

2005 ASSEMBLY BILL 156

1 **AN ACT** *to create* 59.57 (3) of the statutes; and *to affect* Laws of 1975, chapter
2 105, section 1 (1) and (2); **relating to:** allowing certain counties to create tax
3 incremental financing districts.

Analysis by the Legislative Reference Bureau

The people of the state of Wisconsin, represented in senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

4 **SECTION 1.** 59.57 (3) of the statutes is created to read:
5 59.57 **(3)** TAX INCREMENTAL FINANCING. (a) *Authority.* Subject to par. (b), a
6 county board of a county in which no cities or villages are located may exercise all
7 powers of cities under s. 66.1105. If the board exercises the powers of a city under
8 s. 66.1105, it is subject to the same duties as a common council under s. 66.1105 and
9 the county is subject to the same duties and liabilities as a city under s. 66.1105.

ASSEMBLY BILL 156**SECTION 1**

1 (b) *Limitations.* 1. A board acting under par. (a) may not create a tax
2 incremental district unless the town board of each town in which the proposed
3 district is to be located adopts a resolution approving of the creation of the district.

4 2. When a county convenes a joint review board under s. 66.1105 (4m) (a), the
5 county representative specified in that paragraph shall be chosen as specified under
6 s. 66.1105 (4m) (ae) 2., and the city representative specified in s. 66.1105 (4m) (a) and
7 chosen as specified under s. 66.1105 (4m) (ae) 3. shall be a representative of the town
8 where the tax incremental district is located, and shall be the town board chair or his
9 or her designee, consistent with the provisions of s. 66.1105 (4m) (ae) 3.

10 3. The 25 percent vacant land limitation for a tax incremental district that is
11 not a district suitable for industrial sites, as described in s. 66.1105 (4) (gm) 1., does
12 not apply to a tax incremental district that is created under this subsection.

13 **SECTION 2.** Laws of 1975, chapter 105, section 1 (1) and (2) are amended to read:

14 [Laws of 1975, chapter 105] Section 1 (1) The legislature finds that the existing
15 system of allocating aggregate property tax revenues among tax levying
16 municipalities has resulted in significant inequities and disincentives. The cost of
17 public works or improvements within a city, town, ~~or village,~~ or county has been
18 borne entirely by the city, town, ~~or village,~~ or county, while the expansion of tax base
19 which is stimulated, directly or indirectly, by such improvements, benefits not only
20 the city, town, ~~or village,~~ or county but also all municipalities which share such tax
21 base. This situation is inequitable. Moreover, when the cost to a city, town, ~~or village,~~
22 or county of a public improvement project exceeds the future benefit to the city, town,
23 ~~or village,~~ or county resulting therefrom, the city, town, ~~or village,~~ or county may
24 decide not to undertake such project. This situation has resulted in the
25 postponement or cancellation of socially desirable projects.

