



# The Hamilton Consulting Group, LLC

Experience | Insight | Expertise

## ***BADGER STATE SHERIFFS' ASSOCIATION WISCONSIN SHERIFFS AND DEPUTY SHERIFFS ASSOCIATION 2017-18 END OF SESSION UPDATE***

*Prepared by Caty McDermott, R.J. Pirlot & Paige Scobee  
The Hamilton Consulting Group, LLC  
Updated April 4, 2018*

### **OVERVIEW**

The 2017-18 legislative session began on Jan. 3, 2017. From February until September, the legislature's focus was centered around passing the 2017-19 state budget. After a compromise between the Senate and Assembly on transportation, Gov. Scott Walker signed the budget in mid-September, over two months late. Around the same time, the legislature also passed a \$3 billion incentive package to bring the Taiwanese technology company Foxconn to southeastern Wisconsin.

With the budget and Foxconn complete, the legislature continued to hold committee hearings and floor votes through the fall. 2018 began with the governor outlining several major reforms in health care and criminal justice in his annual State of the State address. The Senate held what is expected to be their last floor date on March 20. The Assembly was on the floor on Thursday March 22 for an extraordinary session – taking up several big initiatives, including juvenile justice reform, the child tax credit/sales tax holiday bill and school safety legislation. Both houses are expected to be done for the session, however the Majority leader of the Senate has indicated the Senate could reconvene only to take up tax benefits for Kimberly Clark.

After adjournment, absent exceptional circumstances, the legislature will not reconvene until January 2019. In the meantime, legislators will shift their attention to 2018 elections and preparing legislation and budget items for the upcoming 2019-20 session.

For a full report on all the legislation BSSA/WS&DSA tracked this session, visit:  
<http://www.hamilton-consulting.com/bssa-wsdsa-tracking-report/>

## 2017-18 BSSA/WS&DSA LEGISLATIVE PRIORITIES

### 1. **Protective Status for County Jailers** ([Senate Bill 577/Assembly Bill 676](#))

**Position: Support**

**Status: Dead**

Rep. Mark Born (R-Beaver Dam) and Sen. Howard Marklein (R-Spring Green) introduced legislation in November to classify county jailers, detention officers, and correctional officers to be eligible as protective occupation participants under the Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) without a requirement that their principal duties involve active law enforcement or active fire suppression or prevention. While the bill unanimously passed the Assembly, the Senate bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Government Operations, Technology and Consumer Protection where committee chairman Sen. Dues Stroebe (R-Saukville) refused to hold a public hearing on the bill, thereby killing the bill for the session.

BSSA/WS&DSA will work with the authors to introduce this legislation in the 2019-20 session.

### 2. **Benefits to Survivors of Those Killed in the Line of Duty** ([Senate Bill 97/Assembly Bill 150](#))

**Position: Support**

**Status: Dead**

One of BSSA/WS&DSA's priorities this session was extending benefits to the families of those killed in the line of duty to all law enforcement. The bill received a public hearing and was voted out of the Senate Committee on Insurance, Financial Services, Constitution and Federalism with an amendment that removed firefighters from the bill, lowered the age for dependents to covered from 26 to 22, and eliminated the retroactivity of the bill, so the health benefits would only apply prospectively. However, the bill did not make the final Senate calendar and, due to longstanding concerns from Assembly Speaker Robin Vos (R-Rochester), there was no movement in the Assembly.

### 3. **Asset Forfeiture** ([Senate Bill 61/Assembly Bill 122](#))

**Position: Neutral (with adoption of Senate Substitute Amendment 2 and Senate Amendment 1 to Substitute Amendment 2)**

**Status: Signed Into Law as [2017 Wisconsin Act 211](#)**

One major issue BSSA/WS&DSA was engaged in all session was civil asset forfeiture process reforms. BSSA/WS&DSA opposed the original bill but worked with the authors and other legislators to amend the bill drastically. The amendments mitigated negative impacts on law enforcement and allowed BSSA/WS&DSA to move to neutral on the bill. Below is a summary of the amendments. The Senate passed the bill on Feb. 20. The Assembly concurred in the bill on Feb. 23. The governor signed the bill into law on April 3.

Major Issues in Original Bill (SB 61)	Status of Issues in Substitute Amendment 2 ("Sub") to SB 61	Senate Amendment 1 to Sub 2
<p><b>Conviction Requirement</b>            The original bill prohibits an item from being subject to forfeiture unless a person is convicted of a criminal offense that was the basis of the forfeiture. A court may waive the conviction requirement, upon a motion from the prosecuting attorney, if the prosecuting attorney shows by clear and convincing evidence that one of the following exceptions applies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The defendant has died.</li> <li>2. The defendant was deported by the U.S. government.</li> <li>3. The defendant has been granted immunity in exchange for testifying or otherwise assisting law enforcement investigation or prosecution.</li> <li>4. The defendant fled the jurisdiction after being arrested, charged with a crime that includes the forfeiture of property, and released on bail.</li> </ol>	<p><b>Conviction Requirement</b>            ✓The sub adds to exception requirements included in the original bill. In addition to the four exceptions listed, the court may waive the conviction requirement if (5) the property has been unclaimed for a period of at least nine months; or (6) The property is contraband that is subject to forfeiture.</p> <p>The sub also clarifies exception (4) above to simply be "the defendant has fled."</p>	
<p><b>Limitations on federal asset program participation</b>            The original bill prohibited state and local participation in the federal asset forfeiture program unless one of the following situations applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The seized property is more than \$50K.</li> <li>• The property may be forfeited only under federal law.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Limitations on federal asset program participation</b>            ✓The limitations in the original bill were deleted. The sub generally does <i>not</i> limit a state or local law enforcement to enter an agreement or transfer property as part of the federal asset forfeiture program. The sub does require state or local law enforcement to complete and submit an itemized report to the Department of Administration (DOA).</p> <p>The sub also requires a state or local law enforcement may accept proceeds only if there is a state or federal criminal conviction for the crime that was the basis for the seizure. In addition, the exceptions included under the state asset forfeiture program apply to the federal conviction requirement.</p>	

Major Issues in Original Bill (SB 61)	Status of Issues in Substitute Amendment 2 ("Sub") to SB 61	Senate Amendment 1 to Sub 2
<p><b>Percent of Proceeds to the School Fund</b>            Vehicles: The original bill eliminated use of forfeited vehicles for official use.</p> <p>Proceeds from property: 100 percent of proceeds from the sale of forfeitures are deposited in the school fund. (Current law requires 50 percent of proceeds to be deposited into the school fund).</p>	<p><b>Percent of Proceeds to the School Fund</b>            ✓ Vehicles: the sub allows law enforcement to retain a vehicle for one year, then, after one year, 30 percent of the value of the vehicle, as determined by state Department of Revenue, would need to be deposited into the school fund if the vehicle is retained longer. If the vehicle is sold after one year (or sooner), then 50 percent of the proceeds would be deposited into the school fund.</p> <p>✓ Proceeds from property: The sub allows for law enforcement to retain a portion, not to exceed 50 percent for administrative expenses defined in current law. However, law enforcement must produce an itemized report of actual forfeiture expenses and submit to DOA.</p>	
<p><b>Legal Representation Paid by Proceeds</b>            The original bill modifies the timeline for the person to have his or her property returned and provides that the court must order that the property be returned if certain conditions apply.</p> <p>One of those conditions allows for the return of the property if it is the only reasonable way for the defendant to pay for legal representation in the forfeiture or criminal proceeding, as long the property isn't needed to be held for other investigatory reasons. This provision provides for accounting to ensure only the funds or property is returned to allow for legal representation.</p>	<p><b>Legal Representation Paid by Proceeds</b>            The sub amends this provision by adding to the conditions so that the property can be used for legal representation only if the property is not likely needed for victim compensation or as evidence or for other investigatory reasons.</p> <p>Current law provides that if the right to possession is provided to the court's satisfaction, the property can be ordered to be returned, except for contraband or property covered under 968.20(1m) or (1r) (conditions for firearms to be returned), 173.21(4) (animals), or 968.205 (preservation of biological material).</p> <p>The sub also adds the condition that the property is not <i>reasonably</i> needed as evidence or for other investigatory reasons.</p>	

Major Issues in Original Bill (SB 61)	Status of Issues in Substitute Amendment 2 ("Sub") to SB 61	Senate Amendment 1 to Sub 2
<p><b>Attorney Fees</b>            The original bill allows that a person who prevails in an action to return property subject to forfeiture to be awarded reasonable attorney fees.</p>	<p><b>Attorney Fees</b>            The sub retains the attorney fees provisions.</p>	<p><b>Attorney Fees</b>            The proposed amendment allows for attorney fees to be awarded "if the court finds that the forfeiting agency or prosecuting attorney has <u>arbitrarily and capriciously</u> pursued a forfeiture action."</p>

**4. WRS Changes ([Senate Bill 190/Assembly Bill 324](#))**

**Position: Oppose**

**Status: Dead**

One piece of legislation that BSSA/WS&DSA opposed this session was legislation to make changes to the WRS formula and increases the retirement age for protective occupation participants to 52 (60 for general participants). Authored by Sen. Stroebel and Rep. Tyler August (R-Lake Geneva), the legislation had no movement in either house.

**5. Collector Car Plate ([Senate Bill 458/Assembly Bill 554](#))**

**Position: Oppose**

**Status: Dead**

Sen. Terry Moulton (R- Chippewa Falls) and Rep. Bob Kulp (R-Stratford) introduced legislation that would exempt the front license plate requirement for "collector cars." Due to opposition from BSSA/WS&DSA and other law enforcement groups, the bill did not advance this session.

The original bill included two exceptions to the front license plate requirement: (1) if the vehicle was originally manufactured without a bracket or other means for displaying a registration plate on the front of the vehicle; or (2) if the vehicle will display collector's special interest vehicle registration plates. In January, Rep. Kulp offered an amendment to the legislation that would modify the bill to allow for the front plate exception to apply if: (1)

the vehicle will display personalized registration plates; or (2) the vehicle will display collector's special interest vehicle registration plates.

### **Other Legislation of Interest**

#### **1. Sanctuary Cities ([Senate Bill 275/Assembly Bill 190](#))**

**Position: Other**

**Status: Dead**

Sen. Steve Nass (R-Whitewater) and Rep. Spiros introduced legislation again this session to prohibit a political subdivision, defined as a city, village, town, or county, from enacting an ordinance, adopting a resolution, or establishing a policy that prohibits the enforcement of a federal or state law relating to illegal aliens or ascertaining whether an individual has a satisfactory immigration status. The bill also requires a political subdivision to comply with any lawful detainer issued by Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE). The bill did not pass out of either house this session but did receive a public hearing and was voted out of the Senate Committee on Labor and Regulatory Reform.

BSSA/WS&DSA provided written testimony at the Senate hearing for information only regarding the inability of sheriffs to lawfully hold someone beyond what is allowed relating to their state charges and for the additional 48 hours under the bill for ICE to take physical custody of the person, without violating the person's constitutional rights. In addition to providing testimony, BSSA/WS&DSA discussed possible amendments to the bill with the Department of Justice (DOJ) and Rep. Spiros to address this concern. Rep. Spiros has stated that he preferred the issues be resolved on a federal level; however, he agreed to consider possible amendments if the bill is introduced next session.

#### **2. Revocation Recommendation ([Senate Bill 54/Assembly Bill 94](#))**

**Position: Support (with adoption of Assembly Substitute Amendment 2)**

**Status: Dead**

Introduced last February by Sen. Leah Vukmir (R-Brookfield) and Rep. Joe Sanfelippo (R-New Berlin), SB 54/AB 94 requires the Department of Corrections (DOC) to recommend revoking a person's extended supervision, parole, or probation if the person is charged with a crime while on extended supervision, parole, or probation. The bill underwent a series of amendments in both the Senate and Assembly, but ultimately the Senate did not concur in the Assembly's changes. Originally, BSSA/WS&DSA had concerns with the bill due to the fiscal concerns, however BSSA/WS&DSA worked with the authors to limit the automatic revocation if there is a crime to only felonies and violent misdemeanors. The Senate passed the bill with this amendment in November.

After it seemed unlikely the bill would move in the Assembly, in February 2018, the Assembly passed the bill with several significant amendments. The automatic revocation requirement was modified so that if the person is charged with a felony or violent misdemeanor, DOC shall recommend that the person's extended supervision/parole/probation be revoked, except that DOC may make a different recommendation if the person is participating in a substance abuse program. DOC can revise its recommendation to revoke if the charges are subsequently dismissed or if the person is found not guilty of the

crime. The amendment also requires the Legislative Fiscal Bureau to report back by Jan 2020 on the costs associated with the revocation requirements described above, authorizes \$350 million for general fund supported borrowing for a new adult prison and adds 53.75 district attorney positions.

With the addition of the district attorney positions, BSSA/WS&DSA changed positions to support the bill. The Senate failed to take up the legislation after the Assembly made the additional amendments, and the bill ultimately died this session.

**3. 911 Dispatcher CPR Training ([Senate Bill 549/Assembly Bill 654](#))**

**Position: Neutral (with the adoption of Amendment 1 and 2)**

**Status: Awaiting Governor's Signature**

Since the beginning of the 2017-18 session, BSSA/WS&DSA was involved in a bill to require every public safety answering point (PSAP) to have their 911 dispatchers trained to provide, using an evidence-based protocol, CPR instructions over the phone. The bill also provides an option for the calls to be transferred to a PSAP or another center for CPR to be administered over the phone. The bill ultimately passed the legislature after BSSA/WS&DSA worked with the authors to include several important amendments.

The bill provides \$250,000 for a grant program and allows the Department of Military Affairs (DMA) to return to the Joint Committee on Finance with a supplemental request this biennium. The bill also directs DMA to include a request/line item in its next biennial budget for this training program and includes a two-year delayed implementation. Originally, BSSA/WS&DSA testified in opposition due to the fiscal and logistical concerns with meeting the training requirements included in the original bill.

Working with the authors and the American Heart Association, BSSA/WS&DSA successfully amended the bill to include liability language to protect dispatchers and PSAPs. The amendment also moves the administration of the grant program from DMA to the Department of Health Services (DHS). Following a vote in the Assembly Committee on Criminal Justice and Public Safety, BSSA/WS&DSA requested an additional amendment for more training support from the state. The authors introduced another amendment to provide DHS more flexibility so that the department could contract out for training to PSAPs. With the addition of this amendment, BSSA/WS&DSA moved to a neutral position on the bill.

Before the bill advanced further, the Joint Finance Committee adopted a third amendment to delay the date of the bill by another year. The Assembly passed the bill as adopted on Feb. 20 and the Senate concurred in the legislation on March 21. The bill is available for the governor's signature.

**4. Online Sheriff Sales ([Senate Bill 621/Assembly Bill 690](#) and [Senate Bill 622/Assembly Bill 691](#))**

**Position: Support**

**Status: AB 690 – Signed Into Law as [2017 Wisconsin Act 208](#); AB 691 – Awaiting Governor's Signature**

Introduced by Sen. Luther Olsen (R-Ripon), Rep. Evan Goyke (D-Milwaukee), and Rep. Terry Katsma (R-Oostburg), AB 690 and AB 691 allow for online sheriff sales. BSSA/WS&DSA provided feedback on the legislation and supported both bills throughout the legislative process. The first bill (SB 621/AB 690) specifies the procedures for online sheriff sales and requires a county to enact an ordinance to allow for online sheriff sales. The other bill (SB 622/AB 691) includes the bidder requirements, including the requirement that the purchaser must file an affidavit with the clerk of courts that they are not delinquent on any property taxes and do not have outstanding building code violations. AB 690 was signed in to law on April 4 as 2017 Wisconsin Act 208 and AB 691 is available for the governor's signature.

**5. Law Enforcement Standards Board ([Senate Bill 403/Assembly Bill 506](#))**  
**Position: Support**  
**Status: Dead**

Introduced by Rep. Jim Ott (R-Mequon) and Sen. Patrick Testin (R-Stevens Point) SB 403/AB 506 would update practices of the Law Enforcement Standards Board and streamline hiring practices for law enforcement. Prior to introduction, BSSA/WS&DSA worked with DOJ on the bill draft. Despite passing the Assembly on Jan. 16, the bill failed to get scheduled in the Senate. BSSA/WS&DSA will work with the authors and DOJ to introduce the bill again next session.

**6. Body Cameras on Law Enforcement Officers ([Senate Bill 279/Assembly Bill 351](#))**  
**Position: Support**  
**Status: Dead**

Rep. Jesse Kremer (R-Kewaskum) and Sen. Testin introduced legislation to regulate footage obtained by body cameras. The bill requires law enforcement agencies that use body cameras to have a body camera policy in place and sets parameters for those policies. BSSA/WS&DSA provided feedback on early drafts of this legislation and worked closely with the authors on revisions. The bill passed the Assembly in November and passed the Senate Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety; however, due to concerns raised by broadcasters and newspaper associations, the bill was not scheduled for a Senate vote.

**7. Crime Reporting Requirements: [Senate Bill 611/Assembly Bill 724](#)**  
**Position: Other**  
**Status: Dead**

Sen. Craig and Rep. Sanfelippo authored a bill that required DOJ to collect and publish specific information from law enforcement agencies on crimes involving firearms, distribution of marijuana, and vehicle theft. DOJ and law enforcement organizations conveyed concerns with the fiscal impact of this legislation. While the bill did receive a public hearing in the Senate Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety, it did not advance any further in the Senate or Assembly.

**8. PTSD Worker's Compensation for Law Enforcement ([Senate Bill 564/Assembly Bill 434](#))**

**Position: Neutral**

**Status: Dead**

Sen. Wanggaard and Rep. Andre Jacque (R-De Pere) introduced legislation that would create a presumption that a diagnosis of PTSD in a public safety employee comes from the employment for purposes of worker's compensation. BSSA/WS&DSA had some concerns about this presumption being abused inappropriately and stated a desire for the bill to include some type of "check." The bill received a public hearing in the Assembly Committee on Workforce Development and the Senate Committee on Labor and Regulatory Reform and passed out of the Senate committee. However, the bill did not advance to the floor of either house.

To address the concerns from other stakeholders and the Worker's Compensation Advisory Council, Sen. Wanggaard offered a substitute amendment that replaces the original bill. The sub amendment: 1) uses the definition of PTSD from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders by the American Psychiatric Association; (2) sets requirements for a PTSD claim by a law enforcement official or firefighter, including that the PTSD diagnosis is made by a psychiatrist or psychologist and the conditions of liability under current law are proven by clear and convincing medical or psychiatric evidence; (3) requires that the mental injury cannot be a result of or first reported after the following actions by employer: disciplinary action, work evaluation, job transfer, layoff, demotion, or termination; (4) sets the employer's liability for the employee's treatment. While BSSA/WS&DSA remained neutral on the bill even with the amendment, the groups plan to discuss the issue further before the 2019-20 legislative session.

**9. Emergency Detention ([Senate Bill 681/Assembly Bill 815](#))**

**Position: Support**

**Status: Dead**

During session, Sen. Jon Erpenbach (D-Middleton) and Rep. Spiros introduced legislation regarding emergency detention. This bill requires DHS to allow law enforcement to transport individuals in emergency detention to the most convenient mental health facility (Mendota or Winnebago). The bill also requires DHS to work with hospitals on a grant program for regional mental health crisis centers in the next budget. BSSA/WS&DSA supported the bill; however, due concerns from DHS, the bill did not advance through either house this session. BSSA/WS&DSA plan to discuss this issue with other stakeholders before next session.

**10. Law Enforcement and Public Safety Related to Opioids ([Senate Bill 768 / Assembly Bill 906](#))**

**Position: Support**

**Status: Awaiting Governor's Signature**

This session, Rep. John Nygren (R-Marinette) introduced legislation based on recommendations from the Governor's Task Force on Opioid Abuse. The bill provides \$1.5 million GPR (\$750,000 in each year of the biennium) for nonnarcotic drug treatment grants and \$1 million GPR (only in the second year of the biennium) for law enforcement drug

trafficking response grants. The legislation passed unanimously in the legislature and now awaits the governor's signature. BSSA/WS&DSA registered in support for this legislation.

**11. County Executive Powers ([Senate Bill 777/Assembly Bill 923](#))**

**Position: Neutral (with the adoption of Senate/Assembly Substitute Amendment 1)**

**Status: Dead**

Late in the session, Sen. Wanggaard and Rep. Dale Kooyenga (R-Brookfield) introduced a bill to make changes to the powers of the county executive in any county of 750,000 and make other changes that apply to all counties. The original bill included language that was of concern to BSSA/WS&DSA and required an ordinance to set a sheriff's salary. The bill also includes a process that the county executive/administrator can utilize to appoint an outside commission to recommend compensation for elected county officials.

Working with the group pushing this bill and the authors, BSSA/WS&DSA requested the provisions of concern be removed from the bill. The authors introduced a substitute amendment that removed the provisions of concern; however, the bill did not advance.

**12. Juvenile Justice Reform ([Senate Bill 807/Assembly Bill 953](#))**

**Position: Neutral**

**Status: Signed Into Law as [2017 Wisconsin Act 185](#)**

In the final months of session and at the request of the governor, legislators introduced legislation for broad juvenile justice reform. The bill passed the Assembly in February. Initially, the Senate Committee on Judiciary and Public Safety passed a pared down version of the bill; however, the Senate ultimately took up a similar version to what the Assembly passed. The Assembly concurred in Senate Substitute Amendment 1 on March 23, the last floor date of the session.

The bill closes Lincoln Hills and Copper Lake Schools by Jan.1, 2021, requires the Department of Corrections to establish new Type 1 juvenile correctional facilities, and includes \$25 million in bonding, with approval of the Joint Committee on Finance. The bill also authorizes counties to establish Secured Residential Care Centers for Children and Youth. The bill establishes a Juvenile Corrections Study Committee to make recommendations on the establishment of the new juvenile corrections structure.

BSSA/WS&DSA supported the bill and successfully amended to the bill so that one member of the Juvenile Corrections Study Committee is a sheriff, as appointed by the governor. This is in addition to two other representatives from law enforcement organizations.

**13. Sexually Violent Persons ([Senate Bill 446/Assembly Bill 539](#))**

**Position: Neutral**

**Status: Signed Into Law with a Partial Veto as [2017 Wisconsin Act 184](#)**

After provisions were vetoed by the governor from the budget, Sen. Testin and Rep. Scott Krug (R-Nekoosa) introduced legislation to require the placement of sexual violent persons (SVP) back to the county of origin. The bill requires the county of origin of the SVP to create

a temporary committee to prepare a report that would identify an appropriate residential option within the home county of the offender. The governor signed the bill into law on March 28 but vetoed a key provision in the bill to eliminate current law provisions regarding the distances SVP can be placed relative to several locations, including child care centers, schools, parks, places of worship, and youth centers. While individual members of BSSA/WS&DSA supported the bill, BSSA/WS&DSA remained neutral on the legislation.

**14. Firearm Purchases ([Senate Bill 408/Assembly Bill 524](#))**

**Position: Support**

**Status: Signed into law as [2017 Wisconsin Act 145](#)**

Introduced by Sen. Alberta Darling (R-River Hills) and Rep. Sanfelippo, this bill creates penalties for “straw purchasing,” or purchasing a firearm with intent to transfer it to a person who is prohibited from using a firearm. The bill also creates a mandatory minimum sentence for individuals with firearm convictions who have previously committed crimes.

BSSA/WS&DSA supported the bill. The governor signed the bill into law on March 28.

## **2017-2019 BIENNIAL BUDGET BILL**

Gov. Scott Walker signed the budget bill into law on Sept. 21 as 2017 Wisconsin Act 59, nearly two months after the end of the fiscal year.

### **BSSA/WS&DSA Budget Priority: 911 Funding**

A top budget priority this session was funding to establish a statewide Emergency Services IP Network (ESInet) to support Next Generation 911. BSSA/WS&DSA worked with a coalition of other organizations, including the Wisconsin Counties Association to raise awareness of the need for modernization of 911 in Wisconsin.

The budget includes almost \$7 million in Next Generation 911 in the second year of the biennium. The budget also establishes a 19-member 911 subcommittee attached to DMA to oversee the implementation of a Next Generation emergency services IP network and issues related to PSAPs.

### **DOJ's Budget**

Another area of the budget BSSA/WS&DSA closely tracked was DOJ's budget. The budget included a provision requiring the attorney general to submit a proposed plan for how discretionary settlement funds will be spent to the Joint Committee on Finance for their review before any funds are expended. The attorney general receives discretionary settlement revenues as a result of certain litigation, and the funds are typically utilized at the discretion of the attorney general. This year, the attorney general received \$11.4 million in discretionary settlement funds from the Volkswagen settlement; however, other funds from other settlements can be included in the discretionary account.

In addition to the proposed plan, the budget included \$250,000 annually to fund the Treatment Alternatives and Diversion programs and \$2 million over the biennium for grants to cities to reimburse police overtime costs. Both programs are funded by DOJ discretionary funds.

The budget also provided \$1.1 million dollars over the biennium, also from the DOJ discretionary funds to support overtime costs in the agency's criminal investigation unit.