FISCAL ESTIMATE	⊠ ORIGINAL	☐ UPDATED	LKB OF BIH NO./Adm. Ru	AB 219				
DOA 0040 N/D40/00\	— — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		LRB 1379/1					
DOA-2048 N(R10/98)	CORRECTED	SUPPLEMENTAL	Amendment No. if Applica	ble				
Cubicat	· .							
Subject Create Property Tax Ex	emption on Rea	al Property Used for	Nonprofit Activities					
Fiscal Effect								
State: No State Fiscal Effect Check columns below only sum sufficient appropriation	☑ Increase Costs - May be Possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☑ Yes ☐ No							
☐ Increase Existing Appropriation	☐ Increase Ex	isting Revenues						
Decrease Existing Appropriation	☐ Decrease E	xisting Revenues						
☐ Create New Appropriation			☐ Decrease Costs					
Local: No Local Government Co	sts			<del></del>				
Increase Costs     □ Permissive ⊠ Mandatory	3.	5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected:						
2. Decrease Costs	4. Decre	ase Revenues						
☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory	, De							
Fund Sources Affected		Affected Ch. 20	School Districts  Appropriations					
GPR FED PRO P	RS 🗆 SEG 🗖 SE		Appropriations	* .				
Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fisc	cal Estimate			<del></del>				
The bill creates a property tax exemption for any portion of real property used exclusively in nonprofit activities by a community, local association or local organization. To qualify for exemption under the bill, neither the owner of the property nor the community or organization using the property is required to be an exempt entity, although the owner of the property may not derive profit from such use. A property that was entirely and exclusively used in a nonprofit activity would be wholly exempted under the bill, whereas a property that was only partly used in a nonprofit activity would be exempt-in-part for that portion.								
The bill departs from current law in several ways. First, it departs from the general requirement that exempt property be owned and used exclusively by exempt entities. Second, those properties used in nonprofit activities that are explicitly denied exemption under current law, such as sororities/fraternities and nonprofit health maintenance organizations and nonprofit corporations which service guaranteed student loans, would be exempt under the bill to the extent that they are exclusively used for nonprofit activities.								
	(continued on page two)							
Long-Range Fiscal Implications	- <u> </u>		<del></del>					
Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone	No.) Auth	orized Signature/Telepho	ne No.	Date				
Wisconsin Department of Revenue	Yean	g-Eng Braun	sh · n	2/10/00				
Pohocoa Poldt (608) 266-6785		Yea	ng ty Brann	3/12/99				

1999 Session

Possible applications of the exemption created by the bill include little league or soccer playing fields, volley ball courts owned by an adjacent tavern, land for annual festivals, office or warehouse space used by charitable organizations such as the Salvation Army and food banks as well as property used by political campaign committees, medical clinics and university fraternities.

The bill would result in a shift of property taxes from owners of affected property to other property owners. While the initial property tax shift is assumed to be minor, it is possible that the bill could result in many properties used for nonprofit activities becoming exempt over time.

Local assessment costs would increase under the bill, as assessors would be required to determine 1) what portion of the property was used exclusively in nonprofit activities, and 2) whether such use resulted in pecuniary profit for the property owner.

The bill would require modification to the Wisconsin Property Assessment Manual, the cost of which could be absorbed.

1999 Session

<b>-</b>	₩ OBICINAL		LRB of	r Bill No.	/Adm. Rule No.	Amendment No.		
FISCAL ESTIMATE DOA-2047 N(R10/98)	<ul><li>☑ ORIGINAL</li><li>☐ CORRECTED</li></ul>	☐ UPDATED ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL	LRB	1379/1	AB: 219			
Subject								
Create Property Tax Ex	emption on Re	al Property Used fo	r Nonpr	ofit Ac	tivities			
I. One-Time Costs or Revenue Impact	s for State and/or Loc	cal Government (do not inc	lude in an	nualized	fiscal effect):			
II. Annualized Costs:					Annualized Fiscal impact on State Funds from:			
A. State Costs by Category State Operations - Salaries and Fringe					eased Costs	Decreased Costs		
(FTE Position Changes)								
State Operations-Other Costs				_(	FTE)	(- FTE) -		
Local Assistance						-		
Aids to Individuals or Organizations						-		
TOTAL State Costs by Category						\$ -		
B. State Costs by Source of Funds GPR					eased Costs	Decreased Costs		
FED					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-		
PRO/PRS					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-		
SEG/SEG-S					<u> </u>	-		
III. State Revenues - Complete this only when proposal will increase or decrease state revenues (e.g., tax increase, decrease in license fee, etc.)					eased Rev.	Decreased Rev.		
GPR Taxes		•		\$		\$ -		
GPR Earned						-		
FED						-		
PRO/PRS						-		
SEG/SEG-S						-		
TOTAL State Revenues				5		\$ -		
	NET A	NNUALIZED FISCAL IMP	ACT					
		STATE			<u>L</u>	OCAL		
NET CHANGE IN COSTS	_3	See text of fiscal note.		\$ See text of fiscal note				
NET CHANGE IN REVENUES		<u> </u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phon	Date							
Visconsin Department of Revenue Yeang-Eng Braun						3/12/99		
Rebecca Boldt, (608) 266-6785 (608) 266-2700						3/12/91		