Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

	Original		Updated		Correct	ted	Sup	plemental	
LRB N	Number	03-0216/3		Introd	duction	n Number	AB-51	0	
Subject	t .								
Create r	metropolitan	service districts	S						
Fiscal E	Effect								
	o State Fiscandeterminate Increase E Appropriati Decrease E Appropriati Create Nev	xisting ions Existing	Rever Decre Rever	ease Existing		Increase Cos absorb withir Yes Decrease Co	n agency's es	e possible to budget ☑No	
⊠ In 1. 2.	ndeterminate	Costs ive Mandator e Costs ive Mandator	ry Permi: 4. Decre	ase Revenue Issive Manda ase Revenue ssive Manda	atory	Types of Loca Government I Affected Towns Counties School Districts	Units Village	metropolitan service districts	
	Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations								
GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS									
Agency/	/Prepared B	у		Authorized S	ignatur	9		Date	
DOR/ Daniel Huegel (608) 266-5705				Dennis Collier (608) 266-5773 10/23					

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOR 10/23/2003

LRB Number 03-0216/3	Introduction Number	AB-510	Estimate Type	Original
Subject				
Create metropolitan service distric	ts			

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Under the bill, two or more municipalities (city, village, town, or urbanized portion of a town) in an urbanized area (as defined by the regional planning commission or, if no commission exists, by the county) could by resolution jointly create a "metropolitan service district" (MSD). A MSD would be a separate unit of government. A MSD would be required to provide at least two governmental services, including one of the following: economic development, land use planning, fire protection and emergency medical, parks and recreation, zoning, mass transit, highway maintenance, police, recycling, yard waste and garbage collection, or libraries. Under the provisions of the bill relating to timelines for the process of forming a MSD, no such district could be created prior to January 1, 2006 if the bill is enacted in 2003, or January 1, 2007 if the bill is enacted in 2004.

Local Taxes and Fees

The bill permits a MSD to raise revenues as follows: (1) Service fees could be imposed. (2) A room tax could be imposed if none of the municipalities in the district use the tax and if all municipalities in the district enact ordinances authorizing the MSD to levy the tax. (3) A property tax levy could be imposed for services that are provided to all municipalities in the district. This tax levy would not be included when determining compliance with municipal or county property tax limits. (4) Impact fees could be imposed on developers for certain capital costs related to MSD-provided services. To the extent that the fees and taxes imposed by an MSD merely replace similar fees and taxes imposed by constituent municipalities, total taxes and fees should not be affected by this part of the bill. However, if a MSD increases or decreases the levels of a service, or if a MSD might be able to provide services more efficiently, total taxes and fees could change. Since it is not possible to estimate reasonably where or how many MSDs would be created, it is not possible to estimate the potential change in total taxes and fees that the bill could engender.

The bill exempts MSD-owned property from property taxation. Since local government property is already generally exempt from property taxes, this provision of the bill would have no effect on property tax levels.

State Taxes

The bill affects state taxes as follows: (1) The income of a MSD would be exempt from state income taxes. (2) Purchases made by a MSD would be exempt from state sales and use taxes. (3) Transfers of property to a MSD would be exempt from the real estate transfer fee. Since these tax provisions already apply to local governments, the bill would have no effect on state taxes.

Other Provisions

The bill expands the area in which tax incremental financing (TIF) districts can be created to include the portion of towns that are in a MSD. Since it is not possible to estimate reasonably where or how many MSDs would be created, it is not possible to estimate how many TIF districts in towns could be created under the bill.

A MSD would qualify for expenditure restraint payments (ERP) under state shared revenues. Under current law, only towns, villages, and cities qualify for ERP payments. Since the appropriation for ERP is fixed, ERP payments accruing to MSDs would be funded by equal decreases in payments to current recipients. It is not possible to estimate reasonably the level of ERP payments that could accrue to MSDs.

Administrative Costs

The Department would incur one-time costs of \$11,400 for programming and procedural updates. The Department would also incur total annual costs \$62,500 for salaries and fringe benefits for 1.0 FTE and for travel, supplies, and equipment to determine the equalized value of each MSD, to calculate the amount of net new construction in each MSD, to review MSD budgets (to determine eligibility for ERP payments), to review the increased number of applications for TIF districts that would occur as a result of allowing TIFs in certain towns, and for training of and assistance to local assessors to incorporate MSD data into their information systems. Because the MSD formation process provided in the bill precludes creation of a district prior to 2006

or 2007, these costs would be first incurred in the 2005-2007 biennium.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	Original		Updated			Corrected			Supplemental	
LRB	Number	03-0216/	Introduction Number AB-510							
Subjec	et									
Create	metropolitar	n service distri	cts							
I. One-	time Costs	or Revenue li	mpacts for S	tate	and/or L	ocal Govern	ment (do no	t include in	
ļ	lized fiscal e	•								
		mming and pro	ocedural upda	ıtes						
II. Ann	ualized Cos	its:		_				l impa	act on funds from:	
			-			Increased Co	osts		Decreased Costs	
-	te Costs by									
		- Salaries and	d Fringes	_	\$62,500					
+-	Position Ch				(1.0 FTE)					
-		- Other Costs)	_						
	al Assistance							-		
		s or Organizat		\dashv						
TC	OTAL State	Costs by Cat	egory		\$62,500			\$		
		Source of Fu	nds							
GPR			,		62,500					
FED										
 	/PRS									
SEG	/SEG-S									
III. Stat (e.g., ta	te Revenues ax increase,	s - Complete t decrease in	this only whe license fee, e	en p ets.)	roposal v	will increase	or dec	rease	state revenues	
						Increased F	Rev		Decreased Rev	
	Taxes						\$		\$	
	Earned									
FED				\perp					-	
	/PRS									
	/SEG-S									
TC	OTAL State I	Revenues					\$		\$	
			NET ANNUA	LIZE	ED FISCA	AL IMPACT				
						St	ate		Local	
NET CH	NET CHANGE IN COSTS					\$62,5	500	\$		
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE							\$		\$	
Agency/Prepared By Aut				Aut	thorized Signature				Date	
DOR/ Daniel Huegel (608) 266-5705 Der				Den	nnis Collier (608) 266-5773				10/23/2003	