



**City
of
Milwaukee**

*INTERDEPARTMENTAL CORRESPONDENCE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU*

M E M O

To: Ald. Michael Murphy
From: Barry Zalben, Manager, Legislative Reference Bureau
Date: December 7, 2000
Re: Estimated first-year savings of a 15-member Common Council.

The following estimates have been prepared in response to your inquiry regarding the fiscal impact of decreasing membership of the Common Council from 17 to 15. These estimates are for first-year savings only, commencing in 2004; savings for future years would probably be greater, based on inflationary adjustments for certain items, such as salaries.

Estimated First-Year Savings

A. Personnel Costs

1. Alderman

Salary:	\$68,849
Fringes:	\$22,720
Total	\$91,569 X 2 = \$183,138

2. Legislative Assistant

Salary:	\$35,525
Fringes:	\$11,273
Total	\$47,248 X 2 = \$94,496

Subtotal, personnel savings - \$277,634

B. Nonpersonnel costs		
1. Private transportation allowance	-	\$ 3,916
2. Private telephone allowance	-	\$ 180
3. Cellular phone service	-	\$ 552
4. Supplies	-	\$ 828
5. Services	-	\$34,500

Subtotal, nonpersonnel savings \$39,976 X 2 = \$79,952

Grand Total, First-year savings - \$357,586

Assumptions

1. Common Council members' salaries for the 2000-2004 term are based on the fifth step of pay grade 10 for the year 2000, and will increase by one step (3.1%) annually until the end of the term. Then, to reset the members on a step for the beginning of the 2004-2008 term, Council members' salaries will be reset on the sixth step of pay grade 10 for the year 2004. Pay for year 2004 is based on pay increases granted to management employes; see note #3.

2. Legislative assistant salaries are based on the first step of pay grade 2 as estimated for 2004; see note #3.

3. 2001, 2002, 2003 and 2004 "across the board" increases for management employes are fixed at 2.75% each year.

4. Fringe benefit costs are 33% of salary.

5. Private transportation and private telephone allowances, which are provided to Council members per the Milwaukee Code, are estimated to increase 2.5% annually between 2000 and 2004.

6. Service and supply costs are estimate to increase by 2.5% annually between 2000 and 2004. Service and supply costs are based on costs developed initially for a 1991 memo and subsequently updated in 1998 and 2000.

murphymmo.cc15
BJZ/dw
12/7/00

February 28, 2001

LRB FISCAL REVIEW SECTION MEMORANDUM

TO: Ald. Michael J. Murphy

FROM: Richard Pfaff, Graduate Intern

RE: Municipal Comparison of Constituents per District-Elected Council Members

You had requested that the Legislative Reference Bureau provide information relating to the municipal comparison of the constituents per district-elected council member ratio. Below is a table in which the information is presented.

City	1990 Census Population	Council Members	Constituents Per Member
Los Angeles, CA	3,485,557	15	232,370
Portland, OR	463,634	4	115,909
San Jose, CA	782,224	10	78,222
San Francisco, CA	723,959	11	65,814
Las Vegas, NV	258,204	4	64,551
Chicago, IL	2,783,726	50	55,675
Oklahoma City, OK	444,724	8	55,591
Omaha, NE	342,862	7	48,980
Long Beach, CA	429,321	9	47,702
Albuquerque, N.M.	384,915	9	42,768
Honolulu, HI	377,059	9	41,895
Sacramento, CA	369,365	8	46,171
Milwaukee, WI	628,088	17	36,946
Minneapolis, MN	368,383	13	28,337
Cleveland, OH	505,616	21	24,077

Of the 50 highest populated municipalities, the 15 cities included in the analysis were selected based on the fact that they had a district-elected council membership. Those cities excluded were municipal governments whose council memberships were either elected at large, were a combination of district-elected and at-large-elected members, or included the mayor in the council membership.

TABLE 3 1

POPULATION STATISTICS

YEAR	CITY POPULATION	NUMBER OF DISTRICTS	RESIDENTS PER DISTRICT
1970	717,099	16	44,818
1980	636,295	16	39,768
1990	628,088	17	36,946
2000	600,000 (estimated)	17	35,294
2000	600,000 (estimated)	15	40,000

(Note: A 2000 population of less than 600,000 would decrease the number of residents per district.)

**POPULATION BY ALDERMANIC DISTRICT
UNDER PROPOSED 15-DISTRICT PLAN**

Aldermanic District	Total Population	Pop. 18+	White		White-18+		Black		Black-18+		Hispanic		Hispanic-18+	
			number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent	number	percent
1	39,369	27,516	10,128	25.7%	8,771	31.9%	27,167	69.0%	17,482	63.5%	1,029	2.6%	599	2.2%
2	39,440	26,015	6,373	16.2%	5,446	20.9%	30,551	77.5%	19,209	73.8%	823	2.1%	475	1.8%
3	39,352	37,022	33,449	85.0%	31,725	85.7%	2,421	6.2%	2,184	5.9%	1,231	3.1%	1,049	2.8%
4	40,097	32,274	27,437	68.4%	23,714	73.5%	3,266	8.1%	2,604	8.1%	7,154	17.8%	4,295	13.3%
5	39,382	29,612	27,092	68.8%	22,295	75.3%	9,401	23.9%	5,608	18.9%	1,215	3.1%	705	2.4%
6	39,939	23,087	2,720	6.8%	2,468	10.7%	32,123	80.4%	17,989	77.9%	1,442	3.6%	842	3.6%
7	39,530	24,596	6,033	15.3%	4,992	20.3%	31,385	79.4%	18,445	75.0%	959	2.4%	530	2.2%
8	40,020	29,580	22,581	56.4%	18,729	63.3%	10,795	27.0%	6,826	23.1%	3,819	9.5%	2,350	7.9%
9	39,591	24,870	9,846	24.9%	8,196	33.0%	26,289	66.4%	14,934	60.0%	1,131	2.9%	621	2.5%
10	39,772	26,268	7,359	18.5%	6,506	24.8%	28,133	70.7%	17,075	65.0%	3,308	8.3%	2,042	7.8%
11	40,265	27,899	20,224	50.2%	16,314	58.5%	1,618	4.0%	799	2.9%	15,004	37.3%	8,786	31.5%
12	40,463	26,081	7,924	19.6%	6,556	25.1%	3,012	7.4%	1,450	5.6%	27,330	67.5%	16,817	64.5%
13	40,078	32,340	35,551	88.7%	29,489	91.2%	802	2.0%	447	1.4%	2,426	6.1%	1,516	4.7%
14	40,285	31,743	34,839	86.5%	28,401	89.5%	473	1.2%	249	0.8%	3,306	8.2%	1,994	6.3%
15	39,391	27,087	19,433	49.3%	15,894	58.7%	16,614	42.2%	9,262	34.2%	1,469	3.7%	852	3.1%
City Total	596,974	425,990	270,989	45.4%	229,496	53.9%	224,050	37.5%	134,563	31.6%	71,646	12.0%	43,473	10.2%

Plan-E
05/15/01