

2
3
4 **A RESOLUTION**

5
6 Requesting the Wisconsin State Legislature to provide appropriate levels of
7 funding for lead pipe removal in Milwaukee County
8

9
10 WHEREAS, the recent lead water crisis in Flint, Michigan has concentrated the
11 public's focus on water quality in many communities; and
12

13 WHEREAS, both the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the Centers
14 for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) agree there is no safe level of lead exposure,
15 as lead is known to cause a range of behavioral and cognitive health problems for
16 humans; and
17

18 WHEREAS, lead can enter drinking water through decay or corrosion of old lead-
19 based pipes, fixtures, or from leaded solder that connects drinking water to pipes; and
20

21 WHEREAS, the two main methods to prevent contamination from lead are the
22 treatment approach and plumbing system replacement; and
23

24 WHEREAS, the State of Wisconsin has 176,000 lead lateral pipes; and
25

26 WHEREAS, the State's highest concentration of lead lateral pipes are in
27 Milwaukee County, with the City of Milwaukee alone containing 70,000 lead laterals,
28 amounting to 40 percent of the lead lateral pipes statewide; and
29

30 WHEREAS, ownership of lead lateral service lines is shared between the
31 municipality and the homeowner, as the municipality is responsible for the portion from
32 the water main to the property line, and the homeowner is responsible for the portion
33 from the property line to the home; and
34

35 WHEREAS, national research indicates that the potential risk for increased lead
36 levels is greater when there is only a partial replacement of a lead service line; and
37

38 WHEREAS, it is costly for homeowners, especially in disadvantaged
39 municipalities, to replace their portion of the lead lateral; and
40

41 WHEREAS, in May 2016, \$11.8 million in Federal funding from the EPA was
42 made available to the State of Wisconsin for disadvantaged municipalities to remove
43 lead service lines on private property, thus ensuring full replacement of lead laterals
44 through the Safe Drinking Water Loan Program; and

45 WHEREAS, the requirements for the Safe Drinking Water Loan Program allow a
46 maximum funding limit of \$750,000 to communities with populations of 500,000 or more,
47 which is the allocated amount for the City of Milwaukee; and
48

49 WHEREAS, despite having 40 percent of the homes with lead lateral pipes in the
50 State, the City of Milwaukee is only going to receive 6.4 percent of the EPA funding
51 given to Wisconsin; and
52

53 WHEREAS, if the City of Milwaukee provided full-funding towards replacing
54 homeowners' lead lateral pipes, the \$750,000 allocation would only replace 250 pipes;
55 and

56 WHEREAS, it is the duty of legislators to ensure access to safe water for all
57 residents, particularly those at higher risk for contamination; and

58 WHEREAS, the level of funding allocated in accordance with the requirements of
59 the Safe Drinking Water Loan Program does not adequately meet the needs of the
60 Milwaukee community and necessitates additional legislative action to pursue additional
61 resources for lead pipe replacement; now, therefore,
62

63 BE IT RESOLVED, that the Milwaukee County Board of Supervisors requests the
64 Wisconsin State Legislature to pursue and release adequate funds to Milwaukee
65 County for the purpose of replacing lead lateral pipes in the areas with the highest lead
66 pipe concentration, beyond the amount provided from the Safe Drinking Water Loan
67 Program; and
68

69 BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Wisconsin State Legislature is requested
70 to allow the City of Milwaukee to be eligible to receive \$4,720,000 or an amount
71 equivalent to 40 percent of EPA funding to appropriately match the level of need for
72 homeowners with lead lateral pipes in the City of Milwaukee.

MILWAUKEE COUNTY FISCAL NOTE FORM

DATE: June 15, 2016

Original Fiscal Note

Substitute Fiscal Note

SUBJECT: A resolution requesting the

FISCAL EFFECT:

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Direct County Fiscal Impact <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Expenditures <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Expenditures <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Capital Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Capital Revenues <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 |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------|-----------------|
| 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.
 - A. Approval of this resolution will request the Wisconsin State Legislature to provide adequate funding for lead pipe removal in the areas with the highest concentration of lead pipes within Milwaukee County. This resolution also requests that the State Legislature allows the City of Milwaukee to be eligible to receive \$4,720,000 or the amount equivalent to 40 percent of allocated funds from the EPA for the Safe Drinking Water Loan Program to match the level of need in that area for lead pipe replacement.
 - B. This resolution is requesting that the State Legislature take action to provide additional funding for lead pipe removal, so it will not require an expenditure of funds from Milwaukee County. Existing staff time is required to communicate its contents to the appropriate individuals.
 - C. No budgetary impacts are associated with this proposed action.
 - D. No Assumptions were used.

Department/Prepared By Jessica Janz-McKnight, Research and Policy Analyst, Office of the Comptroller

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

Authorized Signature



Did DAS-Fiscal Staff Review? Yes No

Did CDBP Review?² Yes No Not Required