



ABOVE AND BEYOND. BY DESIGN.

8500 Santa Fe Drive
Overland Park, Kansas 66212
913-895-6000 | www.opkansas.org

House Committee on Taxation
Hearing on House Bill 2047
January 29, 2013
Statement by Dick Carter, Jr.

Chairman Carlson and members of the House Committee on Taxation, I appear before you today on behalf of the City of Overland Park to offer comments from a neutral perspective on HB 2047. As we read it, the bill creates the property tax transparency act, which requires local units of government to vote to approve the budget anytime there is an unintentional increase in the property tax revenue based on an increase in property values.

The City believes that transparency regarding local revenues and budgets is paramount to continuing the relationship of trust between locally elected council members and their constituent tax payers. It is important to note that we believe that local spending and taxing decisions are best left to locally elected officials and the citizens they serve.

The following additional observations are offered, related to the overall discussion on property taxation at the local level:

- The process of adopting a city budget already includes various statutorily required steps, numerous opportunities for public input, and several different votes by locally elected officials.
- The local budget process also includes estimated assessed valuations provided by the County Assessor up until final approval in August of each year.
- Publication of proposed budget, public hearing requirements, and final adoption and filing are all components of the statutorily driven process for budget development and adoption.
- Since 1999, cities have been required to adopt a separate ordinance whenever the amount of revenue from property taxes exceeds the amount of property tax revenue from the preceding year. Like all ordinances, this enactment must be approved by a separate vote of a majority of the governing body at a public meeting and published in the official newspaper of the city.
- It would appear that under HB 2047, the State would not have to roll back its 1.5 mill levy as a result of any increase in assessed valuations from reappraisal within the state – this appears to be inconsistent.

I would be pleased to answer questions at the appropriate time.