

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: 2/22/2016

Original Fiscal Note

Substitute Fiscal Note

SUBJECT: Additional funding for protective netting and long-term planning costs related to existing capital project WP49001 – Mitchell Park Domes

FISCAL EFFECT:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No Direct County Fiscal Impact
<input type="checkbox"/> Existing Staff Time Required
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Expenditures
(If checked, check one of two boxes below)
<input type="checkbox"/> Absorbed Within Agency's Budget
<input type="checkbox"/> Not Absorbed Within Agency's Budget
<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Expenditures
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Operating Revenues
<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Operating Revenues | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Expenditures
<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Expenditures
<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Revenues
<input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Revenues
<input checked="" 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
Operating Budget	Expenditure	\$0	
	Revenue	0	
	Net Cost	\$0	
Capital Improvement Budget	Expenditure	\$500,000	
	Revenue	0	
	Net Cost	\$500,000	

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: Additional funding of \$500,000 for protective netting and long-term planning costs related to existing capital project WP49001 – Mitchell Park Domes is being requested.

B: If the resolution is approved, capital project WP49001 – Mitchell Park Domes will receive an administrative appropriation transfer of \$500,000 from the Appropriation for Contingencies budget, Org. 1800-1945, so that protective netting installation and long-term planning option efforts can move forward.²

C: The 2016 Appropriation for Contingencies budget maintains an unallocated balance of \$5,176,701. There is currently available balance to cover the requested administrative appropriation of \$500,000 for existing capital project WP49001 – Mitchell Park Domes. The table below represents the projected balance (assuming the resolution request is approved and that actions related to approved resolution 16-129 occur in the March 2016 Board committee cycle):

2016 BUDGETED CONTINGENCY APPROPRIATION SUMMARY	
UNALLOCATED CONTINGENCY ACCOUNT	
2016 Budgeted <u>Unallocated</u> Contingency Appropriation Budget	\$5,176,701
*PENDING: Alternative Juvenile Detention Facility (File No. 16-129; Will be released pending Board approval secure juvenile detention program as presented by the Delinquency and Court Services Division---directed for March 2016 Board cycle).	\$ (500,000)
*PROPOSED: Additional Funding for Safety Netting and Long-Term Planning at the Mitchell Park Domes	\$ (500,000)
Estimated Unallocated Contingency Balance	\$4,176,701

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.

² Adopted resolution(s) 15-601/626 established capital project WP49001 – Mitchell Park Domes with funding of \$500,000 from the County’s Debt Service Reserve Fund. This included funding of \$100,000 for long-term planning options and \$400,000 for domes protective netting to capture debris.

D: The assumptions used to calculate the \$500,000 in additional capital project costs for the protective netting and long-term planning options are preliminary. The protective netting costs are highly variable due to the unique design and construction methods of the domes.

It is anticipated that the tropical and arid domes will remain closed while protective netting installation will proceed first at the show dome due to:

- The aforementioned preliminary cost variables (item D:);
- Majority of revenue is generated at the show dome;
- Less plant and tree foliage obstruction(s) in the show dome

It is anticipated that a phased approach will allow for a better understanding of actual cost(s), with a possible requirement to request an additional appropriation fund transfer for protective net installation at the arid and tropical domes.

Department/Prepared By

Steven Kreklow, Director of Performance Strategy and Budget, Department of Administrative Services

Authorized Signature



Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review?

Yes

No

Did CDBP Review?³

Yes

No

Not Required

³ Community Business Development Partners' review is required on all professional service and public work construction contracts.