COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
Inter-Office Communication

1

Date: February 18, 2011

To: Supervisor Johnny Thomas, Vice Chair, Committee on Finance and Audit

From: Jerome J. Heer, Director of Audits

Subject: Status Report - Audit of MCTS's Fare & Data Collection Systems (File No. 09-84)

Attached is an updated status report from Milwaukee County Transit System (MCTS) management describing its progress toward implementation of recommendations made in our report "An Audit of the Milwaukee County Transit System's Fare and Data Collection Systems."

The audit report was reviewed by the Committee on Finance and Audit at its meeting on March 12, 2009, where action was taken to receive and place it on file.

As noted in the current status report (three status reports, dated December 15, 2009, June 2, 2010, and September 7, 2010 have previously been submitted to the Committee), MCTS management continues working toward implementation of the outstanding recommendations. We have no concerns with this progress.

This status report is informational and we recommend it be received and placed on file. Given the long-term nature of the outstanding recommendations, we suggest the Committee request a status report due for its meeting in September 2011.

Jerome J. Heer

JJH/PAG/cah

Attachment

cc: Finance and Audit Committee Members
Marvin Pratt, Interim Milwaukee County Executive
John Ruggini, Acting Fiscal & Budget Administrator, Dept. of Admin. Services
Jack Takerian, Director, Department of Transportation and Public Works
Anita Gulotta-Connelly, Managing Director, Milwaukee County Transit System
Terrence Cooley, Chief of Staff, County Board Staff
Steve Cady, Fiscal & Budget Analyst, County Board Staff
Carol Mueller, Chief Committee Clerk, County Board Staff

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTING DEPARTMENT OF AUDIT REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit Title: An Audit of the Milwaukee County Transit System's Fare and Data Collection Systems

File Number: 09-84

Audit Date: February 2009 **Status Report Date:** February 15, 2011 **Department:** MTS/DTPW

Number & Recommendation	Deadlines Established		Deadlines Achieved		Implementation Status		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Completed	Further Action Required	
1. Develop strategies for verifying, on a spot-check basis, key elements of its ridership profile, including the number of rides per week for various weekly pass fare categories, ratios and percentages used for allocating cash receipts, as well as those affecting transfer and free ride estimates. This should involve seeking resources outside of MTS for incorporating sound sampling techniques.		X				X	Auditee: *Transit has retained the services of IBI Group as a consultant for the fare collection project. The consultant has reviewed the current fare policy and made a recommendation to proceed with a fare collection system that utilizes contact-less fare media (smart cards). The consultant is currently developing a specification for that technology and we expect to have a draft copy of the specification by the end of February 2011.* *After review and approval of the specification, a request for proposal will be issued and a contract awarded to a qualified vendor in late spring/early summer.* *The new system will provide statistical data for all ridership. This data will be used to update the current ridership profile, including rides per pass, ratios for cash receipts, and free ride calculations.* *Our goal continues to limit driver interaction with the system to the extent possible with available technology.*
2. Once a sound and reliable strategy for verifying key elements of its ridership profile is implemented, use a consistent ridership profile for calculating revenue-ride estimates, fare structure analyses and for estimating the fiscal impact of route and service level adjustments.		X				X	Auditee: *New fare collection equipment will provide ridership data by route which will be used when costing the fiscal impacts of route or service level adjustments.*

STATUS OF IMPLEMENTING DEPARTMENT OF AUDIT REPORT RECOMMENDATIONS

Audit Title: An Audit of the Milwaukee County Transit System's Fare and Data Collection Systems

File Number: 09-84

Audit Date: February 2009 **Status Report Date:** February 15, 2011 **Department:** MTS/DTPW

Number & Recommendation	Deadlines Established		Deadlines Achieved		Implementation Status		Comments
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Completed	Further Action Required	
3. Work with the County Executive and County Board to establish a capital expenditure plan for implementing a swipe-care system for MCTS buses.	N/A				X		Auditee: *New fare collection equipment will be procured using Federal ARRA funds. This item is included in the County's 2010 Capital Budget.*
4. Install additional security cameras in the interior of the print shop to record and deter potential theft, vandalism or sabotage.	N/A				X		Auditee: *Security cameras were installed in the Print Shop in January 2011.*
5. Institute a schedule of periodic inventory counts of finished products in the print shop that can be matched against source documents for greater accountability.		X				X	Auditee: *The Print Shop manager has incorporated additional recordkeeping of finished fares to better track fare form production. If it is determined that the Print Shop will continue to be involved with the production or handling of fare forms after the new automated fare collection system is implemented, a procedure will be developed to periodically inventory the finished fare forms against source documents for greater accountability.*
6. Void or mutilate previously redeemed CVCs upon receipt at MTS for storage until they are destroyed.	N/A				X		Auditee: *All Commuter Value Certificates are stamped VOID when remitted to the Cashier's Division.*
7. Initiate a competitive bidding process for contracted ticket and revenue transport services.	N/A				X		Auditee: *A competitive bidding process was carried out earlier this year and an award was made to the most qualified bidder.*
8. Employ a written contractual agreement for ticket and revenue transport services.	N/A				X		Auditee: *A written contract has been issued as a result of the competitive bidding process for delivery services.*

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

2

DATE: April 20, 2011

TO: Supervisor Lee Holloway, Chairman, County Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Michael Mayo, Sr., Chairman, Transportation, Public Works & Transit Committee

FROM: Jack Takerian, Director of Transportation and Public Works

SUBJECT: **AMENDMENT TO AIRPORT AGREEMENT HP-1289 BETWEEN MILWAUKEE COUNTY AND JOHNSON CONTROLS, INC., FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES AT GENERAL MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

POLICY

County Board authorization is required to amend long-term land lease agreements at General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA).

BACKGROUND

Johnson Controls, Inc. (JCI) constructed an aircraft hangar on airport property located on Citation Way under the terms of Airport Agreement No. HP-1289. JCI operates a fleet of jet aircraft and needs to expand an employee parking area adjacent to its aircraft hangar.

Johnson Controls, Inc., is now requesting to enter into an amendment for the lease of vacant land at GMIA on which to construct a 58-foot-by-274.09-foot parking lot in which to expand parking area adjacent to JCI's aircraft hangar.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Airport staff recommends that Milwaukee County enter into a lease amendment with Johnson Controls, Inc., for the lease of land at GMIA, under the terms and conditions of Airport Agreement HP-1289.

1. The amendment shall be binding and take effect upon execution by all parties hereto (the "Effective Date"). The term and obligation to pay additional rent shall not commence until the Date of Substantial Beneficial Occupancy ("SBO") of the completed parking lot, which shall mean the date specifically designated in a written notice to JCI from the Airport Director that the parking lot is completed to the extent that it is usable, but no later than one (1) year after the effective date. Said notice shall be attached to and be deemed a part of the Agreement.

2. Commencing on the Date of SBO, JCI agrees to pay Milwaukee County the then-current land rental rate in effect for the land supporting and surrounding the additional 58-foot-by-274.09 parking area (currently .3133 cents per square foot).

3. The rental rates for the land and associated ramp area shall be adjusted by Milwaukee County each July 1, based on the percentage increase or decrease in the Consumer Price Index (All Urban Consumers) for the Milwaukee area as published by the U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, or the generally accepted national replacement or successor index, as readjusted to the base month and computed by comparison of the then-current January index with the index of the preceding January.

4. Parking lot construction by JCI shall be subject to approval by the Airport engineers, and comply with City of Milwaukee storm water runoff requirements.

FISCAL NOTE

GMIA land rental revenue will increase by approximately $4,980.60 annually with the construction of the Johnson Controls, Inc., employee parking area.

Prepared by: Steven Wright, A.A.E., Airport Properties Manager

Approved by:

Jack Takerian, Director of
Transportation and Public Works

C. Barry Bateman
Airport Director

H:\Private\Clerk Typist\Aa01\TPW&T 11\May 2011\REPORT - JCI Parking.doc

File No. _____
Journal _____

(ITEM) From the Director of Transportation and Public Works requesting authorization to enter into an amendment to Airport Agreement HP-1289 between Milwaukee County and Johnson Controls, Inc., for the construction of additional parking spaces at General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA).

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, Johnson Controls, Inc. (JCI) constructed an aircraft hangar on airport property located on Citation Way under the terms of Airport Agreement No. HP-1289; and

WHEREAS, JCI operates a fleet of jet aircraft and needs to expand its employee parking area adjacent to its aircraft hangar; and

WHEREAS, JCI is now requesting to enter into an amendment for the lease of vacant land at GMIA on which to construct a 58-foot-by-274.09-foot parking lot in which to expand an employee parking area adjacent to JCI's aircraft hangar; and

WHEREAS, airport staff reviewed the proposed construction documents and recommends entering into a lease amendment between Milwaukee County and Johnson Controls, Inc., for the lease of land at GMIA, under the standard terms and conditions.

WHEREAS, the Transportation, Public Works and Transit Committee, at its meeting on May 11, 2011, recommended approval (vote ___) that Milwaukee County enter into an amendment to Airport Agreement HP-1289 between Milwaukee County and Johnson Controls, Inc., effective as of the date of closing on the transaction, now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Director of Transportation and Public Works and the Airport Director are hereby authorized and directed to enter into an amendment to Airport Agreement HP-1289 between Milwaukee County and Johnson Controls, Inc., under the standard terms and conditions.

H:\Private\Clerk Typist\Aa01\TPW&T 11\RESOLUTION - JCI Parking.doc

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: April 20, 2011

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: **AMENDMENT TO AIRPORT AGREEMENT HP-1289 BETWEEN MILWAUKEE COUNTY AND JOHNSON CONTROLS, INC. FOR THE CONSTRUCTION OF ADDITIONAL PARKING SPACES AT GENERAL MITCHELL INTERNATIONAL AIRPORT**

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	$4,980.60	TBD
	Revenue	$4,980.60	TBD
	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.

GMIA land rental revenue will increase by approximately $4,980.60 annually with the construction of Johnson Controls, Inc., employee parking area. There will be no fiscal impact to the tax levy of Milwaukee County.

Department/Prepared by: Steve Wright, A.A.E., Airport Properties Manager

Authorized Signature _____

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Reviewed by:

[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.

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

3

DATE: April 19, 2011

TO: Lee Holloway, Chairperson, County Board of Supervisors
Michael Mayo, Sr., Chairman, Transportation, Public Works & Transit Committee

FROM: Jack Takerian, Director of Transportation & Public Works

SUBJECT: **AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT BETWEEN MILWAUKEE COUNTY AND SYNERGY CONSULTANTS, INC.**

POLICY

County Board Approval is required to amend certain Professional Service Contracts.

BACKGROUND

Over the past several decades, as communities around airports grew and air travel expanded, aircraft noise surfaced as a community concern. Much has been accomplished by Milwaukee County over the last two decades to address the effect of aircraft noise on residents living near General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA). Preserving and improving the neighborhoods near the Airport continues to be an objective for Milwaukee County and GMIA.

To provide financial assistance for airports seeking to reduce airport ground emissions, Congress established a voluntary program in 2003 to reduce such emissions at commercial service airports located in the regions that do not meet or maintain EPA ambient air quality standards. To administer this program, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) created the Voluntary Airport Low Emissions (VALE) Program in 2004.

Projects that are envisioned for VALE funding are included in GMIA's approved FAR Part 150 Noise Study Update. The projects include electrification of various terminal gates/aprons to reduce use of aircraft auxiliary power units (APUs), which reduces noise and emissions. Electrification of the International Arrivals Building gates, Concourses D and E of the Passenger Terminal, the Signature ramp and the West ramp is recommended to reduce the need for APU use. Pre-conditioned air would also need to be provided at the terminal gates. The FAA has indicated that these projects may not be funded under the noise program grant program, but would be eligible for VALE funding.

General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA) entered into an agreement with Synergy Consultants, Inc. on February 22, 2010 to perform professional services related to preparation of an application for VALE project funding. The VALE application process and related inventory requirement are new to the FAA Airport District Office

(ADO) in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The GMIA VALE application is the first to be submitted by an airport in the FAA's Minneapolis District.

Therefore, due to the specialized nature of the application, it has taken the FAA longer than expected to review the application. An extension to the Professional Services Contract is needed to allow completion of the VALE application process, and additional professional services are necessary to complete the grant application process.

The Milwaukee County Office of Community Development Business Partners has approved a disadvantaged business enterprise (DBE) goal of 10% for this professional service contract.

RECOMMENDATION

Airport Staff recommends amending the Professional Service Agreement with Synergy Consultants, Inc. to extend the completion date from December 31, 2010 to March 31, 2012 and to increase the contract amount by $20,093, for a total contract of $119,644. The original contract amount was $99,551.00.

FISCAL NOTE

Approval of the Agreement extension with Synergy Consultants, Inc. will have no fiscal effect on the tax levy of Milwaukee County. Funding is available from the Airport's 5041-6149 A174 account. The contract amount would increase by $20,093.

Prepared by: Kim M. Berry, Airport Noise Program Manager

Approved by:

Jack H. Takerian, Director
Transportation & Public Works

C Barry Bateman
Airport Director

H:\Private\Clerk Typist\Aa01\TPW&T 11\May 2011\REPORT - Synergy Agreement Amendment.doc

File No.
Journal

(Item) From the Director of Transportation & Public Works requesting authorization for the Airport Director to amend the professional services agreement between Synergy Consultants, Inc. and Milwaukee County to extend the completion date from December 31, 2010 to March 31, 2012, by recommending adoption of the following:

RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, County Board Approval is required to amend certain Professional Service contracts; and

WHEREAS, to provide financial assistance for airports seeking to reduce airport ground emissions, Congress established a voluntary program in 2003 to reduce such emissions at commercial service airports located in the regions which do not meet or maintain EPA ambient air quality standards. To administer this program, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) created the Voluntary Airport Low Emissions (VALE) Program in 2004; and

WHEREAS, projects that are envisioned for VALE funding are included in GMIA's approved FAR Part 150 Noise Study Update. The projects include electrification of various terminal gates/aprons to reduce use of aircraft auxiliary power units (APUs), which reduces noise and emissions. Electrification of the International Arrivals Building gates, Concourses D and E of the Passenger Terminal, the Signature ramp and the West ramp is recommended to reduce the need for APU use. Pre-conditioned air would also need to be provided at the terminal gates. The FAA has indicated that these projects may not be funded under the noise program grant program, but would be eligible for VALE funding; and

WHEREAS, General Mitchell International Airport (GMIA) entered into an agreement with Synergy Consultants, Inc. on February 22, 2010 to perform professional services related to preparation of an application for VALE project funding. The VALE application process and related inventory requirements are new to the FAA Airport District Office (ADO) in Minneapolis, Minnesota. The GMIA VALE application is the first to be submitted by an airport in the FAA's Minneapolis District; and

WHEREAS, due to the specialized nature of the VALE application, it has

taken the FAA longer than expected to review the application. An extension to the Professional Services Contract is needed to allow completion of the VALE application process. Additional professional services are necessary to complete the grant application process; and

WHEREAS, the Airport Division seeks authorization to amend the Professional Services Agreement with Synergy Consultants, Inc. to extend the completion date from December 31, 2010 to March 31, 2012 and to increase the contract amount by $20,093; now, therefore,

BE IT RESOLVED, that the Airport Director is hereby authorized to extend the term of the Professional Services Agreement with Synergy consultants to March 31, 2012, and increase the contract amount by $20,093, for a total contract of $119,644.

H:\Private\Clerk Typist\Aa01\TPW&T 11\May 2011\RESOLUTION - Synergy Agreement Amendment.docx

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: April 19, 2011

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: **AMENDMENT TO PROFESSIONAL SERVICES CONTRACT BETWEEN MILWAUKEE COUNTY AND SYNERGY CONSULTANTS, INC.**

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.

Approval of the Agreement extension with Synergy Consultants, Inc. will have no fiscal effect on the tax levy of Milwaukee County. Funding is available from the Airport's 5041-6149 A174 account. The contract amount will increase by $20,093.

Department/Prepared by: Kim M. Berry, Airport Noise Program Manager

Authorized Signature _____

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? ☐ Yes ☐ No
Reviewed by:

H:\Private\Clerk Typist\Aa01\TPW&T 11\May 2011\FISCAL NOTE - Synergy Agreement Amendment.docx

[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.

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
INTER-OFFICE COMMUNICATION

4

DATE: April 26, 2011

TO: Supervisor Lee Holloway, Chairperson, County Board of Supervisors
Supervisor Michael Mayo, County Board of Supervisors

FROM: Jack Takerian, Director of Transportation and Public Works

SUBJECT: **Urban Non-Point Source & Storm Water (UNPS&SW) Program Planning Grants**

POLICY

The DTPW Director is requesting authorization to have the Department of Transportation and Public Works—Architecture, Engineering and Environmental Services Division apply for and accept UNPS&SW Program Planning grants offered by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources in fiscal year 2012.

BACKGROUND

Milwaukee County was issued a storm water permit from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WIDNR) in 2006. The permit requires that the County develop and implement a public involvement and participation program intended to increase awareness of storm water pollution impacts on surface waters and to encourage changes in citizen behavior to reduce impacts.

Other municipalities in the region have similar requirements, and some have banded together to improve the effectiveness of their limited resources. Certain non-profit organizations in the region also share similar goals of improving awareness about the adverse impacts from storm water, such as the Southeastern Wisconsin Watershed Trust, Inc. (SWWT). Milwaukee County Department of Transportation & Public Works and County Parks Department staff have worked cooperatively with SWWT in coordinating water pollution control efforts in the region. County staff have also been active in working with the Menomonee River Group (MRG), a partnership of municipal governments active in that watershed. SWWT and MRG are working together with the WIDNR in efforts to increase water quality improvements in the region, including efforts to better coordinate storm water education efforts like those potentially supported by this WIDNR initiative.

WIDNR is making available planning grant funds that can be used for public education and awareness. The WIDNR Urban Non-Point Source & Stormwater Program Planning Grants are offered to Wisconsin counties, cities, towns, and villages as competitive grant process to improve urban water quality by limiting or ending sources of urban nonpoint source pollution, also known as storm water or run-off pollution. As storm water accounts for more than 90% of the pollutant loadings in the rivers and streams of greater Milwaukee, additional improvements in water quality must include work to reduce this category of pollutants. The Urban Nonpoint Planning Grants allow the WIDNR to reimburse up to 70% of eligible planning activities focused on nonpoint

pollution, with WIDNR awards not to exceed $85,000. Among the eligible activities allowed by the grant are "Public participation, education, and outreach activities."

As noted, the Urban Non-Point Source & Storm Water Planning Grant funding is available to government entities, but not to non-governmental organizations such as SWWT and MRG.

As an eligible entity, Milwaukee County can apply for this grant and SWWT can perform the public education activities outlined in the proposal scope and strategy, working on behalf of its municipal partners. The cost share required by the WIDNR would be provided by SWWT, using both its own resources, funds raised through SWWTs fundraising efforts, and with funding offered by the other municipal partners working with SWWT. Thus far in 2011, SWWT has already secured stormwater outreach education funding from the Wisconsin Coastal Management Program and Fresh Water Future and has other grant requests pending. Should SWWT be unable to provide the required cost share, DTPW will not accept the grant.

RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the DTPW Director be authorized to have the Department of Transportation and Public Works—Architecture, Engineering and Environmental Services Division apply for and accept an Urban Non-Point Source & Storm Water Planning Grant for the purposes of public education and outreach on storm water impacts.

Prepared by: Stevan Keith, P.E., Sustainability & Environmental Engineer

Approved by:

Jack Takerian, Director
Transportation & Public Works

Greg High, Director
DTPW-AE&ES

cc: County Executive Chris Abele
George Aldrich, Chief of Staff
Supervisor Gerry Broderick, Parks, Energy & Environment Committee Chairman

From the Director of Transportation and Public Works requesting authority to apply for and accept grants offered by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, by recommending adoption of the following:

A RESOLUTION

WHEREAS, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources is offering Urban Non-Point Source & Storm Water (UNPS&SW) Program Planning grants for 2012 that can be used for public education regarding storm water management and water quality impacts; and

WHEREAS, Milwaukee County is responsible for the administration of a County-wide stormwater discharge permit issued by the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, which includes the requirement to develop and implement a public education and outreach plan; and

WHEREAS, as part of its education & outreach efforts, Milwaukee County is a member of the Menomonee River Group (MRG), a consortium of municipalities organized to address public education and outreach in communities within the Menomonee River watershed, and actively supports the Southeastern Wisconsin Watersheds Trust, Inc. (SWWT), an organization created to pursue improvements in surface waters in the Greater Milwaukee region; and

WHEREAS, Milwaukee County is eligible to apply for the UNPS&SW grant but MRG and SWWT are not, but SWWT can serve as the consultant if funding is secured; and

WHEREAS, any match funding would be provided by MRG or SWWT; and

WHEREAS, the projects would not have long-term maintenance obligations; and

WHEREAS, the funds will be awarded in fiscal year 2012; now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the County Board of Supervisors does hereby authorize the DTPW Director to have the Department of Transportation and Public Works—Architects, Engineers and Environmental Services Division apply for and accept UNPS&SW Program-Planning grants for fiscal year 2012, contingent on the required match funding being provided by MRG or SWWT.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: 4/26/11

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: UNPS&SW Program Planning Grant

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	NA	NA
	Revenue	NA	NA
	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.

A. The DTPW Director is requesting authorization to have the DTPW A&E&ES Division apply for and accept an Urban Non-Point Source and Storm Water Program Planning Grant for FY 2012.
B. No net increase or decrease in the annual budget. Milwaukee County staff currently devote staff time to this issue. Our time spent on administration of the grant would be absorbed in the existing budget.
C. This is a one-time application for the year 2012. The match amount would be provided by SWWT.
D. None

Department/Prepared By DTPW-Environmental Services, Steve Keith

Approved by:

Jack Takerian, Director Transportation & Public Works	Greg High, Director DTPW-AE&ES

Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? ☐ Yes ☒ No

Reviewed With:

[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.

COUNTY OF MILWAUKEE
INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION

DATE: April 25, 2011

TO: Supervisor Michael Mayo, Sr., Chairperson, Transportation, Public Works & Transit Committee

FROM: Jack Takerian, Director of Transportation and Public Works

SUBJECT: Summary of Fund Transfers for Consideration at the Finance and Audit Committee May 2011- **Informational Report**

Description	Amount
DTPW – Highway Services	$50,000

1. The Director of Transportation and Public Works and the Director of Highway Operations have requested at $50,000 transfer to provide funding and expenditure authority to mitigate construction activity along I-94. The funds are necessary for the planning and execution of a contract with the WISDOT to ensure the safety, accessibility, mobility for the traveling public in the project area including I-94 from STH 16 to the Waukesha/Milwaukee County Line and 70th Street to 32nd Street. Also included in the project area are local alternate route streets within four miles of the interstate roadways. This 100% reimbursed project involves a commitment beginning December 1, 2010 and ending by December 1, 2012.

Approved by:

Jack Takerian, Director of
Transportation and Public Works

JHT:mmb

By Supervisor Mayo

A RESOLUTION

Requesting that the Southeastern Regional Transit Authority's (SERTA) assets be distributed between Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties.

WHEREAS, the State 2011-2013 Biennial Budget proposes a 10 percent reduction in general transportation aids, which results in a $7 million reduction to transit operating funds in Milwaukee County; and

WHEREAS, a $7 million dollar reduction in operating funds would resulting approximately 100,000 less bus operating hours; and

WHEREAS, in order to absorb a reduction of this magnitude, SEWRPC has projected that these proposed transit cuts could equate to an 8-percent service reduction, or a 29-pecent face increase; and

WHEREAS, on Tuesday May 3, 2011, the State's Joint Finance Committee (JFC) voted to eliminate all regional transit authority's in Wisconsin by a vote of 12-4; and

WHEREAS, JFC motion #71 specified, "all assets of the RTA, including any accumulated revenues received from the vehicle rental fees imposed by the authority would be divided and distributed equally among the three counties and would become the assets of those counties, unless the counties of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine agree otherwise"; and

WHEREAS, the Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC) has place SERTA's assets at approximately $1.27 million; and

WHEREAS, these revenues were generated through the imposition of a car rental fee at Milwaukee County General Mitchell international Airport; and

WHEREAS, considering these revenues were generated out of operations at the Milwaukee County General Mitchell International Airport, it is reasonable and prudent that Milwaukee County be allocated, at the minimum, revenues generated in Milwaukee County, now, therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors request that SERTA assets be distributed between Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties; and

43 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that at a minimum, Milwaukee County requests
44 that all revenues generated in Milwaukee County remain in Milwaukee County
45 unless the counties of Kenosha, Milwaukee, and Racine agree otherwise.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: May 6, 2011

Original Fiscal Note ☒

Substitute Fiscal Note ☐

SUBJECT: Requesting that the Southeastern Regional Transit Authority's (SERTA) assets be distributed between Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties.

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	N/A
	Revenue	0	N/A
	Net Cost	0	0
Capital Improvement Budget	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. [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. Requesting that the Southeastern Regional Transit Authority's (SERTA) assets be distributed between Milwaukee, Racine and Kenosha Counties.

B. N/A

C.N/A

D. No assumptions were made.

Department/Prepared By

Authorized Signature _____

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.