Fiscal Estimate - 2001 Session

	Priginal		Updated	<u></u>	Corrected	Supple:	mental
LRB Nu	ımber 01 -	2717/1		Introd	luction Number	AB-230	
Subject							
Use of cou	unty shared rev	enue paymen	īS				
Fiscal Effe	ect						
Inde	State Fiscal Effecterminate ncrease Existin Appropriations Decrease Existin Appropriations Create New Appropriations	ng ng	Increase E Revenues Decrease Revenues	_	Increase Costs within agency's Yes Decrease Costs	i	le to absorb
Inde	Local Governmeterminate Increase Cos Permissive Decrease Cos Permissive	ts 3 Mandatory	Increase Re Permissive Decrease Re Permissive	Mandatory evenue	School	Government Unit Uvillage Others WTCS Districts	s Cities
Fund Sou	rces Affected	PRO	PRS S	EG 🔲 SE	Affected Ch. 20 GS	Appropriations	
Agency/P	repared By		7	Authorized S	ignature	-	Date
	iel Huegel (608	3) 266-5705		/eang-Eng Br	aun (608) 266-2700	*. <u></u>	3/26/01

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOR 3/27/01

LRB Number 01-2717/1	Introduction Number	AB-230	Estimate Type	Original	
Subject					
Use of county shared revenue pay	yments				

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under current law, a county can use its state shared revenues payment for any legal purpose as specified by the county board. Counties generally treat state shared revenues as a general purpose revenue to help offset the local share of all county government costs.

Under the bill, a county would be required to earmark its state shared revenue payments to offset the local share of the cost of probation and parole holds in county jails, circuit courts, and youth services. Any funds remaining could then be used to offset costs that would otherwise be funded from property taxes.

The earmarking of county shared revenues for specific spending programs will have no effect on county property taxes. This earmarking will merely shift the need for property taxation from the services funded with shared revenue to services not so funded.

For payments in 2001, total state shared revenue payments to counties is expected to be about \$189.7 million versus a total county property tax levy for 2000/01 of about \$1.316 billion.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications