

Committee Name:
Joint Committee – Finance
(JC–Fi)

Appointments

99hr_JC–Fi_Appt_pt00

Committee Hearings

99hr_JC–Fi_CH_pt00

Committee Reports

99hr_JC–Fi_CR_pt00

Clearinghouse Rules

99hr_JC–Fi_CRule_99–

Executive Sessions

99hr_JC–Fi_ES_pt00

Hearing Records

99hr_ab0000

99hr_sb0000

Misc.

99hr_JC–Fi__Misc__s.13.10_pt06b2

Record of Committee Proceedings

99hr_JC–Fi_RCP_pt00

Agency: UW-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics

Recommendations:

Agenda Item V: Alternatives 1 and 2.

Separate vote

Comments: This is an area of UW funding that has to disturb even the most ardent UW apologist. Primarily program revenue, the spending appears to be lavish.

- \$491,000 for clubhouse improvements at University Ridge golf course.
- The Kohl center is a revenue drain, not a positive addition (they want \$1.8 million for additional costs).
- Camp Randall revenue is \$1.3 million below projections.
- Salary increases (4.5 and 3.5%) appear many others.

Essentially, this is water under the dam. The money is all pretty much spent. Only a few months remain. The committee can take heart that an audit appears impending.

Alternative 2 attempts to establish a more sane way of budgeting for this department, giving JFC some oversight and requiring future athletic budgets to be included in the governor's biennial budget proposal.

Prepared by: Bob



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 21, 1999

TO: Members
Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: University of Wisconsin-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics: Section 16.515 Request for Expenditure Authority -- Agenda Item V

INTRODUCTION

On February 19, 1999, a s. 16.515 request was submitted to the Joint Committee on Finance from the Department of Administration (DOA), recommending an overall increase in expenditure authority for three appropriations related to the UW-Madison Division of Intercollegiate Athletics (Division). The first item would provide \$5,062,800 PR to the s. 20.285(5)(h) appropriation for UW-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics auxiliaries in 1998-99, which is used to fund the operations of the Division. If approved, total funding would be \$36,049,400 PR in 1998-99, excluding carryover funds. The second recommended item would increase the s. 20.285(5)(i) appropriation by \$67,400 PR for non-income sports, which funds parking expenses and student scholarships. If approved, non-income sports spending authority would be \$395,000 PR in 1998-99. Lastly, DOA's recommendation would decrease the s. 20.285(5)(j) gifts and grants appropriation by \$1,956,000 PR. If approved, the total gifts and grants appropriation would be \$3,958,800 PR in 1998-99.

The Co-Chairs of the Committee, in a letter to the Secretary of DOA on March 11, 1999, indicated that an objection has been raised to this request and that the Committee would schedule a meeting to consider the matter. This item has been included on the agenda for the Committee's s. 13.10 meeting.

BACKGROUND

Expenditure and position authority for the Division's budget is typically provided through the s. 16.515/505 process rather than the biennial budget. While the Division initially approves its budget in the spring of each year, it submits its request for additional expenditure authority to DOA at the end of the football season, when it has information about revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year. At its June, 1991, s. 13.10 meeting the Joint Committee on Finance approved a motion to require that any expenditure increases requested by the Division be submitted to DOA no later than December of the fiscal year for which the request is being made. DOA then reviews the request and forwards its recommendation to the Joint Committee on Finance, which reviews the request under a 14-day passive review.

The Division submitted its 1998-99 budget request to DOA on November 20, 1998. In addition, in July of 1998, the Division submitted a s. 16.505/515 request for additional positions and associated expenditure authority in 1998-99. Staff from the Division indicated that it sought approval for these positions and funding at that time because the annual budget approval process in December would not provide the Division with sufficient time to hire the positions for the 1998-99 academic year. The Joint Committee on Finance approved DOA's recommendations for additional expenditure authority of \$247,400 PR and 15.0 PR positions for the Division in September of 1998.

ANALYSIS

Athletics Division Expenditures

As a part of the UW-Madison Intercollegiate Athletics s. 16.515 request, expenditure authority is requested for the following purposes identified below by each appropriation. These budget increases include a 4.5% pay plan increase for unclassified staff and a 3.5% pay plan increase for classified staff.

Athletics Division Operations. The appropriation for UW-Madison athletics auxiliary enterprises is currently \$30,986,600 PR for 1998-99, excluding carry-over funds from the previous fiscal year. The increase of \$5,062,800 PR in 1998-99 recommended by DOA would bring the Division's funding for operations to \$36,049,400. The Division's budget provides for total increases under this appropriation of \$6,146,300; however, carryover funds and moneys already provided by the Legislature this year reduces the additional funding needed to \$5,062,800. The major components of the total proposed expenditure increase for Division operations include:

Clinics and Special Events (\$1,905,600). Includes funding increases due to the Hockey Showcase and Hockey Hall of Fame game expenses, projected enrollment increases in UW athletic camps, projected increases in costs for special events including costs for concessions and catering, and increased costs of events and parking at the Kohl Center.

Event Management (\$1,799,100). Provides increased expenditure authority to reflect additional costs associated with men's and women's basketball and hockey games held at the Kohl Center and concessions and catering costs.

Other Sports -- Increases (\$720,900). Provides additional expenditure authority for men's and women's track, cross-country, tennis, golf, soccer, basketball and swimming/diving; women's crew, light crew, volleyball, spirit squad and hockey; and men's wrestling.

Other Sports -- Decreases (-\$309,900). Reduces expenditure authority for men's hockey, football and men's crew.

Support Services (\$715,400). Includes increased expenditure authority for video services, sports medicine and medical payments, Kohl Center operations, the compliance office, mail room, budget and finance, administration, facilities maintenance, academic and student services, equipment room, strength and conditioning, sports information, marketing and the ticket office.

Unitwide Overhead Costs (\$628,400). Provides additional expenditure authority primarily for the Coliseum annual payment, credit card processing fees, taxes, utilities and insurance, certain capital projects including the McClain Center roof and stadium repairs.

University Ridge Golf Course (\$491,100). Provides additional expenditure authority for the University Ridge Golf Course clubhouse improvements.

Computer Services (\$195,700). Includes additional expenditure authority for salary and fringe benefits based on demand requirements and funding for computer replacement and upgrades.

Non-Income Sports Expenditure Increases. The non-income sports expenditure authority request of \$67,400 PR would fund parking related expenses for games and special events, such as supplies, contract costs and salaries. If approved, the appropriation would total \$395,000; \$100,800 would fund parking related expenses and \$294,200 would fund scholarships for women's and men's swimming/diving, men's wrestling and women's soccer.

Gifts and Grants. In 1997-98, the Division received a one-time appropriation increase of \$31,729,200 PR, over its base of \$5,914,800 excluding carryover funds, for a total gifts and grants allotment of \$37,644,000 to fund the construction costs of the Kohl Center. The Division's current request and DOA's recommendations would delete an additional \$1,956,000 PR in 1998-99. Under DOA's recommendation, the total appropriation for the gifts and grants appropriation would be \$3,958,800 PR in 1998-99. The reduced expenditure authority reflects the completion of the construction of the Kohl Center.

Athletics Division Revenues

Revenues received by the Division are from a variety of sources. Revenues for auxiliary enterprises are primarily from sports ticket sales, radio and television contracts, NCAA revenue sharing, marketing, promotions, licensing and concessions. Non-income sports revenues are generated from parking fees assessed during sporting events. Revenues for the gifts and grant appropriation are raised through Division fundraisers, anonymous donations and pledges from basketball fans who purchase premium season tickets. In addition, \$576,400 GPR in 1998-99 is appropriated for the Division. In its 1998-99 budget for submission in November, the Division estimated total revenues from all funds would be approximately \$43,681,100 and expenditures would be approximately \$43,977,800. Excluding expenditures of \$500,000, from restricted funds, for improvements to the University Golf Course clubhouse, the Division estimated a positive ending balance of \$203,300 for 1998-99.

However, in February, 1999, the Division projected an overall deficit in 1998-99 of approximately \$1.1 million. Although operating revenues are now projected to be higher than originally anticipated, this will be offset by higher than anticipated capital expenditures and fundraising shortfalls. Specifically, the Division cites the additional one-time capital costs associated with the: (a) McClain Center artificial turf (\$300,000); (b) Goodman Softball field expansion project (\$200,000); (c) McClain Center chiller temporary replacement (\$150,000); and (d) additional Kohl Center construction costs (\$300,000). In addition, fundraising for the Goodman Softball field was approximately \$550,000 less than projected. The Division has indicated that it will fund the \$1.1 million shortfall from its reserve fund.

Reserve Balance

In response to the financial difficulties of the Athletics Department in the late 1980s, UW System and UW-Madison policies required that the Division maintain an adequate unencumbered reserve balance to be held against operating expenses, debt service and deferred repairs and maintenance/capital assets requirements. The actual reserve total for 1997-98 was \$3.9 million. The budgeted reserve balance for 1998-99, taking into account the recent deficit projections, is estimated to be \$2.8 million. The Division's 1998-99 budget includes a target reserve level, once the Kohl Center is fully operational, of approximately \$7.6 million.

1999-00 Budget

On February 26, 1999, the Athletics Board approved the Division's 1999-00 budget. The budget as approved projects a \$600,000 deficit for 1999-00 that would be funded from the reserve balance. If there are no variances to the most recent 1998-99 and 1999-00 budget projections, the reserve balance at the close of 1999-00 would be approximately \$2.2 million.

AB 133 -- Governor's Budget Recommendations for 1999-01

The Governor's 1999-01 biennial budget recommends providing an additional \$794,000 PR in 1999-00 and \$1,616,500 PR in 2000-01 for UW-Madison intercollegiate athletics. Of these amounts, the Executive Budget Book indicates that \$327,400 in 1999-00 and \$644,700 in 2000-01 would be provided for classified and unclassified salaries and \$75,000 in 1999-00 and \$152,200 in 2000-01 for fringe benefits related to projected annual salary increases of 3%. In addition, a funding increase of \$391,600 in 1999-00 and \$799,600 in 2000-01 would be provided for supplies and services, which would represent a 2.5% annual increase. If approved by the Legislature as part of the biennial budget process, these amounts would not be included in the Division's annual budget requests, rather the Division would only request adjustments to this funding, if needed.

Current Budget Process

Under the budget process established for the Division in 1991, current year budgets for the Division are reviewed half way through the fiscal year. However, this year, the 1998-99 Division budget request, which was sent to DOA on November 20, 1998, was not submitted to the Committee until the middle of February and will not be acted upon until April, 1999. Since by this time most of the items in the request have been implemented, obligated or spent and the Division indicates that there are sufficient reserve funds to cover the newly-projected deficit, it appears the most reasonable alternative available is to approve the request. With the current fiscal year almost ended, it would be difficult for the Division to reduce 1998-99 expenditures with only two full months remaining in the fiscal year.

Given this situation, the Committee may wish to consider modifying the current budget setting process for the Division. As noted above, the Division's 1999-00 budget has already been approved by the Athletics Board and is expected to be acted upon by the Board of Regents in July. Therefore, arguably the Division's budget could be submitted and reviewed prior to the end of November.

However, recent actions by the Athletics Division may affect when the Committee decides to review the Division's 1999-00 budget. The Division is currently in the process of reviewing its financial operations and putting together a long-term financial forecast. As part of this process the Division intends to: (a) generate a five-year financial forecast using the Board approved 1999-00 budget as the base year; (b) implement an internal accounting system to accurately and timely record and provide financial information to unit managers; (c) perform a detailed review of all Division spending based on staffing and operational priorities identified in its strategic plan; (d) review, analyze and streamline Booster Club and fundraising revenues; (e) develop and implement an equitable football preferential seating program to be introduced by December, 1999; (f) implement measures which would insure construction does not begin on capital projects until financing sources are identified and approved; and (g) develop and implement a comprehensive fundraising plan, over the next three to five years, that generates funds for capital maintenance and construction projects and the Division's operating budget.

Information from these actions could assist the Committee in reviewing the financial position of the Division. Included in the review of the Division's spending, the Division indicates it will perform a detailed review of all budgets. In addition, it will compile a comprehensive list of expenditures that could be reduced and an overall profile of all the sports teams including a summary of eligible services/expenses that would be associated with each sport. The Division intends to submit final report

The Committee could by the end of October of 1999 operational priorities; and budgeting for the Division. submit its 1999-00 and 2000 reported and the funding request as part of its December Committee would set the Division the biennial budget process. budget, as other state agencies annual budget.

Finally, if after review an independent assessment could recommend that the Committee the Division's financial position

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 12 NO 4 ABS 0

MO# Alt 1

BURKE	2	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

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the DOA recommendations to: (a) increase the s. 20.285(5)(h) appropriation by \$5,062,800 PR in 1998-99; (b) increase the 20.285(5)(i) appropriation by \$67,400 PR in 1998-99; and (c) decrease the s. 20.285(5)(j) appropriation by \$1,956,000 PR in 1998-99.
2. In addition to alternative 1, require the Division to report to the Committee and DOA by October 31, 1999, the following: (a) the five-year financial forecast for the Division; (b) the results of a detailed review of all athletic budgets, including a list of expenditures that could be reduced, and an overall profile of all the sports teams including a summary of eligible services and/or expenses that would be associated with each sport; (c) any other long-term budget actions reviewed, developed or implemented by the Athletics Board that could affect future budgets for the Division; and (d) its 1999-01 budget request. Direct DOA to submit its recommendations on the Division's s. 16.515/505 request by November 30, 1999, so that the Committee can review the request and set the Division's biennial budget as part of the Committee's December, 1999, meeting, if the Committee determines that a meeting is required. Further, request that the Division, beginning for the 2001-03 biennium, prepare biennial budget requests for inclusion in the Governor's biennial budget bill.

Prepared by: Tricia Collins

Agency: Health and Family Services

Recommendations:

Agenda Item VI – Expenditure Plan for Income Augmentation Funds

Alternative: The following items under **Alternative II:**

A1 – WI Resource Center

Comments: This alternative holds the WI Resource Center harmless for the 2% GPR reductions required by Act 27. Alternative 3 is the next best option, which requires a 2% reduction for only the last 2 months of the FY, but allows DHFS to be creative in finding ways to fund this.

B3 – Special Needs Adoption

Comments: This alternative provides additional funding to ensure the completion of 100 special needs adoptions beginning June 1. Any other options will significantly reduce the number of adoptions that can be completed and will increase not only the backlog, but the amount of funding DHFS will need in the budget for these adoptions.

C1 – Mental Health Institutes Cash Deficit

Comments: This will either increase GPR balance or reduce borrowing.

D2 – Fiscal Management and Payroll Processing

Comments: They've already completed most of the computer programming changes they've identified here.

E3 – Care and Treatment Facilities Administrative Overhead

Comments: This will help DHFS support IT infrastructure costs for Division of Care and Treatment Facilities

F1 – Women's Health Conference

Comments: While they have this request in the budget, they'd like to hold this conference in June. Even if it passes in the budget, that won't give them time necessary to plan the conference. If we give them this, they can do the June conference and then if they get their budget request, they can use that money for a conference in 2000.

Prepared by: Cindy



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 21, 1999

TO: Members
Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Health and Family Services: Expenditure Plan for Income Augmentation Funds --
Agenda Item VI

Under s. 46.46 of the statutes, if the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) proposes to use any income augmentation funds for any purpose other than to support costs that are exclusively related to the operational costs of augmenting federal income, DHFS must submit a plan for the proposed use of the funds to the Secretary of the Department of Administration (DOA). Upon approval, the DOA Secretary is directed to forward the plan to the Committee for its review under a 14-day passive review process.

On February 24, 1999, the DOA Secretary submitted a request for the Committee to approve a DHFS plan to expend federal income augmentation funds totaling \$1,209,700 for various DHFS activities. Under the plan, \$222,400 would lapse to the general fund in 1998-99. On March 12, 1999, the Co-Chairs notified DOA Secretary Bugher that this matter would be considered at a future meeting of the Committee.

Background

Income augmentation funds are unanticipated federal funds DHFS receives under Titles IV-E (foster care), XIX (Medicaid) and XVIII (Medicare) of the federal Social Security Act as reimbursement for costs that were initially paid with state or local revenue, or revenue from one of these sources that would not otherwise have been available, had it not been for activities conducted specifically to augment federal income.

Income augmentation funds do not, however, include unanticipated federal Title IV-E funds that must be distributed to counties in order to meet the statutory community aids basic county allocation. Income augmentation funds also do not include at least 50% of the unanticipated Title IV-E funds DHFS receives under Title IV-E, since under current law, these funds are distributed to

counties as incentive funds. These incentive funds are provided to counties in order to encourage counties to adopt practices which are intended to augment federal income available under Title IV-E. The remainder of any unanticipated Title IV-E funds are deposited in the federal income augmentation appropriation in the DHFS Division of Management and Technology. To date, the income augmentation funds received by DHFS have almost exclusively been received as a result of unanticipated Title IV-E funds received by the state.

Distribution of Unanticipated Federal Revenue

The plan submitted by DHFS included expenditures for 1998-99 and the 1999-01 biennium. However, DOA is requesting the Committee to approve \$1,209,700 in expenditure authority for 1998-99 only. The administration's plan for expenditure of income augmentation funds in the 1999-01 biennium is included in the Governor's budget bill. Based on the plan submitted, an additional \$222,400 would lapse to the general fund by June 30, 1999.

For the period July, 1997 through March, 1998, DHFS collected unanticipated federal funds under Title IV-E, Medicaid and Medicare totaling \$18,933,900. The table on the following page identifies how this unanticipated federal revenue would be distributed under the DOA plan. Each of the following sections describes how the \$18,933,900 would be distributed.

Maximus Fee. Unanticipated federal revenues are available to the state as a result of income augmentation activities conducted by Maximus, Inc., a private firm under contract with DHFS to conduct income augmentation activities. Under the terms of this contract, Maximus receives 10% of all collections received as a result of its income augmentation activities.

Community Aids Commitment. After accounting for the Maximus fee, DHFS must credit any unanticipated Title IV-E foster care funds received as reimbursement for counties' foster care costs in the community aids appropriation, up to the amounts included in the statutory community aids basic county allocation. Of the unanticipated federal revenue collected under Title IV-E from July, 1997 through March, 1998, DHFS distributed \$5,632,000 to fulfill the statutory commitment of Title IV-E funds for the basic county allocation for calendar year 1997. This funding does not represent an increase in the basic county allocation; rather it is used to support the existing commitment.

Title IV-E Incentive Funds. Under current law, if, on December 31 of any year, there remains any unspent or unencumbered funds in the community aids basic county allocation that exceed the amount received under Title IV-E and distributed to counties, DHFS must carry forward the excess funds and distribute at least 50% to counties, other than Milwaukee County, for services and projects to assist children and families. (In Milwaukee County, DHFS, rather than the County, administers child welfare services.) Further, 50% of incentive funds must be used to support

DOA's Proposed Allocation of Unanticipated Federal Revenue

	<u>Title IV-E/ Medicaid</u>	<u>Medicare</u>	<u>Total</u>
Total federal revenue claimed as a result of income augmentation activities	\$18,565,800	\$368,100	\$18,933,900
Less Maximus fee - 10% of collections	1,856,600	36,800	1,893,400
Less Title IV-E commitment to the basic county allocation	<u>5,632,000</u>	<u> </u>	<u>5,632,000</u>
Total Available for Incentive Funds and Income Augmentation Funds	\$11,077,200	\$331,300	\$11,408,500
Less incentive funds distributed to counties -- 50% of Title IV-E	\$5,547,500		\$5,547,500
Less items included in the Governor's 1999-01 budget bill	4,261,700		4,261,700
Less costs exclusively related to augmenting federal income	<u>125,000</u>	<u>\$42,200</u>	<u>167,200</u>
Total Amount Subject to Committee Approval	\$1,143,000	\$289,100	\$1,432,100
Proposed Expenditures Under DOA Plan			
Wisconsin Resource Center -- offset 2% lapse requirement	\$400,000		\$400,000
Special needs adoptions	300,600		300,600
Mental health institutes cash deficit		\$180,200	180,200
Fiscal management system and payroll processing	150,000		150,000
DCTF administrative overhead		108,900	108,900
Women's health conference	<u>70,000</u>	<u> </u>	<u>70,000</u>
Subtotal	\$920,600	\$289,100	\$1,209,700
Uncommitted Funds to Lapse to General Fund	\$222,400	\$0	\$222,400

programs for children at risk of abuse or neglect to prevent the need for child abuse and neglect intervention services. These funds may not be used to supplant any other funds expended by a county for services and projects to assist children and families. DHFS distributed \$6.75 million in both calendar years 1998 and 1999 under this provision. Of the unanticipated federal Title IV-E funds collected between July, 1997 and March, 1998, DHFS would distribute \$5,547,500 in calendar year 2000 for services and projects to assist children and families.

1999-01 Biennial Budget Items. An additional \$4,261,700 in income augmentation funds are allocated in the Governor's 1999-01 biennial budget. These funds would be allocated as follows: (a) \$75,000 in 1999-00 would be transferred to the Department of Workforce Development for a fatherhood initiative; (b) \$238,300 in 1999-00 and \$935,200 in 2000-01 would be used to implement changes to DHFS computer systems in order to comply with the 1996 federal Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act; (c) \$500,000 in 2000-01 would be used to partially support costs for developing a statewide automated child welfare information system; (d);

and (e) \$2,513,200 would lapse to the general fund. (It should be noted that the Governor's general fund condition statement assumes that \$2,427,000, rather than \$2,513,200, would be deposited to the general fund in the 1999-01 biennium). The Committee is not addressing these items at this time. These items will be reviewed and subject to the Committee's approval as part of its 1999-01 biennial budget deliberations.

Costs Exclusively Related to Augmenting Federal Income. Under current law, DHFS may expend federal income augmentation funds to support costs exclusively related to augmenting federal income. Under the plan approved by DOA, \$125,000 of the Title IV-E and Medicaid funds and \$42,200 of the Medicare funds would be used to support administrative costs to augment federal income. These costs include salaries for limited-term employees, federal claims processing costs, rent, telephone, fax machine and copier costs, and miscellaneous supplies and services.

Expenditure Plan

DOA has requested that the Committee approve the expenditure of income augmentation funds for costs not exclusively related to augmenting federal income, as identified in the table above. If the Committee does not approve the expenditure of funds for one or more of the items, the Committee could direct DHFS to lapse to the general fund the funds included in the plan for those items or the Committee could direct DHFS to expend the funds for different purposes. Information on each item that would be funded under the plan submitted to Committee is provided below.

Wisconsin Resource Center -- Offset 2% Lapse Requirement. Under the DOA plan, \$400,000 would be provided to offset a portion of the Act 27 requirement that DHFS lapse 2% of its GPR state operations costs.

Under Act 27, DHFS was provided discretion in allocating the required 2% GPR reductions, totaling \$2,101,000 GPR in 1997-98 and \$2,083,500 GPR in 1998-99 among DHFS programs. In the 1998-99 fiscal year, DHFS allocated reductions totaling \$1,179,700 GPR for the Division of Care and Treatment Facilities (DCTF). These reductions include: (a) a reestimate of the costs of fuel for DCTF facilities (-\$200,300 GPR); and (b) reduced funding for the Wisconsin Resource Center (-\$979,400 GPR). However, in February, 1998, the Committee approved the Department of Administration's agency lapse plan that set aside \$579,000 in income augmentation funds to fund DCTF costs that would otherwise be supported with GPR in 1998-99. The income augmentation plan before the Committee would eliminate the need for DHFS to absorb reductions, other than the fuel and utilities reestimate, for the Division of Care and Treatment Facilities.

The administration's proposal to use income augmentation funds to offset a portion of the budget reductions required under Act 27 is based on the argument that DCTF facilities provide services to vulnerable individuals and that services to these individuals cannot be reduced. GPR support for the Mental Health Institutes is used to support forensic patients (patients who have been committed under court orders) and DCTF does not have the option of not providing services to these individuals. This argument was used in exempting the Department of Corrections from the

Act 27 2% reduction requirement. Because the Centers for the Developmentally Disabled are funded with program revenue (medical assistance funds transferred from the Division of Health Care Financing), funds budgeted for the Centers were not included in the 2% calculation. Therefore, the Department initially targeted these reductions to the Resource Center.

The Resource Center provides custody, care, education and training of convicted offenders who have mental health or substance abuse needs and whose needs cannot be met in the traditional prison environment. In addition, the Resource Center provides services to individuals committed under the state's sexually violent persons law. The Resource Center's 1998-99 adjusted base funding level is approximately \$27.9 million GPR; these funds are used to support approximately 519 FTE positions.

On an annual basis, \$400,000 represents approximately 1.4% of the Resource Center's budget. However, DCTF has not taken steps to implement budget reductions at the Resource Center in the current fiscal year to generate these savings. Rather, DHFS has assumed that the Committee would authorize the use of income augmentation funds to offset the need for reductions at the Wisconsin Resource Center. If the Committee does not approve DOA's recommendation to allocate \$400,000 of income augmentation funds to hold the Resource Center harmless for the GPR reductions, DHFS would be required to generate GPR savings from state operations appropriations totaling this amount in the last two months of the state's fiscal year. It is not known how DHFS would generate these savings. However, DHFS has indicated that it would close a unit at the Resource Center, which would require temporary staff lay-offs until July 1, 1999.

In light of the timing of this request, if the Committee wished to require the Division of Care and Treatment Facilities to contribute to the 2% GPR reduction, it could direct DCTF to reduce GPR funding for the Resource Center by 2% for the last two months of the fiscal year, rather than require the 2% reduction to be applied for the entire year's funding. This alternative would require DHFS to reduce funding for the Wisconsin Resource Center by \$93,100 [(\$27.9 million x 2%)/12 months) x 2 months] in 1998-99. The Committee could transfer \$93,100 GPR currently budgeted for supplies and services for the WRC to unallotted reserve to lapse to the general fund to implement this intent. Consequently, the Committee could provide \$306,900, rather than \$400,000 in income augmentation funds to offset the required 2% lapse reduction. Alternatively, the Committee could authorize DHFS to generate these savings from the entire DHFS budget, rather than from the Resource Center's budget, exclusively, in order to provide DHFS flexibility in determining how to meet this reduction requirement.

Special Needs Adoptions. The DOA plan would provide \$300,600 in income augmentation funds for adoption services for children with special needs who are awaiting adoption. In addition, the administration estimates that \$222,100 in federal funding would be available under Title IV-E of the Social Security Act as a match to the income augmentation funds so that a total of \$522,700 (all funds) would be available for this purpose. The administration's proposal would fund the following: (a) 8.0 project social workers, 2.0 project supervisors and 8.0 student interns for nine months (\$336,700 all funds); and (b) a contract with a private agency to provide adoption services to 34 cases (\$186,000 all funds). Adoption services include case

management services, services to the court, identification of potential adoptive parents and a home study of the potential adoptive parents.

Due to enactment of the federal Adoption and Safe Families Act in November, 1997, DHFS anticipates a significant increase in the number of children with special needs who will be available for adoption. The act requires states to file termination of parental rights petitions (TPR) petitions for children that have been in out-of-home care for 15 of the last 22 months. While there are a number of exceptions to this requirement, DHFS anticipates the total number of children with special needs awaiting adoption will increase from 394 as of July 1, 1998 to 692 by July 1, 1999. As of February 1, 1999, 438 children were under DHFS guardianship awaiting adoption. Currently, DHFS has 25.0 FTE adoption social workers located around the state that provide adoption services for children with special needs. These staff can complete approximately 250 adoptions per year, based on current workload models.

Project Positions and Student Interns. The plan developed by DHFS and submitted to DOA in November, 1998, would have funded the project positions and student interns for 12 months, beginning January, 1999. For 12 months, these project positions and student interns were expected to complete 100 adoptions. The plan approved by DOA reestimated the cost of the project positions and interns to assume that they would be funded for nine months, beginning April, 1999. Since DHFS has not yet hired staff and is awaiting approval of this plan by the Committee, it is unlikely DHFS would be able to fill the positions until June 1, 1999. DHFS staff indicate that if funding for the positions and interns were only available from June through December, 1999, DHFS would likely assign cases to these staff that would be expected to be completed by the end of December, 1999.

The Committee could reduce funding provided in the plan for the project staff and student interns by \$75,900 (all funds), or \$32,300 in income augmentation funds, to provide seven months of funding, beginning June 1, 1999. However, it is expected that reducing the funding by this amount would minimize the likelihood that these positions would be able to complete 100 adoptions, even if DHFS were able to assign cases that would require a minimum time commitment. Further, because the workload regarding the backlog of adoption cases remains the same, the extent to which the project staff and interns are unable to complete 100 adoptions, or only focus on the cases requiring a minimal time commitment, the extra share of the workload would have to be addressed by the permanent staff and the private agency. Consequently, the backlog that would have to be addressed in the 1999-01 budget bill would likely increase.

The Committee could increase the amount of funding provided for these staff by \$110,300 (all funds), or \$63,400 in income augmentation funds in order to provide funding for twelve months for these positions, beginning June 1, 1999. This would ensure that these positions would be able to complete at least 100 adoptions and minimize the backlog of cases that would have to be addressed in the 1999-01 budget bill.

Private Agency Contract. The original proposal developed by DHFS and submitted to DOA provided \$248,000 (all funds) to contract with a private agency to complete 45 adoptions at a cost of approximately \$5,511 per adoption. In the plan approved by DOA, this amount was reduced

to \$186,000, assuming that the plan would only be implemented for nine months. However, DHFS indicates that the contract agency would still be required to complete the same tasks for the same amount of time, but for fewer cases. As a result, the estimated \$186,000 would fund adoption services for approximately 34 cases. The agency would not be held to the same time restrictions as project and intern staff, which would terminate on December 31, 1999, under the administration's plan.

The Committee may wish to approve the \$186,000 as included in the administration's plan, which would be sufficient to purchase services for approximately 34 cases. This would result in an increase of nine cases to the backlog that would exist at the end of calendar year 1999. The Governor's budget bill provides funding, beginning January 1, 2000, to address the backlog in cases awaiting adoption.

Instead of providing DHFS with the funding included in the administration's plan, the Committee could provide funding consistent with what DHFS originally requested; \$248,000, to contract with the private agency to provide adoption services to 45 cases. Under this alternative, fewer cases would have to be addressed in the 1999-01 biennial budget bill.

In order to increase the amount of income augmentation funds deposited to the general fund, the Committee could modify the administration's plan to reduce the amount of income augmentation funds provided for the project positions and interns by reducing income augmentation funding by \$43,600, or \$75,900 (all funds) to reflect seven months of funding.

Alternatively, if the Committee wishes to use the income augmentation revenue currently available to reduce the backlog of children with special needs awaiting adoption, the Committee could approve the administration's plan, which would provide funding for project staff and interns for nine months and funding for a private agency contract for 34 cases.

Further, if Committee supports maximizing income augmentation revenue to address the backlog of cases awaiting adoption, the Committee could increase income augmentation funding by \$99,000, or \$172,300 (all funds), to reflect the original amounts requested by DHFS. This additional funding would allow DHFS to more quickly complete adoptions, which would reduce the amount of time these children spend in foster care.

Finally, the Committee could deny funding at this time and review the entire issue of special needs adoption as part of its deliberations on the 1999-01 biennial budget.

Mental Health Institutes Cash Deficit. The DOA plan would provide \$172,400 to reduce the cash deficit for the Mental Health Institutes (MHIs). The MHIs are supported by a combination of GPR and PR funds. GPR funds are used to support the costs of care for patients committed through the criminal justice system. The costs of care for other patients, including individuals who are committed under civil proceedings and youth transferred from the juvenile correctional schools, are supported by PR derived from daily charges to the responsible parties, which includes counties, the Department of Corrections, Medicare, medical assistance (MA), and private insurance.

In the early 1990's, the annual costs of providing care to PR-supported clients exceeded program revenues collected through these daily charges. Consequently, the MHIs incurred yearly losses that resulted in an accrued unsupported cash deficit that grew from \$0.4 million at the end of 1990-91 to \$7.9 million at the end of 1992-93. The 1993-95 biennial budget act increased MA rates paid to the MHIs, directed the MHIs to raise rates each year by 10% until the deficit was eliminated and directed DHFS to eliminate the deficit by July 1, 1995. However, in spite of these actions, the deficit grew to \$10.6 million by the end of 1996-97.

The 1997-99 biennial budget act included additional provisions designed to address the deficit by authorizing DHFS to seek reimbursement for MA-eligible patients based on total actual costs and increasing payments made by the Department of Corrections for youth transferred to MHIs from DOC institutions. DHFS also administratively pursued higher funding for Medicare-eligible patients through its contract with Maximus. The accrued unsupported cash balance has decreased from \$10.6 million at the end of 1996-97 to \$6.0 million by the end of 1997-98. Based on two quarters of actual revenue and expenditure data, it is estimated that the unsupported cash balance will be \$3.2 million by the end of 1998-99.

Since the additional federal funds related to Medicare are based on reimbursement of care for patients at the MHIs, it may be appropriate to use such funds to reduce the MHIs' accrued unsupported cash balance which originated due to inadequate reimbursement for PR-supported patients. Funds used to reduce the accrued deficit will either increase the state's general fund balance or reduce state borrowing, and will, as a result, either increase state GPR interest earnings or lower state GPR interest costs.

Fiscal Management System and Payroll Processing. The DOA plan would provide \$150,000 in 1998-99 to fund several computer programming changes for the agency's fiscal management and payroll systems. First, the plan would provide DHFS \$63,000 to support the estimated costs of converting from a report management distribution system to an electronic report distribution system. DOA recently converted to the new system, which required agencies that interface with the DOA system, including the Departments of Transportation, Workforce Development and Corrections, to ensure compatibility with the new system. DHFS was required to make programming changes to its fiscal management system in order to enable staff to continue to use the system to view and print monthly fiscal and management reports. Second, the plan provides \$25,500 to program and test the DHFS payroll system to ensure that it is Year 2000 compliant. Third, the plan provides \$37,500 to support programming and training costs associated with converting fiscal management systems programs from Endeavor to Changeman. Changeman is a software tool used by programmers to test changes to fiscal and accounting systems. Finally, the plan provides \$24,000 for DHFS to analyze, and conduct any required programming, to address the Year 2000 impact on codes used in the fiscal management system.

DHFS has either already completed these information technology projects or has nearly completed them. Consequently, if the Committee chooses not to fund these costs with income augmentation funds, DHFS would be required to absorb these costs.

Care and Treatment Facilities Administrative Overhead. The DOA plan would provide \$108,900 in income augmentation funds to partially support the Department's information technology and administrative overhead costs. Under the Department's federally approved cost allocation methodology, the Division of Care and Treatment Facilities (DCTF) must support approximately 38.7% of these overhead costs. Based on the Department's 1998-99 projected infrastructure costs (approximately \$8,000,000), DCTF would be required to contribute approximately \$3.1 million to support these costs. Under a previous income augmentation plan approved by the DOA, DHFS was budgeted \$1,406,500 in 1997-98 and \$1,490,100 in 1998-99 to partially support DCTF's share of these costs. Consequently, funding budgeted for the Division of Care and Treatment Facilities is currently approximately \$1.5 million less than DCTF's share of these costs. The costs that cannot be supported by DCTF are shifted to other GPR-funded programs in DHFS. The DOA plan would reduce the amount of costs that DHFS would be required to shift to these other programs.

Income augmentation funds provide a means by which DHFS can support its IT infrastructure costs without funding these costs directly with funds budgeted in DCTF. Although DHFS requested additional funding to address this issue in the 1999-01 biennium, the Governor's budget provides no additional funding for DCTF to support the agency's IT infrastructure costs. Consequently, DHFS will be required to absorb these costs in the 1999-01 biennium to a greater degree than it did in the 1997-99 biennium when DHFS was provided approximately \$2.9 million in income augmentation funds to support these costs.

Women's Health Conference. The DOA plan provides \$70,000 in 1998-99 to support a statewide conference that would focus public attention on women's health issues. However, planning for this conference has not been finalized. DHFS staff indicate that they would like to hold the conference in Wausau in August, 1999, but are waiting for approval of the requested funding before making final arrangements.

A one-day women's health conference was held last April at the Milwaukee Hilton. Promotional materials from the 1998 conference identify three conference objectives: (a) to educate women about health risks, prevention and treatment in the areas of breast cancer, cardiovascular disease, osteoporosis, nutrition, tobacco use, domestic abuse and mental health; (b) to share information about Wisconsin's women's health initiative and resources that are available throughout the state and to empower women to utilize available treatment and prevention resources; and (c) to provide a networking forum on women's health for Wisconsin health care providers, policy makers, legislators, community organizations and businesses. A group of 20 women, representing various professional fields, including medicine and social work, presented information to attendees.

The April, 1998, conference was attended by 384 individuals and total direct conference costs were approximately \$68,400. These costs include the honoraria and travel expenses of the presenters, conference brochure printing and distribution costs, audiovisual expenses, room rental and food, administrative costs and indirect costs totaling 8% of the conference's direct costs. In addition, the Department staff indicated that \$19,000 supported a contract with a public relations firm who promoted the conference and \$29,000 supported salary and fringe benefits costs of DHFS

Division of Public Health staff. Therefore, total conference expenditures were approximately \$116,400.

Approximately \$19,700 of the conference costs were offset by the following revenue sources: (a) registration fees (\$13,710); (b) an educational grant from Eli Lilly (\$1,500); (c) exhibitor fees (\$4,400); and (d) lunch revenues (\$100). The conference registration fee was \$35 prior to the registration deadline and \$40 after the deadline. The remaining costs (\$96,700) were supported with income augmentation previously allocated by DOA for this purpose. However, because DHFS was previously allocated \$130,000 of income augmentation funds to support a women's health conference, \$33,300 of the original allocation is still available to support the upcoming conference. If the Committee approves the Department's request, a total of \$103,300 would be available to support a women's health conference.

This funding is \$13,400 less than the actual cost of the April, 1998 conference. This difference is primarily due to one-time public relations costs associated with the first conference. If the Committee authorized the use of income augmentation funds for the conference, DHFS would encumber these funds before June 30, 1999, so that they would be available to support a conference in August, 1999.

The Governor's 1999-01 budget bill provides \$100,000 GPR annually to support women's health activities, including a statewide conference and a women's health hotline. If the Committee does not approve the Department's request to use income augmentation funds to support a women's health conference, funding may be available to support a conference in the 1999-01 biennium if the Committee approves funding provided in the budget bill for this purpose. However, due to the timing of the passage of the budget, it is unlikely that the Department would have sufficient time to plan a conference for August, 1999. In addition, the estimated annual cost of the women's health hotline is \$50,000. Therefore, under the Governor's budget recommendations, \$50,000 annually would be available to support a conference. Based on the proposed budget for the women's health conference, this funding would be sufficient to fund one conference during the biennium. If the Committee approved the Department's request, under the Governor's recommendation, the Department could support an annual women's health conference in the 1999-00 biennium.

ALTERNATIVES

- I. Approve the request as submitted by DOA.
- II. Select one alternative from each of the following sets of alternatives and deposit the balance in the general fund.

A. Wisconsin Resource Center

1. Adopt DOA's recommendation to provide \$400,000 to offset a portion of the Act 27 requirement that DHFS lapse 2% of its GPR state operations appropriations.
2. Provide \$306,900 to offset a portion of the Act 27 requirement that DHFS lapse 2% of its GPR state operations appropriations and direct DHFS to reduce funding for the Resource Center by \$93,100 GPR in 1998-99 by transferring this amount from supplies and services to unallotted reserve to lapse to the general fund.
3. Provide \$306,900 to offset a portion of the Act 27 requirement that DHFS lapse 2% of its GPR state operations appropriations and direct DHFS to reduce funding for GPR state operations in other divisions by \$93,100 by transferring this amount from supplies and services to unallotted reserve to the general fund.
4. Provide no funding for this purpose. Direct DHFS to close units at the WRC to generate \$400,000 in savings in 1998-99. Deposit \$400,000 to the general fund.

B. Special Needs Adoption

1. Adopt DOA's recommendation to provide \$300,600 for adoption services for children with special needs.
2. Modify the DOA recommendation by reducing the amount provided for special needs adoption project staff and student interns by \$43,600 to reflect seven months of funding, beginning June 1, 1999.
3. Modify the DOA recommendation by increasing the amount provided for adoption services by: (a) \$63,400 for DHFS project staff and student interns to reflect twelve months of funding, beginning June 1, 1999; and (b) \$35,600 for adoption services provided by a private agency under contract with DHFS.
4. Provide no funding for this purpose and deposit \$300,600 to the general fund.

C. Mental Health Institutes Cash Deficit

1. Adopt the DOA's recommendation to provide \$172,400 to reduce the cash deficit for the MHIs.
2. Provide no funding for this purpose and deposit \$172,400 to the general fund.

D. Fiscal Management and Payroll Processing

1. Adopt DOA's recommendation to provide \$150,000 to support several computer-programming changes for the Department's management and payroll systems.
2. Provide no funding for this purpose and deposit \$150,000 to the general fund.

E. Care and Treatment Facilities Administrative Overhead

3. Adopt DOA's recommendation to provide \$108,900 to partially support the Department's information technology and administrative overhead costs.
4. Provide no funding for this purpose and deposit \$108,900 to the general fund.

F. Women's Health Conference

1. Adopt DOA's recommendation to provide \$70,000 to support a statewide conference that would focus public attention on women's health issues.
2. Provide no funding for this purpose and deposit \$70,000 to the general fund.

III. Deny the request and direct DHFS to lapse the total amount subject to Committee approval (\$1,432,100) to the general fund. This amount includes \$222,400 that DOA recommends be deposited to the general fund.

MO# <u>A-1, B-3, C-1, D-2, E-4</u>		MO# _____			
<u>BURKE</u>	<u>Y</u>	N	A	BURKE	Y N A
DECKER	<u>Y</u>	N	A	DECKER	Y N A
JAUCH	<u>Y</u>	N	A	JAUCH	Y N A
MOORE	<u>Y</u>	N	A	MOORE	Y N A
SHIBILSKI	<u>Y</u>	N	A	SHIBILSKI	Y N A
PLACHE	<u>Y</u>	N	A	PLACHE	Y N A
COWLES	<u>Y</u>	N	A	COWLES	Y N A
PANZER	<u>Y</u>	N	A	PANZER	Y N A
GARD	<u>Y</u>	N	A	GARD	Y N A
PORTER	<u>Y</u>	N	A	PORTER	Y N A
KAUFERT	<u>Y</u>	N	A	KAUFERT	Y N A
ALBERS	<u>Y</u>	N	A	ALBERS	Y N A
DUFF	<u>Y</u>	N	A	DUFF	Y N A
WARD	<u>Y</u>	N	A	WARD	Y N A
HUBER	<u>Y</u>	N	A	HUBER	Y N A
RILEY	<u>Y</u>	N	A	RILEY	Y N A

chel

Richard Megna and Charles Morgan

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Expenditure Plan for Income Augmentation Funds

Motion:

Move to modify the DOA plan for income augmentation funds by deleting \$400,000 allocated for the Wisconsin Resource Center. In addition, transfer \$400,000 GPR from the Department of Corrections, adult correctional services general program operations appropriation, to the DHFS Wisconsin Resource Center appropriation in 1998-99.

Provide \$400,000 in income augmentation funds to counties (including Milwaukee County), in calendar year 1999, for projects to assist children and families and require counties to use 50% of these funds for children at risk of abuse and neglect in order to prevent the need for intervention services for child abuse and neglect. The amounts allocated to counties would be based on each county's proportionate share of the community aids basic county allocation for calendar year 1999. Specify that counties may not use these funds to supplant county revenue used for this purpose. Specify that any funds not used by counties in 1999, may be carried forward to calendar year 2000.

MO#				
	BURKE	Y	N	A
2	DECKER	Y	N	A
	JAUCH	Y	N	A
1	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	7	NO 9	ABS 0



State of Wisconsin
Department of Health and Family Services

Tommy G. Thompson, Governor
Joe Lekan, Secretary

April 20, 1999

TO: **Members**
 Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: DHFS

RE: Income Augmentation Expenditure Plan – Agenda Item VI

DHFS supports Alternative I. If the Joint Committee on Finance wishes to take up each component of the plan separately, DHFS would like the Committee to take the following considerations under advisement:

Wisconsin Resource Center

DHFS supports A1.

The only way to implement a 2% reduction in the Wisconsin Resource Center is to shut down units. If the Joint Committee on Finance rejects the requested funding of \$400,000 to offset the two percent lapse of GPR state operation costs, the Wisconsin Resource Center will be forced to close five units and put 126.5 FTE on a one-month layoff. The funding shortfall will have to be absorbed entirely in June of this SFY. Unit closures will result in fewer inmates being served at Wisconsin Resource Center forcing Corrections to serve these inmates.

Alternative A2 is problematic because the WRC supplies and services budget does not contain this level of funding. Supplies and services include budgeted funds for food, medicine, and other costs of the Center. WRC had to expend its supplies and services funding for costs of operating since July.

Alternative A3 is problematic because it would force the Department to impose a cut on other divisions in the Department. All other divisions have already taken a 2% cut in GPR state operations as part of the overall 2% cut requirement.

Special Needs Adoptions

DHFS supports B1 or B3.

Adjusting the original timeline to the time remaining in the calendar year is not consistent with the business of successfully placing children in adoptive homes. A successful adoption demands an average of 12 months of casework to be completed. Any reduction from the requested 12 months of funding will contribute to a backlog for the next biennium.

Any reductions also jeopardize Wisconsin's ability to earn federal incentive payments for increasing numbers of adoptions.

Wisconsin's ability to successfully place greater numbers of special needs adoption cases will be rewarded through the Federal Adoption and Safe Families Act federal incentive funds. The Act provides for incentive payments through FFY 03 to states for finalized adoptions of children in state foster care when the number of adoptions exceeds the average number of adoptions in the previous three state fiscal years. The bonus is \$6,000 for each child with special needs.

Mental Health Institutes Cash Deficit

DHFS supports C1. DHFS is committed to continuing its reduction of the MHI cash deficit.

Fiscal Management System and Payroll Processing

DHFS supports D1.

These IT changes were required by DOA so that DHFS could interface with statewide financial systems. Due to the timing and necessary implementation of these IT systems changes, DHFS had to undertake the changes and temporarily reallocate funding to finance them. Should JFC not allow the agency to make its budget whole with the requested \$150,000, other IT operating activities will suffer. These include general systems demands such as IRS reporting, basic fiscal system maintenance, and general operating costs (e.g., CPU time).

Care and Treatment Facilities Administrative Overhead

DHFS supports E3.

Through appropriate cost allocation methodologies, DCTF has been able to pull down federal funding for 61.3% of its overhead. The state is responsible for the remainder of DCTF overhead through GPR. This GPR commitment has been lessened through the use of augmentation funds in previous state fiscal years.

There are no funds budgeted to meet this need if the \$108,900 is not approved.

Women's Health Conference

DHFS supports F1. The First Lady has indicated her support for Women's Health Conferences in August 1999 and annually in the spring thereafter. Please see the attached letter.



Sue Ann Thompson
Wisconsin's First Lady

April 16, 1999

Joe Leraan, Secretary
Department of Health and Family Services
1 W. Wilson Street
Madison, WI 53701

Dear Secretary Leraan:

The 1st Annual Wisconsin Women's Health Conference that was held last year in Milwaukee was a splendid success and once again, I would like to congratulate you and your staff for a job well done! As you know, I am anticipating that this is an annual event. I recently spoke with Stacey Long, Wisconsin's Women's Health Officer and she indicated that the 2nd Annual Wisconsin Women's Health Conference is scheduled for August 14, 1999 in central Wisconsin.

Although I am enthusiastic about the summer conference, I would prefer that we return to last year's timeframe and schedule the 3rd Annual conference during the spring of 2000.

You have my full support for these events and the numerous women's health activities occurring within your Department.

Sincerely,

Sue Ann Thompson
Wisconsin's First Lady

The Executive Residence ~ Madison

HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Income Augmentation Expenditure Plan

Motion:

Move to modify the Department of Administration's recommendation by:

- a. Adopting Alternative B3 in the LFB paper;
- b. Adopting Alternative D2 in the LFB paper;
- c. Adopting Alternative E4 in the LFB paper; and

In addition, lapse no income augmentation funds to the general fund.

Finally, provide \$382,300 in income augmentation revenue to the Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Board to increase funding, on a one-time basis, for projects funded by the Board. Specify that these funds could be expended through calendar year 2000.

[Change to DOA plan: -\$222,400 lapse to the general fund]

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	8	NO 8	ABS 0

13.10 Meeting
Wednesday, April 21, 1999

Issue: Stewardship Grant for City of Janesville

Recommend: Alternative 1

Barry

Comments: DNR needs JFC approval to give the City of Janesville \$342,500 from Stewardship to help purchase 17.4 acres and demolish some buildings along the Rock River.

The last paragraph on page 4 of the FB memo sums it up pretty well. It's called the Urban Rivers category for obvious reasons. The small amount of funding set aside annually for urban rivers should be used for projects like this one in Janesville. Urban areas often have buildings built in floodplain areas and it costs money to remove them. Plus, land is more expensive in cities. We've funded similar projects before, and we should again.

Alternative 2 would be ok, but it utilizes a grant award formula that doesn't exist in current law. I support the Betty Jo Nelson Task Force's recommended formula for setting grant amounts to local units of government, but that's a discussion for a later day - it's not current law (see FB rationale on page 5, 2nd paragraph). Therefore, Alternative 1 is better.

The other options are unacceptable, and the issue should be delayed if Alt 1 or 2 fail.

Prepared by: Barry



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 21, 1999

TO: Members
Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Natural Resources: Stewardship Grant to City of Janesville for Rock River Acquisition -- Agenda Item VII

REQUEST

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) requests approval to expend \$342,500 from the Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson stewardship program for an urban rivers grant to the City of Janesville for the acquisition of nearly 17.4 acres of land, including improvements, that borders on the Rock River.

BACKGROUND

Stewardship and Urban Rivers

The stewardship program was created in 1989 Act 31 for the purpose of acquiring land to expand recreational opportunities and protect environmentally sensitive areas. The Legislature has authorized \$231 million in general obligation bonding for this purpose over a ten-year period ending in fiscal year 1999-2000. The law allocates funding among twelve categories of land acquisition and development programs.

The urban rivers grant program is funded at a level of \$1.9 million annually. The program provides grants to towns, cities, villages, counties, tribal governments and nonprofit conservation organizations (NCOs) for land acquisition on, or adjacent to, rivers that flow through urban areas. Urban rivers projects must emphasize the preservation or restoration of urban rivers or riverfronts for the purposes of economic revitalization and outdoor recreation, such as fishing, wildlife observation, enjoyment of scenic beauty, canoeing, boating, hiking and bicycling.

The Department considers all of the following criteria in awarding grants: (a) the diversity of outdoor recreational opportunities provided to all segments of the population; (b) the extent of preservation or restoration of an urban riverfront; (c) the project's aesthetic value; (d) the project's potential for increased tourism; (e) the extent of planning, coordination and local support which exists for the project; (f) the potential economic benefits to the community; (g) the extent to which the project preserves an area of historical or cultural value; (h) the improvement of public access to the riverfront; and (i) the project's relation to brownfields redevelopment.

No municipality may receive more than 20 percent of the funds available for urban river grants (\$380,000) in any fiscal year. A municipality must provide at least a 50 percent match from private, local or federal funding, in-kind contributions or non-DNR state funding. By rule, the administrative costs associated with land acquisition and the development, operation and maintenance costs of land are not eligible for grant assistance under the urban rivers program. Title to land acquired through the urban rivers grant program is vested in the local governmental unit or NCO. Land acquired with urban rivers grant funding may not be converted to uses inconsistent with stewardship without DNR approval.

Proposed Janesville Grant

The proposed grant would be used to purchase nearly 17.4 acres of land, including an estimated 1,500 feet of frontage, along the Rock River from the Panoramic Corporation. Of the total acreage, approximately 10.4 acres is located in a floodplain area and has been designated as wetlands by DNR. The remaining seven acres of land are considered developable, and it is this part of the property on which a manufacturing plant, warehouse, loading area, parking lots and landscaped areas are located.

The land is currently zoned M-2 General Industrial, which is designed to accommodate those industrial activities which may produce moderate nuisances or hazards in areas that are relatively remote from residential development. The assessed value of the property in 1996, including improvements, was \$241,700, while in 1997 it was \$250,900. The property is currently used for manufacturing cardboard and plastic packing material.

The proposed use for the property is for open space to expand the Rock River Recreational Corridor, with hiking, biking and roller blading trails and fishing, canoeing and picnicking facilities. The Department also indicates that the purchase would preserve a walleye spawning area, wildlife habitat, shoreline and wetlands. The trail is also expected to be a link in a larger regional trail that could eventually connect the Cities of Beloit, Janesville, Fort Atkinson and Jefferson.

Portions of the manufacturing plant, the oldest, continuously-used industrial structure in the city, would be razed, with the historic core building potentially restored as a museum or other public facility, with restroom and concession facilities and canoe and bike rental shops. If the plans for such a public facility are not successful, the City would likely seek an additional grant for demolition of the remainder of the building. The Department indicates that such a grant would be considered separately from this proposed grant, and that grants for the demolition of buildings are

generally not a high priority for urban rivers funding. In addition, Panoramic would relocate its operations to a new facility in an industrial park in Janesville, which City officials anticipate would generate property taxes and allow for the creation of additional jobs.

The appraisal approved by the Department for determining the grant amount estimated the value of the Panoramic property at \$635,000. The valuation, completed in January, 1998, indicates the highest and best use of the property is for light manufacturing and warehouse facilities for the developable land and recreational use for the land in the floodplain. The breakdown of valuation of the various components of the property are shown in the following table.

DNR-Approved Appraisal for Panoramic Property

<u>Component</u>	<u>Value</u>
Building and site improvements	\$540,000
7.0 acres of developable land	85,000
10.4 acres of wetlands	<u>10,000</u>
Total	\$635,000

A business relocation payment of \$50,000 to Panoramic is also included for determining the amount of the grant. Thus, the total project cost would be \$685,000, with DNR proposing to provide a grant for 50% of that amount, or \$342,500.

A second appraisal of the property was completed in February, 1998. This appraisal, which was accepted by the Department, set the value of the property at \$725,000. The value of the improvements was placed at \$628,000, while the land was estimated to be worth \$96,500.

The Department indicates that the proposed grant to Janesville was the highest ranking urban rivers project submitted for the 1998-99 stewardship grant cycle. In addition to the City, the project is also receiving support from the Rock River Coalition, the Rock Trail Coalition and the Janesville Foundation. The City of Janesville has received four previous stewardship grants related to acquisition and development along the river. The City currently owns 11 miles, or 71 percent, of the Rock River Corridor. If the City acquires the Panoramic property, that would increase to 73 percent.

Joint Finance Review

Under s. 23.0915(4) of the statutes, the Joint Committee on Finance reviews all stewardship projects of more than \$250,000. DNR must notify the Co-chairpersons of the Committee in writing of the proposed encumbrance or expenditure. If the Co-chairpersons of the Committee do not notify the DNR within 14 working days after the Department's notification that a meeting has been scheduled to review the request, then DNR may make the encumbrance or expenditure. If an objection to the project is made, then the Co-chairpersons must schedule a meeting to review the request. The Department may make the proposed expenditure only with Committee approval.

DNR notification of the proposed grant to the City of Janesville was received by the Co-chairpersons on March 8, 1999. On March 26, 1999, the Co-chairpersons notified DNR that a meeting would be scheduled to consider the proposed grant.

ANALYSIS

The funding for the grant would come from the urban rivers component of stewardship. As of January 31, 1999, the Department indicates that the urban rivers category of stewardship had an unobligated balance of \$2.0 million.

The fact that a stewardship grant is being proposed for a purchase of property where 85 percent of the appraised value is related to factors other than the land itself may raise concerns. To reflect this concern, the Committee could approve a grant for half of the value of only the land, or \$47,500. Given the overall cost of the proposed purchase by the City, the Committee could also approve a grant for the full value of the land, or \$95,000.

On the other hand, the purchases of improvements on parcels of land is not uncommon in stewardship land acquisition. In addition, by statute the urban rivers component emphasizes historical and cultural preservation, tourism and economic development in addition to natural resources-related land acquisition. For example, a previous grant under the urban rivers program was for a total of \$560,000 over two consecutive fiscal years (prior to enactment of the Joint Finance passive review provision) to the City of Beloit for the acquisition of 8.53 acres, which provided the City with the opportunity to remove blighted buildings along the Rock River.

In addition, City officials indicate that they approached Panoramic several times over the last decade about the possibility of purchasing a smaller parcel of the property that included some portion of the river frontage and excluded the building and improvements. City officials indicate that these offers were not accepted.

Given that the proposed grant would be used to purchase land in a developed, high-growth area, the cost could be considered high compared to potential grant purchases in most other areas of the state. It could be argued that the Department could better use stewardship funding for grants to purchase larger areas of land in less-developed areas of the state. In this way, the purchasing power of stewardship in terms of acres acquired and landscape preserved could be better maximized. This would then maintain relatively larger areas of land under state control as development spreads into new areas of the state.

On the other hand, the nature of the urban rivers category of stewardship is that it focuses on land preservation and redevelopment in areas of the state where land may often be valued relatively high. In administrative code, urban area is defined for the urban rivers component of stewardship as any area that is within or is characteristic of a city or village. To the extent that heavily improved land with relatively high value is characteristic of cities, grants for land purchases similar to the proposed Rock River grant may be seen as an inevitable part of this component. In addition, under

administrative rule, DNR places principal emphasis on acquisition of lands in the more heavily populated areas of the state and in places readily accessible to such areas.

Another option available to the Committee for setting the amount of the grant would be to follow the recommendation of the Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force on the Stewardship Program for setting grant amounts to local units of government for land that is not zoned agricultural. The Task Force recommended that such grants be based on the lesser of the property's appraised value or an amount equal to one and one-half times the average of the sum of the property's appraised value plus the equalized assessed values for the two most recent years. This formula generates a result of \$563,800, half of which is \$281,900.

However, this Task Force recommendation is not reflected in current law; rather, it is meant to apply to grants under any reauthorized stewardship program. It could be argued that such a mechanism for setting the grant amount should not apply to selected communities under the current stewardship program until a new formula for setting grant amounts is established by statute and would be applied uniformly to all projects.

If the proposed grant is not approved, the funding would remain in the overall balance of the stewardship program and would be available for future urban rivers grants. City officials indicate that if this grant is not approved, they may reapply for a stewardship grant in the next grant cycle. Local staff also believe that such a delay could result in the loss of grants anticipated from other partners for the purchase of the property and could affect the timetable for the Panoramic relocation. In addition, if new appraisals are done for a future grant application, the appraised value of the property may be greater than the DNR-approved appraisal for this grant.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the DNR request to expend \$342,500 from the Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson stewardship program for an urban rivers grant to the City of Janesville for the acquisition of nearly 17.4 acres of land, including improvements on the land, that borders on the Rock River.
2. Approve a grant expenditure of \$281,900 (the amount generated by the formula recommended for a reauthorized stewardship program by the Governor's Blue Ribbon Task Force).
3. Approve a grant expenditure of \$95,000 (the full appraised value of only the land).
4. Approve a grant expenditure of \$47,500 (half of the appraised value of only the land).
5. Deny the request.

Prepared by: Russ Kava

MO# Alt 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 7 NO 9 ABS 0

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 16 NO 0 ABS 0

Elections Board

Section 13.10 Request for Funds for Computer Database Conversion Project and Unfunded Salary Costs -Agenda Item VIII

Alternative: 2 - Brian

This funding alternative will fund the further development of the electronic filing enhancements for the Board's computerized database and the unfunded salary costs while using available PR funding to reduce the amount of additional GPR funding that would otherwise be required.

Summary:

The Elections Board is requesting \$45,000 GPR and a supplement of \$8,000 PR for computer project costs and for unfunded salary costs. Of the total, \$49,000 is for computer project costs and the remaining \$4,000 is for unfunded salary costs.

Computer Project Costs. The Board has run out of funds for necessary database conversion efforts and the campaign finance electronic filing enhancement project and cannot complete the remaining activities necessary to bring the campaign electronic filing module on-line without additional funding. The Board needs to complete these two planned activities by June 30, 1999 to meet the statutory requirement that campaign finance reports be filed electronically for registrants with \$20,000 or more in campaign activity beginning June 30, 1999. If this date is not met, the project will be delayed into the following year and campaign finance registrants will be unable to comply with the statutory requirements.

A total of 900 hours of computer contracting support at a total cost of \$52,200 are needed to provide the functionality necessary to allow the commencement of electronic filing and website access to campaign finance information.

In Dec. of 1997, JFC released funds for the campaign finance electronic filing component and the Board represented at that time that the computer projects would be completed by May 1, 1998. The Board has identified outdated estimates, contractor personnel turnover, and software development difficulties as among the reasons for the delay and increased costs.

Unfunded Salary Costs. The shortfall was caused by a salary increase for the Executive Director for which the agency did not seek supplemental funds, filling two vacant positions at higher salaries than budgeted, and the agency not requesting any pay plan supplement in 1997-98.

*****Prepared by Deb.



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

April 21, 1999

TO: Members
Joint Finance Committee

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Elections Board: Section 13.10 Request for Funds for Computer Database Conversion Project and Unfunded Salary Costs -- Agenda Item VIII

REQUEST

The Elections Board requests a supplement of \$45,000 GPR from the unreserved portion of the Committee's GPR appropriation under s. 20.865(4)(a) for its GPR general program operations appropriation under s. 20.510(1)(a) ~~and~~ a supplement of \$8,000 PR in 1998-99 from the Committee's PR appropriation under s. 20.865(4)(g) for its PR appropriation under 20.510(1)(i). Of the total, \$49,000 (\$45,000 GPR and \$4,000 PR) is for computer project costs and \$4,000 PR is for the unfunded salary costs.

BACKGROUND

The Elections Board was provided a total of \$283,200 GPR in the current biennium for a data-base software conversion and campaign finance electronic filing enhancements information technology project. The project consists of a conversion of the agency database used internally by the Board to administer elections activities and campaign finance reports and an electronic campaign filing enhancement that allows electronic filing and retrieval of campaign finance report information over the internet.

Conversion of data base. A total of \$168,400 GPR was provided in the 1997-99 budget for contract staff to rewrite and convert the existing computer database system -- State of Wisconsin Elections Board Information System (SWEBIS)--from a system utilizing the Ingres data base application to a system using a new data base application (Oracle). This database is used by the

Board to administer elections and campaign finance activity. In terms of election administration, the converted database will be used to verify ballot access and certify election candidates and results. The (campaign finance module) of the conversion will allow the Board to electronically identify participants, ensure that required reports are filed, ascertain compliance with applicable laws and aid auditors in the enforcement of campaign laws.

② *Electronic filing enhancements.* The second part of the computer project, for which the Legislature has appropriated \$114,800 GPR in the current biennium, is to develop enhancements to the agency's new database system (Oracle) which will allow those registrants required to file periodic campaign finance reports with the Board to submit their reports electronically. In addition, the planned enhancements would allow the public to access the agency's elections and campaign finance database by accessing a site on the internet.

Timetable. When the ^{UNAVG} Committee acted in December, 1997, to release funds for the campaign finance electronic filing component, the Board indicated that it expected that both projects would be completed by May 1, 1998, at which time testing would be undertaken. The Board now indicates that it has run out of funds for both the database conversion effort and the campaign finance electronic filing enhancement project and cannot complete the remaining activities necessary to bring the campaign electronic filing module on-line without additional funding. The Board further states that it needs to complete these two planned activities by June 30, 1999, to meet the statutory requirement that campaign finance reports be filed electronically for registrants with \$20,000 or more in campaign activity beginning June 30, 1999. If this date is not met, the Board indicates that campaign finance registrants will be unable to comply with the statutory requirements and the project will be delayed into the following year.

*enact
funds
deadline*

delay if no funding until next year.

ANALYSIS

Analysis of the Board's request can be divided into three segments. The first segment deals with the projected funding shortfall in the GPR general program operations appropriation given existing commitments. The second segment identifies the remaining computer projects tasks associated with the implementation of the campaign finance electronic filing component and why the project is behind schedule. The last segment examines the actual funding need and the proposed allocation of these costs between existing appropriations.

Projected funding shortfall. The Board's projected shortfall is in its GPR general program operations account. Table 1 shows current available funding, estimated annual expenditures (not including the requested additional computer project costs), and the surplus or deficit. The estimated expenditures are based upon actual expenditures through March 31 plus the Board's estimated commitments for the remainder of the fiscal year. The table also identifies available but not yet received GPR supplements that can be released by DOA.

TABLE 1

Funding Shortfall Based on the Remaining Current Commitments

	Available	Estimated Expenditures*	Surplus/ Deficit(-)
Salaries and Fringe Benefits	\$641,264	\$701,221	-\$59,957
Supplies and Services	280,146	279,681	465
Permanent Property	5,447	5,589	-142
TOTAL	\$926,857	\$986,491	[- \$59,634] Shortfall
Additional Funding Available			\$30,410
Eligible Pay Plan Supplements	GPR offset		3,100
Other Supplements			\$33,510 Supplements
TOTAL			\$33,510
Net Shortfall			[-\$26,124] Shortfall

*Based on actual expenditures through March 31, plus Elections Board estimates of remaining commitments.

As Table 1 shows, the Board has \$926,857 GPR available in this appropriation but has estimated expenditures for the year of \$986,500 GPR, leaving a projected shortfall of \$59,600 GPR. The entire shortfall can be attributed almost entirely to salary and fringe benefit costs. The Board indicates that the shortfall has been caused by the following: (a) the Executive Director receiving a salary increase pursuant to 1997 Wisconsin Act 29 in 1997-98 for which the agency did not seek supplemental salary funds in the budget adjustment bill; (b) the agency filling two vacant positions at higher salaries than budgeted; and (c) the agency not requesting any pay plan supplement in 1997-98 which, under a biennial appropriation, could have been carried over into this fiscal year. Available GPR offsets totaling \$33,500 have been identified and consist of pay plan supplements and DOA rent and financial supplements. The net remaining shortfall after these offsets are applied is \$26,100.

In addition to the two GPR offsets identified above, the Board has indicated that it plans to use available but uncommitted PR resources of \$35,200 to reduce the GPR shortfall. This potential offset is addressed later in the section of the paper dealing with addressing the funding need.

Remaining computer project tasks and costs associated costs. The Board, in conjunction with the contractor (Enterprise Solutions Technology Group), who is doing database conversion and electronic filing enhancement, has identified the tasks and the estimated the number of hours necessary to complete those tasks this fiscal year if the electronic filing enhancement is to be operational by June 30 of this year, as required by 1997 Wisconsin Act 230. Table 2 shows the estimated number of hours needed for each project activity and the estimated cost of those tasks at the contractor's current rate of \$58 per hour. A total of 900 hours of computer contracting support

has been identified at a total cost of \$52,200. The SWEBIS conversion component of the project is estimated to require 424 hours of additional contractor time at a cost of almost \$24,600 and the electronic filing module is estimated to require 476 hours of additional contractor time at a total cost of over \$27,600.

TABLE 2

**Required Project Computer Tasks
Remainder of FY 1998-99**

	<u>Hours</u>	<u>Cost (@ \$58 Per Hour)</u>
1. Essential SWEBIS Conversion Tasks		
<u>Component</u>		
a. Database Conversion and Software Development	74	\$4,292
b. Data Migration	10	580
c. Campaign Finance Module	340	19,720
2. Essential Electronic Filing Enhancement Tasks		
<u>Component</u>		
a. Electronic Data Transfer	120	6,960
b. Filer Application	236	13,688
c. Website Development	120	6,960
TOTAL-- Essential Tasks	900	\$52,200

It should be noted that the funding request above will ~~not~~ be sufficient to actually complete the project, but will provide the functionality necessary to allow the commencement of electronic filing and website access to campaign finance information. The tasks that will remain in the next fiscal year include writing additional database reports and integrating existing data sources into the system to make more information available. The Board estimates these tasks will take approximately 191 hours at a cost of \$11,100 and will need to be completed in the next fiscal year.

Why project is behind schedule. When the Committee provided funding in December, 1997, for the electronic filing enhancement, the Board estimated that the project would be completed by about May 1, 1998. In its 13.10 request, the Board has identified outdated estimates, contractor personnel turnover, and software development difficulties as among the reasons for the delay and increased costs.

Addressing the funding need. The sum of the estimated GPR general operating appropriation shortfall and the additional funding requested for additional project activities in the remainder of

Increased costs - why

this fiscal year computer costs could be partially offset by the use of available funds in one of the Board's PR appropriations. Table 3 shows the total identified need and available PR funding that could be used to reduce the amount of additional GPR funding that is otherwise required.

TABLE 3

Distribution of Additional Funding Among Sources

Need	
Shortfall in General Program Operations	\$26,100
Requested Additional Computer Project Expenditures	<u>52,200</u>
TOTAL	\$78,300 <i>need</i>
Proposed Funding Source	
Filing Fees Appropriation (PR)	35,200
Committee Supplement (GPR)	<u>43,100</u>
TOTAL	\$78,300

To achieve the allocation of funding need among available funding sources as outlined in Table 3, the Committee would need to approve the following alternative: (1) increase the current expenditure authority for the Board's s. 20.510 (1) (i) appropriation from the current \$27,200 PR to \$35,200 PR; (2) provide that the Board shall allocate \$35,200 of its proposed additional IT project tasks expenditures to this appropriation; and (3) approve a supplement of \$43,100 GPR from the unreserved portion of the Committee's GPR appropriation to the Board's GPR general program operations appropriation.

*8,000
25,200*

ALTERNATIVES

2nd best
1. Approve the Elections Board's request for a supplement of \$45,000 GPR from the unreserved portion of the Committee's GPR appropriation and a supplement of \$8,000 PR from the Committee's PR appropriation to fund the further development of electronic filing enhancements to the Board's computerized database and for unfunded salary costs.

2. Provide a supplement of \$43,100 GPR from the unreserved portion of the Committee's GPR appropriation and a supplement of \$8,000 PR from the Committee's PR appropriation to fund the further development of the electronic filing enhancements for the Board's computerized database and for unfunded salary costs.

increase expenditure authority

~~100%~~ Deny the request.

Prepared by: David Worzala

from 27,200 to 35,200 8,000 difference

MO# Alt 2

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
1 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 14 NO 2 ABS 0