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

SPONSOR	HAGC	ORIGINAL DATE LAST UPDATED		HB _	CS/46/aHJC/aHFL#1
SHORT TITI	E Farmer Liability fo	r Certain Products		SB _	
			ANALY	ST	Hanika-Ortiz

APPROPRIATION (dollars in thousands)

Appropr	iation	Recurring	Fund Affected
FY11	FY12	or Non-Rec	
	NFI		

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

<u>Responses Received From</u> Administrative Office of the Courts (AOC) Attorney General's Office (AGO)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of HFL#1 Amendment

The House Floor Amendment #1 strikes HJC amendment #3 and portions of #5 and restores the term *genetically engineered product* as used in the title of the new section and definitions for *farmer, genetically engineered product* and *manufacturer* as used in the new section.

Synopsis of HJC Amendment

The House Judiciary Committee Amendment strikes definitions such as *technology use agreement* and redundant language relating to court jurisdiction. It is still unknown if a farmer is able to collect, use and/or store unintentionally acquired but contaminated seed.

Synopsis of Original Bill

The House Agriculture and Water Resources Committee Substitute for House Bill 46 protects farmers from liability to manufacturers of genetically engineered products in the event those products inadvertently grow on a farmer's land.

House Bill CS/46/aHJC/aHFL#1 – Page 2

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

There may be impact to the courts related to disputes as to whether the presence of certain plants or the release of certain products was *unintended*. These costs are unknown and are proportional to the number of infringement cases related to *unintended* or *de minimus* possession and the court's application of the act's definitions of *technology use agreement*.

Farmers in New Mexico could suffer losses if this technology contaminates their conventional, organic or premium crops.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The substitute bill addresses patent rights of seed manufacturers and extends farmer non-liability beyond unintentional possession to include de minimus possession. Unintentional or *de minimus* possession of seed stock can be caused by wind, insects, birds or other animals, or by contamination.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

The AG asserts that it is unknown if the State's attempt to limit liability in a patent may be preempted by federal authority.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

A manufacturer that files an infringement case against a farmer who does not have a technology use agreement must file suit in a federal district court where the farmer lives or where the farmer committed the alleged act.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The court venue requirement may be redundant as it already exists in law. A court must have jurisdiction over a person to hear a case against them.

The bill is not clear if a farmer is protected from saving and using seed that has been contaminated by genetically engineered varieties.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

Biotechnology companies have been patenting genetically engineered seeds that are herbicide resistant. Farmers who want to plant these seeds enter into contracts with the seed manufacturer. The contract specifies that these seeds cannot be saved or replanted. However, it is easy for these crops to cross-pollinate and contaminate neighboring fields. According to *Save New Mexico Seeds*, biotech companies have sued neighboring growers for patent infringement and investigated farmers each year for illegally saving seed. Most lawsuits have been settled out of court with the farmers signing confidentiality agreements.

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

The AG maintains that the bill provides an affirmative defense to farmers that they might not otherwise be able to assert.

QUESTIONS

Has the New Mexico Department of Agriculture developed best management practices for the use of genetically engineered products in New Mexico?

AHO/bym:mew:svb