



Targeted Municipal Aid Programs (Expenditure Restraint and Computer Aid)

Informational Paper 19

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau
January, 2013

Targeted Municipal Aid Programs
(Expenditure Restraint and Computer Aid)

Prepared by

Rick Olin

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau
One East Main, Suite 301
Madison, WI 53703
<http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

Targeted Municipal Aid Programs (Expenditure Restraint and Computer Aid)

This paper provides a detailed description of the eligibility criteria and distribution formulas for the expenditure restraint and computer aid programs.

Expenditure Restraint Program

The expenditure restraint program provides targeted, general aid to towns, villages, and cities. The aid is targeted in that municipalities must qualify for a payment by meeting certain eligibility criteria. The payments are characterized as general aid because the dollars are unrestricted, to be spent however the municipality determines. Since 2003, the program's annual distribution has been set at \$58,145,700.

The Department of Revenue (DOR) administers the program. By September 15 of each year, the Department provides estimates of the succeeding year's payments to qualifying municipalities. This procedure allows municipalities to anticipate aid amounts when they are setting their budgets for the coming year. Expenditure restraint aid is paid in its entirety on the fourth Monday in July.

Eligibility Criteria

A municipality must satisfy two eligibility criteria to receive an expenditure restraint payment:

1. *Municipal Tax Rate.* A municipality must have a full value property tax rate for operation

of city, town, or village government that exceeds five mills. The tax rate for the second year prior to the payment year is used for this test. Therefore, to be eligible for the 2013 payment, a municipality's local purpose tax rate for the 2011 (payable 2012) levy had to exceed \$5.00 per thousand of full value. There were 436 municipalities that met this test relative to 2013 aid payments.

2. *Budget Restraint.* A municipality must restrict the rate of year-to-year growth in its budget to a percentage determined by statutory formula.

Municipal Budget

The statutes define "municipal budget" as the municipality's budget for its general fund exclusive of principal and interest payments on long-term debt. State law provides for the exclusion of several other types of expenditures: (a) amounts paid by municipalities as state recycling tipping fees; (b) amounts paid by municipalities under municipal revenue sharing agreements; (c) unreimbursed expenses related to emergencies declared under an executive order of the Governor; (d) expenditures from moneys received pursuant to the federal American Recovery and Revitalization Act of 2009; and (e) expenditures made pursuant to a purchasing agreement with a school district whereby the municipality makes purchases on behalf of the school district. Finally, adjustments are made for the cost of services transferred to or from the municipality seeking to qualify for a payment.

The statutes prohibit municipalities from

meeting the budget test by creating other funds, unless those funds conform to generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). These principles have been adopted by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board to offer governments guidelines on how to maintain their financial records.

Allowable Rate of Growth

For the year prior to the aid payment, the rate of budget growth cannot exceed the inflation rate plus an adjustment based on growth in municipal property values. The inflation rate is measured as the change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) in the one-year period ending in September two years prior to the payment year, but not less than 0%. The property value adjustment is unique for each municipality and equals 60% of the percentage change in the municipality's equalized value due to new construction, net of any property removed or demolished, but not less than 0% nor more than 2%. The allowable increase is known at the time when municipal officials set their budgets.

To be eligible for a 2013 payment, municipalities had to limit their 2012 budget increases to 2.7% to 4.7%, depending on individual municipal adjustments due to property value increases. The Department of Revenue certifies the change in the CPI annually on November 1 to the Joint Committee on Finance. Based on the November 1, 2012, certification, municipalities will be required to limit the growth in their 2013 budgets to no more than 2.4% to 4.4%, depending on their applicable adjustment for growth in property values, to be eligible for a 2014 expenditure restraint payment.

For 2013 payments, 436 municipalities met the tax rate test, but only 372 municipalities also met the budget test. Thus, 64 municipalities either did not meet the budget test or did not sub-

mit budget worksheets to DOR on a timely basis.

Each year, the Department of Revenue notifies municipalities meeting the tax rate eligibility requirement. To receive a payment, those municipalities must submit a budget worksheet to DOR by the following May 1. The Department uses the worksheet to verify compliance with the budget restraint requirement. Qualifying municipalities are informed in September of the expenditure restraint payment to be received the following July.

Distribution Formula

The formula for distributing payments is based on municipal levy rates and full values. First, an "excess tax rate" is calculated for each qualifying municipality by subtracting the five-mill standard tax rate from the municipality's property tax rate. Second, an excess levy is calculated by multiplying each municipality's excess tax rate by its full value. Finally, a payment is calculated based on each municipality's percentage share of the total of excess levies for all eligible municipalities. For example, if a municipality's excess levy equals \$25 million and the excess levies of all eligible municipalities sum to \$500 million, then the municipality would receive 5% ($\$25 \text{ million} / \500 million) of the total payments.

If an error is found in the calculation of a payment, the error will be corrected by adjusting the affected municipalities' November county and municipal aid payments. In addition, expenditure restraint payments can be corrected by increasing or decreasing the payments in the succeeding year. A similar correction procedure is used for county and municipal aid payments.

The appendix uses the City of Eau Claire as an example to provide a detailed illustration of the steps in determining the City's eligibility for

Table 1: Expenditure Restraint Payment Distribution Summary

	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
2004				
Towns	27	8.8%	\$420,325	0.7%
Villages	134	43.8	5,482,828	9.4
Cities	<u>145</u>	<u>47.4</u>	<u>52,242,547</u>	<u>89.9</u>
	306	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2005				
Towns	33	9.8%	\$461,094	0.8%
Villages	152	45.1	5,198,193	8.9
Cities	<u>152</u>	<u>45.1</u>	<u>52,486,413</u>	<u>90.3</u>
	337	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2006				
Towns	36	11.4%	\$239,473	0.4%
Villages	133	42.2	5,338,424	9.2
Cities	<u>146</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>52,567,803</u>	<u>90.4</u>
	315	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2007				
Towns	24	7.4%	\$144,689	0.3%
Villages	147	45.4	4,896,596	8.4
Cities	<u>153</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>53,104,415</u>	<u>91.3</u>
	324	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2008				
Towns	27	8.5%	\$178,396	0.3%
Villages	136	42.9	4,817,503	8.3
Cities	<u>154</u>	<u>48.6</u>	<u>53,149,801</u>	<u>91.4</u>
	317	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2009				
Towns	13	4.7%	\$146,056	0.3%
Villages	120	43.8	4,352,872	7.4
Cities	<u>141</u>	<u>51.5</u>	<u>53,646,772</u>	<u>92.3</u>
	274	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2010				
Towns	14	4.4%	\$138,517	0.2%
Villages	149	46.6	4,876,499	8.4
Cities	<u>157</u>	<u>49.0</u>	<u>53,130,684</u>	<u>91.4</u>
	320	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2011				
Towns	15	4.6%	\$176,544	0.3%
Villages	153	47.7	5,017,072	8.6
Cities	<u>153</u>	<u>47.7</u>	<u>52,952,084</u>	<u>91.1</u>
	321	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2012				
Towns	18	5.3%	\$176,312	0.3%
Villages	159	47.2	5,034,773	8.7
Cities	<u>160</u>	<u>47.5</u>	<u>52,934,615</u>	<u>91.0</u>
	337	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
2013*				
Towns	23	6.2%	\$162,949	0.3%
Villages	185	49.7	5,735,112	9.9
Cities	<u>164</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>52,247,639</u>	<u>89.8</u>
	372	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%

*Based on the Department of Revenue's September, 2012, estimates of 2013 payments.

the program and in calculating its 2013 payment. Table 1 provides information on the distribution of expenditure restraint payments for the period from 2004 through 2013.

Computer Aid Program

Since the 1999 property tax levy (payable in 2000), computers, software, and related equipment have been exempt from the property tax. Effective as of 2003(04), an additional exemption was created for cash registers and fax machines, except fax machines that are also copiers. Typically, when property becomes exempt, the taxes that would otherwise be levied on that property are shifted to other properties that remain taxable, resulting in higher property tax bills for those properties. To avoid this effect, the Legislature has authorized computer aid payments to hold taxpayers and local governments harmless from the impacts of these two exemptions.

Each county, municipality, school district, technical college district, and special purpose district, including tax incremental financing (TIF) districts, where exempt computer value is located receives a computer aid payment. Payments equal the value of the exempt property multiplied by the local government's current tax rate. Since these payments are intended to replace the property taxes that would otherwise be paid on the exempt property, there are no restrictions on how the local governments can use the aid.

With assistance from local governments, DOR administers the computer aid program. Prior to the exemption's creation, businesses annually reported the value of their computers and related equipment, along with the value of all other taxable personal property, to the assessor for the municipality where the property was located. The reported value was based on the property's original cost, less an amount for depreciation based on the property's age. Since computers and related equipment became exempt, their owners have been required to continue to report the value of the exempt property using the same procedures in effect prior to 1999. Assessors report the total

Table 2: Computer Aid Distribution Summary (In Millions)

	Counties	Towns, Villages, and Cities	School Districts	Technical College Districts	Special Districts	TIF Districts	Total
2002(03)	\$11.8	\$20.1	\$27.1	\$4.6	\$1.2	\$8.6	\$73.4
2003(04)	11.7	19.8	26.9	4.6	1.1	9.4	73.5
2004(05)	11.1	18.7	25.9	4.3	1.1	9.2	70.3
2005(06)	10.8	18.3	24.6	4.3	1.0	8.7	67.7
2006(07)	10.1	17.2	23.4	4.1	0.9	9.4	65.1
2007(08)	10.3	17.8	24.5	4.2	0.9	10.3	68.0
2008(09)	10.5	18.7	26.3	4.4	0.9	12.9	73.7
2009(10)	10.9	19.4	27.7	4.5	0.9	12.6	76.0
2010(11)	11.6	20.7	30.1	4.8	1.2	13.6	82.0
2011(12)	11.6	20.7	29.6	4.9	1.1	12.6	80.5

amount of these values in each municipality to DOR by May 1 of each year, and the Department apportions those values to overlying counties, school districts, technical college districts, and special purpose districts. DOR adjusts the reported values by converting them to full market, or equalized, values. DOR calculates each local government's aid payment by multiplying the exempt value attributable to that jurisdiction by the jurisdiction's current full value tax rate.

State law requires DOR to notify local governments of their exempt computer values by October 1. After the governments have set their property tax levies for the succeeding year's budget, they can use the values to estimate the amount of computer aid they will receive by multiplying their tax rates by their exempt values.

The Department of Administration makes annual payments to local governments, based on the amounts calculated by DOR, on the fourth Monday in July. Table 2 summarizes the computer aid program's payment history over the last 10 years.

Because aid payments are the product of exempt values and tax rates, changes in values and rates determine whether or not aid payments increase or decrease. After the first aid payment, in 1999(00), statewide average property tax rates

declined in each of the seven succeeding years. Generally, exempt computer values either declined or increased at modest rates, during this period.

When combined, the change in tax rates and exempt values produced declining aid payments. By 2006(07), total aid payments had declined to \$65.1 million, the lowest statewide total since payments peaked at \$76.8 million in 2001(02). From 2006(07) to 2011(12), exempt computer values increased 5.3%, and the statewide average property tax rate increased 14.9%. Over the six-year period, total aid payments increased 23.7%, from \$65.1 million for 2006(07) to \$80.5 million for 2011(12).

Increases in exempt values are caused by businesses purchasing new or used computers. However, values do not increase unless purchases exceed the value lost through depreciation and retirements. These factors can result in sizeable valuation reductions each year due to technological improvements.

For 2012(13), DOR has determined a value of \$3,269.7 million for exempt computers and related equipment, which is 2.2% lower than the exempt value for 2011(12) of \$3,343.7 million.

APPENDIX

Calculation of the 2013 Expenditure Restraint Payment for the City of Eau Claire

Eligibility Tests

1.	Municipal Tax Rate (per \$1,000 of full value)	
	Eau Claire's 2011(12) Municipal Tax Rate	\$8.379540
	Statewide Standard Tax Rate for Municipal Purposes	\$5.000000
	Excess Tax Rate, Eau Claire minus State Standard	\$3.379540
	Eau Claire qualifies since its tax rate exceeds the state standard.	
2.	Budget Restraint	
	Change in Eau Claire's Budget, 2011 to 2012	2.39%
	Greater of 0% or Percent Change in CPI, Sept., 2010, to Sept., 2011	2.70%
	Value of New Construction Occurring in 2010	\$38,985,200
	January 1, 2010, Equalized Value	\$4,224,623,800
	Percent Change	0.92%
	60% of Percent Change, but no less than 0% and no more than 2%	0.55%
	Maximum Allowable Budget Increase: Sum of Inflation Rate and Value Adjustment, Rounded to the Nearest 0.10%	3.30%
	Eau Claire qualifies since its budget increase is below 3.30%.	

Calculation of Payment

1.	Calculate Eau Claire's Excess Levy	
	Multiply the Municipality's January 1, 2011, Full Value	\$4,247,467,700
	By the Excess Tax Rate (Per \$1,000 of full value)	<u>X \$3.379540</u>
	Eau Claire's Excess Levy Equals	\$14,354,487
2.	Calculate Eau Claire's Share of Payment	
	Eau Claire's Excess Levy Divided by	\$14,354,487
	Total Excess Levies of Eligible Municipalities	<u>÷ \$731,762,289</u>
	Eau Claire's Share of Payment Equals	1.9616325%
3.	Calculate Eau Claire's Payment	
	Available Funding	\$58,145,700
	Multiplied by Eau Claire's Share of Payment	<u>X 1.9616325%</u>
	Eau Claire's Payment Equals	\$1,140,605