



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

March 4, 2002

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1171

Underage Tobacco Enforcement

CURRENT LAW

The Synar Amendment. In 1992, Congress enacted legislation to encourage states to reduce the sale and distribution of tobacco products to minors. This legislation, commonly referred to as the Synar Amendment, requires states to: (a) have and enforce laws that prohibit tobacco sales to minors; (b) conduct random inspections of tobacco retail or distribution outlets to estimate the level of compliance; and (c) report the outcome of inspection and enforcement activities to the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS). The Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) in DHHS is responsible for promulgating regulations and overseeing states' compliance with the Synar requirements.

The Synar Amendment requires states to demonstrate that minors are able to purchase tobacco products 20% or less of the time such attempts are made, beginning in federal fiscal year (FFY) 2002-03. States are required to meet negotiated rates of compliance in the years before FFY 2002-03. States are also required to report the outcome of enforcement activities. If a state is found not to be in compliance with the requirements for any federal fiscal year, the state may lose up to 40% of the its federal Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) block grant allocation.

Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment (SAPT) Block Grant. The federal SAPT block grant provides funding to develop and implement prevention, treatment and rehabilitation activities directed to substance abuse. In Wisconsin, the Department of Health and Family Services (DHFS) is the administering agency for the SAPT block grant.

In 2001 Wisconsin Act 16 (the 2001-03 biennial budget act), it was estimated that in 2001-02, \$24,837,900 FED would be available under the SAPT block grant. Most of the block grant (\$9,735,700) was budgeted for distribution to counties through community aids and \$1,583,000 was budgeted for substance abuse services in the Bureau of Milwaukee Child Welfare. In addition, \$10,629,200 was budgeted for distribution to counties, tribes and other organizations for

community-based substance abuse programs and \$1,649,200 for the Department of Corrections to provide substance abuse services to persons in the criminal justice system. The remaining amount was budgeted to support state operations (\$1,240,800).

In 2001-02, \$74,000 FED from the SAPT block grant was budgeted to fund costs associated with the Synar Amendment. DHFS uses this funding to complete the annual compliance check survey, which determines the state's inspection failure rate, and for training, which has included sending information packets to every merchant across the state that is licensed to sell tobacco products. These information packets contain health and educational materials, tips for training employees, signs for merchants to display and other materials that are intended to assist merchants in enforcing state and federal regulations regarding the sale of tobacco to minors. In 2000-01, most of the training activities focused on the state law regarding the use of minors in undercover investigations.

GOVERNOR

No provision.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Compliance with Federal Regulations

1. Wisconsin's 2001 Synar tobacco sales compliance survey randomly selected 850 licensed retailers statewide. A total of 555 cases were recorded and 187 successful cigarette purchases by minors were made. This resulted in an inspection failure rate (IFR) of 33.7%. Because Wisconsin's target IFR for 2001 was 22%, the IFR was 11.7 percentage points above the target and Wisconsin was out of compliance with the regulations under the Synar Amendment. The 2001 IFR is 9.1 percentage points higher than Wisconsin's IFR for 2000 of 24.6%.

2. The table on the following page shows Wisconsin's target IFR from 1997 to 2002 and its actual IFR from 1996 to 2001. Federal regulations require states to conduct random, unannounced inspections during the fiscal year and use a 95% confidence interval when determining compliance. This interval is about three percentage points above and below the target IFR. Therefore, Wisconsin is in compliance if the actual IFR is within three percentage points of the target IFR. This explains how Wisconsin was in compliance for 2000.

Wisconsin's Annual Inspection Failure Rates

<u>Year</u>	<u>Target Inspection Failure Rate</u>	<u>Actual Inspection Failure Rate</u>	<u>In Compliance?</u>
1996	--	47.7%	N/A
1997	35%	22.6	Yes
1998	30	27.8	Yes
1999	25	22.0	Yes
2000	23	24.6	Yes
2001	22	33.7	No
2002	20	--	--

Since Wisconsin was out of compliance in 2001, the state will be assessed a penalty equal to 40% of the state's FFY 2001-02 SAPT block grant allocation. Since the enactment of Act 16, DHFS staff have reestimated the amount of SAPT the state expects to receive in FFY 2001-02 to \$25,737,900; a 40% penalty on this award level is \$10,295,200. Attachment 1 identifies the estimated reductions in county and statewide programs that would result from a 40% across-the-board reduction to the SAPT block grant, based on actual calendar year 2002 allocations.

3. The DHHS federal appropriations bill for FFY 2001-02 includes a provision that allows a state that is out of compliance with the Synar Amendment requirements to commit additional state funds to underage tobacco enforcement activities to avoid the 40% penalty on the state's SAPT allocation. The amount of additional state funding must equal 1% of the state's SAPT allocation for each percentage point by which the state misses the retailer compliance rate goal. In addition, the state is required to maintain its expenditures in the current fiscal year for tobacco prevention programs and for compliance activities at least at the previous year's level. The additional funds the state commits are considered one-time funds that will not be incorporated into the future calculation of state expenditures on tobacco prevention programs and compliance activities.

4. DHFS intends to negotiate with DHHS to reduce the amount of the SAPT penalty and hopes to avoid the SAPT penalty entirely by demonstrating that the state will commit additional funding for enforcement activities, as allowed under the DHHS federal appropriations bill. However, DHFS would be required to show that the state will commit an additional \$3,011,300 in state funding for underage tobacco enforcement activities. This amount equals 11.7% of the state's estimated FFY 2001-02 SAPT allocation.

5. "Enforcement activities" are defined as anything to change retailer behavior. Thus, it can include training, public awareness campaigns and law enforcement activities. As part of the negotiations with DHHS, a specific plan of action would be agreed upon by both DHHS and DHFS. The state is then responsible for carrying out the plan.

6. Federal law requires the Governor to certify that the state will commit additional state funds for enforcement activities by May 1, 2002, in order to avoid the SAPT penalty. Federal law also requires that the state's administering agency have access to the funds by June 30, 2002, although the funds do not need to be fully contracted by that date.

Funding Options

7. If the Committee determines that the state should try to avoid the loss of approximately \$10.3 million in federal SAPT block grant funds in FFY 2001-02 by committing additional state funds to support underage tobacco enforcement activities, it could address the issue as part of the budget reform bill and provide \$3,011,300 GPR in one-time funds in 2001-02 for this purpose.

8. However, in light of current demands on general fund revenues, the Committee could consider reallocating a portion of funding currently budgeted in the Tobacco Control Board for tobacco control and prevention activities to instead fund underage tobacco enforcement activities. In state fiscal year 2002-03, \$15.3 million SEG is budgeted for Tobacco Control Board grants and program administration. Of the \$15.0 million SEG budgeted for grants in 2002-03, \$3.5 million is legislatively earmarked (\$1 million for UW- Madison Tobacco Research and Intervention Center, \$2 million for the Thomas T. Melvin youth tobacco prevention and education program and \$500,000 for the Medical College of Wisconsin), and \$6.25 million is committed for calendar year 2002 contracts (shown in Attachment 2 to this paper) for tobacco prevention and control activities. As a result, the Board has total uncommitted funds of \$5.25 million for 2002-03.

9. Federal law requires the state to maintain expenditures for prevention and enforcement activities in FFY 2001-02 at the FFY 2000-01 level. Based on a review of the Board's expenditures, it appears that the amount budgeted for the Board's prevention and enforcement activities in FFY 2001-02 is greater than the actual expenditures in FFY 2000-01. Therefore, the Committee could reallocate \$3,011,300 SEG of the \$5.25 million of uncommitted funds available to the Board in 2002-03 on a one-time basis to increase underage enforcement activities. Any funds reallocated from the Board would reduce the amount available to continue funding its current programs, beginning in calendar year 2003.

10. Another option is to reallocate funding currently budgeted for another DHFS program. DHFS staff have considered reallocating funding currently budgeted for counties to support services to persons convicted of operating while intoxicated (OWI) offenses to instead fund underage tobacco enforcement activities.

11. Persons convicted of OWI offenses are assessed a \$355 driver improvement surcharge. Counties forward 38.5% of these revenues to the state, which is deposited in a DHFS clearinghouse appropriation and transferred to various agencies for programs related to alcohol abuse and law enforcement. The county in which the offense occurred retains the remainder of the revenue from the surcharge.

12. An estimated \$3.6 million in revenues will be available to the state in 2001-02 from the driver improvement surcharge. This funding is distributed to five state agencies: the Departments of Justice, Public Instruction, Health and Family Services, Transportation and the University of Wisconsin. In the 2001-03 biennium, DHFS is budgeted \$1,000,000 PR annually from this source.

13. Currently, DHFS is required to allocate its OWI funding to county human services departments and Chapter 51 boards under the intoxicated driver program for treatment of persons convicted of OWI offenses according to a plan developed by DHHS. DHFS has allocated the money to counties to fund costs resulting from a deficit in the county's intoxicated driver program (IDP) if the county meets the following criteria: (a) collections of surcharge fines and third-party revenue are insufficient to cover the actual or projected cost of services; (b) the county demonstrates a good faith effort to collect surcharges; (c) projected or actual expenditures exceed projected or actual revenues; and (d) the county demonstrates IDP client outcomes. Counties apply for the supplemental funding annually and DHFS allocates the funding based on the amount budgeted and counties' demonstrated need for the supplemental funds. The funding is allocated on a calendar year basis.

14. DHFS has notified counties that the supplemental funding budgeted in 2001-02 for IDP to fund calendar year 2001 costs will not be distributed at this time. DHFS does not want to distribute this funding for IDP so that it would be available if the Legislature wishes to reallocate it to increase support for underage tobacco enforcement activities.

15. DHFS proposed statutory changes that would reallocate IDP funds as a means of avoiding the SAPT penalty to the Governor for inclusion in the budget reform bill. However, the Governor chose not to include the Department's proposal in the bill.

16. The state is projected to need \$3,011,300 in additional funding to avoid the 40% penalty on the FFY 2001-02 SAPT block grant. The maximum amount of funding available from IDP over the 2001-03 biennium is \$2,000,000. Therefore, even if the Committee chose to reallocate IDP funds for underage tobacco enforcement activities, an additional \$1,011,300 would need to be provided for this purpose. Further, Wisconsin will most likely be out of compliance with the Synar Amendment for the next year or two. If the option exists in future years to negotiate a reduced penalty with DHHS, and the state exercises that option, additional state funds would be needed each year. Using IDP funds budgeted in the 2001-03 biennium to avoid the 40% penalty on the SAPT block grant could be viewed as a one-time fix to a problem that will require additional state funds in the next biennium. If the Committee chooses this option, the IDP funds budgeted in 2002-03 would not be available for either IDP or to increase underage enforcement activities to avoid a future penalty on the state's SAPT block grant.

17. DHFS is required to allocate the funding for IDP within state fiscal year 2001-02, which ends June 30, 2002. If no statutory changes are enacted, DHFS will be required to allocate the funding to counties under IDP by the end of the fiscal year. If DHFS distributes the funds for IDP, 24 counties would receive funding, as identified in Attachment 3.

18. Alternatively, the Committee could decide to use a combination of funding sources - additional GPR, funding currently budgeted in the Tobacco Control Board and OWI revenue appropriated for IDP, to increase underage tobacco enforcement activities.

19. If the Committee decides to increase state funding for enforcement activities, it would also need to decide which agency would receive and administer the funding. Three options are presented for the Committee's consideration -- DHFS, the Tobacco Control Board and placing the funds in the Committee's supplemental appropriation.

20. The Wisconsin Tobacco Control Board distributes grants for a number of programs and activities, including enforcement of local laws aimed at restricting underage access to tobacco. However, until last year, the Board was not promoting enforcement through compliance checks as a priority for a couple of reasons. First, the Board provides resources to local coalitions, through a contract with the DHFS Division of Public Health (DPH). One of the allowable uses of the funding is to conduct compliance checks. However, due to the ambiguity of the state law and concern about the legal implications, local coalitions did not use their funding for compliance purposes. Second, the Board's Executive Director indicated that research shows that compliance checks are not the most effective or expedient method to decrease youth consumption of tobacco products. Therefore, the Board had not identified compliance checks as a priority and instead focused on other methods to decrease youth consumption.

21. Last year, DHFS and the Department of Justice (DOJ) determined that coalitions that received Tobacco Control Board grants through DPH could conduct compliance checks, since they were under contract with DHFS. In addition, due to the results of the state's compliance survey last summer and the financial impacts on the state, the Board decided to promote compliance checks. Thus, in June, 2001, local staff received appropriate training in conducting compliance checks and these local coalitions have begun conducting compliance checks in their community.

22. If the Committee wished to provide additional funding to reduce the state's federal penalty, it could provide this funding to the Tobacco Control Board because: (a) the Board has the infrastructure in place to distribute the funding to local communities; (b) these coalitions have already received the necessary training to perform compliance checks; (c) the Board's contracts with local agencies are performance-based contracts, so the Board would be able to track results from the funding; and (d) the Board has existing relationships with local coalitions who are already involved in reducing tobacco consumption.

23. However, the Committee could choose to provide this additional funding to DHFS. The Department is the designated state agency for the SAPT block grant and is responsible for the administration of the compliance survey and other federal regulations associated with the block grant. Therefore, by providing DHFS with the additional funds, it might better ensure that these funds are administered in accordance with federal regulations and the results of negotiations with DHFS and DHHS staff.

24. Alternatively, the funds could be placed in the Committee's supplemental appropriation, to be released upon the approval of a joint request from DHFS and the Board under a 14-day passive review process. The request would specify how the funding would be distributed, the enforcement activities that the funding would support and how the distribution of funding complies with the plan negotiated and agreed upon with DHHS. However, placing the funding in the Committee's appropriation may delay implementation of additional enforcement activities. The enforcement activities should begin as soon as possible so that the state can more quickly comply with the Synar Amendment.

25. Because it is possible, though unlikely, that the state will be able to negotiate a lower level of additional state funding to avoid the SAPT penalty, the Committee could require that the administrating agency of these funds be allowed to spend an amount equal to, but not greater than, the agreed upon level of funding in the negotiated plan of action with DHHS and this amount could not exceed \$3,011,300. In addition, since the funding is one-time funding, appropriate adjustments would need to be made to the appropriation structure in either agency (DHFS or the Board).

26. The option to provide additional state funds to avoid a reduction in federal SAPT funds may not be available to states next year. The National Association of State Alcohol and Drug Abuse Directors (NASADAD) indicated that Congress may not include a provision in the 2001-02 appropriation bill for DHHS as part of the federal budget to allow states to provide additional state funding in order to prevent the loss of federal SAPT dollars if the state is not in compliance with the Synar amendment. If this occurs, states that are out of compliance would be subject to the full 40% penalty.

Enforcement

27. Under the Synar Amendment, states are required to show that they are enforcing the state's laws restricting the sale of tobacco products, including cigarettes, to minors. If the state is unable to show such activities in its annual SAPT application, DHHS could determine that the state is not complying with the requirement, regardless of whether or not the state met its target IFR.

28. 1999 Wisconsin Act 9 (the 1999-01 biennial budget act) made numerous changes relating to the authority of local law enforcement agencies to conduct activities to enforce the prohibition of selling tobacco products to minors. Perhaps the most significant change was to authorize DHFS to contract with local health departments, as agents of DHFS, with a state agency, or with law enforcement agencies of the state or of a county, city, village or town, to conduct annual, unannounced investigations at retail outlets, including sites of tobacco vending machines, to survey overall levels of compliance with the prohibition to sell tobacco products to minors. This statute is somewhat ambiguous relating to the authority of local organizations to conduct enforcement activities if those organizations were not under contract with DHFS. Attorneys at DOJ have concluded that local agencies that are not under contract with DHFS do not have the authority to conduct activities to enforce the prohibition to sell tobacco products to minors if those activities include using minors in unannounced, undercover visits to retailers who sell tobacco products (based on s. 254.92 (2) (b) of the statutes).

29. A minor under 18 years of age, but not under 15 years of age, may purchase, attempt to purchase or possess cigarettes or tobacco products in the course of his or her participation in an investigation that is under contract with DHFS (as stated in s. 254.916 of the statutes) that is conducted in accordance with statutory requirements regarding such investigations. The issue is that local agencies, under this provision, do not have the authority to conduct investigations using minors unless the local agency is under contract with DHFS for these investigations. Therefore, local agencies are not independently conducting such investigations and active enforcement of the state and local youth access to tobacco laws have virtually ceased. While local authorities are still allowed to enforce these state and local laws, they are unable to do so proactively, unless they are under contract with DHFS. Instead, the authorities react to reported incidents of a retailer selling tobacco products to minors or through other, indirect methods.

30. To increase enforcement activities in the state and to ensure that DHFS could identify these enforcement activities in the state's annual SAPT block grant, DHFS began administering contracts for enforcement activities in the last year. Using one-time funds, approved by the Department of Administration, the Bureau of Substance Abuse Services in DHFS issued two contracts for enforcement activities in 2001-02. The first contract was with the City of Appleton Police Department for \$4,500 from July 1, 2001 to September 30, 2001. The second contract is for \$3,500 with the City of Madison Health Department and began October 15, 2001, and is scheduled to continue through June 30, 2002. These contracts are used to fund undercover investigations, using minors, and citations are issued if the sale of tobacco products to a minor occurs.

31. In addition, DPH received a \$2.8 million grant from the Wisconsin Tobacco Control Board in calendar year 2002. DPH distributes this funding to local community coalitions to develop effective community-based programs to reduce tobacco use and change attitudes or norms regarding tobacco. Some of the coalitions have incorporated compliance activities into their program. In calendar year 2001, approximately 29 coalitions (which include counties and cities) used minors in compliance checks but did not issue citations if a violation occurred. In addition, a number of coalitions had retailer education as part of their programs, which included vending machine and advertising sign placement.

32. Engrossed Senate Bill 360 (Senate Substitute Amendment 1 to SB 360, as amended by Senate Amendment 1 to SSA 1 to SB 360) has passed the Senate and the Assembly. This bill allows local governments and law enforcement agencies to perform undercover investigations, deletes the requirement that local agencies have to be under contact with DHFS to perform these investigations, and establishes new training requirements for retailers and their employees or contracted agents.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

A. Funding

1. Provide \$3,011,300 GPR in 2001-02 on a one-time basis to support enforcement activities relating to restricting underage access to tobacco products. Specify that these funds could be expended or encumbered through June 30, 2003.

Alternative A1	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING	\$3,011,300

2. Reallocate \$3,011,300 SEG that is currently budgeted in the Tobacco Control Board for tobacco use prevention activities in 2002-03 to instead fund underage tobacco enforcement activities in 2001-02, per the agreement with DHHS. Specify that these funds could be expended on encumbered through June 30, 2003.

3. Reallocate \$2,000,000 PR that is currently budgeted in DHFS for grants to counties for their intoxicated driver programs to instead fund underage tobacco enforcement activities in 2001-02. In addition, provide \$1,011,300 GPR in 2001-02 to support these enforcement activities and specify that these funds could be expended or encumbered through June 30, 2003.

Alternative A3	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING	\$1,011,300

4. Reallocate \$1,000,000 PR from the IDP program in 2001-02 and \$1,000,000 SEG from the Tobacco Control Board in 2002-03 to increase funding on a one-time basis for underage tobacco enforcement activities in 2001-02. In addition, provide \$1,011,300 GPR in 2001-02 in one-time funds for this purpose. Specify that these funds could be expended or encumbered through June 30, 2003.

Alternative A4	GPR
2001-03 FUNDING	\$1,011,300

5. Reallocate \$1,505,600 PR from the IDP program (\$1,000,000 in 2001-02 and \$505,600 in 2002-03) and \$1,505,700 SEG in one-time funding from the Tobacco Control Board in 2002-03 to increase funding for underage tobacco enforcement activities in 2001-02. Specify that these funds could be expended or encumbered through June 30, 2003.

6. Take no action.

B. Agency

1. In addition to Alternative A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5, specify that the additional funding be budgeted in and administered by DHFS. Prohibit DHFS from expending more than the level of funding specified in the agreement with DHHS.

2. In addition to Alternative A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5, specify that the additional funding be budgeted in and administered by the Tobacco Control Board. Prohibit the Board from expending more than the level of funding specified in the agreement with DHHS.

3. In addition to Alternative A1, A2, A3, A4 or A5, place the additional funding in the Committee's program supplements appropriation. Require DHFS and the Tobacco Control Board to jointly submit a plan to the Committee under a 14-day passive review process for the release of these funds. Require the plan to specify how the funding will be distributed, what enforcement activities it will support, and how this distribution complies with the plan negotiated and agreed upon with DHHS.

4. Take no action.

Prepared by: Yvonne M. Arsenault

Attachments

ATTACHMENT 1

**Calendar Year 2002
Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant
County and Statewide Program Reduction Estimates**

<u>County</u>	<u>2002 SAPT Budget</u>	<u>40% Reduction</u>	<u>Balance</u>
Adams	\$34,248	\$13,699	\$20,549
Ashland	28,276	11,310	16,966
Barron	79,713	31,885	47,828
Bayfield	35,262	14,105	21,157
Brown	465,279	186,112	279,167
Buffalo	23,204	9,282	13,922
Burnett	28,760	11,504	17,256
Calumet	46,328	18,531	27,797
Chippewa	96,341	38,536	57,805
Clark	55,026	22,010	33,016
Columbia	77,128	30,851	46,277
Crawford	32,086	12,834	19,252
Dane	2,618,206	1,047,282	1,570,924
Dodge	111,966	44,786	67,180
Door	46,219	18,488	27,731
Douglas	110,750	44,300	66,450
Dunn	107,714	43,086	64,628
Eau Claire	519,446	207,778	311,668
Florence	8,512	3,405	5,107
Fond du Lac	182,892	73,157	109,735
Forest/Oneida/Vilas	325,754	130,302	195,452
Grant & Iowa	107,759	43,104	64,655
Green	45,365	18,146	27,219
Green Lake	32,340	12,936	19,404
Iron	7,985	3,194	4,791
Jackson	39,385	15,754	23,631
Jefferson	109,299	43,720	65,579
Juneau	42,890	17,156	25,734
Kenosha	715,331	286,132	429,199
Kewaunee	26,797	10,719	16,078
La Crosse	270,793	108,317	162,476
La Fayette	22,055	8,822	13,233
Lincoln/Langlade/Marathon	303,162	121,265	181,897
Manitowoc	140,547	56,219	84,328
Marinette	75,173	30,069	45,104
Marquette	23,939	9,576	14,363
Menominee	41,427	16,571	24,856
Milwaukee	5,823,075	2,329,230	3,493,845
Monroe	71,115	28,446	42,669
Oconto	48,966	19,586	29,380

<u>County</u>	<u>2002 SAPT Budget</u>	<u>40% Reduction</u>	<u>Balance</u>
Outagamie	\$311,259	\$124,504	\$186,755
Ozaukee	85,354	34,142	51,212
Pepin	11,569	4,628	6,941
Pierce	51,163	20,465	30,698
Polk	68,628	27,451	41,177
Portage	240,341	96,136	144,205
Price	19,379	7,752	11,627
Racine	695,171	278,068	417,103
Richland	32,819	13,128	19,691
Rock	835,033	334,013	501,020
Rusk	30,407	12,163	18,244
St. Croix	70,176	28,070	42,106
Sauk	82,089	32,836	49,253
Sawyer	50,066	20,026	30,040
Shawano	73,720	29,488	44,232
Sheboygan	178,215	71,286	106,929
Taylor	31,092	12,437	18,655
Trempealeau	43,091	17,236	25,855
Vernon	44,268	17,707	26,561
Walworth	243,911	97,564	146,347
Washburn	27,842	11,137	16,705
Washington	131,927	52,771	79,156
Waukesha	649,473	259,789	389,684
Waupaca	80,798	32,319	48,479
Waushara	37,207	14,883	22,324
Winnebago	269,227	107,691	161,536
Wood	<u>128,562</u>	<u>51,425</u>	<u>77,137</u>
Subtotal	\$17,503,300	\$7,001,320	\$10,501,980
Statewide Programs			
Tribes	\$467,674	\$187,070	\$280,604
Dept. of Corrections	1,649,200	659,680	989,520
Wisconsin Cert. Board	121,500	48,600	72,900
UW Board of Regents	157,900	63,160	94,740
Brighter Futures Initiative*	1,575,000	630,000	945,000
Administration	148,267	59,307	88,960
Operations	986,233	394,493	591,740
DOH HIV Life Care Services	74,000	29,600	44,400
DOH HIV Prevention	75,000	30,000	45,000
Rural/Urban Women's Projects**	<u>1,776,850</u>	<u>710,740</u>	<u>1,066,110</u>
Subtotal	\$7,031,624	\$2,812,650	\$4,218,974
Grand Total	\$24,534,924	\$9,813,970	\$14,720,954

*45% (or \$1,575,000) of the funding for the Brighter Futures Initiative are supported by the SAPT. The funds go to nine counties and all tribes.

**The statewide rural/urban women's allocation for 2002 is \$2,167,900 of which \$1,776,850 is from the SAPT block grant. The remaining \$391,050 is from DAPIS program revenue.

ATTACHMENT 2

Wisconsin Tobacco Control Board Calendar Year 2002 Allocations

<u>Program</u>	<u>Allocations</u>
Media and Countermarketing	\$2,600,000
Wisconsin Quit Line	1,000,000
Community Coalitions	2,800,000
Technical Assistance and Training	300,000
School Grants	625,000
Ethnic Network	418,000
Youth-Led Movement	661,520
Monitoring and Evaluation	1,115,000
Resource Center	200,000
Spit Tobacco	92,000
Young Adult Pilot Studies	190,000
Pregnant Smokers Pilot Studies	178,646
Youth Cessation Pilot Studies	<u>163,179</u>
Total	\$10,343,345

ATTACHMENT 3

2001 IDP Supplemental/Emergency Funding Request Award

<u>County</u>	2001 Program Costs	2000 Surcharge Revenue Collected	Requested Funding	2001* Award Excess	2001 Award Reduced by 28%
Ashland	\$81,576	\$22,699	\$60,191	\$60,191	\$43,165
Calumet	36,814	29,270	8,814	3,300	2,367
Clark	64,575	37,972	20,411	20,411	14,637
Door	88,642	94,146	70,000	5,200	3,729
Forest/Oneida/Vilas	515,000	194,257	346,000	346,000	248,127
Iron	15,552	5,949	8,162	6,531	4,684
Juneau	75,000	64,097	7,000	7,000	5,020
Kewaunee	102,964	47,401	53,548	53,548	38,401
Lincoln/Langlade/Marathon	533,400	352,031	239,300	239,300	171,609
Marinette	187,222	177,033	68,087	68,087	48,827
Marquette	59,588	39,312	25,308	25,308	18,149
Menominee	14,058	11,758	5,270	5,270	3,779
Milwaukee	659,422	561,317	89,898	89,898	64,469
Monroe	65,117	70,904	15,189	15,189	10,893
Pierce	198,245	49,886	143,890	143,890	103,188
Portage	191,020	117,320	160,047	160,047	114,775
Price	48,771	25,365	19,112	19,112	13,706
Rock	449,798	345,887	80,904	80,904	58,019
Washington	263,237	223,791	25,286	25,286	18,133
Wood	<u>95,000</u>	<u>66,739</u>	<u>19,973</u>	<u>19,973</u>	<u>14,323</u>
Total	\$3,745,001	\$2,537,134	\$1,466,390	\$1,394,445	\$1,000,000

*This column represents the difference between the county's request and its third-party collections.

**Awards are prorated to reflect that \$1 million is budgeted annually for this purpose.