

27n/2

(Base) Agency: DATCP - County Fair Aids

Recommendations:

Burke - 1

Paper No. 221: Alternative 1

Comments: You need to cough up some GPR here because the constitutional amendment regarding lottery proceeds said all the money has to go to property tax relief. Alternative 1 is the amount that is currently being distributed and I don't see any reason to go above that (i.e. alternative 2). We would be increasing county fair aids under alternative 2.

prepared by: Barry



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 4, 1999

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #221

County Fair Aids (DATCP)

CURRENT LAW

DATCP provides county and district fair aids to each county and any organized agricultural society, association or board in the state in an amount equal to 95% of the first \$8,000 actually paid in net premiums and 70% of all net premiums that exceed \$8,000 up to a \$15,000 maximum amount. If premium reimbursement requests exceed available funding, DATCP is required to prorate the amount of aids provided to each fair. Funds for fair aids have been provided from a GPR sum sufficient appropriation capped at \$585,000 and a pari-mutuel racing supplemental aid appropriation capped at \$650,000 PR annually from which available program revenues reduce the GPR funding available dollar-for-dollar.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Due to a Constitutional amendment requiring all state pari-mutuel revenues be directed toward property tax relief, county and district fair aids can no longer be funded from pari-mutuel supplemental aid and instead will be funded entirely from GPR. Fair aids are capped at \$585,000 GPR while base funding is \$264,600 annually. Allocating an additional \$320,400 GPR annually would provide county fair aids at the full \$585,000 GPR annually.

2. The effect of the Constitutional change on county and district fair aids is to cap the amount of aids received by counties at a total of \$585,000 GPR annually. Total fair aids were previously capped at \$585,000 GPR. However, if pari-mutuel revenue exceeded \$585,000, fair aids were capped at the amount of pari-mutuel revenue available or \$650,000, whichever was less. For example, DATCP received \$611,900 in pari-mutuel revenue in 1998-99 and with a continuing

balance of \$127,673, had \$739,573 available in 1998-99. Therefore, \$650,000 in program revenues was expended for county fair aids. Some argue that county and district fair aids should be funded at a level that would ensure the maximum that could have been available from pari-mutuel revenues. Providing an additional \$385,400 GPR annually would provide county fair aids of \$650,000 GPR annually

3. Without the Constitutional change, it is estimated that DATCP would have had \$582,200 in pari-mutuel revenue available in 1999-2000. Thus, 1999 county and district fairs would have been expected to receive \$582,200 in pari-mutuel revenues and \$2,800 GPR, for a total of \$585,000 in state aids. The following table shows expenditures for aids to county and district fairs for 1987-88 through 1998-99.

**Expenditures for Aid
to County and District Fairs
1987-88 through 1998-99**

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Expenditures GPR</u>	<u>Expenditures Pari-mutuel Aid</u>	<u>Total Expenditures</u>
1987-88	\$354,200	\$0	\$354,200
1988-89	368,200	0	368,200
1989-90	367,800	0	367,800
1990-91	400,700*	142,500	543,200
1991-92	0	649,900	649,900
1992-93	0	560,300	560,300
1993-94	0	691,200	691,200
1994-95	601,300*	48,700	650,000
1995-96	585,000	0	585,000
1996-97	0	613,700	613,700
1997-98	0	585,000	585,000
1998-99	0	650,000	650,000

* Includes one-time GPR supplements of \$32,200 in 1990-91 and \$232,800 in 1994-95.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Provide \$320,400 GPR annually to reestimate base funding for county and district fair aids at \$585,000 annually (the maximum GPR available under current law).

<u>Alternative 1</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$640,800
[Change to Bill]	640,800]

2. Provide \$385,400 GPR annually to fund county and district fair aids at \$650,000 annually (the maximum available from pari-mutuel revenues under prior law).

<u>Alternative 2</u>	<u>GPR</u>
1999-01 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$770,800
[Change to Bill]	770,800]

Prepared by: David Schug

MO# 111 1

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
JAUCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COWLES	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PANZER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

2 GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PORTER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
RILEY	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Sound-aided Foliar Plant Growth System

Motion:

Move to require DATCP to study the effectiveness of sound-aided foliar plant growth systems as a fertilizer and growth enhancer and to promulgate rules to allow the use of sound-aided foliar plant growth systems in the state.

Note:

DATCP has previously denied a request to allow the distribution of sound-aided foliar plant growth systems for ginseng.

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

AYE 4 NO 12 ABS _____

AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Retail Food Establishment Inclusion of Cider Establishments

Motion:

Require that a retail food establishment that is primarily engaged in selling cider produced by the establishment obtain a retail food establishment license.

Note:

Retail food establishment operators, excluding restaurants, are required to purchase an annual license. Both the statutes and DATCP administrative rules currently exempt from licensing requirements retail food establishments that are primarily engaged in selling cider produced by the operator of the retail food establishment; these establishments do not pay any licensing fees. Retail food establishments with annual food sales of under \$25,000 are required to pay an annual license fee of \$40 and a reinspection fee of \$40. Establishments annually selling \$25,000 or more are required to pay fees ranging from \$80 to \$450, depending on annual food sales, reinspections and weights and measures fees.

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

AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Agricultural Engineering Practitioner Certification

Motion:

Move to allow an agricultural engineering practitioner who previously has been certified at a job class level by DATCP or the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service, to certify for funding purposes that design specifications for an agricultural engineering practice under that job class level comply with DATCP standards and that an agricultural engineering practice under that job class level has been constructed or installed according to an approved design, and according to applicable standards and specifications, without requiring the agricultural engineering practitioner to receive recertification.

Note:

Current administrative rules require that agricultural engineering practitioners must be recertified for each project they oversee.

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 _____ NO _____ ABS _____

AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

Consumer Protection Assessment Revenue Cap

[Page 102, Item #20]

Motion:

Move to approve the Governor's recommendation. In addition, require that any revenue received that exceeds \$85,000 annually, be deposited in the general fund.

Note:

If the state collected significantly higher than average fines and forfeitures from violations relating to consumer protection in a year, any amount over \$85,000 would be deposited to the general fund rather than to the DATCP PR account. Allowing the Department to collect up to \$85,000 annually while the annual appropriation (expenditure authority) is \$75,000 would allow for some annual variability in revenue (some years may be lower than \$75,000) while maintaining a sufficient account balance to fund appropriated levels.

MO#			
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
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 0

AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
3	Soil and Water Resource Management Bonding
4	Land and Water Resource Engineer Staff
7	Agrichemical Management Fees
13	Agricultural Resource Management Gifts
18	Livestock and Aquaculture Inspection
19	Dog Licenses and Rabies Control
20	Consumer Protection Assessment
21	Trade and Consumer Protection Positions
22	Ginseng Fees
27	Information Sales Position
28	Health and Safety Officer
29	Debt Service Reestimate
30	Management Services
31	Information Technology
33	Milk Standards Program

LFB Summary Item to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
5	Farmland Preservation Modifications and Acreage Credits

LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

<u>Item #</u>	<u>Title</u>
6	Land and Water Resource Management Plans
23	Meat Processing
24	Hazardous Foods
25	Mercury Thermometers