

ORIGINAL

UPDATED

LRB # - 2180/4

CORRECTED

SUPPLEMENTAL

INTRODUCTION #

AB 291

Admin. Rule #

Subject

Distribution of money received from Indian gaming compacts

Fiscal Effect

State: No State Fiscal Effect

Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum sufficient appropriation.

Increase Costs - May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget Yes No

Increase Existing Appropriation

Increase Existing Revenues

Decrease Existing Appropriation

Decrease Existing Revenues

Decrease Costs

Create New Appropriation

Local: No local government costs

1. Increase Costs
 Permissive Mandatory

3. Increase Revenues
 Permissive Mandatory

5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:
 Towns Villages Cities

2. Decrease Costs
 Permissive Mandatory

4. Decrease Revenues
 Permissive Mandatory

Counties Others _____
 School Districts WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected

GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEG-S

Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations

s. 20.505 (8)(h) & (hm), 20.380(1)(km), 20.435(7)(kg), 20.835(1)(k)

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate:

Under current law, the revenues that will be received as a result of the recently negotiated amendments to the Tribal gaming compacts would be deposited in the appropriation under s. 20.505 (8)(h), the Indian gaming regulation appropriation. The existing appropriation language would limit the Office of Indian Gaming to expenditures equal to the amounts in the Chapter 20 schedule for regulation and oversight. In other words, under current law, any moneys received over the amount in the schedule would simply remain in the general fund and continue to accumulate until new law is enacted to distribute the funds.

Statutory language that would direct the distribution of the additional revenues, \$20-\$22 million annually beginning in FY00, has been drafted for the biennial budget bill but has not yet become law. This fiscal note was developed based on the assumption that there is no current law and does not attempt to compare the impact of this language to that contained in the biennial budget bill.

The bill, itself, does not increase revenues to the State. It simply provides direction for the distribution of the moneys that have already been agreed to by the Tribes.

Under this bill, 80% of the compact moneys, or approximately \$16 million, would go directly to counties where a casino is located and counties contiguous to counties where a casino is located. The bill requires counties that receive these payments to use the moneys to develop and implement economic initiatives to benefit Indian tribes and regions around the casinos, support county programs and services, and promote tourism.

This bill also requires that 10% (approximately \$2 million) of the compact moneys be transferred to the Department of Tourism for tourism promotion and 5% (\$1 million) of the compact moneys be transferred to the Department of Health and Family Services for compulsive gambling awareness campaigns.

The remaining 5% (\$1 million) of the compact moneys would be used for Indian gaming regulation and oversight. The bill does not make any changes to either position or expenditure authority for the Office of Indian Gaming.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications:

Unknown

Prepared By: / Phone # / Agency Name
Tara Brunner/266-0016/DOA

Authorized Signature / Telephone No.
Charles E. McDowell / 267-3836

Date
April 15, 1999

FISCAL ESTIMATE WORKSHEET

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

1999 Session

- ORIGINAL UPDATED
 CORRECTED SUPPLEMENTAL

LRB # - 2180/4

Admin. Rule #

INTRODUCTION # AB 291

Subject

Distribution of money received from Indian gaming compacts

I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):

II. Annualized Costs:		Annualized Fiscal impact on State funds from:	
		Increased Costs	Decreased Costs
A. State Costs by Category			
State Operations - Salaries and Fringes		\$	\$ -
(FTE Position Changes)		(FTE)	(- FTE)
State Operations - Other Costs			-
Local Assistance			-
Aids to Individuals or Organizations			-
TOTAL State Costs by Category		\$	\$ -
B. State Costs by Source of Funds			
GPR		\$	\$ -
FED			-
PRO/PRS			-
SEG/SEG-S			-
State Revenues Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)		Increased Rev.	Decreased Rev.
GPR Taxes		\$	\$ -
GPR Earned			-
FED			-
PRO/PRS			-
SEG/SEG-S			-
TOTAL State Revenues		\$	\$ -

NET ANNUALIZED FISCAL IMPACT

	<u>STATE</u>	<u>LOCAL</u>
NET CHANGE IN COSTS	\$ _____	\$ _____
NET CHANGE IN REVENUES	\$ 4,000,000	\$ 16,000,000

Prepared By: / Phone # / Agency Name Tara Brunner 266-0016 DOA	Authorized Signature/Telephone No. Charles E. McDowell 267-3836	Date April 15, 1999
---	--	------------------------