



Tom Barrett
Mayor, City of Milwaukee

November 19, 2004

To the Honorable
Common Council of the
City of Milwaukee

Honorable Members of the Common Council:

The 2005 Budget for the City of Milwaukee presented several novel circumstances. The process included direction from three different mayoral administrations. There were significant changes in department directors and a Common Council with six new members took office. In addition to these institutional dynamics, several factors combined made the development of the Proposed 2005 Executive Budget very challenging.

First and foremost, the State's Shared Revenue policy contributed to a structural imbalance between ongoing expenses and revenues of almost \$30 million. Second, despite the City's excellent record at controlling spending, expectations for property tax control continue. Finally, my discussions with the public and the Common Council revealed significant concern regarding the potential impact of major service reductions on Milwaukee's quality of life.

Upon taking office in April, I determined that my first Budget should accomplish the following three objectives:

Hold to my promise of a 2005 tax levy that was consistent with the legislature's "freeze" proposal, while avoiding increases to major user charges;

Prioritize City services that have the most positive impact on public safety and neighborhood quality;

Allow for future decisions regarding revenues and expenditures to be made within a context of responsible fiscal planning.

The 2005 Proposed Budget accomplished these objectives. My Budget also sends a strong message to the Governor and State Legislature that Milwaukee spends responsibly and that State Shared Revenue translates into property tax relief.

We can't underestimate the importance of a strong message regarding our ability to control spending and property taxes. Our audience includes not only the Governor and the legislature, but the public as well. In general, I was impressed with the Council's review of the Proposed Budget. I am grateful to Ald. Michael Murphy and the other members of the Finance and Personnel Committee, who conducted the Committee's deliberations with insight and courtesy.

Ultimately however, the Council's budget decisions added approximately \$1.7 million to the tax levy-supported portion of the Proposed Budget. In addition, the Council utilized approximately \$650,000 of non-property tax revenues and more than \$500,000 of additional reserves above what I had proposed.

Notwithstanding the impact of additional revenues and reserve use, the adopted tax levy remains about \$743,000 above the levy freeze that I had proposed. I continue to believe that holding the 2005 City Budget to my proposed levy is of great strategic importance to the City in its dealings with State government.

The Council's amendments affect services that are indeed of value to the City. I am concerned, however, that the additional spending challenges our goal of achieving a sustainable balance between revenues and expenditures.

My primary objective in exercising my veto authority is to return the Budget to the tax levy freeze that I proposed. The vetoes and substitute amendments that I am recommending result in a 2005 tax levy of \$202,991,343 and maintain support for the service priorities that the Common Council and I share.

I respect the choices that the Common Council made on November 12. The vetoes that I am proposing reflect a spirit of cooperation and my belief in the value of moving forward with a sustainable financial plan. I ask for your support in sustaining these vetoes, and where appropriate, I recommend that you adopt the related substitute actions.

Veto of Items Contained in Common Council Amendment # 3a

To create funding for two Assistant City Attorney positions to serve as Community Prosecutors. One position will be assigned to the North side and one to the South Side.

I am vetoing Common Council Amendment # 3a.

This amendment provides full-year funding for two new positions in the City Attorney's office for community prosecution activities. The entire amount of funding provided is not needed to implement this program in 2005.

The City Attorney's office has indicated that operating procedures need to be established for the program and that the recruitment and hiring process requires between six to ten weeks. It is likely that the recruitment process won't begin until early in 2005.

Therefore, funding for these positions is not needed for pay periods 1-4. Removing funding for the first four pay periods results in a \$20,148 reduction to the 2005 Budget, helping us meet my tax levy target without compromising the amendment's program objectives. I have proposed a substitute amendment, which provides for position authority for two Assistant City Attorneys, funded for the remaining pay periods that occur during 2005.

Based on the above reasons, I ask that you sustain my veto and adopt my proposed substitute amendment.

Veto of Items Contained in Common Council Amendment # 45

To provide salary funding and FTE's to move the start of the proposed Police Officer recruitment to the third week of August, 2005

I am vetoing Common Council Amendment # 45.

This amendment increases the Milwaukee Police Department's net salary budget by \$629,202 in order to accelerate the initiation of the 2005 Police Officer recruitment class from pay period 25, as proposed, to pay period 18.

My Proposed Budget clearly prioritized Police services. This is exemplified in the significant increase in funding that was allocated to the Police Department's requested Budget. In May, the Police Department submitted a Budget that totaled \$166,833,408. The final 2005 Proposed Budget includes \$185,962,917. This represents an increase of \$19,129,509 or 11.5 % more funding than the Police Department's original requested Budget.

In addition, I dedicated an increased share of the Budget to police services—more than 23% of the proposed Budget supported by the tax levy. The department's budget is equivalent to almost 92% of the proposed tax levy. This compares to the 2003 tax levy-supported Budget proportion of 21.4% and the 2003 total levy equivalent of 85.7%.

Under the leadership of Police Chief Nannette Hegerty, the department has assigned thirty-two officers from administrative duties to patrol during 2004, and the Chief has made several other productivity-enhancing organizational changes. For example, the Chief's decision to have police provide verified burglar alarm response is expected to allow the reallocation of police time valued at an estimated \$1.2 million. In addition, the creation of a civilian Public Relations position in 2005 allows for the reassignment of supervisory personnel.

I also provided funding in the 2005 Budget for court management software which when implemented has the potential to reduce significantly the amount of overtime that Police Officers spend in Court. Reductions in Court time will allow the Chief to reallocate officers to crime fighting. For example, in 2003 officers spent more than 77,000 hours in Court on paid overtime. That's the equivalent of almost 47 officers, or 70 on a "straight time" basis.

I share the Council's interest in providing as many resources as possible for public safety. Unfortunately, the funding required to implement this change is a major factor in the adopted budget being above the tax levy target that I believe is essential. Based on the above reasons, I ask that you sustain my veto and adopt my proposed substitute amendment.

Veto of Items Contained in Common Council Amendment # 46a

To create a \$95,000 Special Purpose Account to fund Milwaukee Alliance Community Prosecution activities in the second police district.

Common Council Amendment # 46a creates a \$95,000 Special Purpose Account to fund Milwaukee Alliance Community Prosecution activities in the second police district.

The amendment proposes funding for Milwaukee County District Attorney efforts. In general, I believe it is inappropriate to use tax levy-supported funding to support positions that are another government's funding responsibility. The amendment is also problematic in that it provides tax levy support on behalf of a specific organization, in the absence of any competitive process.

Based on these reasons, I ask that you sustain my veto.

In closing, I would like to reiterate my appreciation of all your hard work during the 2005 budget process, and I ask that you sustain all of my vetoes.

Sincerely,



Tom Barrett
Mayor

CITY ATTORNEY
AMENDMENT #3A

A. DISAPPROVAL ACTION

The Mayor disapproved of the following budget line(s) in the 2005 Budget: (which were affected by Common Council Amendment #3A which added position authority, funding, and FTE's to create 2 assistant city attorney positions to serve as community prosecutors, one for the north side and one for the south side).

BMD-2 Page and <u>Line No.</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	2005 Positions <u>or Units</u>	<u>2005 Amount</u>
SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES			
CITY ATTORNEY			
130.1-12	Asst. City Attorney (A)(Y)	30	\$2,630,130
130.2-25	O&M FTE'S	57.9	--
130.3-9	ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS	--	\$1,522,101
380.1-3	FRINGE BENEFIT OFFSET	--	\$-95,244,012

In lieu of the above disapproved item, the Mayor recommends adoption of the following substitute action: (to provide funding for two assistant city attorneys to serve as community prosecutors, one on the north side and one on the south side, for 23 of 27 pay periods in 2005. This is intended to allow 2 months in the 2005 fiscal year for recruitment for these positions.)

B. SUBSTITUTE ACTION

BMD-2 Page and <u>Line No.</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	2005 Positions <u>or Units</u>	<u>2005 Amount</u>
SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES			
CITY ATTORNEY			
130.1-12	Asst. City Attorney (A)(Y)	30	\$2,609,982
130.2-25	O&M FTE'S	57.56	--
130.3-9	ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS	--	\$1,514,848
380.1-3	FRINGE BENEFIT OFFSET	--	\$-95,236,759

C. COMBINED EFFECT OF ACTIONS A & B ABOVE:

1. Budget Effect = \$-20,148
2. Levy Effect = \$-20,148
3. Rate Effect = \$-0.001

POLICE DEPARTMENT
AMENDMENT #45

A. DISAPPROVAL ACTION

The Mayor disapproves of the following budget line(s) in the 2005 budget: (whose practical impact was affected by Common Council Amendment #45 which provides salary funding and O&M FTE's to move up the Police Officer Recruit Class so that it starts in August, 2005).

<u>BMD-2</u> <u>Page and</u> <u>Line No.</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>2005 Positions</u> <u>or Units</u>	<u>2005 Amount</u>
SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES			
POLICE DEPARTMENT			
ADMINISTRATION/SERVICES DECISION UNIT			
260.13-5	Other	--	\$1,568,981
260.13-15	O&M FTE'S	665.24	--
260.14-14	ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS	--	\$8,301,909
380.1-3	FRINGE BENEFIT OFFSET	--	\$-95,373,389

In lieu of the above disapproved item, the Mayor recommends adoption of the following substitute action:

B. SUBSTITUTE ACTION

<u>BMD-2</u> <u>Page and</u> <u>Line No.</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>2005 Positions</u> <u>or Units</u>	<u>2005 Amount</u>
SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES			
POLICE DEPARTMENT			
ADMINISTRATION/SERVICES DECISION UNIT			
260.13-5	Other	--	\$939,779
260.13-15	O&M FTE'S	647.47	--
260.14-14	ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS	--	\$8,125,732
380.1-3	FRINGE BENEFIT OFFSET	--	\$-95,197,212

C. COMBINED EFFECT OF ACTIONS A & B ABOVE:

1. Budget Effect	=	\$-629,202
2. Levy Effect	=	\$-629,202
3. Rate Effect	=	\$-0.029

SPECIAL PURPOSE ACCOUNTS
AMENDMENT #46A

A. DISAPPROVAL ACTION

The Mayor disapproves of the following budget line(s) in the 2005 budget: (which were affected by Common Council Amendment #46A which provides funding and creates a Special Purpose Account for Milwaukee Alliance Community Prosecution activities in the second police district).

<u>BMD-2</u> <u>Page and</u> <u>Line No.</u>	<u>Item Description</u>	<u>2005 Positions</u> <u>or Units</u>	<u>2005 Amount</u>
	SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES		
	SPECIAL PURPOSE ACCOUNTS- MISCELLANEOUS		
320.7-16	Milwaukee Alliance for Community Prosecution (O)	--	\$95,000
	(O) Funds to be released upon Common Council approval of contract with Milwaukee Alliance for Community Prosecution		

In lieu of the above disapproved item, the Mayor recommends adoption of the following substitute action:

B. SUBSTITUTE ACTION

NONE

C. COMBINED EFFECT OF ACTIONS A & B ABOVE:

1. Budget Effect	=	\$-95,000
2. Levy Effect	=	\$-95,000
3. Rate Effect	=	\$-0.004



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Master with text

File Number: 041068

File Number: 041068

File Type: Budget Amendment

Status: Passed

Version: 0

Reference:

Controlling Body: COMMON
COUNCIL

File Name:

Introduced: 11/23/2004

Requester: CITY CLERK

Cost:

Final Action: 11/23/2004

Drafter: jro

Effective:

Comments:

Title: Substitute amendment to the 2005 budget relating to line(s) vetoed by the Mayor and contained in Common Council amendment #3a, City Attorney, to create funding for two Assistant City Attorney positions to serve as Community Prosecutors.

Sections:

Indexes: CITY ATTORNEY, BUDGET

Sponsors:

Attachments: Mayor's Veto Letter.PDF

History of Legislative File 041068

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
0	MAYOR	11/23/04	SIGNED				
0	COMMON COUNCIL	11/23/04	ASSIGNED TO	COMMON COUNCIL			

SPONSOR: Finance and Personnel Committee**AMENDMENT 3a**

DEPARTMENT	BUDGET EFFECT	TAX LEVY EFFECT	TAX RATE EFFECT PER \$1,000
City Attorney	\$+136,000	\$+136,000	\$+0.006

AMENDMENT INTENT

To increase position authority, salary funding and FTEs and operating funding for two Assistant City Attorney positions to serve as "Community Prosecutors." One position is to be assigned to the south side and one to the north side.

OVERVIEW

1. This amendment will increase position authority, salary funding and FTEs and operating funding for two Assistant City Attorney positions to serve as "Community Prosecutors."
2. The Assistant City Attorneys who work in these positions will be dedicated to work in the prosecution division/ordinance enforcement, especially with an area focus of nuisance housing, problem properties and related violations.
3. One position is to be assigned to the south side and one to the north side.

EFFECT

The budget effect of this amendment is \$+136,000.

The tax levy effect of this amendment is \$+136,000.

OTHER INFORMATION

This amendment includes funding in the amount of \$130,000 for two Assistant City Attorney, SG 148, salaries as well as \$6,000 for office expenses, furniture and computers.

ORIGINAL SPONSOR(S): Ald. Donovan, McGee

COMMITTEE VOTE (3-2): In Favor: Ald. Witkowiak, Donovan, D'Amato

Opposed: Ald. Davis, Murphy

Prepared by: Mark A. Ramion
LRB – Fiscal Review
November 8, 2004

OBJECTIVE, OVERALL BUDGET LEVY EFFECT OF THIS POSSIBLE AMENDMENT TO THE 2005 PROPOSED BUDGET

CITY ATTORNEY

To increase position authority, salary funding, and FTE's, and operating funding for two Assistant City Attorney positions to serve as "Community Prosecutors". One position is to be assigned to the south side and one to the north side.

BUDGET EFFECT TAX LEVY EFFECT TAX RATE EFFECT (PER \$1,000 A.V.)

Operating Budget

\$+136,000 \$+136,000 \$+0.006

BMD-2 PAGE AND LINE NUMBER	DETAILED AMENDMENT	CHANGE IN 2005 POSITIONS OR UNITS COLUMN		CHANGE IN 2005 AMOUNT COLUMN	
		NUMBER TO BE CHANGED	AMOUNT OF CHANGE	AMOUNT TO BE CHANGED	AMOUNT OF CHANGE
	SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES				
	CITY ATTORNEY				
	SALARIES & WAGES				
130.1-12	Asst. City Attorney (A)(Y)	28	+2	\$2,500,130	\$+130,000
130.2-25	O&M FTE'S	55.90	+2.00	--	--
130.3-9	ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS*	--	--	\$1,475,301	\$+46,800
	OPERATING EXPENDITURES				
130.3-13	General Office Expense	--	--	\$33,000	\$+1,000
	EQUIPMENT PURCHASES				
130.4-16	Office Furniture	--	--	\$2,500	\$+1,000
130.4-17	Computer Peripherals	--	--	\$7,500	\$+4,000
380.1-3	FRINGE BENEFIT OFFSET	--	--	-\$95,197,212	-\$46,800

**Substitute action for vetoed amendment #3a
Offered by Ald. Terry Witkowski**

The Mayor's proposed substitute action, offered by Ald. Witkowski, provides position authority and funding for 2 Assistant City Attorney positions to serve as Community Prosecutors, one on the north side and one on the south side, for 23 of 27 pay periods in 2005. This is intended to allow 2 months in 2005 for recruitment of these positions. If the veto is sustained and this substitute action is approved, the 2 new positions remain in the budget, funding for salaries for the 2 positions is reduced \$20,148 (from \$130,000 to \$109,852), and the new positions are then funded for 10 months instead of 12.

Budget Effect: -\$20,148
Levy Effect: -\$20,148
Rate Effect: -\$0.001

Witkowski.substitute action for vetoed amendment 3a

0 COMMON COUNCIL 11/23/04 ADOPTED Pass
Mover: ALD. WITKOWSKI Ayes: 11 - Hamilton, D'Amato, Bauman, McGee, Jr., Wade, Donovan, Puente, Dudzik, Witkowiak, Witkowski and Zielinski 11 - 4
Noes: 4 - Davis, Bohl, Murphy and Hines, Jr.

Consideration of the veto of items relating to Common Council amendment #3a, City Attorney, to create funding for two assistant city attorney positions to serve as community prosecutors.

The Chair put the question: Shall the foregoing measure be adopted, notwithstanding the objection of the Mayor?

*Roll Call: Ayes: Wade, Donovan, Dudzik, Witkowiak, Zielinski.
Noes: Hamilton, Davis, D'Amato, Bauman, Bohl, McGee, Puente,
Murphy, Witkowski, Hines*

Result: The veto was SUSTAINED

Ald. Witkowski offered substitute action for vetoed amendment #3a to provide funding for two assistant city attorney positions to serve as community prosecutors, one on the north side and one on the south side, for 23 of 27 pay periods in 2005.

*Roll Call: Ayes: Hamilton, D'Amato, Bauman, McGee, Wade, Donovan, Puente,
Dudzik, Witkowiak, Witkowski, Zielinski
Noes: Davis, Bohl, Murphy, Hines*

Substitute APPROVED



City of Milwaukee

200 E. Wells Street
Milwaukee, Wisconsin
53202

Master with text

File Number: 041069

File Number: 041069

File Type: Budget Amendment

Status: Passed

Version: 0

Reference:

Controlling Body: COMMON
COUNCIL

File Name:

Introduced: 11/23/2004

Requester: CITY CLERK

Cost:

Final Action: 11/23/2004

Drafter: jro

Effective:

Comments:

Title: Substitute amendment to the 2005 budget relating to line(s) vetoed by the Mayor and contained in Common Council amendment #45, Police Department, to provide salary funding and FTE's to move the start of the proposed Police Officer recruitment to the third week of August, 2005.

Sections:

Indexes: POLICE DEPARTMENT, BUDGET

Sponsors:

Attachments: Mayor's Veto Letter.PDF

History of Legislative File 041069

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
0	MAYOR	11/23/04	SIGNED				
0	COMMON COUNCIL	11/23/04	ASSIGNED TO	COMMON COUNCIL			

SPONSOR(S): Ald. Donovan

AMENDMENT 45 (F)

DEPARTMENT	BUDGET EFFECT	TAX LEVY EFFECT	TAX RATE EFFECT PER \$1,000
Police	+\$629,202	+\$629,202	+\$0.029

AMENDMENT INTENT

To provide funding and FTEs to move the start of the proposed Police Officer recruitment class to the third week of August 2005

OVERVIEW

1. This amendment will provide funding and FTEs to move the start of the proposed Police Officer recruitment class to the third week of August 2005.
2. This amendment will provide salary, funding, FTE's and direct labor hours for a start date for this police recruit class, August 15, 2005, Pay Period 18.

EFFECT

The budget impact of this amendment is \$+629,202.

The tax levy impact of this amendment is \$+629,202.

OTHER INFORMATION

1. Historically, the start dates for classes depend upon various factors including vacancies, position authorization, the completion of recruit background checks and completion of paperwork, instructor availability and budget concerns. For 2005, the police officer recruit training class is scheduled to begin with Pay Period 25, late November 2005.
2. Police recruit classes vary in size with the most common recruit and enrollment goal being 60 recruits per class.
3. The first Police class for 2004 began on April 12, 2004 and graduated on September 10, 2004 with 59 recruits. A second class is planned to commence on December 6, 2004 with a target group of 60 recruits and graduation in May 2005.

COMMITTEE VOTE (1-4): In Favor: Ald. Donovan

Opposed: Ald. Witkowiak, Davis, , D'Amato, Murphy

Prepared by: Mark A. Ramion
LRB – Fiscal Review
November 8, 2004

OBJECTIVE, OVERALL BUDGET LEVY EFFECT OF THIS POSSIBLE AMENDMENT TO THE 2005 PROPOSED BUDGET

By Ald. Donovan

POLICE DEPARTMENT

Provide funding and FTE's to move the start of the proposed Police Officer recruitment to the third week of August, 2005.

BUDGET EFFECT TAX LEVY EFFECT TAX RATE EFFECT (PER \$1,000 A.V.)

Operating Budget \$+629,202 \$+629,202 \$+0.029

BMD-2 PAGE AND LINE NUMBER	DETAILED AMENDMENT	CHANGE IN 2005 POSITIONS OR UNITS COLUMN		CHANGE IN 2005 AMOUNT COLUMN	
		NUMBER TO BE CHANGED	AMOUNT OF CHANGE	AMOUNT TO BE CHANGED	AMOUNT OF CHANGE
	SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES				
	POLICE DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION/SERVICES DECISION UNIT				
	SALARIES & WAGES				
260.13-4	Personnel Cost Adjustment	-	-	\$-2,939,344	\$+629,202
260.13-15	O&M FTE'S	647.47	+17.77	-	-
260.14-14	ESTIMATED EMPLOYEE FRINGE BENEFITS	-	-	\$8,125,732	\$+176,177
380.1-3	FRINGE BENEFIT OFFSET	-	-	\$-95,197,212	\$-176,177

**Substitute action for vetoed amendment #45
Offered by Ald. Murphy, Hamilton**

The Mayor's proposed substitute action, offered by Ald. Murphy and Hamilton, would provide sufficient funding for the police recruit class to begin in Pay Period 25, as the Mayor had originally proposed.

The combined affect of Disapproval Action (A) and Substitute Action (B) is:

Budget Effect: -\$629,202
Levy Effect: -\$629,202
Rate Effect: -\$0.029

Murphy, Hamilton. Sub for #45

0 COMMON COUNCIL 11/23/04 ADOPTED Pass
Mover: ALD. MURPHY Ayes: 15 - Hamilton, Davis, D'Amato, Bauman, Bohl, McGee, Jr., Wade, 15 - 0
Donovan, Puente, Murphy, Dudzik, Witkowiak, Witkowski, Zielinski
and Hines, Jr.
Noes: 0

Consideration of the veto of items relating to Common Council amendment #45, Police Department, to provide salary, funding and FTEs to move the start of the proposed police officer recruitment to the third week of August 2005.

The Chair put the question: Shall the foregoing measure be adopted, notwithstanding the objection of the Mayor?

*Roll Call: Ayes: Bauman, Bohl, Wade, Donovan, Puente, Dudzik, Witkowiak,
Zielinski
Noes: Hamilton, Davis, D'Amato, McGee, Murphy, Witkowski,
Hines*

Result: The veto was SUSTAINED.

Ald. Murphy and Hamilton offered substitute action for vetoed amendment #45 replacing the funds deleted from the Police Department budget as a result of the Mayor's veto of budget lines relating to Common Council amendment #4,, less the money provided to move up the police officer recruit class so that it starts in August 2005.

This substitute amendment was adopted unanimously.



City of Milwaukee
Master with text

200 E. Wells Street
 Milwaukee, Wisconsin
 53202

File Number: 041070

File Number: 041070

File Type: Budget Amendment

Status: Dead

Version: 0

Reference:

Controlling Body: COMMON COUNCIL

File Name:

Introduced: 11/23/2004

Requester: CITY CLERK

Cost:

Final Action: 11/23/2004

Drafter: jro

Effective:

Comments:

Title: Substitute amendment to the 2005 budget relating to line(s) vetoed by the Mayor and contained in Common Council amendment #46a- to create a \$95,000 Special Purpose Account to fund Milwaukee Alliance Community Prosecution activities in the second police district.

Sections:

Indexes: CRIME PREVENTION, BUDGET

Sponsors:

Attachments: Mayor's Veto Letter.PDF

History of Legislative File 041070

Version:	Acting Body:	Date:	Action:	Sent To:	Due Date:	Return Date:	Result:
0	COMMON COUNCIL	11/23/04	ASSIGNED TO	COMMON COUNCIL			

SPONSOR(S): Ald. Zielinski

AMENDMENT 46a (F)

DEPARTMENT	BUDGET EFFECT	TAX LEVY EFFECT	TAX RATE EFFECT PER \$1,000
Common Council	\$+95,000	\$+95,000	\$+0.004

AMENDMENT INTENT

To create a Special Purpose Account to include \$95,000 for the Milwaukee Alliance Community Prosecution activities in the second police district

OVERVIEW

1. This amendment will create a Special Purpose Account to include \$95,000 for the Milwaukee Alliance Community Prosecution activities in the second police district.
2. This SPA, under control of the Common Council, will provide funding for the payment of the Milwaukee County District Attorney efforts relating to the prosecution of nuisance activities that impact the quality of life of neighborhood residents.
3. These funds are to be spent on community prosecution activities within the Milwaukee area encompassed by the second police district.
4. This SPA budget will include a footnote as follows: "Funds to be released upon Common Council approval of contract with the Milwaukee Alliance for Community Prosecution."

EFFECT

The budget effect of this amendment is \$+95,000.

The tax levy effect of this amendment is \$+95,000.

OTHER INFORMATION

The 2005 Community Development Block Grant budget contains \$190,000 for "Community Prosecution" activities: \$95,000 on the North Side in the Harambee area and \$95,000 on the South Side in an area encompassing the 2nd and 6th (South 27th and Oklahoma) police districts. This SPA will fund another \$95,000 for community prosecution on the South Side, thereby increasing allocation for this activity to \$190,000 on the South Side.

COMMITTEE VOTE (2-3): In Favor: Ald. Witkowiak, Donovan

Opposed: Ald. Davis, D'Amato, Murphy

Prepared by: Mark A. Ramion
LRB – Fiscal Review
November 8, 2004

OBJECTIVE, OVERALL BUDGET LEVY EFFECT OF THIS POSSIBLE AMENDMENT TO THE 2005 PROPOSED BUDGET

By Ald. Zielinski

SPECIAL PURPOSE ACCOUNTS-MISCELLANEOUS

To create a Special Purpose Account to include \$95,000 for Milwaukee Alliance for Community Prosecution activities in the second police district.

BUDGET EFFECT **TAX LEVY EFFECT** **TAX RATE EFFECT (PER \$1,000 A.V.)**

Operating Budget \$+95,000 \$+95,000 \$+0.004

BMD-2 PAGE AND LINE NUMBER	DETAILED AMENDMENT	CHANGE IN 2005 POSITIONS OR UNITS COLUMN		CHANGE IN 2005 AMOUNT COLUMN	
		NUMBER TO BE CHANGED	AMOUNT OF CHANGE	AMOUNT TO BE CHANGED	AMOUNT OF CHANGE
320.7-15	<p>SECTION I.A.1. BUDGETS FOR GENERAL CITY PURPOSES</p> <p>SPECIAL PURPOSE ACCOUNTS- MISCELLANEOUS</p> <p>Immediately following the line:</p> <p>"Mentoring Program"</p> <p>Insert the following line, corresponding amounts, and footnote:</p> <p>"Milwaukee Alliance for Community Prosecution (O)"</p> <p>"(O) Funds to be released upon Common Council approval of contract with Milwaukee Alliance for Community Prosecution"</p>	-	-	\$0	\$+95,000

