



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

June, 2021

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #220

Youth Aids Allocations (Children and Families -- Juvenile Justice)

[LFB 2021-23 Budget Summary: Page 110, #1]

CURRENT LAW

The community youth and family aids program (youth aids) provides each county with an annual allocation of state and federal funds from which a county may pay for juvenile delinquency-related services, including out-of-home placements, cost of detention and secured residential care centers, and non-residential, community-based services for juveniles. Counties may supplement their expenditures on juvenile delinquency-related services with funding from other sources, including community aids, other state aids to counties, county tax revenues, and special grant monies. The Department of Children and Families (DCF) administers the youth aids allocations, contracts with counties for delivery of services, provides counties with consultation and technical assistance, and develops program standards.

Under current law, youth aids funding may not exceed \$45,383,600 for the last six months of 2019, \$90,767,200 for 2020, and \$45,383,600 for the first six months of 2021. Funding for youth aids in 2020-21 is \$90,767,200 (\$88,591,400 GPR and \$2,175,800 FED). The federal funding is provided from Title IV-B, subpart 1, and IV-E of the Social Security Act.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Youth aids was enacted as part of Chapter 34, Laws of 1979. Prior to establishment of youth aids, each county social service agency paid for community-based juvenile delinquency programs with its community aids allocation and county funds. However, counties were not financially responsible for juveniles that were placed in the state's secured juvenile correctional institutions. Concerned that the system created a fiscal incentive for counties to recommend the placement of juveniles in secure care, the Legislature enacted the youth aids program. Under youth

aids, counties assumed responsibility for the costs of caring for juveniles placed at the juvenile correctional institutions, thereby eliminating the financial incentive to place juveniles at the institutions. The state, in turn, allocated funds for operating the juvenile correctional schools, state aftercare, and alternate care to counties through youth aids.

2. Under current law, DCF must allocate youth aids funding based on statutory funding amounts assigned to calendar years. These youth aids allocations are as follows: (a) "base" funding appropriated in the biennium for distribution to counties (\$66,059,300 GPR and \$2,175,800 FED); (b) increases provided under 1999 Act 9 (\$4,000,000 GPR), which are paid to counties according to a three-factor formula; (c) increases provided under 2001 Act 16 (\$2,106,500 GPR), which are paid to counties according to the three-factor formula and an additional override factor; (d) arrest supplements for small counties (\$200,000 GPR); (e) funding earmarked for emergencies (\$250,000); (f) funding earmarked for counties participating in the corrective sanctions program (\$2,124,800 GPR); (g) funding earmarked for alcohol and other drug abuse (AODA) treatment programs (\$1,333,400 GPR); (h) increases provided under 2007 Act 20 (\$12,500,000 GPR); and (i) increases associated with extending out-of-home placements to youth over the age of 18, as provided in 2015 Act 55 (\$89,400 GPR), based on the proportional number of juveniles in correctional facilities during the most recent three-year period. Attachment 1 provides anticipated calendar year 2021 youth aids funding allocations for these components (excluding earmarked funding), by county.

3. Current youth aids funding also includes a \$72,000 imbalance. This deficit was inherited by DCF when youth aids was transferred from the Department of Corrections in January, 2016 (as part of the 2015-17 biennial budget). While DCF does not have information on the origins of the original deficit, it indicates that it could be from "an imbalance between anticipated and actual federal funds that were never reconciled with the county awards." Youth aids is budgeted at \$90,767,200 annually (\$88,591,400 GPR and \$2,175,800 FED). However, youth aids contractual obligations total \$90,839,200 (\$72,000 higher than the budget). While in practice, this deficit hasn't yet resulted in underfunding (as community supervision services funding allocations are usually below the total budgeted amount (for example, in calendar year 2020, \$587,800 of \$2,124,800 was allocated) and carryover funding has been available to manage the deficit), it could result in underfunding the future.

4. In addition, current law (enacted under 2019 Act 8) provides a "bonus" allocation for any county that operates a secured residential care center for children and youth funded by a grant under 2017 Act 185 and serving juveniles from more than one county. The bonus allocation is the lesser of \$750,000 or 15% of the county's youth aids allocation. Currently, no county meets the requirements for the bonus allocation, and it is unlikely that any county will meet the requirements in the 2021-23 biennium.

5. In total, the bill would increase youth aids funding by \$6,024,700 in 2021-22 and \$14,226,900 in 2022-23 (\$48,395,900 for the last six months of 2021 [this amount reflects a minor \$100 correction], \$100,893,000 for 2022, and \$52,497,100 for the first six months of 2023) as a result of reallocating youth aids funding to generally provide more flexibility in distribution while eliminating certain earmarks, increasing total youth aids funding for a new youth aids component,

and eliminating the \$72,000 imbalance identified above. Specific youth aids formula changes under the bill fall into two general categories: (a) a reallocation of existing funds (a net increase of \$697,200 to youth aids, and a corresponding decrease to the community intervention program (CIP) appropriation); and (b) an additional \$5,327,500 in 2021-22 and \$13,529,700 in 2022-23 for a new youth aids component. The bill would also update statutory provisions relating to the calendar year allocation of youth aids funding by updating calendar year references from previous years to calendar years 2021, 2022, and 2023.

6. In addition, the bill would have converted CIP to a new Youth Justice System Improvements Program (YJSIP) and would have provided additional funding and positions for the program. This item was removed from consideration by the Committee. Changes to carryover provisions were also included under the bill and largely related to the YJSIP; as a result of Committee action, both YJSIP and carryover changes are not addressed in this paper. In a December 3, 2020, meeting, the Wisconsin County Human Service Administration (WCHSA) indicated that it supports the changes as identified under the bill.

7. Of the remaining changes, AB 68/SB 111 would reallocate existing youth aids funding, resulting in a net \$697,200 annually transferred from the Department's CIP appropriation to the youth aids appropriation. The specific reallocations would include: (a) transferring \$3,072,000 from the CIP appropriation to the youth aids appropriation to increase youth aids allocations and to eliminate an existing structural deficit; and (b) removing the earmarks for purchasing community supervision services (\$2,124,800) and emergency funding (\$250,000) in the youth aids appropriation and transferring these funds to the CIP appropriation. In addition, the earmark of \$1,333,400 annually in the youth aids appropriation for AODA treatment programs would be removed, and absorbed into the base allocation to be distributed to counties. These reallocations are identified, below:

Net Funding Reallocation Under the Bill as Introduced, by Appropriation

<u>Current Program/Earmarks</u>	<u>Current Funding</u>	<u>Youth Aids Appropriation (20.437(1)(cj))</u>	<u>CIP Appropriation (20.437(1)(cm))</u>
Community Intervention Program	\$3,712,500*	\$3,072,000	-\$3,072,000
Community Supervision Services Funding	2,124,800	-2,124,800	2,124,800
Emergency Funding	250,000	<u>-250,000</u>	<u>250,000</u>
		\$697,200	-\$697,200
 AODA Funding		 \$1,333,400	 \$1,333,400**

*The remaining unallocated \$640,500 would remain in the CIP appropriation.

**The AODA earmark would be eliminated under the bill, but the funding would remain in the youth aids appropriation to be distributed to counties as part of the "base" allocation.

8. While these reallocations would have a net \$0 impact on youth aids-related funding, the changes would have an impact on specific county allocations. As noted by the table below, an additional \$4,333,400 would be distributed to counties as part of a new youth aids base allocation

(the base allocation would increase from approximately \$68.2 million to \$72.5 million) proportionate to the county's current allocation. However, counties would no longer receive allocations of county supervision funding (\$2,124,800), emergency funding (\$250,000), or AODA funding (\$1,333,400). These proposed changes are identified, by county, in Attachment 2.

New Funding as a Result of Reallocation, by Funding Purpose

<u>Current Program/Earmarks</u>	<u>Current Funding</u>	<u>Additional Youth Aids Base Funding</u>	<u>Structural Deficit</u>	<u>CIP Appropriation</u>
Community Intervention Program	\$3,712,500	\$3,000,000	\$72,000	\$640,500
Community Supervision Services Funding	2,124,800	0	0	2,124,800
Emergency Funding	250,000	0	0	250,000
AODA	1,333,400	<u>1,333,400</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
		<u>\$4,333,400</u>	<u>\$72,000</u>	<u>\$3,015,300</u>

9. As noted by Attachment 2, most (but not all) counties would receive more in additional base youth aids funding than they would lose by the removal of particular earmarks. However, the impacts identified in Attachment 2 are only for reallocated youth aids awards and component parts, and not for additional funding provided under the bill (described below) or for changes to the Community Intervention Program. The CIP appropriation (which is used for early intervention services for first time offenders and for intensive community-based intervention services for seriously chronic offenders and allocated to counties based on county-submitted plans for expenditures and other factors) would be reduced from \$3,712,500 to \$3,015,300. As a result, county funding from this specific program would likely decrease. The exact allocation of funding under the proposed new CIP budget is unknown, given that AB 68/SB 111 would have eliminated the CIP program and replaced it with a new program.

10. While CIP funding would decrease, AB 68/SB 111 would provide additional funding (\$5,327,500 in 2021-22 and \$13,529,700 in 2022-23) for a new youth aids component, in addition to the reallocations. This newly-provided funding corresponds to the existing serious juvenile offender (SJO) program in the Department of Corrections. While the SJO program would have been eliminated under the bill, the Committee removed the SJO item from consideration. As a result, the SJO program and associated funding in the Department of Corrections remain unchanged. The bill stipulates that funding for the new component would be used for costs incurred by a county for the care and maintenance of a juvenile placed under the supervision of a county department or the Department of Corrections in a juvenile detention facility, juvenile correctional facility, or a secured residential care center for children and youth. According to DCF, the intent of this funding is to "help counties cover increased costs they may incur from young offenders no longer being placed under state care in the [SJO] program."

11. As previously noted, however, serious juvenile offenders will remain under state care, as the Committee chose not to eliminate the SJO program. As a result, the additional youth aids funding may be better suited for a different youth aids-related purpose. Allocation of the funding

has not yet been determined, and the Department indicates that it will need to work with counties, before making a determination. While exact allocations are unknown, the funding is newly provided, so this specific component would positively impact county allocations.

12. Given that the removed YJSIP item was associated with the remaining youth aids items (for example, the CIP program), the Committee may wish to maintain the current youth aids allocations (without any reallocations or removal of earmarks) (see Attachment 1), but provide the funding identified under the bill (\$18,857,200 over the 2021-23 biennium) to increase the youth aids base (rather than be used for SJO-related purposes). Total funding would match the funding provided in the bill, but would be split evenly between fiscal years (\$9,428,600 GPR annually) and increase the base from \$68.2 million to \$77.6 million. Under this alternative, each county would receive a youth aids increase, proportionate to its current award. [Alternative 1] This alternative also aligns with the Department's wish to not "deviate from the original proposal [which included YJSIP] without discussions with counties," as the allocation, earmarks, and CIP program would remain unchanged. This alternative would require the modification of statutory language to specify that youth aids funding may not exceed \$50,097,900 for the last six months of 2021, \$100,195,800 in 2022, and \$50,097,900 for the first six months of 2023).

13. The Committee could also maintain the status quo of the current youth aids funding (without any reallocations or removal of earmarks), but place the total \$18,857,200 in the Committee's supplemental appropriation for the Department to request at a later date under the provisions of s. 13.10 of the statutes, once a funding purpose has been identified and once decisions surrounding juvenile placements become more clear. If the Department does not propose a plan for the additional funding, the unused amounts provided would lapse to the general fund from the Committee's appropriation. Given that the funding was initially intended for a population that will remain under state supervision, the Department may need time to determine how to best utilize the funding. [Alternative 2]. Under Alternatives 1 and 3, the additional funding would be added to the base allocation; this alternative provides the Department with more flexibility by allowing an evaluation of programming needs. To the extent that the Department's proposals necessitated statutory changes, separate legislation could be adopted to effectuate the distribution of the increased funding.

14. Alternatively, in an effort to adhere to the bill, make youth aids more flexible, and eliminate the imbalance, the Committee could adopt the reallocations (see Attachment 2) and provide funding as identified under the bill (\$18,857,200), modified to be split evenly between the fiscal years (\$9,428,600 annually), and be added to the youth aids base, as opposed to an SJO-related purpose. [Alternative 3] This alternative would increase the base from \$68.2 million to \$81.9 million (new funding (\$9.4 million) plus reallocated funding (\$4.3 million)) and decrease available funding in the CIP program.

15. If the Committee wishes to provide increased funding for youth aids, but at a lesser amount than identified in the bill, the Committee could appropriate a lower amount than is identified Alternative 1, 2, or 3. For example, providing \$4,714,300 GPR annually would increase youth aids by half of the amount identified in the bill. An alternative based on Alternative 1 above would maintain the current youth aids formula and component programs, but increase the youth aids base allocations by \$4,714,300 GPR annually [Alternative 4a.] An alternative based on Alternative 2 above

would maintain the current youth aids formula and component parts, but place \$9,428,600 in additional youth aids funding into the Committee's supplemental appropriations [Alternative 4b.] Finally, an alternative based on Alternative 3 above would provide \$4,714,300 GPR annually to increase youth aids base allocations, require DCF to reallocate an additional \$697,200 to further increase the youth aids base allocation, eliminate the existing imbalance, remove specific earmarks, and modify CIP funding. [Alternative 4c.] Similar to Alternatives 1 and 3, Alternatives 4a. and 4c. would require statutory language changes to specify youth aids amounts may not exceed \$48,089,350 for the last six months of 2021, \$96,178,700 for 2022, and \$48,089,350 for the first six months of 2023.

16. The changes identified under the bill and under Alternatives 1, 3, 4a., and 4c. would increase the base allocation amount (either directly or through reallocations), but would not change how base funding is allocated (currently, based on three factors, additional override factors, and minor adjustments). The three current base allocation factors are: (a) the county juvenile population (age 0 to 17), based on the 1979 data; (b) the average number of Part I juvenile arrests per county, based on 1975-78 data; and (c) the average number of county juvenile correctional placements, based on 1975-98 data. In addition to these three factors, override factors stipulate that no county can receive less than 93% nor more than 115% of the amount if correctional placements were the only factor, and no county can receive less than 65% of the amount provided by using the three-factor formula. Further, the base may be adjusted due to inflation increases for community programs, adjustments to correctional rates in prior years, or other one-time adjustments. These factors have remained unchanged for several decades, including during the youth aids transition from the Department of Corrections to DCF. As a result, DCF does not know how the original three factors (and additional adjustments) were weighted at the time the base allocation was determined.

17. Further, additional components have been added over the years to attempt to update dated portions of the formula. For example, the 1999 Act 9 increase (\$4,000,000) is based on the three base factors, updated for the most recent year for which the information is available. In addition, the 2007 Act 20 increase (\$12,500,000) is based on each county's proportion of the number of juveniles statewide who are placed in a juvenile correctional facility during the most recent three-year period for which information is available. However, funding for these component changes is much smaller than the current base of \$68.2 million (and even smaller than the increased base allocation in Alternatives 1 and 3).

18. The base allocation is largely dependent on data from the late-1970's, including county juvenile population data. As a point of comparison, Attachment 3 provides county juvenile population data from the 1980 census, compared to juvenile population data from 2019. It is important to note that: (a) this data reflects ages 0 to 19 (and not zero to 17, as in the formula), as that is the data available from the Census Bureau; (b) given that 2020 county-demographic population data will not be released until August, 2021, the 2019 column reflects Census Bureau estimates (and also is substantially similar to the data available through the state's Department of Health Services); and (c) juvenile county population is only one of three components used to calculate base youth aids allocations. As such, Attachment 3 is intended only to provide an example of changes over the past four decades.

19. The third column of Attachment 3 depicts the proportional percentage change when comparing the 1980 population to the 2019 population. While the percentage changes appear small, it is noteworthy that a 0.25% change corresponds to a \$170,600 change (when considering the \$68.2 million current base amount) if juvenile population was the only base allocation factor. Ultimately, the youth aids base allocation has not shifted along with the population, which creates the possibility that the youth aids base and population-related components are not distributed equitably.

20. However, updating the formula is difficult as: (a) DCF does not know how the original base factors were used to calculate the original allocation; (b) DCF indicates that it "would need to consider input from the counties before moving any ideas forward"; (c) component increases over the years (1999 Act 9, 2001 Act 16, and 2007 Act 20) hinge on the base allocation's three factors; (d) it is currently unknown how the state will treat juvenile placements in the near future (the current third factor); and (e) the specific 2020 census data needed to analyze current populations will not be released until mid- to late-2021.

21. In considering these factors, the Committee could require DCF to study the current formula and include an updated youth aids base allocation formula (and potentially, component allocations) based on more-recent data in its 2023-25 agency budget request, in addition to any of the other alternatives. This would allow the Department time to assess Committee action on juvenile placements, collect and analyze more-recent juvenile data, and further consult with counties, if needed. This alternative would not provide any additional funding, but instead is meant to redistribute existing funding in the most representative way. [Alternative 5]

22. Under 2019 Act 9 (the 2019-21 biennial budget), a nonstatutory provision was enacted (Section 9106(4)), requiring DCF to "consult with county representatives on modifications to the community youth and family aids formula." According to the Department, several meetings were held with counties in the 2019-21 biennium, which culminated in a consensus that no modifications to the base formula would be taken.

23. While certain counties may be benefitting from historical data use (and may therefore not support formula factor revisions), other counties may not be receiving a representative share of youth aids funding. Alternative 5 is intended to update the formula factors to more precisely reflect current juvenile correctional populations and practices. In addition, Alternative 5 would provide more specific criteria than the nonstatutory language in the 2019-21 budget bill (such as requiring the base allocation to reflect more recent data as opposed to 1970's data, and requiring DCF to produce an updated allocation formula in its next agency budget request) to ensure action is taken. While Alternative 5 would not require input or approval from counties, DCF could work with counties when determining how to best modernize the outdated components of the youth aids formula.

24. Given that the placement of juveniles is in transition, the Committee could maintain the current youth aids formula, but update the statutory calendar year references to 2021, 2022, and 2023. This alternative would allow the youth aids formula to be evaluated subsequent to other changes that are occurring in the juvenile justice subject area during the 2021-23 biennium. [Alternative 6]

ALTERNATIVES

Modify statutory provisions relating to the calendar year allocation of youth aids funding by updating references from previous years to calendar years 2021, 2022, and 2023. In addition, the Committee could do any of the following:

1. Maintain the current the youth aids formula and component programs, but provide \$9,428,600 GPR annually to increase youth aids base allocations. Modify statutory language to specify youth aids amounts may not to exceed \$50,097,900 for the last six months of 2021, \$100,195,800 for 2022, and \$50,097,900 for the first six months of 2023.

ALT 1	Change to Base
GPR	\$18,857,200

2. Maintain the current youth aids formula and component programs, but place \$18,857,200 in additional youth aids funding into the Committee's supplemental appropriations under s. 20.865(4). Under this alternative, the Department could request release of additional overtime funding from the Joint Committee on Finance under s. 13.10.

ALT 2	Change to Base
GPR	\$18,857,200

3. Provide \$9,428,600 GPR annually to increase youth aids base allocations. Require DCF to reallocate \$697,200 to further increase the youth aids base allocation, eliminate the imbalance, remove specific earmarks, and modify CIP funding. Modify statutory language to specify youth aids amounts may not to exceed \$50,446,500 for the last six months of 2021, \$100,893,000 for 2022, and \$50,446,500 for the first six months of 2023.

ALT 3	Change to Base
GPR	\$18,857,200

4. Provide \$4,714,300 GPR annually (instead of \$9,428,600 GPR annually) and adopt one of the following alternatives described below (each alternative would require \$9,428,600 GPR over the biennium):

ALT 4	Change to Base
GPR	\$9,428,600

a. Maintain the current youth aids formula and component programs, but increase the youth aids base allocations by \$4,714,300 GPR annually. Modify statutory

language to specify youth aids amounts may not exceed \$48,089,350 for the last six months of 2021, \$96,178,700 for 2022, and \$48,089,350 for the first six months of 2023.

b. Maintain the current youth aids formula and component parts, but place \$9,428,600 in additional youth aids funding into the Committee's supplemental appropriations.

c. Provide \$4,714,300 GPR annually to increase youth aids base allocations, require DCF to reallocate an additional \$697,200 to further increase the youth aids base allocation, eliminate the existing imbalance, remove specific earmarks, and modify CIP funding. Modify statutory language to specify youth aids amounts may not exceed \$48,437,950 for the last six months of 2021, \$96,875,900 for 2022, and \$48,437,950 for the first six months of 2023.

5. Require DCF to study and update components of the youth aids formula, and include a proposed updated allocation in its 2023-25 biennial budget request. [This alternative may be selected in connection with any other alternative.]

6. Take no action. Maintain statutory language, but update calendar year references, specifying youth aids amounts may not exceed \$45,383,600 for the last six months of 2021, \$90,767,200 for 2022, and \$45,383,600 for the first six months of 2023.

Prepared by: Shannon E. Huberty
Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1

Current County Contract for Calendar Year 2021 Allocations

<u>County</u>	<u>Base Allocation</u>	<u>1999 Act 9</u>	<u>2001 Act 16</u>	<u>Arrest Supplement</u>	<u>2007 Act 20</u>	<u>Out-of-Home Care Extension</u>	<u>Total Award</u>
Adams	\$175,345	\$15,628	\$8,872	\$8,181	\$54,585	\$388	\$262,999
Ashland	174,962	9,141	-	7,692	-	388	192,183
Barron	381,576	14,359	-	5,617	-	284	401,836
Bayfield	126,892	3,559	-	1,221	-	482	132,154
Brown	1,700,233	191,188	58,513	-	291,121	2,406	2,243,461
Buffalo	47,392	3,049	-	122	-	190	50,753
Burnett	174,197	3,971	-	1,099	-	190	179,457
Calumet	240,587	24,576	10,971	-	54,585	190	330,909
Chippewa	481,842	25,509	-	-	-	284	507,635
Clark	404,893	11,278	-	1,709	-	672	418,552
Columbia	293,208	32,354	10,971	-	54,585	284	391,402
Crawford	120,705	6,115	-	3,419	-	190	130,429
Dane	4,550,249	438,575	278,001	-	1,710,335	5,382	6,982,542
Dodge	552,946	31,630	-	-	-	1,440	586,016
Door	169,760	12,342	6,500	4,762	36,390	94	229,848
Douglas	906,800	32,957	20,702	16,481	127,365	482	1,104,787
Dunn	186,993	17,447	-	11,966	-	578	216,984
Eau Claire	888,308	64,401	25,600	-	127,365	2,502	1,108,176
Florence	47,062	755	-	122	-	190	48,129
Fond du Lac	774,467	48,052	7,314	-	36,390	1,536	867,759
Forest	57,417	6,330	3,333	3,541	18,195	-	88,816
Grant	221,013	21,415	10,971	-	54,585	482	308,466
Green	193,848	22,875	14,787	5,250	90,975	482	328,217
Green Lake	107,341	7,663	-	4,762	-	388	120,154
Iowa	138,105	10,192	-	7,204	-	284	155,785
Iron	38,024	5,040	5,915	122	36,390	284	85,775
Jackson	153,318	8,532	3,657	3,053	18,195	578	187,333
Jefferson	523,154	44,263	-	-	-	958	568,375
Juneau	203,574	6,394	-	1,343	-	94	211,405
Kenosha	2,554,937	128,499	79,851	-	491,266	4,226	3,258,779
Kewaunee	97,700	7,516	-	3,541	-	578	109,335
Lacrosse	1,057,303	65,668	3,657	-	18,195	1,250	1,146,073
Lafayette	61,747	4,831	-	1,221	-	190	67,989
Langlade	317,856	8,732	3,657	3,175	18,195	190	351,805
Lincoln	309,233	16,255	7,314	8,059	36,390	94	377,345
Manitowoc	508,593	51,857	7,314	-	36,390	862	605,016
Marathon	1,229,307	68,383	10,971	-	54,585	2,596	1,365,842
Marinette	431,570	35,368	32,532	6,227	200,146	388	706,231
Marquette	78,026	3,273	-	244	-	284	81,827
Menominee	424,169	3,531	2,957	-	18,195	482	449,334

<u>County</u>	<u>Base Allocation</u>	<u>1999 Act 9</u>	<u>2001 Act 16</u>	<u>Arrest Supplement</u>	<u>2007 Act 20</u>	<u>Out-of-Home Care Extension</u>	<u>Total Award</u>
Milwaukee	\$25,228,694	\$1,207,613	\$1,106,089	-	\$6,804,955	\$30,048	\$34,377,399
Monroe	581,118	23,982	7,314	\$11,233	36,390	482	660,519
Oconto	279,147	29,875	26,617	5,983	163,755	284	505,661
Oneida	435,941	24,868	14,787	10,012	90,975	482	577,065
Outagamie	1,422,586	127,808	47,542	-	236,536	1,250	1,835,722
Ozaukee	558,542	39,970	14,628	-	72,780	1,156	687,076
Pepin	51,800	1,796	-	488	-	94	54,178
Pierce	243,547	15,588	-	10,012	-	388	269,535
Polk	350,570	20,072	7,314	9,035	36,390	672	424,053
Portage	426,180	53,812	35,489	-	218,341	1,630	735,452
Price	115,607	8,597	5,915	3,419	36,390	482	170,410
Racine	3,401,604	104,821	25,600	-	127,365	3,554	3,662,944
Richland	75,205	7,208	-	4,396	-	284	87,093
Rock	2,708,139	100,514	18,285	-	90,975	2,596	2,920,509
Rusk	187,839	3,524	-	611	-	284	192,258
Saint Croix	493,153	35,047	7,314	-	36,390	388	572,292
Sauk	405,278	53,790	28,328	-	163,755	388	651,539
Sawyer	152,946	5,247	-	2,564	-	482	161,239
Shawano	440,547	32,325	17,745	14,042	109,170	-	613,829
Sheboygan	956,373	74,938	21,942	-	109,170	768	1,163,191
Taylor	167,791	18,737	17,745	2,686	109,170	482	316,611
Trempealeau	103,390	9,999	-	3,297	-	94	116,780
Vernon	170,174	11,499	-	6,716	-	190	188,579
Vilas	229,268	12,083	11,830	244	72,780	284	326,489
Walworth	729,425	47,478	10,971	-	54,585	862	843,321
Washburn	134,859	4,425	-	2,076	-	-	141,360
Washington	1,043,433	62,597	3,657	-	18,195	672	1,128,554
Waukesha	3,015,930	147,348	18,285	-	90,975	3,554	3,276,092
Waupaca	440,729	26,583	-	-	-	768	468,080
Waushara	221,480	15,401	11,830	3,053	72,780	94	324,638
Winnebago	1,290,710	104,260	18,285	-	90,975	1,734	1,505,964
Wood	1,068,417	54,692	14,628	-	72,780	2,112	1,212,629
County Total	\$68,235,074	\$4,000,000	\$2,106,500	\$200,000	\$12,500,000	\$89,400	\$87,130,974

* Excludes community supervision services funding and emergency funding, which are allocated late in the calendar year. Community supervision services funding is currently budgeted \$2,124,800 annually, and emergency funding is currently budgeted \$250,000 annually. Also excludes AODA funding (\$1,333,400 annually), which is not part of the youth aids formula. County allocations of these components in calendar year 2020 are reflected in Attachment 2.

ATTACHMENT 2

Youth Aids Reallocations and Earmark Removals Under the Bill

	<u>Youth Aids Formula Changes</u>				<u>Other Youth Aids Changes++</u>			
	<u>Percent of Current Base Allocation</u>	<u>Proposed New Base Allocation</u>	<u>Plus Other Components+</u>	<u>Projected Net Youth Aids Base Change from CY 21</u>	<u>Removing AODA</u>	<u>Removing Community Supervision</u>	<u>Removing Emergency Funding</u>	<u>Total of Earmarks Removed</u>
Adams	0.257%	\$186,481	\$274,523	\$11,136	-\$985			-\$985
Ashland	0.256	186,073	203,682	11,111	-4,295			-4,295
Barron	0.559	405,809	426,353	24,233	-7,704			-7,704
Bayfield	0.186	134,951	140,695	8,059	-3,248			-3,248
Brown	2.492	1,808,210	2,353,844	107,977	-38,545			-38,545
Buffalo	0.069	50,402	53,953	3,010	-1,052			-1,052
Burnett	0.255	185,260	190,710	11,063	-2,691		-23,150	-25,841
Calumet	0.353	255,866	346,378	15,279	-5,050			-5,050
Chippewa	0.706	512,442	538,519	30,600	-11,561			-11,561
Clark	0.593	430,607	444,938	25,714	-7,939			-7,939
Columbia	0.430	311,829	410,307	18,621	-7,815	-18,090		-25,905
Crawford	0.177	128,371	138,285	7,666	-2,712		-6,428	-9,140
Dane	6.668	4,839,221	7,276,896	288,972	-89,744	-381,995		-471,739
Dodge	0.810	588,062	622,572	35,116	-12,242			-12,242
Door	0.249	180,541	240,723	10,781	-2,349			-2,349
Douglas	1.329	964,388	1,162,857	57,588	-18,824			-18,824
Dunn	0.274	198,868	229,437	11,875	-4,312			-4,312
Eau Claire	1.302	944,722	1,167,092	56,414	-15,045			-15,045
Florence	0.069	50,051	51,308	2,989	-1,043			-1,043
Fond du Lac	1.135	823,651	918,479	49,184	-12,801			-12,801
Forest	0.084	61,063	92,462	3,646	-464			-464
Grant	0.324	235,049	322,984	14,036	-5,352			-5,352
Green	0.284	206,159	341,010	12,311	-3,255	-19,604		-22,859
Green Lake	0.157	114,158	127,359	6,817	-1,385			-1,385
Iowa	0.202	146,876	164,840	8,771	-2,791			-2,791

	<u>Youth Aids Formula Changes</u>				<u>Other Youth Aids Changes++</u>			
	<u>Percent of Current Base Allocation</u>	<u>Proposed New Base Allocation</u>	<u>Plus Other Components+</u>	<u>Projected Net Youth Aids Base Change from CY 21</u>	<u>Removing AODA</u>	<u>Removing Community Supervision</u>	<u>Removing Emergency Funding</u>	<u>Total of Earmarks Removed</u>
Iron	0.056%	\$40,439	\$88,474	\$2,415	-\$672			-\$672
Jackson	0.225	163,055	197,648	9,737	-1,369		-\$10,725	-12,094
Jefferson	0.767	556,378	602,557	33,224	-12,367			-12,367
Juneau	0.298	216,502	224,427	12,928	-4,776			-4,776
Kenosha	3.744	2,717,193	3,425,261	162,256	-56,855			-56,855
Kewaunee	0.143	103,905	116,118	6,205	-2,265			-2,265
Lacrosse	1.550	1,124,449	1,214,469	67,146	-23,543			-23,543
Lafayette	0.090	65,668	72,100	3,921	-1,459			-1,459
Langlade	0.466	338,042	372,181	20,186	-6,751		-62,701	-69,452
Lincoln	0.453	328,871	397,077	19,638	-7,739			-7,739
Manitowoc	0.745	540,892	638,177	32,299	-12,118			-12,118
Marathon	1.802	1,307,377	1,446,508	78,070	-22,196			-22,196
Marinette	0.632	458,978	734,027	27,408	-9,740			-9,740
Marquette	0.114	82,981	87,066	4,955	-1,705			-1,705
Menominee	0.622	451,107	476,754	26,938	-7,735		-24,650	-32,385
Milwaukee	36.973	26,830,891	36,009,644	1,602,197	-447,730			-447,730
Monroe	0.852	618,023	697,906	36,905	-12,554			-12,554
Oconto	0.409	296,875	523,673	17,728	-5,068	-\$82,530		-87,598
Oneida	0.639	463,626	605,232	27,685	-7,398		-5,364	-12,762
Outagamie	2.085	1,512,930	1,927,316	90,344	-27,365			-27,365
Ozaukee	0.819	594,013	723,703	35,471	-10,354	-23,625		-33,979
Pepin	0.076	55,090	57,562	3,290	-1,169		-13,788	-14,957
Pierce	0.357	259,014	285,390	15,467	-5,407		-8,105	-13,512
Polk	0.514	372,834	446,989	22,264	-7,474			-7,474
Portage	0.625	453,245	764,147	27,065	-8,315			-8,315
Price	0.169	122,949	178,234	7,342	-2,525		-6,915	-9,440
Racine	4.985	3,617,629	3,882,523	216,025	-69,983			-69,983
Richland	0.110	79,981	92,153	4,776	-1,825			-1,825
Rock	3.969	2,880,125	3,095,091	171,986	-59,794			-59,794
Rusk	0.275	199,768	204,471	11,929	-3,808			-3,808

	<u>Youth Aids Formula Changes</u>				<u>Other Youth Aids Changes⁺⁺</u>			
	<u>Percent of Current Base Allocation</u>	<u>Proposed New Base Allocation</u>	<u>Plus Other Components⁺</u>	<u>Projected Net Youth Aids Base Change from CY 21</u>	<u>Removing AODA</u>	<u>Removing Community Supervision</u>	<u>Removing Emergency Funding</u>	<u>Total of Earmarks Removed</u>
Saint Croix	0.723%	\$524,472	\$603,999	\$31,319	-\$9,874			-\$9,874
Sauk	0.594	431,016	677,665	25,738	-8,602			-8,602
Sawyer	0.224	162,659	171,434	9,713	-3,547			-3,547
Shawano	0.646	468,525	641,807	27,978	-10,663		-\$13,616	-24,279
Sheboygan	1.402	1,017,109	1,224,695	60,736	-22,536	-\$26,775		-49,311
Taylor	0.246	178,447	327,749	10,656	-3,260			-3,260
Trempealeau	0.152	109,956	123,440	6,566	-2,963			-2,963
Vernon	0.249	180,981	199,576	10,807	-2,387			-2,387
Vilas	0.336	243,828	341,333	14,560	-2,164		-46,787	-48,951
Walworth	1.069	775,749	890,507	46,324	-14,293	-17,284		-31,577
Washburn	0.198	143,423	149,924	8,564	-1,796			-1,796
Washington	1.529	1,109,698	1,195,491	66,265	-22,122			-22,122
Waukesha	4.420	3,207,462	3,471,178	191,532	-67,070			-67,070
Waupaca	0.646	468,718	496,837	27,989	-10,661			-10,661
Waushara	0.325	235,546	338,798	14,066	-4,004		-27,751	-31,755
Winnebago	1.892	1,372,679	1,589,667	81,969	-23,779			-23,779
Wood	<u>1.566</u>	<u>1,136,269</u>	<u>1,282,593</u>	<u>67,852</u>	<u>-18,416</u>	<u>-17,943</u>		<u>-36,359</u>
County Total	100.000%	\$72,568,474	\$91,553,774	\$4,333,400	-\$1,333,400	-\$587,846	-\$249,980	-\$2,171,226

* Reflects proposed changes to the youth aids base and component parts (including community supervision services, AODA, and emergency funds). The allocation does not reflect additional funding provided (which would increase county allocations), or changes to the CIP program allocation (which would decrease county allocations).

+ The "other components" include additions under 1999 Act 9, 2001 Act 16, the arrest supplement, 2007 Act 20, and out-of-home care extension, as identified in Attachment 1, and would remain unchanged under the bill as introduced.

++ The funding to be removed reflects amounts that counties received in calendar year 2020.

ATTACHMENT 3

Comparison of 1980 and 2019 Census Bureau Data for Populations Aged 0 to 19, by Wisconsin County

<u>County</u>	<u>1980 Population</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>2019 Population*</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Adams	2,792	0.18%	3,166	0.22%	0.04%
Ashland	5,439	0.35	3,861	0.27	-0.08
Barron	12,722	0.82	10,576	0.74	-0.08
Bayfield	4,393	0.28	2,862	0.20	-0.08
Brown	62,363	4.02	69,196	4.87	0.84
Buffalo	4,738	0.31	2,923	0.21	-0.10
Burnett	3,744	0.24	2,934	0.21	-0.04
Calumet	11,725	0.76	12,818	0.90	0.14
Chippewa	18,632	1.20	15,389	1.08	-0.12
Clark	11,663	0.75	11,090	0.78	0.03
Columbia	13,939	0.90	13,261	0.93	0.03
Crawford	5,749	0.37	3,574	0.25	-0.12
Dane	97,751	6.31	127,724	8.98	2.68
Dodge	24,545	1.58	18,996	1.34	-0.25
Door	7,709	0.50	4,962	0.35	-0.15
Douglas	14,064	0.91	9,526	0.67	-0.24
Dunn	11,335	0.73	11,404	0.80	0.07
Eau Claire	26,207	1.69	25,291	1.78	0.09
Florence	1,376	0.09	676	0.05	-0.04
Fond du Lac	30,376	1.96	24,535	1.73	-0.23
Forest	3,186	0.21	2,009	0.14	-0.06
Grant	18,322	1.18	13,671	0.96	-0.22
Green	9,899	0.64	8,893	0.63	-0.01
Green Lake	5,699	0.37	4,562	0.32	-0.05
Iowa	6,961	0.45	5,752	0.40	-0.04
Iron	1,845	0.12	941	0.07	-0.05
Jackson	5,505	0.36	4,933	0.35	-0.01
Jefferson	22,430	1.45	20,373	1.43	-0.01
Juneau	6,970	0.45	5,813	0.41	-0.04
Kenosha	41,122	2.65	43,186	3.04	0.38
Kewaunee	6,865	0.44	4,825	0.34	-0.10
Lacrosse	29,231	1.89	28,282	1.99	0.10
Lafayette	6,165	0.40	4,371	0.31	-0.09
Langlade	6,761	0.44	4,122	0.29	-0.15
Lincoln	8,927	0.58	5,507	0.39	-0.19

<u>County</u>	<u>1980 Population</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>2019 Population*</u>	<u>% of Total</u>	<u>Difference</u>
Manitowoc	27,768	1.79%	17,795	1.25%	-0.54%
Marathon	38,959	2.51	33,604	2.36	-0.15
Marinette	12,767	0.82	8,386	0.59	-0.23
Marquette	3,532	0.23	3,263	0.23	0.00
Menominee	1,636	0.11	1,648	0.12	0.01
Milwaukee	292,041	18.84	251,630	17.69	-1.14
Monroe	11,789	0.76	12,638	0.89	0.13
Oconto	9,859	0.64	8,356	0.59	-0.05
Oneida	9,553	0.62	6,622	0.47	-0.15
Outagamie	46,666	3.01	48,270	3.39	0.38
Ozaukee	23,353	1.51	21,370	1.50	0.00
Pepin	2,613	0.17	1,651	0.12	-0.05
Pierce	11,198	0.72	11,008	0.77	0.05
Polk	10,763	0.69	9,814	0.69	0.00
Portage	20,167	1.30	16,636	1.17	-0.13
Price	5,142	0.33	2,646	0.19	-0.15
Racine	59,837	3.86	49,367	3.47	-0.39
Richland	5,636	0.36	4,117	0.29	-0.07
Rock	47,868	3.09	41,477	2.92	-0.17
Rusk	5,353	0.35	3,159	0.22	-0.12
Saint Croix	15,661	1.01	24,223	1.70	0.69
Sauk	14,131	0.91	15,915	1.12	0.21
Sawyer	4,017	0.26	3,481	0.24	-0.01
Shawano	12,067	0.78	9,517	0.67	-0.11
Sheboygan	32,963	2.13	27,829	1.96	-0.17
Taylor	6,810	0.44	5,193	0.37	-0.07
Trempealeau	8,644	0.56	8,043	0.57	0.01
Vernon	7,953	0.51	8,690	0.61	0.10
Vilas	4,617	0.30	4,102	0.29	-0.01
Walworth	22,893	1.48	24,844	1.75	0.27
Washburn	4,161	0.27	3,231	0.23	-0.04
Washington	31,604	2.04	32,336	2.27	0.24
Waukesha	100,469	6.48	95,452	6.71	0.23
Waupaca	13,658	0.88	11,308	0.80	-0.09
Waushara	5,642	0.36	4,894	0.34	-0.02
Winnebago	41,947	2.71	40,411	2.84	0.14
Wood	<u>25,299</u>	<u>1.63</u>	<u>17,165</u>	<u>1.21</u>	-0.42
Total	1,550,186	100.00%	1,422,095	100.00%	

*Based on Census Bureau estimates, and significantly similar to the 0 to 19 actual population data reported by the Wisconsin Department of Health Services.