

Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the Legislature. LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

**BILL NUMBER:** House Bill 148/ec

**SHORT TITLE:** Property Tax Affidavits

**SPONSOR:** Reps. Lundstrom/Lente and Martinez, J./ Sen. Padilla

**LAST UPDATE:** 2/2/2026      **ORIGINAL DATE:** 1/29/2026      **ANALYST:** Faubion

### REVENUE\* (dollars in thousands)

Type	FY26	FY27	FY28	FY29	FY30	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Property Tax	Up to (\$2,000.0)	Up to (\$3,000.0)	Up to (\$4,000.0)	Up to (\$5,000.0)	Up to (\$6,000.0)	Recurring	State GO
Property Tax	Up to (\$11,800.0)	Up to (\$17,600.0)	Up to (\$23,600.0)	Up to (\$29,400.0)	Up to (\$35,200.0)	Recurring	Counties
Property Tax	Up to (\$4,000.0)	Up to (\$5,900.0)	Up to (\$8,000.0)	Up to (\$9,900.0)	Up to (\$11,900.0)	Recurring	Munis
Property Tax	Up to (\$14,700.0)	Up to (\$22,000.0)	Up to (\$29,400.0)	Up to (\$36,700.0)	Up to (\$43,900.0)	Recurring	Education/Hospitals
Property Tax	Up to (\$10,900.0)	Up to (\$16,400.0)	Up to (\$21,900.0)	Up to (\$27,300.0)	Up to (\$32,700.0)	Recurring	Other Local Government Funds
<b>Property Tax</b>	<b>Up to (\$43,400.0)</b>	<b>Up to (\$64,900.0)</b>	<b>Up to (\$86,900.0)</b>	<b>Up to (\$108,300.0)</b>	<b>Up to (\$129,700.0)</b>	<b>Recurring</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>

Parentheses indicate revenue decreases.

\*Amounts reflect most recent analysis of this legislation.

Related to Senate Joint Resolution 5

### Sources of Information

LFC Files

DFA Property Tax Facts and Certificates

### Agency or Agencies Providing Analysis

Taxation and Revenue Department

NM Counties

### Agency or Agencies That Were Asked for Analysis but did not Respond

Department of Finance and Administration

NM Municipal League

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of House Bill 148

House Bill 148 (HB148) amends the Property Tax Code to temporarily limit increases in the assessed value of nonresidential property and to expand affidavit filing requirements for real property transfers. For tax years 2026 through 2036, the bill caps annual increases in the taxable value of nonresidential property at 105 percent of the prior year's value. The cap does not apply to newly valued properties, increases attributable to added or omitted improvements (other than disaster-related reconstruction), or properties that experience a change in use or zoning. The bill also amends existing law to require an affidavit to be filed with the county assessor for transfers of real property more broadly, rather than limiting the requirement to residential property, while adding specified exemptions from the affidavit requirement for agricultural land and mineral or subsurface estate.

The provisions apply to property tax years beginning on or after January 1, 2026. This bill contains an emergency clause and would become effective immediately on signature by the governor.

## **FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

Estimating the fiscal impact of this bill is challenging due to the lack of detailed information on a wide range of factors affecting various property types and tax provisions. The bill introduces several significant changes, including the five percent cap on nonresidential valuation increases and mandatory disclosure of nonresidential property sales. To accurately assess the fiscal effects, detailed data is needed on the current value and classification of properties, assessor practices, the location of all affected properties across different tax districts, and current and future market dynamics. Additionally, the specific tax rates applied in each jurisdiction and the proportion of properties that will benefit from these changes are critical to understanding how taxable value will be reduced or adjusted. Without this granular information, it is difficult to predict how these overlapping reforms will collectively impact property tax revenues at the local and state levels.

Compounding this uncertainty is the interplay with New Mexico's yield control mechanism, which limits overall property tax revenue growth to five percent or less annually for residential and nonresidential properties separately. Even if the disclosure requirements lead to more accurate and potentially higher valuations of nonresidential properties, the total revenue collected is still constrained by yield control. At the same time, properties benefiting from the five percent cap may see reduced tax obligations, but the magnitude of these reductions will vary depending on how widespread and significant these properties are across the state. The combination of regional variations in property values, different tax rates, and simultaneous policy changes makes it difficult to isolate the effects of any single provision. As a result, predicting the overall fiscal impact of the bill involves considerable complexity and uncertainty.

The yield control statute (7-37-7.1 NMSA 1978) adjusts operating tax rates to offset revenue losses or gains from outsized changes to the aggregate property taxable values within each tax district. When taxable property values grow too much within a district, yield control will reduce the tax rate to maintain "reasonable" revenue growth. If aggregate property values decline, the tax rate can be increased for the entire tax district to maintain revenue. The magnitude of this offsetting is difficult to calculate in this case without access to very specific tax information for all properties affected by this bill.

County, municipal, and school operating mill levies are subject to yield control, and those entities can offset losses to net taxable value by increasing the mill rate, if there is sufficient

“space” between their imposed rate, the rate approved by their local governing bodies, and the current yield-controlled rate, the actual rate levied as calculated by the Department of Finance and Administration (DFA).

In New Mexico, yield control mechanisms are calculated separately for residential and nonresidential properties, meaning that tax revenue growth for each category is capped independently. This system is designed to ensure that total property tax revenue from each sector does not grow by more than five percent annually, regardless of changes in property values. However, the practical impact of yield control differs significantly between residential and nonresidential properties due to the current state of tax rates in these categories. This distinction is particularly significant for nonresidential properties, where many tax rates are already at or near their maximum allowable limits. As a result, even if the total assessed value of nonresidential properties decreases, local governments may have limited ability to raise additional revenue if the yield control cap is hit and rates are already at their ceiling.

In addition to operating mill rates, many special levy mill rates—including those supporting public school debt, county and municipal general obligation bonds, higher education capital projects, and hospital debt—are not subject to yield control and therefore do not automatically adjust to offset changes in taxable value. To the extent the 5 percent limitation on nonresidential valuation growth reduces the growth of net taxable value, revenues from these debt-related and special purpose mills may be more directly and immediately affected than operating revenues, particularly in jurisdictions with a significant share of nonresidential property in the tax base. As a result, the fiscal effects of the limitation may be more pronounced for entities relying on voter-approved or statutorily fixed mill levies than for entities funded primarily through yield-controlled operating mills.

To estimate the impact of disclosure and the cap, LFC used the 2025 net taxable value of nonresidential properties in the state from DFA’s property tax documents and the annual growth of nonresidential property values from both New Mexico’s historical property tax data and S&P Global from 2005 through 2030 to estimate what commercial properties should be valued at if valued at their current and correct values. LFC calculated the average valuation growth on commercial properties in New Mexico and applied that average to estimate out-year net taxable values under the status quo. Then, a five percent growth rate was applied to current values starting in tax year 2026 to estimate the change in net taxable value statewide under the provisions of this bill pre-yield control. To calculate the impact with yield control, LFC compared imposed and approved mill levies for eligible operational mills and adjusted the impact for those mills to account for any adjustment yield-control would allow, up to the statutory maximum of five percent per year. The maximum constitutional mill levy was applied to the net taxable value to estimate the statewide impact for counties, municipalities, and school districts. The impact per government entity would vary based on tax rate, value of commercial property within the district, and the impact of yield control.

The fiscal impact of the bill could be lower than anticipated if appreciation of nonresidential properties occurs more slowly than assumed. To the extent annual appreciation remains below 5 percent, the assessment limitation would not be binding, and assessed values would continue to increase in line with current and correct value, resulting in little to no fiscal impact. However, this outcome is unlikely on a statewide basis, as nonresidential property values do not appreciate uniformly. Rates of appreciation vary significantly across regions, cities, and neighborhoods depending on local development patterns, investment activity, and market demand. As a result,

even if average statewide appreciation remains moderate, the assessment limitation is likely to affect a subset of properties experiencing faster-than-average growth, producing localized fiscal impacts rather than a uniform statewide effect. Since 2021, nonresidential taxable value has grown between 5.1 percent and 11.7 percent year over year, averaging nearly 8 percent per year over that time. In the last 20 years, the average annual growth has been 4.5 percent.

The Taxation and Revenue Department (TRD) reports that it does not currently have sufficient data to model the revenue impact of limiting annual growth in nonresidential property valuations to 5 percent. TRD notes that while the bill's affidavit requirement for nonresidential property transfers may improve assessors' visibility into current and correct values over time, the department lacks data to determine the share of nonresidential properties that are currently undervalued or that have experienced valuation increases exceeding 5 percent annually. As a result, TRD is unable to quantify the fiscal impact but anticipates that the assessment limitation would generally reduce property tax revenue relative to current practice in cases where properties have been assessed at growth rates above the cap. TRD further notes that fiscal impacts will vary widely across jurisdictions depending on local trends in nonresidential valuation growth.

## SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

**Nonresidential Disclosure.** The bill expands the real property transfer affidavit requirement to include nonresidential property transfers, addressing longstanding gaps in market transparency for this segment of the tax base. Unlike residential properties, nonresidential transfers have not historically required disclosure of sales prices, leaving county assessors with limited transaction data to support sales-based valuation analysis. Expanded disclosure will improve access to sales price and transaction terms, strengthening assessors' ability to identify and accurately assess these types of properties, address under-valued properties, and promote greater uniformity across nonresidential parcels.

While increased disclosure is expected to improve valuation accuracy over time, the benefits are likely to accrue gradually. Incorporation of new transaction data into assessments typically occurs over multiple valuation cycles and depends on the rate of turnover of nonresidential properties. As a result, while expanded affidavits may support improved baseline valuations in the long run, they are unlikely to immediately correct existing undervaluations across the nonresidential tax base.

**Nonresidential Assessment Limit.** Under current law, nonresidential property is already required to be valued at its current and correct value each tax year, and the bill does not alter that fundamental valuation standard. Beginning with the 2026 tax year, however, the bill imposes a temporary limitation on the rate at which the assessed value of nonresidential property may increase from one year to the next, capping annual growth at 105 percent of the prior year's value for tax years 2026 through 2036. Regardless of whether a property is valued at current and correct value in tax year 2025, that value becomes the base for applying the limitation in subsequent years, meaning the cap constrains year-over-year growth rather than the initial valuation itself.

Because nonresidential properties are not currently subject to an assessment growth limitation, the cap represents a structural change in how assessed values may respond to market conditions over time. Properties that are already close to market value in 2025 may experience little or no

immediate effect from the cap unless market appreciation exceeds five percent annually. In contrast, in periods of rapid appreciation, the limitation may restrict the speed at which assessed values adjust upward, even where market values increase substantially. For properties that are currently underassessed, the cap locks in the underassessment for a period of 10 years.

The constitutionality of imposing an assessment or valuation increase limit on nonresidential property is uncertain under current law. In 1998, voters approved a constitutional amendment authorizing the Legislature to limit annual valuation increases for residential property only; no similar authority exists for nonresidential property. Absent explicit constitutional authorization, valuation caps on nonresidential property may conflict with the New Mexico Constitution's requirements that property taxes be equal and uniform within a class and assessed in proportion to value. New Mexico courts have recognized that assessment limits are constitutionally permissible only where expressly authorized, as reflected in cases such as *Zhao v. Montoya*, which upheld residential valuation limits based on the 1998 constitutional amendment. As a result, legislation imposing nonresidential assessment limits prior to voter approval of a constitutional amendment could be subject to legal challenge and potential invalidation.

New Mexico Counties expresses concern that proposals to limit or cap nonresidential property valuation growth are problematic due to wide variation in nonresidential growth patterns across counties. NM Counties argues that an arbitrary statewide cap would constrain revenue growth for all counties, while primarily benefiting developers in a limited number of high-growth areas. NM Counties further notes that counties are responsible for providing infrastructure and services in developing areas—including fire protection, law enforcement, roads, and sidewalks—and that limiting nonresidential valuation growth could reduce revenues needed to support these expanding service demands. According to New Mexico Counties, historical data show significant variation in year-over-year nonresidential property growth across counties and industries, and a uniform cap could negatively affect long-term economic growth and counties' ability to finance infrastructure associated with development.

**Impacts on Valuations.** The interaction between expanded disclosure and the assessment limitation has important implications for valuation outcomes. While improved disclosure may, over time, help assessors identify under-valued nonresidential properties, the five percent cap applies immediately beginning in tax year 2026 to all existing nonresidential properties, regardless of whether their assessed values fully reflect current and correct value. As a result, the bill may limit the rate of assessed value growth before additional market data from affidavits can be fully incorporated into valuation models.

In practice, this means the bill may provide short-term stability and predictability for property owners facing sharp, market-driven increases in value—such as those resulting from economic growth, infrastructure investment, or changes in surrounding land use—by smoothing year-to-year changes in assessed value. This may be particularly beneficial for small businesses or local enterprises that would otherwise face sudden increases in property tax liability due to market conditions beyond their control.

At the same time, because the limitation applies uniformly, it may also constrain valuation growth for properties that are currently under-valued, slowing convergence to market value during the limitation period. As a result, while the bill may reduce volatility and improve predictability, it does not ensure that baseline valuations are fully updated before growth limitations take effect. TRD notes that in recent years some counties have implemented

significant reassessments of commercial properties—particularly properties that had not been site-valued for extended periods—resulting in valuation increases exceeding 200 percent in some cases.

**Risk of Tax Lightning.** The five percent limitation on annual nonresidential valuation increases is temporary and expires after tax year 2036. To the extent assessed values are constrained below market value during the limitation period, particularly in areas experiencing sustained appreciation, assessed values may adjust more rapidly once the cap is lifted. If market values continue to rise while the limitation is in effect, removal of the cap could result in sharp, catch-up increases in assessed value in subsequent years.

This potential “tax lightning” effect may reintroduce valuation volatility after the limitation expires, particularly for properties that experienced prolonged divergence between assessed and market value during the capped period. As a result, while the limitation may smooth valuation changes in the short term, it may also shift some valuation pressure into later years once the cap is no longer in place.

## CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

Relates to Senate Joint Resolution 5, which proposes a constitutional amendment to authorize a nonresidential assessment or valuation limit.

## TECHNICAL ISSUES

TRD notes the following:

The limitation in increase in property value includes when a property is sold. TRD suggests adding language from Section 7-36-21.2(B) NMSA 1978 changing residential to nonresidential to apply to the new proposed section on nonresidential. TRD suggests adding a new Subsection on page 2, B (4) that reads, “If a change of ownership of nonresidential property occurred in the year immediately prior to the tax year for which the value of the property for property taxation purposes is being determined, the value of the property shall be its current and correct value as determined pursuant to the general valuation provisions of the Property Tax Code.”

Subsection A, pages 1 and 2, in conjunction with subsection B(2), page 2, lines 9-13, TRD is concerned about the following example for a building rebuilt after a disaster and the logic applied under the proposal: If a building burns down in 2025 and is not rebuilt until 2027, the property would only have the land value assessed in 2026. The limitation says that for 2027, the assessor can’t assess a value greater than the 2026 value plus 5 percent. The purpose of the proposal appears to be that a county assessor should be able to pick up the new building at the value at the time it is replaced. TRD suggests the following language be added on line 13, after the word emergency that reads: “If the state disaster occurred prior to January 1, 2026, the property’s value as of January 1, 2026, as if it had not been destroyed adjusted pursuant to Subsection 1; or If the state disaster occurred after January 1, 2026, its value as the date the property was destroyed adjusted pursuant to Subsection 1.”

Subsection D(17), page 6, lines 22-24, any property that sold and was valued under the

Special method of valuation and land used primarily for agricultural purposes would not be reported to the county assessor. This could lead to inconsistent valuations of similar properties. TRD suggests that on page 7, line 2, a new Subsection D(19) be added that reads: “A deed, patent or contract for sale or transfer of real property that is subject to valuation by the department.”

## ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

The bill contains an emergency clause, which appears intended to provide county assessors with immediate statutory authority to prepare for implementation within existing valuation and assessment timelines. Under current practice, assessors must establish property valuations by April 1 for the upcoming tax year, and advance notice is necessary to update appraisal procedures, revise guidance, and communicate changes to staff and taxpayers. While the emergency clause allows the provisions of the bill to take effect immediately upon enactment, the timing may still be insufficient for full implementation for the current tax year, particularly if enactment occurs close to or after key valuation deadlines. As a result, some assessors may be unable to uniformly apply the new requirements statewide until subsequent tax years, despite the bill’s immediate effective date.

Attachment

JF/ct/dw/ct/hg

## Attachment 1

Estimated Pre-Yield Control Impacts by Locality, 2030					
	Public School/Higer				
	County	Municipal	Ed./Hospital	State GO	Other
Bernalillo Remainder of County	(1,714,546.39)	-	(2,155,860.60)	(194,088.82)	(971,252.81)
Albuquerque	(8,279,430.31)	(7,938,990.94)	(10,487,462.17)	(937,241.99)	(10,357,213.10)
Edgewood	(553.38)	(132.75)	(700.96)	(62.64)	(738.32)
Los Ranchos	(75,831.99)	(6,311.97)	(96,055.53)	(8,584.28)	(94,862.57)
Rio Rancho	(38,243.85)	(31,399.81)	(48,443.05)	(4,329.25)	(24,498.47)
Tijeras	(28,233.93)	(5,228.94)	(35,763.61)	(3,196.12)	(15,378.96)
<b>Bernalillo Total</b>	<b>(10,136,839.85)</b>	<b>(7,982,064.41)</b>	<b>(12,824,285.93)</b>	<b>(1,147,503.10)</b>	<b>(11,463,944.23)</b>
Catron Remainder of County	(153,251.79)	-	(51,464.47)	(21,867.85)	(20,270.63)
Reserve	(7,982.43)	(1,709.38)	(3,405.37)	(1,139.03)	-
<b>Catron Total</b>	<b>(161,234.22)</b>	<b>(1,709.38)</b>	<b>(54,869.84)</b>	<b>(23,006.88)</b>	<b>(20,270.63)</b>
Chaves Remainder of County	(597,146.92)	-	(394,096.17)	(83,914.01)	(497,252.23)
Dexter	(7,346.41)	(1,635.07)	(7,802.62)	(1,032.35)	(7,183.21)
Hagerman	(9,366.87)	(2,067.33)	(9,094.90)	(1,316.28)	(7,984.77)
Lake Arthur	(1,996.73)	(459.05)	(1,394.29)	(280.59)	(1,547.37)
Roswell	(480,639.92)	(323,307.07)	(348,486.29)	(67,541.88)	(362,093.99)
<b>Chaves Total</b>	<b>(1,096,496.86)</b>	<b>(327,468.53)</b>	<b>(760,874.27)</b>	<b>(154,085.11)</b>	<b>(876,061.58)</b>
Cibola Remainder of County	(249,223.53)	-	(246,363.25)	(28,602.87)	(61,948.35)
Milan	(69,023.01)	(29,443.99)	(95,583.76)	(7,921.63)	(20,386.54)
Grants	(134,361.05)	(86,739.41)	(186,064.55)	(15,420.34)	(39,684.70)
<b>Cibola Total</b>	<b>(452,607.60)</b>	<b>(116,183.41)</b>	<b>(528,011.56)</b>	<b>(51,944.84)</b>	<b>(122,019.59)</b>
Colfax Remainder of County	(222,828.21)	-	(172,771.78)	(25,573.53)	(69,300.51)
Angel Fire	(108,020.82)	(108,039.05)	(62,232.75)	(12,397.33)	(23,172.06)
Cimarron	(10,167.29)	(6,506.21)	(5,857.56)	(1,166.88)	(2,181.03)
Eagle Nest	(13,439.75)	(3,657.65)	(7,742.88)	(1,542.45)	(2,883.02)
Maxwell	(2,407.47)	(1,501.98)	(2,627.91)	(276.30)	(983.51)
Raton	(75,102.18)	(48,483.68)	(54,428.48)	(8,619.32)	(13,448.68)
Springer	(8,005.03)	(5,167.81)	(7,730.77)	(918.72)	(2,927.07)
<b>Colfax Total</b>	<b>(439,970.74)</b>	<b>(173,356.38)</b>	<b>(313,392.13)</b>	<b>(50,494.53)</b>	<b>(114,895.89)</b>
Curry Remainder of County	(388,059.14)	-	(287,609.55)	(57,141.67)	(82,141.14)
Clovis	(334,908.37)	(158,388.89)	(264,489.13)	(49,315.22)	(67,337.03)
Grady	(222.68)	(184.44)	(195.38)	(32.79)	(48.22)
Melrose	(7,056.75)	(1,700.01)	(3,313.68)	(1,039.11)	(1,528.10)
Texico	(6,024.50)	(1,451.33)	(4,987.37)	(887.11)	(1,280.44)
<b>Curry Total</b>	<b>(736,271.43)</b>	<b>(161,724.66)</b>	<b>(560,595.11)</b>	<b>(108,415.89)</b>	<b>(152,334.93)</b>
De Baca Remainder of County	(127,136.74)	-	(122,957.81)	(17,433.55)	(25,637.58)
Fort Sumner	(13,773.30)	(3,089.90)	(13,320.58)	(1,888.66)	(2,777.44)
<b>De Baca Total</b>	<b>(140,910.04)</b>	<b>(3,089.90)</b>	<b>(136,278.39)</b>	<b>(19,322.21)</b>	<b>(28,415.01)</b>
Dona Ana Remainder of County	(1,190,404.13)	-	(1,146,603.32)	(135,692.70)	(857,990.27)
Anthony	(53,115.67)	(23,221.13)	(64,775.21)	(6,054.59)	(24,930.66)
Hatch	(24,962.02)	(11,507.09)	(26,809.43)	(2,845.39)	(11,224.64)
Las Cruces	(1,695,138.88)	(1,019,129.26)	(1,010,462.47)	(193,226.79)	(923,794.57)
Mesilla	(25,966.32)	(5,079.66)	(15,478.38)	(2,959.87)	(12,781.85)
Sunland Park	(243,403.65)	(220,187.37)	(296,833.72)	(27,745.28)	(114,245.28)
<b>Dona Ana Total</b>	<b>(3,232,990.66)</b>	<b>(1,279,124.51)</b>	<b>(2,560,962.52)</b>	<b>(368,524.63)</b>	<b>(1,944,967.27)</b>
Eddy Remainder of County	(3,623,340.78)	-	(2,403,160.64)	(657,032.46)	(4,859,302.58)
Artesia	(447,862.06)	(209,002.29)	(188,579.78)	(81,212.32)	(798,209.62)
Carlsbad	(467,106.96)	(366,647.82)	(493,763.20)	(84,702.06)	(453,529.72)
Hope	(443.66)	(361.55)	(186.81)	(80.45)	(425.44)
Loving	(9,518.37)	(2,823.78)	(4,869.60)	(1,726.00)	(3,217.21)
<b>Eddy Total</b>	<b>(4,548,271.83)</b>	<b>(578,835.45)</b>	<b>(3,090,560.03)</b>	<b>(824,753.29)</b>	<b>(6,114,684.56)</b>
Grant Remainder of County	(330,410.04)	-	(81,549.03)	(34,523.48)	(190,488.39)
Bayard	(10,692.89)	(4,292.44)	(3,080.70)	(1,117.27)	(5,346.45)
Hurley	(5,053.19)	(2,028.50)	(1,455.86)	(527.99)	(2,526.60)
Santa Clara	(5,811.05)	(1,886.27)	(1,674.20)	(607.18)	(2,905.53)

Estimated Pre-Yield Control Impacts by Locality, 2030					
	Public School/Higer				
	County	Municipal	Ed./Hospital	State GO	Other
Silver City	(163,952.61)	(48,180.60)	(33,694.93)	(17,130.88)	(44,086.83)
<b>Grant Total</b>	<b>(515,919.78)</b>	<b>(56,387.81)</b>	<b>(121,454.73)</b>	<b>(53,906.80)</b>	<b>(245,353.79)</b>
Guadalupe Remainder of County	(233,488.15)	-	(197,223.60)	(26,796.95)	(74,381.25)
Santa Rosa	(67,834.77)	(28,267.35)	(67,205.08)	(7,785.26)	(16,600.91)
Vaughn	(16,554.71)	(10,687.22)	(11,565.95)	(1,899.95)	(3,702.11)
<b>Guadalupe Total</b>	<b>(317,877.63)</b>	<b>(38,954.57)</b>	<b>(275,994.62)</b>	<b>(36,482.16)</b>	<b>(94,684.27)</b>
Harding Remainder of County	(93,641.11)	-	(58,612.72)	(11,737.50)	(35,842.54)
Mosquero	(1,163.17)	(238.53)	(1,244.86)	(145.80)	(214.41)
Roy	(2,058.39)	(422.11)	(670.64)	(258.01)	(661.15)
<b>Harding Total</b>	<b>(96,862.67)</b>	<b>(660.64)</b>	<b>(60,528.22)</b>	<b>(12,141.31)</b>	<b>(36,718.10)</b>
Hidalgo Remainder of County	(258,145.95)	-	(108,414.04)	(29,626.88)	(43,568.94)
Lordsburg	(58,939.00)	(16,040.36)	(35,885.65)	(6,764.31)	(9,947.51)
Virden	(728.62)	(136.44)	(443.63)	(83.62)	(122.97)
<b>Hidalgo Total</b>	<b>(317,813.56)</b>	<b>(16,176.80)</b>	<b>(144,743.31)</b>	<b>(36,474.81)</b>	<b>(53,639.42)</b>
Lea Remainder of County	(4,453,328.82)	-	(4,879,672.04)	(571,370.49)	(1,616,642.39)
Eunice	(27,185.92)	(19,620.03)	(23,662.01)	(3,488.00)	(10,258.84)
Hobbs	(561,408.60)	(294,209.89)	(582,117.17)	(72,029.78)	(317,778.45)
Jal	(30,538.67)	(22,039.70)	(21,607.55)	(3,918.17)	(7,533.83)
Lovington	(76,391.03)	(40,285.46)	(116,013.48)	(9,801.11)	(33,330.99)
Tatum	(9,345.00)	(3,724.78)	(12,570.79)	(1,198.98)	(1,763.21)
<b>Lea Total</b>	<b>(5,158,198.05)</b>	<b>(379,879.85)</b>	<b>(5,635,643.03)</b>	<b>(661,806.54)</b>	<b>(1,987,307.71)</b>
Lincoln Remainder of County	(305,121.66)	-	(345,770.58)	(57,754.41)	(385,255.91)
Capitan	(9,046.95)	(3,812.69)	(4,855.26)	(1,712.44)	(7,755.07)
Carrizozo	(11,254.97)	(6,820.34)	(13,220.87)	(2,130.38)	(7,440.65)
Corona	(6,152.90)	(2,175.14)	(5,633.09)	(1,164.64)	(3,991.46)
Ruidoso	(278,921.73)	(188,587.58)	(299,729.25)	(52,795.20)	(203,145.08)
Ruidoso Downs	(32,941.71)	(46,393.48)	(53,119.36)	(6,235.31)	(19,746.68)
<b>Lincoln Total</b>	<b>(643,439.91)</b>	<b>(247,789.22)</b>	<b>(722,328.40)</b>	<b>(121,792.38)</b>	<b>(627,334.86)</b>
Los Alamos Remainder of County	(183,691.51)	(82,982.90)	(233,713.72)	(28,228.30)	(67,374.31)
<b>Los Alamos Total</b>	<b>(183,691.51)</b>	<b>(82,982.90)</b>	<b>(233,713.72)</b>	<b>(28,228.30)</b>	<b>(67,374.31)</b>
Luna Remainder of County	(473,481.76)	-	(249,926.45)	(54,340.52)	(119,868.80)
Columbus	(15,611.80)	(8,859.86)	(8,240.66)	(1,791.73)	(2,634.90)
Deming	(290,182.34)	(161,228.74)	(153,172.20)	(33,303.63)	(48,975.92)
<b>Luna Total</b>	<b>(779,275.89)</b>	<b>(170,088.60)</b>	<b>(411,339.30)</b>	<b>(89,435.88)</b>	<b>(171,479.62)</b>
McKinley Remainder of County	(519,604.22)	-	(642,401.82)	(59,633.90)	(98,659.03)
Gallup	(325,031.92)	(239,563.61)	(515,689.89)	(37,303.24)	(54,857.71)
<b>McKinley Total</b>	<b>(844,636.14)</b>	<b>(239,563.61)</b>	<b>(1,158,091.71)</b>	<b>(96,937.14)</b>	<b>(153,516.74)</b>
Mora Remainder of County	(173,009.33)	-	(98,450.70)	(17,025.52)	(43,749.95)
Wagon Mound	(9,205.69)	(5,095.77)	(4,903.93)	(905.91)	(1,998.34)
<b>Mora Total</b>	<b>(182,215.02)</b>	<b>(5,095.77)</b>	<b>(103,354.62)</b>	<b>(17,931.43)</b>	<b>(45,748.29)</b>
Otero Remainder of County	(545,507.21)	-	(378,240.69)	(63,796.53)	(299,937.49)
Alamogordo	(363,337.91)	(271,386.46)	(239,329.99)	(42,492.01)	(104,417.86)
Cloudcroft	(36,186.47)	(6,923.63)	(18,689.13)	(4,231.97)	(5,902.98)
Tularosa	(23,753.12)	(15,625.71)	(8,245.88)	(2,777.90)	(14,469.61)
<b>Otero Total</b>	<b>(968,784.71)</b>	<b>(293,935.80)</b>	<b>(644,505.69)</b>	<b>(113,298.41)</b>	<b>(424,727.94)</b>
Quay Remainder of County	(176,377.41)	-	(125,715.03)	(24,847.03)	(74,141.78)
House	(1,079.69)	(835.88)	(722.93)	(152.10)	(390.09)
Logan	(19,463.14)	(15,422.94)	(10,538.00)	(2,741.86)	(11,035.97)
San Jon	(3,677.08)	(2,766.00)	(3,125.17)	(518.01)	(1,322.06)
Tucumcari	(80,623.16)	(63,887.22)	(88,548.52)	(11,357.73)	(29,229.45)
<b>Quay Total</b>	<b>(281,220.48)</b>	<b>(82,912.03)</b>	<b>(228,649.65)</b>	<b>(39,616.72)</b>	<b>(116,119.34)</b>
Rio Arriba Remainder of County	(723,232.99)	-	(510,178.37)	(73,716.32)	(240,644.04)
Chama	(42,154.45)	(13,294.31)	(40,328.38)	(4,296.64)	(4,928.50)
Espanola	(162,711.18)	(93,287.90)	(142,090.28)	(16,584.52)	(49,302.35)
<b>Rio Arriba Total</b>	<b>(928,098.62)</b>	<b>(106,582.21)</b>	<b>(692,597.03)</b>	<b>(94,597.48)</b>	<b>(294,874.89)</b>
Roosevelt Remainder of County	(754,139.38)	-	(289,182.22)	(86,551.02)	(135,254.15)
Causey	(1,787.83)	(335.69)	(902.06)	(205.19)	(301.74)
Dora	(972.49)	(182.60)	(490.67)	(111.61)	(164.13)

Estimated Pre-Yield Control Impacts by Locality, 2030					
	Public School/Higer				
	County	Municipal	Ed./Hospital	State GO	Other
Elida	(3,058.34)	(489.85)	(129.04)	(351.00)	(516.18)
Floyd	(614.57)	(115.39)	(21.37)	(70.53)	(86.92)
Portales	(114,110.36)	(45,210.81)	(62,303.29)	(13,096.21)	(31,296.09)
<b>Roosevelt Total</b>	<b>(874,682.96)</b>	<b>(46,334.34)</b>	<b>(353,028.66)</b>	<b>(100,385.55)</b>	<b>(167,619.21)</b>
San Juan Remainder of County	(1,522,163.47)	-	(1,922,716.31)	(243,546.15)	(957,172.20)
Aztec	(63,516.04)	(50,371.96)	(41,815.97)	(10,162.57)	(89,677.18)
Bloomfield	(98,173.95)	(80,849.13)	(113,714.31)	(15,707.83)	(88,073.58)
Farmington	(681,727.42)	(171,314.09)	(870,686.22)	(109,076.39)	(331,159.12)
Kirtland	(23,414.21)	-	(34,157.20)	(3,746.27)	(5,509.23)
<b>San Juan Total</b>	<b>(2,388,995.08)</b>	<b>(302,535.18)</b>	<b>(2,983,090.00)</b>	<b>(382,239.21)</b>	<b>(1,471,591.31)</b>
San Miguel Remainder of County	(305,320.07)	-	(241,679.52)	(35,040.95)	(95,976.14)
Las Vegas	(172,126.15)	(111,119.41)	(198,460.72)	(19,754.56)	(50,838.95)
Pecos	(9,313.54)	(1,365.99)	(2,125.22)	(1,068.90)	(2,357.86)
<b>San Miguel Total</b>	<b>(486,759.76)</b>	<b>(112,485.40)</b>	<b>(442,265.46)</b>	<b>(55,864.41)</b>	<b>(149,172.95)</b>
Sandoval Remainder of County	(1,061,587.31)	-	(1,394,264.26)	(173,133.32)	(835,941.13)
Bernalillo	(133,741.54)	(78,763.00)	(179,674.60)	(21,811.79)	(192,889.97)
Corrales	(94,329.75)	(102,182.28)	(118,694.22)	(15,903.86)	(181,157.78)
Cuba	(10,829.91)	(9,935.10)	(11,780.56)	(1,766.24)	(7,689.64)
Edgewood	(2,305.58)	(796.82)	(3,097.43)	(376.02)	(514.26)
Jemez Springs	(10,235.34)	(5,439.86)	(11,703.32)	(1,669.27)	(5,183.34)
Rio Rancho	(821,379.89)	(971,590.26)	(1,378,980.50)	(133,958.11)	(288,797.92)
San Ysidro	(3,645.34)	(3,344.15)	(4,168.16)	(594.52)	(1,846.06)
<b>Sandoval Total</b>	<b>(2,138,054.65)</b>	<b>(1,172,051.47)</b>	<b>(3,102,363.04)</b>	<b>(349,213.11)</b>	<b>(1,514,020.09)</b>
Santa Fe Remainder of County	(1,260,088.49)	-	(834,057.07)	(122,592.49)	(376,678.93)
Edgewood	(102,810.22)	(29,109.58)	(63,617.46)	(10,002.28)	(14,665.11)
Espanola	(27,795.79)	(15,211.23)	(15,686.46)	(2,704.22)	(6,092.45)
Santa Fe	(3,154,534.92)	(810,353.74)	(1,978,382.40)	(306,900.89)	(1,017,737.50)
<b>Santa Fe Total</b>	<b>(4,545,229.43)</b>	<b>(854,674.55)</b>	<b>(2,891,743.39)</b>	<b>(442,199.87)</b>	<b>(1,415,173.99)</b>
Sierra Remainder of County	(138,396.96)	-	(95,196.08)	(15,883.53)	(121,368.87)
Elephant Butte	(39,004.79)	(13,462.41)	(26,829.37)	(4,476.50)	(14,644.08)
T or C	(81,759.43)	(45,999.17)	(56,238.07)	(9,383.36)	(30,696.01)
Williamsburg	(2,750.06)	(473.43)	(1,891.62)	(315.62)	(1,032.49)
<b>Sierra Total</b>	<b>(261,911.24)</b>	<b>(59,935.01)</b>	<b>(180,155.15)</b>	<b>(30,059.01)</b>	<b>(167,741.45)</b>
Socorro Remainder of County	(262,022.57)	-	(198,768.62)	(28,094.50)	(156,685.39)
Magdalena	(8,311.37)	(1,437.65)	(5,738.81)	(891.16)	(3,976.80)
Socorro	(112,988.54)	(49,314.45)	(98,058.80)	(12,114.82)	(100,535.21)
<b>Socorro Total</b>	<b>(383,322.48)</b>	<b>(50,752.10)</b>	<b>(302,566.22)</b>	<b>(41,100.49)</b>	<b>(261,197.40)</b>
Taos Remainder of County	(657,188.23)	-	(341,726.79)	(75,424.13)	(226,460.96)
Questa	(36,619.21)	(16,146.45)	(11,483.29)	(4,202.71)	(10,389.35)
Red River	(81,224.23)	(64,444.74)	(25,470.82)	(9,321.94)	(23,044.38)
Taos	(364,694.61)	(130,028.25)	(169,544.52)	(41,855.25)	(509,587.62)
Taos SV	(145,188.10)	(77,213.12)	(67,497.15)	(16,662.94)	(49,131.16)
<b>Taos Total</b>	<b>(1,284,914.38)</b>	<b>(287,832.55)</b>	<b>(615,722.57)</b>	<b>(147,466.97)</b>	<b>(818,613.47)</b>
Torrance Remainder of County	(550,207.93)	-	(215,988.94)	(62,144.57)	(234,102.26)
Encino	(37,030.07)	(5,111.20)	(12,390.51)	(4,182.45)	(11,224.96)
Estancia	(38,266.90)	(8,739.64)	(19,185.89)	(4,322.15)	(9,534.15)
Moriarty	(71,533.54)	(13,147.06)	(51,388.19)	(8,079.53)	(11,846.02)
Mountainair	(9,699.62)	(5,435.04)	(757.22)	(1,095.55)	(4,076.88)
Willard	(2,582.43)	(1,120.60)	(1,294.75)	(291.68)	(643.41)
<b>Torrance Total</b>	<b>(709,320.50)</b>	<b>(33,553.54)</b>	<b>(301,005.50)</b>	<b>(80,115.93)</b>	<b>(271,427.68)</b>
Union Remainder of County	(236,500.89)	-	(203,144.62)	(27,142.72)	(86,996.40)
Clayton	(43,743.97)	(17,080.45)	(32,101.06)	(5,020.41)	(11,646.60)
Des Moines	(3,302.88)	(1,376.34)	(2,897.62)	(379.07)	(1,279.07)
Folsom	(1,866.36)	(854.43)	(1,637.36)	(214.20)	(722.76)
Grenville	(1,523.87)	(983.76)	(1,336.89)	(174.89)	(590.13)
<b>Union Total</b>	<b>(286,937.98)</b>	<b>(20,294.99)</b>	<b>(241,117.55)</b>	<b>(32,931.28)</b>	<b>(101,234.96)</b>
Valencia Remainder of County	(616,081.44)	-	(553,082.37)	(69,291.33)	(473,129.86)
Belen	(218,971.88)	(155,844.52)	(191,301.60)	(24,628.00)	(197,965.64)

	Estimated Pre-Yield Control Impacts by Locality, 2030				
	Public School/Higer				
	County	Municipal	Ed./Hospital	State GO	Other
Bosque Farms	(39,999.01)	(8,398.73)	(36,873.05)	(4,498.73)	(37,402.31)
Los Lunas	(485,653.69)	(331,105.61)	(447,699.44)	(54,621.98)	(454,125.56)
Peralta	(17,682.24)	(3,720.11)	(16,300.36)	(1,988.74)	(16,534.33)
Rio Communities	(27,749.39)	(5,610.92)	(24,242.85)	(3,121.00)	(8,259.18)
<b>Valencia Total</b>	<b>(1,406,137.64)</b>	<b>(504,679.90)</b>	<b>(1,269,499.68)</b>	<b>(158,149.78)</b>	<b>(1,187,416.89)</b>