

# Targeted Municipal Aid Programs

(Expenditure Restraint  
and Computer Aid)

Informational Paper 19

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau  
January, 2015



Targeted Municipal Aid Programs  
(Expenditure Restraint and Computer Aid)

Prepared by

Rick Olin

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau  
One East Main, Suite 301  
Madison, WI 53703  
<http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>



# Targeted Municipal Aid Programs (Expenditure Restraint and Computer Aid)

This paper provides a detailed description of the eligibility criteria and distribution formulas for the expenditure restraint and computer aid programs.

---

## Expenditure Restraint Program

---

The expenditure restraint program provides targeted, general aid to towns, villages, and cities. The aid is targeted in that municipalities must qualify for a payment by meeting certain eligibility criteria. The payments are characterized as general aid because the dollars are unrestricted, to be spent however the municipality determines. Since 2003, the program's annual distribution has been set at \$58,145,700.

The Department of Revenue (DOR) administers the program. By September 15 of each year, the Department provides estimates of the succeeding year's payments to qualifying municipalities. This procedure allows municipalities to anticipate aid amounts when they are setting their budgets for the coming year. Expenditure restraint aid is paid in its entirety on the fourth Monday in July.

### Eligibility Criteria

A municipality must satisfy two eligibility criteria to receive an expenditure restraint payment:

1. *Municipal Tax Rate.* A municipality must have a full value property tax rate for operation of city, town, or village government that exceeds five mills. The tax rate for the second year prior

to the payment year is used for this test. Therefore, to be eligible for the 2015 payment, a municipality's local purpose tax rate for the 2013 (payable 2014) levy had to exceed \$5.00 per thousand of full value. There were 464 municipalities that met this test relative to 2015 aid payments.

2. *Budget Restraint.* A municipality must restrict the rate of year-to-year growth in its budget to a percentage determined by statutory formula.

### Municipal Budget

The statutes define "municipal budget" as the municipality's budget for its general fund exclusive of principal and interest payments on long-term debt. State law provides for the exclusion of several other types of expenditures: (a) amounts paid by municipalities under municipal revenue sharing agreements; (b) amounts paid by municipalities as state recycling tipping fees; (c) unreimbursed expenses related to emergencies declared under an executive order of the Governor; (d) expenditures from moneys received pursuant to the federal American Recovery and Revitalization Act of 2009; and (e) expenditures made pursuant to a purchasing agreement with a school district whereby the municipality makes purchases on behalf of the school district. Finally, adjustments are made for the cost of services transferred to or from the municipality seeking to qualify for a payment and to exclude payments received from another government for providing a contracted service.

The statutes prohibit municipalities from meeting the budget test by creating other funds, unless those funds conform to generally accepted accounting principles (GAAP). These principles

have been adopted by the Governmental Accounting Standards Board to offer governments guidelines on how to maintain their financial records.

### **Allowable Rate of Growth**

For the year prior to the aid payment, the rate of budget growth cannot exceed the inflation rate plus an adjustment based on growth in municipal property values. The inflation rate is measured as the change that occurred in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) in the one-year period ending in September two years prior to the payment year, but not less than 0%. The property value adjustment is unique for each municipality and equals 60% of the percentage change in the municipality's equalized value due to new construction, net of any property removed or demolished, but not less than 0% nor more than 2%. The allowable increase is known at the time when municipal officials set their budgets.

To be eligible for a 2015 payment, municipalities had to limit their 2014 budget increases to 1.6% to 3.6%, depending on individual municipal adjustments due to property value increases. The Department of Revenue certifies the change in the CPI annually on November 1 to the Joint Committee on Finance. Based on the November 1, 2014, certification, municipalities will be required to limit the growth in their 2015 budgets to no more than 1.6% to 3.6%, depending on their applicable adjustment for growth in property values, to be eligible for a 2016 expenditure restraint payment.

For 2015 payments, 464 municipalities met the tax rate test, but only 340 municipalities also met the budget test. Thus, 124 municipalities either did not meet the budget test or did not submit budget worksheets to DOR on a timely basis.

Each year, the Department of Revenue notifies municipalities meeting the tax rate eligibility

requirement. To receive a payment, those municipalities must submit a budget worksheet to DOR by the following May 1. The Department uses the worksheet to verify compliance with the budget restraint requirement. Qualifying municipalities are informed in September of the expenditure restraint payment to be received the following July.

### **Distribution Formula**

The formula for distributing payments is based on municipal levy rates and full values. First, an "excess tax rate" is calculated for each qualifying municipality by subtracting the five-mill standard tax rate from the municipality's property tax rate. Second, an excess levy is calculated by multiplying each municipality's excess tax rate by its full value. Finally, a payment is calculated based on each municipality's percentage share of the total of excess levies for all eligible municipalities. For example, if a municipality's excess levy equals \$25 million and the excess levies of all eligible municipalities sum to \$500 million, then the municipality would receive 5% ( $\$25 \text{ million} / \$500 \text{ million}$ ) of the total payments.

If an error is found in the calculation of a payment, the error will be corrected by adjusting the affected municipalities' November county and municipal aid payments. In addition, expenditure restraint payments can be corrected by increasing or decreasing the payments in the succeeding year. A similar correction procedure is used for county and municipal aid payments.

The appendix uses the City of Eau Claire as an example to provide a detailed illustration of the steps in determining the City's eligibility for the program and in calculating its 2015 payment. Table 1 provides information on the distribution of expenditure restraint payments for the period from 2006 through 2015.

**Table 1: Expenditure Restraint Payment Distribution Summary**

	Number	Percent	Amount	Percent
<b>2006</b>				
Towns	36	11.4%	\$239,473	0.4%
Villages	133	42.2	5,338,424	9.2
Cities	<u>146</u>	<u>46.4</u>	<u>52,567,803</u>	<u>90.4</u>
	315	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2007</b>				
Towns	24	7.4%	\$144,689	0.3%
Villages	147	45.4	4,896,596	8.4
Cities	<u>153</u>	<u>47.2</u>	<u>53,104,415</u>	<u>91.3</u>
	324	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2008</b>				
Towns	27	8.5%	\$178,396	0.3%
Villages	136	42.9	4,817,503	8.3
Cities	<u>154</u>	<u>48.6</u>	<u>53,149,801</u>	<u>91.4</u>
	317	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2009</b>				
Towns	13	4.7%	\$146,056	0.3%
Villages	120	43.8	4,352,872	7.4
Cities	<u>141</u>	<u>51.5</u>	<u>53,646,772</u>	<u>92.3</u>
	274	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2010</b>				
Towns	14	4.4%	\$138,517	0.2%
Villages	149	46.6	4,876,499	8.4
Cities	<u>157</u>	<u>49.0</u>	<u>53,130,684</u>	<u>91.4</u>
	320	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2011</b>				
Towns	15	4.6%	\$176,544	0.3%
Villages	153	47.7	5,017,072	8.6
Cities	<u>153</u>	<u>47.7</u>	<u>52,952,084</u>	<u>91.1</u>
	321	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2012</b>				
Towns	18	5.3%	\$176,312	0.3%
Villages	159	47.2	5,034,773	8.7
Cities	<u>160</u>	<u>47.5</u>	<u>52,934,615</u>	<u>91.0</u>
	337	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2013</b>				
Towns	23	6.2%	\$162,949	0.3%
Villages	185	49.7	5,735,112	9.9
Cities	<u>164</u>	<u>44.1</u>	<u>52,247,639</u>	<u>89.8</u>
	372	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2014</b>				
Towns	29	8.1%	\$239,214	0.4%
Villages	171	47.6	5,811,945	10.0
Cities	<u>159</u>	<u>44.3</u>	<u>52,094,541</u>	<u>89.6</u>
	359	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%
<b>2015*</b>				
Towns	27	7.9%	\$189,736	0.3%
Villages	162	47.7	5,643,613	9.7
Cities	<u>151</u>	<u>44.4</u>	<u>52,312,351</u>	<u>90.0</u>
	340	100.0%	\$58,145,700	100.0%

\*Based on the Department of Revenue's September, 2014, estimates of 2015 payments.

---

## Computer Aid Program

---

Since the 1999 property tax levy (payable in 2000), computers, software, and related equipment have been exempt from the property tax.

Effective as of 2003(04), an additional exemption was created for cash registers and fax machines, except fax machines that are also copiers. Typically, when property becomes exempt, the taxes that would otherwise be levied on that property are shifted to other properties that remain taxable, resulting in higher property tax bills for those properties. To avoid this effect, the Legislature has authorized computer aid payments to hold taxpayers and local governments harmless from the impacts of these two exemptions.

Each county, municipality, school district, technical college district, and special purpose district, including tax incremental financing (TIF) districts, where exempt computer value is located receives a computer aid payment. Payments equal the value of the exempt property multiplied by the local government's current tax rate. Since these payments are intended to replace the property taxes that would otherwise be paid on the exempt property, there are no restrictions on how the local governments can use the aid.

With assistance from local governments, DOR administers the computer aid program. Prior to the exemption's creation, businesses annually reported the value of their computers and related equipment, along with the value of all other taxable personal property, to the assessor for the municipality where the property was located. The reported value was based on the property's original cost, less an amount for depreciation based on the property's age. Since computers and related equipment became exempt, their owners have been required to continue to report the value of the exempt property using the same procedures in effect prior to 1999. Assessors report the total amount of these values in each municipality to DOR by the second Monday in June of each year, and the Department apportions those values to overlying counties, school districts, technical college districts, and special purpose districts. DOR adjusts the reported values by converting them to full market, or equalized, values. DOR calculates each local government's aid payment by multi-

**Table 2: Computer Aid Distribution Summary (In Millions)**

	Counties	Towns, Villages, and Cities	School Districts	Technical College Districts	Special Districts	TIF Districts	Total
2004(05)	\$11.1	\$18.7	\$25.9	\$4.3	\$1.1	\$9.2	\$70.3
2005(06)	10.8	18.3	24.6	4.3	1.0	8.7	67.7
2006(07)	10.1	17.2	23.4	4.1	0.9	9.4	65.1
2007(08)	10.3	17.8	24.5	4.2	0.9	10.3	68.0
2008(09)	10.5	18.7	26.3	4.4	0.9	12.9	73.7
2009(10)	10.9	19.4	27.7	4.5	0.9	12.6	76.0
2010(11)	11.6	20.7	30.1	4.8	1.2	13.6	82.0
2011(12)	11.6	20.7	29.6	4.9	1.1	12.6	80.5
2012(13)	11.5	20.6	29.3	4.9	1.1	14.4	81.8
2013(14)	12.1	21.7	30.3	5.1	1.2	16.4	86.8

plying the exempt value attributable to that jurisdiction by the jurisdiction's current full value tax rate.

State law requires DOR to notify local governments of their exempt computer values by October 1. After the governments have set their property tax levies for the succeeding year's budget, they can use the values to estimate the amount of computer aid they will receive by multiplying their tax rates by their exempt values.

The Department of Administration makes annual payments to local governments, based on the amounts calculated by DOR, on the fourth Monday in July. Table 2 summarizes the computer aid program's payment history over the last 10 years.

Because aid payments are the product of exempt values and tax rates, changes in values and rates determine whether or not aid payments increase or decrease. After the first aid payment, in 1999(00), the statewide average property tax rate declined in each of the seven succeeding years. Generally, exempt computer values either de-

clined or increased at modest rates during this period.

When combined, the change in tax rates and exempt values produced declining aid payments. By 2006(07), total aid payments had declined to \$65.1 million, the lowest statewide total since payments peaked at \$76.8 million in 2001(02). In the seven years since 2006(07), the statewide average tax rate has increased each year, and the value of the exempt property has increased 7.0% in total. As a result, aid payments equaled \$86.8 million for 2013(14), a 33.3% increase over the amount paid for 2006(07).

Increases in exempt values are caused by businesses purchasing new or used computers. However, values do not increase unless purchases exceed the value lost through depreciation and retirements.

For 2014(15), DOR has determined a value of \$3,511.1 million for exempt computers and related equipment, which is 3.3% higher than the exempt value for 2013(14) of \$3,397.7 million.



## APPENDIX

### Calculation of the 2015 Expenditure Restraint Payment for the City of Eau Claire

#### *Eligibility Tests*

1.	<b>Municipal Tax Rate (per \$1,000 of full value)</b>	
	Eau Claire's 2013(14) Municipal Tax Rate	\$8.772508
	Statewide Standard Tax Rate for Municipal Purposes	\$5.000000
	Excess Tax Rate, Eau Claire minus State Standard	\$3.772508
	<b>Eau Claire qualifies since its tax rate exceeds the state standard.</b>	
2.	<b>Budget Restraint</b>	
	Change in Eau Claire's Budget, 2013 to 2014	0.66%
	Greater of 0% or Percent Change in CPI, Sept., 2012, to Sept., 2013	1.60%
	Value of New Construction Occurring in 2012	\$50,410,700
	January 1, 2012, Full Value	\$4,223,723,600
	Percent Change	1.19%
	60% of Percent Change, but no less than 0% and no more than 2%	0.72%
	Maximum Allowable Budget Increase: Sum of Inflation Rate and Value Adjustment, Rounded to the Nearest 0.10%	2.30%
	<b>Eau Claire qualifies since its budget increase is below 2.30%.</b>	

#### *Calculation of Payment*

1.	<b>Calculate Eau Claire's Excess Levy</b>	
	Multiply the Municipality's January 1, 2013, Full Value	\$4,325,664,800
	By the Excess Tax Rate (Per \$1,000 of full value)	<u>X \$3.772508</u>
	<b>Eau Claire's Excess Levy Equals</b>	\$16,318,605
2.	<b>Calculate Eau Claire's Share of Payment</b>	
	Eau Claire's Excess Levy Divided by	\$16,318,605
	Total Excess Levies of Eligible Municipalities	<u>÷ \$827,324,262</u>
	<b>Eau Claire's Share of Payment Equals</b>	1.9724558%
3.	<b>Calculate Eau Claire's Payment</b>	
	Available Funding	\$58,145,700
	Multiplied by Eau Claire's Share of Payment	<u>X 1.9724558%</u>
	<b>Eau Claire's Payment Equals</b>	\$1,146,898