

**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: Martinez DATE TYPED: 02/23/01 HB 670  
 SHORT TITLE: Statewide Low-Cost Spay and Neuter Services SB \_\_\_\_\_  
 ANALYST: Padilla

### APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY01	FY02	FY01	FY02		
	\$ 100.0			Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis ( ) Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Relates to House Capital Outlay Request 75, which requests \$150.0 for a mobile clinic van and surgical equipment for a spay and neuter program in Dona Ana county.

### SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

No response received:

Department of Finance and Administration (DFA)

### SUMMARY

#### Synopsis of Bill

House Bill 670 appropriates \$100.0 from the general fund to DFA’s Local Government Division for the purpose of contracting for statewide services to provide low-cost or no-cost cat or dog spaying or neutering.

#### Significant Issues

Many communities and non-profit organizations in the United States, including some in New Mexico, have different programs in place to provide low-cost spaying and neutering services. Costs of these programs to pet owners typically range from approximately 20 dollars for a small male cat to 90 dollars for a large female dog. If the program described in this bill were to provide “no-cost” services to low-income caretakers, approximately 1,820 dogs and cats could be served at an average cost of 55 dollars. That estimate does not include the cost of administering the program. If the program were to promote “low-cost” services, many more animals could benefit.

**FISCAL IMPLICATIONS**

The appropriation of \$100.0 contained in this bill is a recurring expense to the general fund. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of fiscal year 2002 shall revert to the general fund.

**OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES**

The appropriation of \$100.0 in this bill may be significantly less than what is required to administer a statewide program.

**POSSIBLE QUESTIONS**

1. What criteria would a contractor use to decide which counties and municipalities could benefit from the program?
2. Who would define what "low-income" means?

LP/njw