City of McPherson's Testimony for the House Taxation Committee March 9, 2016 in support of HB 2609 Representative Marvin Kleeb, Committee Chairman

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today on behalf of the City of McPherson in support of HB 2609. I am Tom Brown, Mayor of McPherson.

The current law commonly known as the Property Tax Lid is functionally unworkable. The City of McPherson begins the budget process each April using valuation estimates from the McPherson County Appraiser and official guidance is not received until July 1. The approved budgets must be sent to the State of Kansas by August. If an election was needed, the election officials would need 30-60 days to prepare ballots and military/overseas ballots must go out 45 days before an election, as required by state law. Calling a special election in September or a general election in November is an unworkable timetable. Additional elections are costly. HB 2609 would provide better functionality enabling support for this bill.

Tying a tax lid around the CPI is not a realistic standard since cities do not purchase the same items consumers purchase. We would support the use of the Municipal Cost Index (MCI) as the appropriate measure budget. The MCI has three components: construction index, machinery and equipment index and the CPI. We would support the use of a five (5) year average of the MCI. A five (5) year average would be a more conservative metric to allow consistency in the budget process and minimize tax increases and decreases. I visited with Governor Brownback when he visited McPherson on February 9, 2016. He stated at that time he was open to using the MCI and a five year average.

Economic development is often dependent on seizing opportunity. In addition, planned and emergency infrastructure repair will be deterred by a tax lid. McPherson has been a job creation engine providing a strong local economy and growth for the state economy. Here are several examples: CHS has just completed a major project in improvements totaling almost \$1,750,000,000, Pfizer is finishing a \$120,000,000 in improvements with a state grant, Viega has finished their second plant with others to follow, and Central Plastics is doing a \$2,000,000 expansion. During the last 13 years we have added 1,311 new jobs in our city. Also, we have been providing export information to local firms in order to expand their exports. Our economy is second only to Sedgwick County in exports per capita. We want the state and our city to grow more jobs and provide more housing. When these objectives are achieved, a larger tax base will lessen the tax burden on our citizens.

Bond ratings will likely be downgraded with a property tax lid thus creating additional long term expense to our community through increased interest rates resulting in less favorable debt funding than the city has historically enjoyed. The MCI five year average would help stabilize bond ratings.

There is great difficulty in competing for and retaining law enforcement personnel thus requiring more funds in the future beyond what a tax lid would allow. While safety and health are the top priorities of our local government, infrastructure, affordable housing, and amenities for citizens are also important if the State of Kansas and our local community are going to grow and provide a stronger tax foundation. Currently, our city has 20 % of our patrol officer and detective positions open. We desire to fund our top priorities and not damage our prospects for growth.

The City of McPherson desires to work with the state officials to create a strategy to strengthen our relationships with state government. We want (1) to help the state economy to expand, (2) to preserve home rule authority for our local community and (3) to provide local taxpayer protection in order achieve a win/win/win for citizens, state and city. Our city has worked diligently to make this win/win.win strategy a reality. We are committed to continuing to pursue this strategy in the future. We want continuous improvement for citizens, the State of Kansas and our city. If the city's economy declines, the state economy will decline. The state is the total sum of the local economies. HB 2609 would help achieve a win/win/win situation.

There is data on the next page.

Shomas & Brown

## Assessed Valuation Analysis City of McPherson, Kansas

Increase or			period)	uring that time	Average Levy over the last 16 years (ranging from 46.416 - 51.570 during that time period)	ars (ranging fro	er the last 16 yea	Average Levy ov	49.833		
			period)			rs (ranging fror	er the last 8 year	Average Levy ov	51.266		
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua		57.35%		42.65%		100.00%	a	v ci canon		9	o o
Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   See) over   %   From New   %   NET of New   Net of Neto						100 00%	D	Valuation Increase	of Assessed	of the Source	ercentage
Assessed Valuation		1.63%		1.21%		2.84%	6 years	ncrease over last 1	d Valuation Ir	ual Assesse	/erage Anr
Assessed Valuation % from New % NET of New % Next of New Next of New Next of Next of New Next of N	12.56%	,439 (2002) =	1,750 jobs (2015) / 10,								
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Properties   Increase   Improvements   Increase	1,311	ast 13 years	added overall in the la	Jobs			the last 16 years	provements over	from New In	ed Valuation	otal Assess
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Increase   Increase   Increase   Increase   Improvements   Increase   Incr	11,750	3.91%	4,235,824	0.73%	790,457	4.64%	5,026,281	113,327,272	51.570	2016	2015
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	11,239	1.47%	1,553,997	0.67%	706,909	2.13%	2,260,906	108,300,991	51.330	2015	2014
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	11,055	0.19%	197,577	0.62%	653,601	0.81%	851,178	106,040,085	51.022	2014	2013
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,891	1.37%	1,416,091	0.51%	530,018	1.88%	1,946,109	105,188,907	51.127	2013	2012
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,717	0.22%	226,899	0.77%	790,675	1.00%	1,017,574	103,242,798	51.127	2012	2011
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,475	-1.92%	(1,979,764)	1.27%	1,309,245	-0.65%	(670,519)	102,225,224	51.281	2011	2010
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,385	-2.46%	(2,571,487)	0.76%	798,953	-1.69%	(1,772,534)	102,895,743	51.336	2010	2009
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,484	1.30%	1,326,381	1.54%	1,564,910	2.84%	2,891,291	104,668,277	51.338	2009	2008
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,809	-1.29%	(1,308,011)	2.06%	2,077,970	0.76%	769,959	101,776,986	48.801	2008	2007
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	11,247	2.52%	2,448,979	1.48%	1,439,869	4.00%	3,888,848	101,007,027	50.168	2007	2006
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	11,107	2.19%	2,050,418	1.43%	1,344,446	3.62%	3,394,864	97,118,179	47.708	2006	2005
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Increase   Increase   Increase   Increase   Increase   Improvements   Increase   Increase   Improvements   Increase   Increase   Improvements   Increase   Increas	11,022	7.97%	6,721,284	3.12%	2,631,220	11.08%	9,352,504	93,723,315	48.734	2005	2004
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Increase   Increa	10,584	1.56%	1,269,291	1.92%	1,568,819	3.48%	2,838,110	84,370,811	50.682	2004	2003
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valua	10,439	1.32%	1,049,065	1.45%	1,150,332	2.77%	2,199,397	81,532,701	47.416	2003	2002
Increase or   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   Assessed Valuation   MET of New   %   NET of New   %	N/A	8.70%	6,238,618	1.94%	1,392,271	10.64%	7,630,889	79,333,304	46.776	2002	2001
Increase or Assessed Valuation Assessed Valuation  (Decrease) over 6 from New 9 NET of New 9 NET	N/A	2.28%		1.52%		3.80%	1		46.909	2001	2000
Increase or Assessed Valuation Assessed Valuation  (Decrease) over % from New % NET of New %	Jobs	Increase	Improvements	Increase	Improvements	Increase	Prior Year	Total	Levied	<u>Year</u>	<u>Year</u>
Increase or Assessed Valuation Assessed Valuation	Sector	%	NET of New		from New	%	(Decrease) over		of Mills	Collection	Valuation
	Private	(d - D)	Assessed Valuation		Assessed Valuation	13	Increase or		Number	Tax	Assessed
Change in (h) Change in		(a b)	Chango in	( <del>b</del> )	Change in	(a)	Valuation	Assessed			
					(B)		(A)	STATE OF THE SHADOW STATE OF THE STATE OF TH			

Mayor, City of McMerson