Administration

General Agency Provisions

(LFB Budget Summary Document: Page 19)

LFB Summary Items for Which an Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #	Title
3	Eliminate Long-Term Vacancies (Paper #100)
10	Eau Claire Confluence Development Project (Paper #101)
17	Office of Lean Government (Paper #102)
21	Prison Industries Procurement Pricing (Paper #103)
22	Federal Surplus Property Program (Paper #104)
23	Diesel Truck Idling Reduction Grant Program (Paper #105)

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

May 7, 2015 | Joint Committee on Finance | Paper #100

Eliminate Long-Term Vacancies (DOA -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 20, #3]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Administration (DOA) has 1,004.03 authorized positions, including 95.84 GPR positions, 78.18 FED positions, 816.41 PR positions, and 13.6 SEG positions.

GOVERNOR

Delete 2.6 GPR positions, 2.0 FED positions, 41.85 PR positions, and 1.2 SEG positions annually to eliminate vacant positions that have been vacant for 12 months or more. In addition, reduce funding by $191,100 GPR annually associated with the 2.6 GPR positions identified for elimination under the provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the bill, 47.65 positions that have been vacant for 12 months or more are identified for deletion under DOA. As with other agencies with long-term vacancies identified for elimination, the bill would delete associated salary and fringe benefit funding for GPR positions, but would not delete funding associated with positions funded from other sources.

2. The following table shows the salary and fringe benefits for the eliminated positions, by appropriation and fund source.

Department of Administration
Long-Term Vacancies and Annual Funding by Appropriation

Current Law Appropriation by Fund Source	FTE	Salaries	Fringe Benefits	Annual Total
GPR				
Supervision and management; general program operations	2.60	$138,200	$52,900	$191,100
FED				
Supervision and management; federal aid	1.00	$46,700	$17,900	$64,600
Housing and community development; federal aid; state operations	1.00	46,700	17,900	64,600
Total FED	2.00	$93,400	$35,800	$129,200
PR				
Printing, mail, communication and information technology services; agencies	12.20	$775,700	$296,600	$1,072,300
Services to nonstate governmental units; entity contract	1.00	29,600	11,300	40,900
Procurement services	2.00	107,100	41,000	148,100
Materials and services to state agencies and certain districts	2.45	157,800	60,300	218,100
Transportation, records, and document services	1.50	55,300	21,100	76,400
Capital planning and building construction services	15.00	642,900	245,800	888,700
Financial services	0.20	9,300	3,600	12,900
Justice information systems	1.00	67,900	26,000	93,900
Information technology and communications services; nonstate entities	0.90	57,300	21,900	79,200
Risk management administration	0.05	1,800	700	2,500
Hearings and appeals fees	0.80	40,200	15,400	55,600
Facility operations and maintenance; police and protection functions	3.75	129,700	49,600	179,300
General program operations; Indian gaming	1.00	46,700	17,900	64,600
Total PR	41.85	$2,121,300	$811,200	$2,932,500
SEG				
General program operations--environmental improvement programs; state funds	1.20	$59,600	$22,800	$82,400
All Funds	47.65	$2,412,500	$922,700	$3,335,200

3. As shown in the table, funding for salaries and fringe benefits associated with the positions identified for elimination totals $3,335,200 annually ($191,100 GPR, $129,200 FED, $2,932,500 PR, and $82,400 SEG). Although funding for eliminated GPR positions would be reduced, funding of $3,144,100 associated with other deleted positions would not. It could be argued that a significant amount of funding for salaries and fringe benefits which would remain in DOA's budget would not be needed.

4. The Committee could approve the Governor's recommendation to delete $191,100 GPR, 2.6 GPR positions, 2.0 FED positions, 41.85 PR positions, and 1.2 SEG positions annually to reduce GPR funding associated with vacant GPR positions and eliminate GPR-, FED-, PR-, and SEG-funded vacant positions that have been vacant for 12 months or more. [Alternative 1] In addition, the Committee could choose to delete funding of $129,200 FED, $2,932,500 PR, and $82,400 SEG annually associated with the FED, PR, and SEG positions identified for elimination. [Alternative 2]

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to delete 2.6 GPR positions, 2.0 FED positions, 41.85 PR positions, and 1.2 SEG positions annually to eliminate vacant positions that have been vacant for 12 months or more. In addition, reduce funding by $191,100 GPR annually associated with the 2.6 GPR positions identified for elimination under the provision.

2. In addition to Alternative 1, delete funding of $129,200 FED, $2,932,500 PR, and $82,400 SEG annually associated with 2.0 FED, 41.85 PR, and 1.2 SEG vacant positions identified for elimination.

ALT 2	Change to Bill
FED	- $258,400
PR	- 5,865,000
SEG	- 164,800
Total	- $6,288,200

3. Delete provision.

ALT 3	Change to Bill Funding	Positions
GPR	$382,200	2.60
FED	0	2.00
PR	0	41.85
SEG	0	1.20
Total	$382,200	47.65

Prepared by: Rachel Janke

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

May 7, 2015 | Joint Committee on Finance | Paper #101

Eau Claire Confluence Development Project (Administration and Miscellaneous Appropriations)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 22, #10 and Page 295, #1]

CURRENT LAW

No provision.

GOVERNOR

Create a continuing appropriation for the purpose of providing grants to an economic development district and provide $15.0 million GPR in 2016-17 for the grants. Permit DOA to award grants to a city in the state for an economic development district that includes a community arts center and a mixed-use development. Require the applicant city to submit to DOA a financial plan for the economic development district. Specify that the plan must include matching funds (cash, in-kind, or both) that equal 100 percent of the grant funding being requested. In addition, require that the applicant provide proof, to the satisfaction of DOA, of other financing for the economic development district. Specify that DOA may not award more than $15.0 million in grants in total. Further, specify that the funding, which is provided in 2016-17, will not remain in the budgeted base for miscellaneous appropriations.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. According to the Budget in Brief, the $15 million GPR for the grant program is provided because, "The Governor intends to provide these funds to the Confluence Development Project in the City of Eau Claire to support development in the City's downtown, provided that the district meets the financial matching requirements." No other specific reasons have been provided by the administration.

Project Background

2. The University of Wisconsin (UW)-Eau Claire's campus master plan, which was completed in November, 2011, identified the construction of a new performance arts center and a new fine arts center as priorities for the first five years of the 20-year plan. At present, the departments of art and design, music, and theatre arts are housed in the Haas Fine Arts Center. That facility houses a 600-seat theatre and two 200-seat theatres that are primarily used for music and dance performances. Theatre programs and productions are housed at the Kjer Theatre which has a 400-seat theatre and is located across the Chippewa River from the Haas Fine Arts Center. According to UW-Eau Claire officials, the campus's current fine arts and performance spaces are too small for current program needs and are poorly configured. In particular, the current 600-seat theatre located in the Haas Fine Arts Center is not large enough to accommodate the music department's choral and orchestra performances. The Kjer Theatre would require significant renovations and has been identified for demolition.

3. As proposed at the time, the arts facility component of the Confluence Project would include a significant amount of space that would be used exclusively by UW-Eau Claire's dance, theatre, and music departments. This space would include a dance studio, rehearsal space, set and costume shops, a lighting laboratory, office space for the departments of theatre and dance, and a classroom. In addition to these spaces, the university portion of the project would also include a 400-seat performance venue which the university would share with the community. The community portion of the project would include a 1,200- to 1,500-seat theatre and music rehearsal space to which the university would also have access.

4. The UW Board of Regents initially considered the Eau Claire Confluence Project at its meeting in October, 2012. At that time, the Regents considered whether to request $25,000,000 in general fund supported borrowing (GFSB), which is the primary source of funding for UW System academic building projects, to purchase the university component of the proposed arts facility. The proposal was considered as an alternative to building an addition to the existing, on-campus Haas Fine Arts Center. According to UW-Eau Claire officials, a study conducted by the Division of Facilities Development in DOA found that building an addition to the Haas Fine Arts Center that would provide the same space as would be provided in university portion of the proposed arts facility could cost $32 million. That addition would not include the 1,200- to 1,500-seat theatre and music rehearsal spaces that would comprise the community portion of the arts facility. Materials provided to the Regents in October, 2012, indicated that the UW System may request funds to renovate the Haas Fine Arts Center in the future.

5. In October, 2012, the Board of Regents approved the Confluence Project in concept and stipulated that the following criteria be met if the Board of Regents and UW-Eau Claire were to be involved: (a) the entity or entities that will own and operate the private components of the project's arts facilities must provide satisfactory proof of an independent guarantor or surety of the financial and operation obligations of the entity or entities; (b) the project's operating agreement must ensure that neither UW-Eau Claire nor the Board of Regents will be liable for more than their prorated share of operational costs; (c) the value of the public component of the project's arts facilities must be directly proportional to the amount of the state investment in that component, as

confirmed by independent audit; (d) the project's development process must be conducted in cooperation with DOA and in compliance with all project delivery requirements relating to fair competition and transparency; and (e) the state investment in the entire project must not exceed $25 million.

2015 AB 21/SB 21

6. Funding for the Confluence Regional Arts Center was initially requested through the 2015-17 capital budget. The Confluence Project has three main components: (a) a Regional Arts Center; (b) Haymarket Landing (which is proposed to include university housing); and (c) a Public Plaza. Eau Claire Confluence Arts, Inc. requested the enumeration of $25.0 million GFSB to support the construction of the Regional Arts Center component of the Confluence Project. At the time of the request, total funding for the Regional Arts Center was estimated at $50.0 million. The Governor recommended denial of the request, citing the GPR provided under the budget bill for the project. Although AB 21/SB 21 contains additional bonding authority of $1.56 billion, the administration has indicated that the Eau Claire Confluence Project was funded with GPR rather than bonding due to "an overall desire to restrain state bonding in this biennium."

7. Subsequent to submission of the capital budget request, Eau Claire Confluence Arts, Inc. reduced the budget for the Regional Arts Center to $40.0 million. Funding would be provided from: (a) $15.0 million GPR provided under the bill; (b) $13.5 million from philanthropic sources; (c) $5.0 million from the City of Eau Claire; (d) $3.5 million from Eau Claire County; and (e) $3.0 million from New Market Tax Credits. According to representatives of the project, any additional reduction to the $40.0 million budget for the facility would compromise the quality of academic programming and services to the public. In addition, representatives of the project indicate that a reduction in the commitment of $15.0 million funding from the state would risk the viability of the project.

8. The Regional Arts Center as currently proposed would include a 1,200-seat main theatre, 450-seat smaller theatre, and 250-seat flexible theatre. The facility would also include offices, classrooms, rehearsal rooms, art studios, theatre production space, and a public gathering place. Eau Claire Confluence Arts, Inc. indicates that the facility would replace the State Theatre, which is owned by the Eau Claire Regional Arts Council, and the Kjer Theatre, which is located on the UW-Eau Claire campus.

9. The facility would be owned by Eau Claire Confluence Arts, Inc., the not-for-profit organization which requested funding for the project under the 2015-17 capital budget. Operation of the facility would be managed by the Confluence Council, LLC, which includes members from the Eau Claire Regional Arts Council, UW-Eau Claire, Visit Eau Claire, the City of Eau Claire, and other community members. Representatives of the project estimate that the arts center would generate operating revenue of $1,681,200 annually ($1,202,000 attributable to the community and $479,200 attributable to UW-Eau Claire) and have operating expenses of $1,643,100 annually ($1,208,500 attributable to the community and $434,600 attributable to UW-Eau Claire), for net operating revenue of $38,100 annually.

Analysis

10. The state operates several economic development programs, some of which are grant programs. In general, economic development programs operated by the state include at least one element that aims to promote positive economic development outcomes and proper utilization of state funding, such as: (a) a competitive application process to promote an efficient or effective use of funds; (b) repayment requirements that would ensure partial or full recovery of the cost to the state; (c) conditional funding provided on the basis of achievement of economic development outcomes; or (d) reporting requirements that ensure, at a minimum, that information regarding the use of funds or program outcomes would be available to the public.

11. On one hand, it could be argued that approval of the proposal in its current form could set a precedent that would lead to other such allocations of funding to specific beneficiaries in the future. The grant, for which a recipient has already been identified, would not be awarded on a competitive basis and no amount of the grant would be repaid to the state. Further, under the bill, the project would not be required to report to the state regarding economic development outcomes, such as the number or type of jobs created by the project.

12. On the other hand, although it is uncommon for funding to be provided to specific non-state entities in the form of a non-competitive, appropriated grant, in recent years funding has been provided to non-state entities for construction of facilities through the state building program, as shown in the following table. If funding for the Confluence Project were to be provided as GFSB, as had been initially requested, it would represent one of the largest such provisions of funding for a local project.

Local Projects Enumerated under State Building Programs, 2009 - 2013

Project	State Funding
Aids Network (2009 Act 28)	$300,000
Aids Resource Center (2009 Act 28)	800,000
Bradley Center Sports and Entertainment Corp. (2009 Act 28)	5,000,000
Dane County Yahara River Watershed Initiative (2009 Act 28)	6,600,000
Madison Children's Museum (2009 Act 28)	250,000
Myrick Hixon EcoPark (2009 Act 28)	500,000
Aldo Leopold Climate Change Classroom and Interactive Library (2009 Act 28)	500,000
Oshkosh Opera House (2009 Act 28)	500,000
L.E. Phillips Library -- Eau Claire (2009 Act 28)	125,000
Stone Barn Restoration -- Town of Chase (2009 Act 28)	100,000
Lac du Flambeau Indian Tribal Cultural Center (2011 Act 32)	250,000
Dane County Livestock Facilities (2013 Act 20)	9,000,000
Domestic Abuse Intervention Center - Madison (2013 Act 20)	560,000
K I Convention Center - Green Bay (2013 Act 20)	2,000,000
Norskedalen Nature and Heritage Center - Vernon County (2013 Act 20)	1,048,300
Wisconsin Maritime Center for Excellence - Marinette County (2013 Act 20)	5,000,000
Total	$32,533,300

13. For the Confluence Regional Arts Center, it should be noted that one of the primary beneficiaries of the project would be UW-Eau Claire, which is a state entity. Therefore, it could be argued that the project should be compared to GFSB-funded projects of the UW System and UW campuses. Under 2013 Act 20, $238.8 million GPR in new general obligation bonds was provided for UW System and UW campus projects ranging from $4.5 million for a UW-Whitewater student success center addition to $82.0 million for a UW-La Crosse science labs building.

14. In August, 2014, the Board of Regents approved a resolution supporting the Eau Claire Confluence Project but did not include a request for GFSB related to the project in its capital budget request. According to UW System staff, the Board of Regents did not request the enumeration of GFSB to purchase the university component of the arts facility, as had been initially proposed, due to concerns regarding UW-Eau Claire's potential responsibility for capital and operating costs related to the facility if the project is not successful in attracting adequate private funds. Project developers have set a goal of raising $13.5 million from philanthropic sources to support the arts facility portion of the project. University of Wisconsin-Eau Claire officials indicate that $8 million in private contributions has been raised to date.

15. In addition to the proposed arts facility, the Eau Claire Confluence Project includes a mixed-use building (Haymarket Landing) that would include retail, restaurant, and office space in addition to 119 apartments. Similar to the proposed arts facility, it was initially proposed that the Board of Regents could request $30 million in program revenue supported borrowing (PRSB) to purchase the housing component of the mixed-use facility after it had been constructed. Construction began on the project in November, 2014, and it is anticipated that the building will be completed in summer, 2016. It is currently being developed by a private partnership which includes the Blugold Real Estate, a subsidiary of the UW-Eau Claire Foundation. The campus master plan identified a significant need for additional student housing both on- and off-campus. The master plan recommended that UW-Eau Claire partner with a private or non-profit developer on a residential project in close proximity to campus and to provide university programming in that space if possible. At present, there is no agreement in place between the private entities developing the property and UW-Eau Claire regarding the use of the residential portion of the property as student housing. The Regents also have not requested any funds related to this portion of the Confluence Project.

16. The Building Commission has developed the following criteria for including state funding for local projects in the state's capital budget: (a) the project must be in the public interest; (b) there should be a statewide basis justifying the need for the project; (c) local or other financing alternatives should be considered first; (d) the requestor should be required to provide evidence that the purpose and use of the project is such that it can be financed with tax-exempt bonds; (e) the requestor and DOA's Division of Facilities Development should consider appropriate language to protect the state's interest in the project if the property is used for purposes other than those approved by the Building Commission; (f) the Commission can modify its original approval if the proposed change is in the public interest and approved by state bond counsel; (g) the requester agrees to provide a 50% or greater match for the project before initial review by the Commission and the Commission may require appropriate guarantees for this match; and (h) the local project must be submitted and reviewed following the same procedures used for state agency requests for

funding through the state capital budget.

17. Eau Claire Confluence Arts, Inc. argues that the project is in the public interest due to its relationship with the Eau Claire community as well as the UW-Eau Claire. The organization explains that the project would support the academic enrichment of students of the arts through provision of performance venues, classrooms, offices, rehearsal rooms, art studios, and theatre production space. The organization further argues that the project would benefit the state as a whole through regional economic development that would: (a) attract and retain students, in addition to employees in various economic sectors; and (b) generate additional sales tax revenue directly through facility events and indirectly through development of and activity in the surrounding area. In particular, the organization notes that Eau Claire competes directly with facilities of similar size in the Minneapolis-Saint Paul metropolitan area, and that the project would benefit Wisconsin as a whole by attracting and retaining people who might have otherwise taken up residence in a neighboring state.

18. Under s. 13.48 of the Statutes, with regard to grants provided by the State Building Commission to certain non-state entities for the construction of facilities, if a grant to an organization is authorized and if, for any reason, the facility that is constructed with funds from the grant is not used in the manner in which it was originally intended, the State of Wisconsin will retain an ownership interest in the facility equal to the amount of the state's grant. Although this language is not included in the bill with regard to the Confluence Project, such language could be included to protect the state's interest.

19. The Committee could choose to approve the Governor's request to provide $15.0 million GPR to the City of Eau Claire for the Confluence Development Project. [Alternative 1] In addition, if the Committee chooses to provide grant funding, either or both of the following modifications could be adopted: (a) in order to provide some level of legislative oversight, the Committee could require DOA to submit a report to the Committee under 14-day passive review containing the following, before providing grants: (1) notification of grant amounts to be provided; (2) dates upon which funding would be provided; and (3) documentation showing that the City of Eau Claire has met the financing requirements under the bill [Alternative 2]; or (b) specify that the State would retain an ownership interest in the Confluence Regional Arts Center facility equal to the amount of the State's grant if the facility is not used in the manner in which it was originally intended, to protect the interest of the State. [Alternative 3]

20. However, it could be argued that the project is more suitable to inclusion in the capital budget, based on past precedents and the amount of funding involved which, though large for a non-state local project, is within the range of funds historically provided to UW System and UW campus projects. Therefore, the Committee could choose to delete the GPR-funded grant program and instead provide the funding through enumeration of the project under the state capital budget. [Alternative 4]

21. If bonding is used to construct the facility, local projects like the proposed Confluence Arts Center are typically enumerated in the biennial state building program and a bonding authorization and debt service appropriation to repay the bonds are created. Further, the Legislature typically makes a finding that the project has a statewide significance and indicates the facility is to

be constructed outside DOA's supervision. Finally, the Building Commission typically provides the funds in the form of a grant with the following caveats: (a) the grant cannot be made until the Commission determines that the organization to receive the grant has raised non-state funds equal to the amount of the grant; and (b) the state would retain an ownership interest in the facility equal to the amount of its grant.

22. If GPR-supported bonding would be provided for the facility, it is estimated that debt service on the bonds would be $1,075,700 GPR in 2016-17, and each year thereafter, assuming construction would begin in early 2016. Over the 20-year life of the bonds, the debt service cost to the state for the project would total $21,514,000 GPR.

23. Finally, given that the administration did not provide specific reasons for the proposal, that the provision is intended to provide funding to a specific recipient, that the funding would not be repaid, that the project would have no requirements regarding economic development outcomes or reporting, and that the proposal could establish a precedent for providing such funds to other non-state entities in the future, the Committee could choose to delete the provision. [Alternative 5]

24. The Committee should note that the Eau Claire Confluence Development Project was included on the April, 14, 2015, Earmark Transparency Report prepared for the Legislature under s. 13.95(1r). Under s. 13.102(2) of the Statutes, "If a member of the joint committee on finance makes a motion during committee deliberations on a biennial budget bill to remove an earmark, as defined in s. 13.95 (1r) (a), from the biennial budget bill, the motion shall prevail on either a majority or a tie vote." As such, adoption of Alternative 5, would prevail by majority or tie vote.

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide $15.0 million GPR in 2016-17 to the City of Eau Claire for the Eau Claire Confluence Development Project.

2. In addition to Alternative 1, require DOA before providing grants to submit a report to the Committee providing, under a 14-day passive review: (a) notification of grant amounts to be provided; (b) dates upon which funding would be provided; and (c) documentation showing that the City of Eau Claire has met the financing requirements under the bill.

3. In addition to Alternative 1, specify that if, for any reason, the facility that is constructed with funds from the grant is not used in the manner in which it was originally intended, the State of Wisconsin will retain an ownership interest in the facility equal to the amount of the State's grant.

4. Delete the Governor's recommendation to create an economic development grant program and funding of $15.0 million GPR in 2016-17. Provide $15,000,000 in GPR-supported bonding and $1,075,700 GPR in 2016-17 for debt service associated with the enumeration of a Confluence Arts Center in Eau Claire under the 2015-17 state building program (the net GPR change to bill funding would be -$13,924,300). Specify the legislative findings and Building Commission authority associated with providing of state bonding for such enumerated projects and

create a bonding authorization and associated debt service appropriation under the Building Commission for the project.

ALT 4	Change to Bill
GPR	- $13,924,300
BR	15,000,000
Total	$1,075,700

5. Delete provision.

ALT 5	Change to Bill
GPR	- $15,000,000

Prepared by: Rachel Janke

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

May 7, 2015 | Joint Committee on Finance | Paper #102

Office of Lean Government
(DOA -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 25, #17]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Administration (DOA) has 1.0 GPR position that serves as a point of contact for state agencies and provides technical assistance in establishing "lean government" initiatives. ["Lean government" generally refers to process improvement or continuous improvement business management practices applied to the administration of governmental duties.] The position is funded $86,100 GPR annually in salary and fringe benefits from DOA's supervision and management general program operations appropriation.

In addition, under state statute $200,000 GPR annually is provided for reimbursement of businesses for assisting local governmental units in establishing a "lean program." No funding has been expended from the appropriation for reimbursing businesses since its creation under the 2013-15 biennial budget act (2013 Act 20).

GOVERNOR

Provide $119,400 PR and 1.0 PR position and delete $119,400 GPR and 1.0 GPR position annually to create an Office of Lean Government attached administratively to DOA. Specify that the Office must be under the direction and supervision of a director employed within the classified service. Require the Office to establish and administer programs for state agencies "to increase the value of goods and services that state agencies provide with the fewest possible resources." Funding and position adjustments would be made to the following appropriations of DOA: (a) supervision and management general program operations (-$119,400 GPR and -1.0 GPR position annually); (b) materials and services to state agencies and certain districts ($348,300 PR and 3.0 PR positions annually); and (c) printing, mail, communication, and information technology services to state agencies and veterans services (-$228,900 PR and -2.0 PR positions annually), an appropriation which is renamed under the bill to consolidate two information technology services appropriations.

The Office of Lean Government would be staffed with 3.0 classified PR positions and an annual budget divided as follows: (a) salaries, $179,600; (b) fringe benefits, $68,700; and (c) supplies and services, $100,000. Funding for the office would be generated from charges to state agencies for training and technical assistance in efficiency and continuous improvement practices.

Repeal statutory language establishing a program that reimburses businesses for assisting local governmental units in establishing efficiency programs. Delete DOA's appropriation for reimbursement of such businesses and associated funding of $200,000 GPR annually.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. In May, 2012, the Governor issued Executive Order #66, establishing a "lean government" initiative and directing 16 state agencies to implement initiatives to "eliminate waste, save time, standardize workflow, and decrease process complexity." As a result, the following state agencies have established such initiatives and programs pursuant to the executive order: (a) DOA; (b) Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection; (c) Children and Families; (d) Corrections; (e) Financial Institutions; (f) Health Services; (g) Natural Resources; (h) Revenue; (i) Safety and Professional Services; (j) Tourism; (k) Transportation; (l) Veterans Affairs; (m) Workforce Development; (n) Office of the Commissioner of Insurance; (o) Wisconsin Economic Development Corporation; and (p) Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority.

2. The lean government executive order requires the agencies listed above to establish measurement criteria for the services each agency performs, with a focus on processes that: generate chronic customer complaints; are visible to staff and customers; show potential for major improvement; currently produce data that the agency can use to track improvement; or would reduce workload or improve customer satisfaction. Agencies are encouraged to collaborate and share insight regarding lean government efforts.

3. Separately, under 2013 Act 20, an appropriation of $200,000 GPR annually was created to reimburse businesses for assisting local governmental units in establishing a "lean program." Lean program is defined under this section of statute as a program established by a governmental unit to increase the value of the goods and services it provides with the fewest possible resources, which develops administrative structures and processes that minimize human effort, building and office space, capital, and time in the provision of goods and services. It should be noted that the repeal of this section of statute under the bill would eliminate the definition of lean program. According to DOA, the reimbursement funding cannot be used due to the structure of the program, which directs the state to pay businesses directly for services provided. The Department indicates that state accounting principles prohibit making direct payments to consultants without an established contract between the business and the state. The Department indicates that funding for the program could be administered if reimbursement were provided to local units of government

instead of businesses.

4. Currently, DOA has a GPR-funded program and policy analyst position that serves as a point of contact for state agencies in establishing lean government initiatives. The position performs the following duties relating to lean initiatives: (a) providing technical assistance to agencies; (b) coordinating lean practice trainings; (c) sharing best practices with lean program contacts at agencies; (d) answering questions relating to lean practices; (e) holding meetings of the Governor's lean government steering committee and lean government initiative points of contact; and (f) developing agency reports relating to lean accomplishments. Under the Governor's budget proposal, this position would be one of three staff in the Office of Lean Government and would continue to provide technical assistance to state agencies. While the funding source to support the position would change, the amount of funding for the position would not be changed.

5. State agencies that wish to have staff undergo training in lean process improvement practices generally do so through outside vendors, including Waukesha County Technical College, Wisconsin Manufacturing and Extension Partnership, Fox Valley Technical College, Optima, and the University of Wisconsin-Madison. The Department expended $52,000 in 2012-13 and $94,800 in 2013-14 in contractual services through Waukesha County Technical College for the provision of lean government training and technical assistance services. Funding covers expenses such as materials, instruction, and instructor travel.

6. Among the core group of agencies that were required to establish lean government initiatives under Executive Order #66, accomplishments vary. The administration cites several examples of agencies that have successfully engaged in process improvement: (a) the Department of Agriculture, Trade, and Consumer Protection simplified approval processes for soil and water resource management cost share transfers, and also improved the licensing and evaluation processes for bulk milk weighers and samplers; (b) DOA improved the measurement of agencies that provide weatherization services for residential units; (c) the Department of Natural Resources simplified the Clean Boats Clean Waters grant application process and the process for filling forestry center orders; and (d) the Department of Transportation estimates it saved 12,500 FTE hours and $814,000 in 2012-13 through numerous lean process improvement initiatives.

7. As noted previously, training and consultation services are currently provided by outside vendors, which are primarily educational institutions. According to the administration, the Office of Lean Government, which would be located under DOA's Division of Administrative Services, would act as an internal provider of lean and other continuous improvement services (such as Six Sigma, a practice that originated from the manufacturing industry, and Kaizen, a practice focused on continuous organizational improvement), including research and analysis, to all state agencies. The Office would also serve as an internal training provider to state and local government employees relating to lean government and other related practices, and would develop lean policy and program proposals for state agencies.

8. According to DOA, the 3.0 PR positions of the Office would be funded through program revenue derived from charges to state agencies for training and technical assistance. Training charges would be based on agency personnel participation in workshops and technical assistance charges would be hourly. Rates for both charges have yet to be determined.

9. Of the three positions, two would need to be recruited. According to DOA, ideal candidates for the policy initiatives advisor (funded at $91,800 annually for salary and fringe benefits) would have prior supervisory experience and knowledge of lean practices. This position would serve as the Office Director. The second position, a training officer (funded at $70,400 annually for salary and fringe benefits), would ideally have prior training, experience, and knowledge of lean practices, as well as experience planning and developing training programs.

10. The Department indicates that the two most essential positions under the proposal are the policy initiatives advisor position (Director) and the program and policy analyst position (which currently provides technical assistance relating to lean initiatives). If the training officer position is not provided, DOA argues that the state would continue to contract for training services at a cost which it estimates would exceed the cost to provide training internally. An accounting of estimated cost savings from providing training services internally, rather than through outside vendors, was not provided.

11. Under the proposal, supplies and services provided for the Office would total $100,000 annually. Supplies and services funding would be provided for: (a) standard expenses of $12,000 annually per position, including desktop licensing and support, risk management premiums, DOA overhead, space rental, and other expenses ($36,000 annually); and (b) $64,000 annually for training expenses such as course materials, textbooks, instructor travel, instructor training and certification, and contractual services.

12. On one hand, creating an office that provides additional technical support, policy advice, and internal training could enhance the state's ongoing efficiency initiatives. In addition, an internal training provider could provide guidance to state agencies and employees that is specific to state service. Therefore, the Committee could approve the Governor's recommendation to create the Office of Lean Government and reallocate GPR and PR funding and position authority for the Office. [Alternative 1] Although the Office is provided a full year of funding for the two positions for which staff would need to be recruited, the State Budget Office instructs agencies, when budgeting for new positions, to provide only nine months of funding in the first year, to account for the time to recruit and hire new staff. Therefore, the Committee could modify the provision to remove three months of funding ($40,500 PR in 2015-16) for salaries and fringe benefits for the 2.0 new positions associated with the time to recruit and hire. [Alternative 2]

13. On the other hand, there are several reasons to limit the scope of the Office to providing technical assistance and support to agencies, rather than expanding the role of DOA to begin to provide training. First, the administration indicates that the training officer position is not essential to the proposal. Second, there is not an apparent need for an internal provider of lean training, which is currently provided by outside vendors with some degree of success. Lastly, it is unclear whether the goal of Executive Order #66, which seeks to promote the operation of government with "business-like efficiency," is best met by creating a state-operated training program rather than utilizing external training programs as is currently done.

14. If the Committee wished to provide some additional support for lean government initiatives, without adding an internal training program, it could modify the provision to remove funding and position authority for a training officer ($70,400 PR for salary and fringe benefits,

$12,000 PR for basic supplies and services, and 1.0 PR position annually). Under this alternative, training supplies and services funding of $64,000 PR would be retained so that DOA could continue to purchase training services through an outside vendor. [Alternative 3]

15. Alternatively, it could be argued that state agencies, including DOA, have demonstrated the capability of conducting lean government initiatives using existing resources, technical assistance provided by 1.0 position in DOA, and services provided by outside vendors. Additionally, given that DOA indicated an ability to reallocate 2.0 vacant PR positions and funding of $186,200 PR annually associated with the positions ($162,200 for salaries and fringe and $24,000 for basic supplies and services), it could be argued that DOA does not need the funding or positions that would have been reallocated. Therefore, the Committee could modify the provision to delete the position authority and associated funding which would have been reallocated from positions authorized under DOA's IT services to state agencies appropriation for the Office of Lean Government. Under this alternative, funding and position authority for the GPR-funded program and policy analyst which currently provides technical assistance for lean government initiatives would be converted to PR, and GPR and PR funding associated with training supplies and services would be reallocated as recommended so that DOA could continue to purchase training services through an outside vendor. The Department would assess state agencies for services provided. [Alternative 4]

16. Under Alternatives 1 through 4, the program to reimburse businesses for assisting local units of government establish lean programs would be eliminated and associated funding of $200,000 GPR annually would be deleted. However, the administration has indicated that the program created under 2013 Act 20 and funded $200,000 GPR annually to reimburse businesses for assisting local governmental units in establishing lean government initiatives could be administered if reimbursement were provided to local units of government instead of businesses. If the Committee wished to assist local governmental units in establishing lean initiatives in this manner, it could delete the provision to repeal the program, and instead modify the program to specify that reimbursement would be provided to local units of government. [Alternative 5]

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide $119,400 PR and 1.0 PR position annually to create an Office of Lean Government attached administratively to DOA, and eliminate a program that reimburses businesses for assisting local governmental units in establishing efficiency programs and an appropriation of $200,000 GPR annually for the program.

2. Modify the provision to delete $40,500 PR in 2015-16 associated with three months of salaries and fringe benefits for the 2.0 vacant positions, associated with the time to recruit new staff.

ALT 2	Change to Bill
PR	- $40,500

3. Modify the provision to delete $82,400 PR and 1.0 PR position annually associated

with a training officer ($70,400 for salary and fringe and $12,000 for basic supplies and services).

ALT 3	Change to Bill Funding	Positions
PR	- $164,800	- 1.00

4. Modify the provision to delete $186,200 PR and 2.0 vacant PR positions annually associated with the 2.0 PR positions that would be reallocated from DOA's IT services to state agencies appropriation. [Supplies and services expenditure authority of $64,000 annually associated with training would be allocated as recommended to DOA's materials and services to state agencies appropriation.]

ALT 4	Change to Bill Funding	Positions
PR	- $372,400	- 2.00

5. Delete bill language that would repeal the program to reimburse businesses for assisting local governmental units in establishing a lean program. Instead, modify the appropriation and program language to specify that reimbursement under the program would be provided to local governmental units rather than to businesses directly.

ALT 5	Change to Bill
GPR	$400,000

Prepared by: Rachel Janke

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

May 7, 2015 Joint Committee on Finance Paper #103

Prison Industries Procurement Pricing (DOA -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 27, #21]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Administration (DOA) and other designated purchasing agents must offer Prison Industries the opportunity to supply products or services if the price charged by Prison Industries is equal to or lower than a price which may be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals and is able to conform to the specifications. The Department of Corrections Prison Industries program provides vocational training and work skills development to participating inmates through production of items such as office furniture, seating, signage, and metal stamping of license plates.

GOVERNOR

Require DOA and any other designated state purchasing agent, prior to seeking bids or competitive sealed proposals with respect to the purchase of any materials, supplies, equipment, or contractual services enumerated in a list of Prison Industries products and supplies available for purchase (provided by the Department of Corrections), to offer Prison Industries the opportunity to supply the products or services if Corrections is able to provide them at a price that is comparable to one which may be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals and is able to conform to the specifications. Specify that DOA and any other designated state purchasing agents may solicit bids or competitive proposals before awarding an order or contract if DOA or another purchasing agent is unable to determine whether the price of Prison Industries is comparable to one that would be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. According to the administration, the purpose of the provision is to support work that develops employable skills among inmates and assists inmates in reintegration after release from prison. Additionally, the administration indicates that "as the state's unemployment rate continues to decline, the need for a skilled workforce will only increase."

2. The Department of Corrections operates the Prison Industries program, known as Badger State Industries (BSI), at many of the maximum- and medium-security correctional institutions and two of the minimum-security centers. The mission statement of the Bureau of Correctional Enterprises, under which BSI is located, is "to enhance public safety by providing jobs and training for inmates which develop marketable skills and experiences in financially viable businesses, producing quality products and services to our customers." The program is funded by program revenue generated from the sale of goods and services produced by the inmates employed by BSI. Sales revenue must, by law, cover the costs of raw materials, inmate wages, equipment, staff salaries and administrative overhead. For 2014-15, the BSI program has an authorized budget of $17,714,000 PR and 96.1 PR positions.

3. The sale of BSI goods and services is limited by statute. A BSI program may only engage in manufacturing articles for the state and its counties, cities, villages, towns, tax-supported institutions, nonprofit agencies, other states and their political subdivisions, and the federal government. In addition, BSI is limited to selling wood and metal office furniture and laundry services only to state agencies. State statutes further require that inmates employed by BSI be provided with training and work experience that allows them to develop skills necessary to retain employment in outside business and industry.

4. Badger State Industries operates the following industries: (a) textiles, including laundry and upholstery; (b) imaging, including sign shops and printing; (c) fabricating, including metal stamping (license plates), wood and metal furniture, and upholstered products; and (d) a distribution center. During 2013-14, BSI had an average of 344 inmate positions in the various programs. The average hourly wage for inmates in 2013-14 was 94¢, ranging from 79¢ to $1.41 per hour.

5. Under state statute, all orders awarded or contracts made by DOA for materials, supplies, equipment, and contractual services, to be provided to any state agency, must be awarded to the lowest responsible bidder, taking into consideration life cycle cost estimates, agency location, quantity to be supplied, conformity to specifications and purpose, and date of delivery. The state procurement manual defines lowest responsible bidder as the supplier who submits the lowest dollar total appearing in combination with other elements of the bid that best meet the requirements of the solicitation.

6. Some exceptions to this low bid requirement are permitted, including a statutory provision that relates to Prison Industries. Created under 1983 Act 333, the low bid exception relating to Prison Industries required at that time that state agencies: (a) to the extent possible, write specifications for the purchase of materials, supplies, commodities, equipment, and contractual services so as to permit their purchase from Prison Industries; and (b) offer Prison Industries the opportunity to supply products or services if the price would be comparable to the price that would

be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals. Both requirements were maintained in state statute until 2011.

7. In addition to low bid requirements, the State Bureau of Procurement within DOA's Division of Enterprise Operations manages contracts for products and services commonly purchased across state government to ensure low cost, standard terms and conditions, and consistent warranties and customer service requirements. Many statewide contracts are mandatory contracts, which means that state agencies must utilize the contract whenever possible for products or services that are needed and are covered under the contract. Several mandatory contracts exist for BSI products, including: (a) office furniture (not including used or refurbished furniture, laboratory furniture, student housing furniture, or dormitory furniture); (b) signage; (c) laundry services for Corrections and the Department of Health Services; and (d) clothing for Corrections. When purchasing office furniture, an agency must first contact BSI to meet the agency's needs. If BSI determines that it cannot meet the agency's needs, it will issue the agency a waiver to purchase some or all of the project from another vendor. According to DOA, most waivers for office furniture are issued when BSI is unable to meet the agency's specifications. Waivers for other mandatory BSI contracts are generally not issued to state agencies.

8. Under 2011 Act 32 (the 2011-13 biennial budget act), the requirement that state agencies consider Prison Industries when writing purchase specifications was repealed. In addition, the pricing rule was changed from "comparable to" to "equal to or lower than." Both changes would have the effect of nullifying the purchasing preference given to Prison Industries. To the extent that the change in requirements would have had an effect on purchases of Prison Industries products and services, it would have reduced purchases from Prison Industries, and increased purchases from other sources. However, according to the administration, "It is unknown at this time whether the Act 32 change had a direct effect on the purchase of prison industries-supplied products and services."

9. Subsequently, during the 2013-15 biennial budget deliberations, the Committee modified the rule for furniture produced by Prison Industries. The change to the bill would have specified that state agencies must offer Prison Industries the opportunity to provide furniture if the price would be comparable to the price that would be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals. In issuing a partial veto of 2013 Act 20 with regard to the furniture procurement pricing rule, the Governor stated, "I am vetoing this provision because I believe that this change has the potential to provide an unfair advantage to Badger State Industries compared to the private sector. My veto will retain current law and retain the appropriate balance between supporting prison industries and the private sector."

10. To the extent that a change in the pricing rule from "equal to or lower than" to "comparable to" would have an effect on sales, the result would be to increase purchases of Prison Industries products and services. Likewise, other manufacturers and service providers could have reduced sales as a result of the provision. It is also possible that an increase in revenue to the Prison Industries program could lead to improvements in the policy goals targeted by the procurement exception: employability of inmates, successful reintegration into the community after release, and reduced probability of reoffending. However, the degree to which the pricing rule might affect sales of BSI products or services, if at all, is unknown.

11. On one hand, it could be argued that the "comparable" pricing rule, which was maintained from 1984 to 2011, supports the development of employable skills among inmates that may in turn support the reintegration of individuals after returning to the community, increase productive contribution through work, and reduce the risk of reoffending. Further, it could be argued that the current law pricing rule in statute, which is statutorily located in Chapter 16 under the heading of "Buy on Low Bid, Exceptions," is not an exception to low bid requirements, given that the price specified is equal to or lower than the price which would be obtained through competitive bids or proposals (which would qualify as a low bid). Therefore, the Committee could approve the Governor's recommendation to return to a pricing rule that requires agencies to offer Prison Industries the opportunity to supply products or services that can be supplied at a price comparable to a price which may be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals. Under this alternative, the product or service would need to meet the specifications of the purchasing agency. The bill would not reinstitute the requirement in place prior to 2011 Act 32 that agencies must consider Prison Industries when writing purchase specifications. [Alternative 1]

12. On the other hand, the administration did not provide evidence that the rule change had negatively affected state agency purchases of Prison Industries products or services. In addition, it could be argued, as the Governor did in his partial veto of 2013 Act 20, that a "comparable" pricing rule provides an advantage to Prison Industries relative to the private sector. Therefore, the Committee could delete the provision. [Alternative 2]

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to change the Prison Industries procurement pricing rule to require DOA and any other designated state purchasing agent to offer Prison Industries the opportunity to supply its products or services if the price is comparable to, rather than equal to or lower than, one which may be obtained through competitive bidding or competitive sealed proposals and is able to conform to the specifications.

2. Delete provision.

Prepared by: Rachel Janke

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

May 7, 2015 | Joint Committee on Finance | Paper #104

Federal Surplus Property Program (DOA -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 28, #22]

CURRENT LAW

The state's federal surplus property program for public organizations in the state is administered by the Wisconsin Technical College System Foundation under contract with the Department of Administration (DOA).

GOVERNOR

Eliminate statutory provisions relating to the administration of the federal surplus property program. Delete DOA's appropriations for federal resource acquisition ($0 PR and 0.0 PR positions annually) and federal resource acquisition support grants ($0 GPR and 0.0 GPR positions annually).

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the bill, the Department of Military Affairs would continue to operate the 1033 federal military property program, which transfers military property to state and local law enforcement agencies. In addition, the provision would not eliminate the state surplus property program established under statute. [The Committee addressed the 1033 program in executive session on April 17, 2015.]

2. The federal surplus property program was established by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949. Under the program, the U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) makes surplus federal property available to the states for use by eligible recipients at a low

cost. Eligible recipients of federal surplus property include any state or local governmental agency as well as non-profit, tax-exempt health or educational institutions. Recipients of federal surplus property must pay the cost of transportation, packaging, crating, handling, and program overhead for each item they receive. The program in Wisconsin currently assesses an additional 5% surcharge. Most recipients of federal surplus property in Wisconsin are educational institutions, counties, and municipalities. Typical purchases include trucks and tractors, forklifts, computer hardware, lab equipment, and industrial materials such as aluminum plates or electrical wire, in addition to a wide variety of other types of products.

3. From 1972 to 1986, DOA operated the program for Wisconsin. The Department managed five regional distribution centers and had 22 budgeted positions for this purpose. However, the program continually operated with cash deficits and a negative overall program position. As a result, under 1985 Act 29 (the 1985-87 biennial budget) the Legislature directed DOA to develop a plan to address the continuing deficits and submit the plan to the Joint Committee on Finance for approval. In acting on the plan submitted by DOA, the Committee at its December, 1985, meeting under s. 13.10 of the statutes directed DOA to close the distribution centers and shift the program to a catalog sales operation.

4. Subsequently, however, DOA indicated that it was pursuing an agreement with the Wisconsin Foundation for Vocational, Technical and Adult Education, Inc. (now the Wisconsin Technical College System Foundation) for the management and operation of the state's federal surplus property catalog sales operation. In December, 1986, DOA entered into an initial cooperation agreement with the Foundation relating to the program. Then, in April, 1987, the parties entered into a contractual agreement for the operation of the program which specified that: (a) the Foundation could terminate the contract for reasons of financial non-viability; (b) the Foundation was to be responsible for the day-to-day operation of the program; and (c) DOA was to be responsible for monitoring the program and determining user eligibility. At the time of the program transfer, the program under DOA had accumulated a negative balance of $1,870,900. The program deficit from the time of the transfer has since been paid in full by DOA using unexpended GPR from the Department's supervision and management general program operations appropriation. In addition, DOA provided an advance to the Foundation under the original agreement and contract in the amount of $414,000 for the initial costs to administer the program as a catalog sales operation. The 5% surcharge that the Foundation currently assesses recipients is remitted to DOA to recover the advance made to the Foundation. Revenue received from the 5% surcharge is deposited to DOA's services to nonstate governmental units appropriation. As of February 28, 2015, the remaining balance of the advance was $124,526.

5. The Department has continued since 1987 to contract with the Foundation for operation of the program. The Foundation, which is a non-profit organization dedicated to advancing vocational, technical, and adult education in Wisconsin, directly assists the 16 technical college districts in acquisition of property and other activities. The Foundation was originally interested in running the program because it already was involved in a corporate property donation program and because the state's vocational, technical, and adult education facilities had been users of the federal surplus property program when it was operated by the state. The original contract expired in 1992, but was renewed for an additional five years (until 1997), and has been renewed

continually since that time. Although the program was intended to be self-sufficient, in most years it has not generated sufficient revenues to meet the costs to the Foundation of operating the program. Although DOA manages eligibility and compliance for the program, it does not attribute any costs of its own to the program.

6. Currently, the Foundation operates a warehouse facility and storage yard in Waunakee where recipients can inspect and select property. However, the Foundation indicates it will close the warehouse by June 30, 2015, and convert the program to a paper screening format with direct transfer of property to receiving organizations. The Foundation intends to conduct an auction of all remaining property on July 1, 2015, and clear the warehouse location of any unsold items by September 30, 2015. Under the plan, the Foundation would operate the program as a paper screening program until June 30, 2016, to demonstrate the financial viability of operating the program as a paper screening and direct transfer operation. The program and records for the program would then transfer to DOA on July 1, 2016. It should be noted, however, that the elimination of the program under the bill would be effective July 1, 2015, or the general effective date of the bill, whichever is later.

7. Table 1 below shows revenues and expenditures for the program in 2012-13 and 2013-14, as reported in annual independent audits of the program. In 2012-13, expenditures exceeded revenue by $17,600. In 2013-14, net revenue was -$181,000.

TABLE 1

Wisconsin Federal Surplus Property Program
Revenues and Expenditures,
2012-13 and 2013-14

	2012-13	2013-14
Revenue		
Sales	$454,700	$156,700
Department of Administration Fees	22,900	7,000
Auction Income	105,200	263,200
Other Revenue	100	4,500
Total Revenue	$582,900	$431,400
Expenditures		
Personnel	$273,000	$285,700
Supplies and Services	11,400	15,700
Cost of Property Transfers	130,700	130,500
Communications and Utilities	400	400
Fixed Charges	46,700	46,900
General Expenses	3,300	2,200
Administrative Allocation	135,000	131,000
Total Expenditures	$600,500	$612,400
Net Revenue	-$17,600	-$181,000

8. State statute requires that the purchase price charged to recipients reflect the cost to provide the property, including transportation, packaging, crating, handling, and program overhead. However, program administrators under both state and Foundation operation have struggled to align revenues with costs. Over time, the negative position of the program on an annual basis has continued. As a result, the program position under Foundation administration was -$1.7 million as of June 30, 2014.

9. The Department and the Foundation have indicated in the past that one reason for the program's negative financial position is that increasing prices to better recover program costs tends to result in fewer purchases due to reduced demand. In addition, determining a price that is appropriate to the value of an individual item is difficult, given that many factors affect the value of an item and the willingness or ability to pay for a particular organization, including: age, condition, and proper functioning of property; purpose for which the property would be used; alternative purchase or acquisition options for an organization; any customization that would need to be made to the property to put it in use; financial resources of the recipient organization; and compatibility of property with other equipment of recipient. Further, identical items may incur different transportation costs due to differences in distance from the property location to the recipient. Current staff primarily manages logistics rather than evaluating, analyzing, and planning for program cost recovery through market-based pricing. Currently, the Foundation employs staff that performs accounting tasks, administrative program support, and manual labor associated with the physical transfer of property (primarily loading and unloading). It is possible that an addition of staff devoted to budgetary and policy analysis could improve the financial position of the program.

10. In a July, 2000, memorandum to the Co-chairs of the Joint Committee on Finance, the Secretary of DOA requested the release of $100,000 GPR provided to the Committee's supplemental appropriation for the federal surplus property program in the 1999-2001 budget. The Department was directed by the Legislature to submit a long-term financial plan for release of the funding. The analysis provided by DOA considered the option to end the program. The Department decided against ending the program and emphasized the benefits it brought to recipients of surplus property. In addition, DOA noted that Wisconsin would be the first state to end participation in the program.

11. Current law requires that DOA engage in such activities as the Secretary of DOA deems necessary to maximize the utilization of federal resources by eligible recipients, including state agencies and local units of government. If the Foundation does not renew its contract with DOA and the statutory language is not repealed or otherwise modified, DOA must determine the means by which it, or another organization under contract, could accomplish this purpose. State statute allows, but does not require, DOA to operate warehouses or otherwise provide for the temporary storage of property being transferred. Therefore, under current law, DOA could choose to operate a lower-cost, paper screening program with direct transfer of property to recipients, as the Foundation plans to do from July 1, 2015, to June 30, 2016.

12. Under state statute, to address any program deficit that DOA may incur when operating the program directly, DOA is required to determine the amount by which total expenditures by DOA for the operation of warehouses and distribution centers under the federal

surplus property program have exceeded income received by DOA that is attributable to the operation of the program. Further, statute specifies that DOA must transfer an amount equal to the excess expenditures from the unencumbered balance of DOA's GPR-funded supervision and management general program operations appropriation to rectify the imbalance. The Department indicates that, following this requirement, the deficit that DOA had incurred when the state operated the program directly was paid by DOA in full in 1999-00. Although this section of statute is not currently needed, and refers to the federal surplus property program, it would not be deleted under the bill.

13. An attachment to this paper identifies the entities that received property through the program from January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014, as well as the amounts each entity expended and the original purchase cost to the federal government. Over this three year period, a total of 99 organizations received property through the program, expending $819,700 for federal property with an original purchase cost of $10,757,600. It should be noted that the original cost to the federal government to purchase the property does not represent the market value of the property when it is transferred as surplus property. Two similar items, such as vehicles or computers, with the same original purchase cost could vary in age and condition significantly. Some items that are transferred may not be functional at the time of transfer or may be in need of repair. In addition, transportation costs for identical items that are transferred from different locations may differ. Of the entities listed, one organization, a non-profit nursing home, is listed as having a recipient purchase price of $0. For certain non-profit organizations, service charges are waived in consideration of the organization's mission and financial resources. Where data was not available for the original federal purchase cost, or the federal government did not assign a value to the original acquisition, the federal purchase cost is listed as $0.

14. The following tables list recipients of federal surplus property from January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014, that had: (a) purchases of property with an original federal purchase cost totaling $50,000 or more (Table 2); and (b) purchases of property with the recipient purchase amount totaling $5,000 or more (Table 3). The top three program customers for this period, in terms of both the total original federal purchase cost and the total amount expended to purchase the surplus property, were: (a) the University of Wisconsin-Madison Purchasing Department (purchases included microwave spectrum analyzers, digital programmable power supply units, servers, a loader, and desktop computers); (b) Adams County Solid Waste (purchases included truck tractors, a wrecker, a bulldozer, and a forklift); and (c) Madison College Financial Resources (purchases included a loader, automated packaging systems, and forklifts).

TABLE 2

Wisconsin Federal Surplus Property Purchases
Original Federal Cost Totaling $50,000 or More
January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014

Recipient Name	Original Federal Purchase Cost	Recipient Purchase Total
University of Wisconsin-Madison Purchasing Department	$5,121,024	$309,930
Adams County Solid Waste	1,589,412	135,323
Madison College Financial Resources	367,922	83,324
Juneau County Public Works Department	351,613	15,500
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College	313,785	19,542
Western Technical College	288,456	24,350
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	253,575	14,325
La Crosse County Highway Department	210,857	25,000
Great Lakes Aerospace Science and Education Center	200,931	100
Dane County Public Works, Highway and Transportation	184,049	12,789
Kenosha County Sheriff's Department	166,137	11,500
Lawrence University	161,322	10,248
Waumandee, Town of	150,942	8,100
Cushing Rural Fire Corporation	113,192	4,355
Necedah, Village of	110,000	9,500
Birchwood Four Corners Emergency Services District	107,683	730
Wayne, Town of	107,329	4,100
Minnesota SASP	98,101	2,500
Adams County Fire District	86,291	3,650
Dane County Parks	74,522	8,344
Lac Courte Oreilles Fire Department	74,450	6,500
Town of Westfield Fire Department	70,613	6,500
Benedictine Living Community of Spooner	51,620	0

TABLE 3

Wisconsin Federal Surplus Property Purchases
Recipient Purchases Totaling $5,000 or More
January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014

Recipient Name	Original Federal Purchase Cost	Recipient Purchase Total
University of Wisconsin-Madison Purchasing Department	$5,121,024	$309,930
Adams County Solid Waste	1,589,412	135,323
Madison College Financial Resources	367,922	83,324
La Crosse County Highway Department	210,857	25,000
Western Technical College	288,456	24,350
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College	313,785	19,542
Juneau County Public Works Department	351,613	15,500
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	253,575	14,325
Dane County Public Works, Highway and Transportation	184,049	12,789
Kenosha County Sheriff's Department	166,137	11,500
Lawrence University	161,322	10,248
Necedah, Village of	110,000	9,500
Dane County Parks	74,522	8,344
Waumandee, Town of	150,942	8,100
Mauston, City of	44,776	7,500
Shelby, Town of	21,225	6,900
Cadott School District	2,570	6,675
Town of Westfield Fire Department	70,613	6,500
Lac Courte Oreilles Fire Department	74,450	6,500
Habitat for Humanity of Dane County	25,964	5,980
Village of Fontana Public Works	26,000	5,400
Jefferson County Highway Department	21,847	5,321
Hartford School District	27,915	5,215
Fox Valley Technical College	9,440	5,120
Iowa County	15,400	5,000

15. Under federal law, for eligible organizations within any state that wish to receive federal surplus property, the transfer must be facilitated by a state-designated agency, which must be formally designated under state law. The state agency designated in state statute in Wisconsin is DOA. The Department is permitted under statute to enter into a contract for the operation of the program. If the authorizing statutory language for the program in Wisconsin is eliminated, as it is under the bill, the language that designates DOA as responsible for the operation of the program would also be deleted, and would need to be legislatively enacted again if the state wished to operate, or contract with an organization to operate, a federal surplus property program in the future. In addition, eligible recipient organizations would no longer be able to apply for or receive federal

surplus property if a state agency were not designated in statute.

16. The effective date of the provision to eliminate the program is July 1, 2015, or the effective date of the bill, whichever is later. Under the bill, the authority to operate the program would therefore be eliminated on July 1, 2015. Given that the Foundation plans to phase out the program by extending a paper only, direct transfer program through June 30, 2016, if the Committee wishes to facilitate this gradual phase-out, it could delay the effective date of the provision to July 1, 2016. Under this alternative, eligible recipients could acquire specific property directly through the program until June 30, 2016, and the program would be formally eliminated under statute effective July 1, 2016. The administration has indicated that a delayed effective date would not present a challenge to the elimination of the program as recommended. [Alternative 2]

17. Under the budget, the federal surplus property program is repealed. However, a reference to the program under state statute, relating to excess expenditures for the program, remains. As noted previously, DOA no longer administers the program directly, and the program deficit incurred by the state was paid off in full in 1999-00. As a result, the statutory language does not currently apply. Further, if the program is eliminated under statute, the section relating to program deficits would no longer be needed. Therefore, in addition to Alternative 1 or 2, the Committee could choose to repeal this section of statute. [Alternative 3]

18. Alternatively, if the Committee wishes to allow for the discontinuation of the program, but also wishes to allow the program to be administered in the future, under a new plan, it could choose to delete the provision and instead modify statutory language to allow DOA to operate the program, rather than to require it to operate the program. Under this alternative, the Foundation could continue its plan to phase out its administration of the program and DOA could proceed to end the program until it wished to operate it again. If the administration wished to pursue a renewed program in the future, it would have the authority under state statute to do so. [Alternative 4]

19. On the other hand, it could be argued, as DOA did in its July, 2000, memorandum to the Committee, that although the program has struggled to be self-sufficient it should be continued due to the benefits provided to recipients of federal surplus property. In addition, it is possible that additional efforts could succeed in recovering program costs. For example, changes could be made to lower variable costs or to generate additional revenue through program service charges. Providing a position that would be responsible for analyzing budgetary and policy issues for the program could potentially improve the annual financial position of the program. Therefore, the Committee could delete the provision and instead create an annual PR appropriation under DOA for administration of the federal surplus property program beginning in 2016-17, including a budget and policy analyst position, funded from service fees charged to program customers. The Committee could further require that service charges be set to fully recover the cost of transportation, packaging, crating, handling, and program overhead. If the Committee wishes to provide funding and staff for a program that would include a warehouse where customers could inspect property in person, it could provide $519,300 PR and 5.0 PR positions in 2016-17 for the following, based on the average hourly rate for each position type across state agencies in January, 2015, and average costs to the Foundation for transportation of property, repair of property, and rental space: (a) 1.0 accountant ($82,800 for salary and fringe benefits); (b) 1.0 budget and policy

analyst ($82,300 for salary and fringe benefits); (c) 1.0 operations program associate ($47,700 for salary and fringe benefits); (d) 2.0 laborers ($36,400 per position for salaries and fringe benefits); and (e) supplies and services to operate the program, including a warehouse ($130,600 for transportation and repairs, $11,400 per position for general supplies and services costs, and $46,100 for rental space). [Alternative 5a] However, it could be argued that the program should be operated at a lower administrative cost overall by converting the program into a paper screening, direct transfer only program. If the Committee wishes to provide funding and position authority for a lower-cost program, it could create a PR appropriation for the program, outlined above, and provide $377,600 PR and 3.0 PR positions in 2016-17 for the following: (a) 1.0 accountant ($82,800 for salary and fringe benefits); (b) 1.0 budget and policy analyst ($82,300 for salary and fringe benefits); (c) 1.0 operations program associate ($47,700 for salary and fringe benefits); and (d) supplies and services to operate a paper screening and direct transfer program ($130,600 for transportation and repairs and $11,400 per position for general supplies and services costs). [Alternative 5b]

20. Finally, it could be argued that DOA should remain the state agency designated in statute to administer the program, and should do so within its existing resources. Therefore, if the Committee wishes for DOA to continue the operation of the program, it could delete the provision. Under this alternative, because the Foundation has indicated that it would no longer administer the program, DOA would need to develop a plan for program operation and determine what budgetary and staff resources would be needed to administer the program. [Alternative 6]

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to eliminate statutory provisions relating to the federal surplus property program and delete DOA's appropriations for federal resource acquisition ($0 PR and 0.0 PR positions annually) and federal resource acquisition support grants ($0 GPR and 0.0 GPR positions annually).

2. Modify the provision to specify that the effective date of the provision is July 1, 2016, to allow for the Foundation's plan to phase out the program through a paper only, direct transfer program until that date.

3. In addition to Alternative 1 or 2, repeal as obsolete any statutory language regarding the transfer of funds between appropriations that is intended to correct deficits resulting from excess expenditures by DOA for the federal surplus property program.

4. Delete the provision. Instead, modify current law to allow, rather than require, DOA to administer a federal surplus property program or enter into a contract with an organization to administer a federal surplus property program.

5. Delete the provision. Instead, create an annual PR appropriation for the program, funded from service fees charged to program customers. Specify that service charges must be set to fully recover the cost of transportation, packaging, crating, handling, and program overhead. In addition, provide to the appropriation:

a. $519,300 PR and 5.0 PR positions in 2016-17 for program costs, including costs for a warehouse; or

ALT 5a	Change to Bill	
	Funding	Positions
PR	$519,300	5.00

b. $377,600 PR and 3.0 PR positions in 2016-17 for a paper screening, direct transfer program.

ALT 5b	Change to Bill	
	Funding	Positions
PR	$377,600	3.00

6. Delete the provision.

Prepared by: Rachel Janke
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Wisconsin Federal Surplus Property Recipients
January 1, 2012, to December 31, 2014

Recipient Name	Original Federal Purchase Cost	Recipient Purchase Total
Adams County Fire District	$86,291	$3,650
Adams County Solid Waste	1,589,412	135,323
Albany School District	750	150
Argyle, Village of	500	575
Bayfield County Emergency Management	36	6
Benedictine Living Community of Spooner	51,620	0
Birchwood Four Corners Emergency Services District	107,683	730
Blackhawk Technical College	22,372	1,300
Brigham, Town of	15,450	2,425
Brule, Town of	1,194	445
Cable, Town of	2,000	1,750
Cadott School District	2,570	6,675
Camp American Legion, Department of Wisconsin	9,900	300
Clinton Public Works, Village of	15,579	905
Cushing Rural Fire Corporation	113,192	4,355
Dane County Parks	74,522	8,344
Dane County Public Works, Highway and Transportation	184,049	12,789
Dane County Regional Airport	50	50
Dane County Sheriff's Office	2,227	250
Dane, County of	62	10
Darlington, City of	300	225
Delavan, Town of	181	150
Department of Natural Resources - Bureau of Law Enforcement	1,526	675
Department of Natural Resources Central Office	17,370	3,500
Department of Natural Resources - Bureau of Wisconsin State Parks & Recreation	0	105
Door County	120	10
Douglas County Emergency Management	0	60
Dunn County Sheriff's Department	203	25
Fontana Police Department	306	305
Fort Atkinson School District	105	36
Fox Valley Technical College	9,440	5,120
Gateway Technical College	3,092	100
Genoa City Police Department	5,724	180
Genoa City, Village of	584	275
Grand Rapids, Town of	494	100

Recipient Name	Original Federal Purchase Cost	Recipient Purchase Total
Great Lakes Aerospace Science and Education Center	$200,931	$100
Great Lakes Indian Fish and Wildlife Commission	4,750	1,215
Habitat for Humanity of Dane County	25,964	5,980
Hartford School District	27,915	5,215
Horicon, City of	14	20
Iowa County	15,400	5,000
Jefferson County Highway Department	21,847	5,321
Juneau County Public Works Department	351,613	15,500
Juneau County Sheriff's Office	11,103	950
Juneau, City of	179	25
Kenosha County Sheriff's Department	166,137	11,500
La Crosse County Highway Department	210,857	25,000
Lac Courte Oreilles Fire Department	74,450	6,500
Lac du Flambeau Tribal Police Department	23,694	3,185
Lakewood, Town of	5,749	885
Lawrence University	161,322	10,248
Madison College Financial Resources	367,922	83,324
Manitowoc County Public Works	14	1
Marquette Co Sheriff's Department	283	50
Mauston, City of	44,776	7,500
Mazomanie, Town of	2,137	225
Merrillan, Village of	13,669	3,450
Milwaukee Police Department	1,399	25
Minnesota SASP	98,101	2,500
Necedah, Village of	110,000	9,500
New London Police Department	3,336	205
Nicolet Area Technical College	7,500	3,200
North Central States Regional Council of Carpenter	181	225
North Lakeland School District	1,723	386
Northeast Wisconsin Technical College	313,785	19,542
Oconto County	21,313	3,000
Plain, Village of	0	5
Prairie du Chien Area School District	3,441	700
Quincy, Town of	740	496
Racine County Sheriff's Office	203	25
Shelby, Town of	21,225	6,900
Sun Prairie Area School District	5,204	730
Town of Belmont	4,566	275
Town of Westfield Fire Department	70,613	6,500
Townsend, Town of	412	125

Recipient Name	Original Federal Purchase Cost	Recipient Purchase Total
University of Wisconsin Extension	9,486	1,800
University of Wisconsin-Madison Purchasing Department	5,121,024	309,930
University of Wisconsin-Parkside	253,575	14,325
UW-Fox Valley	0	900
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee Libraries	0	450
Vernon County Highway Department	200	200
Vilas County Economic Development Corporation	6,000	3,000
Village of Fontana Public Works	26,000	5,400
Village of Fontana-on-Geneva Lake	3,380	180
Village of Lomira	19,574	2,200
Viroqua Police Department	300	75
Waukesha County Technical College	19	3
Waumandee, Town of	150,942	8,100
Waunakee Community School District	1,483	5
Waunakee, Village of	0	50
Wayne, Town of	107,329	4,100
Western Technical College	288,456	24,350
Westfield School District	15,521	4,000
Westport, Town of	21,414	3,750
Wisconsin Emergency Management	126	5
Wisconsin State Capitol Police	200	200
Wisconsin State Fair Park Board	22	5
Winter, Town of	1,660	245
Wisconsin Dells, City of	17,500	35
Total	$10,757,583	$819,738

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

May 7, 2015 | Joint Committee on Finance | Paper #105

Diesel Truck Idling Reduction Grant Program (DOA -- General Agency Provisions)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 28, #23]

CURRENT LAW

The diesel truck idling reduction grant program, which is operated by the State Energy Office within DOA's Division of Energy Services, provides 50% matching grants to freight motor carriers headquartered in Wisconsin to purchase and install idling reduction units for long-haul truck tractors. The grant program has sunset dates of June 30, 2015, for funding of grants and December 31, 2016, for funding of program administration. Base funding for the program is $1,074,900 SEG and 1.0 SEG position annually, funded from the petroleum inspection fund.

GOVERNOR

Extend the sunset date for the diesel truck idling reduction grant program from June 30, 2015, to June 30, 2020, and for program administration to December 31, 2021. Under the bill, the energy office would be transferred to the Public Service Commission. However, the diesel truck idling reduction grant program and position would remain at DOA under the newly combined energy services and housing division.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. It should be noted that since the grant program is statutorily scheduled to end funding for grants on June 30, 2015, and scheduled to end funding for program administration on December 31, 2016, two years of grant funding and six months of salaries and fringe benefits and position authority for the program should have been removed from DOA's base budget as a non-continuing element through standard budget adjustments. If DOA wished to extend the sunset date, the

provision should have been added as a separate budget provision. Total funding for the program under the bill is $1,076,100 SEG in 2015-16 and $1,076,200 SEG in 2016-17 (including standard budget adjustments of $700 SEG annually for full funding of continuing position salaries and fringe benefits and $500 SEG in 2015-16 and $600 SEG in 2016-17 for full funding of lease and directed moves costs).

2. The diesel truck idling reduction grant program, created under 2005 Act 25, is currently operated by the State Energy Office within the Department of Administration's Division of Energy Services. For 2014-15, the program is provided funding of $1,000,000 SEG for grants, and $73,700 SEG and 1.0 SEG position for program administration. Funding for the grant program is provided from the petroleum inspection fund.

3. The program aims to improve fuel efficiency and lower air pollution by providing grants to freight motor carriers headquartered in Wisconsin to purchase and install idling reduction units for long-haul truck tractors. According to the administration, the program sunset would be extended to reduce the cost of fuel to Wisconsin motor carriers and provide a comparative advantage relative to other states that do not assist transportation businesses in this manner.

4. The idling reduction units provide an alternative source of power to heat, cool, or provide electricity to the truck cab, or other parts of the vehicle, instead of using the vehicle's main drive engine to power those functions. Motor carriers are eligible to receive reimbursement of up to 50% of the cost to purchase and install idling reduction equipment. Motor carriers submit grant applications with an itemized price quote from a vendor. Grant awards are allocated through a randomized, computer-based lottery. Once an applicant is selected, the Division sends the applicant an award letter and contract, which must be returned with a signature. The equipment may then be purchased and installed. Self-installation is not an eligible grant expense unless approved by DOA.

5. In 2013-14, $245,500 was awarded to 36 small fleet motor carriers for 52 units; and $753,900 was awarded to 12 large fleet motor carriers for 181 units. The remaining $600 was used to complete payment of a partial 2012-13 award resulting from an accounting error. An attachment to this paper identifies 2013-14 grants by recipient, size of fleet, headquartered city, and grant amount awarded.

6. If the Committee wishes to continue the program, it could approve the Governor's recommendation to extend the program sunset date to June 30, 2020, for grants provided and to December 31, 2021, for program administration. [Alternative 1]

7. Alternatively, if the Committee wishes to allow the program to end on June 30, 2015, for grants provided and December 31, 2016, for program administration, it could delete the provision. Under this alternative, the current law sunset dates would apply. In addition, $1,000,000 SEG in 2015-16 and $1,038,100 SEG in 2016-17 associated with the program would be deleted. Position authority associated with the program of 1.0 SEG position would be deleted in 2016-17, effective December 31, 2016. [Alternative 2]

ALTERNATIVES

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to extend the diesel truck idling reduction grant program sunset date to June 30, 2020, for grants provided and to December 31, 2021, for program administration.

2. Delete the provision and funding and position authority associated with the program in accordance with current law sunset dates.

ALT 2	**Change to Bill** Funding	Positions
SEG	- $2,038,100	- 1.00

Prepared by: Rachel Janke
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Diesel Truck Idling Reduction Grant Awards, 2013-14

Name	Headquarters	Number of Units	Award
Small Fleet Awards (50 or Fewer Truck Tractors)			
BCP Transportation, Inc.	Deerfield	3	$15,863
Zeller Transportation LLC	Hartford	3	15,863
Fuchs Trucking LLC	Sauk City	3	12,442
Blader Trucking Company, Inc.	Wautoma	2	10,575
Brakebush Transportation, Inc.	Westfield	2	10,575
E T Transport, LLC	Dodgeville	2	10,575
Countryside Auto Transport, Inc	Menasha	2	9,885
PJ Trucking	Pewaukee	2	9,544
Timon Perron Trucking, Inc	Campbellsport	2	9,195
Tim Neubauer Trucking, LLC	Sparta	2	8,795
Performance Transportation Corp	Seymour	2	8,788
Schugel, Inc	Tomah	2	7,900
Chris Jensen	River Falls	1	5,358
Furuseth Transport, LLC	Altoona	1	5,358
Great Lakes Logistix, LLC	Mondovi	1	5,358
Paul Peterson	River Falls	1	5,358
B & T Transport, LLC	Mauston	1	5,287
F.T.S.	Kewaskum	1	5,287
Goeman Trucking, Ltd	Slinger	1	5,287
K&S Carriers, LLC	Greenwood	1	5,287
Kevin Voigt Trucking, Inc	Black Creek	1	5,287
Service One Transportation, Inc	Plymouth	1	5,287
Weiler Transport, LLC	Unity	1	5,287
MW2P, LLC	Madison	1	5,097
A & T Enterprises, LLC	Bay City	1	4,632
O'Neil 5 Star, LLC	Ellsworth	1	4,632
Geiger & Geiger Trust	Whitelaw	1	4,598
Gundrum Trucking, Inc.	Slinger	1	4,598
Jim Piontek Trucking, Inc.	Green Bay	1	4,598
Seats Incorporated	Reedsburg	1	4,487
Jepson Transport, LLC	Clintonville	1	4,395
Davis Express, Inc.	Portage	1	4,350
All-Ways Transit, Inc.	Bloomer	1	4,338
Blume Farms Land & Cattle Co. Inc.	Dorchester	1	4,125
KAL Trucking, LLC	Black River Falls	1	3,872
Fox Valley Alfalfa Mill, Inc.	Hilbert	2	3,290
Total Small Fleet Awards		52	$245,453

ATTACHMENT (continued)

Diesel Truck Idling Reduction Grant Awards, 2013-14

Name	Headquarters	Number of Units	Award
Large Fleet Awards (51 or More Truck Tractors)			
Marten Transport Services, Ltd.	Mondovi	33	$149,909
WEL Companies, Inc.	De Pere	27	113,650
Roehl Transport, Inc	Marshfield	29	76,792
H. O. Wolding, Inc.	Amherst	19	76,361
Americas Service Line, LLC	Green Bay	16	73,560
Bulk Logistics, Inc.	Milwaukee	15	71,085
Kreilkamp Trucking, Inc.	Allenton	12	56,868
V/S Midwest Carriers, Corp.	Kaukauna	9	40,338
Pioneer Transportation, Ltd.	Merrill	6	33,031
Hayes Transport	Verona	5	23,695
Karls Transport, Inc.	Antigo	6	21,754
John Veriha Trucking, Inc.	Marinette	4	16,894
Total Large Fleet Awards		181	$753,937
Total All Awards		233	$999,390

ADMINISTRATION

General Agency Provisions

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #	Title
1	Standard Budget Adjustments
2	Lapse Requirement
9	Risk Management Costs Reestimate
11	Land Information Expenditure and Position Authority
12	One-Time GPR Authority for HUD Repayment
13	Facilities Operations and Maintenance Fuel and Utilities Re-estimate
14	Postage Appropriation Creation and Funding
15	Consolidate the Divisions of Housing and Energy Services
16	Eliminate Oil Overcharge References, Funding, and Positions

LFB Summary Items to be Addressed in a Subsequent Paper

Item #	Title
4	Appropriation Obligation Bonds Debt Service Reestimate -- Pension Bonds
5	Appropriation Obligation Bond Debt Service -- Tobacco Bonds
6	Appropriation Obligation Bonds Debt Service Reestimate -- Sports and Entertainment District Bonds
7	Debt Service Reestimate
8	UW System Authority PR Debt Service Appropriation Under DOA
18	Appropriation for University of Wisconsin-Green Bay Programming

LFB Summary Items for Introduction as Separate Legislation

Item #	Title
19	Eliminate General Requirements for Cost-Benefit Analysis
20	Contractual Services Definition