

LESC bill analyses are available on the New Mexico Legislature website (www.nmlegis.gov). Bill analyses are prepared by LESC staff for standing education committees of the New Mexico Legislature. LESC does not assume any responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

LEGISLATIVE EDUCATION STUDY COMMITTEE
BILL ANALYSIS
53rd Legislature, 1st Session, 2017

Bill Number	<u>HJR1</u>	Sponsor	<u>Representatives Maestas, A. & Martínez, J.</u>
Tracking Number	<u>.205365.2</u>	Committee Referrals	<u>HEC/HLELC/HJC</u>
Short Title	<u>Permanent Funds for Early Childhood, CA</u>		
Analyst	<u>McCorquodale</u>	Original Date	<u>1/26/17</u>
		Last Updated	<u></u>

BILL SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

House Joint Resolution 1 (HJR1) amends Article XII, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of New Mexico to permanently increase annual distributions from the Land Grant Permanent Fund (LGPF) by 1 percent for the purposes of educational programs and early childhood educational services beginning in FY20.

FISCAL IMPACT

House joint resolutions do not carry appropriations.

Funding for early childhood education has remained flat since FY16. The Legislative Finance Committee's (LFC) and executive's FY18 public school support recommendation include \$21 million in general fund revenue and \$3.5 million in federal Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) funds for prekindergarten programs. Since FY12, the Legislature has appropriated \$100 million for state-funded prekindergarten programs.

HJR1 would amend Article XII, Section 7 of the Constitution of the State of New Mexico to permanently increase annual distributions for purposes of implementing and maintaining educational programs and funding for early childhood educational services provided by the state. The joint resolution proposes a 1 percent additional distribution if the average of the year-end market values of the LGPF for the immediately preceding five calendar years is at least \$12 billion dollars. The joint resolution proposes to split the additional distribution as follows:

- Beginning in FY20, an additional 0.7 percent distribution of funds to implement and maintain educational programs, and a 0.3 percent distribution of funds used for early childhood educational services;
- Beginning in FY21, the percentages for maintaining educational programs and early childhood educational services would flip; 0.3 percent distribution of funds to implement and maintain educational programs, and a 0.7 percent of the funds shall be used for early childhood educational services; and

- Beginning in FY22, and each subsequent fiscal year, a 1 percent distribution of funds for early childhood educational services.

According to the State Investment Council (SIC), FY20 projected LGPF distributions total \$767 million at the current 5 percent rate. This indicates the five-year average balance of the LGPF was approximately \$16.68 billion. If HJR1 were in place for FY20, projected total distributions for FY20 would be \$920.2 million consisting of:

- \$767 million for a base distribution to beneficiaries of 5 percent;
- \$91.1 million for an additional distribution of 0.7 percent to implement and maintain educational programs;
- \$39 million for an additional distribution of 0.3 percent for early childhood educational services; and
- \$23.2 million additional distribution to the other LGPF beneficiaries (see **Table 3**, page 4).

Based on **Table 1**, estimated LGPF revenue for the additional 1 percent distribution for FY21 and FY22 indicates a 3 percent increase.

Table 1
LGPF Estimated Revenue

Estimated Revenue			Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY20	FY21	FY22		
(\$153,372.70)	(\$158,329.70)	(\$163,140.90)	Recurring	LGPF
\$39,053.90	\$94,071.00	\$138,470.70	Recurring	General Fund (Early Childhood)
\$91,125.80	\$40,316.10	\$0.00	Recurring	General Fund (Educational)
\$23,193.00	\$23,942.60	\$24,670.20	Recurring	Other LGPF Beneficiaries

Parenthesis () indicate expenditure decreases.

Source: SIC

The SIC indicated the projection assumes annual inflows of \$400 million and investment returns of 7 percent with additional distributions of 1 percent beginning in FY20. The starting value of \$16.68 billion is projected for the end of 2018, which determines the distribution for FY20. **Table 2**, on page 3, demonstrates that after 12 years, the higher distribution rate will decrease the corpus of the fund, thus decreasing its value for each subsequent fiscal year. The SIC explained a reduction in the value of the corpus will result in a diminished capacity to participate in positive investment return environments.

**Table 2
LGPF End Year Values and Projections**

Calendar Year	Corresponding Fiscal Year	(\$B) LGPF Value Current (5%)	LGPF Distribution at 5%	(\$B) LGPF Value with HJR1 (6%)	LGPF Distribution at 6%
2018	2020	16.68	\$766,863,713	16.68	\$920,236,456
2019	2021	17.45	\$796,249,788	17.37	\$954,579,510
2020	2022	18.23	\$824,565,983	18	\$997,706,836
2021	2023	19.04	\$873,256,624	18.63	\$1,039,163,583
2022	2024	19.86	\$912,636,751	19.26	\$1,079,140,302
2023	2025	20.7	\$952,841,351	19.89	\$1,117,624,202
2024	2026	21.55	\$993,916,104	20.52	\$1,155,430,777
2025	2027	22.43	\$1,035,824,647	21.16	\$1,193,380,959
2026	2028	23.31	\$1,078,546,437	21.8	\$1,231,494,650
2027	2029	24.22	\$1,122,097,844	22.45	\$1,269,833,927
2028	2030	25.14	\$1,166,493,441	23.1	\$1,308,443,788
2029	2031	26.08	\$1,211,747,978	23.76	\$1,347,351,430

Source: SIC

The constitutional amendment requires approval by voters in a 2018 statewide election, in either a general election or a special statewide election. Section 1-16-13 NMSA 1978 requires the Secretary of State (SOS) to print the full text of each proposed constitutional amendment, in Spanish and English, in an amount equal to 10 percent of the registered voters in the state. The SOS is also constitutionally required to publish the full text of each proposed constitutional amendment once a week for four weeks preceding the election in newspapers in every county in the state. LFC staff estimate each constitutional amendment may cost up to fifty thousand dollars (\$50,000) in printing and advertising costs based on 2016 actual expenditures.

SUBSTANTIVE ISSUES

HJR1 defines “early childhood services” as nonsectarian services for children until they are eligible for kindergarten.

In Section G, page 5, the joint resolution outlines provisions requiring the use of additional funds to increase the availability and quality of early childhood education. The new distributions must not supplant existing funding for early childhood educational services. The provisions also include prioritizing distribution of funds in low-income communities to strengthen and expand early childhood educational services.

Additionally, provisions in HJR1 require school districts to contract only with early childhood educational providers that have employment standards comparable to public schools’ employment standards. Also, school districts must give preference to contractors in the procurement process that are locally owned; minority-owned; women-owned; partnering with public community schools; participating in programs that assist students to transition into kindergarten; or participating in programs intended to align early childhood education services with kindergarten through 12th grade public education. Provisions also require that early childhood educational services are not delivered by a state contractor for the New Mexico School for the Blind and Visually Impaired.

While HJR1 provides a list of requirements for the use of the additional funds, it does not specify a plan for deployment of funds and who will oversee how these funds are spent. Furthermore, HJR1 specifies that 1 percent of the additional annual LGPF distributions shall be used for implementing and maintaining educational programs and early childhood educational services, yet more than a quarter of the LGPF beneficiaries listed are either not educational facilities or have missions unrelated to educational programs or early childhood educational programs.

As a result, SIC indicated language in HJR1 would not allow these beneficiaries (University of New Mexico Saline Lands, New Mexico Technical Institute, New Mexico Military Institute, Division of Health Improvement Miners Hospital, New Mexico State Hospital, State Penitentiary, Charitable, Penal, and Reform Institutions, Water Reservoir, Improvement of the Rio Grande, Public Buildings, the Carrie Tingley Hospital) to legally have access to the additional 1 percent of the funds and could result in costly litigation, or these beneficiaries would have to essentially waive a portion of their share of the LGPF.

Table 3
FY17 Un-audited Land Grant Permanent Fund Balance and Income Distribution

Institutions	LGPF Ownership	January 1, 2017 Beginning Balance	Educational Programs	Early Educational Services
Public Schools	84.9%	\$12,877,298,118.78	Y	Y
New Mexico Military Institute	3.1%	\$465,472,748.12	Y	N
New Mexico School for the Deaf	1.9%	\$283,906,590.47	Y	Y
School for the Blind and Visually Impaired	1.9%	\$283,304,963.50	Y	Y
New Mexico State Penitentiary	1.9%	\$286,947,852.42	Y	N
University of New Mexico	1.3%	\$202,278,980.00	Y	Y
Public Buildings	1.1%	\$161,661,460.26	N	N
Water reservoir	1.0%	\$150,216,338.28	N	N
DHI Miners Hospital	0.9%	\$134,207,601.63	N	N
New Mexico State University	0.4%	\$64,291,707.02	Y	Y
New Mexico State Hospital	0.3%	\$50,292,346.95	N	N
Improvement of the Rio Grande	0.2%	\$33,607,280.26	N	N
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology	0.2%	\$28,641,032.21	Y	N
Eastern New Mexico University	0.1%	\$11,728,677.91	Y	Y
University of New Mexico Saline Lands	0.0%	\$6,786,545.47	N	N
Western NM University	0.0%	\$3,766,185.29	Y	Y
New Mexico Highlands University	0.0%	\$3,746,758.88	Y	?
New Mexico Boys School	0.0%	\$830,441.13	Y	N
Carrie Tingley Hospital	0.0%	\$209,386.54	N	N
Northern New Mexico Community College	0.0%	\$3,037,459.17	Y	?
Charitable, Penal, and Reform Institutions	0.8%	\$119,234,030.18	N	N
Total	100.0%	\$15,171,466,504.47	13	7

Source: SIC

The Department of Finance and Administration (DFA) stressed the LGPF is required by law to benefit public schools and other beneficiaries indefinitely. DFA said the LGPF is not and was never intended to be a “rainy day” fund. The LGPF is funded by income from non-renewable natural resources and was designed to provide a steady revenue source for future generations of New Mexico children even after those resources are exhausted

Early Childhood Issues. The Pew Charitable Trusts, a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization providing analysis to improve public policy, indicated high-quality prekindergarten increases a child’s chances of succeeding in school and in life. The foundation stated children who attend high-quality early learning programs are less likely to be retained, need special education services, and more likely to graduate from high school. Additionally, children who participate in

a high-quality prekindergarten program have higher-earning opportunities as an adult and are less likely to become dependent on welfare or be incarcerated.

While New Mexico has significantly heightened its focus on early childhood programs, the state is among the three lowest-ranked states in the Annie E. Casey Foundation’s annual *Kids Count Data Book*, which ranks states according to 16 child well-being measures, primarily because of the large number of children in need of services.

According to Volume I of the LFC Report for FY18, New Mexico has demonstrated leadership in increased investment in early care and education. LFC indicated early childhood funding has grown by more than 80 percent since FY12. However, improved leadership, coordination, and oversight are needed. LFC noted strategic investments, together with careful attention to implementation and monitoring performance, could improve the social and cognitive skills of children, with benefits extending throughout a child’s life.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

According to SIC, the resolution includes language that protects the fund from the burden of additional distributions during times of financial stress if the five-year average of the fund drops below \$12 billion at calendar end of any given year. The SIC indicates the resiliency of this protection renders itself ineffective. For example, the LGPF would have to lose more than \$12.5 billion next year (leaving the corpus value at \$2.5 billion), before the five-year average actually trips the proposed safety indicated in HJR1.

While HJR1 defines “early childhood educational services,” it is not clear what is included in “educational programs.”

ALTERNATIVES

Established in 2006, the Nebraska Early Childhood Education Endowment Fund, also known as Sixpence, is a public and private venture with the Nebraska Department of Education providing \$40 million from the Nebraska Permanent School Fund and another \$20 million from private donations. The \$40 million from the permanent school fund remains in the cash reserve fund for purposes of investment and the accrued interest is distributed to help fund early childhood educational services. The programs are administered through the Nebraska Children and Families Foundation.

Created in 1992, the Georgia Lottery proceeds are used to fund specific education programs that comprise tuition grants, scholarships or loans to undergraduate college students for attendance at eligible Georgia colleges, universities or technical colleges; the Georgia Pre-kindergarten Program for all four year olds; and capital outlay projects for schools, universities, colleges, and technical schools in the state.

RELATED BILLS

SB182, Early Childhood Land Grant Act, proposes to create an early childhood land grant permanent fund and the early childhood income fund.

SJR 3, Permanent Funds for Early Childhood, CA, proposes to increase the LGPF distribution by 1.5 percent to be used for early childhood education services.

HJR 2, Land Grant Fund for Economic Stimulus, CA, proposes to withdraw \$7 billion from the LGPF to provide economic stimulus programs to include \$1 billion for early childhood services.

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

- LESC Files
- Department of Finance and Administration
- Legislative Finance Committee
- State Investment Council

CMC/rab