

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Sales and Use Tax

ISSUE: Exemption of sales tax on repair of aircrafts with takeoff weight between 2,000 to 15,000 pounds

BILL NUMBER(S): HB1213, SB1384

SPONSOR(S): Rep Crisafulli, Sen Bennett

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 26th, 2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** Currently, section 212.08(7)(ee), F.S., provides sales tax exemption for all labor charges for the repair and maintenance of qualified aircraft of more than 15,000 pounds maximum certified takeoff weight. Section 212.08(7)(rr), F.S., provides sales tax exemption for parts in the repair or maintenance of qualified aircraft of more than 15,000 pounds maximum certified takeoff weight.
- b. **Proposed Change:** amends 212.08(7)(ee) and 212.08(7)(rr), F.S., to provide same sales tax exemption for the parts and labor for the repair and maintenance of qualified aircraft with takeoff weight between 2,000 to 15,000 pounds

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

FAA data

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

See Attached

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | (\$13.8m) | (\$15.0m) | (\$15.5m) | (\$16.1m) | (\$16.7m) |
| Middle | (\$10.4m) | (\$11.3m) | (\$11.7m) | (\$12.1m) | (\$12.5m) |
| Low | (\$6.9m) | (\$7.5m) | (\$7.8m) | (\$8.0m) | (\$8.3m) |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted the middle estimate.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Revenue | (9.2) | (10.0) | (10.4) | (10.7) | (11.1) |
| State Trust | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) |
| Total State Impact | (9.2) | (10.0) | (10.4) | (10.7) | (11.1) |
| Revenue Sharing | (.3) | (.3) | (.3) | (.4) | (.4) |
| Local Gov't Half Cent | (.9) | (1.0) | (1.0) | (1.0) | (1.1) |
| Local Option | (.9) | (1.0) | (1.0) | (1.0) | (1.1) |
| Total Local Impact | (2.1) | (2.3) | (2.3) | (2.4) | (2.6) |
| Total Impact | (11.3) | (12.3) | (12.7) | (13.1) | (13.7) |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Medical Hospital Fees (General Revenue)

ISSUE: Medical Hospital Fee Collections, without change to s. 409.915(1)

BILL NUMBER(S): Proposed Language

SPONSOR(S): Senate Budget Subcommittee on Health and Human Services Appropriations

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: Upon Becoming Law (Collection Impact beginning July 2012)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 27, 2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** Current law (Chapter 409.915, F.S.) specifies the method by which Medical Hospital Fees (also known as county contributions to Medicaid) are determined. The Agency for Health Care Administration is responsible for calculating the amount of obligation among the counties to share in the funding of the state Medicaid program, as well as for collecting the payments. All payments accrue to the General Revenue Fund.

Section 409.915(3), F.S., requires that each county set aside sufficient funds to pay for items of care and service provided to the county's eligible recipients for which county contributions are required. Section 409.915(5), F.S., specifies actions that should be taken when the county share has not been remitted within 60 days after billing. However, a significant backlog of payments has developed over time that is continuing to build. As of 12/31/2011, the distribution of total uncollected billings was as follows:

| 12/31/2011 | | Of Total |
|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| 0 - 1 YEAR | 112,050,745.67 | 34.4% |
| 1 - 2 YEARS | 47,835,790.99 | 14.7% |
| 2 - 3 YEARS | 33,591,236.08 | 10.3% |
| 3 - 4 YEARS | 23,692,136.88 | 7.3% |
| OVER 4 YEARS | 108,313,878.41 | 33.3% |
| | <u>325,483,788.03</u> | 100.0% |

- b. **Proposed Changes:** The bill revises current law to address the process for attributing costs to counties; create a new collection method for billings that are outstanding as of May 31, 2012; and put in place a new payment method for future billings that remain unpaid after six months. The language addressing future billings also provides a refund process.

Process for attributing costs to counties: Establishes that each county's eligible recipients be determined solely by recipient address information contained in the federally approved Medicaid eligibility system within the Department of Children and Families. An exception is made for those instances when the Medicaid eligibility system does not contain a recipient's address information; in these cases, the recipient is considered an eligible recipient of the county in which the costs were incurred. The prior requirement that statements be developed in consultation with counties is removed.

Collection method for billings that are outstanding as of May 31, 2012: Requires that AHCA certify to the Department of Revenue by June 15, 2012, for each county, an amount equal to seventy-five percent of that county's billings which have been denied, re-billed by the agency, and remain unpaid as of May 31, 2012. (While the language is unclear, the remaining 25% is intended to be forgiven.) Beginning with the July 2012 revenue sharing distribution, the Department of Revenue shall reduce each county's distributions pursuant to ss. 218.23 and 218.26 by one thirty-sixths of the amount certified by the agency for that county. However, the amount of the reduction may not exceed fifty percent of that county's distribution. Any amounts that are not applied to the reduction because of the fifty percent limitation shall be applied to reduce subsequent distributions. If after thirty-six months, the reductions for each county do not equal the total amount initially certified by the agency, the Department of Revenue shall continue to reduce each distribution by up to fifty percent until the total amount certified is reached. The amounts by which the distributions are reduced shall be deposited in the General Revenue Fund.

Payment method for future billings that remain unpaid after six months: Beginning December 1, 2012, and each month thereafter, the agency shall certify to the Department of Revenue, for each county, the amount of billings that remain unpaid for six months or longer that have not been previously certified. The Department of Revenue shall reduce each county's distributions pursuant to ss. 218.23 and 218.26 by the amount certified. However, the total reduction for backlogged and current billings may not exceed fifty percent of each county's distribution. Any amounts that are not applied to the reduction because of the fifty percent limitation shall be applied to reduce subsequent distributions. The

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Medical Hospital Fees (General Revenue)

ISSUE: Medical Hospital Fee Collections, without change to s. 409.915(1)

BILL NUMBER(S): Proposed Language

SPONSOR(S): Senate Budget Subcommittee on Health and Human Services Appropriations

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: Upon Becoming Law (Collection Impact beginning July 2012)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 27, 2012

amounts by which the distributions are reduced shall be deposited in the General Revenue Fund. A refund request process is also authorized.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

Schedule of billings and back due amounts by county provided by the Agency for Health Care Administration Revenue Estimating Conference Forecast and Workpapers for Medical Hospital Fees (adopted January 12, 2012) State Revenue Sharing Payments by County for FY 2010-11: <http://dor.myflorida.com/dor/tables/f6fy2011.xls>

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

The estimate is developed by using two methodologies. The first is related to the *collection method for billings that are outstanding as of May 31, 2012* and is referred to as the Backlog on the accompanying worksheet. Total outstanding payments by county as of December 31, 2011 are divided by 36 payment cycles, cumulated into 3 twelve-month groupings, applied to the 2010-11 revenue share payments by county, and constrained to 50 percent of the total to calculate maximum annual payments.

The second methodology is used for the *process for attributing costs to counties* and the *payment method for future billings that remain unpaid after six months*. It is assumed that the combined effect of the new statutory language for each provision increases the ratio of collections to billings in FY 2012-13 from 74.0% of 90.0% to 85% of 90% --- and in FY 2013-14 from 84% of 90% to 95% of 90%. Subsequent years default to the current forecast (100% of 90%).

The high estimate makes the calculations as described above; the middle estimate applies an additional slippage factor of 2.5% to address possible leakage from the various estimates and assumptions used in the analysis. The greatest sources of potential leakage are the number of counties ultimately bound by the 50% constraint and the payment schedule used by the Department of Revenue for the distribution of revenue sharing payments. In the latter case, the Department distributes 95% of the forecasted level of revenue sharing payments in 12 equal payments over the course of the fiscal year, with a 13th payment in the subsequent fiscal year to serve as the true-up. The bill is drafted to begin deducting payments associated with the backlog from the 13th payment of the total FY 2011-12 revenue share. Relative to the other 12 payments, the 13th payment is much smaller --- and a one thirty-sixths payment will exceed 50% of that amount in a larger number of counties than will be the case during the course of the fiscal year. In this regard, the analysis identifies four counties most likely to be constrained within the confines of the fiscal year: Alachua, Hendry, Pinellas, and St. Lucie.

For the purposes of this analysis, it is also assumed that:

- The remaining 25% of billings uncollected as of May 31, 2012 is forgiven, although the bill as drafted may have another effect.
- The ratio of County Billings that are Outstanding to Revenue Sharing Payments in FY 2010-11 will be maintained for each county throughout each year of the forecast.
- Given the way the current estimate is constructed, there will be no long-term recurring impact since the effect is similar to a speed-up --- plus an additional increment related to a portion of the backlog that is not in the current estimate during the relevant forecast period.

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | \$25.6 | | \$22.0 | \$14.4 | (\$29.0) |
| Middle | \$23.6 | | \$20.0 | \$12.4 | (\$29.1) |
| Low | | | | | |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Medical Hospital Fees (General Revenue)

ISSUE: Medical Hospital Fee Collections, without change to s. 409.915(1)

BILL NUMBER(S): Proposed Language

SPONSOR(S): Senate Budget Subcommittee on Health and Human Services Appropriations

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: Upon Becoming Law (Collection Impact beginning July 2012)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 27, 2012

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted the high estimate.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Revenue | \$25.6 | 0 | \$22.0 | \$14.4 | (\$29.0) |
| Total Local Impact | | | | | |
| Total Impact | \$25.6 | 0 | \$22.0 | \$14.4 | (\$29.0) |

**REC Forecast
Medical/Hospital Fees
General Revenue Fund**

| | Medicaid Payments to Hospitals | Ratio of Billings to Payments | Hospital Billings | Nursing Home Patients | Billing Rate per Client | Nursing Home Billings | HMO Payments | Ratio of Billings to Payments | HMO Billings | Total Billings | Amount Collected | Ratio of Collections to Billings | | |
|------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--------|
| FY 1994-95 | 1044.7 | 9.1% | 95.6 | 44,582 | \$56.47 | 30.2 | | | | 125.8 | 118.8 | 94.4% | | |
| FY 1995-96 | 1059.8 | 9.1% | 96.4 | 45,573 | \$59.98 | 32.8 | | | | 129.2 | 114.0 | 88.2% | | |
| FY 1996-97 | 973.4 | 8.7% | 84.7 | 46,312 | \$53.00 | 29.5 | 591.1 | 2.5% | 14.5 | 128.6 | 129.6 | 100.8% | | |
| FY 1997-98 | 985.6 | 5.9% | 57.8 | 46,639 | \$54.50 | 30.5 | 645.1 | 0.8% | 5.1 | 93.4 | 99.8 | 106.9% | | |
| FY 1998-99 | 953.8 | 8.7% | 83.1 | 46,415 | \$57.34 | 31.9 | 727.2 | 0.2% | 1.1 | 116.1 | 104.5 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 1999-00 | 1033.5 | 8.5% | 87.4 | 46,907 | \$57.56 | 32.4 | 715.2 | 0.5% | 3.8 | 123.6 | 118.9 | 96.2% | | |
| FY 2000-01 | 1281.0 | 7.3% | 94.0 | 47,058 | \$58.08 | 32.8 | 894.0 | 0.5% | 4.9 | 131.7 | 127.4 | 96.7% | | |
| FY 2001-02 | 1311.7 | 7.6% | 99.7 | 46,859 | \$58.33 | 32.8 | 1,014.5 | 1.0% | 9.9 | 142.4 | 134.5 | 94.5% | | |
| FY 2002-03 | 1437.5 | 8.0% | 114.9 | 47,704 | \$57.65 | 33.0 | 1,191.4 | 1.2% | 14.2 | 162.1 | 140.9 | 86.9% | | |
| FY 2003-04 | 1,834.1 | 7.6% | 139.7 | 48,203 | \$59.30 | 34.3 | 1,252.4 | 1.6% | 20.3 | 194.3 | 165.9 | 85.4% | | |
| FY 2004-05 | 1,852.5 | 7.9% | 146.9 | 47,465 | \$58.82 | 33.5 | 1,550.4 | 1.1% | 16.8 | 197.2 | 181.2 | 91.9% | | |
| FY 2005-06 | 1,852.0 | 7.7% | 143.0 | 46,558 | \$59.07 | 33.0 | 1,780.1 | 1.0% | 17.4 | 193.4 | 181.0 | 93.6% | | |
| FY 2006-07 | 1,988.4 | 6.9% | 138.0 | 45,856 | \$58.90 | 32.4 | 1,970.6 | 0.9% | 17.3 | 187.7 | 172.6 | 92.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | Expected Amount to be Paid | | Expected Amount to be Paid | |
| FY 2007-08 | 2,029.7 | 6.7% | 135.4 | 43,009 | \$58.51 | 30.2 | 2,192.3 | 1.8% | 39.9 | 205.5 | 185.0 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2008-09 | 2,408.9 | 5.7% | 138.0 | 42,535 | \$60.34 | 30.8 | 2,200.3 | 1.9% | 41.3 | 210.1 | 189.1 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2009-10 | 3,007.1 | 5.6% | 169.0 | 42,661 | \$59.38 | 30.4 | 2,567.4 | 1.7% | 43.4 | 242.8 | 218.5 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2010-11 | 3,079.7 | 5.6% | 173.6 | 43,749 | \$58.29 | 30.6 | 2,864.6 | 1.9% | 55.1 | 259.3 | 233.4 | 90.0% | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | Old Forecast | Change |
| FY 2011-12 | 3,401.5 | 5.6% | 191.5 | 42,509 | \$58.83 | 30.0 | 3,113.7 | 1.9% | 59.2 | 280.7 | 252.6 | 90.0% | 240.1 | 12.5 |
| FY 2012-13 | 3,720.6 | 5.6% | 209.4 | 43,050 | \$58.83 | 30.4 | 3,412.8 | 1.9% | 64.8 | 304.6 | 274.1 | 90.0% | 250.2 | 23.9 |
| FY 2013-14 | 3,862.5 | 5.6% | 217.4 | 43,710 | \$58.83 | 30.9 | 3,641.9 | 1.9% | 69.2 | 317.5 | 285.8 | 90.0% | 255.0 | 30.8 |
| FY 2014-15 | 4,000.7 | 5.6% | 225.2 | 44,370 | \$58.83 | 31.3 | 3,868.3 | 1.9% | 73.5 | 330.0 | 297.0 | 90.0% | 259.0 | 38.0 |
| FY 2015-16 | 4,142.0 | 5.6% | 233.1 | 45,030 | \$58.83 | 31.8 | 4,111.3 | 1.9% | 78.1 | 343.0 | 308.7 | 90.0% | 271.1 | 37.6 |
| FY 2016-17 | 4,349.1 | 5.6% | 244.8 | 45,690 | \$58.83 | 32.3 | 4,316.9 | 1.9% | 82.0 | 359.1 | 323.2 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2017-18 | 4,566.6 | 5.6% | 257.0 | 46,350 | \$58.83 | 32.7 | 4,532.7 | 1.9% | 86.1 | 375.8 | 338.2 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2018-19 | 4,794.9 | 5.6% | 269.9 | 47,010 | \$58.83 | 33.2 | 4,759.3 | 1.9% | 90.4 | 393.5 | 354.2 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2019-20 | 5,034.6 | 5.6% | 283.4 | 47,670 | \$58.83 | 33.7 | 4,997.3 | 1.9% | 94.9 | 412.0 | 370.8 | 90.0% | | |
| FY 2020-21 | 5,286.4 | 5.6% | 297.5 | 48,330 | \$58.83 | 34.1 | 5,247.2 | 1.9% | 99.7 | 431.3 | 388.2 | 90.0% | | |

EDR
18-Jan-12

| | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------|---------|-------|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|------|------|------|------------------|
| 10.4% | +27%YTD | 10.3% | -2.8% | flat YTD | -2.0% | 8.7% | +11%YTD | 7.4% | 8.3% | 8.2% | FY11-12 increase |
|-------|---------|-------|-------|----------|-------|------|---------|------|------|------|------------------|

Medical Hospital Fees Cash Analysis - FINAL

| A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | | |
|----------------|----------------------------------|---|--|--|---|---|--|--|--|--|---|--|-----------------|--------|
| | Expected Amount to be Paid | Current Year Percent paid in current year | Amount of current year paid in current year (B x C) | Amount of current year Past Due (B - D) | | FY09-10 \$107.9 Past Due Amount Collected | FY10-11 \$82.4 Past Due Amount Collected | FY11-12 \$90.9 Past Due Amount Collected | FY12-13 \$71.3 Past Due Amount Collected | FY13-14 \$45.7 Past Due Amount Collected | All Years Past Due Amounts Collected | General Revenue Collections (D + L) | OLD Forecast | Change |
| FY 2007-08 | 185.0 | 89.7% | 165.9 | NA | | | | | | | NA | 165.9 | | |
| FY 2008-09 | 189.1 | 73.0% | 138.1 | NA | | | | | | | NA | 138.1 | | |
| FY 2009-10 | 218.5 | 50.6% | 110.6 | 107.9 | | | | | | | 99.6 | 210.2 | | |
| FY 2010-11 | 233.4 | 64.7% | 151.0 | 82.4 | | 57.6 | | | | | 57.6 | 208.6 | | |
| FY 2011-12 | 252.6 | 64.0% | 161.7 | 90.9 | | 34.7 | 26.4 | | | | 61.1 | 222.8 | 283.6 | -60.8 |
| FY 2012-13 | 274.1 | 74.0% | 202.8 | 71.3 | | 15.6 | 33.0 | 35.5 | | | 84.0 | 286.8 | 315.4 | -28.6 |
| FY 2013-14 | 285.8 | 84.0% | 240.1 | 45.7 | | | 23.1 | 37.3 | 28.5 | | 88.9 | 328.9 | 279.0 | 49.9 |
| FY 2014-15 | 297.0 | 100.0% | 297.0 | 0.0 | | | | 18.2 | 28.5 | 18.3 | 65.0 | 362.0 | 259.0 | 103.0 |
| FY 2015-16 | 308.7 | 100.0% | 308.7 | 0.0 | | | | | 14.3 | 18.3 | 32.5 | 341.2 | 271.1 | 70.1 |
| FY 2016-17 | 323.2 | 100.0% | 323.2 | 0.0 | | | | | | 9.1 | 9.1 | 332.3 | | |
| FY 2017-18 | 338.2 | 100.0% | 338.2 | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 338.2 | | |
| FY 2018-19 | 354.2 | 100.0% | 354.2 | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 354.2 | | |
| FY 2019-20 | 370.8 | 100.0% | 370.8 | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 370.8 | | |
| FY 2020-21 | 388.2 | 100.0% | 388.2 | 0.0 | | | | | | | 0.0 | 388.2 | | |
| | | | | 398.2 | | 107.9 | 82.4 | 90.9 | 71.3 | 45.7 | | | | |
| EDR 1/18/12 | | | | | | 53% | 32% | 39% | 40% | 40% | | | | |
| | | | | | | 32% | 40% | 41% | 40% | 40% | | | | |
| | | | | | | 14% | 28% | 20% | 20% | 20% | | | | |

collection YTD are 13% ahead of last year
 36% of YTD collections are past due collections
 64% of YTD collections are current year collections

backlog as of Oct 10
 0-1 years \$109 m.
 1-2 years \$46 m.
 2-3 years \$33 m.
 3-4 years \$27 m.
 4+ years \$103 m.

AHCA
Medicaid County Billing
Total Estimated Amounts Due as of 12/31/2011

| County | OVER 4 YEARS | 3 - 4 YEARS | 2 - 3 YEARS | 1 - 2 YEARS | 0 - 1 YEAR | TOTALS | Billing FY 10-11 | FY 2010-11 | | Backlog YES: 100%+ | Backlog % Remaining | Backlog Constrain at 50% | Debt Remainder | |
|-----------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|----------------------|---------------|---------------|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| | | | | | | | | At Schedule A | 36 | | | | | |
| ALACHUA | 4,046,798.37 | 1,075,883.72 | 2,137,620.77 | 3,531,667.52 | 2,528,828.22 | 13,320,798.60 | 4,327,359.52 | 3,996,646.91 | 3,330,199.65 | 666,447.26 | 16.7% | XXX | 1,998,323.46 | 3,995,628.59 |
| BAKER | 29,244.83 | 15,804.36 | 22,679.95 | 77,797.44 | 280,907.84 | 426,434.42 | 585,803.80 | 405,318.23 | 106,608.61 | 298,709.63 | 73.7% | | 106,608.61 | |
| BAY | 157,280.85 | 66,544.32 | (69.68) | 286,961.11 | 25,815.49 | 536,532.09 | 2,117,508.25 | 3,061,248.19 | 134,133.02 | 2,927,115.17 | 95.6% | | 134,133.02 | |
| BRADFORD | 2,580.75 | 6,422.12 | 41,224.41 | 45,275.08 | 54,387.26 | 149,889.62 | 384,806.58 | 428,343.64 | 37,472.41 | 390,871.24 | 91.3% | | 37,472.41 | |
| BREWARD | 1,793,439.15 | 215,222.51 | 297,880.95 | 533,849.00 | 559,792.07 | 3,400,183.68 | 5,701,947.41 | 8,387,332.83 | 850,045.92 | 7,537,286.91 | 89.9% | | 850,045.92 | |
| BROWARD | 2,697,233.88 | 5,173,620.03 | 5,772,624.65 | 4,709,693.68 | 16,393,603.35 | 34,746,775.59 | 23,725,537.18 | 21,956,019.11 | 8,686,693.90 | 13,269,325.21 | 60.4% | | 8,686,693.90 | |
| CALHOUN | 5,344.16 | 8,688.65 | 28,957.29 | 67,499.52 | 74,056.17 | 184,545.79 | 167,081.21 | 216,767.00 | 46,136.45 | 170,630.55 | 78.7% | | 46,136.45 | |
| CHARLOTTE | 539,707.85 | 77,356.86 | 14,295.08 | 249,364.12 | 269,187.52 | 1,149,911.43 | 1,077,685.02 | 3,461,347.70 | 287,477.86 | 3,173,869.84 | 91.7% | | 287,477.86 | |
| CITRUS | 295,752.80 | 37,717.80 | 221,481.22 | 161,423.39 | 213,035.45 | 929,410.66 | 1,491,182.43 | 2,886,547.05 | 232,352.67 | 2,654,194.39 | 92.0% | | 232,352.67 | |
| CLAY | 107,264.70 | 77,403.35 | 63,435.97 | 212,726.96 | 462,656.68 | 923,487.66 | 1,525,633.61 | 3,718,325.57 | 230,871.92 | 3,487,453.66 | 93.8% | | 230,871.92 | |
| COLLIER | 574,766.83 | 612,244.72 | 473,567.41 | 227,565.36 | 454,614.51 | 2,342,758.83 | 1,886,052.20 | 7,722,674.51 | 585,689.71 | 7,136,984.80 | 92.4% | | 585,689.71 | |
| COLUMBIA | 107,028.72 | 112,203.56 | 234,309.39 | 174,457.21 | 338,552.17 | 966,551.05 | 860,505.39 | 1,256,126.73 | 241,637.76 | 1,014,488.97 | 80.8% | | 241,637.76 | |
| DADE | 28,654,436.37 | 1,312,720.39 | 1,948,590.07 | 2,334,936.59 | 29,678,923.35 | 63,929,606.77 | 51,009,345.35 | 41,951,075.77 | 15,982,401.69 | 25,968,674.08 | 61.9% | | 15,982,401.69 | |
| DESOTO | 42,889.15 | 31,807.84 | 27,779.07 | 32,925.64 | 44,432.51 | 179,834.21 | 363,414.59 | 574,001.04 | 44,958.55 | 529,042.49 | 92.2% | | 44,958.55 | |
| DIXIE | 131,937.81 | 3,960.00 | 13,433.29 | 23,213.83 | 96,130.95 | 268,675.88 | 185,803.46 | 265,286.94 | 67,168.97 | 198,117.97 | 74.7% | | 67,168.97 | |
| DUVAL | 4,619,183.52 | 1,312,318.87 | 1,531,432.67 | 1,905,677.69 | 3,729,741.16 | 13,098,353.91 | 13,422,609.67 | 17,646,531.83 | 3,274,588.48 | 14,371,943.35 | 81.4% | | 3,274,588.48 | |
| ESCAMBIA | 1,300,279.55 | 454,702.69 | 925,180.83 | 2,197,637.92 | 2,904,709.73 | 7,782,510.72 | 5,492,886.45 | 6,464,199.69 | 1,945,627.68 | 4,518,572.01 | 69.9% | | 1,945,627.68 | |
| FLAGLER | 75,510.46 | 27,941.89 | 67,916.07 | 75,785.00 | 349,647.96 | 596,801.38 | 544,253.66 | 994,937.62 | 149,200.35 | 845,737.28 | 85.0% | | 149,200.35 | |
| FRANKLIN | 11,457.87 | 4,403.37 | 6,241.25 | 41,895.25 | 33,659.84 | 127,657.58 | 101,453.02 | 198,495.94 | 31,914.40 | 166,581.55 | 83.9% | | 31,914.40 | |
| GADSDEN | 284,412.90 | 56,057.07 | 29,787.97 | 58,553.53 | 222,043.84 | 650,855.31 | 550,866.41 | 770,167.91 | 162,713.83 | 607,454.08 | 78.9% | | 162,713.83 | |
| GILCHRIST | 99,933.84 | 34,421.64 | 74,145.96 | 37,237.71 | 110,406.61 | 356,145.76 | 185,213.02 | 280,451.46 | 89,036.44 | 191,415.02 | 68.3% | | 89,036.44 | |
| GLADES | 47,515.90 | 932.65 | 6,531.17 | 20,988.02 | 7,477.96 | 83,445.70 | 63,360.97 | 172,881.35 | 20,861.43 | 152,019.93 | 87.9% | | 20,861.43 | |
| GULF | 34,563.66 | 33,777.51 | 6,906.54 | 19,280.05 | 48,443.47 | 142,971.23 | 222,088.87 | 215,026.75 | 35,742.81 | 179,283.94 | 83.4% | | 35,742.81 | |
| HAMILTON | 116,402.35 | 29,624.41 | 5,485.00 | 945.68 | 4,340.29 | 156,797.73 | 149,001.73 | 195,336.18 | 39,199.43 | 156,136.75 | 79.9% | | 39,199.43 | |
| HARDEE | 192,791.80 | 32,525.30 | 102,118.21 | 135,699.32 | 103,413.53 | 566,548.16 | 419,074.98 | 417,215.65 | 141,637.04 | 275,578.61 | 66.1% | | 141,637.04 | |
| HENDRY | 132,659.02 | 192,944.56 | 547,978.55 | 427,198.27 | 387,110.42 | 1,687,890.82 | 529,571.37 | 681,460.99 | 421,972.71 | 259,488.29 | 38.1% | XXX | 340,730.50 | 243,726.63 |
| HERNANDO | 1,652,532.56 | 146,615.12 | 185,724.57 | 472,392.52 | 979,781.95 | 3,437,046.72 | 2,130,305.50 | 3,355,657.08 | 859,261.68 | 2,496,395.40 | 74.4% | | 859,261.68 | |
| HIGHLANDS | 261,456.74 | 163,503.33 | 99,106.68 | 139,726.17 | 228,384.39 | 892,177.31 | 1,126,545.44 | 1,865,257.78 | 223,044.33 | 1,642,213.45 | 88.0% | | 223,044.33 | |
| HILLSBOROUGH | 7,618,821.99 | 770,394.89 | 1,484,682.64 | 2,551,301.68 | 8,654,734.01 | 21,079,935.21 | 18,959,343.34 | 24,210,773.57 | 5,269,983.80 | 18,940,789.77 | 78.2% | | 5,269,983.80 | |
| HOLMES | 72,790.05 | 1,077.70 | 75,635.56 | 62,150.50 | 70,882.31 | 282,536.12 | 289,773.23 | 303,132.94 | 70,634.03 | 232,498.91 | 76.7% | | 70,634.03 | |
| INDIAN RIVER CO | 197,410.19 | 67,501.31 | 180,743.50 | 425,395.47 | 185,731.98 | 1,056,782.45 | 873,487.21 | 2,653,200.82 | 264,195.61 | 2,389,005.21 | 90.0% | | 264,195.61 | |
| JACKSON | 84,573.21 | 49,916.09 | 86,132.65 | 57,268.70 | 199,499.71 | 477,390.36 | 559,486.05 | 787,057.72 | 119,347.59 | 667,710.13 | 84.8% | | 119,347.59 | |
| JEFFERSON | 79,355.48 | 77,234.81 | 40,595.72 | 21,975.16 | 83,987.14 | 303,148.31 | 156,238.18 | 267,175.81 | 75,787.08 | 191,388.73 | 71.6% | | 75,787.08 | |
| LAFAYETTE | 26,733.65 | 2,143.74 | - | - | 13,811.79 | 42,689.18 | 92,872.22 | 113,090.81 | 10,672.30 | 102,418.52 | 90.6% | | 10,672.30 | |
| LAKE | 1,634,354.19 | 185,384.17 | 270,269.43 | 504,008.38 | 629,774.59 | 3,223,790.76 | 3,159,655.61 | 4,837,508.62 | 805,947.69 | 4,031,560.93 | 83.3% | | 805,947.69 | |
| LEE | 1,457,255.17 | 205,421.45 | 652,668.50 | 1,103,387.77 | 884,747.79 | 4,303,480.68 | 6,214,858.79 | 11,299,593.39 | 1,075,870.17 | 10,223,723.22 | 90.5% | | 1,075,870.17 | |
| LEON | 322,056.94 | 124,500.31 | 300,698.24 | 78,530.86 | 507,412.18 | 1,333,198.53 | 1,940,512.17 | 4,225,480.46 | 333,299.63 | 3,892,180.83 | 92.1% | | 333,299.63 | |
| LEVY | 213,748.28 | 73,352.12 | 129,249.08 | 241,689.37 | 242,136.49 | 900,175.34 | 628,423.64 | 714,643.91 | 225,043.84 | 489,600.08 | 68.5% | | 225,043.84 | |
| LIBERTY | 46,830.96 | 31,455.05 | 37,916.19 | 82,742.29 | 25,738.46 | 224,682.95 | 82,344.92 | 114,868.21 | 56,170.74 | 58,697.47 | 51.1% | | 56,170.74 | |
| MADISON | 33,146.74 | 6,414.42 | 7,489.21 | 170.78 | 4,566.04 | 51,787.19 | 260,205.21 | 309,011.15 | 12,946.80 | 296,064.35 | 95.8% | | 12,946.80 | |
| MANATEE | 1,527,887.16 | 257,085.45 | 604,251.92 | 820,968.27 | 1,214,426.89 | 4,424,619.69 | 3,470,534.90 | 6,260,036.05 | 1,106,154.92 | 5,153,881.13 | 82.3% | | 1,106,154.92 | |
| MARION | 668,718.49 | 552,469.89 | 957,965.06 | 851,712.75 | 1,200,683.63 | 4,231,549.82 | 4,266,598.35 | 6,462,867.24 | 1,057,887.46 | 5,404,979.79 | 83.6% | | 1,057,887.46 | |
| MARTIN | 148,311.18 | 101,286.46 | 175,523.91 | 158,296.50 | 350,583.16 | 934,001.21 | 1,005,186.65 | 3,248,290.81 | 233,500.30 | 3,014,790.51 | 92.8% | | 233,500.30 | |
| MONROE | 1,078,470.74 | 325,561.27 | 601,074.71 | 656,489.16 | 639,759.23 | 3,301,355.11 | 639,850.69 | 1,889,691.02 | 825,338.78 | 1,064,352.24 | 56.3% | | 825,338.78 | |
| NASSAU | 146,148.46 | 57,432.00 | 124,764.10 | 84,410.89 | 159,222.35 | 607,977.80 | 617,917.54 | 1,381,064.58 | 151,994.45 | 1,229,070.13 | 89.0% | | 151,994.45 | |
| OKALOOSA | 123,233.68 | (51,818.57) | 69,833.89 | 178,053.34 | 336,351.82 | 655,654.16 | 1,436,150.34 | 3,784,487.22 | 163,913.54 | 3,620,573.68 | 95.7% | | 163,913.54 | |
| OKEECHOBEE | 728,741.75 | 102,768.95 | 163,337.59 | 92,641.77 | 60,923.93 | 1,148,413.99 | 365,062.39 | 747,989.82 | 287,103.50 | 460,886.32 | 61.6% | | 287,103.50 | |
| ORANGE | 7,979,063.32 | 1,177,371.28 | 1,015,085.59 | 6,927,328.70 | 9,480,770.31 | 26,579,619.20 | 22,531,257.56 | 27,391,727.95 | 6,644,904.80 | 20,746,823.15 | 75.7% | | 6,644,904.80 | |
| OSCEOLA | 1,544,562.41 | 247,672.90 | 210,714.57 | 1,106,142.91 | 1,574,137.88 | 4,683,230.67 | 4,405,158.01 | 5,173,851.10 | 1,170,807.67 | 4,003,043.43 | 77.4% | | 1,170,807.67 | |
| PALM BEACH | 788,659.87 | 2,172,289.07 | 889,436.54 | 2,455,171.26 | 3,106,133.52 | 9,411,690.26 | 15,320,410.98 | 22,477,962.65 | 2,352,922.57 | 20,125,040.09 | 89.5% | | 2,352,922.57 | |
| PASCO | 890,734.61 | 729,810.43 | 377,358.23 | 567,156.69 | 1,694,534.90 | 4,259,594.86 | 4,692,487.66 | 8,928,055.46 | 1,064,898.72 | 7,863,156.75 | 88.1% | | 1,064,898.72 | |
| PINELLAS | 12,145,140.70 | 2,347,566.30 | 2,642,887.46 | 2,387,247.64 | 8,782,042.44 | 28,304,884.54 | 16,189,890.22 | 13,787,761.04 | 7,076,221.14 | 6,711,539.91 | 48.7% | XXX | 6,711,539.91 | 547,021.85 |
| POLK | 5,913,728.59 | 492,466.91 | 3,151,967.67 | 2,134,775.84 | 2,443,439.00 | 14,136,378.01 | 7,863,924.77 | 10,256,751.28 | 3,534,094.50 | 6,722,656.78 | 65.5% | | 3,534,094.50 | |
| PUTNAM | 375,496.43 | (5,828.20) | 234,365.26 | 650,527.41 | 200,338.66 | 1,454,899.56 | 1,188,000.81 | 1,334,541.98 | 363,724.89 | 970,817.09 | 72.7% | | 363,724.89 | |
| SANTA ROSA | 41,072.04 | (8,213.21) | 166,212.79 | 125,659.75 | 391,623.13 | 716,354.50 | | | | | | | | |

MEDICAL HOSPITAL FEES

| SUMMARY DATA | Summary | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|---------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------------|--|--------|--|--|
| | OVER 4 YEARS | | | 3 - 4 YEARS | | | 2 - 3 YEARS | | | 1 - 2 YEARS | | | 0 - 1 YEAR | | | TOTALS | | |
| | 7/31/2011 | 101,045,883.53 | | 26,823,585.02 | | 33,428,693.55 | | 45,914,407.35 | | 97,488,185.07 | | 304,700,754.52 | | | | | | |
| | 9/30/2011 | 103,055,198.64 | 2,009,315.11 | 27,126,078.22 | 302,493.20 | 33,299,290.65 | (129,402.90) | 46,336,285.75 | 421,878.40 | 109,158,189.93 | 11,670,004.86 | 318,975,043.19 | 14,274,288.67 | | | | | |
| 12/31/2011 | 108,313,878.41 | 5,258,679.77 | 23,692,136.88 | (3,433,941.34) | 33,591,236.08 | 291,945.43 | 47,835,790.99 | 1,499,505.24 | 112,050,745.67 | 2,892,555.74 | 325,483,788.03 | 6,508,744.84 | | | | | | |
| 12/31/2011 | | Of Total | | 9/30/2011 | | Of Total | | 7/31/2011 | | | | | | | | | | |
| 0 - 1 YEAR | 112,050,745.67 | 34.4% | | 0 - 1 YEAR | 109,158,189.93 | 34.2% | | 0 - 1 YEAR | 97,488,185.07 | | 32.0% | | | | | | | |
| 1 - 2 YEARS | 47,835,790.99 | 14.7% | | 1 - 2 YEARS | 46,336,285.75 | 14.5% | | 1 - 2 YEARS | 45,914,407.35 | | 15.1% | | | | | | | |
| 2 - 3 YEARS | 33,591,236.08 | 10.3% | | 2 - 3 YEARS | 33,299,290.65 | 10.4% | | 2 - 3 YEARS | 33,428,693.55 | | 11.0% | | | | | | | |
| 3 - 4 YEARS | 23,692,136.88 | 7.3% | | 3 - 4 YEARS | 27,126,078.22 | 8.5% | | 3 - 4 YEARS | 26,823,585.02 | | 8.8% | | | | | | | |
| OVER 4 YEARS | 108,313,878.41 | 33.3% | | OVER 4 YEARS | 103,055,198.64 | 32.3% | | OVER 4 YEARS | 101,045,883.53 | | 33.2% | | | | | | | |
| | 325,483,788.03 | 100.0% | | | 318,975,043.19 | 100.0% | | | 304,700,754.52 | | 100.0% | | | | | | | |
| 6 Months | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Inflow | 14,562,560.60 | 0 - 1 YEAR | Out / In | 1,921,383.64 | 1 - 2 YEARS | Out / In | 162,542.53 | 2 - 3 YEARS | Out / In | (3,131,448.14) | 3 - 4 YEARS | Out / In | 7,267,994.88 | OVER 4 YEARS | | | | |
| | | Growing | | Modest Growth | | | Stable | | | Declining | | | | Growing | | | | |
| | | More Billing | | | | | | | | | | | | Greater Delinquency | | | | |

| PROPOSED CHANGE | Backlog | | Schedule At Flat 75% | | 75.0% Paid Percentage | | Slippage Factor: 0.975 | |
|-----------------|--------------|-------|----------------------|--|-----------------------|-------------|------------------------|--|
| | OVER 4 YEARS | 0.75 | 81,235,408.81 | | | | | |
| | 3 - 4 YEARS | 0.75 | 17,769,102.66 | | | | | |
| | 2 - 3 YEARS | 0.75 | 25,193,427.06 | | | | | |
| | 1 - 2 YEARS | 0.75 | 35,876,843.24 | | | | | |
| | 0 - 1 YEAR | 0.75 | 84,038,059.25 | | | | | |
| | | | 244,112,841.02 | | | | | |
| | | | 6,780,912.25 | | 36 | Payment Mos | | |
| | | | 81,370,947.01 | | 3 | FY | | |
| | (Of Totals) | | 325,483,788.03 | | | | | |
| | Forgiveness | 25.0% | | | | | | |

Assumptions: Total deductions (related to combined backlogged and future certifications) are subject to a hard constraint of no more than 50% of each county's monthly revenue share) Beginning December 2012, 100% of future "current" billings by AHCA greater than 6 MOS old will be certified to DOR and deducted from Revenue Sharing each month. 75% of all outstanding billings as of May 31, 2012 will be certified by AHCA to DOR. Each county's amount will be divided by 36 payments to determine the monthly deduct from Revenue sharing.

| SCHEDULE A | Current Billings | Other Changes | 50% Constraint | TOTAL | Current Estimate | DIFF | SCHEDULE B | Current Billings | Other Changes | 50% Constraint | TOTAL | Current Estimate | DIFF |
|------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|------------------|------------------|--------|------------|------------------|--------------------|----------------|-------|------------------|-------------|
| | at 90% | (.85 & .95 of 90%) | Backlog (36) | | | | | at 90% | (.85 & .95 of 90%) | With Slippage | | | |
| FY 2011-12 | 252.6 | 161.7 | 0.0 | 252.6 | 222.8 | N/A | FY 2011-12 | 252.6 | 161.7 | 0.0 | 252.6 | 222.8 | N/A |
| FY 2012-13 | 274.1 | 233.0 | 79.4 | 312.4 | 286.8 | 25.6 | FY 2012-13 | 274.1 | 233.0 | 77.4 | 310.4 | 286.8 | 23.6 |
| FY 2013-14 | 285.8 | 271.5 | 79.4 | 350.9 | 328.9 | 22.0 | FY 2013-14 | 285.8 | 271.5 | 77.4 | 348.9 | 328.9 | 20.0 |
| FY 2014-15 | 297.0 | 297.0 | 79.4 | 376.4 | 362.0 | 14.4 | FY 2014-15 | 297.0 | 297.0 | 77.4 | 374.4 | 362.0 | 12.4 |
| FY 2015-16 | 308.7 | 308.7 | 3.5 | 312.2 | 341.2 | (29.0) | FY 2015-16 | 308.7 | 308.7 | 3.4 | 312.1 | 341.2 | (29.1) |
| FY 2016-17 | 323.2 | 323.2 | 2.0 | 325.2 | 332.3 | (7.1) | FY 2016-17 | 323.2 | 323.2 | 1.9 | 325.1 | 332.3 | (7.2) |
| FY 2017-18 | 338.2 | 338.2 | 0.0 | 338.2 | 338.2 | - | FY 2017-18 | 338.2 | 338.2 | 0.0 | 338.2 | 338.2 | - |
| FY 2018-19 | 354.2 | 354.2 | 0.0 | 354.2 | 354.2 | - | FY 2018-19 | 354.2 | 354.2 | 0.0 | 354.2 | 354.2 | - |
| FY 2019-20 | 370.8 | 370.8 | 0.0 | 370.8 | 370.8 | - | FY 2019-20 | 370.8 | 370.8 | 0.0 | 370.8 | 370.8 | - |
| FY 2020-21 | 388.2 | 388.2 | 0.0 | 388.2 | 388.2 | - | FY 2020-21 | 388.2 | 388.2 | 0.0 | 388.2 | 388.2 | - |
| | | | | NET GAIN: | 25.8 | | | | | | | NET GAIN: | 19.7 |

NOTE: Slightly Less than aggregated numbers due to removal of unknown and rounding.

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Sales and Use Tax/Local Discretionary Surtax
ISSUE: Sales Tax Exemption on Commercial Rentals
BILL NUMBER(S): SB 1548 / HB 4099
SPONSOR(S): Senator Hays / Rep. O’Toole
MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012
DATE OF ANALYSIS: 1/27/2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** 212.031 F.S. authorizes imposition of sales tax on the rental or license fee charged for the use of commercial real property.
- b. **Proposed Change:** repeal section 212.031 F.S.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

DOR sales tax data and local option discretionary surtax data

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

REC Jan 2012 growth rates for business investment
 High is based on the annual data
 Middle is based on monthly data, assuming business kind code 82 without specific category are commercial rentals;
 Low is based on monthly data, proportion kind code 82 without specific category to commercial rentals

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High (state/local) | (1358.2m/135.9m) | (1481.7m/148.2m) | (1591.3m/159.1m) | (1725.0m/172.5m) | (1849.2m/184.9m) |
| Middle (state/local) | (1253.9m/118.6m) | (1367.9m/129.4m) | (1469.1m/139.0m) | (1592.5m/150.7m) | (1707.2m/161.6m) |
| Low (state/local) | (1203.8m/113.9m) | (1313.2m/124.3m) | (1410.4m/133.5m) | (1528.8m/144.7m) | (1638.9m/155.1m) |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|-----------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Revenue | (1,111.4) | (1,212.5) | (1,302.2) | (1,411.6) | (1,513.2) |
| State Trust | (.1) | (.1) | (.1) | (.1) | (.1) |
| Total State Impact | (1,111.5) | (1,212.6) | (1,302.3) | (1,411.7) | (1,513.3) |
| Revenue Sharing | (36.7) | (40.0) | (42.9) | (46.6) | (49.9) |
| Local Gov’t Half Cent | (105.7) | (115.3) | (123.8) | (134.2) | (143.9) |
| Local Option | (118.6) | (129.4) | (139.0) | (150.7) | (161.6) |
| Total Local Impact | (261.0) | (284.7) | (305.7) | (331.5) | (355.4) |
| Total Impact | (1372.5) | (1,497.3) | (1,608.0) | (1,743.2) | (1,868.7) |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | K |
|----|------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------|
| 1 | | | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | CY 2011 | |
| 2 | | loc opt surtax | 1,667,911,927 | 1,634,848,826 | 1,663,231,549 | 1,652,550,830 | |
| 3 | | total state sales tax | 17,369,164,757 | 16,768,646,720 | 17,575,633,389 | 17,948,683,835 | |
| 4 | | weighted loc opt surtax rate | 0.58% | 0.58% | 0.57% | 0.55% | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | monthly county by kind data | FY 2009 | FY 2010 | FY 2011 | CY 2011 | average |
| 7 | | commercial rentals state sales tax | 740,847,156 | 696,179,261 | 699,034,693 | 694,873,118 | percentage |
| 8 | A | total kind code 82 netdue | 1,356,786,092 | 1,309,212,724 | 1,324,918,715 | 1,316,546,981 | |
| 9 | | kcode 82 general sales tax | 50,591,103 | 47,477,414 | 47,257,555 | 47,199,351 | 6.80% |
| 10 | | kcode 82 txbl purchases sales tax | 3,055,887 | 2,788,010 | 3,867,778 | 3,958,149 | 0.48% |
| 11 | | kcode 82 comm rentals sales tax | 686,828,672 | 638,058,867 | 640,936,575 | 635,545,959 | 91.92% |
| 12 | | kcode 82 transient rentals sales tax | 5,396,211 | 5,799,566 | 5,228,238 | 5,740,010 | 0.78% |
| 13 | | kcode 82 vending machines sales tax | 90,678 | 90,923 | 58,946 | 47,381 | 0.01% |
| 14 | B | kcode 82 all five columns | 745,962,550 | 694,214,780 | 697,349,092 | 692,490,850 | 100.00% |
| 15 | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | portion of comm rentals (A-B)*92% | 561,455,131 | 565,292,147 | 576,847,749 | 573,618,227 | |
| 17 | low | total sales tax on comm rentals c11+c16 | 1,248,283,802 | 1,203,351,014 | 1,217,784,324 | 1,209,164,186 | |
| 18 | low | local options sales tax | 119,869,175 | 117,319,962 | 115,242,351 | 111,328,791 | |
| 19 | | | | | | | |
| 20 | | assuming A-B are all comm rentals | 610,823,542 | 614,997,944 | 627,569,623 | 624,056,131 | |
| 21 | mid | total sales tax on comm rentals c11+c20 | 1,297,652,213 | 1,253,056,811 | 1,268,506,198 | 1,259,602,090 | |
| 22 | mid | local options sales tax | 124,609,884 | 122,165,998 | 120,042,304 | 115,972,653 | |
| 23 | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | annual individual data incl local surtax | CY 2009 | CY 2010 | | | |
| 25 | | total taxable commercial rentals | 11,755,647,832 | 11,393,440,931 | | | |
| 26 | | total sales tax on comm rentals | 785,117,372 | 760,464,332 | | | |
| 27 | | tax rate | 6.68% | 6.67% | | | |
| 28 | | total kcode 82 taxable | 22,204,945,576 | 21,825,575,532 | | | |
| 29 | | total kcode 82 tax | 1,480,766,909 | 1,454,663,289 | | | |
| 30 | | tax rate | 6.67% | 6.66% | | | |
| 31 | | in kcode 82 and comm rentals taxable | 10,804,492,313 | 10,313,279,976 | | | |
| 32 | | in kcode 82 and comm rentals taxes | 720,798,091 | 687,826,536 | | | |
| 33 | | | 6.67% | 6.67% | | | |
| 34 | | all taxes deleting duplicates | 1,545,086,190 | 1,527,301,085 | | | |
| 35 | high | state taxes | 1,389,615,656 | 1,374,022,333 | | | |
| 36 | high | local option surtax | 138,961,566 | 137,402,233 | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | |
| 38 | | using REC Jan 2012 growth rates for business investment | | | | | |
| 39 | | state sales tax | High | Middle | Low | growth rates | |
| 40 | | FY 2012 | | | | 2.70% | |
| 41 | | FY 2013 | -1,481,676,983 | -1,367,893,659 | -1,313,197,726 | 5.00% | |
| 42 | | FY 2014 | -1,591,321,080 | -1,469,117,790 | -1,410,374,357 | 7.40% | |
| 43 | | FY 2015 | -1,724,992,050 | -1,592,523,684 | -1,528,845,803 | 8.40% | |
| 44 | | FY 2016 | -1,849,191,478 | -1,707,185,389 | -1,638,922,701 | 7.20% | |
| 45 | | | | | | | |
| 46 | | local surtax | High | Middle | Low | growth rates | |
| 47 | | FY 2012 | | | | 2.70% | |
| 48 | | FY 2013 | -148,167,698 | -129,447,619 | -124,271,589 | 5.00% | |
| 49 | | FY 2014 | -159,132,108 | -139,026,742 | -133,467,686 | 7.40% | |
| 50 | | FY 2015 | -172,499,205 | -150,704,989 | -144,678,972 | 8.40% | |
| 51 | | FY 2016 | -184,919,148 | -161,555,748 | -155,095,858 | 7.20% | |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Ad Valorem

ISSUE: Government Owned Property

BILL NUMBER(S): Proposed Amendment

SPONSOR(S):

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: UNCERTAIN

DATE OF ANALYSIS: 1/23/2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. Current Law:** Article VII, Section 3 provides that all property owned by a municipality and used exclusively by it for municipal or public purposes shall be exempt from taxation.

Section 196.199, Florida Statutes, provides the following:

1)Property owned and used by the following governmental units shall be exempt from taxation under the following conditions:

(a)All property of the United States shall be exempt from ad valorem taxation, except such property as is subject to tax by this state or any political subdivision thereof or any municipality under any law of the United States.

(b)All property of this state which is used for governmental purposes shall be exempt from ad valorem taxation except as otherwise provided by law.

(c)All property of the several political subdivisions and municipalities of this state or of entities created by general or special law and composed entirely of governmental agencies, or property conveyed to a nonprofit corporation which would revert to the governmental agency, which is used for governmental, municipal, or public purposes shall be exempt from ad valorem taxation, except as otherwise provided by law.

Section 1.01(8), Florida Statutes, provides the following definitions:

The words "public body," "body politic," or "political subdivision" include counties, cities, towns, villages, special tax school districts, special road and bridge districts, bridge districts, and all other districts in this state

Section 189.403(1) provides the following definition for Special District:

(1)"Special district" means a local unit of special purpose, as opposed to general-purpose, government within a limited boundary, created by general law, special act, local ordinance, or by rule of the Governor and Cabinet. The special purpose or purposes of special districts are implemented by specialized functions and related prescribed powers. For the purpose of s. [196.199\(1\)](#), special districts shall be treated as municipalities. The term does not include a school district, a community college district, a special improvement district created pursuant to s. [285.17](#), a municipal service taxing or benefit unit as specified in s. [125.01](#), or a board which provides electrical service and which is a political subdivision of a municipality or is part of a municipality.

- b. Proposed Change:** Adds the following language to Section 196.199(1):

(d) All property of the state and its political subdivisions and municipalities of this state, when used in conjunction with, or as an essential ancillary function of, an exempt or immune Federal, State or County facility, or property, shall be exempt from ad valorem taxation.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

2011 Final Tax Roll Data

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

Extracted from the 2011 final tax rolls those properties that were in the following use codes and which had school taxable value greater than zero:

Use code 85 – Non-Private Hospitals

Use code 86 – County (other than public schools, colleges, hospitals) including non-municipal government.

Use code 87 – State, other than military, forests, parks, recreational areas, colleges, hospitals

Use Code 88 - Federal, other than military, forests, parks, recreational areas, hospitals, colleges

Use Code 89 - Municipal, other than parks, recreational areas, colleges, hospitals

Use Code 90 - Leasehold interests (government owned property leased by a non-governmental lessee)

Growth rates for Non-Homestead Non- Residential properties from 1/2012 Ad Valorem Conference

Millage rates – School 7.6917

Non-School – 10.7356

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Ad Valorem

ISSUE: Government Owned Property

BILL NUMBER(S): Proposed Amendment

SPONSOR(S):

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: UNCERTAIN

DATE OF ANALYSIS: 1/23/2012

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| School Impact: | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | (\$33.4) | | (\$33.0) | (\$33.5) | (\$34.1) |
| Middle | (\$16.9) | | (\$16.5) | (\$16.8) | (\$8.4) |
| Low | (\$8.3) | | (\$ 8.3) | (\$ 8.4) | (\$8.5) |

| Non-School Impact: | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | (\$46.3) | | (\$45.7) | (\$46.5) | (\$47.3) |
| Middle | (\$23.1) | | (\$22.9) | (\$ 23.2) | (\$23.7) |
| Low | (\$11.6) | | (\$11.4) | (\$11.6) | (\$11.8) |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted the high estimate.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| School Impact | (33.4) | (33.4) | (33.0) | (33.5) | (34.1) |
| Non-school Impact | (46.3) | (46.3) | (45.7) | (46.5) | (47.3) |
| Total Impact | (79.7) | (79.7) | (78.7) | (80.0) | (81.4) |

Proposed Amendment - Government Owned Property

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | |
|----|--------------------------|-----------------------|--------|---------------|------------|---------------|--|--------------|--------------|-------|-------|-------|
| 1 | 2011 Final Tax Roll data | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | Use Code | | | Sum | | Assumptions | | | | | | |
| 3 | 85 | Non-Private Hospitals | JV | 1,259,859,977 | | high Impact | total amount of the taxable value in use codes 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, and 90 plus an equal amount that is in other usecodes | | | | | |
| 4 | | | TV_SD | 178,405,525 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | TV_NSD | 178,405,038 | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | | Count | 54 | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | 86 | County | JV | 262,315,344 | | Middle impact | 50% of the value in above use codes plus an equal amount in other use codes | | | | | |
| 8 | | | TV_SD | 214,084,310 | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | TV_NSD | 211,265,205 | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | | | Count | 296 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | 87 | State | JV | 5,949,404 | | millage | | | | | | |
| 12 | | | TV_SD | 5,484,616 | School | 7.6917 | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | TV_NSD | 5,476,138 | Non-School | 10.7356 | | | | | | |
| 14 | | | Count | 47 | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | 88 | Federal | JV | 83,044,670 | | Growth | Non-Homestead Non-Residential Property Growth rates from | | | | | |
| 16 | | | TV_SD | 81,322,007 | | | 2012 | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | |
| 17 | | | TV_NSD | 81,043,107 | | | Growth rate | -3.11% | -1.15% | 1.63% | 1.82% | 1.82% |
| 18 | | | Count | 82 | | | effective date - effective for assessments beginning January 1, 2012 | | | | | |
| 19 | 89 | Municipal | JV | 578,349,174 | | Impact | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | TV_SD | 229,101,549 | | | 2011 | School | NonSchool | | | |
| 21 | | | TV_NSD | 228,701,030 | | | High | \$34,444,309 | \$47,751,441 | | | |
| 22 | | | Count | 771 | | | Middle | \$17,222,155 | \$23,875,721 | | | |
| 23 | 90 | Leasehold Interest | JV | 1,692,048,098 | | Low | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | TV_SD | 1,530,658,972 | | | 2012 | School | NonSchool | | | |
| 25 | | | TV_NSD | 1,519,085,839 | | | High | \$32,989,301 | \$45,734,308 | | | |
| 26 | | | Count | 1325 | | | Middle | \$16,494,650 | \$22,867,154 | | | |
| 27 | Total | | JV | 3,881,566,667 | | Low | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | TV_SD | 2,239,056,979 | | | High | \$33,373,091 | \$46,266,371 | | | |
| 29 | | | TV_NSD | 2,223,976,357 | | | Middle | \$16,686,546 | \$23,133,186 | | | |
| 30 | | | Count | 2575 | | | Low | \$8,343,273 | \$11,566,593 | | | |
| 31 | | | | | | 2013 | School | NonSchool | | | | |
| 32 | | | | | High | | \$32,989,301 | \$45,734,308 | | | | |
| 33 | | | | | Middle | | \$16,494,650 | \$22,867,154 | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | Low | | \$8,247,325 | \$11,433,577 | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | 2014 | School | NonSchool | | | | |
| 36 | | | | | High | | \$33,527,026 | \$46,479,777 | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | Middle | | \$16,763,513 | \$23,239,889 | | | | |
| 38 | | | | | Low | | \$8,381,757 | \$11,619,944 | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | 2015 | School | NonSchool | | | | |
| 40 | | | | | High | | \$34,137,218 | \$47,325,709 | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | Middle | | \$17,068,609 | \$23,662,855 | | | | |
| 42 | | | | | Low | | \$8,534,305 | \$11,831,427 | | | | |
| 43 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Insurance Premium Tax

ISSUE: A contribution to surplus collected from its policyholders by a mutual P&C insurer domiciled in Florida is exempt from the insurance premium tax.

BILL NUMBER(S): SB 1190

SPONSOR(S): Senator Hays

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012

DATE OF ANALYSIS: 01/27/2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** Under s 624.509, F.S., premiums including all contributions to surplus, collected by a mutual property and casualty insurer, are subject to the insurance premium tax,
- b. **Proposed Change:** SB 1190 provides that the amount collected by a mutual P&C insurer domiciled in Florida from its policyholders as a contribution to surplus is exempt from the insurance premium tax.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

Insurance Premium Tax Forecasts (General Revenue Estimating Conference, January 12, 2012)
OIR data

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

According to OIR data, there are only four mutual P&C insurers domiciled in Florida and over the past five years, they have not collected any contributions to surplus. It is difficult to estimate their future contributions to surplus, as the annual amount of contributions to surplus will be determined by business decisions of these insurers. The impact of this bill will be insignificant, as the total tax due (after the credits were taken) from these four insurers in 2010 was only less than \$1 million.

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| High | | | | | |
| Middle | Insignificant/negative | Insignificant/negative | Insignificant/negative | Insignificant/negative | Insignificant/negative |
| Low | | | | | |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted an indeterminate negative estimate.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Revenue | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) |
| State Trust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total State Impact | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) |
| Total Local Impact | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Impact | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) | (Indeterminate) |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Motor Vehicle Licenses

ISSUE: New Specialty License Plate – American Legion specialty plate, and Some Special Use License Plates

BILL NUMBER(S): CS/CS/SB 922

SPONSOR(S): Criminal Justice Committee; Military Affair, Space, and Domestic Security Committee; Senator Bennett and others

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012 (October 1, 2012, for Section 5 of CS/CS/SB 922)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: 01/27/2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** Florida Law provides for a number of specialty license plates for which an additional fee is charged. The additional fee is usually distributed to a non-profit entity.

Certain members of the general public may be eligible to apply for special use license plates if they are able to document their eligibility pursuant to various sections of Chapter 320, F.S. This category of plates primarily includes special military license plates as well as plates for the handicapped.

- b. **Proposed Change:** Sections 4 of CS/CS/SB 922 amends s. 320.08056, F.S., and s. 320.08058, F.S., to create a new specialty plate – American Legion specialty plate. Sections 5 and 6 of CS/CS/SB 922 amends s. 320.089, F.S., and s. 320.0892, F.S., to require the manufacturing and issuance of special use license plates – Combat Infantry Badge, Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, Silver Star, Korean Conflict Veteran, and Vietnam War Veteran.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

Bill analysis of CS/CS/SB 922 and HSMV bill analysis

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

It is unknown how many Floridians would purchase each of these types of plates.

The “American Legion” specialty license plate has an indeterminate positive impact as each purchaser of this specialty license plate pays an additional \$25 use fee.

The special use license plates of the Combat Infantry Badge, Vietnam Veteran, and Korean Conflict Veteran have an no impact since vehicle owners pay the same license taxes under s. 320.08, F.S.

The special use license plates of the Distinguished Service Cross, Navy Cross, Air Force Cross, and Silver Star have an indeterminate negative impact since the vehicle owners no longer pay the license taxes under s. 320.08, F.S.

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|--|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| High | | | | | |
| American Legion Combat Infantry, etc. Distinguished Service Cross, etc. | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) |
| Low | | | | | |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted the proposed estimates.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|---|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| American Legion Combat Infantry, etc. Distinguished Service Cross, etc. | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) | Indeterminate 0 (Indeterminate) |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Ad Valorem

ISSUE: Deployed Servicemember Exemption/New Operations

BILL NUMBER(S): N/A

SPONSOR(S): N/A

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: upon becoming law (first applies to ad valorem tax rolls for 2012)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 24, 2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** s. 196.173, F.S., provides an additional ad valorem tax exemption to servicemembers who already receive a homestead exemption and who were deployed during the preceding calendar year on active duty outside the continental United States, Alaska, or Hawaii in support of the following military operations:
- Operation Enduring Freedom, which began on October 7, 2001;
 - Operation Iraqi Freedom, which began on March 19, 2003, and ended on August 31, 2010; or
 - Operation New Dawn, which began on September 1, 2010.
- b. **Proposed Change:** this proposal adds Operation Noble Eagle and Operation Odyssey Dawn to the list of military operations for which the exemption applies. In addition, the proposal adds language indicating that Operation New Dawn ended on December 15, 2011.

Operation Noble Eagle is the name given to the military operations related to homeland security and civil support services to federal, state, and local agencies in the wake of the September 11, 2001, attacks. This operation began with the mobilization of thousands of National Guard and Reserve personnel to perform security missions on military installations, airports and other potential targets such as bridges, power plants, and port facilities.

Operation Odyssey Dawn is the name given to the military operations initiated to enforce U.N. Security Council Resolution 1973 to protect the Libyan people from the country's ruler. The goal of the military coalition was to prevent further attacks by regime forces on Libyan citizens.

Operation New Dawn is the name given to the military operation that marked the official end of Operation Iraqi Freedom and United States combat operations in Iraq and a new focus on advising, assisting and training Iraqi security forces.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

Florida Department of Military Affairs

Florida Department of Revenue, Florida Property Tax Data Portal, *NAL Tax Rolls*, 2011

Deployment Health Clinical Center (<http://www.pdhealth.mil/>)

U.S. Department of Defense (<http://www.defense.gov/>)

Navy Handbook (<http://navyhandbook.org/>)

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

Currently, there are approximately 58,000 active duty personnel and 37,000 reservists in Florida. As of December 2011, there were 8,007 individuals deployed overseas (5,907 active and 2,100 reserve), which amounts to about 8.4% of the total military personnel.

Operation Noble Eagle

Staff found no specific data related to Florida deployments for this operation, but expects the fiscal impact to be insignificant.

Operation Odyssey Dawn

Staff found no specific data related to Florida deployments. Overall, the United States did not deploy ground troops, but had naval involvement in launching cruise missiles from its submarines. In addition, the United States provided command and control, logistics, and launched electronic attacks against regime forces systems.

For estimating purposes, staff considered the United States Navy ships that were involved in Operation Odyssey Dawn, which can accommodate up to 6,644 troops. Taking into account the share of Florida's population compared to the United States population (6%), it was determined that approximately 399 Florida troops were involved in Operation Odyssey Dawn.

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Ad Valorem

ISSUE: Deployed Servicemember Exemption/New Operations

BILL NUMBER(S): N/A

SPONSOR(S): N/A

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: upon becoming law (first applies to ad valorem tax rolls for 2012)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 24, 2012

After using the homeownership ratio from last year’s analysis (25%) and assuming a deployment length of 6 months, the taxable value per home for deployed military from the 2011 analysis was used to obtain the total values of school and non-school levies applicable to fiscal year 2012-13.

Operation New Dawn

Because the proposed language simply clarifies that this operation ended on December 15, 2011, and because the deployment counts used in last year’s analysis from May 19, 2011 (CS/CS/HB 1141, Enrolled, Exemption for Deployed Service Members) were not specific to operations, it is expected that any military deployed for this operation was included in the analysis for last year’s impacts.

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

IMPACT VALUE---SCHOOL LEVIES

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | | | | | |
| Middle | (\$30,000) | | | | |
| Low | | | | | |

IMPACT VALUE---NON-SCHOOL LEVIES

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | | | | | |
| Middle | (\$35,000) | | | | |
| Low | | | | | |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted an estimate of $-\$.1$ for 2012-13.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Revenue | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| State Trust | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total State Impact | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Local Impact | (.1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Impact | (.1) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|----|---|--------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|
| 1 | 2011 Tax Roll Values for Deployed Military Exemption | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | Row Labels | County | Sum of School impact | Sum of Nonschool impact | Count of CO NO | Max of School impact2 |
| 4 | 11 | Alachua | \$679,095 | \$679,095 | 12 | \$130,090 |
| 5 | 13 | Bay | \$4,978,445 | \$4,046,598 | 74 | \$204,016 |
| 6 | 14 | Bradford | \$478,192 | \$389,009 | 8 | \$245,870 |
| 7 | 15 | Brevard | \$1,233,140 | \$907,450 | 27 | \$102,140 |
| 8 | 16 | Broward | \$3,123,030 | \$2,583,530 | 48 | \$219,010 |
| 9 | 17 | Calhoun | \$274,073 | \$229,348 | 2 | \$168,976 |
| 10 | 19 | Citrus | \$350,476 | \$228,331 | 10 | \$55,825 |
| 11 | 20 | Clay | \$7,864,810 | \$6,198,101 | 185 | \$213,406 |
| 12 | 21 | Collier | \$111,949 | \$111,949 | 2 | \$80,552 |
| 13 | 22 | Columbia | \$186,415 | \$157,100 | 3 | \$137,271 |
| 14 | 23 | Dade | \$1,459,530 | \$1,162,643 | 25 | \$231,659 |
| 15 | 25 | Dixie | \$89,400 | \$64,400 | 1 | \$89,400 |
| 16 | 26 | Duval | \$12,175,242 | \$12,249,742 | 222 | \$196,723 |
| 17 | 27 | Escambia | \$166,660 | \$166,660 | 2 | \$160,281 |
| 18 | 28 | Flagler | \$504,237 | \$372,040 | 10 | \$113,767 |
| 19 | 29 | Franklin | \$78,008 | \$54,720 | 1 | \$78,008 |
| 20 | 30 | Gadsden | \$40,408 | \$30,408 | 1 | \$40,408 |
| 21 | 31 | Gilchrist | \$90,689 | \$66,168 | 1 | \$90,689 |
| 22 | 35 | Hardee | \$72,726 | \$62,794 | 2 | \$64,130 |
| 23 | 37 | Hernando | \$857,992 | \$605,576 | 18 | \$105,997 |
| 24 | 40 | Holmes | \$115,468 | \$72,248 | 2 | \$76,109 |
| 25 | 42 | Jackson | \$336,987 | \$248,014 | 5 | \$110,142 |
| 26 | 43 | Jefferson | \$133,869 | \$103,664 | 2 | \$77,677 |
| 27 | 45 | Lake | \$693,461 | \$541,337 | 10 | \$127,116 |
| 28 | 46 | Lee | \$171,325 | \$119,109 | 4 | \$74,177 |
| 29 | 47 | Leon | \$1,421,710 | \$1,147,911 | 19 | \$148,464 |
| 30 | 48 | Levy | \$97,824 | \$72,793 | 3 | \$45,264 |
| 31 | 51 | Manatee | \$334,329 | \$265,329 | 4 | \$156,640 |
| 32 | 52 | Marion | \$510,209 | \$354,114 | 16 | \$57,462 |
| 33 | 53 | Martin | \$85,678 | \$71,158 | 2 | \$75,330 |
| 34 | 54 | Monroe | \$485,532 | \$444,711 | 3 | \$240,290 |
| 35 | 55 | Nassau | \$780,881 | \$621,500 | 11 | \$162,100 |
| 36 | 56 | Okaloosa | \$25,220,680 | \$20,696,301 | 518 | \$361,565 |
| 37 | 58 | Orange | \$2,087,881 | \$2,087,881 | 30 | \$169,003 |
| 38 | 59 | Osceola | \$919,580 | \$681,896 | 13 | \$124,932 |
| 39 | 60 | Palm Beach | \$645,557 | \$509,528 | 13 | \$124,027 |
| 40 | 61 | Pasco | \$2,250,562 | \$1,770,340 | 33 | \$178,467 |
| 41 | 62 | Pinellas | \$2,534,032 | \$1,885,051 | 52 | \$163,672 |
| 42 | 64 | Putnam | \$15,444 | \$15,444 | 1 | \$15,444 |
| 43 | 65 | Saint Johns | \$4,487,011 | \$3,718,958 | 64 | \$248,555 |
| 44 | 66 | Saint Lucie | \$297,312 | \$198,110 | 6 | \$75,040 |
| 45 | 67 | Santa Rosa | \$19,741,995 | \$15,906,514 | 446 | \$169,404 |
| 46 | 68 | Sarasota | \$376,555 | \$305,740 | 5 | \$216,755 |
| 47 | 69 | Seminole | \$2,139,280 | \$1,748,166 | 26 | \$257,426 |
| 48 | 70 | Sumter | \$304,749 | \$304,749 | 2 | \$198,840 |
| 49 | 73 | Union | \$36,910 | \$23,080 | 2 | \$23,080 |
| 50 | 74 | Volusia | \$482,783 | \$482,783 | 16 | \$75,364 |
| 51 | 75 | Wakulla | \$24,118 | \$14,666 | 1 | \$24,118 |
| 52 | 76 | Walton | \$1,010,267 | \$837,250 | 18 | \$147,854 |
| 53 | 77 | Washington | \$317,174 | \$212,535 | 6 | \$83,526 |
| 54 | | | | | | |
| 55 | | Grand Total | \$102,873,680 | \$85,826,542 | 1,987 | \$361,565 |
| 56 | | | | | | |
| 57 | | School Impact | \$791,273 | | | |
| 58 | | Non-School Impact | \$921,399 | | | |
| 59 | | Total Impact | \$1,712,673 | | | |

| Row Labels | Sum of School impact | Sum of Nonschool impact | Count of CO_NO | Max of School impact2 |
|--------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-----------------------|
| 11 | 679,095 | 679,095 | 12 | 130,090 |
| 13 | 4,978,445 | 4,046,598 | 74 | 204,016 |
| 14 | 478,192 | 389,009 | 8 | 245,870 |
| 15 | 1,233,140 | 907,450 | 27 | 102,140 |
| 16 | 3,123,030 | 2,583,530 | 48 | 219,010 |
| 17 | 274,073 | 229,348 | 2 | 168,976 |
| 19 | 350,476 | 228,331 | 10 | 55,825 |
| 20 | 7,864,810 | 6,198,101 | 185 | 213,406 |
| 21 | 111,949 | 111,949 | 2 | 80,552 |
| 22 | 186,415 | 157,100 | 3 | 137,271 |
| 23 | 1,459,530 | 1,162,643 | 25 | 231,659 |
| 25 | 89,400 | 64,400 | 1 | 89,400 |
| 26 | 12,175,242 | 12,249,742 | 222 | 196,723 |
| 27 | 166,660 | 166,660 | 2 | 160,281 |
| 28 | 504,237 | 372,040 | 10 | 113,767 |
| 29 | 78,008 | 54,720 | 1 | 78,008 |
| 30 | 40,408 | 30,408 | 1 | 40,408 |
| 31 | 90,689 | 66,168 | 1 | 90,689 |
| 35 | 72,726 | 62,794 | 2 | 64,130 |
| 37 | 857,992 | 605,576 | 18 | 105,997 |
| 40 | 115,468 | 72,248 | 2 | 76,109 |
| 42 | 336,987 | 248,014 | 5 | 110,142 |
| 43 | 133,869 | 103,664 | 2 | 77,677 |
| 45 | 693,461 | 541,337 | 10 | 127,116 |
| 46 | 171,325 | 119,109 | 4 | 74,177 |
| 47 | 1,421,710 | 1,147,911 | 19 | 148,464 |
| 48 | 97,824 | 72,793 | 3 | 45,264 |
| 51 | 334,329 | 265,329 | 4 | 156,640 |
| 52 | 510,209 | 354,114 | 16 | 57,462 |
| 53 | 85,678 | 71,158 | 2 | 75,330 |
| 54 | 485,532 | 444,711 | 3 | 240,290 |
| 55 | 780,881 | 621,500 | 11 | 162,100 |
| 56 | 25,220,680 | 20,696,301 | 518 | 361,565 |
| 58 | 2,087,881 | 2,087,881 | 30 | 169,003 |
| 59 | 919,580 | 681,896 | 13 | 124,932 |
| 60 | 645,557 | 509,528 | 13 | 124,027 |
| 61 | 2,250,562 | 1,770,340 | 33 | 178,467 |
| 62 | 2,534,032 | 1,885,051 | 52 | 163,672 |
| 64 | 15,444 | 15,444 | 1 | 15,444 |
| 65 | 4,487,011 | 3,718,958 | 64 | 248,555 |
| 66 | 297,312 | 198,110 | 6 | 75,040 |
| 67 | 19,741,995 | 15,906,514 | 446 | 169,404 |
| 68 | 376,555 | 305,740 | 5 | 216,755 |
| 69 | 2,139,280 | 1,748,166 | 26 | 257,426 |
| 70 | 304,749 | 304,749 | 2 | 198,840 |
| 73 | 36,910 | 23,080 | 2 | 23,080 |
| 74 | 482,783 | 482,783 | 16 | 75,364 |
| 75 | 24,118 | 14,666 | 1 | 24,118 |
| 76 | 1,010,267 | 837,250 | 18 | 147,854 |
| 77 | 317,174 | 212,535 | 6 | 83,526 |
| Grand Total | 102,873,680 | 85,826,542 | 1987 | 361,565 |
| School Impact | \$791,273 | | | |
| NonSchool impact | \$921,399 | | | |
| Total | \$1,712,673 | | | |

| | A | B | C |
|----|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | | | |
| 2 | | <u>OPERATION ODYSSEY DAWN OVERVIEW</u> | |
| 3 | | | |
| 4 | | <u>Ships Deployed</u> | <u>Military Compliment</u> |
| 5 | | | |
| 6 | | USS Newport News (SSN-750) | 134 |
| 7 | | USS Providence (SSN-719) | 110 |
| 8 | | One other attack submarine | 134 |
| 9 | | USS Mount Whitney (Command ship) | 930 |
| 10 | | USS Kearsarge (Amphibious Assault Ship) | 1893 |
| 11 | | USS Bataan (Amphibious Assault Ship) | 1894 |
| 12 | | USS Ponce | 516 |
| 13 | | USS Kanawha | 21 |
| 14 | | USS Stout | 281 |
| 15 | | USS Scranton | 110 |
| 16 | | USS Lewis & Clark | 136 |
| 17 | | USS Peary | 49 |
| 18 | | USS Florida | 155 |
| 19 | | USS Barry | 281 |
| 20 | | | |
| 21 | | Total | 6644 |
| 22 | | | |
| 23 | | Florida Share Based on Population | 398.6 |
| 24 | | | |
| 25 | | Homeownership Ratio From 2011 Analysis | 25% |
| 26 | | Eligible Deployed Military Homeowner | 99.7 |
| 27 | | Assumed Deployment Length | 6 months |
| 28 | | Annual Equivalent Deployed Military | 49.8 |
| 29 | | | |
| 30 | | <u>Taxable Value Per Home For Deployed Military From 2011 Analysis</u> | |
| 31 | | School | 79,293 |
| 32 | | Non-School | 65,421 |
| 33 | | | |
| 34 | | Total Value Impact School | 30,394 |
| 35 | | Total Value Impact Non-School | 35,001 |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Ad Valorem

ISSUE: Storm Hardening (Wind Improvements)

BILL NUMBER(S): CS/HB 133

SPONSOR(S): Representative Frishe

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012 (applying to assessments beginning January 1, 2013)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 27, 2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

- a. **Current Law:** section 4(i), Article VII of the Florida Constitution allows the legislature, by general law, to prohibit the consideration of any change or improvement made for the purpose of improving the property's resistance to wind damage in determining the assessed value of real property used for residential purposes. No current general law authorization exists.
- b. **Proposed Change:** by general law, when determining the assessed value of real property used for residential purposes, any increase in the just value of the property attributable to the installation of a renewable energy source device or changes or improvements made for the purpose of improving a property's resistance to wind damage may not be considered. These provisions apply to installations, changes, or improvements for new and existing residential real property that are installed or made on or after January 1, 2012.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

Florida Department of Revenue, Florida Property Tax Data Portal, *Parcel Count by Property Type Reports* (2007-2011)

Florida Department of Business & Professional Regulation, Building Codes and Standards Section (for building codes and wind zone information)

Broward County Board of Rules & Appeals (for building codes and wind zone information)

Florida Department of Emergency Management (for GIS and wind zone information)

University of Florida, GeoPlan Center (for GIS and wind zone information)

Internet Sources: Security, Storm and Hurricane Shutters (www.stormshutters.com)

Hurricane Shutter Guide: Compare Types, Calculate Costs (www.sun-sentinel.com)

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

Wind Improvements

Residential population by wind zone was obtained from a population density overlay map for Risk Category II occupancy type, which includes one and two-family residential homes and small commercial buildings. It was assumed that the historical distribution of Florida's population was not significantly different from that depicted in this map. The population distribution was then used to evaluate which properties were constructed in wind zones while considering the building code that was active at the time and any requirements to install certain storm hardening improvements. It was also assumed that storm shutters would result in the most significant expense related to wind damage improvements.

Existing Homes

An adjusted number of existing homes was obtained to estimate the number of single-family residential and condominiums (both homestead and non-homestead) that are currently not subject to the statewide building code. Four cohorts were tracked (calendar years 2013-2016) using a composite cost that included a distribution in the number of windows per dwelling, a shutter cost of \$776 (Bahamian type), and installation costs.

The estimates were then derived as follows:

- the high estimate assumes that the bill applies to 1% of existing homes;
- the middle estimate assumes that the bill applies to 0.55% of existing homes; and
- the low estimate assumes that the bill applies to 0.1% of existing homes.

Once the current total millage rate was applied, the applicable dollar amounts were broken down to provide the school and non-school values.

New Homes

The new construction data adopted during the January 3, 2012, Ad Valorem Conference was used to track four cohorts (calendar years 2013-2016).

The estimates were then derived as follows:

- the high estimate assumes that the bill applies to 15% of total new construction;
- the middle estimate assumes that the bill applies to 10% of total new construction; and

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Ad Valorem

ISSUE: Storm Hardening (Wind Improvements)

BILL NUMBER(S): CS/HB 133

SPONSOR(S): Representative Frishe

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012 (applying to assessments beginning January 1, 2013)

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 27, 2012

- the low estimate assumes that the bill applies to 5% of total new construction.

Once the current total millage rate was applied, the applicable dollar amounts were broken down to provide the school and non-school values.

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

WIND IMPROVEMENTS---TO EXISTING RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

IMPACT VALUE SCHOOL

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | 0 | | (3.1M) | (6.1M) | (9.2M) |
| Middle | 0 | | (1.7M) | (3.4M) | (5.1M) |
| Low | 0 | | (0.3M) | (0.6M) | (0.9M) |

IMPACT VALUE NON-SCHOOL

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | 0 | | (4.3M) | (8.6M) | (12.8M) |
| Middle | 0 | | (2.4M) | (4.7M) | (7.1M) |
| Low | 0 | | (0.4M) | (0.9M) | (1.3M) |

WIND IMPROVEMENTS---TO NEW RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES

IMPACT VALUE SCHOOL

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | 0 | | (8.4M) | (17.1M) | (27.9M) |
| Middle | 0 | | (5.6M) | (11.4M) | (18.6M) |
| Low | 0 | | (2.8M) | (5.7M) | (9.3M) |

IMPACT VALUE NON-SCHOOL

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | 0 | | (11.8M) | (23.8M) | (39.0M) |
| Middle | 0 | | (7.9M) | (15.9M) | (26.0M) |
| Low | 0 | | (3.9M) | (7.9M) | (13.0M) |

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted the middle estimate for existing homes and the low estimate for new homes.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|-------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| School Impact | 0 | (21.0) | (4.5) | (9.1) | (14.4) |
| Non-school Impact | 0 | (29.3) | (6.3) | (12.6) | (20.1) |
| Total Impact | 0 | (50.3) | (10.8) | (21.7) | (34.5) |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H | I | J | K | L | M | N |
|----|--|---|--------|---------------|-------------|-------------|---------------|---------------|--------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 1 | EXISTING RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES ANALYSIS (HOMESTEAD AND NON-HOMESTEAD) | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | HOMESTEAD PROPERTIES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | Historical Totals | Statewide 2002-2011 | Statewide 1994-2011 | Broward/Miami-Dade 1994-2011 | Adjusted Number of Existing Homes |
| 7 | UC 1 (SF Residential) | 72,226 | 65,138 | 68,785 | 69,923 | 70,774 | 77,076 | 79,831 | 83,037 | 3,486,250 | 631,608 | 1,218,398 | 275,358 | 2,579,284 |
| 8 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 | | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | | | | | |
| 10 | UC 4 (Condominiums) | 6,632 | 6,451 | 7,091 | 6,799 | 7,217 | 6,971 | 7,937 | 9,220 | 561,217 | 61,300 | 119,618 | 27,034 | 472,883 |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | HOMESTEAD TOTAL | 78,858 | 71,589 | 75,876 | 76,722 | 77,991 | 84,047 | 87,768 | 92,257 | 4,047,467 | 692,908 | 1,338,016 | 302,392 | 3,052,167 |
| 13 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | NON-HOMESTEAD PROPERTIES | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 16 | | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | Historical Totals | Statewide 2002-2011 | Statewide 1994-2011 | Broward/Miami-Dade 1994-2011 | Adjusted Number of Existing Homes |
| 17 | UC 1 (SF Residential) | 19,560 | 17,948 | 19,230 | 20,319 | 20,433 | 22,522 | 24,788 | 26,600 | 1,433,931 | 338,271 | 509,671 | 115,186 | 980,474 |
| 18 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 | | 1994 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | | | | | |
| 20 | UC 4 (Condominiums) | 8,916 | 9,258 | 12,799 | 11,930 | 14,918 | 15,075 | 18,731 | 21,021 | 988,802 | 219,816 | 332,464 | 75,137 | 693,849 |
| 21 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | NON-HOMESTEAD TOTAL | 30,470 | 29,201 | 34,025 | 34,246 | 37,349 | 39,596 | 45,519 | 49,622 | 2,422,733 | 558,087 | 842,135 | 190,323 | 1,674,323 |
| 23 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 4,726,491 |
| 25 | | 4,726,491 = Adjusted Number of Existing Homes | | | | | | | | | | | | TOTAL |
| 26 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | | SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL COST | | | | |
| 29 | High Estimate Assumes that Bill Applies to 1% of Existing Homes (Using the Composite Cost from Cell N39) | | | Cohort 1 | 401,619,383 | 401,619,383 | 401,619,383 | 401,619,383 | | | | | | |
| 30 | | | | Cohort 2 | | 397,603,189 | 397,603,189 | 397,603,189 | | Number of Windows | Windows Distribution | Cost per Shutter | Composite Cost For Single-Family Residential | Composite Cost Doubled to Account for Installation |
| 31 | | | | Cohort 3 | | 393,627,157 | 393,627,157 | 393,627,157 | | | | | | |
| 32 | | | | Cohort 4 | | | 389,690,885 | 389,690,885 | | 2 | 0.025 | 776 | 38.8 | 77.6 |
| 33 | | | | Cohort Totals | 401,619,383 | 799,222,571 | 1,192,849,728 | 1,582,540,613 | | 4 | 0.135 | 776 | 419.0 | 838.1 |
| 34 | | | | | | | | | | 5 | 0.34 | 776 | 1,319.2 | 2,638.4 |
| 35 | High Estimate Tax Impact (School) | | | | 3.1 | 6.1 | 9.2 | 12.2 | | 6 | 0.34 | 776 | 1,583.0 | 3,166.1 |
| 36 | High Estimate Tax Impact (Non-School) | | | | 4.3 | 8.6 | 12.8 | 17.0 | | 7 | 0.135 | 776 | 733.3 | 1,466.6 |
| 37 | | | | | | | | | | 8 | 0.025 | 776 | 155.2 | 310.4 |
| 38 | | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | | | | | | |
| 39 | Middle Estimate Assumes that Bill Applies to 0.55% of Existing Homes (Using the Composite Cost from Cell N39) | | | Cohort 1 | 220,890,660 | 220,890,660 | 220,890,660 | 220,890,660 | | | | | 4,248.6 | 8,497.2 |
| 40 | | | | Cohort 2 | | 219,675,762 | 219,675,762 | 219,675,762 | | | | | | SF Residential |
| 41 | | | | Cohort 3 | | | 218,467,545 | 218,467,545 | | | | | | TOTAL |
| 42 | | | | Cohort 4 | | | | 217,265,974 | | | | | | |
| 43 | | | | Cohort Totals | 220,890,660 | 440,566,422 | 659,033,967 | 876,299,941 | | | | | | |
| 44 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 45 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact (School) | | | | 1.7 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 6.7 | | | | | | |
| 46 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact (Non-School) | | | | 2.4 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 9.4 | | | | | | |
| 47 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 48 | | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 | | | | | | |
| 49 | Low Estimate Assumes that Bill Applies to 0.1% of Existing Homes (Using the Composite Cost from Cell N39) | | | Cohort 1 | 40,161,938 | 40,161,938 | 40,161,938 | 40,161,938 | | | | | | |
| 50 | | | | Cohort 2 | | 40,121,776 | 40,121,776 | 40,121,776 | | | | | | |
| 51 | | | | Cohort 3 | | | 40,081,655 | 40,081,655 | | | | | | |
| 52 | | | | Cohort 4 | | | | 40,041,573 | | | | | | |
| 53 | | | | Cohort Totals | 40,161,938 | 80,283,715 | 120,365,369 | 160,406,942 | | | | | | |
| 54 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 55 | Low Estimate Tax Impact (School) | | | | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.2 | | | | | | |
| 56 | Low Estimate Tax Impact (Non-School) | | | | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 | | | | | | |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|----|--|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| 1 | <u>NEW RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES ANALYSIS (HOMESTEAD AND NON-HOMESTEAD)</u> | | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | <u>Using Total New Construction</u> | | | | | | | |
| 5 | <u>(Numbers From 01/03/12 Ad</u> | | | | | | | |
| 6 | <u>Valorem Conference)</u> | | | | | | | |
| 7 | | <u>2010</u> | <u>2011</u> | <u>2012</u> | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> |
| 7 | HOMESTEAD JUST VALUE | 4,593 | 4,102 | 3,462 | 3,653 | 4,041 | 5,617 | 8,523 |
| 8 | NON-HOMESTEAD JUST VALUE | 10,946 | 6,322 | 3,634 | 3,667 | 3,438 | 3,783 | 4,405 |
| 9 | TOTAL JUST VALUE | 15,539 | 10,424 | 7,096 | 7,320 | 7,479 | 9,400 | 12,928 |
| 10 | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | | | | | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> |
| 12 | <u>High Estimate Assumes that Bill Applies to 15% of Total New Construction</u> | | | Cohort 1 | 1,098 | 1,098 | 1,098 | 1,098 |
| 13 | | | | Cohort 2 | | 1,122 | 1,122 | 1,122 |
| 14 | | | | Cohort 3 | | | 1,410 | 1,410 |
| 15 | | | | Cohort 4 | | | | 1,939 |
| 16 | | | | Cohort Totals | 1,098 | 2,220 | 3,630 | 5,569 |
| 17 | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | <u>High Estimate Tax Impact (School)</u> | | | | 8.4 | 17.1 | 27.9 | 42.8 |
| 19 | <u>High Estimate Tax Impact (Non-School)</u> | | | | 11.8 | 23.8 | 39.0 | 59.8 |
| 20 | | | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> |
| 22 | <u>Middle Estimate Assumes that Bill Applies to 10% of Total New Construction</u> | | | Cohort 1 | 732 | 732 | 732 | 732 |
| 23 | | | | Cohort 2 | | 748 | 748 | 748 |
| 24 | | | | Cohort 3 | | | 940 | 940 |
| 25 | | | | Cohort 4 | | | | 1,293 |
| 26 | | | | Cohort Totals | 732 | 1,480 | 2,420 | 3,713 |
| 27 | | | | | | | | |
| 28 | <u>Middle Estimate Tax Impact (School)</u> | | | | 5.6 | 11.4 | 18.6 | 28.6 |
| 29 | <u>Middle Estimate Tax Impact (Non-School)</u> | | | | 7.9 | 15.9 | 26.0 | 39.9 |
| 30 | | | | | | | | |
| 31 | | | | | <u>2013</u> | <u>2014</u> | <u>2015</u> | <u>2016</u> |
| 32 | <u>Low Estimate Assumes that Bill Applies to 5% of Total New Construction</u> | | | Cohort 1 | 366 | 366 | 366 | 366 |
| 33 | | | | Cohort 2 | | 374 | 374 | 374 |
| 34 | | | | Cohort 3 | | | 470 | 470 |
| 35 | | | | Cohort 4 | | | | 646 |
| 36 | | | | Cohort Totals | 366 | 740 | 1,210 | 1,856 |
| 37 | | | | | | | | |
| 38 | <u>Low Estimate Tax Impact (School)</u> | | | | 2.8 | 5.7 | 9.3 | 14.3 |
| 39 | <u>Low Estimate Tax Impact (Non-School)</u> | | | | 3.9 | 7.9 | 13.0 | 19.9 |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|----|--|---|---|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
| 1 | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES ANALYSIS (HOMESTEAD AND NON-HOMESTEAD; EXISTING AND NEW) | | | | | | | |
| 2 | (in \$ Millions) | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | TO EXISTING RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| 6 | | | | | | | | |
| 14 | High Estimate Tax Impact---SCHOOL (1% Assumption) | | | | 3.1 | 6.1 | 9.2 | 12.2 |
| 15 | High Estimate Tax Impact---NON-SCHOOL (1% Assumption) | | | | 4.3 | 8.6 | 12.8 | 17.0 |
| 16 | | | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact---SCHOOL (0.55% Assumption) | | | | 1.7 | 3.4 | 5.1 | 6.7 |
| 26 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact---NON-SCHOOL (0.55% Assumption) | | | | 2.4 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 9.4 |
| 27 | | | | | | | | |
| 35 | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Low Estimate Tax Impact---SCHOOL (0.1% Assumption) | | | | 0.3 | 0.6 | 0.9 | 1.2 |
| 37 | Low Estimate Tax Impact---NON-SCHOOL (0.1% Assumption) | | | | 0.4 | 0.9 | 1.3 | 1.7 |
| 38 | | | | | | | | |
| 39 | | | | | | | | |
| 40 | TO NEW RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| 48 | | | | | | | | |
| 49 | High Estimate Tax Impact---SCHOOL (15% Assumption) | | | | 8.4 | 17.1 | 27.9 | 42.8 |
| 50 | High Estimate Tax Impact---NON-SCHOOL (15% Assumption) | | | | 11.8 | 23.8 | 39.0 | 59.8 |
| 51 | | | | | | | | |
| 59 | | | | | | | | |
| 60 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact---SCHOOL (10% Assumption) | | | | 5.6 | 11.4 | 18.6 | 28.6 |
| 61 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact---NON-SCHOOL (10% Assumption) | | | | 7.9 | 15.9 | 26.0 | 39.9 |
| 62 | | | | | | | | |
| 63 | | | | | | | | |
| 71 | Low Estimate Tax Impact---SCHOOL (5% Assumption) | | | | 2.8 | 5.7 | 9.3 | 14.3 |
| 72 | Low Estimate Tax Impact---NON-SCHOOL (5% Assumption) | | | | 3.9 | 7.9 | 13.0 | 19.9 |
| 73 | | | | | | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | | | |
| 75 | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES (IMPACT VALUE SCHOOL) | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| 76 | | | | | | | | |
| 77 | High Estimate Tax Impact | | | | 11.5 | 23.2 | 37.1 | 55.0 |
| 78 | | | | | | | | |
| 79 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact | | | | 7.3 | 14.8 | 23.7 | 35.3 |
| 80 | | | | | | | | |
| 81 | Low Estimate Tax Impact | | | | 3.1 | 6.3 | 10.2 | 15.5 |
| 82 | | | | | | | | |
| 83 | | | | | | | | |
| 84 | | | | | | | | |
| 85 | TOTAL RESIDENTIAL STRUCTURES (IMPACT VALUE NON-SCHOOL) | | | | 2013 | 2014 | 2015 | 2016 |
| 86 | | | | | | | | |
| 87 | High Estimate Tax Impact | | | | 16.1 | 32.4 | 51.8 | 76.8 |
| 88 | | | | | | | | |
| 89 | Middle Estimate Tax Impact | | | | 10.2 | 20.6 | 33.1 | 49.3 |
| 90 | | | | | | | | |
| 91 | Low Estimate Tax Impact | | | | 4.4 | 8.8 | 14.3 | 21.6 |
| 92 | | | | | | | | |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Sales/Corporate

ISSUE: Sports Tourism Economic Development Zones

BILL NUMBER(S): N/A

SPONSOR(S): N/A

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 25, 2012

SECTION 1: NARRATIVE

a. Current Law:

Florida currently does not have any sports tourism economic development zones.

b. Proposed Change: this proposal would:

- allow for the certification of up to 5 Florida sports tourism economic development zones by January 1, 2015;
- provide that the physical area for each sports zone must be at least 100 acres and no more than 1.5 square miles;
- provide a process for state certification of sports zones when requested by local governments;
- establish minimum standards for certification of sports zones;
- provide for state certification of sports facilities;
- provide for economic incentives available to certified sports facilities within certified sports zones;
- establish sales tax exemptions available to certified sports facilities within certified sports zones;
- provide for a sales tax credit for property taxes paid on new, expanded and renovated certified sports facilities in certified sports zones;
- provide for an income tax credit for property taxes paid on new, expanded and renovated certified sports facilities in certified sports zones; and
- grant rulemaking authority to the Department of Economic Opportunity and the Department of Revenue.

SECTION 2: DESCRIPTION OF DATA AND SOURCES

Florida Department of Revenue, Florida Property Tax Data Portal, Final 2011 Ad Valorem Tax Roll

SECTION 3: METHODOLOGY (INCLUDE ASSUMPTIONS AND ATTACH DETAILS)

For illustrative purposes, the following assumptions were made in evaluating this proposal:

- certification of the maximum number of sports zones (5);
- for the facility tax impact:
 - used the base minimum capital investment amount of \$20,000,000 for the low and middle estimates;
 - used a \$40,000,000 capital investment amount for the high estimate;
 - assumed that 50% of the investment is construction-related (building materials); and
 - used a 6% rate for sales tax purposes;
- for the related ancillary investment impact, building materials and tangible personal property are included; and
- for the ad valorem tax impact, the high estimate assumes that \$100 M in new construction value occurs that will first be on the tax roll in 1/1/2015 for each of the 5 zones. Middle assumes \$50 M of new construction value that will first be on the roll on 1/1/2015 for each of the 5 zones. Low estimate assumes \$20 M of investment that will first be on the rolls in 1/1/2015 for each of the 5 zones.

SECTION 4: PROPOSED FISCAL IMPACT

| State Impact: All Funds | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| High | (\$4.5 m) | (\$4.5 m) | (\$3.7 m) | (\$0.8 m) | (\$4.5 m) |
| Middle | (\$2.3 m) | (\$2.1 m) | (\$1.8 m) | (\$0.3 m) | (\$2.1 m) |
| Low | (\$0.8 m) | (\$1.6 m) | (\$0.8 m) | (\$0.8 m) | (\$1.6 m) |

REVENUE ESTIMATING CONFERENCE

TAX: Sales/Corporate

ISSUE: Sports Tourism Economic Development Zones

BILL NUMBER(S): N/A

SPONSOR(S): N/A

MONTH/YEAR COLLECTION IMPACT BEGINS: July 1, 2012

DATE OF ANALYSIS: January 25, 2012

SECTION 5: CONSENSUS ESTIMATE (ADOPTED 1/27/12) The conference adopted the high estimate.

| | FY 2012-13 Cash | FY 2012-13 Annualized | FY 2013-14 Cash | FY 2014-15 Cash | FY 2015-16 Cash |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|--------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| General Revenue: Sales Tax | (4.0) | (3.3) | (3.2) | (.6) | (3.3) |
| General Revenue: Corporate Tax | 0 | (.8) | (.1) | (.1) | (.8) |
| State Trust | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) | (Insignificant) |
| Total State Impact | (4.0) | (4.1) | (3.3) | (.7) | (4.1) |
| Revenue Sharing | (.1) | (.1) | (.1) | (Insignificant) | (.1) |
| Local Gov't Half Cent | (.4) | (.3) | (.3) | (.1) | (.3) |
| Total Local Impact | (.5) | (.4) | (.4) | (.1) | (.4) |
| Total Impact | (4.5) | (4.5) | (3.7) | (.8) | (4.5) |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|----|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|
| 1 | <u>SPORTS TOURISM ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ZONES ANALYSIS</u> | | | | | | |
| 2 | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | | | | |
| 4 | <u>CAPITAL INVESTMENT REQUIREMENT</u> | | | | | | |
| 5 | | | | | | | |
| 6 | <u>Assumptions Applicable to All Facility-Related Estimates:</u> | | | | | | |
| 7 | (1.) 50% of the investment is related to construction (building materials); and | | | | | | |
| 8 | (2.) the applicable sales tax rate is 6%. | | | | | | |
| 9 | | | | | | | |
| 10 | <u>High Estimate Assumptions:</u> there is a capital investment of \$40,000,000 within each of the 5 sports zones over a 2-year period. | | | | | | |
| 11 | <u>Middle Estimate Assumptions:</u> there is a capital investment of \$20,000,000 within each of the 5 sports zones over a 2-year period. | | | | | | |
| 12 | <u>Low Estimate Assumptions:</u> there is a capital investment of \$20,000,000 within each of the 5 sports zones over a 5-year period. | | | | | | |
| 13 | | | | | | | |
| 14 | Assumed Investment per zone | | | | | | |
| 15 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 16 | HIGH | \$20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | | | | |
| 17 | MIDDLE | \$10,000,000 | \$10,000,000 | | | | |
| 18 | LOW | \$4,000,000 | \$4,000,000 | \$4,000,000 | \$4,000,000 | \$4,000,000 | |
| 19 | | | | | | | |
| 20 | Total Assumed Investment - all 5 zones | | | | | | |
| 21 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 22 | HIGH | \$100,000,000 | \$100,000,000 | | | | |
| 23 | MIDDLE | \$50,000,000 | \$50,000,000 | | | | |
| 24 | LOW | \$20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | |
| 25 | | | | | | | |
| 26 | Tax Impact | | | | | | |
| 27 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | <u>OVERALL FACILITY TAX IMPACT OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD</u> |
| 28 | | | | | | | |
| 29 | HIGH | \$ (3,000,000) | \$ (3,000,000) | | | | \$ (6,000,000) |
| 30 | MIDDLE | \$ (1,500,000) | \$ (1,500,000) | | | | \$ (3,000,000) |
| 31 | LOW | \$ (600,000) | \$ (600,000) | \$ (600,000) | \$ (600,000) | \$ (600,000) | \$ (3,000,000) |
| 32 | | | | | | | |
| 33 | <u>OTHER BUILDING MATERIALS AND TANGIBLE PERSONAL PROPERTY</u> | | | | | | |
| 34 | | | | | | | |
| 35 | <u>Assumption Applicable to All Related Ancillary Estimates:</u> | | | | | | |
| 36 | (1.) the investment includes building materials and tangible personal property. | | | | | | |
| 37 | | | | | | | |
| 38 | <u>High Estimate Assumptions:</u> this component includes 50% of the facility tax impact in Year 1 and 10% for every year thereafter. | | | | | | |
| 39 | <u>Middle Estimate Assumptions:</u> this component includes 50% of the facility tax impact in Year 1 and 5% for every year thereafter. | | | | | | |
| 40 | <u>Low Estimate Assumptions:</u> this component includes 25% of the facility tax impact for every year. | | | | | | |
| 41 | | | | | | | |
| 42 | Assumed Investment per zone | | | | | | |
| 43 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 44 | HIGH | \$5,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | |
| 45 | MIDDLE | \$2,500,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | \$250,000 | |
| 46 | LOW | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | |
| 47 | | | | | | | |
| 48 | Total Assumed Investment - all 5 zones | | | | | | |
| 49 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 50 | HIGH | \$25,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | |
| 51 | MIDDLE | \$12,500,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | |
| 52 | LOW | \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 | |
| 53 | | | | | | | |
| 54 | Tax Impact | | | | | | |
| 55 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | <u>OVERALL RELATED ANCILLARY TAX IMPACT OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD</u> |
| 56 | | | | | | | |
| 57 | HIGH | \$ (1,500,000) | \$ (300,000) | \$ (300,000) | \$ (300,000) | \$ (300,000) | \$ (2,700,000) |
| 58 | MIDDLE | \$ (750,000) | \$ (75,000) | \$ (75,000) | \$ (75,000) | \$ (75,000) | \$ (1,050,000) |
| 59 | LOW | \$ (150,000) | \$ (150,000) | \$ (150,000) | \$ (150,000) | \$ (150,000) | \$ (750,000) |
| 60 | | | | | | | |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G |
|-----|---|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|
| 61 | AD VALOREM TAX IMPACT | | | | | | |
| 62 | | | | | | | |
| 63 | High Estimate Assumptions: assumes that there is an investment of \$60 M made that is entirely new construction and new Tangible Personal Property over a 2-year period for each of the 5 zones. Property is not on Roll as New construction until 1/1/2015. New TPP is on the roll the year after acquisition. | | | | | | |
| 64 | Middle Estimate Assumptions: assumes that there is an investment of \$30 M made that is entirely new construction and new Tangible Personal Property over a 2-year period for each of the 5 zones. Property is not on Roll as New construction until 1/1/2015. New TPP is on the roll in the year after acquisition | | | | | | |
| 65 | Middle Estimate Assumptions: assumes that there is an investment of \$25 M made that is entirely new construction and new Tangible Personal Property over a 2-year period for each of the 5 zones. Property is not on Roll as New construction until 1/1/2015. New TPP is on the roll the year after acquisition. | | | | | | |
| 66 | | | | | | | |
| 67 | | | | | | | |
| 68 | | Five year investment total | High | Middle | Low | | |
| 69 | | New Construction to Real Property (5 zones) | 200,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 100,000,000 | 3534420.0 | |
| 70 | | New Tangible Personal Property (5 zones) | 45,000,000 | \$17,500,000 | 12,500,000 | | |
| 71 | | Total New Property | 245,000,000 | 117,500,000 | 112,500,000 | | |
| 72 | | | | | | | |
| 73 | | 2012 Millage Rate for All Levies: | | 0.0176721 | | | |
| 74 | | | | | | | |
| 75 | | | | | | | |
| 76 | Assumed Additional Ad Valorem Value Per Zone - Yearly Increment | | | | | | |
| 77 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 78 | HIGH | | \$5,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | \$41,000,000 | \$1,000,000 | |
| 79 | MIDDLE | | \$2,500,000 | \$250,000 | \$20,250,000 | \$250,000 | |
| 80 | LOW | | \$500,000 | \$500,000 | \$8,500,000 | \$4,500,000 | |
| 81 | | | | | | | |
| 82 | Total Assumed Additional Ad Valorem Value- all 5 zones - Yearly Increment | | | | | | |
| 83 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 84 | HIGH | | \$25,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$205,000,000 | \$5,000,000 | |
| 85 | MIDDLE | | \$12,500,000 | \$1,250,000 | \$101,250,000 | \$1,250,000 | |
| 86 | LOW | | \$2,500,000 | \$2,500,000 | \$42,500,000 | \$22,500,000 | |
| 87 | | | | | | | |
| 88 | Total Assumed Additional Ad Valorem Value- all 5 zones - Yearly Increment | | | | | | |
| 89 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | |
| 90 | HIGH | \$0 | \$25,000,000 | \$30,000,000 | \$235,000,000 | \$240,000,000 | |
| 91 | MIDDLE | \$0 | \$12,500,000 | \$13,750,000 | \$115,000,000 | \$116,250,000 | |
| 92 | LOW | \$0 | \$2,500,000 | \$5,000,000 | \$47,500,000 | \$70,000,000 | |
| 93 | | | | | | | |
| 94 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | OVERALL AD VALOREM TAX IMPACT OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD |
| 95 | | | | | | | |
| 96 | HIGH | \$ - | \$ (441,803) | \$ (530,163) | \$ (4,152,944) | \$ (4,241,304) | \$ (9,366,213) |
| 97 | MIDDLE | \$ - | \$ (220,901) | \$ (242,991) | \$ (2,032,292) | \$ (2,054,382) | \$ (4,550,566) |
| 98 | LOW | \$ - | \$ (44,180) | \$ (88,361) | \$ (839,425) | \$ (1,237,047) | \$ (2,209,013) |
| 99 | | | | | | | |
| 100 | TOTAL TAX IMPACT OF PROPOSAL | | | | | | |
| 101 | | | | | | | |
| 102 | | <u>2012-13</u> | <u>2013-14</u> | <u>2014-15</u> | <u>2015-16</u> | <u>2016-17</u> | OVERALL TAX IMPACT OF PROPOSAL OVER A 5-YEAR PERIOD WITH ASSUMED LEVEL OF INVESTMENT |
| 103 | | | | | | | |
| 104 | HIGH | \$ (4,500,000) | \$ (3,741,803) | \$ (830,163) | \$ (4,452,944) | \$ (4,541,304) | \$ (18,066,213) |
| 105 | MIDDLE | \$ (2,250,000) | \$ (1,795,901) | \$ (317,991) | \$ (2,107,292) | \$ (2,129,382) | \$ (8,600,566) |
| 106 | LOW | \$ (750,000) | \$ (794,180) | \$ (838,361) | \$ (1,589,425) | \$ (1,987,047) | \$ (5,959,013) |
| 107 | | | | | | | |
| 108 | | | | | | | |
| 109 | | \$ (4.5) | \$ (3.7) | \$ (0.8) | \$ (4.5) | \$ (4.5) | \$ (18.1) |
| 110 | | \$ (2.3) | \$ (1.8) | \$ (0.32) | \$ (2.1) | \$ (2.1) | \$ (8.6) |
| 111 | | \$ (0.8) | \$ (0.8) | \$ (0.8) | \$ (1.6) | \$ (2.0) | \$ (6.0) |