

FULL ANALYSIS

I. SUBSTANTIVE ANALYSIS

A. HOUSE PRINCIPLES ANALYSIS:

The bill does not appear to implicate any of the House Principles.

B. EFFECT OF PROPOSED CHANGES:

Distributions to Fiscally Constrained Counties

Current Situation: Section 212.20(6), F.S., currently provides a formula for distributing the proceeds generated by state tax on sales, use, and other transactions; communications services taxes other than those classified as gross receipts taxes; and, taxes on the retail sales price of any direct-to-home satellite service. After the required distribution to certain trust funds, the remaining tax proceeds are distributed in accordance with specific statutory standards to the General Revenue Fund, the Ecosystem Management and Restoration Trust Fund, the Local-Government Half-cent Sales Tax Clearing Trust Fund, the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund for Counties, and the Revenue Sharing Trust Fund for Municipalities. After these distributions are made, a specific amount of the remaining proceeds are distributed to each county, qualified facilities for a new professional sports franchise or facilities for a retained spring training franchise, professional golf halls of fame, and International Game Fish Association World Center facilities. Any remaining proceeds remain in the General Revenue Fund.

Effect of Proposed Changes: This bill amends s. 212.20(6), F.S., to provide that after initial distributions are made to the General Revenue Fund, the Ecosystem Management and Restoration Trust Fund, and the Local-Government Half-cent Sales Tax Clearing Trust Fund, 0.0841 of the available proceeds is transferred to the Local Government Half-cent Sales Tax Clearing Trust Fund to be distributed to “fiscally constrained counties” pursuant to s. 218.67, F.S.

The bill creates s. 218.67, F.S., to provide distributions of funds to fiscally constrained counties. The term “fiscally constrained county” is defined as each county for which the value of one mill will raise no more than \$4 million annually, based on the property valuations and tax data annually published by the Department of Revenue. Thirty counties qualify as a “fiscally constrained county” under this definition, including: Baker, Bradford, Calhoun, Columbia, De Soto, Dixie, Franklin, Gadsden, Gilchrist, Glades, Gulf, Hamilton, Hardee, Hendry, Highlands, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Levy, Liberty, Madison, Okeechobee, Putnam, Sumter, Suwannee, Taylor, Union, Wakulla, and Washington. Based upon 2004 taxable values of property, distributions to fiscally constrained counties range from \$165,555 to \$636,751, with most counties receiving between \$400,000 and \$575,000.

The bill provides that each fiscally constrained county government that participates in the local government half-cent sales tax is eligible to receive an additional distribution from the Local Government Half-cent Sales Tax Clearing Trust Fund, as provided in s. 212.20, F.S., in addition to its regular monthly distribution and any emergency or supplemental distribution under s. 218.65, F.S.

The amount to be distributed to each fiscally constrained county will be determined by the Department of Revenue at the beginning of the fiscal year, using the prior fiscal year property valuations, tax data, population estimates and the latest available millage rate. The amount distributed must be allocated based upon the following factors:

- The relative revenue-raising-capacity factor is the ability of the eligible county to generate ad valorem revenues from one mill of taxation on a per capita basis. A county that raises no more than \$25 per capita from one mill shall be assigned a value of 1; a county that raises more than \$25 but no more than \$30 per capita from one mill shall be assigned a value of 0.75; and a county that raises more than \$30 but no more than \$50 per capita from one mill shall be assigned a value of

0.5. No value shall be assigned to counties that raise more than \$50 per capita from one mill of ad valorem taxation.

- The local-effort factor is a measure of the relative level of local effort of the eligible county as indicated by the latest available millage rate. The local-effort factor is the most recently adopted countywide operating millage rate for each eligible county multiplied by 0.1.
- Each eligible county's proportional allocation of the total amount available to be distributed to all of the eligible counties is the same proportion as the sum of the county's two factors is to the sum of the two factors for all eligible counties. Counties that are eligible to receive an allocation under this subsection and the amount available to be distributed to such counties does not include counties participating in the phase-out period nor the amounts they remain eligible to receive during the phase-out.

For counties that no longer qualify as a "fiscally constrained county" after the effective date of this act, there will be a 2-year phase-out period. Beginning on July 1 of the year following the year in which the value of a mill for that county exceeds \$4 million in revenue, the county will receive two-thirds of the amount received in the prior year, and beginning on July 1 of the second year following the year in which the value of a mill for that county exceeds \$4 million in revenue, the county will receive one-third of the amount received in the last year that the county qualified as a fiscally constrained county. Following the 2-year phase-out period, the county will no longer be eligible to receive any distributions under this section unless the county can be considered a fiscally constrained county.

Revenues by fiscally constrained counties may be used by a county for any public purpose, except that revenues may not be used to pay debt service on bonds, notes, certificates of participation, or any other forms of indebtedness.

Shared Responsibility for Juvenile Detention

Current Situation: In accordance with s. 985.2155(1), F.S., it is the policy of this state that the state and counties have a joint obligation to contribute to the financial support of detention care provided for juveniles. Therefore, each county or the state must pay the costs incurred by the county in providing detention care for juveniles for the period of time prior to final court disposition. However, the state pays all costs of detention care for juveniles for which a fiscally constrained county would otherwise be billed. The term "fiscally constrained county" is defined as a county designated as a rural area of critical economic concern under s. 288.0656, F.S., for which the value of a mill in the county is no more than \$3 million, based on the property valuations and tax data annually published by the Department of Revenue under s. 195.052, F.S.

Effect of Proposed Changes: This bill amends s. 985.2155(2), F.S., to redefine the term "fiscally constrained counties" for purposes of s. that section. Under the new definition, a county is fiscally constrained if the value of a mill in the county is no more than \$4 million. The new definition does not require a county to be classified as a "rural area of critical economic concern." Thirty counties qualify as a "fiscally constrained county" under this definition, including: Baker, Bradford, Calhoun, Columbia, De Soto, Dixie, Franklin, Gadsden, Gilchrist, Glades, Gulf, Hamilton, Hardee, Hendry, Highlands, Holmes, Jackson, Jefferson, Lafayette, Levy, Liberty, Madison, Okeechobee, Putnam, Sumter, Suwannee, Taylor, Union, Wakulla, and Washington.

C. SECTION DIRECTORY:

Section 1. Amends s. 212.20(6), F.S., providing for 0.0841 percent of available sales tax proceeds to be transferred to the Local Government Half-cent Sales Tax Clearing Trust Fund for distribution to fiscally constrained counties. In addition, it makes a number of stylistic changes to promote uniformity in the provisions of the statute, and deletes obsolete language.

- Section 2. Creates s. 218.67, F.S., providing a distribution formula to apportion the funds provided for in this bill among fiscally constrained counties.
- Section 3. Amends s. 985.2155, F.S., revising the definition of "fiscally constrained county".
- Section 4. Amends s. 288.1169(6), F.S., to update a cross reference.
- Section 5. Provides that this bill shall take effect July 1, 2005.

II. FISCAL ANALYSIS & ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL IMPACT ON STATE GOVERNMENT:

1. Revenues: This bill will reduce the state's share of sales tax revenues by 0.0841 percent, which has an annualized impact of negative \$15 million dollars on general revenue.
2. Expenditures: None.

B. FISCAL IMPACT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENTS:

1. Revenues: This bill will distribute to fiscally constrained counties 0.0841 percent of the state sales tax. This increase has been estimated to increase revenues of fiscally constrained counties, in total, by an annualized \$15 million.
2. Expenditures: None.

C. DIRECT ECONOMIC IMPACT ON PRIVATE SECTOR: None.

D. FISCAL COMMENTS: None.

III. COMMENTS

A. CONSTITUTIONAL ISSUES:

1. Applicability of Municipality/County Mandates Provision:

This bill does not require counties or municipalities to spend funds or to take an action requiring the expenditure of funds. The bill does not reduce the percentage of a state tax shared with counties or municipalities. This bill does not reduce the authority that municipalities have to raise revenue.

2. Other: None.

B. RULE-MAKING AUTHORITY: None.

C. DRAFTING ISSUES OR OTHER COMMENTS: None.

IV. AMENDMENTS/COMMITTEE SUBSTITUTE & COMBINED BILL CHANGES

None.