

### Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

Original     
  Updated     
  Corrected     
  Supplemental

LRB Number <b>01-2755/2</b>	Introduction Number <b>SB-120</b>
-----------------------------	-----------------------------------

**Subject**  
 Revenue limit adjustment for security measures

**Fiscal Effect**

**State:**

No State Fiscal Effect  
 Indeterminate

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Appropriations <input type="checkbox"/> Create New Appropriations	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Existing Revenues <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Existing Revenues	<input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs
---	--	---

**Local:**

No Local Government Costs  
 Indeterminate

1. <input type="checkbox"/> Increase Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 2. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	3. <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Increase Revenue <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory 4. <input type="checkbox"/> Decrease Revenue <input type="checkbox"/> Permissive <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory	<b>5. Types of Local Government Units Affected</b> <input type="checkbox"/> Towns <input type="checkbox"/> Village <input type="checkbox"/> Cities <input type="checkbox"/> Counties <input type="checkbox"/> Others <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> School Districts <input type="checkbox"/> WTCS Districts
--	--	--

<b>Fund Sources Affected</b>	<b>Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations</b>
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> GPR <input type="checkbox"/> FED <input type="checkbox"/> PRO <input type="checkbox"/> PRS <input type="checkbox"/> SEG <input type="checkbox"/> SEGS	20.255 (2) (ac)

<b>Agency/Prepared By</b> DPI/ Thomas Johnson (608) 266-2819	<b>Authorized Signature</b> Brian Pahnke (608) 266-2804	<b>Date</b> 4/5/01
---	--	-----------------------

## Fiscal Estimate Narratives

DPI 4/6/01

LRB Number	01-2755/2	Introduction Number	SB-120	Estimate Type	Original
<b>Subject</b>					
Revenue limit adjustment for security measures					

### Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill increases a school district's revenue limit in any school year by the amount spent by the school district in that school year for security measures designed to prevent criminal activity in schools, but not more than an amount equal to \$100 multiplied by the number of pupils enrolled. If this bill had been in effect in 2000-01, and each school district in the state had incurred costs for security measures, it is estimated that school districts' revenue limit statewide could have been increased by a maximum of approximately \$87 million (870,000 pupils X \$100).

#### State Fiscal Effect:

The bill would increase the amount needed for the state to meet its commitment to fund two-thirds of partial school revenues by a maximum of \$58 million GPR (\$87 million X 2/3). Because the amount that school districts will spend on security measures is unknown, the exact increase in state aid necessary to meet the state's two-thirds funding is indeterminate.

The bill would result in additional calculations for school district revenue limits and, thus, increased workload for staff on the school financial services team. It is assumed that these increases could be absorbed within the agency's operating budget.

#### Local Fiscal Effect:

Local school districts could realize an increase in revenues as a result of this bill. Because the department does not collect data on the amount that local school districts annually spend on security measures designed to prevent criminal activity, the local fiscal effect of this bill is indeterminate. If all school districts in the state were to raise their revenue limit by \$100 per pupil for security purposes as provided under this bill, local school property taxes could have increased by a maximum of \$29 million in FY01 (\$87 million X 1/3), on a statewide basis.

### Long-Range Fiscal Implications