
◊ The TAX TIMES ◊

Volume 17, Issue 3

Newsletter of The Brown County Taxpayers Association

February, 2002

VOTERS HAVE CHOICES

There will be twenty-six seats on the new County Board. This compares to twenty-four on the current Board. There are Fifty-Five candidates running for the 26 seats. Only six districts have one candidate. All of these are incumbents running unopposed.

In an effort to help voters decide how candidates feel about spending and taxes in Brown County, the Taxpayers Association sent out pledges to each candidate asking the pledges to be returned by January 31st. There are two pledges candidates are asked to sign. The first pledge reads, "I support limiting County spending to growth in population percent plus growth in inflation percent. A 2/3 vote of the County Board is needed to exceed this cap." The second pledge reads, "I support keeping the County sales tax at 0% (the current sales tax is 5% State and 1/2% Packer Stadium). I will vote against any initiative to increase the sales tax."

Of the 55 pledge letters sent, one was returned by the mail service as undeliverable. Of the 54 received by candidates, 27 were returned. Only districts 1,7,8,12,20,22,and 23 did not have at least one reply. Of these 7 districts, 5 have incumbents running unopposed. The remaining 18 districts with challengers had at least one pledge returned. A summary of the responses is included in the body of this newsletter. A yes indicated the candidate signed the pledge and a no means they responded but did not sign the pledge. Of note is that Patrick Moynihan Jr. in district 21 signed the pledges even though he is running unopposed. Thank you Pat. Other incumbents returning the pledge letters are Simons, Vanden Plaus, Zima, and Schmitt who committed to the pledges and Schmitz, Krueger, and Collins who returned the pledge letters unsigned. Congratulations to all of these candidates. They have the courage to let people know where they stand on taxes and spending. The incumbents who have opposition and failed to respond are: Haefs in District 6; Bicoy in District 10; Kuehn in District 14; Schillinger in District 18; Fleck in District 19; Shadewald in District 23; Williquette in District 25. We ask why they chose not to respond? Were they afraid to let us know how they felt about taxes and spending?

It is best not to assume when it comes to voting, so each of us must evaluate the data on each candidate and than chose the one that best represents our own thinking. The Press-Gazette and the News Chronicle will help us with information on each candidate. If you need additional help, call the candidate and ask them questions. I bet they will be happy to talk to you and will also be willing to share their thoughts on future choices they may be asked to make.

We are indeed blessed to have so many people running for the seats and we owe it to them and ourselves to make the choice that best suits our own philosophy.

Frank Bennett
President – BROWN COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION

TAXPAYER SURVEY ENCLOSED

The BROWN COUNTY TAXPAYERS ASSOCIATION Promoting Fiscal Responsibility in Government
--

Another Challenging Year Ahead.

Two things that are certain when we enter a new year. We know what happened during the previous year and how we met the challenges it presented, and secondly, we are never sure of what lies ahead.

Recall that when we entered 2001, we were still riding rather high from several years of economic prosperity, even though warning signs were beginning to appear. We had somehow survived the first year of a new century without much fallout from the dreaded Y2K bug. We had a new president who was either placed in office under illegal methods, or would remedy everything we didn't like about his predecessor--depending on your point of view.

News wise, things last year were probably quite normal – until September 11. Most of us have been around long enough to realize there was no guarantee that the standard of living we had attained would go on forever, and the events of that day truly proved it. Although we were already experiencing an economic slowdown, Sept. 11, delivered a punishing blow. Our priorities were changed from a care free, easy living way of life to a more serious mode, accepting a high level of security and the realization that things can change very rapidly in a dangerous world.

From a taxpayer point of view, we face considerable challenges. During the past several years of prosperity, revenues from taxes to units of government in many cases exceeded projections and even requirements. Our elected officials often responded by finding new ways to spend it, and in many cases they fine-tuned and added new taxes to satisfy their spending appetites. Most studies indicate that the percentage of gross income going for taxes has consistently increased at a rather steady pace, faster than inflation, and this is particularly true in Wisconsin. Citizens have responded by electing business as usual incumbents to office.

Up to now, local, state, and national officials have proposed budgets based on current revenues, plus adding a percentage for anticipated inflation. This, coupled with an economic downturn, could prove to be a formula for disaster.

For example, the State of Wisconsin, by its own estimates will be \$1.1 billion short of required revenue in the current fiscal year. While this appears to be more the result of excessive spending than declining revenues from taxes, the remedies to balance the state budget may not be pleasant. For example, about 60% of the state budget is returned to the states cities, schools, and counties in the form of state aids.

These same local units are usually asking for even more money from the state, claiming that state mandates are driving up their expenses and that property taxes for local purposes are already the highest in the nation. The Wisconsin teachers union (WEAC) is constantly pulling all the stops in an effort to obtain additional public funding for their cause, complaining that state imposed spending limits are making it impossible for them to properly educate our children. Locally, we face the prospect of paying for a expensive new county hospital, a metropolitan water system, and possibly cleanup costs for the bay, among other day to day items.

The governor's plan is for the state to make dramatic cuts in aids to local governments, and to freeze state and property taxes in the meantime. Nice plan if it works. State law prohibits operating at a deficit. If state aids are reduced, local governments would be compelled to make dramatic cuts in the services they provide. Taxes in Wisconsin are already among the highest in the nation and people are beginning to wonder what is going on. Additional sales taxes on either the state or local option level have been proposed, but any new or increased taxes on any level will be rather unpopular all the way around. Even business is complaining more about the negative tax climate in Wisconsin.

It seems that rather than proposing any meaningful cuts in spending, our elected officials have been content to wait for a miracle — an upturn in the economy.

It is difficult to believe anything from Washington. While the states often expect the federal government to support them and bail them out if necessary, they seem to be on a spending spree of their own. The war against terrorism is and will continue to be a drain, and one economic aid package after another is being proposed to “stimulate” the economy and compensate for Sept. 11. The problem is that the federal government also depends largely on income taxes for their main source of revenue, and this is indexed to the economy. If unemployment raises much above the current 5% or so, welfare related costs could rise dramatically.

Simply, what it comes down to is that while the cost of government keeps going up, the sources of income become more limited. Is government asking for more from less the answer, or should we be expecting more for what we are paying?

It will be an interesting year.

Jim Frink – BCTA

Senator Cowles to Address March BCTA Meeting.

State Senator Robert Cowles will be our speaker at the March 21, BCTA meeting. Details on the back cover of this “TAX TIMES.”

No Tax Times in March.

We do not plan on publishing a “TAX TIMES” for the month of March. We will prepare a detailed analysis of the results of our membership survey for the April edition.

“An association of men who will not quarrel with one another is a thing which has never yet existed, from the greatest confederacy of nations down to a town meeting or a vestry.” . . . Thomas Jefferson

VISIT OUR WEBSITE
www.BCTAxpayers.Org

Questions to County Board Candidates.

Taxes and spending will likely be the two biggest issues facing the new Brown County Board of Supervisors.

We sent a letter to all candidates to the county board thanking them for making their commitment and interest in making Brown County a better place to live.

Mentioning the excessive increase in county spending the past several years, we asked them to commit on a couple of issues. #1, That no increase in the county sales tax be imposed, and 2, That spending increases be held to the growth in county population plus inflation, unless overridden by a 2/3 majority vote of the county board.

We asked for additional comments and that the results would be printed in the "TAX TIMES." The two pledges are printed below, with the responses printed at the right.

#1 – PLEDGE TO LIMIT COUNTY REVENUE INCREASES.

I support keeping the County sales tax at 0% (the current sales tax is 5% State and 1/2% Packer Stadium). I will vote against any initiative to increase the sales tax.

#2 – PLEDGE TO LIMIT FUTURE COUNTY SPENDING.

I support limiting County spending to growth in population percent plus growth in inflation percent. A 2/3 vote of the County Board is needed to exceed this cap.

Signed _____ Date _____.

Note: This pledge request was sent prior to the announcement of the governor's plan to reduce state shared revenues. Also, we realize that to make a 2/3 vote necessary to pass legislation would require a change in state and county statutes. We would recommend and support such a change.

"We will not be able to afford all that we want. We will not even be able to afford everything we currently have." . . . **Michael R, Bloomberg**
New York Mayor

Letter to The Governor From The BCTA.

Our letter to the Governor was sent prior to his announcement drastically cutting state shared revenues with municipalities and counties.

Gov. McAllum has undoubtedly received many suggestions for balancing the state budget, along with an outcry from interests fearing that funding supporting their livelihood could be threatened. While it appears that the Governors plan is placing more of a burden on local communities than the state itself, we would assume it his intent to have all levels of government operate more cost effectively.

No doubt there will be a lot of discussion before the governors or any other plan to balance the budget is approved. Hopefully costs can be reduced without seriously effecting vital services. The Governor has promised that no new taxes would be imposed, so at this time, the problem of cutting services without increases income is left up to the municipalities and counties.

The Governors' reply to Frank Bennett is printed below.

Brown County Taxpayers Association

January 7, 2002

Dear Governor McCallum,

The Brown County Taxpayer Association wants to thank you for your veto of the budget provision to allow school districts to exceed spending limits without a referendum. We also thank you for your veto of over \$65 million in State spending. It would appear that the \$65 million figure is too small with the potential deficits now facing the State.

Our organization of approximately 200 taxpayers would like to make a few suggestions on how to adjust the budget to avoid any increases in taxes. First, please stop buying land. The State already owns more land then it can properly manage and recent additions will only make this more obvious. Second, consider a change in the way the State supports schools. The current 2/3 supports of schools include capital costs. We believe that 2/3 support of operating expenses is appropriate and needs to continue. This will give every student in the State equal opportunity to learn. We also believe that 2/3 supports of capital costs put an undue burden on taxpayers. Some school districts have looked at this support as a license to steal from other districts. It would help taxpayers and currently the State to limit the amount of capital costs that are supported by the State. Third, consider reducing employees like any other business would do in similar situations. This may include one day off each month without pay for all employees. This would have the effect of a 5% reduction in staff without any loss in skill.

The emerging financial crisis in the State is indeed an opportunity for creative solutions and should be solved without asking taxpayers to increase their support. Wisconsin is already the third highest taxed State and we don't need to increase taxes to solve this problem.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Brown County Taxpayers Association

Frank Bennett, President

SCOTT McCALLUM
Governor State of Wisconsin

January 16, 2002

Dear Mr, Bennett:

Thank you for your recent letter regarding the state budget and the state tax environment. I appreciate the time you took to write. I also appreciate your suggestions and knowing that I have your support as I look for ways to trim state spending in the coming budget adjustment period.

I am currently reviewing numerous options to address the state budget shortfall. Let me assure you that during the coming deliberations, nothing is beyond consideration. As you have no doubt heard and read, I am asking my staff and others to take a look at a broad variety of proposals for reducing spending.

I have recently asked state agencies to prepare for cuts of another 3.5% in their general fund operating budgets. This will bring to 10% the total GPR cuts seen by many agencies in this biennium. Such steps are necessary if we are to meet the fiscal challenges ahead.

I share your concern about the tax burden we face in Wisconsin. I have said from the beginning that my number one priority is no new general tax increases in the State of Wisconsin. This includes sales and income taxes. State government must live within its means, like the families of Wisconsin have been asked to do. Imposing new or increased state taxes would only serve as a mirage for the state budget. I believe it is important that the budget shortfall will be shared as equally as possible. Again, thank you for writing.

Sincerely, *Scott McCallum* Governor

The High Cost Of State Prisons.

Wisconsin's average per capita personnel income increased 69.8% between 1990 and 2000. According to the Wisconsin Taxpayers Alliance, the budget for the state Dept. of Corrections increased over 350% during this time, and the cost for each inmate in Wisconsin is the 11th highest in the nation.

This year, there will be over 20,000 inmates in our maximum security institutions, or 1 out of every 270 Wisconsin citizens. If we count county jail inmates, Huber law inmates, monitored probation, etc., the total exceeds over 100,000, or one out of every 54 residents. Much of this results from a get tough on crime attitude and stricter sentencing laws which we all seem to favor.. We wonder, however if the cost to taxpayers was calculated when these tougher laws were passed.

Vote February 19.

One of the favorite quotations which appears in the "TAX TIMES" is, "Bad officials are elected by good citizens who do not vote." It is disturbing that in recent years the percentage of citizens who take the time to vote keeps getting smaller. Are we so complacent that we are satisfied to let others make important decisions for us? If we did not vote we have no right to criticize the decisions our public officials make in spending our tax dollars and running our government.

The Brown County Board of Supervisors race this year will determine how a good portion of your tax dollars are spent and will be spent in the future. Question the candidates as to what they feel is important to us as taxpayers and where they will take us on key spending and tax issues. Remember their decisions will effect all of us. The primary election is Feb. 19, and the general election is Tuesday, April 2. Your vote does count.

Random Notes: It will be interesting to see the fallout from the Door County recall election in which their entire county board will be replaced. The main issue apparently was spending and a proposed new jail that not everyone felt was necessary.

Despite a good flow of income from the county sales tax paid by visitors and out of county property owners their tax levy had already increased 16.8% in the last year, compared to a state average of 7.9%.

Articles and views appearing in the "TAX TIMES" do not necessarily represent the official position of the Brown County Taxpayers Association. We want to encourage discussion and input on current issues of taxpayer interest and invite your comments or articles suitable for future "TAX TIMES." Please send them to the BCTA, P. O. Box 684, Green Bay, WI 54305-0684, or call Jim Frink at 336-6410. E-Mail Frink@ExecPC.Com.

Year 2002 BCTA Taxpayer Survey. Twenty important questions to let us know what you think.

Each year the Brown County Taxpayers Association prepares a questionnaire to determine the opinions of its members and other interested parties on taxpayer issues of current interest. This information is very useful in prioritizing areas of concern and what our members feel about what are elected officials should be doing.

SURVEY ENCLOSED WITH THIS "TAX TIMES."

This years survey is completely different from previous years. We need your input on such current and important issues as the metropolitan area water supply, dredging of the Fox River, the states budget problems, and the new proposed county mental health center.

In view of the states money problem, the economy, and Wisconsin's high taxes in general, we ask you to prioritize what you feel is most important. Are current spending levels acceptable?

IT WILL TAKE YOU ONLY 5 MINUTES TO COMPLETE !

You should be able to complete this in about 5 minutes. We would like to have 100% participation in order that our conclusions will be complete and accurate. Please complete and return to us by **March 1, 2002!**

Results will be printed in the April "TAX TIMES."

COMPLETE, FOLD, STAPLE or TAPE, ADD STAMP, MAIL.

It's that simple - Thank you.

Campaign Finance Reform, What DO We Want?

Everyone is in favor of doing something, but nobody wants to do anything. Be careful not to give your opponent an unfair advantage seems to be the rule. No matter what reforms are enacted, it will still take a lot of money (in most cases), to be elected to a political office. Some candidates simply have more purses to open than other and design their campaigns accordingly. Perhaps some contributors don't make their wishes known at the time, but even if you donate \$1 you feel entitled to be heard after the election.

In this day of skilled advertising agencies specializing in creating an image rather than an honest agenda, and campaigns by media blitzes, where do you draw the line? Asking

taxpayers to foot even part of the bill could cause even more problems and inequities and is not the solution.

Would "campaign finance reform" truly limit second party advertising, or prevent the media from giving more favorable coverage (for free) to one candidate than the other? It is a matter of influence, power and politics as usual. The big losers are Mr. & Mrs. Joe Citizen who have access to their elected officials pushed aside by big money contributors with their own agenda. The big winners are those selling advertising. It won't change until the playing field is truly level, but the people now in office seem to like it the way it is. Agree?

"If you're too open minded, your brains will fall out." ... Bar Sign

THINGS THAT MAKE US WONDER.

Suddenly the state is concerned about its financial situation. The truth is that the legislature has been warned it was spending itself into a corner for several years. One problem is that spending increased more than revenue decreased. The weaker economy complicated by the Sept. 11, disaster may be more of an excuse rather than the cause. More taxes are not the answer either.

The trouble with tax increases is that they are usually imposed for a special spending purpose, but when that need has been fulfilled the additional tax revenues remain. Think back.

One of the cornerstones of the Lambeau Field proposal was a \$9.1 million expenditure by the state highway dept. for parking and roadway improvements. This has been presented directly to the Packers and we look forward to this portion of the project being completed along with the rest of the project.

There has been some discussion of to who would pay for the added cost of security at Lambeau Field brought about by the Sept. 11, tragedy. This certainly wasn't the fault of the City of Green Bay, but they seem to be stuck with the bill. Wasn't there a big ticket surcharge added this year to the price of tickets.?

About two years ago tobacco companies agreed to a \$246 billion settlement for states to fund anti-smoking advertising and reimburse for the public cost of smoking related illnesses. Each state was to receive it's share but could spend it at their discretion. So far, Wisconsin has made a modest contribution for the intended purpose, and now has opted to use the available balance of \$794 billion to apply against the shortage in the state budget.

In the meantime, taxes on tobacco products have already been increased dramatically. While the purpose of these tax increases is always announced as a means to discourage smoking, increased revenue is always pro-

jected for the state budget. So much for public health.

~~Wisconsin is by no means the~~ only state to use their share of tobacco settlement funds for other purposes. A number of states have found that legal settlements against large corporations for whatever reasons to be a lucrative source of revenue. The suit against Microsoft is an example. There is even talk of a suit against Enron to compensate for losses to retirement accounts. Good luck.

We congratulate the Packer organization for their rapid progress on Lambeau Field reconstruction and agree it will look nice when it is finished. In the past they have maximized every source of revenue such as selling boxes of sod, (to save the taxpayers money), and publicity on all the charitable contributions they claim. It is surprising they apparently had originally opted not to donate or at least sell the furnishings and fixtures from the 200 or so sky boxes and club seat sections they are demolishing. Whatever the outcome, this would have represented a complete waste of money already spent.

While honoring Martin Luther King on his birthday is an appropriate tribute to the accomplishments he has been credited with, a recent article in the *Press-Gazette* reported that only about a quarter of workplaces allow their employees a paid holiday to celebrate. We question whether this is a matter of disrespect as much as it is economics. Heavily benefited government employees can add this paid holiday at taxpayer expense, the dollar amount of which is probably never calculated. However, in the case of private employers, a mandated paid holiday represents both a loss of income and considerable expense. It can make a big difference on the profit and loss statement. For example, would the management of the *Press-Gazette* endorse losing a days advertising and circulation revenue, and then pay their entire staff a days wages to stay home?

One of the fastest growing expenses in the state budget the past few years has been for the Dept. of Corrections. New correctional institutions have been added along with increases in personnel and overhead costs to run them. While this has been brought about largely by a general get tough on crime attitude and tougher sentencing laws, the unfortunate result is that a large proportion of our population is behind bars. Many of those that are released will require expensive rehabilitation at taxpayer expense in order to return to society. When all of these sentencing laws were passed, did anyone put a pencil to the ultimate cost? We don't have the answer either, but wonder if this is what we really want.

It will likely take time to resolve the Wisconsin state budget problem, and the Governors plan to drastically cut aid to counties and municipalities will cause plenty of controversy. There are also questions of policy and control to be considered. Despite Wisconsin's ranking as the third highest taxed state in the country, it was interesting to note that when the governors plan was announced, the media seemed to focus largely on city and county administrators and the problems they would face if state funding was reduced. Nothing about sacrifices that citizens will have to make if taxes are increased.

The Governor claims he has alternative sources of revenue in mind to balance the budget. Let's hope it isn't ~~more local option sales taxes as his consultant Morris Andrews suggested.~~ A state takeover of all the bingo halls and casinos could balance the budget and then some but would make the native Americans unhappy. Does anyone else have any suggestions?

Just wondering.

JF

"I am concerned about the economy. I was the first one laid off."

. . . AI

Rep. Lasee Comments on Governor McCallum's Budget Proposal.

January 24, 2002

Last week, I listed three things that I wouldn't recommend to fix the state's budget deficit. Now that we know what Governor McCallum's plan is, it's time for some grades.

#1. I said I wouldn't raise any taxes. The Governor's plan doesn't raise any taxes - at least, not yet. Grade: A.

#2. I said I wouldn't use accounting gimmicks, or put any spending off until next biennium. There's none of that in the Governor's plan, so far as I can tell. A.

#3. I said I would not use the tobacco settlement money to finance state government. McCallum uses all \$794 million of it. F.

Nearly all government expenditures are ongoing expenditures, meaning that we'll have to pay for the same things again next year. Salaries, road maintenance, schools and prisons are all ongoing costs - not one-time costs.

The tobacco settlement money is one-time money. It's coming in once, and then never again. Using one-time money to cover ongoing expenses just puts the problem off for another year - it doesn't fix the problem.

Sure, we've got a verbal promise that the state will replenish the tobacco fund. My advice - don't hold your breath waiting for that to happen. That's \$1.5 billion in one-time tobacco money used to get us through this biennium - more than \$700 million in the original budget, and \$800 million now.

And we've only solved our problem for the moment. In July, 2003, we'll start another fiscal year, with all the same ongoing expenses, but no more tobacco fund to raid.

2003 will also be the first year of a new four-year term for the Governor (whoever that is by then). Imagine a governor who is soft on taxes, in the first year of a four-year term, and a huge deficit to handle.

I predict that, in 2003, the structural deficit we're leaving for ourselves will suddenly be too big, too expensive to handle, and support for a tax increase will emerge. McCallum has already floated the idea of a local sales tax. He's not pursuing it now, but just wait another year - wait until he's got three full years to make people forget.

There may well be local support for tax increases, if McCallum's plan goes through. Local governments don't like McCallum's cuts in shared revenues (money the state sends to local governments), and well they shouldn't. McCallum wants to cut shared revenues by a third now, then eliminate them entirely in 2004.

He said in his speech Tuesday that the cut will only amount to 4.4% of municipal spending, but that's the statewide average, not the reduction to each local government. Some municipalities depend on shared revenues more than others. Eliminating shared revenue will mean 40% of DePere's budget, gone; 25% of Green Bay's budget, gone; 14% of Manitowoc's budget, gone. Will those cities cut services? Or will the state spend this billion dollars on other programs, and then blame local governments for wanting to raise taxes to cover the difference? This will all become clear - in 2003.

Also, cutting shared revenues now puts local governments in a time bind. They have already set their budgets for this year, and it will be months before they get this final budget plan. If this proposal goes forward, they will have the remaining part of the year - not a full fiscal year - to make the necessary cutbacks.

State Rep. Frank G. Lasee

January Meeting Notes.

Monthly meeting held January 17, 2002 at the *Glory Years*. Mark Quam, Director of Human Services for Brown County, presented an update on the proposed construction of a new Brown County Mental Health Center. He began by explaining that in Wisconsin the counties run the state's programs. He stated that the gap between state requirements and state funding is widening, leaving county residents with an increasing share of the cost of state mandated services. He noted that counties can meet the state's requirements by either providing the services or buying the services. Brown County presently contracts for about 50 percent of its human services and that percentage is growing. Outagamie County buys services from Brown County.

Mr. Quam stated that the original part of the Mental Health Center (MHC) was built in the 1930's and the psychiatric care facility was added in 1967. There are three components of the MHC: a nursing home, a facility for the mentally retarded, and a psychiatric care facility. About 45 percent of the psychiatric care patients are from other counties and are paid for by their respective counties.

With the project cost for the new MHC reduced to \$31.9 million by the county board, Mr. Quam believes it is necessary to start over with a new plan instead of merely scaling back the original design. About 55 percent of the cost will come from the property tax levy. The remainder will be covered by revenues.

Several candidates for seats on the Brown County Board appeared to speak at the meeting: John Gower (District 4), Chad Fradette (District 6), Greg Lipovac (District 11), Brian Verheyden (District 11), Bill Vachon (District 14), and Ken Simons (District 24)

Each of the candidates expressed grave concerns about Brown County's recent history of spending increases and bonding for more and more expensive new facilities.

Mike Riley of Taxpayers Network, Inc. (TNI) explained that Wisconsin's fiscal problems result from the legislature outspending incoming revenue. He distributed two reports, *Crisis in State Spending* and *Taxes and Economic Growth*. Mike also explained that the non-government component of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) is shrinking while the government component is increasing fast enough to create an overall increase in GDP. This is not a healthy situation!

Dave Nelson - Secretary

BCTA Meeting and Events Schedule. (Mark Your Calendars)

Tuesday - February 19, 2002, Primary Elections.

Thursday - February 21, 2002, BCTA Monthly Meeting.

GLORY YEARS, 347 S. Washington St. 12:00 Noon
Open discussion of State Budget and implications on
City and County budgets. All Candidates for Brown
County Board invited to attend and be introduced.

Thursday - March 21, 2002, BCTA Monthly Meeting.

GLORY YEARS, 347 S. Washington St. 12:00 Noon
Guest Speaker, State Senator Robert Cowles.

Tuesday - April 2, 2002, General Elections.

Monday - April 15, 2002, State and Federal Income Taxes!

Thursday - April 18, 2002, BCTA Monthly Meeting.

Program to be announced.

Please Mark Your Calendars, There will not be a March TAX TIMES.

All members of the BCTA, their guests and other interested parties are
Cordially invited to attend and participate in our open meetings.
Call 336-6410 or 399-0768 for information or to leave message.
COST – \$6.50 per meeting, includes lunch, tax & Tip.



**February,
2002**

“Thunder is great. Thunder is impressive. But it is lightning that does all the work.” . . . **Mark Twain**

“Giving money and power to government is like giving whiskey and car keys to teenage boys.”
. . . **R. J. O'Rourke**

“There can no longer be anyone too poor to vote.” . . **Lyndon Johnson**

**SUPPORT THE BCTA
New Members are Always
Welcome.**

Call 336-6410 or 499-0768

Write us at P. O. Box 684

or visit our website

**www.BCTAxpayers.Org
for Details.**

The TAX TIMES

Brown County Taxpayers Association

P. O. Box 684

Green Bay, WI 54305-0684

PRSR STD

U. S. Postage

PAID

Green Bay, WI

Permit No. 255

Inside This Issue

Voters Have Choices.

Another Challenging Year Ahead.

Senator Cowles to Address March Meeting.

Questionnaire to County Board Candidates.

BCTA Letter to The Governor.

The High Cost of State Prisons.

YEAR 2002 BCTA TAXPAYER SURVEY.

Campaign Finance Reform Comments.

Rep. Lasee on Governors Proposals.

and more.