



OFFICE OF THE COUNTY EXECUTIVE

# Milwaukee County

CHRIS ABELE • COUNTY EXECUTIVE

DATE: November 20, 2013  
 TO: The Honorable County Board of Supervisors  
 FROM: Chris Abele, Milwaukee County Executive  
 SUBJECT: **PARTIAL VETO OF FILE NUMBER 13-756 (2014 BUDGET)**

---

The budget I am returning to the County Board strikes a significant compromise while lowering taxes by \$1.6 million and building our rainy day fund. If the Supervisors sustain my vetoes, the 2014 Adopted Budget will put Milwaukee County in a stronger and more sustainable position. The vetoes outlined in this document represent over \$3.6 million. My intent is to:

- Dedicate \$1.6 million, which was used to fund the Flexible Savings Account, to lower property taxes; and
- Allocate the remaining \$2 million to the Debt Service Reserve (DSR). The County's financial policy, supported by the Board and the Comptroller, states that the goal is to grow and maintain a strong reserve. Investing this \$2 million continues moving us in that direction, making the County more stable and sustainable.

The 2014 Milwaukee County Recommended Budget I submitted prioritized sustainability while maintaining and enhancing essential County services. For the third year in a row I presented a budget that cut wasteful spending and reinvested in critical services and measurable outcomes - from public parks to public safety to our mental health system - all while creating opportunities for economic development and job growth.

As a direct result of this approach over the past two years, we have been able to protect the County's most valued services from cuts. Instead of the \$86 million deficit projected in the five-year forecast just a few years ago, we actually confronted a \$15 million challenge. That's still too high, but it's a \$71 million dollar swing in the right direction. I say all of this as a reminder that we need to, and will continue to need to, make tough decisions. Those decisions might not be popular to some in the short term, but they will pay off in the long run.

The budget I presented makes major strides by introducing countywide performance measures and financial management policies, connecting our investments to outcomes. These are the first steps toward a budgeting process that will allow policymakers to make decisions based on strategic priorities and program performance, give our community the tools to hold us accountable, all while encouraging decision-making that values sustainability and a long-term outlook.

## County Board Amendments

Through its budget process, the Board passed 75 amendments to my budget. While some of the amendments strengthen the budget, many reverse this progress and weaken the connection between the community's investments and outcomes by: appropriating one-time funding for ongoing costs; providing earmarked funds that distract from the County's mission and undercut our progress towards sustainability; spending precious resources on underutilized and unsustainable amenities or services; budgeting for revenue that may not be realized; and abolishing or unfunding critical County positions.

Other Board amendments create unnecessary reporting requirements and red tape that would otherwise impede the cost-effective and timely operation of government at a time when the community is demanding responsiveness. Transparency is critical to democracy, and department leaders are always willing to provide information to Supervisors; however, it is not an efficient use of their time to provide burdensome and unnecessary reports to the Board.

I am concerned about the Board's practice as it relates to super-amendments – this year five super-amendments contained 41 individual amendments. While I understand that it may be an effective political maneuver to convince Supervisors to vote for amendments that would otherwise give them pause, it does not create a transparent or democratic process. For this reason, I have separated out veto messages into individual amendments, rather than the super-amendments introduced by the Board.

This super-amendment process, coupled with extremely vague noticing of public budget hearings, meant that neither department leaders nor the public were aware of what issues the Board was taking up on any given day. Furthermore, members of the public were not allowed to speak during these public hearings. Many members of the public showed up to meetings only to be told they could not speak and many department leaders and other staff wasted several days attending budget hearings in anticipation of an amendment that may affect their department. The result was little to no public debate of amendments.

I am also vetoing three actions by the Board that break the law. As elected officials, we all took an oath of office to uphold the law, I urge Supervisors to sustain these vetoes and send the message to the community that you take that oath seriously.

The following is a brief summary of how this budget, including my vetoes, will strengthen Milwaukee County.

### **Public Safety**

We all know that public safety is not isolated to the city or suburbs; it's an issue everyone cares about. The importance of public safety demands that, as a community, we leverage and coordinate as much of our manpower, our resources, and our data as possible. This budget provided a Public Safety Initiative to build these partnerships that we hope to continue.

In the 2014 Recommended Budget, the Sheriff's Office budget was \$72 Million, or twenty-two percent of the entire property tax levy and included enhanced mandated services such as Courtroom Security and Freeway Patrol. Under this plan, the Sheriff's Office will have the largest staff dedicated to Freeway Patrols since 2004.

The Budget also either transferred or streamlined other Sheriff's Office operations to better reflect its actual activity. These changes were done carefully with input from law enforcement professionals and best practices. Unfortunately, without much discussion or consideration, the Board restored many changes to the Sheriff's Office at a large cost to taxpayers without clear positive outcomes.

For example, my proposed budget provided funding for some Sheriff parks patrols while - in response to Supervisors' expressed concerns last year - allowing municipalities to choose whether their police will uniquely patrol parks in their cities. Throughout the budget deliberation process, Supervisors heard from the Milwaukee Police Department and their local municipalities' police departments and mayors about why this plan works for them. Supervisors ignored this broad support, as well as the substantial cost savings.

I did not veto this amendment to restore the Sheriff's parks patrol unit, as the Supervisors clearly want to give the Sheriff a third chance to improve the parks patrol unit. Over the next year, I will continue to closely monitor parks patrol to make sure Milwaukee County residents are paying for an effective and efficient service provided by the Sheriff's Office. If this does not happen, I will consider reintroducing this plan to transition funding to agencies that will provide this service.

I am also disappointed that the Board did not fully fund the ShotSpotter program to benefit parks. ShotSpotter is a proven tool that gives police officers the ability to respond more quickly and with better information to serious crimes. In a situation where seconds matter, this investment is critical. The Board's action on this item puts an important public safety initiative at risk.

### **Health and Human Services**

The 2014 Recommended Budget made significant investments in transforming our mental health delivery system. Following on the successful state approval of the closure of Hilltop, one of the long-term care units, this budget invests in building community capacity. Unfortunately, because of the lack of understanding about this process, the Board added unnecessary and burdensome reporting requirements, cut critical services like Targeted Case Management for AODA clients and prevented significant redirection of resources to community capacity by rejecting the CSP outsourcing.

One of the more concerning amendments was rejecting a retention plan for BHD. The retention plan is a best practice when downsizing or closing a medical facility to ensure that employees are treated respectfully and that the facility can be fully staffed until closure. By rejecting the funding for this plan, the Board is treating employees unfairly and putting the safe transition of clients to the community at risk.

### **Parks and Recreation**

The 2014 Recommended Budget included the second year of investments in my Urban Parks Initiative, with millions of dollars allocated to neglected parks in Milwaukee County. I appreciate the Supervisors' attempt to try to supplement this initiative with funding for parks in their districts. However, in order to be fair and transparent, I would like the experts in the Parks Department to prioritize the parks in need of repair based on a professional assessment of priorities. The Parks Department is currently in the middle of strategic planning, which will inform this prioritization process.

In order to reach a compromise with Supervisors, I am not vetoing the Board's decision to keep indoor pools open. In the next year, the Parks Department will attempt to market and increase the utilization of these pools. We will monitor this closely to make sure any further investment into these amenities is sustainable.

### **Transportation and Transit**

While I am very grateful that Supervisors were willing to compromise from their original transit amendments, I remain very concerned about the Board's amendment to in-house transit services if a contract is not approved by April 2014. The Board approved this amendment with a default transition date without giving consideration to the fiscal and organizational impact, and without knowledge of the contract proposed by the administration because of their own delay in scheduling an appeal hearing. I encourage the Board to consider all information before making a decision on this critical service; the administration's goal remains finding the most efficient provision of service for riders.

### **Employees**

Because I know employee benefits are important to a strong workforce, my veto presents a fair compromise to the Board's amendment, balancing your concerns with the need to address the County's structural deficit.

In addition, in the next year, the administration will be involved in investigating some exciting initiatives, including a possible transition toward Affordable Care Act exchanges and transition to defined contribution system. The Board's interest in this exploratory phase is certainly welcome.

### **County Operations**

Over the last several years, we have made great strides in professionalizing County operations. I am very disappointed by the changes the Board made that undermine this progress. Most of the changes result in further micromanaging of County departments, including taking away flexibility from the Government Affairs office by earmarking funding for various organizations, calling for the confirmation of the Community Business Development Partners (CBDP) Director, and creating more workgroups and reporting requirements to oversee the creation of performance measures and spending of land sales proceeds after a detailed description of proposed projects was already presented.

I am also concerned about the cuts the Board has made to department leadership and other positions, including Departments of Administration (Procurement, Fiscal Affairs, IMSD, and Facilities Management), Human Resources, Transportation, and Health and Human Services. These cuts will weaken these departments and harm the County's ability to attract and retain top talent.

Unfortunately, the veto process does not allow for sufficient time to discuss these vetoes with all Supervisors. However, my staff and I will be available to answer any questions Supervisors may have while reviewing this document. I ask Supervisors to give these vetoes serious consideration.

## VETO MESSAGES

### PUBLIC SAFETY

#### **Unfund Sheriff's command staff positions 2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 194**

This amendment unfunds 1.0 FTE Facility Administrator (Inspector), 1.0 FTE Bureau Director (Deputy Inspector), and 6.0 FTE Deputy Sheriff's Captain positions in the Office of the Sheriff that had been abolished in the Recommended Budget.

I am vetoing this amendment that restores high-level positions that do not directly impact public safety. The 2014 Recommended Budget refocuses resources on core, mandated services. Due to this refocus of services, the management structure of the Office of the Sheriff is streamlined and reduced in 2014 to a more appropriate level. These appropriate staffing levels were determined through extensive input from other law enforcement agencies and professionals.

Further, by unfunding these positions, as opposed to abolishing them, the Board is putting the County at risk to deficit by close to \$1 million, as the Sheriff will most likely keep these positions filled.

#### **Restore Emergency Preparedness in the Sheriff's Office 2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 228-232**

This action denies the transfer of the Emergency Management and 911 Communications/Dispatch functions from the Office of the Sheriff to a new Department of Emergency Preparedness, and denies the creation of a position of Program Director (Pay Range 29MN) in Communications.

I am vetoing the Board's action to move the emergency management function to the Sheriff's Office. The structure presented in the 2014 Recommended Budget is used by Waukesha County and many other Counties where the Emergency Management Coordinator under the executive branch is responsible for 911 communications, public safety agency dispatch, and emergency preparedness services.

The Sheriff has stated that he does not believe that 911 communications and dispatch should be his responsibility. He has also not upgraded the 911 communications technology, putting Milwaukee County at risk with an outdated system. Dispatch communications is too important a function and we must make sure that we are using best practices and have effective backup systems.

Emergency Management is also a critical County function. Good working relationships with other County and non-County entities would increase its success. In addition, the statutory responsibility ultimately lies with the County Executive as outlined in chapter 323.14(1)(a)(2): "*In counties having a county executive under s. 59.17, the county board shall designate the county executive or confirm his or her appointee as county head of emergency management.*" The new Department would ensure proper steps are taken to fortify this function.

The proposed structure for 2014 will allow for efficient and effective management of the existing Communications technology, putting in place backup systems and enabling policymakers to base decisions on accurate data that should be, but has not been, made readily available to them and the public. This new structure will allow for cooperation with municipalities and other County public safety agencies to seek shared or consolidated services where opportunities exist to improve efficiency and service quality, as well as save taxpayer dollars.

**Reduce citation revenues within the expressway patrol unit**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 197**  
**Transfer \$217,763 to the Debt Service Reserve**

This change reduces citation revenues within the Expressway Patrol service area from the 2014 Recommended Budget by \$217,763. It appears that the Board inadvertently took out the narrative for this section, although the revenue projects are decreased.

I am vetoing the Board's decision to lower revenues for the Sheriff's expressway patrol unit. This budget adds Sheriff Deputies on the expressway patrol unit, which should result in higher citation revenue, not less.

**Reduce ShotSpotter funding by half**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 404**

This change reduces funding for the ShotSpotter program by half, or \$175,000, and requires a match by either the City of Milwaukee or another organization for the remaining half of the \$350,000 in start-up costs.

I am vetoing the Board's decision to cut funding for the ShotSpotter program. Through this amendment, Supervisors called for partial funding to come from a non-County entity, but did not secure matching funds. This type of imprudent budgeting puts this important public safety initiative at risk.

The proposed County budget allocation of \$350,000 for ShotSpotter is a one-time grant that would cover one year of subscription services and capital costs to supplement the larger parks patrol plan. With this funding, ShotSpotter coverage will increase from the current three square miles to ten square miles. The expanded area includes those County neighborhoods most impacted by crime. Eleven County parks in both the north and south sides of Milwaukee are included in this area. If this veto is sustained, a fund transfer to provide half the funding from the Appropriation for Contingencies will be forthcoming in the January 2014 Board cycle.

**Deny approval of Armor Contract**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 214**

This change denies approval of a contract extension with Armor Correctional Health Services for the remainder of 2014.

I am vetoing the denial of the Armor Contract approval. As Supervisors know, the Armor Contract was court-ordered in May 2013. While I agree with Supervisors that we should consider issuing an RFP, it is prudent to wait until the Christensen Decree is lifted before releasing an RFP for this service again.

## **HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES**

**Shelter Funding/County Executive Security**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 60**

This change reduces funding in the Office of the County Executive for security services by \$300,000, and increases funding in the Department of Health and Human Services for the Shelter Task Force for emergency shelter services for the homeless.

I am partially vetoing this amendment that provides funding to homeless shelters and restricts County Executive security.

I commend the Board for paying attention to the critical issue of homelessness in our community. I want to make sure, however, that the County is strategic in how it funds community organizations. The County cannot sustainably and effectively provide its mandated services while also serving as a funding source where the federal or state governments' funding streams have shifted. Thus, any County funding must be directed at helping these organizations shift their service delivery models to achieve their own sustainability.

While shelters will always be necessary, the federal government has changed its priorities in addressing homelessness. These priorities include a shift toward permanent housing. The 2014 Recommended Budget already provides \$500,000 in funding for permanent housing, including a program that targets homeless veterans.

I urge the homeless shelters that receive this one-time County funding this year to consider the sustainability of their own organizations and consider other funding streams. I ask Supervisors to recognize that the County cannot fill every federal funding gap that results in community groups asking the County for money.

I also ask that the Board allow professional law officials to analyze County Executive security needs and make recommendations. Given the Sheriff's statement last month that he "... won't spend one penny of taxpayer money on Abele's self-importance exercise" and other statements, the Sheriff may not be the best person to provide security.

My plan would be to seek out the most efficient security provider that can provide the needed service. The Sheriff may end up being the best option but I would appreciate the chance to explore all possibilities. I ask you to not make this a political issue and consider my request seriously to allow me to find the most appropriate provider given the limited funding you are providing.

**Report to Board on State process for BHD relocations**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This amendment requires the Department of Health and Human Services and the Department of Family Care to provide the Finance, Personnel and Audit Committee with semi-annual Relocation Reports regarding information on individuals relocated from BHD's long-term care units. It also requires the two departments to perform quarterly audits of community placement facilities.

I am vetoing this action from the Board because it places additional unnecessary reporting requirements on DHHS staff. While DHHS will continue to rightfully update the Board on the downsizing process, the BHD Hilltop closure is a State-mandated and -operated process. The State convenes a relocation team that oversees every relocation from BHD long-term care units to community housing. Once a patient is relocated in the community, each will be overseen by either Milwaukee County Family Care or one of the private Family Care agencies. It is impossible for DHHS to report on clients who are no longer under the care of BHD. The Board has its own Government Affairs Liaison whose job is to interact with the State. I would suggest that the Liaison help the Board in attaining these documents from the State as requested.

For the same reasons that this is a state-operated process and that not all clients will be relocated by the County, BHD and Family Care cannot perform quarterly audits of community placement facilities. It is important to note that any community-based residential facilities to which individuals are relocated are licensed by the state. To maintain such licensure, high levels of quality are expected. Further, any Family Care agency has strong quality assurance of not only facilities, but also of personnel and services.

**Reject CSP Outsourcing**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 275**  
**Transfer \$689,031 to the Debt Reserve Fund**

This amendment denies the outsourcing of the Milwaukee County-run Community Support Programs and related abolishment of 45.0 FTE on April 1, 2014.

I am vetoing the Board's move to reject the outsourcing of the two remaining County-operated Community Support Programs (CSPs). The money saved by outsourcing has been reinvested in additional community mental health services – close to \$1 million annually.

Milwaukee County currently contracts for and funds seven Community Support Program provider agencies throughout Milwaukee County. The total annual operating cost for these seven CSPs is \$3,689,749 and serves 963 persons with severe mental illness (roughly \$3,800 for the average person served).

The County-operated CSPs are much less efficient due to the large personnel costs, including pension. The total operating cost for these two CSPs is \$3,585,212 and serves 337 persons with severe mental illness annually (roughly \$10,600 for the average person served).

The rationale to privatize the two County-operated programs is simple – we can serve three times more people for the same cost. During the budget debate I heard Supervisors raise concern that the County should continue to run these CSPs because their clients have complex needs. A comparison of all CSPs shows that this is not true; individuals with the most complex clinical needs are spread throughout the agencies.

We understand that these types of transitions are extremely difficult on employees. To help ease this transition, Human Resources has devised the following plan to help the 45 employees who work at both CSPs:

- Current employees at CSPs will be eligible for a retention plan. This will be a lump-sum payment of approximately 15-20% of their base pay for those employees who stay until the County-operated CSP is transitioned to a private entity. Unfortunately, this plan has been rejected by the Board. I ask that you reconsider.
- Human Resources is contracting with an employment agency to help employees at risk of losing their jobs to find new ones.

#### **ARCW Funding/Reject funding for Targeted Case Management 2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 276**

This amendment denies funding of \$100,000 for Targeted Case Management services and provides funding of \$100,000 to the AIDS Resource Center of Wisconsin.

I am vetoing the Board's action to reject funding for targeted case management (TCM) services at BHD for approximately 50 individuals who are in the early stages of recovery from a substance use disorder. The Board's amendment transfers the money to the AIDS Resource Center of Wisconsin (ARCW).

This move from the Board undermines the work of the mental health redesign team and takes away from our ability to build community services capacity, a critical need as we move toward a community based mental health service delivery model. The TCM plan I presented to the Board is based on evidence, experience and best practices. It will be more difficult to successfully achieve redesign of our system if the Board continues to put up roadblocks to important components of our service transformation.

HIV is a serious problem in our community, especially among young men of color. I appreciate the social and economic impacts of this serious public health threat on Milwaukee County. ARCW has been a leader in fighting the HIV epidemic in Milwaukee County and I am sincerely grateful for their work. It is also important to state that the County already provides ARCW with \$96,213 annually for substance abuse prevention services.

As stewards of the County's resources, we need to first ensure that we are able to sustainably provide critical, quality County services without added burden on taxpayers. This earmark eliminates a critical community mental health service while encouraging dangerous expectations. While there are many great nonprofits that provide critical services in Milwaukee County, the County simply cannot fund every worthy cause; this earmark to ARCW sets a dangerous precedent that the County cannot sustain if other nonprofits expect similar results.

**Aging Coordinator/Cut BHD Budget  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This amendment reduces non-recurring professional service contracts in the Behavioral Health Division by \$77,968 in order to fund an Outreach and Customer Service Coordinator in the Department on Aging.

I am vetoing the Board's removal of funding from BHD to create a redundant outreach position in the Department on Aging. The funding used to offset this position has already been budgeted to fund other major initiatives within the BHD, specifically the Electronic Medical Record. The Board's idea that funding can simply be found in existing budgets is unsustainable and violates the Financial Management Policies which the Board adopted this year.

Furthermore, the Department on Aging already has an outreach staff member who works closely with DHHS community relations to market nutrition sites. The Department on Aging Director feels that this collaboration is sufficient and that this position is unnecessary.

**Retention package  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 289**

This section of the amendment eliminates funding of \$1,022,000 in the Behavioral Health Division for a proposed retention program for critical nursing and other staff during the transition to community-based care services.

I am vetoing the Board's decision to cut crucial funding for a retention package for BHD staff who are at-risk for layoffs. This move by Supervisors puts patients at BHD at significant risk, further weakens serious efforts to redesign our mental health service delivery and undermines the administration's efforts to treat employees respectfully. BHD's goal is to implement a retention plan as soon as possible in order to ensure safe and stable staffing levels. Without this certainty, we risk losing employees who are crucial to a safe transition.

We need to discuss the retention bonus plan with employees now, so that they are more likely to consider staying until their end dates, not several months from now if and when the money may or may not become available. Wherever possible, retaining employees until their end dates will ensure our patients are safely and effectively cared for.

This retention plan was created by BHD and HR and has previously been shared with the Board on several occasions, including through email, in-person meetings with interested Supervisors, during the budget process, and in Committee. It is critical to the safety of BHD patients that the Board approves this retention plan funding in the budget so it can be rolled out to employees as soon as possible.

**Community Capacity Study  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A  
Transfer \$100,000 to Debt Service Reserve**

This amendment replaces sales tax funding of \$100,000 in capital project WC088 – Courthouse Security X-Ray Equipment with general obligation bonding and transfers the sales tax revenue to the General Fund to supplant tax levy, which is utilized to fund a community capacity study. This study would review existing and planned

capacity of community services, to which many existing Behavioral Health Division patients and clients would be transferred.

I am vetoing the Board's desire for yet another study on downsizing BHD. While I appreciate the Supervisors' passion for mental health, another study is not needed and will only be an unnecessary use of taxpayer money. DHHS and BHD have already completed a thorough assessment of community capacity and created their recommendations for downsizing based on this assessment, including back-up services and resources. As we move forward, capacity will be continually assessed. Any further study of mental health capacity should be done with financial support from private providers, as they are key players in the mental health system in Milwaukee County.

**Abolish Deputy Superintendent  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 268**

This section of the amendment would deny the creation of a Deputy Superintendent at the Juvenile Detention Center within the Department of Health and Human Services.

I am vetoing the Board's denial of a critical position in the Delinquency and Court Services Division. This position is critical for succession planning purposes. It is important that policymakers support our move to better enable the County to deal with leadership transitions. It is also important to note that this position is being created without a levy increase to this Division.

In July 2012, the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors approved the implementation of the Milwaukee County Accountability Program. This program is a short-term secure placement program, within the Milwaukee County Secure Detention Center. It is a dispositional placement option for the circuit courts as an alternative to Department of Correction placement.

Over the last year, as we have begun implementation of the program, significant gaps in management emerged. The Deputy Superintendent position is being created in part to meet the additional management oversight responsibilities of both programming services in secure detention and in the community of the Milwaukee County Accountability Program as expansion of the program is anticipated. This position will have significant and mandatory responsibilities, including: supervision; performance evaluations and discipline of Juvenile Correction Officer Supervisors and Nurses; and management of contracted services within the facility (housekeeping, dietary and psychiatric nursing services). Further responsibilities will include:

- Monitoring adherence to Detention Center Policy & Procedures, Milwaukee County Judicial Intake Policy and DHHS policies.
- Maintaining compliance with Wisconsin Administrative Code 346, Federal Laws, Prison Rape Elimination Act (PREA), Wisconsin State Statute 48 and 938.
- Providing management oversight of the screening (custody intake process) of youth brought to secure detention by law enforcement agencies to determine appropriate admission or community placement pending judicial review.
- Monitoring JCO and JCOS staff compliance with Law Enforcement Standards Board statutory certification and annual training requirements.
- Coordinating the Global Positioning Systems (GPS) equipment utilization by our community partners within the scope of our Juvenile Detention Alternative Initiative (JDAI).

**PARKS AND RECREATION**

**Restore potential O'Donnell parking revenue  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 332**

This amendment increases parking and other associated revenues at O'Donnell Park by \$1.03 million and restores operating costs of \$246,132 that had been reduced due to the possible sale of the facility in the second half of 2014. It also inserts language requiring a workgroup to provide a cost-benefit analysis of the parking structure, and requires that an updated parking study be commissioned.

I am vetoing the Board's decision to replace the parking revenue at the O'Donnell parking garage.

Contrary to some Supervisors' statements, the 2014 Recommended Budget does not include the sale of the O'Donnell parking garage. Rather, it presents a responsible budgeting assumption by not relying on \$1 million in revenue in case the Board approves a sale in 2014.

By replacing this revenue, Supervisors are putting the County at risk for deficit if O'Donnell is sold and the revenue is not realized.

Further, this amendment creates yet another workgroup and necessitates more studies, many of which have already been recently completed. For example, the County recently received an appraisal of O'Donnell, yet Supervisors are requesting another one. I ask that Supervisors not micromanage this process that is being carefully pursued by economic development professionals. The Chairwoman has been kept in the loop about this process for months and, when exploratory conversations with stakeholders around O'Donnell result in a potential transaction, the Board will appropriately be provided with details to consider whether the sale is in the best interest of the County.

**Funding Parks, Recreation and other Supervisor-specific capital improvements - Oak Leaf Trail, Dineen Park, McGovern Park, South Shore Park, Tiefenthaler Park, Storm water pond on College Avenue  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A  
Transfer \$303,638 to Parks Department<sup>1</sup>**

These various amendments create new capital projects: One amended project, related to the Oak Leaf Trails, increases general obligation bonding by \$500,000. One amendment creates two new projects by increasing general obligation bonding (\$80,000 for South Shore Boat Launch Parking Lot) and tax levy (\$84,000 for South Shore Beach Groomer). One amended project, Dineen Park, increases general obligation bonding by \$303,600 and transfers \$150,000 in sales tax funding from a recommended capital project (WO 141 – Zoo Interchange). Another amended project, McGovern Park Basketball Courts, transfers sales tax funding of \$248,000 from one recommended project (WP 460 Lindsay Park Play Area Replacement). Two amended projects, Tiefenthaler Park and College Avenue Storm Water Pond Upgrade, are financed by transferring sales tax revenue from two recommended projects. Tiefenthaler is funded by \$110,000 from WG018 – Research Park Fire Protection and the College Avenue Storm Water Pond Upgrade is funded with \$96,539 from WG019 – Child Adolescent Treatment Center Fire Protection Monitoring System.

I am partially vetoing these amendments because funding priorities for parks are best made by the parks and engineering professionals who can consider the entire portfolio of needs and priorities. None of these items ranked highly, and were therefore not recommended by the Capital Improvements Committee. The overall funding of County Board approved (as amended) projects has put the budget above the Board's "self-imposed" bonding cap by approximately \$870,000. I am vetoing these selected (amended) capital projects that are above the cap as the Board should either follow its own policy or pass new policy that reflects changed priorities. Any additional funding, including approximately \$220,000 in bonding and \$84,000 in tax levy will be directed to the Parks Department to fund the highest priority needs. This will be done through a 2014 fund transfer prior to the issuance of the 2014 corporate purpose bonds. The Parks Department is currently undergoing a master strategic plan. This plan can and should be used to inform and prioritize further parks maintenance and upgrade decisions.

---

<sup>1</sup> This includes \$84,000 in tax levy to the Parks Department operating budget and \$219,638 for parks-related capital projects that are bond eligible.

## TRANSPORTATION AND TRANSIT

### **Insource transit and create transit taskforce 2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This amendment requires that a workgroup be formed to study the advantages/disadvantages of insourcing vs. outsourcing transit system management. Furthermore, this amendment states that transit system management will be brought in-house if a management contract is not approved by the County Board by April 1, 2014.

I am vetoing the Board's decision to in-source Milwaukee County transit services if a contract is not approved by April 1, 2013.

First, with regard to the default in-sourcing deadline, it is the administration's goal to have a contract approved by April 1, 2013. However, this will depend almost entirely on the pace of the Board's already delayed actions. The several month delay in scheduling an appeal, in addition to the workgroup requested by the Board, creates a situation tilted in favor of insourcing. If the Board can schedule, hear and make a decision on this appeal as soon as possible, then the administration can be prepared to send down the MV contract for approval as early as the December cycle. The administration will then be able to share the details of the contract as well as how the vendor was selected. If the Board does not delay making a decision, an April 1<sup>st</sup> deadline is realistic and attainable.

Second, this amendment neither includes any kind of fiscal note, nor provides an analysis of future costs and liabilities, including budgeting for positions that would be needed to in-house this function. The County needs to have a better understanding of the fiscal impact of this move before making a decision of this magnitude.

The County has much to gain from bringing in outside expertise to manage the transit system. In particular, private firms:

- Can offer economies of scale when purchasing goods and commodities for the transit system operations, resulting in decreased costs.
- Bring specialized management experience and operational efficiencies from operating multiple transit systems. Experiences gained and lessons learned at other systems can be utilized to the benefit of the County.
- Can leverage existing resources used for other systems. It is more efficient for a firm to add marginal resources to an existing function, than for a local provider to create the entire function.
- Have access to significant training resources currently not available to Milwaukee County.
- Have the ability to test equipment and products as well as bring technological and logistical improvements from other systems to the County.
- Have an incentive to manage more effectively and make positive changes more quickly due to competition with other private parties based on a desire to retain the contract and to develop a positive national and local reputation.
- Provide staffing flexibility to respond to needs more quickly.
- Will not face a learning curve of operating a transit system, unlike the County.
- Would not be able to make any modifications to routes or fares without the County's approval.

In contrast, insourcing transit management services has significant drawbacks, particularly in:

- Significant administrative and real costs of integrating IT, HR, payroll, benefits -including pension- and procurement functions for a 1,000-person organization. Given the exemption of public transit from the provisions of Act 10, additional resources would be required in the areas of Labor Relations. In addition, great care would have to be taken to ensure the County does not jeopardize federal funding by in-housing this function.

- Difficulty of responding to real-time needs. Transit has delegated authority to perform certain functions, such as procurement. Ordinance and County procurement and financial policies would need to be reviewed in conjunction with Transit's current business operation to determine what changes or exceptions need to be made to keep transit functioning without operational delays.

At a minimum, I encourage Supervisors to wait until they are able to consider the proposed contract in full before acting to put the County on this path.

**Deny creation of DOT Safety and Emergency Program Manager and Transportation Analyst  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 261**

This amendment denies the creation of 1.0 FTE Safety and Emergency Program Manager and 1.0 FTE Transportation Analyst, and reduces revenues by \$75,175.

I am vetoing the Board's denial of two important positions in the Department of Transportation. These positions were created in the Director's Office to address current deficiencies and will help DOT operations run more efficiently and professionally.

In 2014, the Safety and Emergency Program Manager would allow the Director's Office to begin efforts to create a coordinated Safety and Emergency Management Program across all DOT divisions – a critical program that does not currently exist. The goal of this program is to provide a uniform approach to safety and emergency management across the divisions within the department.

The Transportation Analyst position will help DOT increase the efficacy and efficiency of current programs and services by creating and monitoring performance measures. The Analyst will investigate best practices and make recommendations for quality improvement. Further, if the Board is considering in-housing transit, this position would prove critical in providing analysis for this transition.

## **EMPLOYEE RELATIONS**

**Monthly Premiums  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 392  
Transfer up to \$1,400,000 to Debt Service Reserve**

This section of the amendment reduces employee health insurance monthly premiums from the 2014 Recommended Budget levels as follows:

For employees who participate in the wellness program, monthly premiums would be \$80 for single employees, \$100 for employees with children, \$160 for employees and their spouses only, and \$180 for family coverage. The 2014 Recommended Budget monthly premiums were \$115, \$175, \$230 and \$315 respectively.

For employees who do not participate in the wellness program, monthly premiums would be \$130 for single employees, \$150 for employees with children, \$210 for employees and their spouses only, and \$230 for family coverage. The 2014 Recommended Budget monthly premiums were \$165, \$225, \$280, and \$365 respectively.

Assuming a revenue offset of approximately 17 percent for fringe benefits, this change increases tax levy by approximately \$2.9 million.

I am partially vetoing this amendment to strike a strong compromise that acknowledges employees concerns about health care costs alongside taxpayers' concerns about rising taxes. I am asking the Board to consider utilizing the premiums the Board proposed for wellness program non-participants as the wellness program

participant premium level (with a \$50 incentive). Decreasing the wellness program participant premium rates to levels below 2012 could undercut the objective of the wellness bonus: to encourage participation and ultimately incentivize more healthy behaviors. This would, instead, bring us more in-line with city, state and other public-sector comparable premium rates as presented on page 393 of the 2014 Recommended Budget.

To decrease the employee contribution at a time when health care costs are going up nationwide is unsustainable; the County cannot continue to provide services for generations to come if we are unwilling to seriously address the components of our budget that threaten our sustainability.

Our first goal must be to ensure we can efficiently provide the highest quality services to Milwaukee County citizens. Unfortunately, the County cannot support massive spending on employee health care and still maintain appropriate County services. A balanced contribution by employees to their benefits is critical to a truly sustainable County.

I ask Supervisors' to accept these compromise premium rates – which are below the 2014 Recommended Budget's proposal.

**FSA Contribution**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 391**  
**Dedicate \$1.6 million to lower property taxes**

This section of the amendment restores the employee flexible spending account, but restructures it to conform to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act. The program would now provide a match to employees for every dollar they contribute up to \$1,200. Previously the flexible spending account was provided to employees at a set amount, with no match, based on their tier of health insurance coverage.

Assuming a revenue offset of approximately 17 percent for fringe benefits, this change increases tax levy by approximately \$1.6 million.

I am partially vetoing this amendment to remove the County's contribution to active employees FSAs as this is an unparalleled benefit the County simply cannot afford. This veto will still allow employees to contribute to their own FSAs pre-tax. The money saved from this unusual benefit will lower property taxes for Milwaukee County residents by \$1.6 million.

**FMLA Reporting**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 128**

This amendment transfers \$50,000 in funding for supplemental services to process Family Medical Leave Act claims into an allocated contingency account within the division and requires the Risk Manager to provide a plan to the County Board before the funds can be transferred and utilized.

I am vetoing this amendment that puts unnecessary and burdensome reporting requirements on an administrative function. It has been determined by both Risk Management and Human Resources that Milwaukee County has uncontrolled abuse of FMLA, as compared to other public sector agencies. A 2012 state audit of FMLA in Milwaukee County has also confirmed this. While the federal FMLA serves a very important purpose and will be preserved and protected, precautions must be taken to avoid abuse.

Further, the Board repeatedly acknowledged the limited resources allocated to this function contributed to the problems with limiting abuse. By adding this reporting requirement, the Board has made it virtually impossible to bring additional resources to bear to help staff resolve short-term spikes in FMLA activity.

**Decrease Salary Appropriations for Human Resources**  
**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This section of the amendment increases vacancy and turnover in the amount of \$129,666 in the Department of Human Resources.

I am vetoing the Board's action to cut vacancy and turnover in Human Resources because it will cut filled positions and undo HR's ability to serve employees and the County overall. As a central service agency, HR does not have much budget flexibility and asking the Department to absorb a cut of \$130,000 will mean one or two current employees will become unemployed. HR has made significant strides over the past two years in professionalizing and building a place that employees can go to with problems and concerns. Cutting this funding and positions will significantly impact our ability to build a better work environment for employees, which in turn enhances our efficiency, productivity and overall service to constituents. This would harm our ability to function effectively.

I ask Supervisors, who have repeatedly stressed the importance of our employees, to support a high functioning HR department which ensures that employees are treated fairly and equitably.

**Cut 2 Management Assistants in the Department of Human Resources  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 120-121**

This section of the amendment denies the creation of 2.0 FTE Management Assistants in the Department of Human Resources.

I am vetoing this amendment that denies the creation of two support positions – one to support HR functions at the both the House of Correction and Child Support Services, and one to support central Employment Relations functions. These positions are critically important in order to ensure compliance and timely processing of work, as well as reduce the significant workload and hours of overburdened team members. In exchange for these positions, the Department surrendered three higher-level positions, resulting in a net savings to taxpayers. Human Resources submitted a budget that represented a decrease over 2013. These further cuts are unnecessary and harm the Department's and County's services.

**Reporting requirements – employee benefits workgroup  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 393, 395**

This section of the amendment requires the Employee Benefits Workgroup to study two issues: transferring employees and retirees to health care exchanges created by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act, and the possibility of allowing employees to opt out of the defined benefit pension plan and into a defined contribution pension plan with the possibility of a County match.

I am partially vetoing two amendments that refer to the employee benefits workgroup – related to the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and Voluntary Transition to Defined Contribution System. Although some work has been ongoing for months, both of these items still need a lot of investigation and analysis. In the 2014 Recommended Budget, the administration identified the departments whose input will be critical to making decisions. It is therefore not necessary to add an additional burden and red tape of another workgroup. As always, we want Supervisors to be part of the process and have left in the reference to the Board being part of the groups.

## COUNTY OPERATIONS

**Deny creation of Records Management Analyst and Fund UW-Extension Programs  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 134**

This amendment denies the creation of a records management program area within the Department of Administrative Services – Fiscal Division and would instead create one attorney position within the Office of Corporation Counsel to provide open records services Countywide. The amendment also provides \$50,000 in funding to UW-Extension to expand the 4H Pre-college Program within three designated zip codes on the north side of the County.

I am partially vetoing this amendment to try to recover some of the funds that were lost in another amendment when vacancy and turnover was reduced in Corporation Counsel by \$82,317, essentially eliminating the funding for the critical Records Management position.

While it was initially my intent to not veto this amendment because Corporation Counsel said they would attempt to work with just one Records Management position this year, eliminating the funding for this position puts the County at great risk. Records Management is one of the most critical County functions that not only helps the County function, but also ensures the County is appropriately responsive to requests for information and helps protect vulnerable data such as health information. Milwaukee County's records management system urgently needs to be strengthened and I ask for Supervisors' support in making sure this essential position is fully funded.

To partially offset the cost of this position, I am also vetoing the increase in funding for UW Extension to expand the 4H Pre-college Program. While this program is well-meaning and the goals of the amendment are admirable, this amendment represents yet another shift in funding away from critical County functions.

**Government Affairs changes – department administration  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 66**

This section of the amendment would deny the creation of the Office of Government Affairs within the Office of the County Executive, instead creating it as an independent department.

I am partially vetoing this amendment which conflicts with state statute. The prevailing state statute, 59.17 (2)(b)(1) clearly states that *“Except for a statutory provision which specifies that a board or commission or the county board shall supervise the administration of a department, the county executive shall administer, supervise, and direct all county departments...”*

In relation to this office, State Statute 59.53(24) reads in entirety, *“Government relations. In any county with a population of 750,000 or more, if the county has an office of intergovernmental relations or a department or subunit of a department that provides lobbying services for the county, that office, department, or subunit shall employ one individual who is responsible for representing the interests of, and reports to, the county executive and one individual who is responsible for representing the interests of, and reports to, the county board.”*

The budget resolution as adopted by the Board infers that department administration is maintained by the Board, which it is not, under the plain language of the law. Clearly, 59.53(24) confers to the Board only the allocation of one (1) staff member, employed by the office, to represent their interests. Therefore, The Office of Government Affairs will employ one individual who shall represent the interest of and report to the County Board, as is the current operation. Administration of the department, consistent with the statutes and Opinion of the Attorney General (OAG 06-13), is vested in the executive branch of county government.

**Government Affairs changes – constituent relations  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This section of the amendment transfers 1.0 FTE Constituent Services Representative from the Office of the County Board to Government Affairs and adds language requiring this position to *“address constituent concerns, including those brought to his attention by the County Board, and to provide general support for the co-directors of the office.”*

I am partially vetoing this amendment that puts restrictions on the role of the Constituent Relations Representative. To clarify, the position will assist with constituent needs that are brought to the attention of the County Executive. Consistent with State Statute, if a member or staff to the County Board wishes to refer constituent matters to the attention of the Executive, they may do so to my office. Further, I am vetoing references to the use of this position as an office support or secretarial position for the Government Affairs office. I am confident that such a use of county resources is unnecessary, as office staff have performed such functions without administrative support for some time.

**Government Affairs changes – budget restrictions  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 66-67**

This section of the amendment earmarks operations funding within the Office of Government Affairs for certain memberships and adds language that the remaining funds “shall be used to support the efforts of each of the positions in an equal manner.”

I am vetoing this amendment which micromanages the operations of the Government Affairs office. In an already conservative office budget, the adopted budget resolution places serious constraints on the ability of the office to function. Further, in evaluating the value of the time and resources devoted to Government Affairs, it is not prudent to expend this small budget to pay for intergovernmental cooperation membership fees, such as Sister Cities International memberships. I would encourage the Board to provide for those memberships from their budget if they so desire such memberships, rather than compromise the County's ability to have all resources available to advocate and lobby our state and federal government partners.

**Office Coordinator in Clerk’s office  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A  
Transfer \$94,606 to Debt Service Reserve**

This section of the amendment transfers 1.0 FTE Office Coordinator and some operating costs from the Office of the County Board to the Office of the County Clerk.

I am vetoing the Board’s amendment to shift an Office Coordinator to the County Clerk’s Office. The Clerk did not request this position in his budget and has stated prior to the introduction of this amendment that more positions are not needed, as his office already has enough staff to manage the Legistar position. As good stewards of tax dollars, we should not create or transfer positions that are not needed, particularly given the 11 positions the Board has already shifted to other departments this year.

**County Board service charges  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 57**

This section of the amendment requires future budgets for internal crosscharges within the Office of the County Board be “based on actual usage, not historical or rolling average amounts.”

I am vetoing this amendment that attempts to change the way crosscharges are allocated to the Board. This will create administrative difficulties in producing future budgets, especially if staff in the Department of Administrative Services – Office of Performance, Strategy and Budget are cut. For instance, crosscharges for Risk Management services are budgeted based on actuarial advice and will continue to be done so for all departments. The only other major source of crosscharges in the Office of the County Board are for information technology services and the 2014 Recommended Budget already allocated these based on updated staffing levels. This amendment is simply not feasible to administer.

In addition, the Board failed to correct this amendment to provide a balanced crosscharge budget, even though it was warned of the necessity to do so. This leaves a discrepancy of \$84,760. Therefore, a fund transfer would

have to be submitted in the January 2014 cycle to move funds from the Appropriation for Contingencies to DAS-Risk Management to account for the deficit this amendment created.

**Change Board responsibility  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 55**

This section of the amendment adds narrative language relating to the powers and duties of the County Board of Supervisors based on a cited State Statute.

I am vetoing this amendment to better reflect the entirety of the State Statutes relating to the administrative powers of the Board. The budget resolution, as adopted by the Board, inserts portions of Wisconsin State Statute 59.51(2): *“to represent the county, have management of the business and concerns of the county in all cases where no other provision is made, apportion and levy taxes and appropriate money to carry into effect any of the Board’s powers and duties.”*

However, analyzed in the full context of the Statutes, one finds that another “provision is made” – that being the County Executive, who, per Wisconsin State Statute 59.17(2)(a), can *“coordinate and direct all administrative and management functions of the county government.”* Additionally, the cited Statute and its predecessor, Stats. 59.51 (1), are more accurately understood when articulated in context of the whole of Chapter 59, Opinions of the Attorney General, and relevant case law.

In analyzing such context, I draw the Board’s attention to the UW-Extension Local Government Fact Sheet 21, distributed at the County Board’s training session on September 16th, which reads in part: *“Wis. Stat. §59.51(1) gives the board authority to exercise organizational or administrative powers subject only to the Constitution and any enactment of the Legislature which grants those powers to the County Executive or the County Administrator, or ‘...[a]ny enactment of statewide concern and which uniformly affects every county’.”*

The last phrase is significant because the Statute specifically references County Executive and administrator powers as limiting Board administrative authority. *“Thus the requirement that all counties have one of the three types of administrative positions is an enactment affecting counties uniformly statewide, and a further limit to county board administrative authority granted under §59.51(1). These statute statutes have diminished, if not eliminated entirely, county board daily administrative authority.”* (pg 5, <http://lgc.uwex.edu/program/pdf/Fact%20Sheet%2021%20-%20Limits%20of%20County%20Board%20Administrative%20Authority.pdf>)

I object to characterizing the powers of the Board, the Executive, and the Constitutional Officers of this County in the improper manner and veto this amended section to remove the incorrect inferences.

**Department Head Salary Cuts  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This amendment would transfer five specified positions from pay grade 903E to 904E and would reduce the maximum salary in pay grade 903E to \$120,613. Any remaining positions in 903E not transferred to 904E that have a salary above that amount would be required to take a reduction in pay to the new maximum.

I am vetoing this amendment because, as Corporation Counsel clearly stated in writing and verbally in committee, the Finance Committee’s action to cut salaries of appointed positions violates State Statute.

Further, such decision making is reckless and does nothing to advance the mission of Milwaukee County government. It further hinders retention and recruitment of skilled public servants and ultimately threatens the services the County exists to provide. Other concerns include:

- The “data” included in this amendment is flawed and should not be utilized as the basis for decisions on this amendment. The positions listed as “comparables” were not reviewed or scoped to determine whether or not they are in fact similar jobs. The chart also implies that the “# of employees supervised” is the single factor in determining job scope. This is not accurate, as multiple facets of the job relate to proper compensation.
- This change would result in disparate impact from an EEO perspective (gender, age, race, disability). Typically when compensation professionals propose changes to groups of people, they perform analyses on the potential for disparate impact before implementing.
- As has been shared with Supervisors numerous times, the Compensation Division of Human Resources has been working for the past 11 months on an intensive Job Analysis & Evaluation Project. Not only will the Committee receive a report on the status in the December cycle, but once the project is completed, the Committee will also receive proposed new salary ranges that are up-to-date and consistent. It is ill-advised, moments before receiving sound data from compensation experts, to make such a massive change with no data to back it up.
- This amendment adversely affects our services, by severely limiting our ability to bring the best and brightest leaders to the County.
  - We are currently in the process of recruiting for the BHD Administrator and Facilities Management Director. Although completely different in nature, both are complex and specialized functions that are key to the County's most pressing objectives. From conversations with industry professionals and experts, as well as from past searches, it is clear that to fill these positions with highly skilled and dedicated professionals will be difficult at the current compensation rate and impossible at the rate the Board has randomly determined to be adequate.
  - Succession planning and talent management are key to the success of our County. When some of the most broad, complex positions at the County - the roles some of our top talent aspire to - have been hand-picked for demotion, it becomes exceedingly difficult to retain the people who are key to providing services.

I am asking Supervisors to sustain this veto due to the fact that it violates State Statute, creates significant legal liability to the County, and harms our ability to deliver needed services.

### **Land Sales Appropriations**

#### **2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 383-384**

This amendment eliminates the list of projects that would be funded upon receipt of anticipated land sales revenue in 2014, requires that one quarter of any such funds be placed into the Economic Development Fund, and would establish a workgroup that would analyze requests from departments and make recommendations to the County Board for use of the remaining funds.

I am partially vetoing this amendment to remove the unnecessary red tape that the Board's action creates. Under this compromise the Finance, Personnel and Audit Committee will still have final approval; however, experts will be allowed to recommend priorities to Supervisors and we will be able to move much faster on these important projects.

Projects recommended will either address critical County needs or will help the County become more efficient and sustainable. Under the Board's amendment, funding these critical projects will be held up by several months while yet another bureaucratic committee is assembled, discusses projects and makes recommendations.

Lastly, I am also vetoing the amendment language that directs money to be put into the Economic Development Fund. The Economic Development Director agrees the money can be better spent on infrastructure and other critical projects.

### **Performance budgeting**

#### **2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 16-21**

This amendment strikes all narrative language related to service provision (mandated, committed, discretionary, administrative) within departmental program narratives and eliminates the table on pages 17-21 of the 2014 Recommended Budget summary section. It further requires the Department of Administrative Services to establish a workgroup that would make recommendations on implementing performance-based budgeting for review and approval by the County Board.

I am vetoing this amendment that attempts to insert the Board in an administrative function. This administration has made a firm commitment to performance management, meaning departments will be held accountable for delivering services in an effective and efficient manner. DAS has been, and will continue to, work with departments and all other affected parties to develop strategic outcomes, as well as measurement and data gathering tools. These strategic outcomes will be available to the Board and the other stakeholders.

This amendment also creates an expectation of service that DAS will likely be unable to meet due to staffing cuts. The Board cannot seriously expect the reduced budget staff to effectively serve on all of the workgroups it has created in the adopted budget in addition to the workgroups and special committees that already exist, such as the Five Year Forecast workgroup and the Capital Improvements Committee.

### **CBDP reporting and confirmation of director**

#### **2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This amendment would require the County Executive to appoint the Director of the Community Business Development Partners (CBDP), who would then be confirmed by the County Board.

I am vetoing this amendment that requires Board confirmation and changes the reporting line of the CBDP Director. In response to the Board's and Comptroller's concerns, we chose not to place CBDP under procurement, but instead under the DAS Director. In addition, placing this position in DAS helps insulate the CBDP Director from politics.

According to Corporation Counsel, State Statute provides for Board confirmation of specific department heads, but no provision has been made for other positions, such as the CBDP Director.

### **CBDP Microloan Fund**

#### **2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This amendment would direct Community Business Development Partners to seek at least a \$25,000 match for the Microloan Fund and would require the Director to provide monthly reports to both the Committee on Economic Development and the Committee on Transportation, Public Works and Transit.

I am partially vetoing this amendment that increases the workload on CBDP without extra resources, requiring CBDP to provide monthly reports to multiple committees.

The Board recently passed file #13-496, which states: "To eliminate the need for County staff and the public to attend multiple committee hearings, the chairperson shall not refer files (e.g. reports, resolutions, ordinances or appointments) to more than one standing committee within one cycle unless required elsewhere in state law or county ordinances." I hope you will agree that assigning reporting items to more than one committee is not a

productive use of anyone's time. Supervisors can always attend and ask questions in any committee meeting or can meet with department leaders outside of committee meetings.

Further, while CBDP will look for and accept opportunities to grow the microloan fund, assigning a specific fundraising requirement, as the Board has proposed, only threatens the success of the entire program.

**Abolish 2 DAS-Fiscal Positions and decrease DAS-Fiscal salary appropriations (increase V&T)  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 132**

This change would abolish two Budget Coordinator positions and decrease salary appropriations through vacancy and turnover in the Fiscal Affairs Division of the Department of Administrative Services.

I am vetoing this amendment that handicaps our fiscal division by cutting two critical positions and decreasing other salary appropriations by \$62,194. DAS-Fiscal proposed a much more efficient and less costly model for its operations in the 2014 Recommended Budget, with reduced personnel cost for the budget office.

The Board heard from the Comptroller and the Public Policy Forum who all spoke in favor of strengthening the budget office. The Public Policy Forum stated, "Efforts to reduce unnecessary administrative staff are laudable. But in this case, care should be taken to ensure that DAS' fiscal staffing levels are equal to the task of preparing and monitoring the county's complicated budget."

Similarly, the Comptroller stated, "Milwaukee County has a budget that exceeds \$1.3 billion annually, which requires many hands to monitor the spending and revenue activity to ensure that the County achieves a breakeven, or surplus. A budget amendment was approved by the Finance, Personnel and Audit Committee to abolish two positions within DAS Fiscal Affairs that would have helped perform that monitoring and assist in the annual budget preparation. Supervisor Haas's budget amendment removed that language, which kept those positions funded. I believe having these positions helps the County."

The Board has ignored this expertise and further slashed the division. As noted previously, the Board cannot expect quality service with a significantly reduced staff.

**Decrease salary appropriations (increase V&T) from Corporation Counsel, Procurement, IMSD and Facilities Management  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

This change decreases salary appropriations through vacancy and turnover on the following departments: Corporation Counsel (\$82,317), the Department of Administrative Services (DAS) Procurement Division (\$25,382), The DAS-Information Management Services Division (\$86,081), and the DAS-Facilities Management Division (\$153,946).

I am vetoing this amendment that will cause damage to departmental operations for these four departments. These cuts give departments less flexibility and harm their ability to function efficiently.

The cut to Corporation Counsel (\$82,317) is approximately the amount needed for the newly created Records Management positions which would essentially undo the ability of the Department to fill this essential position. Records Management is one of the most critical functions that not only helps the County function, but also ensures the County is appropriately responsive to requests for information and helps protect vulnerable data, such as health information. Milwaukee County's records management system urgently needs to be strengthened and I ask for Supervisors' support in making sure this essential position is fully funded.

In the 2014 Recommended Budget, DAS-Procurement presented several departmental efficiencies including cutting a highly paid position. This extra cut (\$25,382) is unnecessary.

As Supervisors know, DAS-IMSD is in the middle of some major County upgrades and replacements of outdated systems to increase the efficiency of all other County functions. Asking them to make further cuts (\$86,081) will only slow these improvements.

I am surprised that Supervisors decided to make a cut in Facilities Management (\$153,946) considering we are still recovering from the Courthouse fire and have such a long list of deferred maintenance needs.

## MISCELLANEOUS

### **Saferide**

**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page N/A**

**Transfer \$5,000 to Debt Service Reserve**

This amendment provides funding to the SafeRide Milwaukee Program in the amount of \$5,000.

I am vetoing this amendment that provides funding to Saferide. Saferide is a great organization that serves an important purpose in our community. As previously stated, the County is simply not in the position to fund the many great nonprofits that provide critical services in Milwaukee County. Providing this earmark funding to Saferide would create yet another expectation of ongoing funding for a new service when the County already has significant sustainability issues. At some point, this County must prioritize the services it provides if we wish to avoid annual cuts to services and employee compensation. Adding another ongoing cost is counterproductive to this concept.

### **MCFLS**

**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 384**

**Transfer \$100,000 to Debt Service Reserve**

This amendment increases the annual funding allocation from the County by \$150 and provides one-time funding of \$100,000 for the Milwaukee County Federated Library System to upgrade its technology.

I am partially vetoing this amendment that appropriates money to MCFLS. In the 2014 Recommended Budget, funding for MCFLS was provided through land sales proceeds. I ask that it be kept that way so that if MCFLS receives extra County funding, then such funding does not take priority over some of the critical maintenance needs on the land sales list.

## NON-VETO MESSAGES

### **Restore absconder/apprehension unit to Criminal Investigations Division**

**2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 200**

This section of the amendment restores the Absconder Unit at the Office of the Sheriff. This amendment funds 5.0 FTE Deputy Sheriff 1 positions and transfers 2.0 FTE Clerical Assistant 1 positions from the Office of the District Attorney to the Office of the Sheriff as part of the restoration while abolishing 5.0 FTE Investigator – District Attorney positions. Further, three quarters of the funding for the Office of Sheriff Absconder Unit will be placed in Appropriation for Contingency due to the anticipation that that funding will only be received by the Office of the Sheriff if he performs the duties to the satisfaction of the Judiciary Committee during the first quarter of 2014. If the duties are not performed adequately, the funding will be given to the District Attorney's Office for the Absconder Unit.

Although I am not vetoing the Board's action to move the Apprehension Unit from the District Attorney to the Sheriff's Office, I have several concerns with the Board's action. When it looked like they may lose this staff, the Sheriff's Office made a vague pledge to actually fulfill the function and pick up absconders. It remains clear to me that the District Attorney's Office remains the best place for this unit. The DA and his staff proposed a much more extensive and proactive program, including random checks on Huber inmates to assure compliance with HOC rules and to enhance the overall integrity of the program. The DA also proposed using these resources to monitor no contact orders in domestic violence cases and to support the witness protection unit.

The Sheriff has stated that "since participants in Huber/work release and home detention have been evaluated and identified as low risk prior to participating in these programs, the search for these low risk absconders is not the highest priority of the Apprehension Unit." The Sheriff's characterization of this program as "not the highest priority" should concern Supervisors as much as it does me. The successful implementation of electronic monitoring and community release programs relies on credible enforcement of rules governing those inmates who participate. The Board's action risks undermining the program if inmates are able to abscond or otherwise break the rules without fear of consequence.

I appreciate that the Board is holding some of the funds for this program to assure compliance, which is why I am not vetoing the move; however, I think the Board should implement a memorandum of understanding with the Sheriff's office to better assure they will properly fulfill this duty, as it has for the Training Academy.

I will continue to closely monitor how the Sheriff provides absconder services to the HOC to make sure Milwaukee County residents are paying for an effective and efficient service. If this does not happen, I will consider reintroducing this plan to move funding to agencies that will prioritize this service.

**Fund additional 7 FTE Deputy Sheriffs for parks patrol, remove language regarding MPD and other municipal law enforcement agencies performing park patrol.  
2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 203**

This section of the amendment denies the transfer of responsibility for law enforcement services in parks within the City of Milwaukee to the Milwaukee Police Department through a Memorandum of Understanding, denies funding for suburban municipalities to enter into data-sharing agreements for park security services, and partially restores the Tactical Enforcement/Park Patrol Unit within the Office of the Sheriff, including funding for 7.0 FTE Deputy Sheriff 1 positions.

Although I am not vetoing the Board's decision to discard a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the County and municipal police agencies to improve law enforcement at County Parks, I am concerned by the implications of the Board's decision. This approach to ignore local police sends the wrong message about public safety and intergovernmental cooperation, a goal I thought Supervisors shared with me.

During the 2013 budget process, the Sheriff promised to increase patrol of parks. He has, instead, directed 90% of the resources specified by the Board's own policy for this purpose to other activities. According to his own report to the Board in October 2013, the Sheriff stated that he has only spent 4,365 straight time hours on dedicated parks operations (unassigned patrol and calls of service), which represents deputy staffing of less than 3.0 FTE. In contrast, the 2013 Adopted Budget provides 25.0 FTE budgeted deputies and 2.0 FTE Sergeants. The Sheriff's own numbers show only a 5% increase over 2012, when the Sheriff admitted to not providing park patrol.

Not only does this amendment add to the tax levy, but it also gives the Sheriff tax dollars without any guarantees he will re-institute parks patrols while restraining the suburban communities' local control.

As many Supervisors admitted, the Milwaukee Police Department and other municipal police departments are already patrolling the parks as part of their routine neighborhood patrol. This is a more effective and efficient way of providing this service in a fully incorporated area, as parks are located within neighborhoods that local

police departments are already physically in or close to, understand well and have connections within. County taxpayers already pay for parks patrols in Milwaukee; shifting funding to MPD will ensure these tax dollars are spend on the intended purpose and allows MPD to integrate this with other public safety initiatives. Under the proposed plan, local municipalities that are already providing parks patrol would choose to participate and receive \$10,000 to cover the cost of data collection and reporting to the County.

The goal is that this initiative would improve public safety, as well as produce cost savings and other efficiencies. Savings for just 2014 were projected at \$508,893. Cost for future years could further decrease if the 10 FTEs that remain in the Office of the Sheriff are not needed. This plan has also received strong support from the Mayor of Milwaukee, the majority of the Milwaukee Common Council, suburban mayors and police chiefs from all across Milwaukee County, as well as the budget departments at the County and City of Milwaukee.

Over the next year, I will continue to closely monitor parks patrol to make sure Milwaukee County residents are paying for an effective and efficient service provided by the Sheriff's department. If this does not happen, I will consider reintroducing this plan to transition funding to agencies that will provide this service.

### **Restore pools funding**

#### **2014 Recommended Budget Reference Page 324-326**

This section of the amendment denies the closure of the two indoor pools and changes the scope of related capital projects from demolition and replacement with new amenities to repair of the existing facilities.

This section of the amendment reduces general obligation bonding by \$968,170 and increases tax levy by \$243,070.

Although I am not vetoing the Board's move to reject new amenity options for our citizens, I have strong concerns about the sustainability of these pools despite the increase in user fees in the Board's amendment.

The proposal to replace the two indoor pools was made after extensive analysis of pool utilization, availability of other indoor swimming pool options nearby, and maintenance costs. These indoor pools are underutilized and costly to taxpayers. The money spent keeping these pools open would be better invested differently in the parks to benefit a far larger portion of the community. Both of these pools require millions of dollars of maintenance on top of hundreds of thousands of dollars a year to run. The reality is that, with today's attendance numbers, we could give all current pool users vouchers to go to the YMCA and still save money.

The Board chose to divert funding from parks across the County to two pools that are used by a relatively small amount of people. Furthermore, the \$2 million funding the Board provides in this budget only covers half of the necessary repairs and upgrades needed.

I would like to give the Parks Department the opportunity to explore ways to increase utilization of these amenities, within their strategic plan. In addition, I would like to continue the conversation - about how to sustainably fund an array of parks amenities to benefit a diverse group of residents - with Supervisors through 2014.