

1 By Supervisors Biddle, Holloway, Broderick, Dimitrijevic, Haas, Harris, and Thomas

2

3

**A RESOLUTION**

4

5 Expressing opposition to current pending legislation in the Wisconsin State Legislature  
6 that greatly expands the locations and circumstances where an individual may carry a  
7 weapon.

8

9 WHEREAS, the Wisconsin State Senate and the Wisconsin State Assembly are  
10 each considering legislation that would repeal prohibitions on carrying a concealed  
11 weapon, and although the bills differ in significant ways, each bill allows for the  
12 carrying of a handgun, an electric weapon, a knife other than a switchblade or a billy  
13 club in virtually any public place in the State; and

14 WHEREAS, the following is a partial list of public places where, under the  
15 proposed legislation, an individual may go armed:

- 16 • Public venues such as Lambeau Field, Miller Park, Milwaukee Public Zoo,  
17 Milwaukee Public Museum, Milwaukee Art Museum, Discovery World, and  
18 the Performing Arts Center;
- 19 • Other areas of public congregation such as restaurants and taverns,  
20 Summerfest and other festivals where liquor is available, shopping malls,  
21 state, county and municipal parks, city buses, hospitals and places of  
22 worship;
- 23 • Publicly-owned facilities other than courthouses and police stations such as  
24 the Marcia Cogg Center, the Behavioral Health Division, Senior Centers and  
25 non-secure areas of General Mitchell International Airport;
- 26 • Day Care centers and school zones (although not on school grounds); and,

27 WHEREAS, allowing individuals to carry weapons into these various locations  
28 will have a chilling effect on tourism, costing businesses and local governments untold  
29 millions in lost revenue dollars; and

30 WHEREAS, as currently drafted, the proposed legislation has the following  
31 potential negative implications for Milwaukee County operations:

- 32 • The County would be required to purchase and install \$8,000  
33 magnetometers and \$2,000 storage lockers at all public entrances to public  
34 buildings such as the Cogg Center, BHD or the common areas of the  
35 Airport, in order to be permitted to bar weapons from those buildings;
- 36 • In addition to the equipment costs to install magnetometers and lockers at  
37 potentially hundreds of building entrances, each magnetometer would  
38 require one or two security staff to operate, which, at an hourly rate of \$10 -

39 \$14, would dramatically increase the unfunded operational costs to  
40 Milwaukee County;

- 41 • Non-law enforcement and non-judicial individuals may carry weapons in the  
42 Courthouse if authorized in writing by any licensed judge, allowing  
43 unknown actors to bring weapons into secure areas of the Courthouse;
- 44 • While a business owner may ask a person carrying a firearm to leave the  
45 premises (under trespassing laws), Milwaukee County would be expressly  
46 prohibited by law from doing the same;
- 47 • Milwaukee County, as an employer, would not be able to prohibit  
48 employees from carrying concealed weapons in their personal vehicles even  
49 if the vehicle is being used in the course of employment; and

50 WHEREAS, an expansion of circumstances where an individual may “go armed”  
51 is unnecessary, as there are many situations where it is currently permissible for an  
52 individual to carry a weapon, including that the person is “not motivated by an  
53 unlawful purpose in concealing it,” and the Wisconsin Attorney General has advised  
54 local law enforcement to cease ticketing those carrying weapons for disorderly conduct;  
55 and

56 WHEREAS, various law enforcement associations around the state have  
57 expressed concerns regarding the proposed legislation, citing the lack of requirements  
58 regarding weapons training, permitting, and licensing – deficiencies in the legislation  
59 that, because of the lack of readily available data on who may be carrying a weapon,  
60 may endanger law enforcement personnel; and

61 WHEREAS, it is clear from a casual reading of the two pieces of legislation that,  
62 as with other recent initiatives of State government, the legislation is hastily crafted and  
63 not fully considered with regard to the impacts on law enforcement, business owners,  
64 tourism, and the general public; now, therefore,

65 BE IT RESOLVED, for the reasons listed above that the Milwaukee County Board  
66 of Supervisors hereby opposes current pending legislation in the Wisconsin State  
67 Legislature that greatly expands the locations and circumstances where an individual  
68 may carry a weapon; and

69 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if the Legislature passes legislation legalizing  
70 concealed carry, it is imperative that the State grant Milwaukee County, as a local  
71 government, the unfettered authority to regulate its own facilities (including buildings,  
72 land, vehicles, and parking lots) for security purposes and preserves the same criminal  
73 penalties as in previous statutes if the law is violated; and

74 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Milwaukee County Intergovernmental  
75 Relations staff are authorized and directed to communicate this position to the  
76 Wisconsin State Legislature as part of the Milwaukee County legislative agenda.

**MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM**

**DATE:** May 11, 2011

Original Fiscal Note

Substitute Fiscal Note

**SUBJECT:** A RESOLUTION

Expressing opposition to current pending legislation in the Wisconsin State Legislature that greatly expands the locations and circumstances where an individual may carry a weapon.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

- |                                                                                                        |                                                        |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Direct County Fiscal Impact                                     | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Expenditures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Existing Staff Time Required                                                  | <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Expenditures |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Expenditures<br>(If checked, check one of two boxes below) | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Revenues     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Absorbed Within Agency's Budget                                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Revenues     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget                                           |                                                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Expenditures                                               | <input type="checkbox"/> Use of contingent funds       |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Revenues                                                   |                                                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Revenues                                                   |                                                        |

*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.*

	<b>Expenditure or Revenue Category</b>	<b>Current Year</b>	<b>Subsequent Year</b>
<b>Operating Budget</b>	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0
<b>Capital Improvement Budget</b>	Expenditure		
	Revenue		
	Net Cost		

## 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.<sup>1</sup> 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.

Adoption of this resolution will not result in an increase in tax levy, but will require Intergovernmental Relations staff to include this position as part of Milwaukee County's legislative agenda.

Department/Prepared By County Board / Ceschin

Authorized Signature \_\_\_\_\_

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review?  Yes  No

---

<sup>1</sup> 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.

1 By Supervisors Romo West and Biddle

File No.

2

3

4

**A RESOLUTION**

5

6

opposing provisions in the proposed State budget reducing funding and setting program enrollment caps in the Family Care program

7

8

9

WHEREAS, Family Care was initiated in 1999 by Governor Tommy Thompson to provide greater choices to long-term care consumers, and to provide more cost-effective long-term care services; and

10

11

12

WHEREAS, an independent assessment by APS Healthcare in 2005 found that Family Care had a high consumer satisfaction rate, and saved the State’s Medical Assistance program on average \$452 per person per month; and

13

14

15

WHEREAS, a 2011 Legislative Audit Bureau report indicates that Family Care “has improved access to long-term care by allowing participants to avoid institutional care, and in many instances, to remain in their own homes...” and that “the implementation of this large, complex program has generally proceeded as planned...” ; and

16

17

18

WHEREAS, Governor Walker introduced his 2011-2013 State Budget in March, 2011, which included a \$500 million reduction in MA Program funding; and

19

20

21

WHEREAS, one of the many programs operated within the Milwaukee County, which would be affected by this funding reduction is the Family Care program; and

22

23

24

WHEREAS, the Milwaukee County Department of Family Care provides over 7,700 enrolled members with high quality, cost effective services; and

25

26

27

WHEREAS, the Milwaukee County Department of Family Care is fiscally solvent and operationally sustainable; and

28

29

30

WHEREAS, the Governor’s budget also included a provision capping enrollment to the Family Care program effective June 20, 2011; and

31

32

33

WHEREAS, the cap on long term care will result in cost-shifting in the form of increased nursing home admissions, hospitalizations, admissions to psychiatric facilities, admissions to correctional facilities, and Medicaid card costs; and

34

35

36

WHEREAS, Family Care holds the promise of eliminating waiting lists for people age 18-59 with physical and developmental disabilities, reducing institutional care, and reducing other Medical Assistance costs, such as hospitalization and emergency care use; and

37

45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

WHEREAS, should the provision capping the number of enrollees in Family Care pass as part of the final 2011-2013 State Budget, Milwaukee County will not be able to clear its waiting list of approximately 2,000 disabled individuals awaiting enrollment in Family Care and will have to implement a waiting list for seniors for the first time in nearly a decade; and

WHEREAS, Family Care continues to be a cost-effective model for long-term care reform in Wisconsin; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors hereby opposes provisions in the Governor's Proposed 2011-2013 Budget cutting funding to, and capping enrollment in the Family Care program, and asks the Legislature to lift any caps and continue with the previously planned implementation of Family Care in Milwaukee County; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Milwaukee County Board directs Intergovernmental Relations staff to communicate the Board's position on this topic to the Milwaukee County legislative delegation and other appropriate State officials.

## MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

**DATE:** May 17, 2011

Original Fiscal Note

Substitute Fiscal Note

**SUBJECT:** A resolution opposing provisions in the proposed State budget reducing funding and setting program enrollment caps in the Family Care program.

**FISCAL EFFECT:**

- |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                          |                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                                  |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Direct County Fiscal Impact<br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Existing Staff Time Required<br><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Expenditures<br>(If checked, check one of two boxes below)<br><input type="checkbox"/> Absorbed Within Agency's Budget<br><input type="checkbox"/> Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget<br><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Expenditures<br><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Revenues<br><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Revenues | <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Expenditures<br><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Expenditures<br><input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Revenues<br><input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Revenues<br><input type="checkbox"/> 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
<b>Operating Budget</b>	Expenditure	0	0
	Revenue	0	0
	Net Cost	0	0
<b>Capital Improvement Budget</b>	Expenditure		
	Revenue		
	Net Cost		

## 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. <sup>1</sup> 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 opposes provisions in the proposed State budget that reduce funding to the Family Care program and set program enrollment caps. Milwaukee County Intergovernmental Relations staff are to communicate the Board's position on these topics to the Milwaukee County legislative delegation and other appropriate State officials.

There is no fiscal impact associated with this resolution other than existing staff time required to communicate the contents of this resolution to appropriate State legislators and officials.

Department/Prepared By Jennifer Collins, County Board

Authorized Signature

Jennifer Collins

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review?  Yes  No

<sup>1</sup> 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.