



# Budget Briefing: State Revenue Sharing

Jim Stansell, Senior Economist

January 2017

# Briefing Topics

- Revenue Sharing Overview
- Constitutional Revenue Sharing
- Statutory Revenue Sharing
- Economic Vitality and Incentive Program (EVIP)
- CVT Revenue Sharing
- County Revenue Sharing

# Revenue Sharing Overview

# Revenue Sharing Overview

- There are 280 cities, 253 villages, and 1,240 townships (CVTs) in Michigan, along with 83 counties.
- There are 16 cities and 11 villages that span across county lines and therefore have population and/or taxable value in more than one county.
- Article IX, section 30 of the State Constitution requires that 48.97% of state spending from state sources be paid to local units of government, and state revenue sharing payments represent the largest unrestricted portion of that requirement.
- State Revenue Sharing payments have traditionally been comprised of two components:
  - Constitutional Revenue Sharing payments, which are distributed to cities, villages, and townships on a per capita basis.
  - Statutory Revenue Sharing payments, which have generally been distributed to all CVTs and counties, although various changes over the past decade have significantly reduced the number of eligible local units.

# Constitutional Revenue Sharing

# Constitutional Revenue Sharing

- Constitutional Revenue Sharing began in 1946 and was reaffirmed in the State Constitution of 1963.
- The Constitution stipulates that 15% of sales tax collections at the 4% rate be distributed to CVTs on a per capita basis as determined by the most recently completed decennial census. Population adjustments not resulting from the decennial census are typically not factored into the distribution.
- Although voters approved an increase in the sales tax rate to 6% in 1994, Constitutional Revenue Sharing payments are still calculated based on the first 4% since the 2% increase is constitutionally dedicated to the School Aid Fund.
- Constitutional Revenue Sharing payments are issued by the Department of Treasury at the end of October, December, February, April, June, and August of each state fiscal year based on actual sales tax collections from the prior two months.

# Constitutional Revenue Sharing Payments to Cities, Villages, and Townships


\$ in Millions

	Final FY 2014-15	Final FY 2015-16	Estimated FY 2016-17
Constitutional Revenue Sharing Payments	\$750.7	\$750.0	\$756.3
Detroit	54.3	54.2	54.7
Other CVTs	696.4	695.7	701.6
Cities (280)	366.4	366.0	369.1
Villages (253)	20.3	20.3	20.5
Townships (1,240)	364.4	363.6	366.7

## Notes

- 1) Dollar amounts may not sum to the total shown due to rounding.
- 2) Because Constitutional Revenue Sharing payments are based on actual sales tax collections, FY 2016-17 amounts are calculated using the January 2017 Consensus Revenue Estimating Conference sales tax projections.

# Constitutional Revenue Sharing Payments to Cities, Villages, and Townships




# Statutory Revenue Sharing to Cities, Villages, and Townships

# Statutory Revenue Sharing to Cities, Villages, and Townships

- Statutory Revenue Sharing began with the repeal of prohibition in 1933 when 85% of liquor license fees were returned to local units.
- The State Revenue Sharing Act of 1971 was amended by 1998 PA532 to implement new distribution formulas. Under 1998 PA532, full funding for Statutory Revenue Sharing to CVTs was defined as 74.94% of 21.3% of sales tax revenue at the 4% rate. Between FY 1999-00 and FY 2001-02, Statutory Revenue Sharing payments followed the provisions of 1998 PA 532.
- Because actual appropriations were routinely well below the full funding guideline, between FY 2004-05 and FY 2010-11, reductions in funding and changes in the distribution formulas eliminated Statutory Revenue Sharing payments for 1,033 CVTs.
- Only 740 CVTs received Statutory Revenue Sharing in FY 2010-11, the last year in which Statutory Revenue Sharing payments were made.

# Statutory Revenue Sharing Payments to Cities, Villages, and Townships



# Economic Vitality and Incentive Program

# Economic Vitality and Incentive Program


- The Economic Vitality and Incentive Program (EVIP) replaced Statutory Revenue Sharing beginning in FY 2011-12, although it only existed in boilerplate. EVIP was never been codified into statute, and Statutory Revenue Sharing has never been repealed.
- A CVTs EVIP payment was contingent on fulfilling requirements in such areas as Accountability and Transparency, Consolidation and Collaboration, Employee Compensation Issues, and Reducing Unfunded Liabilities.
- Due to limited funding, the number of CVTs eligible for EVIP funding decreased from 740 during the final year of Statutory Revenue Sharing to 486 CVTs when EVIP was initiated. Eligible CVTs received a percentage of their FY 2009-10 Statutory Revenue Sharing payments.
- For a more thorough explanation of the EVIP program, see the following document: [HFA EVIP Memo](#)

# CVT Revenue Sharing


# CVT Revenue Sharing

- For FY 2014-15, the majority of the EVIP compliance requirements were eliminated, leaving only Accountability and Transparency, and the program name was changed from EVIP to CVT Revenue Sharing in boilerplate.
- A CVT that was eligible for EVIP payments in prior years is eligible to receive the greater of 78.51% of its FY 2009-10 statutory payment or a payment of \$2.65 per person.
- CVTs with populations in excess of 7,500 that had not previously been eligible for EVIP payments are eligible for a payment of \$2.65 per person. 101 additional CVTs qualify under this provision.
- CVTs with populations less than 7,500 that had not previously been eligible for EVIP payments continue to be ineligible.
- The same FY 2014-15 provisions were extended for FY 2015-16 and FY 2016-17.

# EVIP and CVT Revenue Sharing Payments to Cities, Villages, and Townships



# Total Revenue Sharing Payments to Cities, Villages, and Townships



# Total Revenue Sharing Payments to Cities, Villages, and Townships

\$ in Millions

	Final FY 2014-15	Final FY 2015-16	Estimated FY 2016-17
Total Revenue Sharing Payments	\$999.4	\$998.7	\$1,005.1
Detroit	194.8	194.7	195.2
Other CVTs	804.6	804.0	842.1
Cities (280)	601.0	600.7	603.7
Villages (253)	23.8	23.9	24.1
Townships (1,240)	374.5	374.2	377.3

## Notes

- 1) Dollar amounts may not sum to the total shown due to rounding.
- 2) Because Constitutional Revenue Sharing payments are based on actual sales tax collections, FY 2016-17 amounts are calculated using the January 2017 Consensus Revenue Estimating Conference sales tax projections.
- 3) CVT Revenue Sharing payments for FY 2016-17 are based on the appropriations contained in 2016 PA 268.

# County Revenue Sharing


# County Revenue Sharing

- Counties do not receive Constitutional Revenue Sharing payments.
- The State Revenue Sharing Act of 1971, as amended by 1998 PA532, defined full funding for Statutory Revenue Sharing to counties as 25.06% of 21.3% of sales tax revenue at the 4% rate.
- Statutory Revenue Sharing payments to counties were generally distributed on a per capita basis, although a portion was based on single business tax revenue that had been earmarked to counties as repayment for making inventories exempt from the personal property tax.
- As with CVTs, actual appropriations for Statutory Revenue Sharing to counties were routinely below the full funding guideline.

# County Revenue Sharing

- Statutory Revenue Sharing payments to counties were temporarily suspended beginning in FY 2004-05.
- Counties were required to create reserve funds with own-source general operating revenue from which they were allowed to withdraw an annual amount in lieu of Statutory Revenue Sharing.
- The annual authorized withdrawal for each county was its FY 2003-04 payment, adjusted for inflation.
- When a county's reserve fund balance is exhausted, it will again be eligible for Statutory Revenue Sharing payments equal to its final authorized withdrawal amount. Additional inflation adjustments will not be applied.
- Beginning in FY 2013-14, 20% of a county's Revenue Sharing payment became subject to the County Incentive Program (CIP), which imposes the same transparency and accountability requirements as EVIP.
- In FY 2016-17, an estimated 78 counties will receive Statutory Revenue Sharing payments, leaving only five counties with positive reserve fund balances.

# State Revenue Sharing Payments to Counties



# For more information about state revenue sharing:

## HFA website

<http://www.house.mi.gov/hfa/>

## Contact Information

Jim Stansell

Senior Economist

[jstansell@house.mi.gov](mailto:jstansell@house.mi.gov)

Ben Gielczyk

Senior Fiscal Analyst

[Bgielczyk@house.mi.gov](mailto:Bgielczyk@house.mi.gov)

(517) 373-8080