

NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only 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 for other purposes.

The most recent FIR version (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR: Maes DATE TYPED: 01/28/03 HB _____

SHORT TITLE: Manufacturing Extension Services SB 11

ANALYST: Padilla

APPROPRIATION

Appropriation Contained		Estimated Additional Impact		Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY03	FY04	FY03	FY04		
\$400.0				Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates HB 88

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Responses Received From

Economic Development Department

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

Senate Bill 11 appropriates \$400.0 from the general fund to the Economic Development Department for expenditure in fiscal years 2003 and 2004 for the purpose of contracting for manufacturing extension services. Expenditure of the funds is contingent on the receipt of an unspecified amount of funds from the National Institute of Standards and Technology (NIST) for a NIST-approved manufacturing center in New Mexico. The bill contains an emergency clause.

Significant Issues

The only NIST-approved center for manufacturing extension services in New Mexico is the New Mexico Manufacturing Extension Partnership (MEP). The MEP is part of a nationwide system of centers intended to assist small manufacturers to become more competitive. According to EDD, NIST supports the MEP network and provides funds at a one-third match. The bill, however, does not specify the level of NIST contributions.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$400.0 contained in this bill is a recurring expense to the general fund. Any unexpended or unencumbered balance remaining at the end of fiscal year 2004 shall revert to the general fund.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

EDD believes there may be administrative implications to the agency for administration of the contract. In FY01, when EDD last managed a contract with the MEP, the agency did not have sufficient resources to conduct what it felt was an adequate audit. Via spot checks, EDD found two significant issues: 1) the MEP invoiced the department for services that were specifically excluded by the contract, and 2) the MEP initially invoiced the department for a 20 percent “management fee” on all the services it provided to small businesses.

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

Senate Bill 11 duplicates House Bill 88

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

According to EDD, the New Mexico MEP is managed by a Maine-based non-profit organization called MEP/MSI. The New Mexico MEP pays a fee to MEP/MSI for its services. EDD believes this arrangement is not ideal and does not allow for the best use of MEP resources in New Mexico.

LP/prr