

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

Current FIRs (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) are available on the NM Legislative Website (legis.state.nm.us). Adobe PDF versions include all attachments, whereas HTML versions may not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

	ORIGINAL DATE	1-26-06		
SPONSOR	<u>Lujan, B.</u>	LAST UPDATED	<u>2-10-06</u>	HB <u>112/aHGUAC/aHAFC/aHFL#1</u>
SHORT TITLE	<u>Family Opportunity Accounts</u>			SB _____
		ANALYST	<u>Lucero</u>	

Duplicates SB279, Relates to SB067, Conflicts with, Companion to

Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act – Special Appropriations – Executive recommends \$2,000.0, LFC recommends \$500.0, HAFC recommends \$1,000.0, SFC recommends \$1,500.0

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Responses Received From

Office of Workforce Training and Development (OWTD)

Children, Youth and Families Department (CYFD)

Human Services Department (HSD)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of HB 112/a HFL#1

This House Floor Amendment #1 contains four items:

1. Item numbered 1, reverses the House Government and Urban Affairs Committee (HGUAC) amendment 4 and 5 which deleted certain language and inserted new language to make all public funds, not just federal, available for matching. This item is inconsequential because item number four below, deletes this whole paragraph.
2. Item numbered 2, deletes certain language. The revision attempts to improve the definition of “indigent”. The revised definition is more inclusive than exclusive.
3. Item numbered 3, on page 4 line 2, deletes the word “other” and inserts the word “basic”. This language restores some of the eligibility limitation; however, the language remains somewhat vague.
4. Item numbered 4, deletes paragraph 2 on page 15 line 22. This removes the language which was giving preference to family opportunity account programs which had the ability to match state funds with other funds. The removal of this paragraph opens the opportunity to more vendors/providers in more areas of the state, especially rural areas.

Although the language concerning the definition of “indigent” has improved, there still remains some question concerning who is eligible to participate. The original change in eligibility criteria is due to a narrow interpretation of the “anti-donation clause” by attorneys at DFA. Questions pertaining to the “anti-donation” clause may need to be investigated further, perhaps by the Attorney General. This bill has not been reviewed by the Judiciary committee; therefore, the

DFA attorney's anti-donation interpretation hasn't been reviewed by another legal authority.

The administrative allocation which was changed from ten percent to five percent is not sufficient to adequately administer the program. Currently, HAFC substitute for HB2 contains a non-recurring appropriation of \$500.0, which will allow for \$25.0 for administering the program.

Synopsis of HB 112/a HAFC

This House Appropriations and Finance Committee amendment removes the \$2,000.0 appropriation in the bill. The amendment strikes the word "Making an Appropriation" and Section 18 which was the appropriation amount and language.

Synopsis of HB 112/a HGUAC

This House Government and Urban Affairs Committee amendment allows other local governmental entities to provide the matching funds, not just the federal or state government. This will allow local municipalities and counties to provide matching funds. The amendment also makes one technical correction for an item which was marked as new material incorrectly.

SB379 which is the duplicate of this bill, must include the same amendment if it is continue to be the companion bill.

If this amendment is not passed – only state funds or federal funds will be able to be used for matching portions of the accounts – this amendment allows other sources of matching funds to be utilized – such as HUD monies from the county and municipalities.

Synopsis of original bill

House Bill 112 appropriates \$2,000.0 from the GENERAL FUND to the family opportunity fund for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of the Family Opportunity Accounts Act
The bill amends the Individual Development Account Act to be entitled the Family Opportunity Accounts Act, changes the eligibility requirements removing the earned income requirement being less than 200% of federal poverty and replaces it with a newly defined requirement of indigence, establishes criteria for program administrators, creates the Family Opportunity Accounts Council charged with the oversight administration of the Act, and adds language for approval of the Family Opportunity Accounts Programs.

The bill creates the family opportunity fund in the state treasury. The provisions of the Individual Development Account Act currently are administered by the Office of Workforce Training and Development, which would continue to administer the provisions of this bill.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The appropriation of \$2,000.0 contained in this bill is a RECURRING expense to the family opportunity fund. The family opportunity fund is non-reverting.

This bill creates a new fund and provides for continuing appropriations. The LFC has concerns with including continuing appropriation language in the statutory provisions for newly created funds, as earmarking reduces the ability of the legislature to establish spending priorities.

Funds used for allowable purposes do not impact Medicaid income eligibility.

The state matching funds have been capped at \$2,000 per year per individual.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The eligibility criterion is being changed significantly. The current statute uses an income standard of 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL). This proposes to change the eligibility requirement to a definition of “indigent” mostly derived from a New Mexico Supreme Court ruling in Humana of New Mexico, Inc vs. Board of County Commissioners of the County of Lea, New Mexico.

1. FPL is a cut and dry eligibility standard which works well for almost all social programs
 2. The definition of indigent is vague and may allow individuals with income levels higher than 200% participate. An individual who earns an adequate living but is in debt and unable to pay the costs to purchase a home, car, or start a business may qualify.
 3. The change in eligibility criteria is due to a narrow interpretation of the “anti-donation clause” by DFA.
 4. Questions pertaining to the “anti-donation” clause may need to be investigated further.
- Reduces the amount available for administration from 10% to 5%. Depending on the size of the appropriation, this may be a significant issue for OWTD. OWTD needs a sufficient amount of administrative budget to administer and monitor these accounts, as well as provide for the financial training programming. The statute requires a nine member advisory council which meets twice a year with per diem and mileage reimbursement.
 - The responsibility to provide the financial training has been passed to the program administrator. It is unclear if the program administrator will also take an additional administrative allocation for providing the training or if it is a component of the 10% or 5% OWTD allocation.
 - The financial training curriculum has not been addressed. There should be a minimum amount of class or course hours required taught by a degreed instructor.
 - Clarifies the RFP process for selecting program administrators.
 - The bill adds language to guide the selection of program administrators to ensure geographically diverse populations are served. This may limit the ability of some non-profits to respond to the RFP if their population is concentrated such as Native Americans living on tribal lands or densely populated Hispanic locations.
 - Another program administrator preference is given to those which can ensure the highest possible match. This may limit rural area non-profits who do not have the expertise to obtain federal funds to match with state funds.
 - Another program administrator preference is given to one which will benefit families with children. Foster children who may be eligible to participate beginning at age 16, may be limited from participating in the program.
 - Counting money as a resource one year after withdrawal, if not approved by the program ad-

ministrator, is problematic for eligibility determination.

- HSD will need to amend state rules to mirror the new terminology, e.g., “family opportunity accounts” instead of IDA, indigent, etc.

After an account has been established, an account holder may be eligible to keep the account even after his/her income has increased.

This bill refers to childcare as a support category available for temporary assistance and a monthly maximum amount allowable.

Page 7 line 9 – 12 deletes language providing eligibility for a child in foster care at 200% of the federal poverty level and replaces it with “indigent” eligibility. The use of the definition of “indigent” in relation to a child in foster care may eliminate many foster children. Few children in foster care would qualify as being indigent as they do not typically have liabilities in excess of income.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

State general fund dollars used in matching family Opportunity Accounts might be credited toward the TANF Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement; however, under the federal Budget Reconciliation Bill for TANF reauthorization which is likely to pass this spring and become effective on October 1, 2006, families must be meeting the federal work participation rates. This might be difficult to track the credit for MOE for participants under the Family Opportunity Accounts Act. HSD may opt to exclude some or all of these general fund dollars from the MOE requirement.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

OWTD will need an employee responsible for RFP, monitoring and assessing the success of this program.

OWTD will be required to fund the financial training aspect of the IDA concept out of the administrative allocation.

A nine member advisory council which meets twice a year is entitled to per diem and mileage and the administrative support of OWTD staff. The proposed administrative allocation change to 5% may not be sufficient.

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

Relates to an appropriation in the General Appropriation Act – Special Appropriations – Executive recommends \$2,000.0, LFC recommends \$500.0,

This bill relates to SB067 which appropriates \$1,000.0 from the general fund for expenditure in 2007 – 2010 with no more than \$250.0 expended per year for the purpose of implementing the individual development account program. At the end of 2010, any unexpended or unencumbered balance shall revert to the general fund. SB067 does not change the current IDA statutes, it provides for phased-in funding.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The bill creates a family opportunity fund to carry out the provisions of the Family Opportunity Accounts Act. The language in this section states “... and money in the fund shall not be transferred to any other fund at the end of a fiscal year”. The Section 58-30-5 of the current statute allows 10% of the money appropriated for the Individual Development Account Act to be used to administer the act. Limiting the ability to transfer the 10% administrative allocation to the Office of Workforce Training and Development to one fiscal year reduces the Department’s ability to properly use the funds.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

HSD has identified a number of legal issues:

1. Section 58-30-2(J): The definition of “indigent” is vague and ambiguous and open to different interpretations that are or may be inconsistent with existing statutes and regulations governing the Department’s public assistance programs.
2. HB 112 allows the account holder to establish sub-accounts that, without more specific guidelines, could open the door to abuse of the program.
3. HB 112 would essentially require a retroactive determination of eligibility. If an improper withdrawal of account funds is not repaid within a given 12-month period, the withdrawn amount would then be countable as a resource. There is no retroactive denial in Medicaid, and ISD would have no way of retroactively determining eligibility in such a situation. (e. g., See Section 58-30-12.)
4. In Sections 58-30-(A) and (B), the financial eligibility standards have been removed without identifying what constitutes an eligible individual.
5. In Section 58-30-5(B), it is not clear whether the director may report orally to the governor or is required to submit a written annual report, which would be preferable.
6. Section 58-30-6 has been improperly amended. Language that appears in the original statute should be restated and lined out to indicate deletion. That step has been omitted.
7. The “family opportunity accounts council” should be defined in the Definitions Section (58-30-2).
8. Section 58-30-7(C) allows the office of workforce training and development to establish a matching amount exceeding the maximum two thousands dollars, without any stating any legal justification or program criteria.
9. In Section 58-30-8(A)(6), the use of the term “recipient” is ambiguous and confusing.
10. Section 58-30-10(B) allows money in a reserve account to be deposited into a family opportunity account, without proper safeguarding and tracking, in the event the director is unable to obtain and certify a new program administrator

ALTERNATIVES

Fund the IDA program as it currently exists in statute in a phased-in process. Additional legal council can be sought to determine if a conflict exists with the anti-donation clause, as well as, the best eligibility criteria to use.

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

If this bill is not passed – the original act (IDA’s) will continue to be an unfunded Act/Program. Federal money is continuing to be held unused because the Act requires matching funds for federal money to be spent. Also, if the changes in the original Act are not passed, but an appropriation alone is passed, the original bill may violate the anti-donation clause –which DFA has warned about.

DL/yr:nt:mt