File No.12-780

(ITEM 78) From the Director, Department of Health and Human Services, requesting approval to Allocate Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding in 2013, by recommending adoption of the following:

A RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, as part of the annual Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) process, all applicants were invited to attend a public hearing and present their proposals to the Economic and Community Development Committee on September 17, 2012; and

WHEREAS, for 2013, a review process was put in place by staff to objectively rank projects based on a scoring system to make final recommendations and a panel was arranged to score each project based on this system; and

WHEREAS, once the County Board approves the projects, the 2013 Annual Plan will be published for comment for 30-days, as required, then any public comments will be incorporated into the final 2013 Annual Plan and the Plan will then be submitted to the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for approval by November 15, 2012; and

WHEREAS, the 2013 Milwaukee County CDBG allocation totals $1,644,101 and consists of $376,225 in funds reallocated from ineligible projects in 2011 and $1,267,876 in anticipated 2013 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding; and

WHEREAS, twenty-percent (20%) of the anticipated 2013 allocation can be used for Administration ($253,575); and

WHEREAS, fifteen-percent (15%) of the total funds, less the amount reserved for Administration, can be set aside for public service projects ($208,580); and

WHEREAS, the allocation continues to be split between at large competitive projects and municipal projects; and

WHEREAS, although the municipal projects were not scored and ranked for the purpose of this report, they are included to show the complete allocation; and

WHEREAS, if projects are not able to provide specific documentation that they are serving the Milwaukee County CDBG jurisdiction and that they are serving low-to-moderate income individuals, Milwaukee County will not be able to provide reimbursement per HUD regulations; and

WHEREAS, in no case will program expenditures exceed available revenue; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, the County Board of Supervisors authorize the Director, DHHS, or his designee, to allocate the total anticipated 2013 Community Development Block Grant funds to the following projects:

County-wide Projects	Public Service	Non Public Service	Total
Metro. Milwaukee Fair Housing Council	$35,000		$35,000
Legal Aid Society of Milwaukee	$21,000		$21,000
Wisconsin Community Services - CDLRE	$25,000		$25,000
Wisconsin Community Services – Job Training	$23,290		$23,290
Milwaukee County Housing, Emergency Home Repair		$60,000	$60,000
Milwaukee County Housing, Architectural Barrier Removal		$120,000	$120,000
Wisconsin Women's Business Initiative, Microenterprise		$60,000	$60,000
St. Mary's – Marian Center		$100,000	$100,000
Wisconsin Preservation Fund		$113,000	$113,000
Hunger Task Force, Well Pump		$16,496	$16,496
Hunger Task Force, Infrastructure		$26,280	$26,280
Rebuilding Together, Minor Home Repair		$95,197	$95,197
At large total	**$104,290**	**$590,973**	**$695,263**

Suburban Set-Aside Projects	Public Service	Non Public Service	Total
Village of Bayside, Senior Services	$5,598		$5,598
Village of Brown Deer, Senior Club	$25,017		$25,017
City of Cudahy, Program for the Elderly	$6,000		$6,000
City of Cudahy, Project Concern	$6,200		$6,200
City of Cudahy, Property Maintenance Program	$4,800		$4,800
City of Cudahy, Handicap Ramp/Bus Pad		$30,000	$30,000
City of Franklin, Senior Travel	$5,883		$5,883
City of Franklin, SW Interfaith	$3,381		$3,381
City of Franklin, Clare Meadows Sidewalk		$80,000	$80,000
City of Glendale, ADA Sidewalk		$31,345	$31,345
Village of Greendale, Adult Program Services	$9,702		$9,702

Village of Greendale, ADA Enhancements		$29,383	$29,383
City of Greenfield, Maple Grove Access		$62,000	$62,000
City of Greenfield, Senior Services	$17,209		$17,209
Village of Shorewood, Senior Resource Center	$10,000		$10,000
Village of Shorewood, Shoreline Interfaith	$2,500		$2,500
Village of Shorewood, Water Main Replacement		$21,614	$21,614
City of South Milwaukee, Human Concerns Food	$3,000		$3,000
City of South Milwaukee, Human Concerns Boiler		$20,606	$20,606
City of St. Francis, Interfaith	$5,000		$5,000
City of St. Francis, Trail System		$60,000	$60,000
City of St. Francis, Sidewalk Replacement and Ramp		$40,000	$40,000
City of St. Francis, Sidewalk Replacement Phase II		$50,000	$50,000
Village of West Milwaukee, Community Center		$32,000	$32,000
Village of West Milwaukee, Community Center		$9,000	$9,000
Suburban Home Repair Collaboration – County Housing		$125,025	$125,025
Suburban Total	**$104,290**	**$590,973**	**$695,263**

jmj
09/25/12
H:\Shared\COMCLERK\Committees\2012\Sep\ECD\Resolutions\12-780.doc

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: September 24, 2012

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: Report from the Director, Department of Health and Human Services, Requesting Approval to Allocate the Anticipated 2013 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Funding

FISCAL EFFECT:

☐ No Direct County Fiscal Impact

☐ Existing Staff Time Required

☒ Increase Operating Expenditures
(If checked, check one of two boxes below)

☐ Absorbed Within Agency's Budget
☐ Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget

☐ Decrease Operating Expenditures

☒ Increase Operating Revenues

☐ Decrease Operating Revenues

☐ Increase Capital Expenditures

☐ Decrease Capital Expenditures

☐ Increase Capital Revenues

☐ Decrease Capital Revenues

☐ Use of contingent funds

Indicate below the dollar change from budget for any submission that is projected to result in increased/decreased expenditures or revenues in the current year.

	Expenditure or Revenue Category	Current Year	Subsequent Year
Operating Budget	Expenditure	0	249,964*
	Revenue	0	249,964*
	Net Cost	0	0
Capital Improvement Budget	Expenditure		
	Revenue		
	Net Cost		

*The increase for the subsequent year is based on the 2013 DHHS Requested Budget.

DESCRIPTION OF FISCAL EFFECT

In the space below, you must provide the following information. Attach additional pages if necessary.

A. Briefly describe the nature of the action that is being requested or proposed, and the new or changed conditions that would occur if the request or proposal were adopted.
B. State the direct costs, savings or anticipated revenues associated with the requested or proposed action in the current budget year and how those were calculated. [1] If annualized or subsequent year fiscal impacts are substantially different from current year impacts, then those shall be stated as well. In addition, cite any one-time costs associated with the action, the source of any new or additional revenues (e.g. State, Federal, user fee or private donation), the use of contingent funds, and/or the use of budgeted appropriations due to surpluses or change in purpose required to fund the requested action.
C. Discuss the budgetary impacts associated with the proposed action in the current year. A statement that sufficient funds are budgeted should be justified with information regarding the amount of budgeted appropriations in the relevant account and whether that amount is sufficient to offset the cost of the requested action. If relevant, discussion of budgetary impacts in subsequent years also shall be discussed. Subsequent year fiscal impacts shall be noted for the entire period in which the requested or proposed action would be implemented when it is reasonable to do so (i.e. a five-year lease agreement shall specify the costs/savings for each of the five years in question). Otherwise, impacts associated with the existing and subsequent budget years should be cited.
D. Describe any assumptions or interpretations that were utilized to provide the information on this form.

A. The Director, Department of Health and Human Services (DHHS), is requesting authorization to allocate $1,644,101 in Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding in 2013. This amount consists of $376,225 in funds reallocated from ineligible projects in 2011 and $1,267,876 in anticipated 2013 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding.

B. The anticipated 2013 Community Development Block Grant (not including the reallocated 2011 funds) amount represents a decrease of $126,361 compared to the 2012 Adopted (and 2013 Requested) Housing Division Budget for CDBG funds of $1,394,237. The total allocated funding, including the 2011 reallocated funds, amount represents an increase of $249,964 compared to the 2012 Adopted (and 2013 Requested) Housing Division Budget for CDBG funds.

C. It is anticipated that the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) will provide approximately $1,267,876 in grant revenue in 2013. This combined with the $376,225 in funds reallocated from ineligible projects in 2011, results in a total amount available and allocated in for 2013 of $1,644,101. It is important to note that Federal allocations of grant awards may change but in no case will program expenditures exceed available revenue. There is no tax levy impact associated with approval of this request. If the final amount awarded differs from the allocation presented here, DHHS will return to the Board with an update and any necessary fund transfers.

D. No further assumptions are made.

---

[1] If it is assumed that there is no fiscal impact associated with the requested action, then an explanatory statement that justifies that conclusion shall be provided. If precise impacts cannot be calculated, then an estimate or range should be provided.

Department/Prepared By Thomas F. Lewandowski, Fiscal & Management Analyst

Authorized Signature

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? ☐ Yes ☒ No

File No. 12-773

(ITEM 79) A resolution and ordinance by Supervisors Jursik, Broderick and Bowen relating to real estate procedures for the disposition of County Land, by recommending adoption of the following:

A RESOLUTION/ORDINANCE

WHEREAS, all future land sales shall follow the policy and procedure for disposition of real estate as recommended by the Committee on Economic and Community Development (ECD committee), approved by the County Board and implemented by the Department of Administration (DAS) - Economic Development Division; and

WHEREAS, all land sales including those declared surplus by the County shall be referred to the ECD committee for disposition and the ECD committee shall consider any of the following policies for such disposition:

a. A site-specific plan because of the unique character or location of the property

b. A Request For Proposal (RFP) process which is intended to be a formal process that is generally reviewed in closed hearings if such hearings are deemed appropriate by opinion of Corporation Counsel

c. A Request For Information (RFI) process which is intended to be a less formal process that is generally reviewed in an open hearing unless Corporation Counsel provides an opinion that proprietary information must be protected and such RFI process may be followed by a more specific procedure as recommended by the ECD committee

d. Any other policy for disposition that the ECD committee establishes as appropriate which may be determined by the totality of the circumstances regarding the real estate involved

e. A development agreement negotiated by DAS - Economic Development Division that the ECD committee established with regard to a specific developer to develop an identified real estate parcel

; and

WHEREAS, the ECD committee may, at their discretion, recommend to the County Board any Community Benefit requirements for the disposition plan or development plan; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, this resolution shall be prospective and specifically does not apply to the designation of the Downtown Transit Center; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all negotiations and review of RFP, RFI, or any other negotiated procedures shall be conducted by the DAS - Economic Development Division which shall make final recommendations to the ECD committee for review and recommendation to the County Board; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the effective date of this resolution and ordinance shall be 30 days after publication; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors hereby amends Chapter 32.96 of the Milwaukee County Code of General Ordinances by adopting the following:

AN ORDINANCE

The County Board of Supervisors of the County of Milwaukee does ordain as follows:

SECTION 1: Chapter 32.96 of the General Ordinances of Milwaukee County is amended as follows:

32.96. - Real estate.

(1) Manage, sell and acquire real estate for the county. Specific responsibilities include managing and leasing improved and unimproved properties, including air space parking lots for the state department of transportation (WIDOT). County surplus real estate and tax deed foreclosure properties in the county suburbs are sold by the division.

(2) Land sales shall follow the policy and procedure for disposition of real estate as recommended by the Committee on Economic and Community Development (ECD committee), approved by the County Board and implemented by the Department of Administration (DAS) - Economic Development Division.

(3) All land sales including those declared surplus by the county shall be referred to the ECD committee for disposition and the ECD committee may consider any of the following policies for such disposition:

(a) A site-specific plan because of the unique character or location of the property.

(b) A Request For Proposal (RFP) process which is intended to be a formal process that is generally reviewed in closed hearings if such hearings are deemed appropriate by opinion of Corporation Counsel.

(c) A Request For Information (RFI) process which is intended to be a less formal process that is generally reviewed in an open hearing unless Corporation Counsel provides an opinion that proprietary information must be protected. Such RFI process may be followed by a more specific procedure as recommended by the ECD committee.

(d) Any other policy for disposition that the ECD committee establishes as appropriate which may be determined by the totality of the circumstances regarding the real estate involved.

(e) A development agreement negotiated by DAS - Economic Development Division that the ECD committee established with regard to a specific developer to develop an identified real estate parcel.

(4) The ECD committee may, at their discretion, recommend to the County Board any Community Benefit requirements for either the surplus disposition plan or development agreement.

(5) All negotiations and review of RFP, RFI, or any other negotiated procedures shall be conducted by the DAS - Economic Development Division which shall make final recommendations to the ECD committee for review and recommendation to the County Board.

SECTION 2. This ordinance shall become effective thirty days after passage and publication.

jmj
09/21/12
H:\Shared\COMCLERK\Committees\2012\Sep\ECD\Resolutions\12-773R.doc

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: September 19, 2012

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: A resolution and ordinance relating to Real Estate Procedures for Disposition of County Land.

FISCAL EFFECT:

☒ No Direct County Fiscal Impact

☐ Existing Staff Time Required

☐ Increase Operating Expenditures
(If checked, check one of two boxes below)

☐ Absorbed Within Agency's Budget

☐ Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget

☐ Decrease Operating Expenditures

☐ Increase Operating Revenues

☐ Decrease Operating Revenues

☐ Increase Capital Expenditures

☐ Decrease Capital Expenditures

☐ Increase Capital Revenues

☐ Decrease Capital Revenues

☐ Use of contingent funds

Indicate below the dollar change from budget for any submission that is projected to result in increased/decreased expenditures or revenues in the current year.

	Expenditure or Revenue Category	Current Year	Subsequent Year
Operating Budget	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0
Capital Improvement Budget	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0

DESCRIPTION OF FISCAL EFFECT

In the space below, you must provide the following information. Attach additional pages if necessary.

A. Briefly describe the nature of the action that is being requested or proposed, and the new or changed conditions that would occur if the request or proposal were adopted.
B. State the direct costs, savings or anticipated revenues associated with the requested or proposed action in the current budget year and how those were calculated. [1] If annualized or subsequent year fiscal impacts are substantially different from current year impacts, then those shall be stated as well. In addition, cite any one-time costs associated with the action, the source of any new or additional revenues (e.g. State, Federal, user fee or private donation), the use of contingent funds, and/or the use of budgeted appropriations due to surpluses or change in purpose required to fund the requested action.
C. Discuss the budgetary impacts associated with the proposed action in the current year. A statement that sufficient funds are budgeted should be justified with information regarding the amount of budgeted appropriations in the relevant account and whether that amount is sufficient to offset the cost of the requested action. If relevant, discussion of budgetary impacts in subsequent years also shall be discussed. Subsequent year fiscal impacts shall be noted for the entire period in which the requested or proposed action would be implemented when it is reasonable to do so (i.e. a five-year lease agreement shall specify the costs/savings for each of the five years in question). Otherwise, impacts associated with the existing and subsequent budget years should be cited.
D. Describe any assumptions or interpretations that were utilized to provide the information on this form.

This resolution and ordinance has no fiscal effect.

Department/Prepared By Glenn Bultman, Legislative Research Analyst

Authorized Signature Glenn Bultman

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? ☐ Yes ☒ No

[1] If it is assumed that there is no fiscal impact associated with the requested action, then an explanatory statement that justifies that conclusion shall be provided. If precise impacts cannot be calculated, then an estimate or range should be provided.

File No. 12-761

(ITEM 80) A resolution by Supervisors Johnson and Jursik authorizing the Director of Economic Development to negotiate with MRH West LLC on the purchase and development of a parcel located on the west side of Old World Third Street between West Juneau Avenue and West McKinley Avenue in the Park East Corridor in the City of Milwaukee, by recommending adoption of the following:

A RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, MRH West LLC is seeking to develop a parcel in the Park East located on the west side of Old World Third Street between West Juneau Avenue and West McKinley Avenue; and

WHEREAS, the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors has previously issued a Request for Proposal on this parcel which has not been fruitful; and

WHEREAS, MRH West LLC has successfully developed the Aloft Hotel which is located across the street from this parcel; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, the Committee on Economic and Community Development (ECD committee) directs the administration to enter into negotiations with MRH West LLC; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the ECD committee directs the administration to enter into a site-specific agreement, incorporating the items of the Park East Redevelopment Compact (PERC) into this agreement; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the effective date of this resolution and ordinance shall be 30 days after publication; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, after successfully negotiating a site-specific agreement with the PERC requirements, the administration shall bring a negotiated agreement before the ECD committee for its recommendation to the County Board.

jmj
09/5/12
H:\Shared\COMCLERK\Committees\2012\Sep\ECD\Resolutions\12-761.doc

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: September 24, 2012

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: A resolution authorizing the Director of Economic Development to negotiate with MRH West LLC for purchase of land in the Park East Corridor.

FISCAL EFFECT:

☒ No Direct County Fiscal Impact

☐ Existing Staff Time Required

☐ Increase Operating Expenditures
(If checked, check one of two boxes below)

☐ Absorbed Within Agency's Budget

☐ Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget

☐ Decrease Operating Expenditures

☐ Increase Operating Revenues

☐ Decrease Operating Revenues

☐ Increase Capital Expenditures

☐ Decrease Capital Expenditures

☐ Increase Capital Revenues

☐ Decrease Capital Revenues

☐ Use of contingent funds

Indicate below the dollar change from budget for any submission that is projected to result in increased/decreased expenditures or revenues in the current year.

	Expenditure or Revenue Category	Current Year	Subsequent Year
Operating Budget	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0
Capital Improvement Budget	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0

DESCRIPTION OF FISCAL EFFECT

In the space below, you must provide the following information. Attach additional pages if necessary.

A. Briefly describe the nature of the action that is being requested or proposed, and the new or changed conditions that would occur if the request or proposal were adopted.
B. State the direct costs, savings or anticipated revenues associated with the requested or proposed action in the current budget year and how those were calculated.[1] If annualized or subsequent year fiscal impacts are substantially different from current year impacts, then those shall be stated as well. In addition, cite any one-time costs associated with the action, the source of any new or additional revenues (e.g. State, Federal, user fee or private donation), the use of contingent funds, and/or the use of budgeted appropriations due to surpluses or change in purpose required to fund the requested action.
C. Discuss the budgetary impacts associated with the proposed action in the current year. A statement that sufficient funds are budgeted should be justified with information regarding the amount of budgeted appropriations in the relevant account and whether that amount is sufficient to offset the cost of the requested action. If relevant, discussion of budgetary impacts in subsequent years also shall be discussed. Subsequent year fiscal impacts shall be noted for the entire period in which the requested or proposed action would be implemented when it is reasonable to do so (i.e. a five-year lease agreement shall specify the costs/savings for each of the five years in question). Otherwise, impacts associated with the existing and subsequent budget years should be cited.
D. Describe any assumptions or interpretations that were utilized to provide the information on this form.

This resolution and ordinance has no fiscal effect.

Department/Prepared By Glenn Bultman, Legislative Research Analyst

Authorized Signature Glenn Bultman

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? ☐ Yes ☒ No

[1] If it is assumed that there is no fiscal impact associated with the requested action, then an explanatory statement that justifies that conclusion shall be provided. If precise impacts cannot be calculated, then an estimate or range should be provided.