LRBa0158

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AA2-AB42)

Received: **02/07/2001**

Received By: **mdsida**

Wanted: **Today**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Larry Balow (608) 266-9172**

By/Representing: **Rob**

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

Drafter: **mdsida**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - prisons**

Extra Copies: **rpn**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Delete exemption to construction prohibition for pre-existing contracts

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

Vers.	Drafted	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/1	mdsida 02/07/2001 mdsida 02/14/2001	jdyer 02/07/2001	kfollet 02/07/2001		lrb_docadmin 02/07/2001	lrb_docadmin 02/07/2001	
/2	mdsida 02/14/2001	jdyer 02/14/2001	kfollet 02/14/2001		lrb_docadmin 02/14/2001	lrb_docadmin 02/14/2001	
/3			kfollet 02/14/2001		lrb_docadmin 02/14/2001	lrb_docadmin 02/14/2001	

FE Sent For:

<END>

LRBa0158

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AA2-AB42)

Received: **02/07/2001**

Received By: **mdsida**

Wanted: **Today**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Larry Balow (608) 266-9172**

By/Representing: **Rob**

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

Drafter: **mdsida**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - prisons**

Extra Copies: **rpn**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Delete exemption to construction prohibition for pre-existing contracts

---

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

Vers.	Drafted	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/1	mdsida 02/07/2001 mdsida 02/14/2001	jdyer 02/07/2001 3 2/14 jld	kfollet 02/07/2001		lrb_docadmin 02/07/2001	lrb_docadmin 02/07/2001	
/2			kfollet 02/14/2001		lrb_docadmin 02/14/2001	lrb_docadmin 02/14/2001	

FE Sent For: 2/14 2/14 kfl 48 km

<END>

LRBa0158

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AA~~(LRBa0126/3)~~ 2 -AB42)

Received: **02/07/2001**

Received By: **mdsida**

Wanted: **Today**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Larry Balow (608) 266-9172**

By/Representing: **Rob**

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

Drafter: **mdsida**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - prisons**

Extra Copies: **rpn**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Delete exemption to construction prohibition for pre-existing contracts

---

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

Vers.	Drafted	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/1	mdsida 02/07/2001	jdyer 02/07/2001	kfollet 02/07/2001	_____ _____	lrb_docadmin 02/07/2001	lrb_docadmin 02/07/2001	

FE Sent For:

12 2/14 jld

kyf 2/14

kyf FE Sent For 2/14

<END>

LRBa0158

2001 DRAFTING REQUEST

Assembly Amendment (AA-AA(LRBa0126/3)-AB42)

Received: **02/07/2001**

Received By: **mdsida**

Wanted: **Today**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Larry Balow (608) 266-9172**

By/Representing: **Rob**

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

Drafter: **mdsida**

May Contact:

Alt. Drafters:

Subject: **Correctional System - prisons**

Extra Copies: **rpn**

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Delete exemption to construction prohibition for pre-existing contracts

---

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

Vers.	Drafted	Reviewed	Typed	Proofed	Submitted	Jacketed	Required
/1	mdsida	1 2/7 jld	2/7	2/7			

FE Sent For:

<END>

Dsida, Michael

From: Burnett, Douglas
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2001 6:34 PM
To: Dsida, Michael; Sappenfield, Anne; Walker, Scott; Gilbert, Melissa
Cc: Suls, Robert
Subject: LRBa 0126/3 to AB 42

Importance: High

I have reviewed the amendment and Anne's memo on the amendment. I have one question: what is the purpose of the second exemption (below) from the prohibition of a person commencing construction unless it is enumerated in the building program? Is it necessary, or can it just be deleted?

"2. It is constructed or converted under a contract with DOC under a contract with DOC if the contract was entered into on or before the effective date of the act created by AB 42."

The concern is that this could allow DOC to sign a contract for another prison in the state if it did it before enactment of AB 42. The third exemption I believe allows the Stanley conversion. Maybe I'm not understanding it correctly, but I would like some assurance that there is not a loophole there.

If some form of the second exemption is needed could we make the date retroactive to January 1 or the signing of the Stanley contract, so there's no temptation for funny business on the part of DOC or any of the other interests trying to sneak another prison by the Legislature?

Leg. Council memo on Assembly ...

Dsida, Michael

From: Suls, Robert
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2001 8:28 AM
To: Burnett, Douglas; Dsida, Michael; Sappenfield, Anne; Walker, Scott; Gilbert, Melissa
Subject: RE: LRBa 0126/3 to AB 42

The second exemption was added at the request of representatives for Dominion Venture Group. If the Stanley prison undergoes modification to meet DOC's needs it may be considered a converted facility constructed after Oct 1, 1999. The point is only to spell out an exemption for Stanley from the enumeration rules laid out in the amendment, avoiding any retroactive liability for its builders.

Also, I think we can say with confidence that the interests in Superior will follow the preferred route and not that of Stanley. This amendment will assure us of that.

Thanks, Rob

Rob Suls
Office of State Rep. Larry Balow
409 North State Capitol
p. 608-266-9172
f. 608-282-3668

-----Original Message-----
From: Burnett, Douglas
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2001 6:34 PM
To: Dsida, Michael; Sappenfield, Anne; Walker, Scott; Gilbert, Melissa

Cc: Suls, Robert
Subject: LRBa 0126/3 to AB 42
Importance: High

I have reviewed the amendment and Anne's memo on the amendment. I have one question: what is the purpose of the second exemption (below) from the prohibition of a person commencing construction unless it is enumerated in the building program? Is it necessary, or can it just be deleted?

"2. It is constructed or converted under a contract with DOC under a contract with DOC if the contract was entered into on or before the effective date of the act created by AB 42."

The concern is that this could allow DOC to sign a contract for another prison in the state if it did it before enactment of AB 42. The third exemption I believe allows the Stanley conversion. Maybe I'm not understanding it correctly, but I would like some assurance that there is not a loophole there.

If some form of the second exemption is needed could we make the date retroactive to January 1 or the signing of the Stanley contract, so there's no temptation for funny business on the part of DOC or any of the other interests trying to sneak another prison by the Legislature?

<< File: Leg. Council memo on Assembly amendments.pdf >>

Dsida, Michael

From: Burnett, Douglas
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2001 8:41 AM
To: Suls, Robert; Dsida, Michael; Sappenfield, Anne; Walker, Scott; Gilbert, Melissa
Subject: RE: LRBa 0126/3 to AB 42

Anne, Mike, and Rob-Dominion already has a contract with either DOA or DOC-I'm not sure which. Is there a way to use that contract, and the date of that contract, so that we don't have to accept on faith that DOC or DOA won't sign another contract for a prison while this bill is awaiting the governor's signature? Sen. Chvala's goal with this is to prevent anything like this from ever happening again, without enumeration by the Legislature.

-----Original Message-----
From: **Suls, Robert**
Sent: Wednesday, February 07, 2001 8:28 AM
To: Burnett, Douglas; Dsida, Michael; Sappenfield, Anne; Walker, Scott; Gilbert, Melissa
Subject: RE: LRBa 0126/3 to AB 42

The second exemption was added at the request of representatives for Dominion Venture Group. If the Stanley prison undergoes modification to meet DOC's needs it may be considered a converted facility constructed after Oct 1, 1999. The point is only to spell out an exemption for Stanley from the enumeration rules laid out in the amendment, avoiding any retroactive liability for its builders.

Also, I think we can say with confidence that the interests in Superior will follow the preferred route and not that of Stanley. This amendment will assure us of that.

Thanks, Rob

Rob Suls
Office of State Rep. Larry Balow
409 North State Capitol
p. 608-266-9172
f. 608-282-3668

-----Original Message-----
From: Burnett, Douglas
Sent: Tuesday, February 06, 2001 6:34 PM
To: Dsida, Michael; Sappenfield, Anne; Walker, Scott; Gilbert, Melissa

Cc: Suls, Robert
Subject: LRBa 0126/3 to AB 42
Importance: High

I have reviewed the amendment and Anne's memo on the amendment. I have one question: what is the purpose of the second exemption (below) from the prohibition of a person commencing construction unless it is enumerated in the building program? Is it necessary, or can it just be deleted?

"2. It is constructed or converted under a contract with DOC under a contract with DOC if the contract was entered into on or before the effective date of the act created by AB 42."

The concern is that this could allow DOC to sign a contract for another prison in the state if it did it before enactment of AB 42. The third exemption I believe allows the Stanley conversion. Maybe I'm not understanding it correctly, but I would like some assurance that there is not a loophole there.

If some form of the second exemption is needed could we make the date retroactive to January 1 or the signing of the Stanley contract, so there's no temptation for funny business on the part of DOC or any of the other interests trying to sneak another prison by the Legislature?

<< File: Leg. Council memo on Assembly amendments.pdf >>

2001 Date (time) needed Now LRBa 0158 / 1

AMENDMENT

mgd : jld : ____

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

S (A) AMENDMENT

TO S (A) AMENDMENT ____ (LRBa 0126 / 3),

TO S A SUBSTITUTE AMENDMENT ____ (LRBs ____ / ____),

TO 2001 SB SJR SR (AB) AJR AR 42 ~~(LRB ____ / ____)~~

At the locations indicated, amend the amendment ~~amendment~~ as follows:

(fill ONLY if "engrossed ...." or "as shown by .....")

#. Page 3, line 15:

delete lines 15 to 17.

#. Page ____, line ____:

(end)

#. Page ____, line ____:

#. Page ____, line ____:

#. Page ____, line ____:

State of Wisconsin
2001 – 2002 LEGISLATURE

LRBa0158/1
MGD:jld:kjf

LPS - Fix request sheet

2

ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ,

TO ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT (~~LRBa0126/3~~) 2,

TO 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 42

Wed 10:00 am

At the locations indicated, amend the amendment as follows:

1. Page 3, line 15: delete lines 15 to 17.

(END)

Wsent 1/2 ✓

insert 1/2

1. Page ~~2~~ 3, line ~~2~~ 18: delete lines ~~2~~ 18 to ~~2~~ 20 and substitute:

"(c) A building, structure, or facility the construction of which was completed before January 1, 2001, if the building, structure, or facility was designed to confine persons convicted of criminal offenses.".

ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT ,
TO ASSEMBLY AMENDMENT 2,
TO 2001 ASSEMBLY BILL 42

11:00
Wed

At the locations indicated, amend the amendment as follows:

1. Page 3, line 15: delete lines 15 to 17.

2. Page 3, line 18: delete lines 18 to 20 and substitute:

"(c) A building, structure, or facility the construction of which was completed before January 1, 2001, if the building, structure, or facility was designed to confine persons convicted of criminal offenses.".".

(END)

Page 2, line 1: delete that line and substitute "into a correctional facility either was completed before January 1, 2001, or began after the building,". ✓