational Telecommunications Access for State Residential Schools (TEACH Board)

[LFB 1999-01 Budget Summary: Page 567, #7]

CURRENT LAW

The telecommunications access program provides subsidized access to new data lines and video links to school districts, private schools, CESAs, technical college districts, private colleges or public library boards. In addition, the program provides grants to school districts and private schools that had in effect on October 14, 1997, (the effective date of the 1997-99 state budget), a contract for access to a data line or video link.

GOVERNOR

Expand the educational telecommunications access program to include the Wisconsin School for the Visually Handicapped and the Wisconsin School for the Deaf and provide \$55,200 annually in a new, biennial appropriation for the estimated cost of the telecommunications access for these schools. Require the Department of Administration (DOA) to coordinate with TEACH to provide these schools with contracts for telecommunication access. Provide that moneys received by DOA from the Department of Public Instruction for its share of the cost of telecommunications access services provided to the state residential schools would be used in providing access services.

MODIFICATION TO BASE

Modify a cross-reference to reflect that payments for the state residential schools' telecommunication access services not funded by TEACH would be paid from the DOA appropriation that receives moneys from state agencies rather than the DOA appropriation that receives moneys from local governmental units and entities in the private sector. In addition,

modify the cross-reference under which the state residential schools would be eligible for the program from the statutory section relating to eligibility for technical college districts under the telecommunications program to the general telecommunications access program section number.

Explanation: These modifications would replace two incorrect cross-references with appropriate section numbers. These modifications are necessary to accomplish the Governor's intent that the two state residential schools be eligible for TEACH telecommunications access funding.

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

MO#			
	BURKE	Y	N A
	DECKER	Y	N A
	JAUCH	Y	N A
	MOORE	Y	N A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
	PLACHE	Y	N A
	COWLES	Y	N A
	PANZER	Y	N A
2	GARD	Y	N A
	PORTER	Y	N A
	KAUFERT	Y	N A
	ALBERS	Y	N A
	DUFF	Y	N A
	WARD	Y	N A
	HUBER	Y	N A
	RILEY	Y	N A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

(Base) Agency: TEACH -- Technology Block Grants

Recommendations:

Card 3

Paper #904: Alternative 2

Comments: This moves \$5 million SEG from ed tech grants common school fund to library aids and re-establishes originally intended base funding levels -- consistent with the Legislature's wishes in the last budget that were vetoed by the governor. (see point 5).

Prepared by: Bob



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 27, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #904

Technology Block Grants (TEACH Board)

CURRENT LAW

The TEACH Board provides funding to public school districts for any purpose related to educational technology. Educational technology is defined statutorily as technology used in the education or training of any person or in the administration of an elementary or secondary school and related telecommunications services. Grants under the program may not be used to fund salaries or benefits of any school district employe or replace funding available from other sources.

Funding for the program was \$10 million GPR and \$5 million SEG in 1997-98 and \$30 million GPR and \$5 million SEG in 1998-99. General purpose revenue funding for this program is distributed based on a formula that uses equalized value per member. The segregated funding is provided from income of the common school fund and is distributed in proportion to the number of persons between the ages of four and 20 who reside in each district, with a proportional adjustment for K-8 and union high school districts. The TEACH Board can distribute the SEG funding only after \$14.3 million of annual income from the common school fund is apportioned by DPI to school districts for school libraries. If there is insufficient funding available in the common school fund to fund the TEACH appropriation, the Board will distribute the remaining income of the fund, rather than the amount appropriated.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. As part of the 1997-99 budget bill, the Governor recommended that \$10 million GPR in 1997-98 and \$35,000,000 GPR in 1998-99 be provided for technology block grants. The

Joint Committee on Finance, and subsequently the Legislature, in 1997 Act 27, reduced 1998-99 funding for the program by \$5 million in order to provide \$5 million GPR in 1997-98 for transition funding for the pioneering partners competitive grant program. Act 27 provided that the base level of funding for the general fund block grant would be considered to be \$35 million GPR in 1998-99 for purpose of the 1999-01 budget process.

2. The Governor also recommended as part of the 1997-99 budget bill, that \$15 million SEG in 1997-98 and \$5 million SEG in 1998-99 be provided from the income of the common school fund for technology block grants to school districts. The bill provided that the TEACH Board could distribute these funds only after \$14.3 million of annual income from the common school fund is apportioned by DPI to school districts for school libraries, and to extent the additional \$5 million SEG is available. As passed by the Legislature, the 1997-99 budget bill modified the Governor's recommendation by specifying that technology block grants funded through the common school fund would sunset on June 30, 1999. Therefore, the full amount of income from the common school fund would have been appropriated to school library aids through a continuing appropriation, starting July 1, 1999. However, the Governor vetoed the June 30, 1999, sunset date for the use of the common school fund income for educational technology block grants.

3. Based on the actions taken during deliberations on the 1997-99 biennial budget, one could argue that the intent of the Legislature was to provide a total of \$35 million annually for educational technology block grants. Under the Governor's 1999-01 budget recommendations, a total of \$40 million annually (\$35 million GPR and \$5 million SEG) would be provided for these block grants. Consideration could be given to maintaining the Legislature's recommended base level funding of \$35 million annually for the program.

4. If the Committee decided to reduce GPR funding for the program by \$5 million, the amount of equalization aid would have to be increased by \$1,666,700 GPR to meet the state commitment to fund two-thirds of K-12 partial school revenues. As a result, the net cost savings that would be realized by reducing funding for the program by \$5 million GPR annually would be \$3,333,300 GPR annually. When both the TEACH block grants and DPI school library aids are considered, this alternative would reduce overall funding by \$5 million compared to base level funding under the 1997-99 budget bill as passed by the Legislature.

5. Alternatively, the Committee could decide to specify that the SEG funding for the TEACH block grant program be transferred back to the appropriation that funds school library aids. Under this alternative, the full amount of income from the common school fund would be appropriated to school library aids through a continuing appropriation. Such action would be consistent with the Legislature's action during the 1997-99 budget process that was later vetoed by the Governor.

6. Conversely, the Committee could decide that the additional \$5 million of funding should be provided to school districts under the TEACH block grant program. The funding provided under the program provides school districts with flexibility in meeting their educational technology needs and does not count against their revenue limits.

7. As a result of the veto to 1997 Act 27, beginning in 1999-00 the SEG appropriations of common school fund income under DPI for school library aid and under TEACH for SEG block grants are inconsistent. Current law does not clearly allocate the first \$14.3 million for school library aid and the next \$5 million for TEACH block grants in 1999-00 and thereafter. If the Committee wishes to maintain this current law allocation of funding, the appropriation governing school library aids under DPI should be modified.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Delete \$5,000,000 GPR annually from the appropriation that funds educational technology block grants. Increase equalization funding by \$1,666,700 GPR annually to maintain two-thirds funding of partial school revenues.

Alternative 1	GPR
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	- \$6,666,600
[Change to Bill]	- \$6,666,600]

2. Delete \$5,000,000 SEG annually from the appropriation that funds educational technology block grants. In addition, provide that the full amount of income from the common school fund would be appropriated to school library aids through a continuing appropriation and increase that DPI appropriation by \$5,000,000 SEG annually. Under this alternative, the \$5 million SEG deleted from TEACH would be fully expended under the school library aids appropriation.

3. Maintain current law, but modify the DPI appropriation for school library aids to be an annual sum certain appropriation with \$14.3 million SEG annually.

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

MO# Alt 3

BURKE	Y	(N)	A
DECKER	Y	(N)	A
JAUCH	Y	(N)	A
MOORE	Y	(N)	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	(N)	A
PLACHE	Y	(N)	A
COWLES	(Y)	N	A
PANZER	(Y)	N	A
GARD	(Y)	N	A
PORTER	(Y)	N	A
KAUFERT	(Y)	N	A
ALBERS	(Y)	N	A
DUFF	(Y)	N	A
WARD	(Y)	N	A
HUBER	Y	(N)	A
RILEY	Y	(N)	A

MO# Alt. 2

BURKE	(Y)	N	A
DECKER	(Y)	N	A
JAUCH	(Y)	N	A
MOORE	(Y)	N	A
SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N	A
PLACHE	(Y)	N	A
COWLES	(Y)	N	A
PANZER	(Y)	N	A
GARD	(Y)	N	A
PORTER	(Y)	N	A
KAUFERT	(Y)	N	A
ALBERS	(Y)	N	A
DUFF	(Y)	N	A
WARD	(Y)	N	A
HUBER	(Y)	N	A
RILEY	(Y)	N	A

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

TEACH BOARD

Governor's Council on World Languages for Wisconsin Citizens

Motion:

Move to create a permanent Governor's Council on World Languages for Wisconsin Citizens. The Council would be required to promote communication among language teachers, programs, colleges and K-12 public schools. Specify that the Council would: (a) encourage all districts to create a K-12 plan for foreign language education; (b) encourage elementary teachers to have a second language proficiency; (c) link language learning with school-to-work initiatives and other subject areas; and (d) re-examine foreign language proficiency as a graduation requirement for both high school and college.

Note:

This motion would establish a permanent Governor's Council on World Languages for Wisconsin Citizens.

MO# 193

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

TEACH BOARD

Waiver of E-Rate Application

Motion:

Move to prohibit the TEACH Board from requiring the KSCADE consortium to apply for E-Rate discounts in order to be eligible for a TEACH preexisting contract grant under the telecommunications access program in 1999-00 only.

Note:

This motion would exempt the KSCADE consortium from the TEACH Board requirement that in order to be eligible for a TEACH preexisting contract grant under the telecommunications access program in 1999-00 an applicant must have applied for the federal E-rate program.

MO# 630

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
2 GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

TEACH BOARD

Rulemaking for Training and Technical Assistance Grant Program

Motion:

Move to require that the TEACH Board promulgate rules, using an emergency rulemaking process, to specify the administrative procedures, eligibility and application requirements, and funding criteria for the training and technical assistance grant program. Provide that the TEACH Board could promulgate the initial rule for this purpose as an emergency rule, without having to provide evidence of the necessity of preservation of the public peace, health, safety or welfare. Specify that the emergency rule would be subject to approval or disapproval by the Joint Committee on Information Policy (JCIP) under a 14-day passive review process.

Note:

This motion would establish a rulemaking process for the training and technical assistance grant program that was included in the 1997-99 budget bill as passed by the Legislature, but vetoed by the Governor.

MO#	BURKE	DECKER	JAUCH	MOORE	SHIBILSKI	PLACHE	COWLES	PANZER	GARD	PORTER	KAUFERT	ALBERS	DUFF	WARD	HUBER	RILEY	AYE	NO	ABS
	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A			
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N			
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			

Senator Jauch
Senator Panzer

TEACH BOARD REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Long-Term Access Program Planning with Agency Budget Request

Motion:

Move to require the TEACH Board in submitting its 2001-03 agency budget request to include information on the following: (a) projections on the telecommunications access program as to the ultimate size of the program; (b) how much of the funding required for the access program should be drawn from universal service fund assessments; (c) other funding sources to be utilized if the recommended assessment funding is less than projected total program costs; and (d) how long should school districts and other participating entities receive these subsidies and how best could the phase-out of the program be administered.

Note:

This motion would require the TEACH Board to include the specified information as part of its next biennial budget request.

TEACH BOARD

Training and Technical Assistance Grant Program

Motion:

Move to require the TEACH Board to consult with the State Superintendent before awarding training and technical assistance grants.

Note:

This motion would require the TEACH Board and the Department of Public Instruction (DPI) to consult with one another prior to the awarding of TEACH training and technical assistance grants. DPI awards federal competitive grants to school districts to assist schools in integrating technology into curricula and improving student achievement. In 1998-99, DPI awarded approximately \$6.8 million in federal funding under this program. Under the Governor's budget bill, the State Superintendent would be required to consult with the TEACH Board before awarding these federal grants. This motion, in combination with the Governor's recommendation related to DPI, would require both agencies to consult with one another prior to the awarding of funding under these programs.

TEACH BOARD

Educational Telecommunications Access Program

Motion:

Move to require that when awarding subsidies or grants, the TEACH Board indicate to each recipient, in writing, that the subsidy or grant may be temporary in nature, and is funded largely from an increase on the monthly utility bill paid by telephone customers in Wisconsin.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS 0

TEACH BOARD

Payments for Telecommunications Service

Motion:

Move to allow the TEACH Board to make payments to telecommunications providers for contracted services, on behalf of participating entities under the telecommunications access program, if the providers have entered into such contracts following a competitive bidding process.

Note:

This motion would allow the TEACH Board to make payments, on behalf of libraries and educational institutions, to telecommunications providers that have competitively bid and entered into contracts to provide services under the TEACH telecommunications access program. Under current law, the TEACH Board may only make payments under the telecommunications access program for these services if they are provided by telecommunications providers under contract with DOA.

(Base) Agency: TEACH

Recommendations:

Paper #: Items for which no paper has been prepared

Comments: Because this is a base agency, these items need to be approved. Sen. Jauch may raise a few issues, but I see no major concerns or problems.

Prepared by: Bob

TECHNOLOGY FOR EDUCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT IN WISCONSIN BOARD

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
5	Wisconsin Advanced Telecommunications Foundation
8	Educational Telecommunications Access Eligibility
9	Educational Telecommunications Access Additional Data Lines
11	Educational Telecommunications Access Transfer from PSC
13	Educational Technology Infrastructure Loans
14	One-Time Supplemental Technology Block Grants
15	TEACH Board Member Designees

LFB Summary Items to be Addressed in Subsequent Pa

MO# except 11

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
2	Debt Service Reestimate
12	Institutional Assistance Support Program
16	TEACH Board Membership -- Replace ECB Appointee

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A

GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legisla

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
10	Educational Telecommunications Access Shared Service Agr Units of Government

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

Tourism

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 572)

LFB Summary Item for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #

Title

2&3

Tribal Gaming Revenue for Tourism Marketing (see Paper #171 -- Tribal Gaming Revenue Allocations)

Gov Agency: Tribal Gaming—Tourism

Recommendations:

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Comments: All look okay.

Prepared by: Julie

TOURISM

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
4	Agency Budget Reductions
5	Remove One-Time Funding

LFB Summary Item for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
6	Exemption from Open Records Law

Transportation

Transportation Finance

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 574)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Transportation Fund Condition Statement (Paper #915)
2	Federal Highway Aid (Paper #916)
-	Terminal Tax Distribution (Paper #917)

—
TRANSPORTATION

Motion:

Move the following:

Approve the following changes to the base:

1. *General Transportation Aid -- Funding Level [Paper 925]*. Provide \$9,794,500 SEG in 1999-00 and \$21,319,400 SEG in 2000-01 to fund increases in the calendar year distributions for both counties and municipalities equal to 6.0% in 1999-00 and 1.0% in 2000-01. In addition, set the calendar year distribution for counties at \$83,469,000 for 2000 and \$84,303,700 for 2001, and thereafter, and for municipalities at \$262,603,400 for 2000 and \$265,229,400 for 2001, and thereafter. Establish the mileage aid rate at \$1,692 per mile for calendar year 2000 and \$1,709 per mile for calendar year 2001, and thereafter. Further, require that payments be made based on the share of costs calculation in the event the amounts calculated under the share of costs and mileage aid components of the transportation aids formula are the same.

Further, for calendar year 2000 and 2001 aid payments, suspend the aid calculation formula and provide the percentage increase in total funding uniformly for all aid recipients, based on their 1999 aid payment amounts.

2. *General Transportation Aid -- Local Highway Mileage [Paper #927, Modification]*. Approve the Governor's recommendation as modified to specify that the changes in jurisdictional mileage would be reflected in transportation aid calculations for the second calendar year following the year in which the plat was certified.

3. *General Transportation Aid -- Law Enforcement Costs. [LFB Summary: Page 579, #3]*. Provide DOT the authority to determine the portion of law enforcement costs to be used in determining transportation aid payments. Require DOT to make this determination in consultation with representatives of local governments and their associations, as appointed by the DOT Secretary. Allow DOT to establish different portions of law enforcement costs for different classes of counties or municipalities. Highway-related law enforcement cost data are part of the three-year and six-year average costs used in determining payments under the general transportation aid formula and are currently calculated as varying percentages of total law enforcement costs, as

outlined in DOT's annual cost reporting manual. Based on the recommendations of the Local Roads and Streets Council, DOT lowered these percentages, effective with 1997 cost data used in the computation of 1999 aid payments. Specify that the portion of law enforcement costs determined by DOT under this provision would first apply to transportation aid amounts calculated for calendar year 2000.

4. *Mass Transit Operating Assistance -- Tier A Funding Level and Formula [Paper #928, Alternatives #A2 and #C (intro)]*. Delete the current tier system and replace it with a tier structure that places the Madison system in one tier and the Milwaukee County and Milwaukee user-side subsidy systems in a separate tier, effective with calendar year 2000 payments. Delete the current formula for distributing aid to these systems and require DOT to distribute the amount specified in statute to the local government providing the local match for each system. Specify that if this local government sponsors more than one system, that the aid shall be distributed between the systems at the discretion of the local government.

Provide \$2,932,200 SEG in 1999-00 and \$6,384,000 SEG in 2000-01 to fully fund 1999 payments and to provide a 7.5% increase in funding, beginning in calendar year 2000, as follows: (a) \$617,900 SEG in 1999-00 and \$1,345,200 SEG in 2000-01 to the tier containing the Madison transit system; and (b) \$2,314,300 SEG in 1999-00 and \$5,038,800 SEG in 2000-01 to the tier containing the Milwaukee County and Milwaukee user-side subsidy transit systems. Set the calendar year distribution amounts at \$14,297,600 for 2000, and thereafter, for the tier containing the Madison transit system and at \$53,555,600 for 2000, and thereafter, for the tier containing the Milwaukee County and Milwaukee user-side subsidy transit systems.

5. *Mass Transit Operating Assistance -- Tier B and C Funding Level, Formula Changes and Basis for Aid [Paper # 929, Alternatives #A1d and #C (intro) and Paper #931, Alternative #1]*

Maintain the current tier structure with separate tiers for Tier B and Tier C systems and provide \$982,700 SEG in 1999-00 and \$2,298,900 SEG in 2000-01 to fully fund 1999 payments and to provide a 7.5% increase in funding, beginning in calendar year 2000, as follows: (a) \$763,300 SEG in 1999-00 and \$1,799,600 SEG in 2000-01 to the current Tier B systems; and (b) \$219,400 SEG in 1999-00 and \$499,300 SEG in 2000-01 to the current Tier C systems. Set the calendar year distribution amounts at \$19,804,200 for 2000, and thereafter, for Tier B systems and at \$5,349,100 for 2000, and thereafter, for Tier C systems.

Allow DOT to require any applicant eligible for Tier B or C transit aid to notify the Department of the amount of federal aid under the applicant's discretion that the applicant intends to apply toward annual operating expenses, including maintenance expenses.

Delete the current law requirement that annual state transit aid payments for Tier B and C be based on estimated operating costs for that year, effective with calendar year 2000 payments. Rather, require that annual transit aid payments be made based on actual operating costs from the second preceding year. Specify that any system beginning or adding service in a year for which an aid payment is made would have to notify DOT of its intent to do so in the year prior to the service

expansion and would have to provide an estimate of the projected annual operating costs for the service expansion. Require DOT to include these costs, to the extent the Department determines they are reasonable, plus the estimated costs of new service in the year preceding the aid payment in the cost base for calculating aid payments, with an adjustment for inflation to make all the aidable costs expressed in the same year's dollars

6. *Mass Transit Operating Assistance -- Local Match Requirements [Paper 930, Alternative #4]*. Specify that DOT may not enter into a mass transit aid contract for any system for calendar year 2000 and thereafter unless the Department has promulgated the administrative rules required under current law for cost-efficiency standards and the contract satisfies the current law requirements related to these standards.

7. *Elderly and Disabled Aid*. Provide increased funding for elderly and disabled specialized transportation services as follows: (a) \$450,800 SEG in 1999-00 and \$933,100 SEG in 2000-01 to provide a 7.0% annual increase in county assistance funding; and (b) \$55,800 SEG in 1999-00 and \$115,600 SEG in 2000-01 to provide a 7.0% annual increase in state funding for capital assistance and \$100,000 FED and \$25,000 SEG-L annually to reflect a reestimate of federal and local funding for capital assistance in the biennium. Further, convert the state aid capital grant appropriation from an annual appropriation to a continuing appropriation. Delete the current requirement that total state and federal funding for a capital assistance project for the elderly and disabled may not exceed 80% of the project costs and, instead, require that: (a) a capital grant may not exceed a percentage of project costs established by a DOT administrative rule; and (b) for the specific types or categories of equipment involved, a capital grant may not exceed the percentage of costs eligible for federal aid. Correct the cross-reference with federal code that is used in determining eligible grant applicants.

8. *Lift Bridge Aid [Paper #932, Alternative #1]*. Provide \$413,400 SEG in 1999-00 and \$75,000 SEG in 2000-01 to increase funding for lift bridge aid to reflect actual 1998 costs and estimated 1999 costs.

9. *Expressway Policing Aid*. Provide \$70,000 SEG annually for expressway policing aids to Milwaukee County.

Approve the following changes to the bill:

10. *Pretrial Intoxicated Driver Intervention Grant Program*. Delete \$150,000 SEG annually from the pretrial intoxicated driver intervention grant program. This action, in conjunction with the Committee's earlier action to provide \$265,000 SEG in 1999-00 and \$464,700 SEG in 2000-01 would provide an above-base increase of \$115,000 in 1999-00 and \$314,700 in 2000-01. This amount, when added to the base funding of \$150,000, would be sufficient to maintain the program at the base level during the biennium if federal safety funds that are currently used for the program are not received.

11. *Freight Rail Assistance -- Interest Rate [Paper #935, Alternative #4]*. Maintain current law by eliminating the provision of the bill that would require DOT to promulgate a rule establishing a minimum interest rate for loans made under the freight rail infrastructure improvement program and the freight rail preservation program.

12. *Richard I. Bong Air Museum [Paper #936, Alternative #2]*. Specify that the \$1,000,000 FED grant in 1999-00 from the transportation enhancements program to the City of Superior for the construction of the Richard I. Bong Air Museum may not exceed 80% (instead of 90% under the bill) of the cost of constructing the museum.

13. *Sixth Street Bridge in Milwaukee -- Funding [Paper #937, Alternative #1]*. Provide \$51,000,000 FED (ICE funds), \$6,500,000 SEG and \$2,500,000 SEG-L in 1999-00 for the accelerated local bridge improvement assistance program. Specify that, notwithstanding current provisions related to the payment of the costs of a bridge under the accelerated local bridge improvement assistance program, the share of the costs paid by the state and local governments for the Sixth Street Bridge shall be as determined by the agreement on the use of the ICE funds.

14. *Sixth Street Bridge in Milwaukee -- Design-Build Contracting*. Permit DOT, subject to the approval of the federal government, to use a design-build contract for the Sixth Street Bridge in Milwaukee, defined as a method of construction under which the engineering, design and construction are provided by a single entity through a competitive selection process that utilizes, at a minimum, qualifications, quality, time of completion and cost as award criteria. Specify that such a contract must be entered into by DOT and approved by the Governor and be subject to the following conditions that currently apply to other DOT construction projects: (a) prevailing wage requirements; and (b) public works lien and performance bond requirements. Specify that to be eligible to participate in the competitive selection process, entities seeking the contract must be prequalified as a contractor and design consultant by the Department. Require DOT to submit a report to the Legislature on the effectiveness of design-build contracting procedures not later than five years after the effective date of the bill.

15. *Town Road Improvement Program -- Discretionary Funds*. Provide \$1,000,000 SEG and \$1,000,000 SEG-L in 1999-00 for the local roads improvement program to fund an increase in the TRIP-D component. Increase the amount that DOT must set aside for the discretionary town road improvement program in 1999-00 from \$500,000 to \$1,500,000.

16. *Local Transportation Facility Improvement Assistance*. Provide \$6,000,000 FED and \$1,500,000 SEG-L in 1999-00 in the local transportation facility improvement assistance appropriation for local highway projects.

17. *State Highway Rehabilitation -- Funding Level [Paper #945]*. Provide an additional \$12,641,700 FED in 1999-00 and \$7,918,800 FED in 2000-01 and delete \$5,941,700 SEG in 1999-00 and \$7,918,800 SEG in 2000-01 for the state highway rehabilitation program to provide a total increase to the bill of \$6,700,000 in 1999-00. The total, above-base increase for the program would be \$13,305,100 in 1999-00 and \$16,153,300 in 2000-01.

18. *Major Highway Development -- Funding Level [Paper #946]*. Provide \$5,900,000 SEG in 1999-00 and \$5,500,000 SEG-S (bonding) in 2000-01 and delete \$5,500,000 SEG in 2000-01 for the major highway development program. This would provide total, above base increases of \$12,121,000 in 1999-00 and \$12,628,700 in 2000-01. Decrease estimated transportation fund revenues by \$75,400 in 2000-01 to reflect increased debt service from the increased use of bonds.

19. *Transportation Fund Reserves [Paper #945 Alternative #2b and Paper #946, Alternative #A3]*. Reduce transportation fund reserves by \$289,500 in 1999-00 and \$723,800 in 2000-01 to subtract reserves calculated for major highway development and state highway rehabilitation program employees whose salaries and fringe benefits are funded with SEG funds. Specify that compensation increases for major highway development and state highway rehabilitation employees whose salaries and fringe benefits are funded with SEG funds, up to the inflationary percentages provided for the major highway development and state highway rehabilitation programs, must be funded within the inflationary funding increases provided for these programs.

20. *State Highway Maintenance and Traffic Operations [Paper #947, Alternative #3]*. Provide \$4,079,300 SEG in 1999-00 and delete \$4,079,300 SEG in 2000-01 to provide equivalent total annual increases of \$7,706,000, which would provide the same total amount of funding for the program over the biennium as the bill.

21. *Federal Highway Aid to Replace SEG Funds*. Provide \$468,400 FED annually and delete \$468,400 SEG annually in the state highway rehabilitation program to reflect a decision to replace SEG funding with federal highway aid saved during previous Committee action. During a May 11 Executive Session on the bill, the Committee replaced \$468,400 of federal highway aid that the bill provided for transportation planning and research with federal discretionary research and transit planning funds, allowing the federal highway funds to be used for other purposes.

22. *Outdoor Advertising Sign Annual Permit Fee [Paper #948, Alternative #B1d]*. Allow DOT to create, by rule, an annual permit fee for outdoor advertising signs. Specify that the failure to pay the fee to renew a sign permit within two months of the time the permit fee is due shall be considered evidence that the sign has been abandoned. In addition, specify that the fees shall be initially established to limit the amount of additional, annual revenue (above the current base of \$21,300), beginning in 2000-01 to \$510,000, which is the amount that would produce enough additional revenue to cover the additional cost of a outdoor advertising computerized inventory system (total fee revenue would be \$531,300).

23. *Transportation Projects Commission*. Move to prohibit DOT from preparing an environmental impact statement or environmental assessment for a potential major highway development project unless the project is approved by the Transportation Projects Commission (TPC), first applying to projects for which DOT commences preliminary engineering or design work or studies on April 1, 2000.

Require DOT to: (a) not later than October 15 of each odd-numbered year, provide a list of potential major highway projects that the Department has initially determined may be recommended to the TPC for approval for preparation of an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment; and (b) not later than March 15 of each even-numbered year, report to the TPC the potential major highway development projects that the Department recommends be approved for preparation of an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment.

Require the TPC, not later than April 15 of each even-numbered year, to approve those potential major highway development projects, if any, for which DOT may begin preparing an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment.

24. *Terminal Tax Distribution [LFB Issue Paper #917 -- Modification].* Reestimate the annual payments from the transportation fund for the terminal tax distribution at \$1,046,300 SEG in 1999-00 and \$1,057,400 SEG in 2000-01, which represent increases of \$190,800 SEG in 1999-00 and \$201,900 SEG in 2000-01.

Note:

[Change to Bill: -\$1,216,100 SEG-REV; \$16,648,700 SEG; \$26,497,300 FED (highway); \$51,000,000 FED (ICE); \$5,000,000 SEG-L; and \$5,500,000 SEG-S]

MO#			
2	BURKE	Y	N A
	DECKER	Y	N A
	JAUCH	Y	N A
	MOORE	Y	N A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
	PLACHE	Y	N A
	COWLES	Y	N A
	PANZER	Y	N A
	GARD	Y	N A
	PORTER	Y	N A
	KAUFERT	Y	N A
	ALBERS	Y	N A
	DUFF	Y	N A
	WARD	Y	N A
	HUBER	Y	N A
	RILEY	Y	N A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Flambeau River Recreational Bridge Enhancements Project in Park Falls

Motion:

Move to require DOT to allocate \$190,400 FED during the 1999-01 biennium from the transportation enhancements program for making a grant to the City of Park Falls for a project known as the Flambeau River Recreational Bridge.

Note:

This motion would require DOT to allocate \$190,400 in transportation enhancements funds for the Flambeau River Recreational Bridge in the City of Park Falls. This amount represents 80% of the total estimated cost of the bridge. The remaining \$47,600 would be paid by the city.

MO#			
2	BURKE	(Y)	N A
	DECKER	(Y)	N A
	JAUCH	(Y)	N A
	MOORE	(Y)	N A
	SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N A
	PLACHE	(Y)	N A
	COWLES	(Y)	N A
	PANZER	(Y)	N A
	GARD	(Y)	N A
	PORTER	(Y)	N A
	KAUFERT	(Y)	N A
	ALBERS	(Y)	N A
	DUFF	(Y)	N A
	WARD	(Y)	N A
	HUBER	(Y)	N A
	RILEY	(Y)	N A

AYE 10 NO 0 ABS _____

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Traffic Signals for USH 8 and 218th Street in St. Croix Falls

Motion:

Move to require DOT to install traffic signals at the intersection of USH 8 and 218th Street in the City of St. Croix Falls.

Note:

DOT estimates that the cost of this project would be about \$100,000 to \$150,000.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Sidewalks Along STH 54 in Wisconsin Rapids

Motion:

Move to require DOT to install sidewalks along both sides of STH 54 northeast of Wisconsin Rapids between 32nd and 48th street and provide \$160,800 SEG in 1999-00 in the state highway rehabilitation appropriation for this purpose.

Note:

DOT recently completed a major highway project between Wisconsin Rapids and Plover, which includes the segment between 32nd and 48th streets. This motion would require DOT to install sidewalks in that segment and provide \$160,800 in the state highway rehabilitation program, which is the estimated cost of the sidewalks.

[Change to Bill: \$160,800 SEG]

MO#			
2	BURKE	(Y)	N A
	DECKER	(Y)	N A
	JAUCH	(Y)	N A
	MOORE	(Y)	N A
	SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N A
	PLACHE	(Y)	N A
	COWLES	(Y)	N A
	PANZER	(Y)	N A
	GARD	(Y)	N A
	PORTER	(Y)	N A
	KAUFERT	(Y)	N A
	ALBERS	(Y)	N A
	DUFF	(Y)	N A
	WARD	(Y)	N A
	HUBER	(Y)	N A
	RILEY	(Y)	N A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Railroad Crossing Gates in Stevens Point

Motion:

Move to require DOT to provide funding for the installation of railroad crossing gates at the intersections of West Clark Street and Water Street with the Wisconsin Central Railroad tracks, both in the City of Stevens Point, and ^{provide} ~~provide~~ \$287,100 SEG in 1999-00, in the railroads crossing improvement and protection installation appropriation for this purpose. Require the City of Stevens Point to provide a local match equal to at least 10% of the installation costs.

Note:

DOT estimates that installing railroad crossing gates with constant warning time circuitry at both the locations in Stevens Point would cost \$319,000. The motion would require DOT to fund up to 90% of the cost of installing crossing gates to replace the existing, flashing light signals and would provide \$287,100 for this purpose (90% x \$319,000 = \$287,100). There are about 25 trains that pass through these crossings per day and about 5,500 vehicles at the West Clark Street crossing and 8,800 vehicles at the Water Street crossing per day.

[Change to Bill: ^{0 SEG} ~~\$287,100 SEG~~]

MO#	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	BURKE	DECKER	JAUCH	MOORE	SHIBILSKI	PLACHE	COWLES	PANZER		GARD	PORTER	KAUFERT	ALBERS	DUFF	WARD	HUBER	RILEY

AYE 12 NO 4 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Reconstruction of STH 59 in Waukesha County

Motion:

Move to permit DOT to reconstruct STH 59 to add lanes between STH 164 on the eastern edge of the City of Waukesha to 124th Street at the eastern Waukesha County line, notwithstanding a statutory provision that prohibits the Department from, within any six-year period, constructing a highway project consisting of separate, contiguous projects, which do not individually qualify as major highway projects, but which in their entirety would constitute a major highway project.

Note:

Under current law, DOT is prohibited from, within any six-year period, constructing a highway project consisting of separate, contiguous projects, which do not individually qualify as major highway projects, but which in their entirety would constitute a major highway project. The motion would allow DOT, notwithstanding this provision, to reconstruct a six-mile segment of STH 59 in Waukesha County to add lanes.

In a highway rehabilitation project scheduled to begin this summer, DOT will upgrade STH 59 from the Waukesha County line to Calhoun Road, a 2.2-mile segment, from two lanes to four lanes. The Department indicates that a 3.8-mile segment from Calhoun Road to STH 164 has been considered for capacity expansion for several years, but disputes over the project between the affected local governments have prevented the project from being constructed. Although the disputes now appear to be resolved, this western segment cannot be constructed as a state highway rehabilitation project because, when combined with the eastern segment, it would involve adding lanes to more than five miles of existing highway. The combined projects, therefore, would be defined as a major highway development project and could not be constructed either as a rehabilitation project (because of the prohibition against constructing contiguous rehabilitation projects that together would be defined as a major highway project) or as a major highway project (because it is not enumerated in the statutes). The motion would allow the western segment to be improved to add lanes under the state highway rehabilitation program. This would be the first exception to this statutory provision since the requirement for enumerating major highway projects was established.

MO# _____

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
2 GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
1 DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 11 NO 0 ABS _____

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Aviation Training Program for Disadvantaged Youth

Motion:

Move to require DOT to administer an aviation career education program to provide training and apprenticeship opportunities associated with aviation careers for socially and economically disadvantaged youth. Create a new, annual SEG appropriation for the program. Transfer \$71,800 SEG annually from DOT's aeronautics assistance appropriation to the new aviation career education appropriation and provide an additional \$23,500 SEG and 1.0 SEG position in 1999-00 and \$66,500 SEG and 1.0 SEG position in 2000-01 in the new appropriation.

Note:

DOT currently administers an aviation career education (ACE) program for school-aged youth under general statutory authority that requires the Department to formulate programs of aviation education and training, and disseminate information regarding such programs in cooperation with educational institutions of the state. Under the program, DOT hires youth as limited term employees (LTEs) to work in part-time jobs with participating aviation employers. In 1998-99, DOT has allocated \$71,800 from the aeronautics assistance appropriation for the program, which is sufficient to hire about 20 LTEs, all of whom are in Milwaukee, and one LTE to administer the program. Until recently, DOT allocated funding sufficient to hire about 10 LTEs in Madison as well, but has reduced funding for the program so that currently there are no participants in Madison.

This motion would create specific authorization for a disadvantaged youth aviation career education program, create an appropriation for the program and provide funding, through transfers and new funding, sufficient for DOT to hire 10 participants in Madison and 30 in Milwaukee, starting in June, 2000. In addition, the motion would create a permanent position to administer the program. The current LTE position for the administration of the program is due to expire at the end of the summer of 1999.

[Change to Bill: \$90,000 SEG and 1.0 SEG position]

10/10/54

2/11/54

1/1/54

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AVE 16 NO 0 ABS

minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...

minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...

minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...

minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...

minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...

minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...
minutes meeting of ...

minutes meeting of ...

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Railroad Crossing Gate on Swarthout Road Near Fall River

Motion:

Move to require DOT to fund the installation of railroad crossing gates, from the railroad crossing improvement appropriation, at the intersection of Swarthout Road and the Canadian Pacific railroad tracks northwest of Fall River in Columbia County.

Note:

The installation of railroad crossing gates typically costs about \$130,000. The Office of the Commissioner of Railroads plans to conduct a hearing on whether to close this crossing sometime in the next several months. There are about 25 trains daily on this line and an average of 79 vehicles per day that travel across the crossing.

MO#			
	BURKE	Y	N A
	DECKER	Y	N A
	JAUCH	Y	N A
	MOORE	Y	N A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
	PLACHE	Y	N A
	COWLES	Y	N A
	PANZER	Y	N A
2	GARD	Y	N A
	PORTER	Y	N A
	KAUFERT	Y	N A
1	ALBERS	Y	N A
	DUFF	Y	N A
	WARD	Y	N A
	HUBER	Y	N A
	RILEY	Y	N A

AYE 9 NO 7 ABS _____

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Allocation of Federal Highway Safety Funds

Motion:

Move to require DOT, when selecting projects for funding with federal hazard elimination safety funds, to consider the public safety benefits of proposed projects that reduce the response time of emergency vehicles.

Note:

DOT allocates federal hazard elimination safety funds based on a consideration of the traffic safety benefits of proposed projects. Using this procedure, projects that would result in the greatest reduction in traffic accidents are given the highest priority for funding. This motion would require DOT to consider the public safety benefits that would result from a project that may not necessarily have a large impact on the number of traffic accidents, but would reduce the response time of emergency vehicles.

MO#			
BURKE	(Y)	N	A
DECKER	(Y)	N	A
JAUCH	(Y)	N	A
MOORE	(Y)	N	A
SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N	A
PLACHE	(Y)	N	A
COWLES	(Y)	N	A
PANZER	(Y)	N	A
GARD	(Y)	N	A
PORTER	(Y)	N	A
KAUFERT	(Y)	N	A
ALBERS	(Y)	N	A
DUFF	(Y)	N	A
WARD	(Y)	N	A
HUBER	(Y)	N	A
RILEY	(Y)	N	A

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Study of the Conversion of Tolles Road in Rock County to a State Highway

Motion:

Move to require DOT, not later than June 30, 2000, to conduct a study on whether Tolles Road in Rock County should be a state trunk highway and to report the results of the study to the Governor and Legislature.

Note:

Tolles Road is a 4.5-mile town road in the Town of Porter in Rock County. The road is classified as a minor collector road on the basis of traffic volume and function. Normally, major and minor collector roads are county highways.

MO#			
	BURKE	(Y)	N A
	DECKER	(Y)	N A
	JAUCH	(Y)	N A
	MOORE	(Y)	N A
	SHIBILSKI	(Y)	N A
	PLACHE	(Y)	N A
	COWLES	(Y)	N A
	PANZER	(Y)	N A
2	GARD	(Y)	N A
	PORTER	(Y)	N A
	KAUFERT	(Y)	N A
1	ALBERS	(Y)	N A
	DUFF	(Y)	N A
	WARD	(Y)	(N) A
	HUBER	(Y)	N A
	RILEY	(Y)	N A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

Little Lake Butte des Morts Trestle Trail Causeway

Motion:

Move to ^{baseline} provide \$80,000 FED in the transportation enhancements program for the Little Lake Butte des Morts Trestle Trail Causeway and require DOT to provide this amount or 50% of the total project cost, whichever is less, to the City of Menasha.

Note:

This motion would require DOT to provide a transportation enhancements grant to the City of Menasha for a project known as the Little Lake Butte des Morts Trestle Trail Causeway and would provide \$80,000 FED in the transportation enhancements appropriation for this project. The amount of the grant would be limited to \$80,000 or 50% of the project cost, whichever is less. For most enhancements projects, the local sponsor must pay only 20% of the cost of a project. The total estimated cost of this project is \$160,000.

[Change to Bill: ^{0 FED} ~~\$80,000 FED~~]

MO#			
	BURKE	Y	N A
	DECKER	Y	N A
	JAUCH	Y	N A
	MOORE	Y	N A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
	PLACHE	Y	N A
	COWLES	Y	N A
	PANZER	Y	N A
2	GARD	Y	N A
	PORTER	Y	N A
1	KAUFERT	Y	N A
	ALBERS	Y	N A
	DUFF	Y	N A
	WARD	Y	N A
	HUBER	Y	N A
	RILEY	Y	N A

AYE 10 NO 0 ABS 0

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Signs On USH 41 for the Hartford Heritage Auto Museum

Motion:

Move to require DOT, at the Department's expense, to erect signs along USH 41 near the interchange with STH 60 that directs motorists to the Hartford Heritage Auto Museum.

MO#			
	BURKE	Y	N A
	DECKER	Y	N A
	JAUCH	Y	N A
	MOORE	Y	N A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
	PLACHE	Y	N A
	COWLES	Y	N A
	PANZER	Y	N A
2	GARD	Y	N A
	PORTER	Y	N A
	KAUFERT	Y	N A
	ALBERS	Y	N A
	DUFF	Y	N A
	WARD	Y	N A
	HUBER	Y	N A
	RILEY	Y	N A
	AYE	16	NO 0 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- TRANSPORTATION FINANCE

Motor Fuel Tax Exemption for Local Governments

Motion:

Move to exempt a county, city, village, town or school district in this state that purchases and uses gasoline, diesel or alternate fuels in vehicles owned by the local unit of government from paying the excise tax imposed on those fuels, effective with fuel purchased on January 1, 2001.

Reduce estimated transportation fund revenues by \$7,000,000 in ^{July 1, 2001} 2000-01 to reflect this exemption.

Note:

Under current law, an excise tax is generally imposed on gasoline, diesel and alternate fuels received by a fuel supplier for sale in the state. The fuel tax rate is adjusted annually on April 1, based on the change in the Consumer Price Index. Receipts are deposited to the transportation fund. Currently, exemptions are granted for certain uses of motor fuel. Purchasers of fuel for use in some exempted purposes do not have to pay the tax, while those purchasing taxed fuel for other nonhighway purposes are allowed to file a claim with DOR for a refund of the tax.

The motor vehicle fuel tax is expected to generate \$802.9 million in 1999-00 and \$824.4 million in 2000-01. The motion would reduce these amounts by \$7.0 million in 2000-01. On an ongoing basis, the motion would reduce revenues by \$14.2 million annually, based on the estimated 26.9 cents per gallon fuel tax rate for 2001.

[Change to Base: -\$7,000,000 SEG-REV]

[Change to Bill: -\$7,000,000 SEG-REV]

CONFIDENTIAL

1954

...

The following is a list of names and their corresponding status...

MO#	NAME	STATUS
A	BURKE	A
A	DECKER	A
A	JAUCH	A
A	MOORE	A
A	SHIBILSKI	A
A	PLACHE	A
A	COWLES	A
A	PANZER	A
A	GARD	A
A	PORTER	A
A	KAUFERT	A
A	ALBERS	A
A	DUFF	A
A	WARD	A
A	HUBER	A
A	RILEY	A

AYE 4 NO 12 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- LOCAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS

State Match for Discretionary Airport Grants for Fencing

Motion:

Move to require DOT to provide a 20% match from the aeronautics assistance SEG appropriation for any federal funds received during the 1999-01 biennium for the construction of airport perimeter fencing.

Note:

This motion would require DOT to provide a 20% SEG match for any federal discretionary airport funds provided for the construction of airport perimeter fencing.

MO#			
2	BURKE	Y	N A
	DECKER	Y	N A
1	JAUCH	Y	N A
	MOORE	Y	N A
	SHIBILSKI	Y	N A
	PLACHE	Y	N A
	COWLES	Y	N A
	PANZER	Y	N A
	GARD	Y	N A
	PORTER	Y	N A
	KAUFERT	Y	N A
	ALBERS	Y	N A
	DUFF	Y	N A
	WARD	Y	N A
	HUBER	Y	N A
	RILEY	Y	N A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS _____

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Signs and Commercial Activities Within Highway Rights-of-Way

Motion:

Move to permit DOT, as part of a build-operate-lease or transfer agreement for the construction or operation of a transportation facility, to exempt a private entity from the prohibition against: (a) conducting a commercial enterprise within or on property acquired for, or designated as, a controlled-access highway; and (b) placing a sign, other than a sign necessary for the guidance or warning of traffic, within the limits of any street or highway. Specify that DOT may only exempt a private entity from these restrictions if the Department: (a) determines that such an exemption advances the public interest; and (b) specifies any requirements, as part of the build-operate-lease agreement, that the Department determines will practicably advance the purposes of those restrictions.

Note:

Under current law, DOT is authorized to enter into build-operate-lease or transfer agreements for the construction of transportation facilities or for the operation and maintenance of transportation facilities if those facilities are not purchased by the state upon completion. DOT is required to include several provisions in any such agreement. This motion would allow DOT to include a provision that exempts the private entity from restrictions against conducting commercial activities within the highway right-of-way and against placing signs within the limits of any street or highway.

MO#	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A	A
	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N	N
	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
	BURKE	DECKER	JAUCH	MOORE	SHIBILSKI	PLACHE	COWLES	PANZER		GARD	PORTER	KAUFERT	ALBERS	DUFF	WARD	HUBER	RILEY

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Sign on I-43 for Black Holocaust Museum

Motion:

Move to require DOT, at the Department's expense, to erect and maintain a sign along I-43 that directs motorists to ~~the~~ Black Holocaust Museum.

Americas

MO#			
2 BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 13 NO 3 ABS _____

TRANSPORTATION -- STATE HIGHWAY PROGRAM

Study of USH 8 Alternatives in Barron, Polk, Price and Rusk Counties

Motion:

Move to require DOT, not later than June 30, 2001, to conduct a corridor study for USH 8 in Barron, Polk, Price and Rusk Counties and to report the results of the study to the Governor and Legislature.

Note:

USH 8 runs east-west in northern Wisconsin. This motion would require DOT to study alternatives for making transportation improvements on the portion of USH 8 in the western part of the state.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
JAUCH	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
COWLES	Y	N	A
PANZER	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
PORTER	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
RILEY	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS