

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 02/08/12
 LAST UPDATED 02/10/12 **HB** _____

SPONSOR Munoz

SHORT TITLE Federal Water Projects Gross Receipts **SB** 289/aSCORC/aSFC

ANALYST Walker-Moran

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY12	FY13	FY14		
\$0.0	\$0.0 to \$1,500.0	\$0.0 to \$1,500.0	Recurring	Local Governments
\$0.0	NFI	NFI	Recurring	General Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Revenue Decreases)

Duplicates HB 277

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Responses Received From

Taxation and Revenue Department (TRD)
 Office of the State Engineer (OSE)
 Department of Finance and Administration (DFA)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of SFC Amendment

The Senate Finance Committee amendment to Senate Bill 289 also changes language in the bill to state that a municipality shall dedicate the revenue from this tax for the repayment of loan obligations to the federal government for the construction, expansion, operation and maintenance of a water delivery system, rather than that they may dedicate it for this purpose. It reinstated the language that SCORC had removed stating that the revenue from the federal water project gross receipts tax shall not be dedicated to repay revenue bonds or any other form of bonds, and restates that restriction in another way. SFC also added language to define a “municipality” as one in a class B county that has a population between 20,000 and 25,000.

Synopsis of SCORC Amendment

The Senate Corporations and Transportation Committee amendment to Senate Bill 289 changes language in the bill to state that a municipality shall dedicate the revenue from this tax for the repayment of loan obligations to the federal government for the construction, expansion, operation and maintenance of a water delivery system, rather than that they may dedicate it for

this purpose. It also removes the language stating that the revenue from the federal water project gross receipts tax shall not be dedicated to repay revenue bonds or any other form of bonds, and restates that restriction in another way.

Synopsis of Original Bill

Senate Bill 289 enacts a new section of the Municipal Local Option Gross Receipts Taxes Act. The new section imposes the “Federal Water Project Gross Receipts Tax”. A majority of the members of the governing body of a municipality may enact an ordinance imposing an excise tax on any person engaging in business in the municipality. The rate shall not exceed 0.25 percent of the gross receipts. This ordinance goes into effect January 1 or July 1 following an election in which a majority of voters in the municipality vote in favor of imposing the tax. If this tax is imposed then the municipality shall not also impose a municipal capital outlay gross receipts tax.

The revenue from this tax can be dedicated to the repayment of loan obligations to the federal government for the construction, expansion, operation and maintenance of a water delivery system and for the expansion, operation and maintenance of that water delivery system after the loan obligation to the federal government is retired or repaid. The revenue cannot be used to repay revenue bonds or any other form of bonds.

The effective date of this bill is July 1, 2012. There is no sunset date. The LFC recommends adding a sunset date.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

This bill will generate revenue for municipalities or local government if approved by voters in an election. This bill has no fiscal impact on the general fund or any other State funds.

SFC Amendment: This bill, as amended, intends to restrict this federal water project gross receipts tax to Gallup which has the population 21,678 and is located in McKinley County (class B). The revenue of the City of Gallup would increase by approximately \$1.5 million each year if Gallup voters approved the whole .25% authority. This estimate is based on the taxable gross receipts in RP-80 reports of the last three fiscal years multiplied by a tax rate of 0.25%.

Per the OSE, in defining the term “municipality” as it pertains to this bill, the amendment significantly limits the number of municipalities that could seek to enact the tax. The City of Gallup is the only city with a population level that falls within the specified population range.

Original Bill: According to the TRD, the bill would impose no fiscal impacts on the State of New Mexico. However, this bill would generate revenue to local governments if voters approved it. Albuquerque, Santa Fe, Taos, Gallup and, perhaps, other municipalities in the state might impose the federal water project gross receipts tax under this bill. The amendment restricts the use of the funds. But there are still no restrictions on the entities eligible to impose the tax. The only criterion is that the imposition must be put to the voters for approval. Of the four municipalities mentioned above, Santa Fe would lose the municipal capital outlay gross receipts tax if it imposed the federal water project gross receipts tax. The estimate is based on the taxable gross receipts in RP-80 reports of last three fiscal years for the four municipalities mentioned with a tax rate 0.25%.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The SCORC amendment addresses policy issue 1. According to the TRD, the key policy issues here are (1) although named as “federal water project gross receipts tax”, in fact, there is no restriction on the use of the funds for the named purpose. This is quite unusual. Of course, an ordinance enacted by a municipality asking the voters to approve the tax would have to declare how the funds were to be used. (2) With average gross receipts rates statewide approaching 7 percent and the peak rate at 8.6875 percent (Taos Ski Valley), further gross receipts tax increases might be slow to receive voter approval.

According to the OSE, if passed the revenues from the Federal Water Project Gross Receipts Tax will provide the City of Gallup with the ability to generate the revenue necessary to develop a renewable water supply as Gallup groundwater supply is finite and is being exhausted.

The DFA reports that the NM Municipal League (NNML) is not taking an active position on this bill; however, the NNML does not take issue with the proposal.

ADMINISTRATIVE IMPLICATIONS

According to the TRD, this bill will have a low impact (60 hours) on the staffing resources of the Department’s information systems team and a low impact on the distribution process.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

The TRD identified that on Page 2, line 5, “may” should be replaced by “shall” to limit the revenue only for the repayment of loan obligations to the federal government on the water project. The SCORC and SFC amendments make this change.

The rate is expressed as “not to exceed one-fourth percent.” In the usual practice, this is expressed as “the tax may be imposed of increments of one-sixteenth of one percent not to exceed an aggregate rate of one-fourth of one percent,” allowing the adopting municipalities maximum flexibility but minimizing the administrative problem of having to reprogram the GRT processing system for each new enactment.

OTHER SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

According to the TRD, the municipal capital outlay gross receipts tax (Section 7-19D-12 NMSA 1978) is virtually identical to this authorization, except that the MCOGRT can be enacted in increments of 1/16 percent to a maximum of .25 percent (the same as this authorization) and the proceeds of the MCOGRT are restricted to infrastructure, but cannot be used to repay loans to federal government for water projects. Since this standalone municipal gross receipts tax is an either/or authority, a more artful way of drafting for this purpose would be to include repayment of water loans to the federal government in the allowed purposes of the municipal capital outlay gross receipts tax (Section 7-19D-12(C) NMSA 1978). This would also address the two technical issues identified above.

Does the bill meet the Legislative Finance Committee tax policy principles?

1. **Adequacy:** Revenue should be adequate to fund needed government services.
2. **Efficiency:** Tax base should be as broad as possible and avoid excess reliance on one tax.
3. **Equity:** Different taxpayers should be treated fairly.
4. **Simplicity:** Collection should be simple and easily understood.
5. **Accountability:** Preferences should be easy to monitor and evaluate