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- Founded in 1916
- Statewide
- Nonpartisan
- Private not-for-profit
- Promotes sound policy for state and local governments through factual research
- Relies on charitable contributions from Michigan foundations, businesses, organizations, and individuals
Importance of State Payments

- 1995 – 56% of local government revenue in Michigan raised by the state
- 1/3 of local government revenue from the states on average in U.S.
- Only New Mexico did more
- Reflected state school aid
State Distributor of Revenues

- >60% of revenues raised directly by the state were paid to local governments and other entities
  - ~7% paid to universities
- Local government payments for public education, mental health services, transportation, courts, and unrestricted revenue sharing
  - >13% unrestricted in Michigan
  - ~8% nationwide
Objectives of Revenue Sharing

- Improving the overall state and local tax structure
- Promoting economic development
- Maintaining acceptable levels of government services from community to community
Improving Tax Structure

- Diversifies local tax structure
  - Should improve equity and stability of the tax base and revenue structure
- Increases equity and efficiency of collections
  - State better collector of tax than local governments
- State revenues promote local property tax relief
- Improves administrative efficiency for governments and taxpayers
Promoting Economic Development

- By promoting local property tax relief, differences between units are lessened
- Allows local governments to use revenues to meet their needs
Service Maintenance

- Preempt local governments from levying a tax
  - Share revenues in exchange for local support
- Exempt property from taxation
  - Compensate with revenues from another tax
- Insure a minimal level of basic local services
  - Equalize the ability of local governments to provide those services
Intangibles Tax

- Pre-1939 – intangible property (stocks, bonds, etc.) taxed as part of the General Property Tax Act
  - Lack of information to properly assess value
  - Not uniformly assessed across CVTs
- 1939 - Intangible property exempted from GPTA and replaced with state tax
Intangibles Tax (continued)

- 2/3 of revenues returned to CVTs on a per capita basis
- No effort to match state revenues to:
  - Those that were taxing before
  - Those where intangible property was owned
- Increased to 100% distribution for short period
  - Frozen at $11 million from 1951-57
  - Frozen at $9.5 million 1958-98 with some exceptions (8% of total state intangibles tax revenues when ended)
- 1991 state discontinued distribution
Sales Tax

• 1933 state property tax reduced to free available millage for local governments
• Sales tax enacted to provide revenues for state government
• 1946
  • State coffers flush post WWII
  • Some local governments financially challenged
Sales Tax (continued)

- Municipal League champions constitutional amendment to share sales tax revenues with local governments on per capita basis
- 1946 – 1/6 of 3% tax
- 1963 – 1/8 (12.5%) of 4% tax
- 1974 – 15% of 4% tax
  - (exempted food and drugs)
Income Tax

- **1961** – Detroit and Hamtramck begin levying city income taxes
- **1964** – state Uniform City Income Tax Act enacted
- **1967**
  - 8 cities levying city income taxes
  - Other cities considering enactment
  - State working on plan to levy state income tax
- **Concern of preempting cities from levying local taxes**
Income Tax (continued)

- **Initial distribution** – 17% of net collections (11.5% of gross) of 2.6% tax distributed on per capita basis
  - ½ to counties
  - ½ to CVTs

- **Distributions changed over time**
  - Percent of revenues shared
  - Split between counties (less) and CVTs (more)
Relative Tax Effort

- Introduced in 1971
- Attempt to have dollars follow need
- Local Tax Effort
  - Property taxes
  - Income taxes
  - Utility Users excise tax
  - Ad valorem special assessment
  - All translated to mills
- Divided by the statewide tax effort rate
RTE (continued)

- **Positives**
  - Reflect needs in the community
  - Ability to raise revenues to support services
  - Willingness to tax themselves to pay for their government

- **Negatives**
  - Perceived to encourage higher taxes
  - Sent money to cities (especially older core cities) while general out-migration occurring from these cities
Single Business Tax

- Enacted in 1975 to replace 8 state and local taxes on businesses
  - Including inventories as part of GPT Act
- CVTs share in growth of SBT revenue using RTE formula
- CVTs, counties, authorities reimbursed for loss of tax bases
- Reimbursement continued until replaced
  - Tax rate levied last year x SEV of inventory property in 1975
  - Over time – no relationship to inflation, economic changes, variations in growth
USRS Funding

- Distributions subject to vagaries of state budget cycles
- Payments reduced and/or eliminated during recessions
- 1993 - 53% of CVTs received more state revenue sharing than collected in local taxes
- RTE grew very unpopular
  - Benefited cities more than villages and townships at a time people were moving out of cities and away from SE Michigan
1998 Amendment to USRS Act

- Townships and villages gained, cities lost
- Extremely complicated formulae
- Phase in designed to protect against abrupt changes
- Formulas expired on June 30, 2006
1998 Amendment

- Shifted from intangibles, income, SBT to 21.3% of sales tax revenues at 4% tax rate
  - (~14% of all sales tax revenues)
- 10 year phase-in
  - With provisions to account for 2000 Census
  - Phasing out 2 pre 1998 formulas while phasing in 3 new ones = complicated system
- Detroit allocation frozen
  - Deal for city to lower city income tax rate
3 New Formulae

1. Unit Type Population Weighting
   • Service delivery costs a function of the type of unit and population size
   • Weights increase as population increases
   • Weights progressively higher for given population as type moves from township to village to city
2. Taxable Value per Capita Weighting

- Provide greater state support to units with smaller per capita tax bases
  - State average taxable value per capita
  - \( \times \) the unit’s population
  - = weighted population
3. Yield Equalization

- Create a minimum guarantee on combined state and local revenue per mill of tax levy
- Amount necessary to guarantee the total revenue proceeds from each mill of local tax effort is computed
  - Expressed in terms of taxable value per capita
  - Local tax effort in mills x difference between the guarantee and the actual TV per capita x unit’s population
History of Phase in

- 1999–2001 – 3 years into a 10 year phase in
- 2001–present – what you get this year depends on what you got last year
- 8 years of reduced funding available for distribution
Economic Vitality Incentive Program (EVIP)

- $215 million divided among 486 CVTs
- Introduced idea that have to perform certain actions to qualify for funds
  - Citizens’ Guides to Financial Performance and Performance Dashboards
  - Employee Health Care reforms
  - New Intergovernmental Collaboration arrangements
EVIP Thoughts

- Before now -- incentives or funding specific activities = taking money from other governments
- EVIP went through that door
- Adding funding back into program does not subtract funds from other governments
- Distribute new funding
  - Based on formula(s) to measure needs
  - Using same EVIP incentives
  - Using new EVIP incentives
  - To fund specific activities that state has interest in promoting (Police, Fire, Health, etc.)
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