

2003 DRAFTING REQUEST

Senate Amendment (SA-SB188)

Received: **06/11/2003**

Received By: **mshovers**

Wanted: **Today**

Identical to LRB:

For: **Robert Wirch (608) 267-8979**

By/Representing: **Amber**

This file may be shown to any legislator: **NO**

Drafter: **mshovers**

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: **Munis - tax incrmntal financing**

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: **YES**

Requester's email: **Sen.Wirch@legis.state.wi.us**

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Kenosha tax incremental financing (TIF) changes

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
/?							
/1	mshovers 06/11/2003	csicilia 06/11/2003	pgreensl 06/11/2003	_____	lemery 06/11/2003	lemery 06/11/2003	

FE Sent For:

<END>

20649

Senate Amendment (SA-SB188)

Received: 06/11/2003

Received By: mshovers

Wanted: Today

Identical to LRB:

For: Robert Wirch (608) 267-8979

By/Representing: Amber

This file may be shown to any legislator: NO

Drafter: mshovers

May Contact:

Addl. Drafters:

Subject: Munis - tax incrmntal financing

Extra Copies:

Submit via email: YES

Requester's email: Sen.Wirch@legis.state.wi.us

Carbon copy (CC:) to:

Pre Topic:

No specific pre topic given

Topic:

Kenosha tax incremental financing (TIF) changes

Instructions:

See Attached

Drafting History:

<u>Vers.</u>	<u>Drafted</u>	<u>Reviewed</u>	<u>Typed</u>	<u>Proofed</u>	<u>Submitted</u>	<u>Jacketed</u>	<u>Required</u>
--------------	----------------	-----------------	--------------	----------------	------------------	-----------------	-----------------

/?	mshovers	1 cjs 6/11/03	6/11/03	6/11/03			
/1 MES 6/11/03							
FE Sent For:							
P8							
P8/1pk							
<END>							

Shovers, Marc

From: Gaston, Geoff
Sent: Wednesday, June 11, 2003 2:49 PM
To: Shovers, Marc
Subject: THANK YOU (Wirch amendment request)

Could we have an amendment to SB 188 (and AB 397) that would make the following changes:

1) Page 4, line 14:

strike "as often as the plan commission considers necessary" with language similar to current 66.1105 (h) 2 that would limit the plan commission expansion to "not more than once" during the expenditure period already specified in the bill (line 15, p. 4)

NOTE: With this, we want simply to eliminate the authority in the bill for the TID to be expanded more than once, leaving the authority and expenditure period the same but specifying that the expansion can occur only a single time

2) After 2016, only TIDs 1, 4 & 5 in Kenosha can pool increments. These are the TIDs defined elsewhere in the bill as those created before October 1, 1995.

3) In addition to the above, Joint Review Board approval is needed for that pooling to continue

NOTE: With these changes, we want to eliminate from the bill the extension of pooling authority through 2031 (currently expires in 2016) for TIDs created AFTER 10/1/95, retain that authority (through 2031) for TIDs created BEFORE 10/1/95 but add a requirement that the Joint Review Board must approve that authority in 2016.

We would like to have these changes drafted as a single, simple amendment. And unfortunately there is a very tight timeline with an exec scheduled for the Senate on Friday (6/13) and one very likely in the Assembly Monday or Tuesday of next week. Committee chairs have asked to see the amendment(s) prior to the hearing, if possible tomorrow. Realize this is a very busy time, but if it we could see a draft by then we'd very much appreciate it.

We understand there will likely be questions, and please feel free to call at 6-0455 (Steinbrink - Geoff) or 7-8979 (Wirch - Amber), and thank you very much.



fme
js

~~PRELIMINARY DRAFT - NOT READY FOR INTRODUCTION~~

SENATE AMENDMENT,

TO 2003 SENATE BILL 188

1-note

*WA nted
today
FN 6/11*

*SAV
2/2/04
new CR ✓*

1 At the locations indicated, amend the bill as follows:

2 1. Page 4, line 14: delete "as often as the plan commission considers necessary"
3 and substitute "not more than once".

4 2. Page 7, line 12: after that line insert:

5 "SECTION 8m. 66.1105 (6) (d) 1. of the statutes is amended to read:

6 66.1105 (6) (d) 1. After Subject to subd. 1m., after the date on which a tax
7 incremental district pays off the aggregate of all of its project costs under its project
8 plan, but not later than the date on which a tax incremental district terminates
9 under sub. (7) (am), a planning commission may amend under sub. (4) (h) 1. the
10 project plan of such a tax incremental district to allocate positive tax increments
11 generated by that tax incremental district to another tax incremental district
12 created by that planning commission in which soil affected by environmental

1 pollution exists to the extent that development has not been able to proceed
2 according to the project plan because of the environmental pollution.

History: 1975 c. 105, 199, 311; 1977 c. 28 ss. 724m, 725, 1646 (1), (3); 1977 c. 418; 1979 c. 221, 343; 1979 c. 361 s. 112; 1981 c. 20, 317; 1983 a. 27, 31, 207, 320, 405, 538; 1985 a. 29, 39, 285; 1987 a. 27, 186, 397; 1989 a. 31, 336; 1993 a. 293, 337, 399; 1995 a. 27 ss. 3330c to 3337, 9116 (5), 9130 (4); 1995 a. 201, 225, 227, 335; 1997 a. 3, 27, 237, 252; 1999 a. 9; 1999 a. 150 ss. 45, 472; Stats. 1999 s. 66.1105; 2001 a. 5, 11, 16, 104.

3 SECTION 8s. 66.1105 (6) (d) 1m. of the statutes is created to read:

4 66.1105 (6) (d) 1m. After December 31, 2016, subd. 1. applies only to tax
5 incremental districts number 1, 4, and 5 in the City of Kenosha, and no increments
6 may be allocated under that subdivision, after December 31, 2016, unless the
7 allocation is approved by the joint review board.”

8 (END)

Tax Incremental District Number One,
Tax Incremental District Number Four,
and Tax Incremental District
Number Five

O-note

A Under s. 66.1105(4m) (a), a joint review board could vote to ~~disband~~ disband following its approval ~~or~~ or rejection of a TID ~~or~~ proposal. Do you want to require that Kenosha's joint review board remain in existence while Kenosha has a TID in existence?

AMZJ

**DRAFTER'S NOTE
FROM THE
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE BUREAU**

LRBa0649/1dn
MES:cjs:pg

June 11, 2003

Under s. 66.1105 (4m) (a), a joint review board could vote to disband following its approval or rejection of a TID proposals. Do you want to require that Kenosha's joint review board remain in existence while Kenosha has a TID in existence?

Marc E. Shovers
Senior Legislative Attorney
Phone: (608) 266-0129
E-mail: marc.shovers@legis.state.wi.us