Fiscal Estimate - 2011 Session

X	Original		Updated		Corrected	d [] Supple	emental
LRB	Number	11-2894/1		Introd	luction	Number	AB-027	' 2
Description correcting the 2011 equalized valuation for the village of Twin Lakes.								
Fiscal	Effect							
	No State Fisc ndeterminate Increase E Appropriat Decrease Appropriat Create Ne	e Existing tions Existing	Revenue Decreas Revenue	e Existing		Increase Co to absorb w XYe Decrease C	ithin agency s	
	Indeterminate 1. Increase Increase Increase Increase Increase Increase	e Costs sive Mandato se Costs	3. lncrease ory Permissi 4. Decreas ory Permissi	ve Man e Revenue	datory	Types of Loc Government Affected Towns Counties School Districts	Units Village Others	special districts
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations								
☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☒ SEG ☐ SEGS state forestry tax								
Agend	y/Prepared	Ву	Au	thorized S	Signature			Date
DOR/ Paul Ziegler (608) 266-5773 Paul Z				ul Ziegler (Ziegler (608) 266-5773			

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOR 9/21/2011

LRB Number	11-2894/1	Introduction Number	AB-0272	Estimate Type	Original		
Description							
correcting the 2011 equalized valuation for the village of Twin Lakes.							

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Background and Current Law

The equalized value for the Village of Twin Lakes for 2011, as established by the Department of Revenue (DOR) on August 15, 2011, was overstated by \$70,841,100. Under current law, DOR will correct for this error by reducing the equalized value for 2012, as certified on August 15, 2012, by \$141,682,200. One-half of the total reduction (\$70,841,100) represents the amount necessary to correct the base value of the municipality for 2012. The other half (\$70,841,100) represents a one-time compensation for the 2011 overstatement in Equalized Value and is not carried forward to 2013. In short, the municipality was apportioned property taxes that were based upon \$70,841,100 more in Equalized Value for 2011, which is compensated for by the reduction in 2012. The correction is carried out under section 70.57.

For property tax purposes, equalized values are used (1) to calculate the state forestation tax charged to a municipality, and (2) to allocate property tax levies among municipalities in multiple municipal entities – such as counties, special districts, school districts, and technical college districts. When a municipality's equalized value is overstated, the property taxes allocated to it are overstated – in effect; property taxes are shifted into the municipality. When a municipality's equalized value is understated, the property taxes allocated to it are understated – in effect; property taxes are shifted away from the municipality.

The purpose of the correction under section 70.57 is for the property tax error in one year to be balanced by an adjustment in the other direction in the following year – so that total levy allocations over the two year period will be essentially correct.

Proposal

Under the bill, the section 70.57 process described above to correct the error in the 2011 valuation of the Village of Twin Lakes would not be used. Instead, DOR would be directed to correct the 2011 equalized value of the village prior to November 30, 2011.

Fiscal Effect

Correcting the Village of Twin Lakes value prior to November 30, 2011 would avoid the over and under allocation of levies that occur when valuation errors occur.

The state forestry tax (currently imposed at a rate of about \$0.1697 per \$1,000 equalized value) would be decreased by approximately \$12,000 for FY12 (due to the reduction in equalized value caused by correcting the village's value for 2011). The state forestry tax would, however, be increased by this same amount in FY13.

Correcting the equalized value at this point in time will create additional administrative duties for the department. If the bill is passed after October 1st, school district equalized values will need to be corrected in addition to correcting the values for the village and Kenosha County. All previously posted county and state totals will need to be revised. DOR will also need to notify various departments and agencies that 2011 equalized value figures have been revised. DOR costs for these activities are expected to be absorbed within existing expenditure authority.

Due to the administrative changes that the bill will require, delays may occur in DOR's provision of equalized value figures to local governments. As a consequence, the time period provided to local governments to make budget decisions based on final valuations and the period to distribute property tax bills may be narrowed. The procedure for allocating a municipality's equalized value to the other taxing entities includes a number of steps – including (a) allocating state-assessed manufacturing property to individual school districts, technical college districts, and special districts; (b) allocating municipally assessed property to

overlying jurisdictions; and (c) adjusting overlying jurisdiction amounts to reflect corrections or omissions.

Local government administrative costs in determining levies and issuing tax bills may increase if delays in the issuance of equalized values occur or if initial (uncorrected) valuations are utilized during some portion of a locality's budget process.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2011 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

X	Original		Updated		Corrected		Supplemental			
LRF	B Number	11-2894	/1	Intro	duction Nu	ımber	AB-0272			
corre	cription ecting the 2011		***************************************							
State	ualized fiscal e	effect): evenue would	l decrease in F	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	2,000 and incre	ease by thi	o not include in			
II. Ar	nnualized Cos	its:			Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:					
					Increased Cos	sts	Decreased Costs			
A. S	tate Costs by	Category								
St	tate Operations	- Salaries an	d Fringes			\$	\$			
(F	TE Position Ch	anges)								
St	tate Operations	- Other Cost	S							
Lo	ocal Assistance									
Aid	ds to Individual	s or Organiza	ations							
	TOTAL State	Costs by Ca	tegory			\$	\$			
B. S	tate Costs by	Source of Fu	ınds							
GF	PR									
FE	ED .									
PF	RO/PRS									
SE	EG/SEG-S									
III. Si reve	itate Revenues enues (e.g., tax	s - Complete increase, de	this only whe ecrease in lice	en proposa ense fee, e	ts.)					
<u> </u>					Increased Re		Decreased Rev			
	PR Taxes					\$	\$			
	PR Earned									
FE										
	RO/PRS	<u></u>								
<u> </u>	EG/SEG-S									
Ш	TOTAL State I					\$	\$			
<u> </u>		1	NET ANNUAL	IZED FISC	AL IMPACT					
					<u>Sta</u>	<u>.te</u>	Local			
	NET CHANGE IN COSTS					\$	\$			
NET	CHANGE IN R	EVENUE				\$	\$			
Ager	ncy/Prepared i	Зу	 ^	Authorized	Signature		Date			
DOR/ Paul Ziegler (608) 266-5773 Pau				'aul Ziegler	ul Ziegler (608) 266-5773 9/2					