

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

So are things like meeting state workforce needs in the mission, as opposed to responsibilities? Otherwise, generally, I agree – we should draft based on UWHCA, and give Eric a list of mission/powers/duties/responsibilities – guessing they'll need to go back to Gov, but at least we'll have it ready.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

A lot of the powers of the Board will be removed per the instructions I have already given Mark. It's things like appointments to parking fees and nursing programs at Point.

In my opinion, the powers and responsibilities of the Board should be similar to UWHCA's. It has basic powers to do whatever it needs to, to issue bonds, employ people, etc. The responsibilities require them to create a personnel system, enter a lease agreement, establish a budget, get liability insurance, etc. But I think ES should sign off those decisions. We could direct the drafters to start drafting it after the UWHCA though. To me, UWHCA's powers and responsibilities are broad yet specific, which is what ES wanted.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Without getting into each of the items, is there a way to phrase it as a general question? Or is that something that maybe we put together what we think it should look like, and then ask Eric to ratify?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: FW: Questions regarding UW

I don't think the employees question needs to be brought up next week, since I think it is pretty clear what they want to do there.

I am thinking of adding the other question to the document for Eric. Do you agree?

Nathan

From: Kunkel, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Kunkel@legis.wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 4:56 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA

Cc: Champagne, Rick - LEGIS; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Gary, Aaron - LEGIS

Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

One issue would be the treatment of UW employees. Currently, we are creating an authority and transferring the employees to the authority. Is that going to be okay?

More generally, we will need guidance on how to deal with the powers and duties of the UW specified in ch.

36. You've given me some guidance on ss. 36.09 to 36.21, but we will need clarification on what to do with the rest of ch. 36.

As for other questions, I'm sure we'll have plenty, but they will depend on what you ultimately decide to do. However, if we think of anything else this week, we'll get in touch.

--Mark

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA [<mailto:Nathan.Schwanz@wisconsin.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:58 PM

To: Kunkel, Mark

Subject: Questions regarding UW

Hi Mark,

We have a meeting next week with the Gov's office and some staff from the UW. Do you have any questions or topics we should bring up to get direction on? If so, could you send them to me by Friday. I know it's short notice; we just found out today. If you don't have anything for us to bring up, that's fine. Thanks.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I've already asked Mark to update the mission with the added focus on the state's workforce needs.

I will have Mark craft the powers and responsibilities similar to UWHCA's.

Did you hear back from Jenny or Mickie with any questions to add to the list? I would like to send to Michael and Kirsten today.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

So are things like meeting state workforce needs in the mission, as opposed to responsibilities? Otherwise, generally, I agree -- we should draft based on UWHCA, and give Eric a list of mission/powers/duties/responsibilities -- guessing they'll need to go back to Gov, but at least we'll have it ready.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

A lot of the powers of the Board will be removed per the instructions I have already given Mark. It's things like appointments to parking fees and nursing programs at Point.

In my opinion, the powers and responsibilities of the Board should be similar to UWHCA's. It has basic powers to do whatever it needs to, to issue bonds, employ people, etc. The responsibilities require them to create a personnel system, enter a lease agreement, establish a budget, get liability insurance, etc. But I think ES should sign off those decisions. We could direct the drafters to start drafting it after the UWHCA though. To me, UWHCA's powers and responsibilities are broad yet specific, which is what ES wanted.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Without getting into each of the items, is there a way to phrase it as a general question? Or is that something that maybe we put together what we think it should look like, and then ask Eric to ratify?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:31 AM

To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: FW: Questions regarding UW

I don't think the employees question needs to be brought up next week, since I think it is pretty clear what they want to do there.

I am thinking of adding the other question to the document for Eric. Do you agree?

Nathan

From: Kunkel, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Kunkel@legis.wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 4:56 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Cc: Champagne, Rick - LEGIS; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Gary, Aaron - LEGIS
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

One issue would be the treatment of UW employees. Currently, we are creating an authority and transferring the employees to the authority. Is that going to be okay?

More generally, we will need guidance on how to deal with the powers and duties of the UW specified in ch. 36. You've given me some guidance on ss. 36.09 to 36.21, but we will need clarification on what to do with the rest of ch. 36.

As for other questions, I'm sure we'll have plenty, but they will depend on what you ultimately decide to do. However, if we think of anything else this week, we'll get in touch.

--Mark

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA [<mailto:Nathan.Schwanz@wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:58 PM
To: Kunkel, Mark
Subject: Questions regarding UW

Hi Mark,

We have a meeting next week with the Gov's office and some staff from the UW. Do you have any questions or topics we should bring up to get direction on? If so, could you send them to me by Friday. I know it's short notice; we just found out today. If you don't have anything for us to bring up, that's fine. Thanks.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:57 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Will be here Friday.

I'd note... these are fairly short lists. We both were remarking yesterday that it seems like it should be more complicated, but perhaps it's not – because the Gov's office is driving the process this time, and we are doing a wholesale "conscious uncoupling", the issues seem a bit more clear cut. But if we're totally missing something, let us know.

Nathan also is putting together a document that simply shows the mission, responsibilities, duties, and powers that we are drafting for Eric's review.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

I wasn't planning on being here but can be if needed.

Nathan

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:44 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Thx. I will try to get further clarity from Eric regarding the structure/format and desired outcomes of this meeting. That may not occur til Monday. Are both of you planning to be in the office on Friday?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:29 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Cc: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: Topics of Discussion for next week

Michael and Kirsten,

Attached are two separate documents containing questions regarding the UW authority; one specific for Eric and the Gov's office and one to guide our discussion next Wednesday. Please review and let me know if there is anything you think should be added or if there are any corrections that need to be made.

Let me know if you have any questions regarding either document.

Thank you for your time.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:59 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Sounds good.

Sorry, I already promised a list of mission etc. ☺ Can you create that list, too? Maybe we can send along.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I've already asked Mark to update the mission with the added focus on the state's workforce needs.

I will have Mark craft the powers and responsibilities similar to UWHCA's.

Did you hear back from Jenny or Mickie with any questions to add to the list? I would like to send to Michael and Kirsten today.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

So are things like meeting state workforce needs in the mission, as opposed to responsibilities? Otherwise, generally, I agree – we should draft based on UWHCA, and give Eric a list of mission/powers/duties/responsibilities – guessing they'll need to go back to Gov, but at least we'll have it ready.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

A lot of the powers of the Board will be removed per the instructions I have already given Mark. It's things like appointments to parking fees and nursing programs at Point.

In my opinion, the powers and responsibilities of the Board should be similar to UWHCA's. It has basic powers to do whatever it needs to, to issue bonds, employ people, etc. The responsibilities require them to create a personnel system, enter a lease agreement, establish a budget, get liability insurance, etc. But I think ES should sign off those decisions. We could direct the drafters to start drafting it after the UWHCA though. To me, UWHCA's powers and responsibilities are broad yet specific, which is what ES wanted.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Without getting into each of the items, is there a way to phrase it as a general question? Or is that something that maybe we put together what we think it should look like, and then ask Eric to ratify?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: FW: Questions regarding UW

I don't think the employees question needs to be brought up next week, since I think it is pretty clear what they want to do there.

I am thinking of adding the other question to the document for Eric. Do you agree?

Nathan

From: Kunkel, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Kunkel@legis.wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 4:56 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Cc: Champagne, Rick - LEGIS; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Gary, Aaron - LEGIS
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

One issue would be the treatment of UW employees. Currently, we are creating an authority and transferring the employees to the authority. Is that going to be okay?

More generally, we will need guidance on how to deal with the powers and duties of the UW specified in ch. 36. You've given me some guidance on ss. 36.09 to 36.21, but we will need clarification on what to do with the rest of ch. 36.

As for other questions, I'm sure we'll have plenty, but they will depend on what you ultimately decide to do. However, if we think of anything else this week, we'll get in touch.

--Mark

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA [<mailto:Nathan.Schwanz@wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:58 PM
To: Kunkel, Mark
Subject: Questions regarding UW

Hi Mark,

We have a meeting next week with the Gov's office and some staff from the UW. Do you have any questions or topics we should bring up to get direction on? If so, could you send them to me by Friday. I know it's short notice; we just found out today. If you don't have anything for us to bring up, that's fine. Thanks.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office

608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 12:00 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I was going to say, didn't know I was working on that. Haha

Should be no problem to develop. Should I also send a similar list to Mark so they can work off that or just wait to hear from Eric?

Also, Mark is wondering about other aspects of ch. 36, pretty much everything after ch. 36.21. Should I direct him with our recommendations until we hear otherwise from Eric?

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:59 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Sounds good.

Sorry, I already promised a list of mission etc. ☺ Can you create that list, too? Maybe we can send along.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I've already asked Mark to update the mission with the added focus on the state's workforce needs.

I will have Mark craft the powers and responsibilities similar to UWHCA's.

Did you hear back from Jenny or Mickie with any questions to add to the list? I would like to send to Michael and Kirsten today.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

So are things like meeting state workforce needs in the mission, as opposed to responsibilities? Otherwise, generally, I agree – we should draft based on UWHCA, and give Eric a list of mission/powers/duties/responsibilities – guessing they'll need to go back to Gov, but at least we'll have it ready.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:49 AM

To: Hynek, Sara - DOA

Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

A lot of the powers of the Board will be removed per the instructions I have already given Mark. It's things like appointments to parking fees and nursing programs at Point.

In my opinion, the powers and responsibilities of the Board should be similar to UWHCA's. It has basic powers to do whatever it needs to, to issue bonds, employ people, etc. The responsibilities require them to create a personnel system, enter a lease agreement, establish a budget, get liability insurance, etc. But I think ES should sign off those decisions. We could direct the drafters to start drafting it after the UWHCA though. To me, UWHCA's powers and responsibilities are broad yet specific, which is what ES wanted.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA

Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:37 AM

To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA

Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Without getting into each of the items, is there a way to phrase it as a general question? Or is that something that maybe we put together what we think it should look like, and then ask Eric to ratify?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA

Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:31 AM

To: Hynek, Sara - DOA

Subject: FW: Questions regarding UW

I don't think the employees question needs to be brought up next week, since I think it is pretty clear what they want to do there.

I am thinking of adding the other question to the document for Eric. Do you agree?

Nathan

From: Kunkel, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Kunkel@legis.wisconsin.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 4:56 PM

To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA

Cc: Champagne, Rick - LEGIS; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Gary, Aaron - LEGIS

Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

One issue would be the treatment of UW employees. Currently, we are creating an authority and transferring the employees to the authority. Is that going to be okay?

More generally, we will need guidance on how to deal with the powers and duties of the UW specified in ch. 36. You've given me some guidance on ss. 36.09 to 36.21, but we will need clarification on what to do with the rest of ch. 36.

As for other questions, I'm sure we'll have plenty, but they will depend on what you ultimately decide to do. However, if we think of anything else this week, we'll get in touch.

--Mark

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA [<mailto:Nathan.Schwanz@wisconsin.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:58 PM

To: Kunkel, Mark

Subject: Questions regarding UW

Hi Mark,

We have a meeting next week with the Gov's office and some staff from the UW. Do you have any questions or topics we should bring up to get direction on? If so, could you send them to me by Friday. I know it's short notice; we just found out today. If you don't have anything for us to bring up, that's fine. Thanks.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 12:01 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Mark could probably just work off UWHCA? But I suppose if you're making a list based on that too, it might be easier for him.

Yes, that sounds good re: Ch. 36.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 12:00 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I was going to say, didn't know I was working on that. Haha

Should be no problem to develop. Should I also send a similar list to Mark so they can work off that or just wait to hear from Eric?

Also, Mark is wondering about other aspects of ch. 36, pretty much everything after ch. 36.21. Should I direct him with our recommendations until we hear otherwise from Eric?

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:59 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Sounds good.

Sorry, I already promised a list of mission etc. ☺ Can you create that list, too? Maybe we can send along.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I've already asked Mark to update the mission with the added focus on the state's workforce needs.

I will have Mark craft the powers and responsibilities similar to UWHCA's.

Did you hear back from Jenny or Mickie with any questions to add to the list? I would like to send to Michael and Kirsten today.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

So are things like meeting state workforce needs in the mission, as opposed to responsibilities? Otherwise, generally, I agree – we should draft based on UWHCA, and give Eric a list of mission/powers/duties/responsibilities – guessing they'll need to go back to Gov, but at least we'll have it ready.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

A lot of the powers of the Board will be removed per the instructions I have already given Mark. It's things like appointments to parking fees and nursing programs at Point.

In my opinion, the powers and responsibilities of the Board should be similar to UWHCA's. It has basic powers to do whatever it needs to, to issue bonds, employ people, etc. The responsibilities require them to create a personnel system, enter a lease agreement, establish a budget, get liability insurance, etc. But I think ES should sign off those decisions. We could direct the drafters to start drafting it after the UWHCA though. To me, UWHCA's powers and responsibilities are broad yet specific, which is what ES wanted.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Without getting into each of the items, is there a way to phrase it as a general question? Or is that something that maybe we put together what we think it should look like, and then ask Eric to ratify?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: FW: Questions regarding UW

I don't think the employees question needs to be brought up next week, since I think it is pretty clear what they want to do there.

I am thinking of adding the other question to the document for Eric. Do you agree?

Nathan

From: Kunkel, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Kunkel@legis.wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 4:56 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Cc: Champagne, Rick - LEGIS; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Gary, Aaron - LEGIS
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

One issue would be the treatment of UW employees. Currently, we are creating an authority and transferring the employees to the authority. Is that going to be okay?

More generally, we will need guidance on how to deal with the powers and duties of the UW specified in ch. 36. You've given me some guidance on ss. 36.09 to 36.21, but we will need clarification on what to do with the rest of ch. 36.

As for other questions, I'm sure we'll have plenty, but they will depend on what you ultimately decide to do. However, if we think of anything else this week, we'll get in touch.

---Mark

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA [<mailto:Nathan.Schwanz@wisconsin.gov>]

Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:58 PM

To: Kunkel, Mark

Subject: Questions regarding UW

Hi Mark,

We have a meeting next week with the Gov's office and some staff from the UW. Do you have any questions or topics we should bring up to get direction on? If so, could you send them to me by Friday. I know it's short notice; we just found out today. If you don't have anything for us to bring up, that's fine. Thanks.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 12:02 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Well, I already told Mark that about UWHCA re the duties and responsibilities, so maybe a list will make it more clear for him.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 12:01 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Mark could probably just work off UWHCA? But I suppose if you're making a list based on that too, it might be easier for him.

Yes, that sounds good re: Ch. 36.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 12:00 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I was going to say, didn't know I was working on that. Haha

Should be no problem to develop. Should I also send a similar list to Mark so they can work off that or just wait to hear from Eric?

Also, Mark is wondering about other aspects of ch. 36, pretty much everything after ch. 36.21. Should I direct him with our recommendations until we hear otherwise from Eric?

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:59 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Sounds good.

Sorry, I already promised a list of mission etc. ☺ Can you create that list, too? Maybe we can send along.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:58 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

I've already asked Mark to update the mission with the added focus on the state's workforce needs.

I will have Mark craft the powers and responsibilities similar to UWHCA's.

Did you hear back from Jenny or Mickie with any questions to add to the list? I would like to send to Michael and Kirsten today.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:56 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

So are things like meeting state workforce needs in the mission, as opposed to responsibilities? Otherwise, generally, I agree – we should draft based on UWHCA, and give Eric a list of mission/powers/duties/responsibilities – guessing they'll need to go back to Gov, but at least we'll have it ready.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:49 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

A lot of the powers of the Board will be removed per the instructions I have already given Mark. It's things like appointments to parking fees and nursing programs at Point.

In my opinion, the powers and responsibilities of the Board should be similar to UWHCA's. It has basic powers to do whatever it needs to, to issue bonds, employ people, etc. The responsibilities require them to create a personnel system, enter a lease agreement, establish a budget, get liability insurance, etc. But I think ES should sign off those decisions. We could direct the drafters to start drafting it after the UWHCA though. To me, UWHCA's powers and responsibilities are broad yet specific, which is what ES wanted.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:37 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

Without getting into each of the items, is there a way to phrase it as a general question? Or is that something that maybe we put together what we think it should look like, and then ask Eric to ratify?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 10:31 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: FW: Questions regarding UW

I don't think the employees question needs to be brought up next week, since I think it is pretty clear what they want to do there.

I am thinking of adding the other question to the document for Eric. Do you agree?

Nathan

From: Kunkel, Mark [<mailto:Mark.Kunkel@legis.wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 4:56 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Cc: Champagne, Rick - LEGIS; Hanaman, Cathlene - LEGIS; Gary, Aaron - LEGIS
Subject: RE: Questions regarding UW

One issue would be the treatment of UW employees. Currently, we are creating an authority and transferring the employees to the authority. Is that going to be okay?

More generally, we will need guidance on how to deal with the powers and duties of the UW specified in ch. 36. You've given me some guidance on ss. 36.09 to 36.21, but we will need clarification on what to do with the rest of ch. 36.

As for other questions, I'm sure we'll have plenty, but they will depend on what you ultimately decide to do. However, if we think of anything else this week, we'll get in touch.

--Mark

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA [<mailto:Nathan.Schwanz@wisconsin.gov>]
Sent: Monday, December 29, 2014 1:58 PM
To: Kunkel, Mark
Subject: Questions regarding UW

Hi Mark,

We have a meeting next week with the Gov's office and some staff from the UW. Do you have any questions or topics we should bring up to get direction on? If so, could you send them to me by Friday. I know it's short notice; we just found out today. If you don't have anything for us to bring up, that's fine. Thanks.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 1:11 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

They were reports instituted by the Joint Committee on Finance, that is probably why. Would JCF need to vote to remove these reports?

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:57 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Will be here Friday.

I'd note... these are fairly short lists. We both were remarking yesterday that it seems like it should be more complicated, but perhaps it's not -- because the Gov's office is driving the process this time, and we are doing a wholesale "conscious uncoupling", the issues seem a bit more clear cut. But if we're totally missing something, let us know.

Nathan also is putting together a document that simply shows the mission, responsibilities, duties, and powers that we are drafting for Eric's review.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

I wasn't planning on being here but can be if needed.

Nathan

From: Helfetz, Michael G - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:44 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Thx. I will try to get further clarity from Eric regarding the structure/format and desired outcomes of this meeting. That may not occur til Monday. Are both of you planning to be in the office on Friday?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:29 AM
To: Helfetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA

Cc: Hynek, Sara - DOA

Subject: Topics of Discussion for next week

Michael and Kirsten,

Attached are two separate documents containing questions regarding the UW authority; one specific for Eric and the Gov's office and one to guide our discussion next Wednesday. Please review and let me know if there is anything you think should be added or if there are any corrections that need to be made.

Let me know if you have any questions regarding either document.

Thank you for your time.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 1:11 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

That was intended for Mark, Not sure why it sent to you. Sorry.

Nathan

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 1:11 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

They were reports instituted by the Joint Committee on Finance, that is probably why. Would JCF need to vote to remove these reports?

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:57 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week.

Will be here Friday.

I'd note... these are fairly short lists. We both were remarking yesterday that it seems like it should be more complicated, but perhaps it's not -- because the Gov's office is driving the process this time, and we are doing a wholesale "conscious uncoupling", the issues seem a bit more clear cut. But if we're totally missing something, let us know.

Nathan also is putting together a document that simply shows the mission, responsibilities, duties, and powers that we are drafting for Eric's review.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

I wasn't planning on being here but can be if needed.

Nathan

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:44 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA

Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA

Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Thx. I will try to get further clarity from Eric regarding the structure/format and desired outcomes of this meeting. That may not occur til Monday. Are both of you planning to be in the office on Friday?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA

Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:29 AM

To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA

Cc: Hynek, Sara - DOA

Subject: Topics of Discussion for next week

Michael and Kirsten,

Attached are two separate documents containing questions regarding the UW authority; one specific for Eric and the Gov's office and one to guide our discussion next Wednesday. Please review and let me know if there is anything you think should be added or if there are any corrections that need to be made.

Let me know if you have any questions regarding either document.

Thank you for your time.

Nathan Schwanz

Executive Policy & Budget Analyst

State Budget Office

608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 4:01 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week
Attachments: Mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities FG.docx

Here's the promised document. Let me know what you think. Longer than I would like, but as we agreed, it includes items to be removed.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:57 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Will be here Friday.

I'd note... these are fairly short lists. We both were remarking yesterday that it seems like it should be more complicated, but perhaps it's not – because the Gov's office is driving the process this time, and we are doing a wholesale "conscious uncoupling", the issues seem a bit more clear cut. But if we're totally missing something, let us know.

Nathan also is putting together a document that simply shows the mission, responsibilities, duties, and powers that we are drafting for Eric's review.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

I wasn't planning on being here but can be if needed.

Nathan

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:44 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Thx. I will try to get further clarity from Eric regarding the structure/format and desired outcomes of this meeting. That may not occur til Monday. Are both of you planning to be in the office on Friday?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:29 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA

Cc: Hynek, Sara - DOA

Subject: Topics of Discussion for next week

Michael and Kirsten,

Attached are two separate documents containing questions regarding the UW authority; one specific for Eric and the Gov's office and one to guide our discussion next Wednesday. Please review and let me know if there is anything you think should be added or if there are any corrections that need to be made.

Let me know if you have any questions regarding either document.

Thank you for your time.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 4:14 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA; Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week
Attachments: Mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities FG.docx

Attached is a proposal for the UW's mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities to discuss with the Gov's office. Let me know if you have any questions or suggestions.

Thank you.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:57 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Will be here Friday.

I'd note... these are fairly short lists. We both were remarking yesterday that it seems like it should be more complicated, but perhaps it's not – because the Gov's office is driving the process this time, and we are doing a wholesale "conscious uncoupling", the issues seem a bit more clear cut. But if we're totally missing something, let us know.

Nathan also is putting together a document that simply shows the mission, responsibilities, duties, and powers that we are drafting for Eric's review.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:53 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

I wasn't planning on being here but can be if needed.

Nathan

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:44 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Subject: RE: Topics of Discussion for next week

Thx. I will try to get further clarity from Eric regarding the structure/format and desired outcomes of this meeting. That may not occur til Monday. Are both of you planning to be in the office on Friday?

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, December 30, 2014 11:29 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA
Cc: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: Topics of Discussion for next week

Michael and Kirsten,

Attached are two separate documents containing questions regarding the UW authority; one specific for Eric and the Gov's office and one to guide our discussion next Wednesday. Please review and let me know if there is anything you think should be added or if there are any corrections that need to be made.

Let me know if you have any questions regarding either document.

Thank you for your time.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Monday, January 05, 2015 3:10 PM
To: Schutt, Eric - GOV
Cc: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: UW Proposal
Attachments: Mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities FG.docx; Questions for Gov's Office.docx; Questions regarding authority.docx

Hi Eric,

I hope you are doing well. I have attached several documents regarding the UW that need your review.

The first attachment is the proposal for UW's mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities as an authority. This document is not for discussion with UW officials on Wednesday. We need your feedback on this proposal.

The second attachment is a list of questions that we have regarding the bill drafting. This document is not for discussion with UW officials on Wednesday. We need your guidance on these items.

Finally, the third attachment is a list of questions to discuss at the meeting on Wednesday with UW officials. Let us know if anything should be added or removed from this list.

Please let me know if you have any questions about these documents.

Thank you for your time and feedback.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Questions for Gov's Office

1. Should the UW System be made an authority or exempted from statutory requirements?
 - a. Making it an authority allows for a reset of the Board.
 - i. If made an authority, should a word other than 'authority' be used in the title?
 - b. Exempting it from statutory requirements may be an easier sell (wouldn't be called an authority).
2. How should the Board be structured? What should it be called?
3. Instead of reducing UW's GPR, it could be made responsible for outstanding debt service payments on GPR backed bonds.
 - a. In FY17, the payments will be about \$240M GPR.
 - b. This is similar to the lease agreement between UWHCA and the Board.
 - c. Allows the state to realize savings without directly reducing base resources.
4. Should the UW authority be required to seek Building Commission approval for renovations/projects involving state owned facilities?
5. s. 13.101(6) allows for the reduction of appropriations to state agencies but doesn't mention authorities.
 - a. Should this be maintained for the UW if it is an authority?
6. How should the State Lab of Hygiene, State Cartographer and Veterinary Diagnostic Lab be handled?

Questions regarding UW Authority

1. Is a July 1, 2016 effective date for the authority possible?
2. How should the pending transition to new personnel systems on July 1, 2015 be handled?
 - a. Are there any provisions needed to help UW address the transition to the new personnel systems?
 - b. Should the transition continue as is even with the authority beginning on July 1, 2016?
3. Campuses will need to be granted police authority similar to the authority granted to Marquette University in s. 175.42.
 - a. Should this be granted broadly to the UW System or only to specific institutions?
4. Are there particular statutory provisions that should be kept or removed?
5. What is the estimated tuition increase after the tuition freeze is over?
6. The Governor is proposing to transfer responsibility for the MN/WI Student Reciprocity Agreement to the Board. Are any provisions beyond the transfer and authorization needed?
7. Will the UW authority want to have the ability to lease/rent vehicles from central fleet and utilize the records center for records storage?
 - a. Other state authorities (WHEDA, WEDC) are exempt from these.
8. Are there circumstances in which UW would like to be able to use the state procurement process/contracts?
9. Should the UW authority be required to maintain similar IT systems/databases as the state?
 - a. Other states have recommended doing this for ease of reporting/accountability.
10. Should statutory references to specific campuses, positions and titles be kept or will those be reconsidered by the authority and with the new personnel system?
11. What should be the official name of the UW authority?

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Saturday, January 24, 2015 7:22 PM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: Response to P2 Requests
Attachments: Response to UW Requests for Changes to P2 1.24.15.docx

Michael,
Attached is the document you requested. Enjoy!

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

UW System Administration Comments on LRB-0971/P2, Version 2,
1/20/2015

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
13.101 (6)(a)	p.3, line 1	Delete UWS from requirement. Keep language as in 0971/p1		Deny – State needs to maintain the ability to withhold money in an emergency.
13.48 (4)	p.4, line 24	Provide Gift & Grant project authority to BoR & maintain current \$500,000 exemption		N/A – Building Commission and Capital Projects were incorrectly drafted in P2. P3 will reflect negotiated intentions.
13.48 (6)	p. 5, line 17	UWS should obtain an exemption for projects funded by PR, Cash, Gifts and Grants from the State Building Commission		N/A – Building Commission and Capital Projects were incorrectly drafted in P2. P3 will reflect negotiated intentions.
13.48 (7)	p. 5, line 22	UWS should obtain an exemption for projects funded by PR, Cash, Gifts and Grants from the State Building Commission		N/A – Building Commission and Capital Projects were incorrectly drafted in P2. P3 will reflect negotiated intentions.
13.48(10)(c)	p.6, line 19	Leave in statute if BOA review for gift & grant funded projects still applies.		Deny
13.62(2)	p. 9, line 12	Do not insert chp. 36 into this subsection. Remove reference from lrb 0971/p2	Chancellors & System President are currently exempt from lobbying regulations and UWS would like to maintain this exemption.	Deny – Current lobbying regulations will continue to apply.
13.94 (1)	pp. 10, line 5-9	Remove lines p. 10, 5-9 of this section	Authority has own audit function for programmatic purposes	Deny – Gov's office decided to keep all current LAB audit powers.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
13.94 (4) (a) 1	p. 10, line 22-23	Remove words "and politic".	Consistency with proposed later amendment in Chp. 36.01 to describe authority as public body corporate. Preservation of sovereign immunity.	Deny – This change will not preserve sovereign immunity.
16.417(1)(b) and 16.417(2)(f)2	p.18, line 25 – p.19, line 3	Keep exemption retaining dual employment capabilities OR make the prohibition not applicable to chp. 36.	Removes the exemption in current law from dual employment restrictions. Repeal of exemption would leave us at the status quo.	Deny – UW Authority employees will not be granted dual employment.
16.53 (1)(d)(4)	p. 22, line 6-10	UWS needs to retain garnishment provisions as per existing law. Retain current language or recreate.		Deny – The state cannot garnish wages of non-state employees.
16.54(8r) [x-ref 25.50 (3m) et al.	p. 23, line 17-18, p. 71, line 23	In addition, provide cash management language that retains management of Funds 128 & 228.8 Trust Funds with Board of Regents.		This is yet to be determined.
16.64 (1) (a) & 16.64 (2)(a)	p. 25, line 16 – p. 26, line 9	Repeal 16.64, (1) (a) & (2) (a)	These provisions should be repealed as they refer to an outmoded tuition & expense plan	Deny – There does not seem to be compelling reason to make these changes.
16.85(12)	p. 38 line 21 – p. 39, line 11	Maintain current law. UWS should obtain an exemption from para (12) for projects funded by PR, Cash, Gifts and Grants.	Current language would not provide UWS more flexibility, indeed it would create further limitations on the authority's ability to effectively and efficiently operate. Language in Draft 2	N/A – Building Commission and Capital Projects were incorrectly drafted in P2. P3 will reflect negotiated intentions.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		<p>Delete p. 39, Lines 1-5 as it would not be necessary if Authority is provided exemption in this paragraph</p> <p>Delete added language , p. 39, 9-11 as it would be less than current law provides</p>	would be less than current law provides (full BOB authority for projects under \$500,000)	
19.42 (13)(cm)	p. 51, line 20-21	Remove separate reference to UW-Colleges and UW-Extension. They are included as part of UWS Authority. Include language necessary to clarify intent, if needed.		Yes -- Will incorporate request into the draft.
19.84(5)	Not included in draft 2	<p>Repeal & Recreate. Below please find suggested language to clarify applicability of open meetings components:</p> <p>"The board shall provide in its operating policies for access to the board by the public, students and employees, and board meetings shall be open in accordance with subch. V of chp. 19. In addition to the s. 19.85</p>	<p>Place in separate section in new chp. 36. Open meetings component is provide board flexibility to discuss strategic & budgetary operations in a confidential manner.</p> <p>Exempt Board from 5 finalists rule</p>	<p>Deny -- The Board will not be granted to ability to meet in closed session for any reason they deem necessary.</p> <p>We are checking to see if the 5 finalist rule will apply to the UW since they will not be filling state positions.</p>

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		exemptions, the board may convene in closed session to deliberate concerning the conduct of specified public business whenever, in the board's opinion, budgetary or strategic reasons require a closed session. All records of such meetings and of all proceedings of the board shall be open to inspection in accordance with subch. 11 of ch. 19. Section 19.36(7) shall not apply to positions appointed by the board."		
20.235(1)(ke)	Not included in draft 2	Repeal provision	Obsolete provision	This is already being repealed.
20.285(1)(q) – (tm)	p. 56, lines 1, 4-11	Maintain existing law	University would like to retain these funds for continued operation of services	Deny – The Gov's office determined that the UW will not receive any SEG appropriations.
20.285 (1)(U) & (w)	-	Repeal Trust fund income and operations provisions.		Yes – Jeff Anderson has confirmed that this is OK.
20.866 (2)(s)	p. 62, line 22	Maintain current law	UWS needs to maintain access to all approved GPR & other bonding in this biennium.	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.
20.866 (2)(t)	p. 63, line 5	Maintain current law	UWS needs to maintain access to all approved GPR & other bonding	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
25.17(1)(zm)	p.70, lines 1-4	Retain existing law exemption, currently removed on p. 70, lines 3-4	in this biennium. Clarification needed that retains autonomy of UW Trust Funds. Does use of word "authority" in this section accomplish this continued exemption from SWAB?	Checking to see if this is necessary.
25.50(3m)	p.71, lines 19- 23	Add language to end of paragraph that reads "except for revenue from auxiliary operations contained in Funds 128 & 228	Retains cash management ability of UW System Authority	Yet to be determined.
36.01 (1)	p. 75, line 2-15	Proposed language for this section is outlined below: 36.01 (1) <u>The legislature finds it in the public interest to provide There is created a state system of higher education provided by the authority to be known as the University of Wisconsin System; which enables students of all ages, backgrounds and levels of income to participate in the search for knowledge and individual development; which stresses undergraduate teaching as its main priority; which offers selected professional graduate and research programs with emphasis on state and national</u>	Suggest keeping existing language mostly intact. The Legislature has been credited with crafting careful and wonderfully descriptive language to create the System. The language is frequently quoted. If the purpose of the System is largely unchanged, this language should remain unchanged, as well.	Deny – Have added language to make clear constitutional compliance. The Gov requested a simplified and clearer mission and purpose statements. The Board of Regents is free to adopt any additional statements of mission or purpose.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		<p>needs; which fosters diversity of educational opportunity; which promotes service to the public; which makes effective and efficient use of human and physical resources; which functions cooperatively with other educational institutions and systems; and which promotes internal coordination and the wisest possible use of resources. The principal office and one university of the system shall be located at or near the seat of state government as provided for in article X, section 6 of the state constitution</p>		
36.01(2)	p. 75, line 17-25	<p>Proposed language for this section is below:</p> <p>The mission of the system is to develop human resources to meet the state's workforce needs, to discover and disseminate knowledge, to extend knowledge and its application beyond the</p>	<p>The mission of the System is integral to the System's operation and is frequently cited. The existing language goes to the character and uniqueness of the state's great University System.</p>	Deny – See previous item.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
36.02 (1) (a)	p. 76, line 4, 19-20 p. 76, line 12- p. 77, line 2	<p>boundaries of its campuses and to serve and stimulate society by developing in students heightened intellectual, cultural, and humane sensitivities, scientific, professional and technological expertise, and a sense of purpose. Inherent in this broad mission are methods of instruction, research, extended training and public service designed to educate people and improve the human condition. Basic to every purpose of the system is the search for truth.</p> <p>Delete words "and politic" on line 4 to be consistent with proposed amendment earlier.</p> <p>New language for point 4 in this subsection: Two students appointed by the governor for 2 year terms. The students shall be enrolled at least half-time and in good academic standing at institutions within the University of Wisconsin System who are and shall be residents of</p>	<p>Sovereign immunity preservation</p> <p>Term limits for students need to be added. Also, since the "even-numbered" language was moved from Chapter 15, the end date of the other student could be addressed here, as well.</p>	<p>Deny – Adding "and politic" will not preserve sovereign immunity. Other statutory changes have been made to attempt to protect some sovereign immunity.</p> <p>Yes – Will add clarification that the student members serve 2-year terms.</p>

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		this state... The term of the undergraduate student member who is at least 24 years old shall expire on May 1 of every even-numbered year, and the term of the other student shall expire on May 1 of every odd-numbered year...		
36.02 (5)	p. 77, line 12-17	New proposed language for this subsection: (5) The members of the board shall annually elect a chairperson and may elect other officers as they consider appropriate required by the board's bylaws. Eleven voting members of the board constitute a quorum for the purpose of conducting the business and exercising the powers of the authority, notwithstanding the existence of any vacancy. The board may take action upon a vote of a majority of the members present, unless the bylaws of the authority require a larger number.	The board's bylaws already define a quorum to be more than half the members, and this has worked well. This level of operational detail is readily addressed in the bylaws and need not be specified in statute.	Deny – We are checking to see where 11 came from. Whether it is 10 or 11, we feel that this should be stipulated in statute and not Board policy.
36.05(6)	P. 78, line 13	Reinstate updated language referencing university staff, as	Definitional update	Deny – Repealing this provision is consistent with overall intent of

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		noted below: "Classified University staff" means <u>employees who contribute in a broad array of positions in support of the University's mission and who are not all employees of the system other than faculty</u> , academic staff, persons whose employment is a necessary part of their training, student assistants and/or student hourly help.		the draft and not needed in statute since classified staff is not referenced in ch. 36.
36.05 (8)	p. 78, line 18	Strike language after the word "institution" on line 17		Deny – This language was inserted to make the definition more encompassing in the event the UW adds or changes titles for faculty as part of the new personnel systems.
36.05 (9)	p. 78, line 25	Add back in reference to UW Colleges	Re-insert UW Colleges as they are not an "organizational equivalent" in this particular circumstance.	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.
36.11 (1g)	p. 80, line 16-17	Remove references to night course	Outdated provisions	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.
36.11 (1r)	p. 80, line 21-23	Line 20-21 – Add in "president of system" and "chancellor for each institution"	Key component of Board responsibilities and should not be delegated.	Deny – The Board will maintain the ability to appoint the President of the System and a

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
36.11 (1w) (a) et al.				Chancellor for each institution. DOA Legal agrees that the current draft is more permissive than the UW's requested change.
	p. 82, line 17-19	<p>Proposed language follows:</p> <p>36.11 (1w) (a) The board may promulgate rules under ch. 227 adopt policies to protect the lives, health and safety of persons on property under its jurisdiction and to protect such property and to prevent obstruction of the functions of the system. Any person who violates policies adopted in accordance with this paragraph may be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 90 days or both. Any person who violates any rule promulgated under</p>	<p>The Board needs to retain forfeiture powers for enforcement purposes on university-controlled property.</p>	Deny – We are incorporating other changes into the draft to give the UW authority the ability to create ordinances and collect forfeitures.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
36.11 (1) (d)	p. 84, line 11	<p>this paragraph may be fined not more than \$500 or imprisoned not more than 90 days or both.</p> <p>This section should be reinstated with the following language:</p> <p>All fines imposed and collected under this subsection shall be transmitted to the county treasurer for disposition in accordance with ss. 59-25(3)(a) and (l). All forfeitures, including forfeitures of posted bail if any, imposed and collected under this subsection shall be transmitted to the county treasurer for disposition in accordance with ss. 778.13 and 778.17</p>	<p>UWS needs to retain its forfeiture powers for enforcement purposes on university-controlled property</p> <p>Deny – We are incorporating other changes into the draft to give the UW authority the ability to create ordinances and collect forfeitures.</p>	
36.11 (1) (c)	p. 83, line 18 – p. 84, line 3	<p>Proposed language for this section below:</p> <p>36.11 (1w) (c) The board may promulgate rules under ch. 227 adopt policies for the management of all property</p>	<p>UWS needs to retain its forfeiture powers for enforcement purposes on university-controlled property</p> <p>Deny – We are incorporating other changes into the draft to give the UW authority the ability to create ordinances and collect forfeitures.</p>	

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		<p>under its jurisdiction, for the care and preservation thereof and for the promotion and preservation of the orderly operation of the system in any or all of its authorized activities and in any or all of its institutions with forfeitures for their violation, which may be sued for and collected in the name of the board before any court having jurisdiction of such action. Forfeitures shall not exceed \$500. with forfeitures for their violation, which may be sued for and collected in the name of the board before any court having jurisdiction of such action. Forfeitures shall not exceed \$500.</p>		
36.11 (2)	P. 84, line 14	<p>Proposed language for this section as follows:</p> <p>36.11 (2) Police authority. (a) The board shall have</p>	Reinstate Chp. 36 police authority of UWS. UWS not a private institution like Marquette University.	Deny – As an authority, the UW will be unable to have a police authority as requested. Instead of creating the authority's police authority with Marquette's in ch. .

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		<p>concurrent police power, with other authorized peace officers, over all property subject to its jurisdiction, and all property contiguous to such property at the University of Wisconsin-Parkside if owned by a nonprofit corporation the primary purpose of which, as determined by the board, is to benefit the system. Such concurrent police authority shall not be construed to reduce or lessen the authority of the police power of the community or communities in which a campus may be located. All campus police officers shall cooperate with and be responsive to the local police authorities as they meet and exercise their statutory responsibilities. The designated agents of the board may arrest, with or without warrant, any person on such property who they have reasonable grounds to believe has violated a state law or any rule promulgated under this</p>		<p>175, the UW will be granted local police power in ch. 62 and 66.</p>

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		<p>chapter and deliver such person to any court having jurisdiction over the violation and execute a complaint charging such person with the violation. This subsection does not impair the duty of any other peace officers within their jurisdictions to arrest and take before the proper court persons found violating any state law on such property.</p> <p>(b) The board may employ police for the institutions and chiefs to head such police or contract for police, all of whom shall be deemed peace officers under s. 939.22(22) under the supervision and control of the appropriate chancellor or the chancellor's designees. Such police officers shall meet the minimum standards established for other police officers by the law enforcement standards board or a comparable agency.</p> <p>Such police shall preserve the peace on all property described</p>		

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
		under par. (a), enforce all rules promulgated under this chapter and all other laws, and for that purpose the chancellor or the chancellor's designee may call for aid from such other persons as is deemed necessary.		
36.11 (8)	p. 85, line 20	Retain existing law in (8) to retain parking enforcement authority	Board needs to have authority to have ability to regulate enforced parking via fines	Deny – See previous item.
36.11 (9)	p. 85, line 23	Retain existing law in (9) to retain condemnation authority		Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.
36.11(27m)	p. 86, line 16 – p. 87, line 20	75-99 year leases needed Lease agreement & extensions should require gubernatorial approval as opposed to approval from the Joint Finance	Consistent with UW Colleges leasing with counties and necessary for lending requirements.	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft, except that the lease will still need to be approved by Joint Finance.
36.11 (55)	p. 90, line 2	Reinstate language in this subsection	Important to retain research contracts provision here in relation to private interests in public contracts. Designed to avoid criminal penalties as per Section 946.13	Deny – This can be maintained as a Board policy. Reinstating it will be less permissive and inconsistent with the draft's intent.
36.11 (59)	p. 90, line 15	Insert words "no more than" directly before \$30,338,500 on line 15	This cap should reflect understanding of requirements in this section. Unclear as to why	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
36.25 (2)			20.285 (1) (qe) and (qj) are linked to this.	
36.29	p. 91, line 15-22	Repeal Housing residency requirement	Authority should set policy in this area.	Deny – The state has an interest in maintaining this provision.
36.33, 36.335	p. 95, line 8	Wish to retain authority of Board to accept gift & grant bequests.		Deny – The authority will maintain this even if it is not explicitly stated.
	p. 96, line 6	Retain language until impact on the research functions of UW-Madison can be further explored	Impact on UW-Madison needs to be ascertained further	Deny – UW Madison will not own this property and will need Building Commission approval before it can be sold.
36.35	p. 96, line 9	Retain existing provision	Board must effectively control property under its jurisdiction and to enforce student discipline	Deny – See previous sections requesting reinstatement of police power.
36.51	p.97, line 5	Repeal provision	Authority should maintain ability to provide such a program at its direction and current language is obsolete	Deny – Current language states that the Board "may" provide this program. Cannot be any more permissive than it already is.
36.59	p. 99, line 6-12	Repeal provision & all associated provisions	Reports will be provided to UWS Authority.	Deny – Having the authority self-report on GPR spending does not fit the definition of accountability.
36.65 (2) (a), (2)(g)	p. 100, line 8-12	Repeal. UW System can recreate with upcoming dashboard measures	Performance requirements should be repealed. Board of Regent directed to dashboard measures.	Deny – State has an interest in continuing annual accountability reports, regardless of any potential real-time reporting the UW plans to implement (not to mention the content of said real-

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
39.47, 39.47 (1), 39.47 (2), 39.47 (2g), 39.47 (2m), 39.47 (3)	p. 102, line 25 – 105, line 19	Remove requirements and references to reciprocity agreements. Delete all associated provisions.	UWS Board of Regents shall set tuition policy.	time reports is uncertain at this time).
70.119 (1) – 70.119 (7) (a)	p. 118, line 13 – p. 120, line 22	Maintain existing law in this area	UW Authority payment for all services would result in a \$6.4 million annual impact upon budget on top of loss of funds from other sources.	Deny – These changes are needed to give UW the ability to determine whether they will continue the MN/WI reciprocity agreements or not. Deny – As an authority, the UW will be responsible for payments for municipal services.
101.14((4)(b)3.a., b., c., d.	p. 130, line 15 – p. 131, line 14	Outdated provisions and should be repealed.	The references to fire sprinklers and other building-related requirements are outdated.	Deny – It is in the state's, not to mention the residents of said dorms, to maintain a requirement to have fire sprinklers in the dorms. Further, these sections will be clarified to reflect the fact that the UW does not own them.
111.81 (7)(ar) – 111.935	p. 132, line 15 – p. 138, line 7	Clarification needed as to potential consequences.	UWSA removal from SELRA and its impact needs clarification and further discussion.	Deny – UW employees will not be covered by SELRA, instead they will be covered by MERA.
175.42	p. 144, line 10 – p. 149, line 2	See reinstatement of Chp. 36 police authority as noted earlier. Amend other sections that would contradict this.		Deny – See denials of previous requests for reinstatement of police authority as noted earlier.
255.15 (3)(b) 11	p. 154,	Reinstate existing provision	Removes appropriation for	Deny – The Gov decided that the

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
	line 9		tobacco research and intervention center at the University of Wisconsin-Madison & looking at smoking cessation programming. Discretionary grant from Dept. of Health Services. Funding needed to continue programming.	UW will not receive any SEG appropriations as an authority.
345.28 (1)(c)	p. 160, line 22 – line 55	The Board needs to retain its powers as to non-moving traffic violations & forfeiture. See other revised sections for guidance as to this.		Deny – See previous provisions on how police authority will be handled.
939.22 (22)	p. 163, line 24 – p. 164, line 5	Refer to proposed Chp. 364.1(2) police authority reinstatement & remove any contradictory provisions		Deny – Once again, police authority will be handled in an appropriate manner to reflect the fact that the UW will be an authority.
Sec. 716	p. 165, line 1-9	Clarify that UWS will not be responsible for 2014-15 MIN reciprocity payment given other provisions in bill as we would have already transferred money to state for this. Delete municipal services section as UWS wishes to maintain existing law in this area	Clarify if Medical Assistance Trust Fund continues after UW becomes an Authority	Yes – The next draft will clarify that the UW will not be responsible for FY15 and FY16 reciprocity payments. Deny – UW will be responsible for payments for municipal payments. This is consistent with being an authority.
				No need to clarify that the Medical Assistance Trust Fund

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
Sec. 9148 (1) (b) & (d)	p. 165, line 21-22; p. 166, line 9-12	Strike "as determined by the secretary of administration" from both provisions	UW System Authority are best positioned to determine inclusion of assets & liabilities and tangible personal property	continues after the UW becomes an authority since it will be preserved in statute (which is already pretty clear). Deny – Since anything that isn't retained as UW's assets will be assumed by the state, the DOA Secretary is in the best position to determine what assets belong to the state and the UW.
CREATE 893.82 (2)(D)(4)	Not in Draft 2	Need to add language re: definition of state office, employee or agent, notice of claim & damages caps. Proposed language reads as follows: "An officer, employee or agent of the University of Wisconsin System Authority"	Retain protection of state \$250,000 damage cap and notice of claim provisions	Deny – DOA Legal has recommended changes to ch. 893 to attempt to provide some sovereign immunity.
CREATE 895.46(1)(f)		Indemnification statute applicability. Language to be added reads as follows: "Officers, employees and agents of the University of Wisconsin System Authority are state officers, employees or agents for the purposes of this subsection."	Retain defense & indemnification for authority employees, as exists under current law	Deny – DOA Legal has recommended changes to ch. 893 to attempt to provide some sovereign immunity.

Section #	Line #	Proposed Revision	Comments/Questions	SBO Decision
CREATE (If Necessary)		Language explicitly providing Bonding authority to UW System Authority	Should be specified under Chp. 36.11 under Board powers	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.
CREATE (If necessary)		Reference to receipt of proportionate share of sales tax.	Reference to future funding mechanism	Yes – Will incorporate request into the draft.
GENERAL DELETION		Delete the term “and procedures” where it appears after various provisions where the Board of Regents is issuing “policies and procedures” for certain matters.		Deny – The requested change is not necessary.

Reardon, Patricia A - DOA

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Wednesday, February 04, 2015 1:14 PM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Subject: Waylon's Question

Here is what I will send him, let me know if you have changes:

The Governor is recommending revising the UW's mission and statement of purpose to reflect its change to a public authority. By making the UW a public authority, instead of dictating all the things the Board of Regents can or cannot do, the state will provide a set of guidelines or parameters for the Board of Regents to operate within. To make the UW's mission and purpose statements consistent with this change, permissive portions and statements were kept while dictatorial and repetitive portions were removed. Beyond this framework, the Board of Regents will be able to adopt any statements of purpose and mission they see fit.

Not sure if this is worth adding (kind of corny):

Furthermore, the Wisconsin Idea does not exist in the statutes or on paper alone. It exists in the hearts and minds of Wisconsinites across our great state which, in turn, drives the UW's teaching, research, outreach and public service to move Wisconsin forward. The Governor's budget preserves this and provides the framework for the UW to better continue these efforts.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

From: [Heifetz, Michael G - DOA](#)
To: [Schutt, Eric - GOV](#)
Subject: FW: UW Budget
Date: Friday, June 06, 2014 8:46:08 AM

Can discuss at your convenience.

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2014 4:30 PM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA; Kraus, Jennifer - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: UW Budget

I should add, those are just the fiscal requests. Stat language will include capital projects and procurement flexibilities, plus adding "merit" to Ch. 36.

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Thursday, June 05, 2014 4:28 PM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA (kirsten.grinde@wisconsin.gov); Kraus, Jennifer - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: UW Budget

Quote by David Miller during budget presentation at Regents meeting:

"A major part of the budget, and always the largest dollar amount...is costs to continue. Those are costs just to continue operations – fixed cost increases. These are determined by the state. In the biennial budget you don't put in a request for a specific dollar amount. Rather, the resolution you will see in August **will authorize the president to negotiate the Administration to refine those amounts and the Governor puts them in his budget and sends that to the Legislature. It includes debt service, fringe benefits, fuel and utilities, standard budget adjustments.**"

That sounds to me like the UW plans not to submit any standard budget adjustments, pay plan, etc. Items that will be included in the budget request:

Incentive grants
Performance funding
Regional development initiative
Tuition share of 13-15 costs to continue
WHEG increase

Sara Hynek
Team Leader, Education and Workforce Development Team
State Budget Office
Wisconsin Department of Administration
608-266-1037

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
To: Schutt, Eric - GOV
Cc: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA; Hynek, Sara - DOA; Kraus, Jennifer - DOA
Subject: UW GPR Savings
Date: Tuesday, December 16, 2014 1:17:27 PM
Attachments: Authority GPR Reductions v.1.0 12.16.14.docx

Eric,

Attached is the summary of anticipated GPR savings that you requested.

Please let me know if you have any questions or need anything else.

Thank you for your time.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Possible GPR Reductions

15-17 GPR Block Grant w/ SBAs	\$1,160.0M
Appropriation/Program	Annual GPR Savings
Capital Planning and Building	\$60.0M
Procurement	\$50.0M
WI-MN Student Reciprocity	\$33.0M
Increased private fundraising	\$18.8M
System Administration	\$7.3M
Compensation Reserve	\$30.2M
Total Savings	\$199.3M
15-17 Projected GPR Block Grant	\$960.7M

Capital Planning and Building

- Applies the median of UW-Madison's estimated savings per project of 12.5% to UW's non-GPR capital budget request for 15-17.

Procurement

- Applies the average savings of higher education institutions through cooperative purchasing agreements with other institutions
 - UW-Madison accounts for 40% of the projected savings (\$20M).

WI-MN Student Reciprocity

- Assumes 85% of Wisconsin residents and 55% of Minnesota residents currently enrolled in reciprocity decide to attend a Wisconsin institution post-reciprocity.

Increased private fundraising

- Applies, systemwide, the amount of additional private fundraising UW-Madison anticipated as a result of becoming an authority.
 - UW-Madison accounts for 40% (\$7.5M)

System Administration

- Eliminate GPR appropriation for System Administration.

From: [Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA](#)
To: [Schutt, Eric - GOV](#)
Cc: [Heifetz, Michael G - DOA](#); [Grinde, Kirsten - DOA](#); [Hynek, Sara - DOA](#)
Subject: UW Proposal
Date: Monday, January 05, 2015 3:10:30 PM
Attachments: [Mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities FG.docx](#)
[Questions for Gov's Office.docx](#)
[Questions regarding authority.docx](#)

Hi Eric,

I hope you are doing well. I have attached several documents regarding the UW that need your review.

The first attachment is the proposal for UW's mission, purpose, powers and responsibilities as an authority. This document is not for discussion with UW officials on Wednesday. We need your feedback on this proposal.

The second attachment is a list of questions that we have regarding the bill drafting. This document is not for discussion with UW officials on Wednesday. We need your guidance on these items.

Finally, the third attachment is a list of questions to discuss at the meeting on Wednesday with UW officials. Let us know if anything should be added or removed from this list.

Please let me know if you have any questions about these documents.

Thank you for your time and feedback.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

Questions for Gov's Office

1. Should the UW System be made an authority or exempted from statutory requirements?
 - a. Making it an authority allows for a reset of the Board.
 - i. If made an authority, should a word other than 'authority' be used in the title?
 - b. Exempting it from statutory requirements may be an easier sell (wouldn't be called an authority).
2. How should the Board be structured? What should it be called?
3. Instead of reducing UW's GPR, it could be made responsible for outstanding debt service payments on GPR backed bonds.
 - a. In FY17, the payments will be about \$240M GPR.
 - b. This is similar to the lease agreement between UWHCA and the Board.
 - c. Allows the state to realize savings without directly reducing base resources.
4. Should the UW authority be required to seek Building Commission approval for renovations/projects involving state owned facilities?
5. s. 13.101(6) allows for the reduction of appropriations to state agencies but doesn't mention authorities.
 - a. Should this be maintained for the UW if it is an authority?
6. How should the State Lab of Hygiene, State Cartographer and Veterinary Diagnostic Lab be handled?

Questions regarding UW Authority

1. Is a July 1, 2016 effective date for the authority possible?
2. How should the pending transition to new personnel systems on July 1, 2015 be handled?
 - a. Are there any provisions needed to help UW address the transition to the new personnel systems?
 - b. Should the transition continue as is even with the authority beginning on July 1, 2016?
3. Campuses will need to be granted police authority similar to the authority granted to Marquette University in s. 175.42.
 - a. Should this be granted broadly to the UW System or only to specific institutions?
4. Are there particular statutory provisions that should be kept or removed?
5. What is the estimated tuition increase after the tuition freeze is over?
6. The Governor is proposing to transfer responsibility for the MN/WI Student Reciprocity Agreement to the Board. Are any provisions beyond the transfer and authorization needed?
7. Will the UW authority want to have the ability to lease/rent vehicles from central fleet and utilize the records center for records storage?
 - a. Other state authorities (WHEDA, WEDC) are exempt from these.
8. Are there circumstances in which UW would like to be able to use the state procurement process/contracts?
9. Should the UW authority be required to maintain similar IT systems/databases as the state?
 - a. Other states have recommended doing this for ease of reporting/accountability.
10. Should statutory references to specific campuses, positions and titles be kept or will those be reconsidered by the authority and with the new personnel system?
11. What should be the official name of the UW authority?

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
To: Schutt, Eric - GOV
Subject: FW: UW 15-17 Budget
Date: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 12:20:19 PM
Attachments: UW 15-17 Budget (2).xlsx

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 11:50 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: UW 15-17 Budget

Revised

From: Schutt, Eric - GOV
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Subject: RE: UW 15-17 Budget
Date: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 12:26:00 PM

Yep. Fine to send to UW.

ES

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 12:20 PM
To: Schutt, Eric - GOV
Subject: FW: UW 15-17 Budget

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2015 11:50 AM
To: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA; Grinde, Kirsten - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: UW 15-17 Budget

Revised

From: Heifetz, Michael G - DOA
To: Schutt, Eric - GOV; Huebsch, Mike - DOA; Zipperer, Rich - GOV; Polzin, Cindy M - GOV; Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV; Schoenfeldt, Eileen - GOV
Cc: Grinde, Kirsten - DOA; Hamel, Mary - DOA; Hochkammer, Debbie - DOA
Subject: MGH Combined Comebacks 1-21-2015.pptx
Date: Monday, January 19, 2015 9:41:21 PM
Attachments: MGH Combined Comebacks 1-21-2015.pptx
Importance: High

Good evening. Here's the deck for Tuesday morning. Team leaders and Quinn will be over.

Plan is to start with FY15 update (not much of an update but more a reminder of where we are) and up-to-date GF condition overview for the 2015-17 biennium.

I will bring 20 copies.

We will likely need one more brief session w/the Gov, pending LFB numbers this week...

If we missed anything pls advise.

thx

COMEBACKS

January 21, 2015

- Emergency Detention
- WI Army National Guard Soldier Readiness Processing
- VETransfer
- Medicaid Dental Services Pilot
- Medicaid Miscellaneous Items
- FY15 Hiring Discussion
- State Energy Office to PSC
- DOT Cost-Benefit Analysis
- Dedicated DFI Revenues to FWDA
- Chiropractic Education
- Miscellaneous Items (list)

Emergency Detention and Crisis Intervention

Modification to Decision:

- Delay changes to emergency detention to July 1, 2016, to allow counties time to prepare for performing crisis assessment by a mental health professional prior to an emergency detention.
- Provide \$1.5 million one-time PR in FY16 for crisis services grants (DHS originally proposed \$250,000).

WI Army National Guard Soldier Readiness Processing

Request:

- Provide \$500,000 GPR annually to DMA for a limited National Guard state activation to pay costs of military dental, medical and administrative staff necessary to operate the Soldier Readiness Processing (SRP) program. The program annually validates each National Guard member's dental, medical and personnel readiness.

Considerations:

- The current US Department of Defense budget proposal reduces Army National Guard troop strength from 350,200 to 335,000 initially, with a further reduction to 315,000 by 2019. Such cuts could impact the readiness of the Wisconsin Army National Guard.
- SRP staff serve one weekend/month and process an average of 320 soldiers/day.
- Under the proposed activation, only the payroll and travel costs of the approximately 100 Soldier Readiness Processing personnel would require state support. The soldiers being processed are on federally-funded training orders.
- Wisconsin statutes permit the Governor to call the Wisconsin National Guard into state service to prepare to respond to anticipated natural disasters or public emergencies.

VETtransfer

Proposal:

- Provide funding to VETtransfer, Inc., an organization that provides training and other assistance to veterans engaged in entrepreneurship.

Considerations:

- The 2013-15 budget included \$500,000 SEG (one-time) in FY14 for VETtransfer, Inc.
 - \$300,000 was allocated to pay for costs associated with the start-up of veteran-owned businesses located in Wisconsin.
 - \$200,000 was allocated to provide entrepreneurial training & related services to veterans who are state residents.
 - VETtransfer is required to submit to the Governor and the Secretaries of DVA and DOA, an annual financial report containing detailed grant award information. The report is due by March 1, until 2018, or one year following the sunset date.
- Veterans Trust Fund financial picture and availability of GPR.

Wisconsin Dental Association Pilot

Proposal:

- Create a 7-county MA pilot project under which dental services reimbursement rates would be increased for certain procedures.
- Provide \$5.5 million to \$7.8 million GPR annually under the median fee scenario.

Considerations:

- Pilot area: Brown, Dunn, Marathon, Polk, Racine, Richland and Sauk counties.
- MA reimbursement rate would be increased in these counties for pediatric dental services and emergency dental services provided to adults.

Medicaid Miscellaneous Items

1. Medicaid & County Mental Health
2. The following items currently do not have an identified fiscal component:
 - Childless Adult waiver request
 - FSET drug screening
 - Immunization reimbursement for pharmacies
 - Ending 3 month waiting period for certain BadgerCare Plus participants

Options:

- Maintain current decisions.
- Assign a nominal fiscal impact to each item.
- Combine these as efficiencies and assign a nominal fiscal impact.

FY15 Hiring Discussion

- Question:

With exemption for 24/7 operations at DOC, DHS and DPI, should FY15 hiring freeze be implemented?

- Considerations:

FY15 "Soft" Freeze - \$3,070,200 GPR from remaining agencies
plus \$3 million GPR from UW based on assumed increase of vacancy rate of 1%

FY15 "Hard" Freeze Budget Assumptions
\$14,447,200 GPR plus \$3 million from the UW

State Energy Office Transfer to PSC

Question:

- Should incumbents be transferred or positions deleted and recreated at PSC?

Repeal Cost Benefit Analysis for DOT?

- Question:

Should repeal of cost benefit analysis required under chapter 16 procurement provisions also apply to DOT's engineer/consultant contracts?

Dedicating DFI Revenues to FWDA

- **Proposal:** Dedicate revenues from DFI (merged into DFIPS) relating to corporate registrations and Uniform Commercial Code filings to provide an additional revenue stream for the Forward Wisconsin Development Authority (FWDA). Possibly transfer regulatory functions as well.

- **Background:**

	FY14 Actual	FY15 Estimated	FY16 Budget	FY17 Budget
Corporation Fees	\$21,369,100	\$21,370,000	\$21,400,000	\$21,400,000
Corporation Expenses	\$2,644,900	\$2,644,900	\$2,644,900	\$2,644,900
GPR-Earned	\$18,724,200	\$18,725,100	\$18,755,100	\$18,755,100
UCC	\$1,483,600	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000	\$1,400,000
UCC expenses	\$350,700	\$350,700	\$350,700	\$350,700
GPR-Earned	\$1,132,900	\$1,049,300	\$1,049,300	\$1,049,300
Total GPR-Earned From Corp and UCC	\$19,857,100	\$19,774,400	\$19,804,400	\$19,804,400

Dedicated DFI Revenues to FWDA

1. Actual full transfer of regulatory functions to authority may be problematic. The authority is not a state agency, while the regulatory functions related to incorporation are a core regulatory function of the state.
2. Additionally, one of the rationales behind consolidating these functions at DFIPS is to house licensing and incorporation in "one stop". Moving the functions elsewhere counters this intent. The proposed FWDA would not have any functions that naturally relate to the filing and regulatory functions at DFI or the new DFIPS.
3. Simply transferring the excess revenues can be done relatively easily.
4. These revenues generally do not grow rapidly, especially UCC filing fees. While it would likely be a stable revenue source, it would not provide meaningful new funding for economic development functions.
5. Since the effect is to reduce general fund revenues by the amount of the GPR-Earned, a similar effect could be achieved by dedicating an equivalent percentage of general fund tax revenue. In FY16, this would be approximately 0.133% of GPR taxes.

Chiropractic Education

- Require DSPS/DFIPS to issue \$250,000 GPR grant to MCOW to develop model Doctor of Chiropractic Medicine (DCM) curriculum, steering committee policy and academic program support. Model curriculum would be due on January 1, 2016.
- Require DSPS/DFIPS to issue a \$2 million GPR grant, \$1 million in each year of the biennium, to MCOW for student scholarships and clinical training. 100 students/year at \$10,000/student.
- Require DSPS/DFIPS to enter into MOU with MCOW to create DCM stakeholder steering committee & outline grant deliverables.
- Include statutory changes to expand DCM scope of practice.

Further consideration:

- *Should the funding for the model curriculum and steering committee support all be in FY16 or split over two years?*
- *Is there a PR funding source that could be used instead of GPR?*

Recommendation: Deny funding requests. Assign statutory changes related to the DCM scope of practice to the regulatory reform package.

Miscellaneous Items

- FY16 Environmental Fund Resources for UW System
- Block Grants: Courts and Legislature
- Veterans Home Privatization
- PECFA
- Fast Forward & Other FY17 Initiatives (if \$\$)

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: Authority Highlights
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:02:14 AM
Attachments: UW Authority 01.19.15.docx

Waylon,

Attached is what I sent Michael at his request. Let me know if you need clarification on anything or would like more.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

- UW has complete control over setting employee compensation, allowing it to create personnel and compensation structures that increase its ability to compete for the best and brightest.
- By creating a new personnel system, UW has complete control over all employee matters, including sick leave, tenure, and shared governance.
- UW may negotiate and enter into procurement contracts that meet its needs and can achieve cost savings by working with other higher education institutions.
- Institutions have full flexibility over setting tuition rates and will be more market-based.
- UW may plan, design and manage construction projects funded with tuition, fees, gifts and grants which will cut down on project time to completion.
- The UW will receive a true GPR block grant, giving full flexibility of use of state resources.
- The amount of reporting will be reduced and streamlined, while maintaining necessary state oversight.
- UW will manage the MN/WI student reciprocity program for the state which will allow UW institutions to better compete with MN and draw more prospective workers to WI.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: RE: Authority Highlights
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:12:04 AM
Attachments: Preliminary Second Draft 01.16.15.pdf

Attached is the second draft.

There are changes being made to this draft, but it is the most current draft from LRB.

Nathan

From: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:08 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Authority Highlights

Do you have the stat language or an up-to-date draft I could scan through.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:02 AM
To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: Authority Highlights

Waylon,

Attached is what I sent Michael at his request. Let me know if you need clarification on anything or would like more.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

From: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Authority Highlights
Date: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:12:00 AM

Thanks.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:12 AM
To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: RE: Authority Highlights

Attached is the second draft.

There are changes being made to this draft, but it is the most current draft from LRB.

Nathan

From: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:08 AM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: Authority Highlights

Do you have the stat language or an up-to-date draft I could scan through.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 22, 2015 9:02 AM
To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: Authority Highlights

Waylon,

Attached is what I sent Michael at his request. Let me know if you need clarification on anything or would like more.

Nathan Schwanz
Executive Policy & Budget Analyst
State Budget Office
608-266-2843

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA; Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: RE: UW Savings
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2015 11:43:09 AM

According to research I previously did on UW System Admin personnel and budget data that is reported in the Redbook for FY15:

- There are about 157 FTE supported by GPR at UW System Admin;
- 15 of those positions were vacant when the Redbook was compiled;
- Assuming those 15 positions are still vacant today and System Admin is not using the funding to give other employees higher salaries, total savings would be \$1,313,924 in salaries (which they would already have realized anyway).
 - In comparison, the one office at System Admin, the HRS Service Center, had 22 PR funded vacancies with a total salary cost of \$1,422,753, when the Redbook was published.
- Overall, GPR accounts for about \$12M of UW System Admin's \$20.2M total salary costs, at the time of Redbook publication.

It is worth noting this data could have changed since the Redbook was published and the costs don't include fringes.

Nathan

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 10:40 AM
To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: UW Savings

I think this is literally just at System, so the statewide numbers wouldn't be applicable here.

Also, Mickie indicated that we weren't carrying a hiring freeze number for the U because we wouldn't actually see the savings, and because we don't know their churn rate and it would be difficult to calculate.

Freeze is GPR only – will be interesting to see how many PR positions get created in the next couple months.... "savings" could be minimal if they just spend balances.

From: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 10:10 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: UW Savings

<http://media.jrn.com/documents/uwmoratorium.pdf>

Is there a way to put a reasonable savings number on this system wide?

Don't we usually assume UW is half of all state savings so we could take our hiring freeze savings and cut it in half?

Waylon Hurlburt
Policy Director
Office of Governor Scott Walker
608-266-1212

From: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Bcc: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Subject: RE: UW Savings
Date: Thursday, January 29, 2015 12:59:00 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)

I'm trying to come up with examples that include actual dollar savings for UW.

Would it be defensible to say that if the faculty at UW institutions were able to teach just one more student it would bring in another \$46 million annually? (6,276 faculty * average tuition of \$7,317 LFB Papers) And I understand that enrollment is down at some institutions, not all these faculty teach, and this is a rough way of looking at it.

Table 17: 2014-15 Budgeted Faculty and Staff Positions* (Full-Time Equivalent)

Institution	Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Assoc. Prof.	Instructor	Total Faculty	Academic Staff	Total Unclass.	Classif. Staff	Total Staff
Eau Claire	170	123	148	0	440	399	789	420	1,210
Green Bay	33	88	35	0	177	253	428	217	645
La Crosse	101	108	195	0	404	416	820	375	1,193
Madison	1,241	388	510	0	2,139	8,876	11,016	3,088	16,104
Milwaukee	262	339	210	0	811	1,564	2,425	1,124	3,549
Oshkosh	131	111	164	4	410	517	927	399	1,327
Parkside	32	49	45	0	127	217	343	186	529
Platteville	117	60	115	0	293	362	655	321	974
River Falls	118	45	48	0	211	220	431	230	661
Stevens Point	145	99	123	9	376	399	754	384	1,118
Stout	68	96	146	0	311	366	676	405	1,079
Superior	40	27	61	0	127	128	255	150	405
Whitewater	99	142	162	0	403	374	777	410	1,187
Subtotal	2,558	1,723	1,982	13	6,276	13,999	20,276	9,706	29,981
Colleges	68	137	109	0	314	327	640	199	839
Extension	73	116	68	32	289	692	982	229	1,211
System Admin	0	0	0	0	0	51	51	51	102
Systemwide	0	0	0	0	0	31	31	108	199
Total	2,699	1,977	2,159	45	6,879	15,101	21,979	10,354	32,332

*Excludes vacant positions. Does not include 3,137 student assistant positions in the UW System.

Table 4: 2013-14 Instructional Cost Per Student and Percent of Cost Paid by Tuition

	Undergraduate				Graduate			
	Resident Tuition	Cost Per Student			Resident Tuition	Cost Per Student		
		Freshman/Sophomore	Junior/Senior	All Levels		Master's	Ph.D.	
Madison*	\$9,273	\$10,787 86.0%	\$15,598 59.4%	\$13,710 67.6%	\$10,728	\$23,529 45.5%	\$21,244 50.5%	
Milwaukee	8,091	7,402 109.3	11,854 68.3	9,812 82.3	10,387	21,624 48.0	26,268 39.3	
Doctoral Average	8,805	9,319 94.5	14,219 61.9	12,168 72.4	10,603	22,851 46.4	22,018 48.2	
Eau Claire	7,361	8,960 82.2	11,359 64.8	10,219 72.0	7,640	16,562 46.7		
Green Bay	6,298	8,127 77.5	11,261 55.9	9,880 63.7	7,640	9,447 80.9		
La Crosse	7,585	8,178 92.7	11,537 65.7	9,848 77.0	7,780	15,096 51.5		
Oshkosh	6,422	6,952 92.4	10,970 58.5	9,063 70.9	7,640	15,540 56.4		
Parkside	6,298	10,304 61.1	13,351 47.2	11,814 53.5	7,640	11,578 66.0		
Platteville	6,418	7,534 85.2	9,945 64.5	8,660 74.1	7,640	11,884 64.3		
River Falls	6,428	8,050 80.0	10,055 63.9	9,094 70.7	7,640	15,106 58.3		
Stevens Point	6,298	7,514 83.8	9,681 65.1	8,663 72.7	7,640	15,158 50.4		
Stout	7,014	8,307 84.3	11,185 62.7	9,826 71.4	6,613	16,464 40.2		
Superior	6,535	11,675 56.0	15,317 42.7	13,828 47.3	7,640	17,311 44.1		
Whitewater	6,519	7,115 91.6	10,592 61.5	8,835 73.6	7,640	11,920 64.1		
Comprehensive Average	6,721	8,015 83.9	11,010 61.0	9,563 70.3	7,522	15,946 53.9		
Colleges Average	4,750	7,691 61.8		7,691 61.8				
System Average	7,317	8,357 87.6	12,307 59.5	10,349 70.7	9,422	19,438 48.5		

* Master's cost per student includes law students; doctoral cost per student excludes medical and veterinary students.

From: Hynek, Sara - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 10:40 AM

To: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: UW Savings

I think this is literally just at System, so the statewide numbers wouldn't be applicable here.

Also, Mickie indicated that we weren't carrying a hiring freeze number for the U because we wouldn't actually see the savings, and because we don't know their churn rate and it would be difficult to calculate.

Freeze is GPR only – will be interesting to see how many PR positions get created in the next couple months.... “savings” could be minimal if they just spend balances.

From: Hurlburt, Waylon - GOV
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 10:10 AM
To: Hynek, Sara - DOA; Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: UW Savings

<http://media.jrn.com/documents/uwmoratorium.pdf>

Is there a way to put a reasonable savings number on this system wide?

Don't we usually assume UW is half of all state savings so we could take our hiring freeze savings and cut it in half?

Waylon Hurlburt
Policy Director
Office of Governor Scott Walker
608-266-1212

From: Hubert, Wayne - GOV
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: RE: UW System assessments
Date: Friday, January 30, 2015 9:13:00 AM

Thanks.

From: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Sent: Friday, January 30, 2015 9:44 AM
To: Hubert, Wayne - GOV
Subject: FW: UW System assessments

Risk Assessments includes worker's comp, property and liability. The UW Authority will not be able to participate in the worker's comp program. So the risk assessments savings should be about \$4.5M, not the \$12M listed below.

Nathan

From: Bong, Sacha E - DOA
Sent: Thursday, January 29, 2015 3:10 PM
To: Schwanz, Nathan E - DOA
Subject: UW System assessments

Number	Agency Name	Federal Cash Management	Financial Services	OSER Assessment	Procurement Assessment	Risk Assessments	State Use Board	Legal Services	DOA OH Assessment	Federal Aids Management Fee	Public Land Administrative Services	Vehicle Fees	Consolidated RIX Assessment	Public Records Management	National Community Service Board Match	TOTAL
285	UNIV OF WISCONSIN SYSTEM	\$ -	\$ 570,422.00	\$ 1,680,661.00	\$ (1,254,435.00)	\$ 12,851,594.00	\$ 54,858.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 79,170.00	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 13,982,270.00

As we discussed, this does not include DFD's 4% fee, which we estimated at \$24.5 million for projects enumerated in the 2013-15 budget. The amounts in the table above are annual, whereas DFD fees are not (they are based on when bonds are issued and construction starts).

Thanks,

Sacha Bong
Executive Policy and Budget Analyst
Department of Administration, State Budget Office
(608) 266-5468
Sachaf.Bong@wisconsin.gov