

AGENCY BILL ANALYSIS - 2026 REGULAR SESSION

WITHIN 24 HOURS OF BILL POSTING, UPLOAD ANALYSIS TO
AgencyAnalysis.nmlegis.gov and email to billanalysis@dfa.nm.gov
(Analysis must be uploaded as a PDF)

SECTION I: GENERAL INFORMATION

{Indicate if analysis is on an original bill, amendment, substitute or a correction of a previous bill}

Date Prepared: 1/21/2026 **Check all that apply:**
Bill Number: HB110 **Original** **Correct**
Amendment **Substit**

Sponsor: Parajon
Short Title: Housing Development Data Reporting

Agency Name and Code Number: Municipal League (ML)
Person Writing Jacob Rowberry
Phone: 505-992-3538 **Email** jrowberry@nmml.org

SECTION II: FISCAL IMPACT

ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT (dollars in thousands)

	FY26	FY27	FY28	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
Total		Indeterminate	Indeterminate	Indeterminate	Recurring	Municipalities

(Parenthesis () Indicate Expenditure Decreases)

Duplicates/Conflicts with/Companion to/Relates to:
Duplicates/Relates to Appropriation in the General Appropriation Act

SECTION III: NARRATIVE

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis:

House Bill 110 requires Class A counties and municipalities with populations greater than 30,000 to report quarterly on residential development plans and building permits. The bill specifies the reporting metrics to be collected and reported. The covered counties and municipalities must publish quarterly to their website, as well as submit the report to the Economic Development Department and the Legislative Finance Committee.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Local governments would incur additional costs to comply with the provisions of HB110. Additional staff would likely be needed to standardize, track, and maintain the mandated reporting data, as well as support the quarterly reporting. Local governments may also incur costs related to

standing up appropriate systems (software, technology, etc.) to accurately capture and maintain the necessary reporting data.

Note: major assumptions underlying fiscal impact should be documented.

Note: if additional operating budget impact is estimated, assumptions and calculations should be reported in this section.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

House Bill 110 does not identify how the reported data will be used to improve housing outcomes or inform specific policy decisions. Instead, HB 110 adds an administrative and regulatory burden on local government staff. These additional requirements are likely to slow, rather than streamline, the residential development plan and building permit process, as staff would need to dedicate time and resources to data collection and reporting at the expense of reviewing and issuing permits.

Additionally, the reported data may be difficult to interpret, as planning review timelines vary widely by project type, making cross-jurisdiction comparisons misleading without significant contextual analysis. There is also concern that local governments' reporting metrics could be adversely impacted by delays that shouldn't be attributed to the local government—such as applicant revisions, required approvals from other entities, or infrastructure constraints like water and wastewater availability.

HB110 also creates an unfunded mandate for local governments by requiring new data collection and reporting without an accompanying appropriation. Local governments would likely incur additional costs for staff time, training, and new or upgraded information systems to accurately capture and maintain required data. Unfunded mandates place additional financial strain on local government budgets and may divert resources from providing core municipal services.

PERFORMANCE IMPLICATIONS

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

CONFLICT, DUPLICATION, COMPANIONSHIP, RELATIONSHIP

TECHNICAL ISSUES

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

ALTERNATIVES

WHAT WILL BE THE CONSEQUENCES OF NOT ENACTING THIS BILL

AMENDMENTS