

AGENCY: DAs

Paper #: 381

ISSUE: Additional Prosecutors

ALTERNATIVES:

A1 (WDDA recommendation). \$2,447,600 GPR. 26.6 positions in 01-02 and 28.1 in 02-03.

| <u>Alt.</u> | <u>% of caseload</u> |
|-------------|----------------------|
| 2 | 105% |
| 3 | 110% |
| 4 | 115% |
| 5 | 120% |
| 6 | 125% |
| 7 | 130 % |

B2 (Require DOA to transfer position authority from a county with a neg. need if there's a vacancy, they do not reflect a need based on weighted caseload, the recipient county requested additional resources and the transfer is approved through passive review by JFC.)

SUMMARY:

Prepared by: Tanya



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 21, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #381

Additional Prosecutors (District Attorneys)

CURRENT LAW

District Attorneys are authorized 412.15 full-time equivalent (FTE) prosecutor positions.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under 1999 Act 9, the Governor vetoed \$631,800 GPR in 1999-00 and \$823,500 GPR in 2000-01 and 17.0 GPR assistant district attorney (ADA) positions annually provided by the Legislature in 1999 Enrolled Assembly Bill 133. In total, Enrolled AB 133 would have provided the following 17.0 additional prosecutor positions: Adams (0.25), Chippewa (0.25), Dane (2.5), Jefferson (0.25), Kenosha (0.5), La Crosse (0.5), Manitowoc (1.0), Marathon (1.0), Milwaukee (5.75), Oneida (0.5), Outagamie (0.5), Portage (0.5), Rock (0.75), Sauk (1.0 position to serve Columbia, Marquette and Sauk Counties), Sheboygan (0.5) and Winnebago (1.25).

2. Subsequently, the Joint Committee on Finance provided, under s. 13.10 action at its May, 2000, meeting, \$239,500 GPR in 2000-01 and 5.0 GPR ADA positions for the following counties: (a) Columbia (0.5); (b) La Crosse (0.3); (c) Marathon (0.5); (d) Marquette (0.2); (e) Oneida (0.5); (f) Rock (0.75); (g) Winnebago (0.75); (h) Manitowoc (0.5); (i) Sheboygan (0.5); (j) Washburn (0.25); and (k) Burnett (0.25).

3. Under the 2001-03 biennial budget agency request, district attorney offices requested a total of 35.45 additional prosecutor positions. The Governor did not provide any caseload-related prosecutor positions in the budget bill. The bill would eliminate 10.5 PR project positions under the standard budget adjustment removal of non-continuing elements from the

base as follows: (a) 6.0 Milwaukee County ADA positions funded by federal high-intensity drug trafficking area (HIDTA) grants that terminate in September, 2002; (b) 3.0 Dane County ADA positions funded by the federal Violence Against Women Act that terminate in January, 2003; (c) 1.0 Dane County ADA position funded by the Wisconsin Department of Transportation and the Federal National Highway Traffic Safety Administration that terminates in January, 2003; and (d) 0.5 Milwaukee County children in need of protection or services (CHIPS) ADA position that terminates in April, 2003. The deletion of these 10.5 project positions would bring the number of prosecutors to 401.65. The analysis in this paper uses 401.65 positions as the position base ("authorized positions").

4. In response to the substantial requests by counties in the past and questions regarding the prosecutorial caseload management, in 1995 the Legislative Audit Bureau (LAB) reviewed the methodology used to measure prosecutorial caseload and recommended changes to improve the methodology. The LAB recommended that once a more accurate case measurement system was developed, a productivity standard be created for DAs to determine the time that a prosecutor has available to prosecute cases (similar to the method used to determine judicial resources).

5. In response to the LAB report, the State Prosecutors Office, in conjunction with the Wisconsin District Attorneys Association (WDAA), reviewed available data and surveyed district attorneys to estimate the average time needed to prosecute different types of cases. (The WDAA is an association of state district attorneys that meets to discuss various issues that affect prosecutors.) The revised prosecutor need analysis assigns the following times to case types:

| <u>Type of Case</u> | <u>Average Hours Required</u> |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Class A Homicide | 100.00 |
| Class B Homicide | 100.00 |
| Sexually Violent Person Commitment | 100.00 |
| Other Felony | 8.49 |
| Misdemeanor | 2.17 |
| Delinquency | 3.32 |
| Children in Need of Protection or Services | 2.61 |
| Criminal Traffic | 1.68 |
| Termination of Parental Rights | 7.00 |
| Writ of Habeas Corpus | 2.00 |
| Inquest | 64.00 |

6. A "time available" standard for prosecutors was also estimated through a district attorney survey. The analysis assumes that, on average, each prosecutor has 1,227 hours per year to prosecute cases. This is based on 2,088 total hours per position less: (a) an average of 300 hours annually for holiday, personal, sick and vacation time; and (b) an average of 561 hours annually for other prosecutorial duties such as administration, John Doe proceedings, post-conviction hearings, training, review of referrals not charged, search warrants, wage claims, public records, probation revocations and community services.

7. This methodology has been used to analyze prosecutorial workload by county. The attachment to this paper indicates the results of this analysis using averaged case filings for 1997-99 (the most recent data available). The attachment shows, by county, the current authorized number of prosecutors, the estimated number of additional positions needed to prosecute the county's averaged 1997-99 caseload, and the resulting workload for each prosecutor. The attachment adjusts a 1.0 Outagamie County PR ADA position to account for the amount of time the Outagamie County drug prosecutor spends prosecuting in Outagamie County (50%), Fond du Lac County (25%), and Winnebago County (25%). The attachment also adjusts a 0.5 Washburn County GPR ADA position to account for the amount of time the prosecutor spends prosecuting in Washburn County (50%) and Burnett County (50%).

8. Based on this analysis, there is a net need for 51.61 prosecutor positions. This includes 49 prosecutorial units with a total need of 62.73 FTE, and 22 prosecutorial units with a combined need of -11.12 FTE (each county is its own prosecutorial unit, except for Shawano and Menominee, which are combined).

9. It should be noted that this analysis makes a number of assumptions which may not apply to all offices. For instance, single DA offices have unique challenges. Larger offices may have more staff to perform administrative and investigative duties, so that DAs in those counties have more time to prosecute cases. Further, there may be different practices among counties which would not be reflected in this type of analysis. However, despite such problems, the analysis takes into account a number of improvements suggested by the LAB and can be used as a general measurement for ADA need.

10. Individual DA offices submitted requests for additional prosecutor positions that were compiled and submitted to the Governor as part of the District Attorneys 2001-03 budget request. The WDAA reviewed these requests and issued its own recommendations as to which DA offices should receive additional prosecutor positions. These recommendations were forwarded in a letter to the Governor and Lieutenant Governor on January 10, 2001. In total, the WDAA supported the addition of 28.10 prosecutors over the biennium. (In addition, the WDAA recommended a 1.0 DNA evidence prosecutor position that is included in the bill as a PR position, supported by revenue from a \$5 crime lab and drug law enforcement assessment and a \$250 DNA surcharge.) The WDAA recommendations are for assistant district attorney positions, except for the requests of two part-time district attorneys (Florence and Pepin) to be increased by 0.2 FTE each.

11. The following table shows, for those counties that requested positions (except the DNA evidence prosecutor): (a) the total number of prosecutors (district attorney and deputy and

assistant district attorneys, if any) currently authorized; (b) the number of additional positions requested by the district attorney office; (c) the WDAA recommendation; and (d) the number of additional prosecutors needed according to the weighted caseload study using 1997-99 averaged caseload data.

| <u>County</u> | <u>Authorized Positions</u> | <u>Additional FTEs Requested by Individual DA Offices</u> | <u>Additional FTE's Recommended by WDAA*</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 1997-99 Caseload Methodology</u> |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---|--|---|
| Adams | 1.20 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.30 |
| Ashland | 1.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.60 |
| Brown | 12.00 | 3.00 | 3.50 | 3.29 |
| Chippewa | 3.00 | 1.00 | 0.75 | 1.72 |
| Columbia | 3.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.67 |
| Dane | 27.00 | 8.00 | 3.50 | 8.96 |
| Florence*** | 0.50 | 0.20 | 0.20 | -0.06 |
| Grant | 2.00 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.34 |
| Green | 2.00 | 0.50 | 0.10 | 0.11 |
| Jefferson | 4.80 | 0.45 | 0.45 | 1.58 |
| Juneau | 2.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.24 |
| Kenosha | 12.00 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 3.83 |
| La Crosse | 7.30 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 3.07 |
| Langlade | 1.50 | 0.50 | 0.10 | 0.46 |
| Manitowoc | 4.50 | 1.50 | 1.50 | 1.92 |
| Marathon | 7.50 | 2.50 | 2.50 | 2.66 |
| Oconto | 1.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 0.22 |
| Outagamie** | 7.50 | 3.00 | 3.00 | 4.36 |
| Ozaukee | 3.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99 |
| Pepin*** | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.20 | -0.04 |
| Polk | 2.00 | 2.00 | 0.50 | 0.51 |
| Portage | 4.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | -0.13 |
| Rock | 14.25 | 0.25 | 0.25 | 3.29 |
| Sauk | 4.50 | 0.50 | 0.50 | 1.36 |
| Taylor | 1.00 | 0.30 | 0.30 | 0.32 |
| Winnebago** | 9.00 | 2.25 | 2.25 | 3.40 |
| TOTAL | 139.65 | 36.15 | 28.10 | 44.97 |

*All positions recommended by WDAA to begin upon enactment of the bill with the following exceptions: Brown, 0.5 FTE on 7/02; Columbia, 1.0 FTE on 1/02; Dane, 0.5 FTE on 7/02; and Juneau, 0.5 FTE on 9/02.

**Reflects that the workload of the drug prosecutor assigned in Outagamie County is divided as follows: 50% in Outagamie County; 25% in Fond du Lac County; and 25% in Winnebago County.

*** Increase by 0.2 FTE the part-time district attorney positions in these counties.

12. The WDAA recommended providing an additional 0.5 ADA position in July, 2002, for Brown County that was not originally requested by the Brown County DA office. According to the State Prosecutors Office, this recommendation was based on the WDAA's view that the prosecutorial workload is continuing to increase for the Brown County DA Office. Likewise, the WDAA recommended positions for Grant (0.5), Juneau (0.5 in September, 2002) and Oconto (0.5)

Counties whose needs are not completely supported by the caseload data (position needs according to the weighted caseload data for these counties are 0.34, 0.24 and 0.22 respectively). The WDAA based its recommendation on the belief that the trendline for workload is up in these counties. In addition, in Grant and Juneau Counties, it was felt that the additional position authority would be needed to attract qualified candidates to accept a part-time position. Finally, the WDAA recommended position increases for the DA positions in Florence and Pepin counties essentially premised on the "philosophy that communities are best served by full-time district attorneys", not based on the caseload data. The cost of the WDAA recommendation would be \$1,010,000 GPR and 26.6 GPR positions in 2001-02 and \$1,437,600 GPR and 28.1 GPR positions in 2002-03.

13. The weighted caseload measurement is based on attorneys working full-time less vacation, sick leave and holidays. This assumes that each prosecutor handles 100% of a caseload. The "current prosecutor workload" column of the attachment shows what percent of a full-time caseload prosecutors currently work, using 100% as the standard full-time workload. According to this analysis, caseloads in a number of counties require prosecutors to handle more cases than they have "time" to handle based on the "time available" analysis. For example, in Outagamie County, each prosecutor, on average, currently handles 158% of the caseload he or she has "time" to handle, based on the LAB methodology and the average number of cases filed in 1997-99. In Marathon County, prosecutors handle 136% of caseload levels and in Forest County, the prosecutor handles 129% of the caseload a full-time position would have "time" to do.

14. Given the limited funding available, the Committee may wish to consider adding fewer positions than what the 100% standard would indicate. The Committee could use this analysis to allocate positions to counties that have the highest caseloads per prosecutor.

15. The table below indicates, for counties which requested positions, the number of additional prosecutors that would be required so that no county requesting positions would average more than 105% of caseload per prosecutor. For this and the remaining alternatives, these numbers were then adjusted so that no county received more positions than requested by the DA Office or recommended by the WDAA. In addition, positions were rounded to the nearest 0.1 FTE except that, because a position must be at least 0.3 FTE in order to qualify for state fringe benefits, positions were rounded so that no DA office would receive less than 0.3 FTE unless so requested by the DA office, or recommended by the WDAA. For counties that requested delayed starting dates for positions or were recommended to have delayed starting dates by the WDAA, the costs are calculated using those delayed starting dates.

16. If additional positions were provided based on 105% of caseload, this would require 24.2 GPR positions and \$903,500 GPR in 2001-02 and 24.8 GPR positions and \$1,252,600 GPR in 2002-03.

| <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 105%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 105% of Caseload</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 105%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 105% of Caseload</u> |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---|---------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Adams | 0.23 | 0.30 | Manitowoc | 1.61 | 1.50 |
| Ashland | 0.50 | 0.50 | Marathon | 2.18 | 2.20 |
| Brown | 2.56 | 2.60* | Oconto | 0.13 | 0.00 |
| Chippewa | 1.50 | 0.75 | Outagamie | 3.79 | 3.00 |
| Columbia | 1.42 | 1.40** | Ozaukee | 0.80 | 0.80 |
| Dane | 7.25 | 3.50*** | Polk | 0.39 | 0.40 |
| Grant | 0.23 | 0.30 | Rock | 2.46 | 0.25 |
| Green | 0.01 | 0.00 | Sauk | 1.08 | 0.50 |
| Jefferson | 1.28 | 0.45 | Taylor | 0.26 | 0.30 |
| Juneau | 0.13 | 0.00 | Winnebago | 2.81 | 2.25 |
| Kenosha | 3.08 | 3.00 | | | |
| La Crosse | 2.57 | 0.70 | Total | | 24.80 |
| Langlade | 0.37 | 0.10 | | | |

*2.5 positions in 2001-02 and 2.6 positions in 2002-03.

**1.4 positions in 2001-02, of which 0.9 position starts in January, 2002.

***3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03.

17. If additional positions were provided based on 110% of caseload, this would require 21.4 GPR positions and \$800,200 GPR in 2001-02 and 21.9 GPR positions and \$1,106,100 GPR in 2002-03.

| <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 110%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 110% of Caseload</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 110%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 110% of Caseload</u> |
|---------------|-------------------------------|---|---------------|-------------------------------|---|
| Adams | 0.17 | 0.30 | Manitowoc | 1.34 | 1.30 |
| Ashland | 0.41 | 0.40 | Marathon | 1.74 | 1.70 |
| Brown | 1.90 | 1.90 | Oconto | 0.06 | 0.00 |
| Chippewa | 1.29 | 0.75 | Outagamie | 3.28 | 3.00 |
| Columbia | 1.20 | 1.20* | Ozaukee | 0.62 | 0.60 |
| Dane | 5.69 | 3.50** | Polk | 0.28 | 0.30 |
| Grant | 0.13 | 0.00 | Rock | 1.70 | 0.25 |
| Jefferson | 1.00 | 0.45 | Sauk | 0.83 | 0.50 |
| Juneau | 0.04 | 0.00 | Taylor | 0.20 | 0.30 |
| Kenosha | 2.39 | 2.40 | Winnebago | 2.27 | 2.25 |
| La Crosse | 2.12 | 0.70 | | | |
| Langlade | 0.28 | 0.10 | Total | | 21.90 |

*1.2 positions in 2001-02, of which 0.7 position starts in January, 2002.

**3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03.

18. If additional positions were provided based on 115% of caseload, this would require 17.95 GPR positions and \$672,300 GPR in 2001-02 and 18.45 GPR positions and \$931,800 GPR in 2002-03.

| County | FTE Need Based on 115% | Additional Positions At 115% of Caseload | County | FTE Need Based on 115% | Additional Positions At 115% of Caseload |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|-----------|------------------------------|--|
| Adams | 0.11 | 0.00 | Manitowoc | 1.08 | 1.10 |
| Ashland | 0.33 | 0.30 | Marathon | 1.34 | 1.30 |
| Brown | 1.29 | 1.30 | Outagamie | 2.81 | 2.80 |
| Chippewa | 1.11 | 0.75 | Ozaukee | 0.47 | 0.50 |
| Columbia | 0.99 | 1.00* | Polk | 0.19 | 0.30 |
| Dane | 4.27 | 3.50** | Rock | 1.00 | 0.25 |
| Grant | 0.04 | 0.00 | Sauk | 0.60 | 0.50 |
| Jefferson | 0.75 | 0.45 | Taylor | 0.15 | 0.00 |
| Kenosha | 1.77 | 1.80 | Winnebago | 1.78 | 1.80 |
| La Crosse | 1.71 | 0.70 | | | |
| Langlade | 0.21 | 0.10 | Total | | 18.45 |

*1.0 position in 2001-02, of which 0.5 position starts in January, 2002.

**3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03.

19. If additional positions were provided based on 120% of caseload, this would require \$546,300 GPR in 2001-02 and \$734,800 GPR in 2002-03 and 14.55 GPR positions annually.

| County | FTE Need Based on 120% | Additional Positions At 120% of Caseload | County | FTE Need Based on 120% | Additional Positions At 120% of Caseload |
|-----------|------------------------------|--|-----------|------------------------------|--|
| Adams | 0.05 | 0.00 | Manitowoc | 0.85 | 0.90 |
| Ashland | 0.25 | 0.30 | Marathon | 0.97 | 1.00 |
| Brown | 0.74 | 0.70 | Outagamie | 2.38 | 2.40 |
| Chippewa | 0.93 | 0.75 | Ozaukee | 0.32 | 0.30 |
| Columbia | 0.81 | 0.80* | Polk | 0.09 | 0.00 |
| Dane | 2.97 | 3.00 | Rock | 0.37 | 0.25 |
| Jefferson | 0.52 | 0.45 | Sauk | 0.38 | 0.40 |
| Kenosha | 1.19 | 1.20 | Taylor | 0.10 | 0.00 |
| La Crosse | 1.34 | 0.70 | Winnebago | 1.33 | 1.30 |
| Langlade | 0.13 | 0.10 | | | |
| | | | Total | | 14.55 |

*0.8 position in 2001-02, of which 0.3 position starts in January, 2002.

20. If additional positions were provided based on 125% of caseload, this would require \$386,200 GPR in 2001-02 and \$517,700 GPR in 2002-03 and 10.25 GPR positions annually.

| <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 125%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 125% of Caseload</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 125%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 125% of Caseload</u> |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Ashland | 0.18 | 0.30 | Manitowoc | 0.64 | 0.60 |
| Brown | 0.23 | 0.30 | Marathon | 0.63 | 0.60 |
| Chippewa | 0.78 | 0.75 | Outagamie | 1.99 | 2.00 |
| Columbia | 0.63 | 0.60* | Ozaukee | 0.19 | 0.30 |
| Dane | 1.77 | 1.80 | Polk | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Jefferson | 0.31 | 0.30 | Sauk | 0.19 | 0.30 |
| Kenosha | 0.67 | 0.70 | Taylor | 0.06 | 0.00 |
| La Crosse | 0.99 | 0.70 | Winnebago | 0.92 | 0.90 |
| Langlade | 0.07 | 0.10 | | | |
| | | | Total | | 10.25 |

*0.6 position in 2001-02, of which 0.1 position starts in January, 2002.

21. If additional positions were provided based on 130% of caseload, this would require 5.6 GPR positions annually at a cost of \$211,700 GPR in 2001-02 and \$282,800 GPR in 2002-03.

| <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 130%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 130% of Caseload</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>FTE Need Based on 130%</u> | <u>Additional Positions At 130% of Caseload</u> |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------|---------------------------------------|---|
| Ashland | 0.12 | 0.00 | Manitowoc | 0.44 | 0.40 |
| Chippewa | 0.63 | 0.60 | Marathon | 0.32 | 0.30 |
| Columbia | 0.48 | 0.50 | Outagamie | 1.62 | 1.60 |
| Dane | 0.66 | 0.70 | Ozaukee | 0.07 | 0.00 |
| Jefferson | 0.11 | 0.00 | Sauk | 0.01 | 0.00 |
| Kenosha | 0.18 | 0.30 | Taylor | 0.02 | 0.00 |
| La Crosse | 0.67 | 0.70 | Winnebago | 0.54 | 0.50 |
| Langlade | 0.01 | 0.00 | | | |
| | | | Total | | 5.60 |

22. The above proposals do not take into account counties which, using the revised weighted caseload methodology, show a negative need for positions. Given the large variability in need among counties, as shown in the attachment, it could be argued that the current assignment of resources is not efficient and some reassignment should occur to allow for a more equitable distribution of existing prosecution resources statewide. If counties that show a negative need in the attachment (using 1997-99 caseload data) are rounded down to the nearest 0.5 position, a total of 7.0 ADA positions could be deleted.

23. Alternatively, the Committee could consider requiring DOA to transfer position authority from a county which has a negative need for positions to a county with a positive need for positions, if: (a) a vacancy in an ADA position occurs in a county that has a negative need; (b) following the transfer, the county losing the position does not indicate a need for positions based on the weighted caseload measurement; (c) the recipient county requested additional resources for

2001-03; and (d) the position transfer is approved through passive review by the Joint Committee on Finance.

24. It should be noted that the uniform crime reports published by the Office of Justice Assistance indicate a reduction in the number of violent crimes in Wisconsin (including murder, forcible rape, robbery, and aggravated assault) from 1997 to 1998 (the last year for which data is available). Overall, violent crime decreased by 6.7% from 1997 to 1998 (from a total of 13,992 offenses in 1997 to 13,060 in 1998).

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Additional Prosecutor Positions

1. Provide \$1,010,000 and 26.6 positions in 2001-02 and \$1,437,600 and 28.1 positions in 2002-03 as recommended by the WDAA. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive positions: Adams (0.3), Ashland (0.5), Brown (3.5), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (1.5), Dane (3.5), Florence (0.2), Grant (0.5), Green (0.1), Jefferson (0.45), Juneau (0.50), Kenosha (3.0), La Crosse (0.7), Langlade (0.1), Manitowoc (1.5), Marathon (2.5), Oconto (0.5), Outagamie (3.0), Ozaukee (1.0), Pepin (0.2), Polk (0.5), Rock (0.25), Sauk (0.5), Taylor (0.3), and Winnebago (2.25). All positions would be provided annually, with the exception of Brown and Dane Counties, which would each receive 3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03, and Juneau County, which would receive 0.5 position in 2002-03. For Florence and Pepin counties, this would increase the position authority for the part-time district attorneys in these counties by 0.2 FTE each, from 0.5 FTE to 0.7 FTE in Florence County and from 0.6 FTE to 0.8 FTE in Pepin County.

| Alternative A1 | GPR |
|---|--------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$2,447,600 |
| [Change to Bill] | \$2,447,600] |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 28.10 |
| [Change to Bill] | 28.10] |

2. Provide \$903,500 and 24.2 positions in 2001-02 and \$1,252,600 and 24.8 positions in 2002-03. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive ADA positions: Adams (0.3), Ashland (0.5), Brown (2.6), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (1.4), Dane (3.5), Grant (0.3), Jefferson (0.45), Kenosha (3.0), La Crosse (0.7), Langlade (0.1), Manitowoc (1.5), Marathon (2.2), Outagamie (3.0), Ozaukee (0.8), Polk (0.4), Rock (0.25), Sauk (0.5), Taylor (0.3), and Winnebago (2.25). All positions would be provided annually, with the exception of Brown County, which would receive 2.5 positions in 2001-02 and 2.6 positions in 2002-03, and Dane County, which would receive 3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03. For those counties requesting positions approved by the WDAA, this alternative provides positions for those counties at or above 105% of caseload.

| Alternative A2 | GPR |
|---|---------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$2,156,100 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>\$2,156,100]</i> |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 24.80 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>24.80]</i> |

3. Provide \$800,200 and 21.4 positions in 2001-02 and \$1,106,100 and 21.9 positions in 2002-03. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive positions: Adams (0.3), Ashland (0.4), Brown (1.9), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (1.2), Dane (3.5), Jefferson (0.45), Kenosha (2.4), La Crosse (0.7), Langlade (0.1), Manitowoc (1.3), Marathon (1.7), Outagamie (3.0), Ozaukee (0.6), Polk (0.3), Rock (0.25), Sauk (0.5), Taylor (0.3), and Winnebago (2.25). All positions would be provided annually, with the exception of Dane County, which would receive 3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03. For those counties requesting positions approved by the WDAA, this alternative provides positions for those counties at or above 110% of caseload.

| Alternative A3 | GPR |
|---|---------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$1,906,300 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>\$1,906,300]</i> |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 21.90 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>21.90]</i> |

4. Provide \$672,300 and 17.95 positions in 2001-02 and \$931,800 and 18.45 positions in 2002-03. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive positions: Ashland (0.3), Brown (1.3), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (1.0), Dane (3.5), Jefferson (0.45), Kenosha (1.8), La Crosse (0.7), Langlade (0.1), Manitowoc (1.1), Marathon (1.3), Outagamie (2.8), Ozaukee (0.5), Polk (0.3), Rock (0.25), Sauk (0.5), and Winnebago (1.8). All positions would be provided annually, with the exception of Dane County, which would receive 3.0 positions in 2001-02 and 3.5 positions in 2002-03. For those counties requesting positions approved by the WDAA, this alternative provides positions for those counties at or above 115% of caseload.

| Alternative A4 | GPR |
|---|---------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$1,604,100 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>\$1,604,100]</i> |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 18.45 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>18.45]</i> |

5. Provide \$546,300 in 2001-02 and \$734,800 in 2002-03 and 14.55 positions annually. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive positions: Ashland (0.3), Brown (0.7), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (0.8), Dane (3.0), Jefferson (0.45), Kenosha (1.2), La Crosse (0.7), Langlade (0.1), Manitowoc (0.9), Marathon (1.0), Outagamie (2.4), Ozaukee (0.3),

Rock (0.25), Sauk (0.4), and Winnebago (1.3). For those counties requesting positions approved by the WDAA, this alternative provides positions for those counties at or above 120% of caseload.

| Alternative A5 | GPR |
|---|---------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$1,281,100 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>\$1,281,100]</i> |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 14.55 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>14.55]</i> |

6. Provide \$386,200 in 2001-02 and \$517,700 in 2002-03 and 10.25 positions annually. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive positions: Ashland (0.3), Brown (0.3), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (0.6), Dane (1.8), Jefferson (0.3), Kenosha (0.7), La Crosse (0.7), Langlade (0.1), Manitowoc (0.6), Marathon (0.6), Outagamie (2.0), Ozaukee (0.3), Sauk (0.3), and Winnebago (0.9). For those counties requesting positions approved by the WDAA, this alternative provides positions for those counties at or above 125% of caseload.

| Alternative A6 | GPR |
|---|-------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$903,900 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>\$903,900]</i> |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 10.25 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>10.25]</i> |

7. Provide \$211,700 in 2001-02 and \$282,800 in 2002-03 and 5.6 positions annually. Under this alternative, the following counties would receive positions: Chippewa (0.6), Columbia (0.5), Dane (0.7), Kenosha (0.3), La Crosse (0.7), Manitowoc (0.4), Marathon (0.3), Outagamie (1.6), and Winnebago (0.5). For those counties requesting positions approved by the WDAA, this alternative provides positions for those counties at or above 130% of caseload.

| Alternative A7 | GPR |
|---|-------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) | \$494,500 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>\$494,500]</i> |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) | 5.60 |
| <i>[Change to Bill]</i> | <i>5.60]</i> |

8. Maintain current law.

B. Redistribution of Assistant District Attorney Positions

1. Delete \$264,600 in 2001-02 and \$353,500 in 2002-03 and 7.0 ADA positions, effective October 1, 2001, to delete ADA positions, rounded down to the nearest 0.5 position, for counties which show a negative need for ADA positions using 1997-99 averaged caseload data. Under this alternative, the following counties would lose positions: Pierce (-1.5), Richland (-0.5), St. Croix (-2.0), Vernon (-1.0), Vilas (-0.5) and Waukesha (-1.5).

| <u>Alternative B1</u> | <u>GPR</u> |
|--|-----------------------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base) [Change to Bill] | - \$618,100 - \$618,100] |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Base) [Change to Bill] | - 7.00 - 7.00] |

2. Require DOA to transfer position authority from a county which has a negative need for positions to a county with a positive need for positions, if: (a) a vacancy in an ADA position occurs in a county that has a negative need; (b) following the transfer, the county losing the position does not reflect a need for positions based on the weighted caseload measurement; (c) the recipient county requested additional resources for 2001-03; and (d) the position transfer is approved through passive review by the Joint Committee on Finance.

3. Maintain current law.

MO# _____

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| BURKE | Y | N | A |
| DECKER | Y | N | A |
| MOORE | Y | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | Y | N | A |
| PLACHE | Y | N | A |
| WIRCH | Y | N | A |
| DARLING | Y | N | A |
| WELCH | Y | N | A |
| | | | |
| GARD | Y | N | A |
| KAUFERT | Y | N | A |
| ALBERS | Y | N | A |
| DUFF | Y | N | A |
| WARD | Y | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | Y | N | A |
| HUBER | Y | N | A |
| COGGS | Y | N | A |

AYE _____ NO _____ ABS _____

Senator Burke
Representative Kaufert
Representative Huber

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

Vehicle Fines and Forfeitures and Additional Prosecutors

[LFB Paper #381]

Motion:

Move to provide that: (a) when the cumulative amount retained by a county for fines and forfeitures imposed by the courts under Chapters 341 through 347, 349 and 351 is equal to the amount retained by the county for such fines and forfeitures in 2000-01, the county must remit 100% of such fines and forfeitures that exceed the amount retained by the county in 2000-01 to the State Treasurer, who shall distribute 50% of these funds to the common school fund and 50% to a district attorney fines and forfeitures program revenue appropriation; and (b) create a district attorney fines and forfeitures program revenue appropriation that would receive these funds and provide that these funds could be used to support the costs of prosecutors.

In addition provide \$368,100 PR in 2001-02 and \$734,800 PR in 2002-03 and 14.55 PR assistant district attorney positions as follows: Brown (2.0), Chippewa (0.75), Columbia (1.0), Dane (1.85), Jefferson (0.5), Kenosha (1.0), Juneau (0.5), La Crosse (0.7), Manitowoc (1.0), Marathon (1.0), Outagamie (2.0), Rock (0.5), Sauk (0.5), and Winnebago (1.25). Provide that the 14.55 PR positions would begin January 1, 2002.

Note:

[Change to Base: \$1,102,900 PR, \$1,284,000 PR-REV and 14.55 PR positions]

[Change to Bill: \$1,102,900 PR, \$1,284,000 PR-REV and 14.55 PR positions]

MO# _____

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| BURKE | Y | N | A |
| DECKER | Y | N | A |
| MOORE | Y | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | Y | N | A |
| PLACHE | Y | N | A |
| WIRCH | Y | N | A |
| DARLING | Y | N | A |
| WELCH | Y | N | A |
| GARD | Y | N | A |
| KAUFERT | Y | N | A |
| ALBERS | Y | N | A |
| DUFF | Y | N | A |
| WARD | Y | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | Y | N | A |
| HUBER | Y | N | A |
| COGGS | Y | N | A |

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS _____

ATTACHMENT

Prosecutor Weighted Caseload Using 1997-99 Average Cases Filed

| County | Authorized Positions* | Additional Positions Needed at 100% | Current Prosecutor Workload | County | Authorized Positions* | Additional Positions Needed at 100% | Current Prosecutor Workload |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------|-----------------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Outagamie** | 7.50 | 4.36 | 158% | Dodge | 4.00 | 0.58 | 115% |
| Chippewa | 3.00 | 1.72 | 157 | Oconto | 1.50 | 0.22 | 114 |
| Columbia | 3.50 | 1.67 | 148 | Clark | 2.00 | 0.27 | 113 |
| Manitowoc | 4.50 | 1.92 | 143 | Juneau | 2.00 | 0.24 | 112 |
| La Crosse | 7.30 | 3.07 | 142 | Price | 1.00 | 0.09 | 109 |
| Ashland | 1.50 | 0.60 | 140 | Bayfield | 1.00 | 0.09 | 109 |
| Eau Claire | 8.00 | 3.04 | 138 | Racine | 19.00 | 1.63 | 109 |
| Sheboygan | 7.50 | 2.84 | 138 | Trempealeau | 1.60 | 0.12 | 108 |
| Winnebago** | 9.00 | 3.40 | 138 | Marinette | 2.50 | 0.18 | 107 |
| Marathon | 7.50 | 2.66 | 136 | Green | 2.00 | 0.11 | 106 |
| Burnett*** | 1.25 | 0.44 | 135 | Door | 2.00 | 0.08 | 104 |
| Dane | 27.00 | 8.96 | 133 | Waushara | 1.50 | 0.03 | 102 |
| Jefferson | 4.80 | 1.58 | 133 | Walworth | 5.00 | 0.05 | 101 |
| Ozaukee | 3.00 | 0.99 | 133 | Milwaukee | 113.50 | 0.36 | 100 |
| Taylor | 1.00 | 0.32 | 132 | Waupaca | 4.00 | -0.12 | 97 |
| Kenosha | 12.00 | 3.83 | 132 | Portage | 4.00 | -0.13 | 97 |
| Langlade | 1.50 | 0.46 | 131 | Barron | 3.00 | -0.20 | 93 |
| Lincoln | 2.00 | 0.61 | 130 | Green Lake | 1.50 | -0.10 | 93 |
| Sauk | 4.50 | 1.36 | 130 | Pepin | 0.60 | -0.04 | 93 |
| Forest | 1.00 | 0.29 | 129 | Calumet | 2.00 | -0.17 | 91 |
| Monroe | 3.00 | 0.84 | 128 | Dunn | 3.50 | -0.31 | 91 |
| Brown | 12.00 | 3.29 | 127 | Waukesha | 18.50 | -1.65 | 91 |
| Oneida | 2.50 | 0.67 | 127 | Florence | 0.50 | -0.06 | 89 |
| Polk | 2.00 | 0.51 | 126 | Crawford | 1.00 | -0.14 | 86 |
| Shawano/Menominee | 3.00 | 0.76 | 125 | Rusk | 1.50 | -0.22 | 85 |
| Adams | 1.20 | 0.30 | 125 | Iowa | 1.75 | -0.32 | 81 |
| Sawyer | 2.00 | 0.50 | 125 | Buffalo | 1.00 | -0.19 | 81 |
| Fond du Lac** | 5.25 | 1.22 | 123 | Jackson | 2.00 | -0.39 | 80 |
| Rock | 14.25 | 3.29 | 123 | Iron | 1.00 | -0.22 | 78 |
| Washington | 5.00 | 1.14 | 123 | Kewaunee | 1.50 | -0.35 | 77 |
| Wood | 4.00 | 0.74 | 119 | Lafayette | 1.00 | -0.30 | 70 |
| Grant | 2.00 | 0.34 | 117 | Richland | 1.80 | -0.58 | 68 |
| Douglas | 3.50 | 0.56 | 116 | Vilas | 2.00 | -0.64 | 68 |
| Marquette | 1.20 | 0.19 | 116 | Saint Croix | 6.00 | -2.23 | 63 |
| Washburn*** | 1.25 | 0.19 | 116 | Pierce | 3.00 | -1.51 | 50 |
| | | | | Vernon | <u>2.40</u> | <u>-1.23</u> | <u>49</u> |
| | | | | Total | 401.65 | 51.61 | 113% |

*Reflects the adjusted base, minus 10.5 PR project positions deleted under the bill in 2002-03.

**Reflects that the workload of the drug prosecutor assigned in Outagamie County is divided as follows: 50% in Outagamie County; 25% in Fond du Lac County; and 25% in Winnebago County.

***Reflects that the workload of the 0.5 GPR prosecutor assigned in Washburn County is divided as follows: 50% in Washburn County and 50% in Burnett County.

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS/HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES

Reporting Suspected or Threatened Sexual Abuse of a Child

Motion:

Move to adopt the provisions of LRB draft 2015/2 relating to establishing new reporting requirements for county departments of social services (county departments), county departments of human services (county departments), the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS), licensed child welfare agencies under contract with DHFS (licensed agencies), sheriffs departments and police departments regarding all cases involving suspected or threatened sexual abuse of a child.

Note:

LRB draft 2015/2 would provide that: (a) a county department, DHFS or a licensed agency shall within 12 hours, exclusive of Saturdays, Sundays, or legal holidays, refer to the sheriff or police department all cases of suspected or threatened sexual abuse of a child, as defined in s. 48.02(1)(b) to (f), reported to it; (b) for all such reported cases of suspected or threatened sexual abuse of a child, the sheriff or police department and the county department, DHFS or a licensed agency shall coordinate the planning and execution of the investigation of the report; (c) each sheriff and police department shall adopt a written policy specifying the kinds of reports of suspected or threatened sexual abuse of a child that the sheriff or police department will routinely refer to the district attorney for criminal prosecution; (d) law enforcement agencies be specifically added as agencies to whom DHFS, county departments and licensed agencies provide continuing education and training programs designed to encourage reporting of child abuse and neglect and of unborn child abuse, encourage self-reporting and voluntary acceptance of services and improve communication, cooperation, and coordination in the identification, prevention and treatment of child abuse and neglect and of unborn child abuse; and (e) these changes first apply to reports of suspected or threatened abuse on the effective date of the bill. For purposes of LRB draft 2015/2, sexual abuse of a child includes: (a) sexual assault; (b) sexual assault of a child; (c) repeated sexual assault of the same child; (d) sexual exploitation of a child; (e) permitting, allowing or encouraging a child to violate laws against prostitution; (f) causing a child to view or listen to sexual activity; and (g) exposing genitals or pubic area to a child or encouraging a child to expose genitals or pubic area.

MO#

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| BURKE | Y | N | A |
| DECKER | Y | N | A |
| MOORE | Y | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | Y | N | A |
| PLACHE | Y | N | A |
| WIRCH | Y | N | A |
| DARLING | Y | N | A |
| WELCH | Y | N | A |
| | | | |
| GARD | Y | N | A |
| KAUFERT | Y | N | A |
| ALBERS | Y | N | A |
| DUFF | Y | N | A |
| WARD | Y | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | Y | N | A |
| HUBER | Y | N | A |
| COGGS | Y | N | A |

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

DISTRICT ATTORNEYS

Base Agency

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

| Item # | Title |
|--------|-----------------------------|
| 1 | Standard Budget Adjustments |
| 3 | DNA Evidence Prosecutor |
| 4 | Operation Ceasefire |

LFB Summary Item to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper

| Item # | Title |
|--------|--|
| 5 | Continued Funding for Anti-drug Prosecutors in Dane and Milwaukee Counties |

MO# _____

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| BURKE | Y | N | A |
| DECKER | Y | N | A |
| MOORE | Y | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | Y | N | A |
| PLACHE | Y | N | A |
| WIRCH | Y | N | A |
| DARLING | Y | N | A |
| WELCH | Y | N | A |
| | | | |
| GARD | Y | N | A |
| KAUFERT | Y | N | A |
| ALBERS | Y | N | A |
| DUFF | Y | N | A |
| WARD | Y | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | Y | N | A |
| HUBER | Y | N | A |
| COGGS | Y | N | A |

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

Veterans Affairs

General Agency Provisions

Bill Agency

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 693)

LFB Summary Items for Which Issue Papers Have Been Prepared

| <u>Item #</u> | <u>Title</u> |
|---------------|--|
| 3 | In-House Servicing of the Primary Mortgage Loan Program Portfolio (Paper #970) |
| 4 | Document Imaging of Agency Records (Paper #971) |
| 6 | Establishment of Regional Service Delivery Centers (Paper #972) |
| 12 | Management Travel Increases (Paper #973) |
| 15 | Additional Unclassified Division Administrators (Paper #974) |

VETERANS AFFAIRS -- GENERAL AGENCY PROVISIONS
AND TRUST FUND PROGRAMS AND VETERANS BENEFITS

Funding Allocations and Adjustments

Motion:

Move to approve the following alternatives contained in the Fiscal Bureau Papers #970, #971, #972, #973, #974, #985, #986 and #987 with additional modifications, as indicated:

1. LFB Paper #970. Alternative 2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by: (a) providing \$30,000 SEG to the Department of Veterans Affairs for hiring a consultant to assist DVA and DOA in developing a plan for the most cost-effective method for implementing the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage portfolio; and (b) shifting \$4,810,600 SEG in 2001-02 and \$898,800 SEG in 2002-03 initially recommended for loan servicing administration and the purchase of loan-servicing rights to the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(u) appropriation for possible future release to the Department, once the Committee has reviewed and approved the plan developed by DVA and DOA.

2. LFB Paper #971. Alternative 2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by shifting \$885,700 SEG in 2001-02 and \$188,900 SEG 2002-03 to the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(u) appropriation for possible future release to the Department of Veterans Affairs, once the documents imaging feasibility study had been completed. The feasibility study would have to include the results of requests for information for the costs of the documents imaging project if undertaken by the State Records Center or by private vendors and an assessment by DVA of the most cost-effective strategy for the documents conversion project. Delete position authority for 5.0 SEG project positions, pending a determination of whether or not the documents imaging project would be undertaken in-house or contracted out.

3. LFB Paper 972: Delete the Governor's recommendation to provide \$154,400 SEG in 2001-02 and \$638,500 SEG in 2002-03 and 9.0 SEG positions annually to enable the Department to establish six regional service delivery and seven videoconferencing centers. Provide instead \$271,700 SEG in 2001-02 and \$135,300 SEG in 2002-03 and 3.0 SEG positions, as follows: (1) \$87,000 SEG in 2001-02 and \$110,300 SEG in 2002-03 and 2.0 FTE mobile claims officer positions and 1.0 FTE claims officer position to provide veterans pension and health care benefits counseling; (2) \$45,000 SEG annually for additional veterans benefits fairs and associated promotional efforts; (3) \$158,900 SEG in 2001-02 for transportation and computers for regional coordinators, claims officers, and mobile claims officers.

Direct the Department to employ no more than five regional coordinators for providing claims and benefit application assistance to veterans in coordination with the appropriate county veterans service officer in order to maximize assistance to veterans.

Direct the Department to employ no more than seven claims officers to provide federal claims and benefit assistance to veterans and specify that these positions be based in the agency's regional office in Milwaukee County.

Direct the Department to employ no more than two mobile claims officers in the agency's southeast region and no more than one mobile claims officer in each of the agency's three remaining regions to provide claim and benefit assistance to veterans in coordination with the appropriate county veterans service officer in order to maximize assistance to veterans.

Require the Department in consultation with veterans service organizations, county veterans' service officer organizations and county veterans' service officers to study whether additional mobile claims officers and regional coordinators are needed to provide claim and benefit assistance to veterans located outside the Department's southeast region service area. If the Department determines that additional mobile claims officers are needed, authorize the Department to submit a proposal to the Joint Committee on Finance to increase the number of authorized mobile claims officer positions in the Department for mobile claims officers under a 14-day passive review procedure. If the Department determines, with the concurrence of veterans service organizations, county veterans' service officer organizations and county veterans' service officers, that additional regional coordinators are needed, authorize the Department to submit the proposal to the Joint Committee on Finance to increase the number of regional coordinators in the Department under a 14-day passive review procedure.

4. LFB Paper #973. Delete Governor's recommendation.
5. LFB Paper #974. Alternatives A3 and B2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.
6. LFB Paper #985. Modify the Governor's recommendation by funding the Tuition and Fee Reimbursement Grant program and Part-Time Study Grants program at 85% and by deleting \$1,062,500 SEG in 2001-02 and \$1,288,700 SEG in 2002-03.
7. LFB Paper #986. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing an additional \$104,900 SEG in 2001-02 and \$175,200 SEG in 2002-03 for the subsistence aid grant program, based on a revised estimate of program needs and by requiring that veterans be in a treatment program approved by the Department as a prior condition to receiving a subsistence aid grant where the veteran's incapacitation is the result of alcohol or other drug abuse. Adopt Alternative B2 deleting the Governors' recommendation for the health care and grant program modifications.
8. LFB Paper #987. Modify the Governor's recommendation by providing an additional \$100,000 SEG annually from the Veterans Trust Fund (to provide total funding of \$200,000 SEG

annually) for transportation services for veterans. In addition to directing that the Department make an annual grant of \$100,000 SEG to the Disabled American Veterans Transportation Network, require the Department to distribute the remaining funds as follows: (a) award grants of up to \$1,000 to counties that receive transportation services from the Disabled American Veterans Transportation Network to develop, maintain, and expand transportation services to veterans; and (b) award grants to counties not served by the Disabled American Veterans Transportation Network to develop, maintain, and expand transportation services to veterans. Require the Department to promulgate rules specifying the application procedures and eligibility criteria for these grants. Prohibit a county from allocating any portion of a transportation services grant for use by another county department and from reducing funding to a county veterans service office based upon receipt of a transportation services grant.

9. Provide \$12,500 SEG annually from the Veterans Trust Fund for a grant to the Vietnam Veterans of America to reimburse the costs of basic and advanced training of qualified individuals for certification courses that would allow these individuals to represent veterans in disputes over federal benefits. Provide that these grants would not count against the annual awards amounts granted to veterans service organizations by the Department under s. 45.353(2) of the statutes.

10. Provide \$1,500 SEG annually for County Veteran Service Office grants to reflect increased annual expenditures due to the movement of a county into a higher grant payment category due to an increase in population.

11. Provide \$25,000 SEG in 2001-02 to provide a grant to Armitage, Inc., to establish a supportive living environment for veterans near Onalaska.

[Change to Bill: -\$1,100 PR and -\$732,100 SEG in 2001-02 and -\$1,400 PR and -\$990,400 SEG in 2002-03 and -12.0 SEG positions annually]

MC# _____

| | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------------|---|---|
| BURKE | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| DECKER | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| MOORE | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| PLACHE | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| WIRCH <i>Barney</i> | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| DARLING | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| WELCH | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| GARD | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| KAUFERT | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| ALBERS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| DUFF | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| WARD | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| HUBER | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |
| COGGS | <input checked="" type="radio"/> | N | A |

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

VETERANS AFFAIRS -- GENERAL AGENCY PROVISIONS

Wisconsin Veterans Tribute Memorial

Motion:

Move to provide one-time funding of \$3,000 GPR in 2001-02 to permit the Department to make a matching grant to the Wisconsin Veterans Tribute Memorial in Chippewa County. Require the Wisconsin Veterans Tribute Memorial to provide an initial amount of \$3,000 before the grant can be made by the Department.

Note:

The grants would be used for repair and replacement of flags at the Memorial.

| MO# | | | |
|-----|-----------------------|---|-----|
| | BURKE | Y | N A |
| | DECKER | Y | N A |
| | MOORE | Y | N A |
| | SHIBILSKI | Y | N A |
| | PLACHE | Y | N A |
| | WIRCH <i>Baumgart</i> | Y | N A |
| | DARLING | Y | N A |
| | WELCH | Y | N A |
| | GARD | Y | N A |
| | KAUFERT | Y | N A |
| | ALBERS | Y | N A |
| | DUFF | Y | N A |
| | WARD | Y | N A |
| | HUEBSCH | Y | N A |
| | HUBER | Y | N A |
| | COGGS | Y | N A |

Motion #1062 AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

VETERANS AFFAIRS – GENERAL AGENCY PROVISIONS

Perpetual Care Funds for the Korean War Memorial at Plover

Motion:

Move to incorporate into the budget the provisions of 2001 Assembly Bill 71, relating to providing funding to the Korean War Memorial Association of Wisconsin for the perpetual care of the Korean War memorial at Plover.

Note:

Assembly Bill 71 would create a GPR-funded continuing appropriation under DVA and would provide \$90,000 GPR in 2001-02 towards the perpetual care for the Korean War memorial at Plover. The Department would be directed to allocate the appropriated funds to the Korean War Veterans Memorial Association of Wisconsin for this purpose. No matching funds would be required from the Association.

The Korean War memorial was dedicated June 19, 1994, at Plover in Portage County. Funding for the construction of the memorial was provided under 1987 Wisconsin Act 399 from the transportation fund (\$300,000 SEG).

[Change to Bill: \$90,000 GPR]

MO# _____

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| BURKE | Y | N | A |
| DECKER | Y | N | A |
| MOORE | Y | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | Y | N | A |
| PLACHE | Y | N | A |
| WIRCH | Y | N | A |
| DARLING | Y | N | A |
| WELCH | Y | N | A |
| | | | |
| GARD | Y | N | A |
| KAUFERT | Y | N | A |
| ALBERS | Y | N | A |
| DUFF | Y | N | A |
| WARD | Y | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | Y | N | A |
| HUBER | Y | N | A |
| COGGS | Y | N | A |

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

VETERANS AFFAIRS – GENERAL AGENCY PROVISIONS

Veterans Museum Funding

Motion:

Move to modify the Governor's recommendation by providing \$580,500 GPR and -\$580,500 SEG in 2001-02 and \$476,900 GPR and -\$476,900 SEG in 2002-03 and 1.0 GPR and -1.0 SEG two-year project position annually to restore GPR funding for the Wisconsin Veterans Museum for space rental and fuel and utility costs (\$471,100 SEG annually) and to fund the new museum initiatives recommended by the Governor (\$109,400 SEG in 2001-02 and \$5,800 SEG in 2002-03 and 1.0 SEG project position, net of the \$100,000 PR annually already provided by the Committee on May 24, 2001, from tribal gaming revenues).

Note:

On May 24, 2001, the Committee approved a motion that would provide \$100,000 PR annually to the Department of Veterans Affairs for operational costs related to the Wisconsin Veterans Museum from tribal gaming revenue allocations. That action reduced Veterans Museum funding recommended by the Governor from the Veterans Trust Fund by \$100,000 SEG annually and resulted in the following funding amounts being recommended for the Museum: -\$471,100 GPR, \$100,000 PR and \$580,500 SEG in 2001-02 and -\$471,100 GPR, \$100,000 PR and \$476,900 SEG in 2002-03 and 1.0 SEG two-year project position annually.

This motion would delete the remaining additional Veterans Trust Fund amounts recommended by the Governor for the Wisconsin Veterans Museum and would instead provide GPR funding.

[Change to Bill: \$1,057,400 GPR and -\$1,057,400 SEG and 1.0 GPR and -1.0 SEG position]

MO#

| | | | |
|-----------|---|---|---|
| BURKE | Y | N | A |
| DECKER | Y | N | A |
| MOORE | Y | N | A |
| SHIBILSKI | Y | N | A |
| PLACHE | Y | N | A |
| WIRCH | Y | N | A |
| DARLING | Y | N | A |
| WELCH | Y | N | A |
| GARD | Y | N | A |
| KAUFERT | Y | N | A |
| ALBERS | Y | N | A |
| DUFF | Y | N | A |
| WARD | Y | N | A |
| HUEBSCH | Y | N | A |
| HUBER | Y | N | A |
| COGGS | Y | N | A |

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 1, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #985

Educational Grants Reimbursement Rate Increase (Veterans Affairs -- Trust Fund Programs and Veterans Benefits)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 702, #2]

A2, B2 package

CURRENT LAW

Tuition and Fee Reimbursement Grant (TFRG) Program. Tuition and fee grant reimbursements equal to 65% of the cost of tuition and fees for a UW-Madison resident undergraduate are authorized if the qualifying veteran attends any institution or center within the UW system, any state technical college or any similar institution that has a tuition reciprocity agreement with Wisconsin. The base level of funding for the tuition and fee reimbursement grant program is \$1,551,400 SEG annually.

Part-Time Study Grant (PTSG) Program. Grant reimbursements equal to 65% of the cost of tuition and fees are authorized if the qualifying veteran attends an institution of higher education in the state or a public or private high school. The base level of funding for the part-time study grant program is \$415,600 SEG annually.

Eligibility for both the tuition and fee reimbursement grant program and the part-time study grants program is restricted to veterans with incomes of \$47,500 or less (plus \$500 for each dependent in excess of two).

GOVERNOR

Tuition and Fee Reimbursement Grant Program. Increase the grant reimbursement rate for qualifying veterans under the TFRG program from 65% to 100% of the cost of tuition and fees for a UW-Madison resident undergraduate and provide \$812,300 SEG in 2001-02 and \$1,048,600 SEG in 2002-03 for the additional costs associated with this change. Delete a

redundant statutory reference to a 100% reimbursement rate for disabled veterans since all veterans would be reimbursed at 100% under the proposed change.

Part-Time Study Grant Program. Increase the grant reimbursement rate for qualifying veterans under the PTSG program from 65% to 100% of the cost of tuition and fees and provide \$679,800 SEG in 2001-02 and \$789,300 SEG in 2002-03 for the additional costs associated with this change. Delete a redundant statutory reference to a 100% reimbursement rate for disabled veterans since all veterans would be reimbursed at 100% under the proposed change.

Qualifying Schools. Authorize these programs to be used by qualifying veterans who attend proprietary schools approved by the Educational Approval Board and clarify the proper statutory citation for the definition of "institution of higher education."

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. *Tuition and Fee Reimbursement Grant Program* The TFRG program was established by 1993 Wisconsin Act 254 and funding for the program was first provided under the 1995-97 biennial budget act (1995 Wisconsin Act 27). Initially, under Act 254, the reimbursement rate for the program was set at 25% but was subsequently increased by Act 27 to 35%. The TFRG reimbursement rate was again increased to 50% by 1995 Wisconsin Act 255. Provisions of 1997 Wisconsin Act 27 established a maximum reimbursement equivalent to 50% of the undergraduate resident tuition and fees charged at the UW-Madison. Finally, provisions of 1999 Wisconsin Act 9 increased the TFRG program's reimbursement rate from 50% to the current 65% of the undergraduate resident tuition and fees charged at the UW-Madison.

2. Tuition and fee reimbursements are made upon an eligible veteran's successful completion of a semester at any UW System institution or center, state technical college or similar institution with a tuition reciprocity agreement with Wisconsin. Veterans are eligible for reimbursement for up to 120 credits or eight semesters of study and may receive reimbursement only for credits completed prior to the 10-year anniversary of their separation from active duty. Requests for reimbursement must be received by the Department within 60 days of the completion of coursework. In general, this 60-day timeline for making reimbursement requests results in virtually all reimbursements being paid in the fiscal year in which the veteran received the educational services.

3. *Funding Needs for the Proposed Reimbursement Rate Modification.* The Governor has recommended providing an additional \$812,300 SEG in 2001-02 and \$1,048,600 SEG in 2002-03 to fund the TFRG program reimbursement rate increase from 65% to 100%. This estimate has been developed based on the growth of 1999-00 fiscal year actual program expenditures over the preceding fiscal year (15.37%). This same rate of increase in annual program costs has then been projected forward through the 2001-02 fiscal year. (These rates of increase approximate the impact of an annual 10% growth in program utilization and an estimated 5% annual increase in UW-Madison tuition and fee costs.) Thereafter, the rate of increase in program costs is projected at 10%



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 1, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #970

In-House Servicing of the Primary Mortgage Loan Program Portfolio (Veterans Affairs -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 694, #3]

CURRENT LAW

Chapter 208, Laws of 1973 authorized the issuance of bonds to provide low-interest home mortgages to qualified veterans. Lending activities under the program began in 1974. The program is designed to be self-supporting. This means that the veteran mortgage loan repayments (principal and interest) are intended to be sufficient to repay the funds borrowed, plus interest costs, as well as the administrative costs of the home loan program.

To obtain a loan, a veteran applies through a financial institution approved by DVA. The financial institution reviews a veteran's loan application for creditworthiness. DVA also reviews the loan application to ensure that a veteran is qualified for the loan program. If the application is approved, the local lending institution originates the loan using monies from the capital improvement fund and acts as the collection agent for DVA. The financial institution typically charges a fee of three-eighths of 1% to one-half of 1% of the amount of the loan to cover its loan servicing costs.

GOVERNOR

Authorize the Department to assume the servicing of the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio and to purchase from authorized lenders the servicing rights for such portfolios. Provide \$4,840,600 SEG in 2001-02 and \$898,800 SEG in 2002-03 for the likely implementation of an in-house loan servicing function following the development of a plan for the most cost-effective method of servicing such loans, as follows:

Loan Servicing Administration. Create a SEG-funded sum certain appropriation, funded from the veterans mortgage loan repayment fund, to support the in-house servicing of the

veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio and provide \$1,297,000 SEG in 2001-02 and \$898,800 SEG for this purpose. Of the amounts provided, all but \$30,000 SEG in 2001-02 for supplies and services costs would be budgeted in unallotted reserve. Define the Department as a "mortgage banker" for the purpose of providing the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio.

Escrow Payments. Create a SEG-funded continuing appropriation, funded from the veterans mortgage loan repayment fund, to which would be credited monthly escrow payments from borrowers for real estate taxes and casualty insurance premiums, in the event that the Department assumes the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio. Require the Department to hold in escrow all such payments and to pay all of the required amounts due for real estate taxes and casualty insurance premiums for each borrower making escrow payments, even if the amounts held in escrow are insufficient. In the case of an insufficiency, the Department would be directed to recover the amount of the insufficiency from the veteran. If the amounts in the borrower's escrow account were in excess of the amounts required for the real estate taxes and casualty insurance premium payments, the Department would be required to pay all of the amounts due and refund the amount of the excess to the veteran. Extend the current law provision requiring that borrowers maintain adequate fire and extended coverage insurance to specify that the Department also be named as an insured in the event that it assumes the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio. No expenditures are estimated under this new appropriation.

Loan Servicing Rights. Create a SEG-funded biennial appropriation, funded from the veterans mortgage loan repayment fund, to support the purchase of loan servicing rights from existing authorized lending institutions and provide \$3,543,600 SEG in 2001-02 for this purpose. All of these amounts would be budgeted in unallotted reserve.

Development of a Plan for Servicing Primary Mortgage Loans. Require the Department and DOA to develop a plan for the most cost-effective method for the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio. Specify that the Secretary of DOA could not authorize the encumbrance or the expenditure of funds under any of the new appropriations described above until after the plan developed by the two agencies had been completed. Finally, the Department would be prohibited from holding any escrow payments until the actual completion of the plan.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Department states that the primary benefit of developing an in-house capability to service the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio is that the program will no longer be required to provide qualified lending institutions with a servicing fee for processing the loans. [These institutions will continue to assess standard loan origination and closing fees.] While the Department would newly incur additional loan administration and escrow account management expenses, it is estimated that the elimination of servicing fee payments to lending institutions would

net the program an additional \$2.1 million per year, based on the value of the current portfolio. The agency estimates that it would require approximately two years for the program to achieve sufficient savings to offset the agency's start-up costs associated with this initiative.

2. In concept, the proposal to have the Department provide in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage loan portfolio appears reasonable. Discussions with the Department and a review of the testimony presented to the Committee during its public hearings on the biennial budget have not identified any major areas of concern with the concept.

3. However, the agency has identified some implementation issues that still must be addressed before the program can be implemented:

- The agency does not want to bring the existing loan portfolio in house until after the beginning of the next calendar year. This arrangement would be least disruptive to financial institutions and borrowers that have existing escrow accounts in place. However, this delay could have a significant impact of the agency's administrative funding needs for the remainder of the 2001-02 fiscal year and may impact its administrative funding for 2002-03.

- The agency must explore the degree to which certain administrative activities, such as the management of escrow accounts, can be centralized. For example, the responsibility for making all year-end escrow payments could be contracted to an outside financial services vendor.

- Adjustments to the agency's current loan accounting system will likely be required as a result of the proposed change.

- No additional position authority has been provided to the Department to staff the proposed initiative. The agency initially identified a staffing need of 7.0 FTE positions; however, this position authority was denied by the Governor, pending the results of a feasibility study and associated implementation plan.

4. The Governor has recommended that DVA and DOA jointly develop a plan for the most cost-effective manner of providing in-house servicing of the veteran primary mortgage loan portfolio and has provided \$30,000 SEG in 2001-02 for consultant services for this purpose. However, as the bill is drafted, the Secretary of DOA may not authorize the expenditure of any funds appropriated to DVA for in-house loan servicing, including the amounts appropriated to complete this plan, until after the plan has actually been completed. A technical correction to the bill is required to permit the release of the funds for preparing the plan.

5. Pending the development of that plan and proposed options for implementation of the in-house loan servicing initiative, the Committee may wish to shift \$4,810,600 SEG in 2001-02 and \$898,800 SEG in 2002-03 initially recommended for loan-servicing administration and the purchase of loan-servicing rights to the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(u) appropriation. These funds would be reserved for possible future release to the Department, once the Committee has reviewed and approved the plan developed by DVA and DOA and is satisfied that the implementation proposal is the most cost-effective. Under this alternative, \$30,000 SEG in 2001-02 would be

retained under DVA's loan-servicing administration to fund the costs of preparing the plan.

6. Alternatively, if the Committee believes that the recommended plan to be developed jointly by DVA and DOA, coupled with DOA's ability to release the necessary in-house portfolio funding amounts from unallotted reserve, based on the results of the plan, are sufficient to ensure that the most cost-effective option is pursued, then it could approve the Governor's recommendation. If the Committee chooses this option, however, it should make a technical adjustment to the Governor's recommendation to specify that \$30,000 SEG in 2001-02 is available for expenditure to fund the development of the plan.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation with the modification that \$30,000 SEG in 2001-02 may initially be expended to develop a plan for the most cost-effective method for the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage portfolio.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by: (a) providing \$30,000 SEG to the Department of Veterans Affairs for hiring a consultant to assist DVA and DOA in developing a plan for the most cost-effective method for implementing the in-house servicing of the veterans primary mortgage portfolio; and (b) shifting \$4,810,600 SEG in 2001-02 and \$898,800 SEG in 2002-03 initially recommended for loan servicing administration and the purchase of loan-servicing rights to the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(u) appropriation for possible future release to the Department, once the Committee has reviewed and approved the plan developed by DVA and DOA.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

| Alternative 3 | SEG |
|----------------------------------|---------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill) | - \$5,769,400 |

Prepared by: Darin Renner



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 1, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #971

Document Imaging of Agency Records (Veterans Affairs -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 695, #4]

CURRENT LAW

AA & Peterson

The Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) has a general program operations appropriation for the administration of programs funded from the Veterans Trust Fund and a similar general program operations appropriation for the administration of veterans loan programs. These two appropriations have combined base level supplies and services funding of \$1,328,400 SEG annually. No funds are currently budgeted for document imaging activities.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$910,700 SEG in 2001-02 and \$188,900 SEG in 2002-03 and 5.0 SEG four-year project positions to begin an initiative to convert the agency's estimated six million pages of veterans' files from a paper storage format to an electronic imaging format. Of the amounts provided, \$25,000 SEG in 2001-02 would fund a feasibility study to determine the advisability of a document-imaging project for veterans' records and program usage files. All of the remaining funds would be budgeted in unallotted reserve (\$885,700 SEG in 2001-02 and \$188,900 SEG 2002-03) for release by DOA, based on its concurrence with the feasibility study recommendations. Of the amounts provided for 2001-02, \$751,000 SEG would be reserved for scanning software, file servers, scanners and monitors associated with the imaging of the documents.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Department indicates that a major feature of the documents imaging proposal is

to provide protection for the agency's 1.5 million paper files associated with Wisconsin veterans and their usage of DVA programs. In many cases these records are the only copies in existence, as a large volume of federal veterans records were destroyed in the early 1970's as a result of a fire at a records storage center in St. Louis.

2. The agency believes that the documents imaging proposal would:

- Secure and preserve the existing paper files; and
- Improve access to the files by veterans and by agency staff who must work with the files on a daily basis. Electronic files would offer the advantage of allowing veterans and veterans' service providers to access these records on-line.

3. The Department argues that the advantage of providing funds for the agency to purchase the necessary equipment and authorizing 5.0 FTE project employees for documents preparation and scanning is that the Department could systematically convert the files over a four-year time line and also use the equipment for other electronic filing purposes, such as providing web access to loan or health care information. Furthermore, if the Legislature authorizes the Department to undertake the in-house servicing of veterans housing loans, the files associated with those functions would likely be imaged as well.

4. It is anticipated that the Department's documents imaging proposal would require a four-year effort to complete. Costs of the project in the 2003-05 biennium can be expected to be at least \$188,900 SEG annually for on-going salary and fringe benefits costs and hardware/software support and maintenance.

5. While the agency believes that it would be cost-effective to proceed in-house with the documents imaging initiative, the state has centralized many services such as mailing, fleet operations, mainframe IT services and records management in order to avoid unnecessary duplication of services by agencies and to avoid providing equipment that is used on an infrequent basis. Consequently, it could be argued that the State's Record Center or a private vendor could provide for the Department's file conversion needs on a more cost-effective basis.

6. There are several elements involved in the cost of a document imaging undertaking if the State Records Center or a private vendor would undertake the imaging project. These include:

- *The Number of Pages.* There are usually volume discounts when such services are out-sourced..
- *In-House or Off-Site Processing.* If the Department needs to maintain access to the documents, then there are usually higher costs involved. Imaging services can usually offer lower rates by bringing the documents to a facility established exclusively for document imaging.
- *Indexing/Data Entry.* The degree to which discrete items of data must be entered for each record scanned (so that it can be searched electronically) will have an impact on the cost of the

project. Examples of this type of data might include the veteran's name, position/rank, date of enlistment, date of separation and military identification number. Discounts may be available if number of data fields that must be indexed can be minimized.

- *Document Preparation.* Costs of the project will vary depending on the amount of document preparation necessary (such as, grouping documents, arranging documents chronologically and removing staples and clips).
- *Searchable Documents.* Additional costs may be involved if the imaged documents must be formatted to allow for electronic searches of the document.

7. Several major state agencies have undertaken significant data imaging projects in the last two or three years. One of the largest file conversion projects to date involved the Department of Employee Trust Funds (ETF), which converted over 10,000,000 documents. This imaging effort was one of considerable complexity. A vendor was hired to convert the agency's files on-site. The vendor, using contract staff, prepared and scanned the files. ETF's file conversion was completed in this manner in a 24-month period at 99.9% accuracy level. The agency's costs averaged \$0.24 per page scanned.

8. Discussions with ETF's vendor have determined that the agency's file conversion project was a highly complex one that had to accommodate over 3,000 possible document types. The DVA file conversion project would likely be considerably less complex and could probably be accomplished at a cost of between \$0.15 and \$0.24 per scanned document. This would suggest that the DVA imaging project could be undertaken at a total cost of between \$900,000 SEG and \$1,440,000 SEG.

9. Further, the State's Record Center has an established rate of \$0.15 per scanned page, with additional costs for formatted text (\$0.03 per page), indexing (\$4.38 per 1,000 characters entered), and document preparation (\$18.00 per hour). The Center has also indicated that the cost of indexing and preparation is highly variable. The Center requires a pilot application that costs \$500 to \$1,000 that is used to estimate the total cost of a project.

10. The Governor's funding recommendation for the Department's documents imaging conversion project included \$25,000 SEG in 2001-02 for a feasibility study by an IT consultant to determine the advisability of a documents imaging project. It is anticipated that the study would take six months to complete.

11. The Committee may wish to consider, as an alternative to the Governor's recommendation, providing only the \$25,000 SEG in 2001-02 at this time for the feasibility study. The balance of the funding for the project (\$885,700 SEG in 2001-02 and \$188,900 SEG 2002-03) could be reserved in the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(u) appropriation for possible future release to the Department, once the documents imaging feasibility study had been completed. Under this alternative, the feasibility study would have to include the results of requests for information for the costs of the documents imaging project if undertaken by the State Records Center or by private

vendors and an assessment of the most cost-effective strategy for the documents conversion project. Also under this alternative, position authority for the 5.0 SEG project positions would be deleted, pending a determination of whether or not the documents imaging project would be undertaken in-house or contracted out.

12. Alternatively, if the Committee believes that the recommended feasibility study and DOA's ability to release the necessary imaging project funding amounts from unallotted reserve, based on the results of that study, are sufficient to ensure that the least costly documents imaging conversion option will be pursued, then it could approve the Governor's recommendation.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by shifting \$885,700 SEG in 2001-02 and \$188,900 SEG 2002-03 to the Committee's s. 20.865(4)(u) appropriation for possible future release to the Department of Veterans Affairs, once the documents imaging feasibility study had been completed. The feasibility study would have to include the results of requests for information for the costs of the documents imaging project if undertaken by the State Records Center or by private vendors and an assessment by DVA of the most cost-effective strategy for the documents conversion project. Delete position authority for 5.0 SEG project positions, pending a determination of whether or not the documents imaging project would be undertaken in-house or contracted out.

| <u>Alternative 2</u> | <u>SEG</u> |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill) | - 5.00 |

3. Maintain current law.

| <u>Alternative 3</u> | <u>SEG</u> |
|------------------------------------|---------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill) | - \$1,099,600 |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill) | - 5.00 |

Prepared by: Darin Renner



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 1, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #972

Establishment of Regional Service Delivery Centers (Veterans Affairs -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 696, #6]

CURRENT LAW

VVA motion

Currently, the Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) does not operate a statewide system of regional service delivery centers. However, the agency does maintain a unit of its Bureau of Claims at the Zablocki Veterans Administration Medical Center in Milwaukee.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$154,400 SEG in 2001-02 and \$638,500 SEG in 2002-03 and 9.0 SEG positions annually to enable DVA to establish six regional service delivery centers and seven video conferencing systems in the state. Funds would be used for: (1) benefits specialists, clerical staff and associated supplies and services to support the operation of the new centers (\$12,400 SEG in 2001-02 and \$441,000 SEG in 2002-03 and 9.0 SEG positions annually); (2) one-time funding for the purchase of computer equipment, copiers, faxes, office furniture and three motor vehicles for each center's office (\$22,100 SEG in 2001-02 and \$174,800 SEG in 2002-03); (3) one-time funding for the purchase of videoconferencing equipment that would be placed in the Milwaukee claims office and six regional offices (\$97,200 SEG in 2001-02); and (4) on-going funding for videoconferencing equipment (\$22,700 SEG annually). Require the Department to submit report to DOA no later than June 30, 2003, on the performance of the regional delivery centers, including each center's video conferencing system.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Department anticipates that the new regional service delivery centers would be operational by the 2002-03 fiscal year. While the regional service delivery centers could be located at the sites of the six current state regional office buildings (Eau Claire, Green Bay, La Crosse, Milwaukee, Waukesha and Wisconsin Rapids), the Department indicates that the ultimate assignment of regional service center staff would most likely be based on such elements as the relative concentration of veterans in the population of an area and the Department's assessment of service need in an area.

2. The Department proposes to reallocate 9.0 FTE existing agency staff, which combined with the 9.0 SEG new positions authorized under the Governor's recommendation, would permit each regional service delivery office to be staffed with 3.0 FTE employees. The typical staffing at one of the regional centers would include two veterans benefits specialists and one clerical support position.

3. The Department's stated rationales for the establishment of the regional service delivery centers are the following:

- The centers would augment the agency's current organizational structure for counseling and applying for federal claims by providing veterans with more accessible one-stop assistance.
- The centers would ideally be located at sites with other federal, state and local services that provide benefits to veterans, thereby enhancing the likelihood that a veteran would receive coordinated assistance. The Department sees these services as being additive to those available through county veterans services offices.
- The centers would allow the veteran to receive more timely claims eligibility advice and claims processing than would be the case if the veteran had to come to Madison or to Milwaukee.
- The presence of state staff at the regional claims centers would ensure the delivery of a uniform level of information on veterans' benefits opportunities. The Department believes that this is an important consideration since local veterans services may not be "sufficiently trained to provide this task and do not maintain the time or staff resources to undertake the specialized training or workload demand."
- Wisconsin has consistently ranked in the bottom tier of states in terms of utilizing federal veterans benefits. The Department believes that inadequate outreach efforts may be part of the cause of this situation. The existence of a regional service delivery network could significantly enhance the agency's overall efforts to qualify state veterans for the federal benefits they are due.

4. The Department also believes that the potential return for Wisconsin veterans as a result of establishing the regional service delivery centers could be substantial. The agency

estimates that if total veterans claims for federal benefits could be increased by only 7% in the state, this would result in an additional \$23 million in federal benefit dollars. If the state could reach the national per capita average for federal benefits, this would equate to an additional \$116 million in federal benefits.

5. As points of comparison, Minnesota has a central veterans affairs department and two regional state office. Each county also has a county veterans service office. In Iowa and Michigan, each state has a central veterans affairs department and no state regional offices. In Michigan, each county is required to have at least a part-time county veterans service office to assist veterans with applications for federal benefits. In Iowa, each county operates a veterans service office with a staff of three to five individuals. The Illinois veterans affairs agency maintains a limited presence at small offices in 50 of the state's 99 counties. In 38 of these county offices, state staff circulate on a limited basis into the counties with no state office. Illinois counties also provide veterans benefits services assistance.

6. In Wisconsin, there are county veterans service officers in each of the state's 72 counties. [These county veterans service officers are fulltime in 70 of the counties and part-time in two counties.] Under current law, county boards are required to provide the county veterans service officer with office space, clerical assistance and any other assistance necessary to complete the following statutory tasks: (a) advising county resident veterans of their potential benefits and providing assistance counseling to such individuals; (b) reporting to their respective county boards; (c) cooperating with federal and state veterans agencies; (d) furnishing information about veterans' burial places within the county; and (e) performing any other duties prescribed by law.

7. Currently, county veterans service offices are partly supported by state DVA grants of \$8,500 to \$13,000 annually, depending on the county's population. The remainder of the costs of the county veterans service offices is supported by the general tax levy. In addition, the Department sponsors at least two annual training sessions for county veterans service officers. Among other things, these sessions review the availability of state and federal veterans benefits.

8. During the Committee's public hearings around the state on the biennial budget, testimony was offered on several occasions opposing the Governor's recommendation to establish six regional service delivery centers. The County Veterans Service Officers Association of Wisconsin has issued a position paper in opposition to the regional office proposal, stating that this funding would be duplicative of the services the members of its Association already provide at the local level.

9. In written testimony submitted to the Committee, the Vietnam Veterans of America, the Disabled American Veterans and the Paralyzed Veterans of America have all stated that they concur with the County Veterans Service Officers Association and view the current proposal as representing a duplication of local services.

10. If the Committee concludes that the regional service delivery office concept would unnecessarily duplicate the services that are currently provided by county veterans service officers

and existing state and federal veterans offices, then it could delete the Governor's recommendation.

11. Alternatively, if the Committee concludes that the regional service delivery office concept would more easily make available to state veterans a consistent level of veterans benefit information and services that may not be available at the local level, then it could approve the Governor's recommendation.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$154,400 SEG in 2001-02 and \$638,500 SEG in 2002-03 and 9.0 SEG positions annually to enable DVA to establish six regional service delivery and videoconferencing centers.

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

| <u>Alternative 2</u> | <u>SEG</u> |
|------------------------------------|-------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill) | - \$792,900 |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill) | - 9.00 |

Prepared by: Darin Renner



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 1, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #973

Management Travel Increases (Veterans Affairs -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 699, #12]

DIT 1 package

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) has a general program operations appropriation for the administration of programs funded from the Veterans Trust Fund and a similar general program operations appropriation for the administration of veterans loan programs. These two appropriations have combined base level supplies and services funding of \$1,328,400 SEG annually.

GOVERNOR

Provide total additional funding of \$25,000 SEG annually under these two general program operations appropriations to support increased travel expenses for the Department's senior management and other staff.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Department has identified a combined total of \$50,100 SEG annually of base level funding budgeted under these two general program operations appropriations to support central office management travel during the current fiscal year.
2. The agency has offered the following rationales for the need for additional senior management travel funding above current funding levels:
 - The new funding would allow increased attendance at such venues as town meetings

with veterans; conferences and conventions of the various national veterans organizations; and before Congressional committees for the purpose of offering testimony on new programs or seeking additional funding for the state.

- There are a variety of critical programs that significantly affect state veterans that agency management believes can best be influenced to the benefit of Wisconsin's veterans through face-to-face meetings with the appropriate federal officials.

- The Department has made it a high priority to secure additional federal funding allocations to Wisconsin. During the 1999-00 fiscal year, DVA indicates that its direct involvement with federal officials led to over \$11 million in additional federal grants and payments; consequently, the "additional funding for travel is needed if the Department is to continue its success in obtaining federal grant dollars."

3. The agency has not provided any additional detail on how the need for \$25,000 SEG annually was actually determined. However, an examination of the agency's total in-state and out-of-state travel costs charged during 1999-00 to the two administrative appropriations cited above determined that the agency expended a total of \$34,100 SEG for all in-state travel and conferences and for all out-of-state travel and conferences. During the current fiscal year, the agency has expended \$31,100 SEG for these same purposes through April, 2001. Based on these expenditures to date, total travel expenditures for all of the 2000-01 fiscal year are projected at \$37,300 SEG.

4. Inasmuch as the Department has identified base level travel funding of \$50,100 SEG annually of base level funding for travel, it would appear that the agency has sufficient available base level resources, given its current level of travel expenditures, to support additional travel without the need for further resources. Arguably, within the agency's total supplies and services base for these two appropriations [\$1,328,400 SEG annually], additional discretionary funding could likely be identified to fund additional travel expenses, if needed.

5. Further, it could be argued that during periods of budgetary constraints, all agencies, regardless of funding source, should exercise restraint on discretionary spending items, such as travel. Agencies always have the option of coordinating out-of-state travel events to minimize the number of separate out-of-state trips that must be made, utilizing teleconferencing and interactive Internet capabilities, and securing the assistance and intervention of the state's Congressional delegation. To the extent that additional travel is indicated, priority should be given to activities designed to maximize the flow of federal funds for veterans to the state with correspondingly less emphasis on town meetings with veterans or conferences and conventions of the various national veterans organizations.

6. If the Committee concludes that these considerations have merit, it could delete the \$25,000 SEG annually recommended for additional senior management staff travel expenses.

7. Alternatively, the Committee could conclude that the benefits of increasing the ability of the Department's senior management to engage in additional travel to Washington to monitor and participate in the development of federal veterans policy and work for the allocation of

additional federal veterans funding to the state would far outweigh the additional \$25,000 SEG annually being requested by the agency. If the Committee believes that this argument has merit, it could approve the additional travel funding, as recommended by the Governor.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation
2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

| | |
|----------------------------------|------------|
| Alternative 2 | SEG |
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill) | - \$50,000 |

Prepared by: Darin Renner



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 1, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #974

Additional Unclassified Division Administrators (Veterans Affairs -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 770, #15]

AB, B2 package

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Veterans Affairs (DVA) is authorized under s. 230.08(2)(e)13. of the statutes, to appoint two unclassified division administrators. Currently, the agency is organized into four formal divisions. The Division of Veterans Programs and the Division of Veterans Home [King] are both under the direction of an unclassified administrator. The Division of Administration and the Division of Veterans Home [Southern Wisconsin Veterans Retirement Center] are both under the direction of classified administrators. A separate Wisconsin Veterans Museum unit in the Department is administered by a classified director.

GOVERNOR

Divide the existing Division of Veterans Programs, currently headed by an unclassified administrator, into two separate divisions and authorize an additional 1.0 SEG unfunded unclassified division administrator position for the second new division. Convert the existing classified administrator of the Division of Administration and the position of director of the Wisconsin Veterans Museum from the classified to the unclassified service and provide an additional \$1,100 PR and \$5,800 SEG in 2001-02 and \$1,400 PR and \$7,600 SEG in 2002-03 for salary and fringe benefits for these positions. Include statutory language increasing the total authorized number of unclassified division administrators in the agency from two to five. [An additional enumeration of a new unclassified Commandant for the Southern Wisconsin Veterans Retirement Center would also be provided as a separate decision item and is not addressed in this paper.]

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the Governor's recommendation, the Department's existing Division of Veterans Programs with a total annual all funds budget of \$27,197,000 and 92.0 FTE positions would be divided into: (a) a new Division of Veterans Benefits, under the supervision of the existing unclassified division administrator; and (b) a new Division of Veterans Services, under the supervision of a new unclassified division administrator position.

2. The new Division of Veterans Benefits would include the supervision of the veterans home loan, home improvement and personal loan programs as well as the educational grant programs. The new Division of Veterans Services would include the supervision of veterans assistance programs for homeless veterans, employment and training programs, veterans outreach activities, cemeteries and the military funeral honors program.

3. The existing Division of Administration would be retained unchanged and the Wisconsin Veterans Museum unit in the Department would be elevated to division status.

4. The proposed new divisions would have the following budgets and assigned staff under the proposed reorganization:

| <u>Division</u> | <u>Budget</u> | <u>Positions</u> |
|-------------------|---------------|------------------|
| Veterans Benefits | \$20,408,600 | 54.0 |
| Veterans Services | 4,043,800 | 38.0 |
| Administration | 3,466,100 | 52.5 |
| Museum Services | 1,750,900 | 14.0 |

5. The new unclassified division administrators would serve at the pleasure of the appointing authority, and in the case of the current classified administrator of the Division of Administration and the classified director of the Veterans Museum would no longer have those protections accorded to classified employees relating to demotion, suspension, discharge, layoff or reduction in base pay and classified service reinstatement privileges. Further, the new unclassified division administrators would receive a higher Wisconsin Retirement System multiplier for retirement purposes, would have an earlier normal retirement age and an additional week of vacation.

6. The Department states that the growth and diversity of veterans programs and benefits for the past several biennia have made it increasingly difficult for a single administrator to oversee them. For example, eligibility requirements have been relaxed so that peacetime veterans are now eligible for the Department's programs, income limitations have been eliminated for the primary mortgage loan program, annual educational benefits have been increased, home improvement loan grant amounts have been increased and a new military funeral honors program has been started. The agency believes that by splitting the existing Division of Veterans Programs a more effective span of control as well as improved administration of the programs would result.

7. The Department also argues that the Wisconsin Veterans Museum unit should be

elevated to the status of a separate division because of the expanded scope of the museum coupled with its increasing public visibility. Presumably, these considerations relate to the installation of the Museum on Capitol Square and the recent integration of the Wisconsin National Guard Museum with the Wisconsin Veterans Museum. Further, converting the director position to an unclassified division administrator is consistent with the way other division administrators are typically treated in state government. This last point is also cited as the justification for converting the classified administrator of the Division of Administration to unclassified status.

8. The budget and number of staff supervised in the proposed new Division of Veterans Services do not appear to be out of line with budgets and scope of program divisions in reasonably comparable agencies [the Division of Veterans Home was excluded in making these comparisons] such as the Public Service Commission or the Department of Employment Relations.

9. However, the proposed new Division of Museum Services would tend to be a relatively modest division in terms of budget and staff supervised.

10. If the Committee concludes that the agency's proposed reorganization would be desirable, it could approve some or all of the statutory authorizations for an additional unclassified administrator for the Division of Veterans Services (and 1.0 SEG unfunded position authorization), for the Division of Administration and for the Division of Museum Services.

11. Alternatively, the Committee could delete the corresponding enumerations of any or all of these new unclassified division administrator authorizations.

12. If the Committee approves any of the new unclassified division administrator authorizations, it should also address whether or not to provide the additional salary and fringe benefits funding for these administrators, as recommended by the Governor. The additional salary and fringe benefits funding has been budgeted on the assumption that the new division administrator positions would all be assigned to Executive Salary Group (ESG) 3.

13. However, before any such assignment may occur, the Department of Employment Relations must first review the characteristics of each new unclassified division administrator position and then make recommendations with respect to the appropriate ESG assignment. The Department of Employment Relations will typically consider such factors as knowledge, responsibility for decision-making, responsibility for policy-making and relations skills along with such quantitative factors as the total number of positions, total payroll, total budget, discretionary budget and number of programs under the administrator in making the ESG determination.

14. Consequently, it could be argued that it is premature to budget for possible additional salary costs for an ESG assignment that has yet to be determined. Further, the Department would have considerable latitude in placing the administrator within the appropriate pay range associated with the recommended ESG level. This placement could most likely be accomplished so that no additional salary and fringe benefits costs would need to be incurred by the Department. These considerations would argue that the recommended funding should be deleted at this time.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Authorizing Additional Unclassified Administrators

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to divide the existing Division of Veterans Programs, currently headed by an unclassified administrator, into two separate divisions by authorizing an additional 1.0 SEG unfunded unclassified division administrator position for the second new division, converting the existing position of administrator of the Division of Administration and the position of director of the Wisconsin Veterans Museum from the classified to the unclassified service and including statutory language increasing the total authorized number of unclassified division administrators in the agency from two to five.

2. Modify the Governor's recommendation by approving one or more of the following:

a. Delete an additional 1.0 SEG unfunded unclassified division administrator position for a Division of Veterans Services and reduce the proposed statutory authority for the number of unclassified division administrators in the Department by one.

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Alternative 2a | SEG |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill) | - 1.00 |

b. Delete the conversion of the existing classified administrator of the Division of Administration from the classified to the unclassified service and reduce the proposed statutory authority for the number of unclassified division administrators in the Department by one.

c. Delete the conversion of the existing director of the Wisconsin Veterans Museum from the classified to the unclassified service and reduce the proposed statutory authority for the number of unclassified division administrators in the Department by one.

3. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

| | |
|------------------------------------|------------|
| Alternative 3 | SEG |
| 2002-03 POSITIONS (Change to Bill) | - 1.00 |

B. Additional Salary and Fringe Benefits Funding

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide an additional \$1,100 PR and \$5,800 SEG in 2001-02 and \$1,400 PR and \$7,600 SEG in 2002-03 for additional salary and fringe benefits costs associated with the anticipated assignment of the unclassified division administrator positions to Executive Salary Group 3.

2. Delete the Governor's recommendation.

| <u>Alternative B2</u> | <u>PR</u> | <u>SEG</u> | <u>TOTAL</u> |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|--------------|
| 2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Bill) | - \$2,500 | - \$13,400 | - \$15,900 |

Prepared by: Darin Renner

VETERANS AFFAIRS
General Agency Provisions

Bill Agency

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

| <u>Item #</u> | <u>Title</u> |
|---------------|---|
| 1 | Standard Budget Adjustments |
| 5 | Information Technology Initiatives |
| 7 | Fuel and Utility Cost Increases |
| 8 | Veterans Museum Operations |
| 9 | Military Honors Funeral Cost Increases |
| 10 | Northern Wisconsin Veterans Memorial Cemetery Funding |
| 11 | Veterans Outreach Initiatives |
| 13 | Employment and Training Program Resources |
| 14 | SASI Initiative |
| 17 | Educational Approval Board Functions and Funding |

*Notion
fund museum
w/ GPR*

LFB Summary Item to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper

| <u>Item #</u> | <u>Title</u> |
|---------------|--------------------------|
| 2 | Debt Service Reestimates |

LFB Summary Item Addressed at a Previous Committee Executive Session

| <u>Item #</u> | <u>Title</u> |
|---------------|--|
| 16 | American Indian Veterans Service Grants (Paper #166) |