

**NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used in any other situation.**

**Only the most recent FIR version, excluding attachments, is available on the Intranet. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC office in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.**

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR: Lujan DATE TYPED: 01/25/01 HB 15  
 SHORT TITLE: In-Plant Training SB \_\_\_\_\_  
 ANALYST: Woodlee

### APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02		
\$ 15,000.0				Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Relates to House Bill 2, Senate Bill 98 - Performance Budget of the Economic Development Department.  
 Duplicates House Bill 78

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Economic Development Department  
 Labor Department  
 LFC Files

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 15 appropriations \$15 million from the general fund to the development training fund found within the Economic Development Department for the Industrial Development Training Program (IDTP), or In-Plant Training.

#### Significant Issues

In recent fiscal years, the IDTP has received a flat appropriation of \$6 million annually. According to the IDTP Budget Report, in FY01 the IDTP Board awarded 86 percent of the appropriation before the first month of the fiscal year. The entire fund balances were awarded prior to the end of the second quarter of FY01. The bill would grow the appropriation by 150 percent. This would address a high demand for the program. however, it is unclear if just an increase in funds will address the issue of available funds.

Because the program pays a percentage of an employees wages during training, the fund is adversely impacted when higher wages are attracted. In addition, if the training is unavailable in-house, the program will pay a higher education institution or another organization to conduct the training, as well as fund part of the employees' wages. These factors add to the rising cost of the program. According to the National Governor's Association in 1998, New Mexico had the highest cost per

employee of \$3.3 thousand, when comparing employee-based training programs across the country. In 2000, the cost per employee was \$5.2 thousand.

Because the Industrial Development Training Board uses a first-come, first served policy, it is unclear if the additional funds would extend the life of the development training fund. The IDTP has changed its policies to help address the situation, such as only allowing for the initial six months of training and only funding rural areas 65 percent of wages instead of the potential 75- or 90-percent. Although these are steps in the right direction, no policies have been adopted to prioritize applications, or has any changes been made to address the issue of funding the majority of projects in the first month of the fiscal year.

The IDTP staff and board need to develop an application process that allows for consideration of projects, given a certain restraint on the amount that can be allocated. Currently, the board meets once a month and addresses completed applications that have been received and approved as qualified applicants. However, as in FY01, the board could feasibly allocate all the available funds prior to the end of the fiscal year. It is perhaps more efficient to meet quarterly or semi-annually and allow applications to be gathered and then considered against one another. As it is now, companies must rush to get their applications in at the beginning of the fiscal year in order to avoid missing out on the available funds later.

One problem with the funding process is that it is difficult to predict what companies may need funding and when. The first come, first served policy is seen to some as a solution to this. However, another possible solution to this issue to offer a contingency appropriation that would be able to be utilized only when the initial appropriation has been completely allocated, certified by the Department of Finance and Administration and/or the Legislative Finance Committee.

### **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

The appropriation of \$15,000.0 contained in this bill is a recurring expense to the general fund for fiscal year 2001 and subsequent fiscal year.

### **CONFLICT/DUPLICATION/COMPANIONSHIP/RELATIONSHIP**

House Bill 15 duplicates House Bill 78. Also relates to the performance-based budget of the Economic Development Department found in House Bill 2 and Senate Bill 98.

MW/njw