MONTANA SENATE<br>5lst LEGISLATURE - REGULAR SESSION

COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Call to Order: By Senator Bob Brown, Chairman, on April 4, 1989, at 8:00 a.m.

ROLL CALL
Members Present: Senator Brown, Senator Hager, Senator Norman, Senator Eck, Senator Bishop, Senator Walker, Senator Halligan, Senator Harp, Senator Gage, Senator Severson, Senator Mazurek, Senator Crippen

Members Excused: None
Members Absent: None
Staff Present: Jill Rohyans, Committee Secretary Jeff Martin, Legislative Council

Announcements/Discussion: None

HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 163

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Representative Campbell, District 48 , sponsor, said the bill eliminates a variety of nuisance taxes. The collection procedures do not produce enough revenue to cover the cost of administration. Those taxes being stricken are the rural electric and telephone co-op tax, camper decal fee, express company license tax, sleeping car tax, store license tax, coal retailer's license, and the cement and gypsum producer's license tax. He submitted proposed amendments to the bill proposed by Director Nordtvedt (Exhibit \#1).

## List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:

Mike Strawbridge, Vice President and General Manager,
Montana Division of Ideal Cement, Trident
Charles Brooks, Executive Vice President, Montana Retail Association

## List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:

None

## Testimony:

Mike Strawbridge, Ideal Cement, presented his testimony in support of the bill (Exhibit \#2).

Charles Brooks, Montana Retail Association, said his organization supports the elimination of store licenses. They feel the store license represents a duplicate tax as cities and counties now require licenses for retail stores and the control of the licenses is best left to them. He said it is not efficient for the Department of Revenue to administer this tax.

Questions From Committee Members: None
Closing by Sponsor:
Representative Campbell noted in closing that he would like to see the micaceous mineral mines license tax restored. The W.R. Grace Company mines vermiculite and this is the only company covered under the micaceous mineral mines tax. He urged the committee to also consider the amendments proposed by the Department of Revenue.

## HEARING ON HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 13

Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:
Representative Bob Ream, District 54, sponsor, said the resolution contains the official revenue estimate for the 1990-1991 biennium. He submitted a copy of the report of the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee (Exhibit \#3). He noted natural gas production is now higher than estimated on table 3, page 13. The natural gas severance tax estimate of 1.100 is now at l.15. He said the income tax revenues are also running higher than anticipated. Representative Ream believed things look good for the coming biennium.

## List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:

None

## List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:

None

## Testimony:

None

## Questions From Committee Members:

Senator Harp asked Terry Johnson to comment on the effect of federal tax reform.

Terry Johnson said 1987 is the first year of data available on the effects of federal tax reform on the state. Based on that data, it appears federal tax reform is bringing in more revenue than was originally anticipated. The base, as defined by federal tax reform, has been expanded, and there are other options in the area of capital gains and various deductions that are phased. He felt by fiscal year 1991 the total impact of the completely phased in federal tax reform will be understood.

Senator Harp asked about reserves such as the Common School Trust Account.

Terry Johnson replied the Common School Trust Account has a balance of approximately $\$ 225$ million. That figure is somewhat misleading as it includes land asset values, therefore the actual cash amount is about $\$ 170-\$ 180$ million.

Senator Harp asked if that money is ever used, and if so, what for.

Mr. Johnson said the investment of the Common School Trust Account is $95 \%$ utilized for the school foundation program and the other $5 \%$ reverts back to the trust account.

## Closing by Sponsor:

Representative Ream closed by suggesting changing the resolution in the areas of natural gas production, the final values for metalliferous mines, and the freight license tax. He said he felt Terry Johnson and Judy Waldron could provide the committee with the final figures on those three items. Other than those specific figures, he felt everything is right on target for the coming biennium.

HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 690

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Representative Gary Spaeth, District 90, sponsor, said the bill provides that a title plant will not be considered as taxable property and disallows depreciation or amortization of a title fund for income tax purposes. The Department of Revenue and title companies of the state have been fighting over DOR imposed rules for a number of years. In 1986 the Supreme Court ruled that the rules were invalid and that the assets of the title plant are intangible property and thus not taxable. He pointed out the bill is not dealing with the actual furnishings of the plant but with the microfiche or the records of the company. They obviously have some value, but the question becomes how much is a piece of microfiche blank worth compared to a piece with something on it. There are no guidelines with which to arbitrate since the Supreme Court decision. He said there are less than $\$ 50,000$ in property taxes collected statewide on title plants and so it would seem better to just eliminate the assessment altogether than go to litigation and the expense involved to reach a resolution.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:
Gene Phillips, Montana Land Title Association
List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:
None

## Testimony:

Gene Phillips, Montana Land Title Association, said the Association asked for the bill and requested Representative Spaeth carry it. He said they are trying to determine just what the value of a title plant is in terms of what in contained in the microfiche. He pointed out that value can vary a great deal between counties such as Yellowstone and Treasure. The bill will prohibit the use of the title plant as a deduction for income tax purposes and prevents the state from taxing the plant as personal property.

Questions From Committee Members: none
Closing by Sponsor: Representative Spaeth closed.

HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 766

## Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:

Representative Driscoll, District 92, said the bill classifies all machinery and equipment used in a malting barley facility as class six property which would be a rate of $4 \%$. He pointed out there are no malting barley plants in Montana presently, however, attempts are being made to entice Anheuser Busch to locate a plant here and the bill is intended to be an inducement to them. He said the plant would be valued at about $\$ 50$ million and at the $4 \%$ rate would pay \$657,000 in taxes.

List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:
None
List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:
None
Testimony:
None

## Questions From Committee Members:

Senator Crippen asked what the rate would be without this bill.

Representative Driscoll replied they would be taxed at $11 \%$. Closing by Sponsor: Representative Driscoll closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION
DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 690
Discussion: None

## Amendments and Votes:

Senator Mazurek MOVED to amend the bill in the title and the body with an applicability date applying to taxable years beginning after December 31, 1989.

The motion CARRIED unanimously.
Recommendation and Vote:
Senator Eck MOVED HB 690 Be Concurred In As Amended.
The motion CARRIED unanimously.

DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 163
Discussion:
Senator Brown asked Director Nordtvedt to address the fiscal note.

Director Nordtvedt, DOR, said there are a number of taxes in the bill and they are all raising revenue very inefficiently. The total amount is budgeted for in the DOR budget.

Senator Mazurek asked Director Nordtvedt why the language eliminating the micaceous mineral mines license tax was stricken in the House.

Director Nordtvedt said he had no idea. This is also tax that was budgeted for in the planned elimination of a number of nuisance taxes.

Senator Harp said he had questioned the sponsor about this and he had no idea why the House Taxation Committee had taken the action. He said there is only one plant in the state affected by the tax, the W. R. Grace Company in Libby. The sponsor had indicated that he would like to have it put back in the bill.

Senator Eck asked if it is not cost effective to spend $\$ 14,000$ to collect $\$ 500,000$.

Director Nordtvedt said this is a relative issue. He pointed out the FTE time spent in this area could be producing a great deal more revenue in another area. He also said the elimination of the nuisance taxes is done because of the benefit to the taxpayer, not to the state.

Amendments and Votes:
Senator Mazurek MOVED to reinsert the stricken language re micaceous mineral mines in the bill.

The motion CARRIED unanimously.
Senator Eck MOVED to amend the bill according to the proposed amendments in Exhibit \#l.

The motion CARRIED unanimously.
Recommendation and Vote:
Senator Harp MOVED that HB 163 Be Concurred In As Amended.
The motion CARRIED unanimously.
HEARING ON HOUSE BILL 588
Presentation and Opening Statement by Sponsor:
Representative Menahan, District 67, sponsor, said the billwas passed two years ago, however, anyone who had acanoe or raft or personal watercraft under 12 feet inlength was not included in the fee process and stillhad to pay the tax. This bill simply includes thesevehicles in the fee process and also provides for aregistration system for water vehicles which providesprotection for the owner in case of theft.Representative Menahan said he had worked people fromthe Flathead Lake area and Gates of the Mountains toensure the boatowners concerns were addressed in thebill.
List of Testifying Proponents and What Group they Represent:None
List of Testifying Opponents and What Group They Represent:
None
Testimony:
None
Questions From Committee Members:
Senator Eck asked what advantages there are to boatregistration.
Representative Menahan replied there are several advantages:the safety aspect, i.e. drinking, wrecks, and the Fishand Game Department's ability to exercise some controlin that area. Also boats are used for a limited time.Therefore, a one-time fee is better than an ad valoremtax. There is also the benefit to the owner of aregistration in case of theft.
Closing by Sponsor: Representative Menahan closed.

## EXECUTIVE SESSION DISPOSITION OF HOUSE BILL 588

Discussion: None
Amendments and Votes: None
Recommendation and Vote:
Senator Bishop MOVED HB 588 Be Concurred In.
The motion CARRIED with Senators Severson and Gage voting no.

ADJOURNMENT
Adjournment At: 10:00 a.m.
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MR. PRESIDENT:
We, your comittee on Taxation, having had under consideration HB 163 (third reading copy - blue), respectfully report that $H B$ 163 be amended and as so amended be concurred in:

1. Title, line 5.

Following: "INCLUDING"
InEert: "THE LIQUOR EXCISE TAX PAID BY PRSSENGER CARRIERS,"
2. Title, line 7.

Following: "聖A为;"
InEert: "THE HICACEOUS MINERAL HINES LICENSE TAX,"
3. Title, line 11.

Following: ":"
Incert: "EXEHPTING PASSENGER CARRIERS FROM PURCHASING LIQUOR FROM HONTANA STATE LIQUOR STORES; ELIMINATING THE REPORTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE SHIPHENT OF BEER AND WINE BY COHMON CARRIERS; "
4. Title, line 12.

Following: "SECTIONS"
Inestr: "16-6-303."
Following: "35-18-503"
Insert:","
5. Title, line 13.

Insert: "TITLE 15, ChAETER 37, FART 2;"
6. Title, line 14.

Following: "23-2-715\%"
Insert: $16-1-402,16-1-403,16-3-235,16-3-405$, "

## 7. Page 1.

Following: line 18
Insert: "Section 1. Section 16-6-303. MCA, is amended to read: "16-6-363. Sale of liquor not: purchased from state store forbidden -- penalty. It Except for a passenger carrier iseued a license pursuant to $16-4-302$, it is unlawful for any licensee to sell or keep for sale or have on his premises for any purpose whatever any liquor except that purchased from the state liquor store, and any licence e found in possession of or selling and keeping for sale any liquor which was not purchased from a fate liquor store shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than $\$ 500$ or more than \$1,500, by imprisonment for not less than 3 months or more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment. If the department is satisfied that any such liquor was knowingly sold or kept for sale within the licensed premises by the licensee or by his agents, servants, or employees, the department shall immediately revoke the license.""
Renumber: subsequent sections

```
8. Page 2, line 14.
Following: "port-z;"
Insert: "Title 15, chapter 37, part 2;"
```

9. Page 2, lie 15.

Following: "83-2-745,"
Insert: "16-1-402, 16-1-403, 16-3-325, 16-3-406,"

## SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

MR. PRESIDENT:
He, your committee on Taxation, having fad under consideration HB 588 (third reading copy -- blue), respectfully report that $H B$ 588 be concurred in.

Sponsor Menahan (Bishop)

BE CONCURRED TM

BILL NO. $\qquad$

Comments to HB 163 Amendments

The proposed amendments accomplish two objectives:

1) Passenger carriers, ie. railroads and airlines, are issued liquor licenses in order to serve alcoholic beverages on their Montana routes. All licensees must buy their liquor from state liquor stores. Wine must be purchased from a state liquor store or a Montana wine distributor. Beer must be purchased from a Montana beer wholesaler. SS 16-1-402 and 403, MCA, allow passenger carrier licensees to purchase liquor from out of state sources if they pay the amount of liquor excise tax which would have been collected had the liquor been purchased from a Montana state liquor store.

The most recent draft of the Legislative Auditor Report (Recommendation \#5) calculated the amount of liquor excise tax collected in this manner as $\$ 12,824$ for $F Y 86-87$ and $\$ 13,641$ for FY 87-88. Updated forms with new factors would have collected an additional $\$ 1,331$ for $F Y$ 87-88 for a total of $\$ 14,972$ in FY 8788.

Repealing SS 16-1-402 and 403, and amending § 16-6-303 will get rid of the requirement that passenger carrier licensees buy their liquor from state liquor stores or pay the liquor excise tax for liquor consumed on Montana routes. Beer and wine will still have to be purchased from Montana sources.
2) All common carriers must file monthly shipping reports with the Liquor Division for all beer ( $\$ 16-3-235$ ) and wine ( $\$ 16-3-$ 405) they transport within the state. The purpose of these shipping reports is to cross reference with beer wholesaler and wine distributor records to make sure all beer and wine being sold is subject to taxation. However, the Liquor Division does not consider the cross reference necessary. The beer wholesaler and wine distributor reports are considered adequate. The common carrier reports are not enforced.

Repealing ss 16-3-235 and 16-3-405 will get rid of these unnecessary and burdensome reports. This proposed amendment is based upon the most recent draft of the Legislative Auditor Report, Recommendation \# 4.


HB 163 Amendments

1. Page 1 , line 5. Following: "INCLUDING"
Insert: "LIQUOR EXCISE TAX PAID BY AIRLINES AND RAILROADS,"
2. Page l, line 11. Following: "TAX;"
Insert: "EXEMPTING PASSENGER CARRIERS FROM PURCHASING LIQUOR FROM MONTANA STATE LIQUOR STORES; REPEALING COMMON CARRIER REPORTING REQUIREMENTS;"
3. Page l, line ll.

Following: "SECTIONS"
Insert: "16-6-303,"
4. Page l, line 14 .

Following: "SECTIONS"
Insert: "16-1-402, 16-1-403, 16-3-235, 16-3-405,"
5. Page 1.

Following: line 17
Insert: "Section 1. Section 16-6-303, MCA, is amended to read:

16-6.303. SEer of liquor not purchased from state store forbidden

- penalty. It is unlawful for any licensee ${ }_{j}$
, except for a passenger carrier issued a license pursuant to 16-4-302,
to sell or keep for sale or have on his premises for any purpose whatever any liquor except that purchased from the state liquor store, and any licensee found in possession of or selling and keeping for sale any liquor which was not purchased from a state liquor store shall, upon conviction, be punished by a fine of not less than $\$ 500$ or more than $\$ 1.500$, by imprisonment for not less than 3 months or more than 1 year, or by both such fine and imprisonment. If the department is satisfied that any such liquor was knowingly sold or kept for sale within the licensed prem, mise by the licensee or by his agents, servants, or employees, the departDent shall immediately revoke the license.

Renumber: subsequent sections
6. Page 2, line 14. Following: "sections"
Insert: "16-1-402, 16-1-403, 16-3-235, 16-3-405,"
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 a bill for an act entitled: "an act repealing certain taxes

$\qquad$
$\qquad$

Mr. Chairman and committee members, my name is Mike Strawbridge and $I$ am the Vice-President and General Manager for the Montana Division of Ideal Cement at Trident, Montana.

I wish to support Mr. Campbell's bill of removing nuisance taxes for the following reasons:

1. The cement industry in Montana has experienced severe economic times over the last seven years. Cement consumption in Montana has dropped to approximatey $50 \%$ of the amount used by this state in the early 1980s. We as an industry have had to implement some permanent lay-offs and extended lay-offs for many of our employees. We have been unable to provide pay increases for our employees for nearly six years. In order to find a market for our cement, we have been forced to expand our shipping area far into other states where our competitors are not faced with the same tax burden placed on Montana industry. In one area, we must compete against a cement producer that pays no federal, state, or local taxes.
2. The cement tax slated for elimination in Mr. Campbell's bill is a prime example of why any industry is reluctant to further process raw materials in Montana. We as an industry currently pay "net proceeds" tax on all raw materials used in the production of cement. After the processing is complete, we are taxed

DATE

I hope you will favorably consider House Bill 0163 which will eliminate nuisance taxes not only for the cement industry in this state, but for other businesses as well. Thank you for this opportunity to voice my opinion in support of this bill.

# SENATE TAXATION 

EXHIBIT NO. 3


BILL NO. HJR13

## The Second Report of the

# Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee 

## The Fifty-First Legislative Session 60th Legislative Day

## Senators

Robert J. (Bob) Brown
Dorothy Eck
Delwyn Gage
John Harp
Bill Norman
Mike Walker

Representatives

Bob Ream, Chairman
Jerry Driscoll
Orval Ellison
Leo Giacometto
John Patterson
Ted Schye


## MONTANA ROUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

 REPRESENTATIVE BOB REAMHELENA ADDRESS: CAPITOL STATION HELENA, MONTANA 59620 PHONE: (406) 444-4800
HOME ADDRESS:
5950 WILDCAT ROAD
MISSOULA, MONTANA 59802
PHONE: (406) 542-2695

COMMITTEES:
FISH AND GAME, CHAIRMAN TAXATION, VICE-CHAIRMAN agriculture REVENUE OVERSIGHT

March 15, 1989

TO: Senator Jack Gait, President of the Senate Representative John Vincent, Speaker of the House Honorable Members of the Senate Honorable Members of the House of Representatives

FROM: Representative Bob Ream, Chairman Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee

RE: First Report of the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee

Under the Joint Rules adopted by the 5lst Legislature, the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee is required to report to the respective houses on the 40 th Legislative Day and on the 60 th Legislative Day. (Joint Rule 30-60(2).) As Chairman of the Joint Subcommittee, I respectfully submit the following report, as required, as the Second Report of the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee.

Although the Subcommittee is not required to submit any reports subsequent to this, it is our intention to keep apprised of all legislation that significantly affects the revenue estimates. Prior to final adoption of House Joint Resolution No. 13, we intend to include the effects of the legislation into the HJR 13 estimates.


## RECENT HISTORY AND BACKGROUND OF REVENUE ESTIMATES

The Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee has its origin in a House Joint Resolution introduced during the 48th Legislative Session. House Joint Resolution No. 33, introduced by Representative Jack Ramirez, et al., was one of the first formal attempts by the Legislature to estimate state revenues for an ensuing biennium. After receiving the approval of the House on a vote of 89 to 5 , the resolution was amended in the Senate and approved 50 to 0 on second reading, then killed.

In 1985. Representative Steve Waldron soloed as the sponsor of House Joint Resolution No. 9, again a resolution to estimate state revenues for the biennium. In addition, HJR 9 also recommended the adoption of a beginning general fund balance based on generally accepted accounting principles, or GAAP, and requested that the economic assumptions and revenue estimates contained in the resolution be used by the Governor's Office of Budget and Program Planning (for the purpose of developing fiscal notes).

Also in 1985, then Representative John Harp became the first chairman of a six member subcommittee of the House Committee on Taxation. It was this "Subcommittee on Revenue Estimates" that began the formalization of estimating revenues in the Legislature, rather than in a committee of the Legislature or by deferring to the Executive branch.

While HJR 9 had considerable success in both houses, passing the House 95 to 4 and, as amended, the Senate 34 to 15, it never received final approval.

The effort was not abandoned, however, and in 1987, then
Representative John Harp introduced House Joint Resolution No. 41.


In addition, the Joint Rules Committee established a Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee comprised of the members of the respective Committees on Taxation. The responsibility of the Subcommittee was to estimate revenues for the coming biennium. With the adoption of the Joint Rules in 1987, the responsibility of the Legislature to estimate revenues finally had an institutionalized toehold in the legislative process.

The resolution, HJR 41, again attempted to establish revenue estimates for the 1988-89 biennium. The resolution passed the House with flying colors, 95 to 3, but was never acted on by the Senate Taxation Committee.

During this 51st Legislative Session, House Joint Resolution No. 13, introduced by Representative Bob Ream, establishes a formal estimate by the Legislature of revenues for the ensuing biennium. As required by the Joint Rules of the House and Senate, this narrative is part of the second report of the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee.

## WHY ADOPTING THE RESOLUTION IS IASPQRTANT

Creating a balanced budget for the State of Montana is a big job with many components and complexities. If a bill has a specific appropriation, the fiscal impact of the legislative action is more easily recognized. All too often, however, the budgetary impacts of substantive legislation of a general nature go unnoticed or are underestimated or overestimated. As a result, the Appropriations and Finance and Claims Committees and the Taxation Committees struggle to assure that incoming revenue will at least balance with outgoing expenditures.

Montana's Constitution speaks directly to the question of balancing the state's budget. Article VI, section 9, requires the Governor to submit a budget to the Legislature detailing expenditures and revenues. As a
counterweight on the balance of power scales, Article VIII, sibftion 9 . precludes the Legislature from appropriating funds in excess of anticipated revenues. The language in Article VIII, section 9, not only requires the Legislature to determine appropriations, it also requires the Legislature to estimate revenues.

The argument is often made that incoming revenues can only be estimated, while appropriations are specifically limited in the main appropriations bill and the "cats and dogs" that survive the session. The clarity of the argument fades, however, if one examines reversions of unexpended appropriations made by state agencies at fiscal yearends or the requests for supplemental appropriations that crop up for each Legislature to consider. Appropriations appear to be specific, but some funds go unspent and are reverted. Similarly, expenditures are made for which insufficient money has been appropriated, thereby causing supplementals. Neither appropriating funds nor estimating revenues is an exact science -- except in hindsight!

While the Appropriations and Firiance and Claims Committees struggle to establish the maximum amount of funds that may be expended, other committees, primarily the Taxation Committees, struggle to assure that the minimum amount of revenue necessary to fund state activities will be generated. Because the actions of all committees and all legislators affect both sides of the budget equation -- revenues as well as expenditures -- the Constitution requires the Legislature as a whole to adopt a balanced budget. Consequently, it is the responsibility of the entire Legislature to balance authorized expenditures with anticipated revenues, not to delegate the responsibility to the committees that consider raising or expending revenue.

## FIRST PROGRESS REPOR ON REVENUE ESTIMATES

To date, the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee has met nine times and reached consensus on the fundamental economic assumptions that underlie the revenue estimates: interest rates, inflation, population and employment mineral prices and production, corporate

profits, and the general direction of the state's economy.

The prognostication of the Subcommittee is that growth in Montana for the next two years will be slow.

Based on testimony provided by Mr. Phil Brooks, formerly the State Economist; Ms. Judith Curtis Waldron and Ms. Madalyn Quinlan, Analysts in the Office of the Legislative Fiscal Analyst; Mr. Terry Johnson, staff to Governor Schwinden's Revenue Estimating Advisory Council; and various industry representatives and based on projections from Wharton Econometrics, the Subcommittee's consensus is that growth in population and employment will be no greater than 1 percent each year of the 1990-91 biennium. The slow growth in population and employment will be accompanied by annual growth ranging from over 7 to under 5 percent in total personal income and slightly higher growth in nonfarm labor income. The purchasing power associated with the growth in total personal income will be somewhat offset. however, by inflation ranging from 4 io 5 percent over the biennium.

## general fund revenue estimates

Because approximately 70\% of general fund revenue is generated from five sources .- individual income taxes, corporation license taxes, oil severance taxes, coal severance taxes, and income from the investment of state funds .- the Subcommittee concentrated on those sources. The following sections discuss briefly some of the major forecast assumptions adopted by the Joint Revenue Estimating Subcommittee. All forecasts are based on law as of January 1, 1989, and may need to be adjusted for legislation that has been or will be passed by the 1989 Legislature.

The Subcommittee forecasts total general fund revenue at $\$ 402.4$ million in fiscal 1989, $\$ 390$ million in fiscal 1990, and $\$ 405.8$ million in fiscal 1991. The revenue forecasts and the underlying economic assumptions are discussed below and in Table 1.

## Table 1

## GENERAL FUND REVENUE COMPARISON Fiscal Years 1990 and 1991 (Millions)
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General fund revenue from the individual income tax is anticipated to total $\$ 150.5$ million in fiscal 1989, $\$ 149.3$ million in fiscal 1990, and $\$ 159.9$ million in fiscal 1991. These general fund estimates are based on the following assumptions:
(1) Total Montana personal income is expected to grow 7.8 percent in 1989, 4.5 percent in 1990, and 4.3 percent in 1991.
(2) Montana's population growth will average 0.6 percent per year over the biennium.
(3) The individual income tax surtax applies only to 1987 and 1988 income tax liabilities. Termination of the surtax causes fiscal 1990 revenue to drop below the fiscal 1989 level.
(4) Income tax collections in fiscal 1990 will be bolstered by 1989 income growth that exceeds the estimated rate of inflation by 3.1 percent.
(5) The effects on income tax collections from the final phase-in of the 1986 federal income tax reform are estimated to be $\$ 49.4$ million in 1988, $\$ 60.6$ million in 1989, $\$ 73.2$ million in 1990 , and $\$ 87.4$ million in 1991.

## Corporation License Tax

Each year of the forecast period, the corporation income tax is expected to yield approximately $\$ 29$ million of general fund revenue. Experience indicates that the profitability of Montana corporations and, hence, their corporate tax liabilities are dependent on U.S. corporate
profits, oil prices, and interest rates. Underlying the committed $N$ forecasts of corporate tax collections are the assumptions that U.S. corporate profits will rise 8 percent in 1988, 5 percent in 1989, and 5 percent in 1990. Accompanying the increases in profits are gradually rising oil prices and long-term interest rates averaging 10 percent.

## Coal Severance Tax

The general fund's share of the coal severance tax is forecast to drop from $\$ 9.1$ million in fiscal 1989 to $\$ 7.2$ million in fiscal 1990 and $\$ 6.4$ million in fiscal 1991. The decline between fiscal 1989 and 1990 is the result of the general fund allocation falling from 15.31 percent of total revenue to 13.68 percent and production falling from the record 36.9 million ton production level of 1988. Coal production is anticipated to decline to 31.8 million tons in 1989 and 32 million tons in both 1990 and 1991. Forecasted production shows tonnages returning to the levels of 1985 and 1986. Shifts in the average price of Montana coal result from shifts in production among companies. each with different contracted prices.

## Oil Severance Tax

According to the Subcommittee's forecasts, general fund revenue from the oil severance tax will decline from $\$ 13.5$ million in fiscal 1989 to $\$ 13.2$ million in fiscal 1990 and $\$ 12.6$ million in fiscal 1991. While average oil prices are not expected to return to the levels of the early 1980s, the Subcommittee anticipates a gradual price rise after the drop More than offsetting the anticipated price increases are declines in the state's total production which falls from 22.5 million barrels in 1988 to 19 million barrels in 1990. Taxable production falls even more as tax exemptions for "new" and "stripper" production reduce the proportion of total production subject to taxation.

## Interest on Investments

Unless statutes specify otherwise, cash balances in the state's treasury earn interest that is deposited in the general fund. Revenue from interest on investments is expected to total $\$ 21$ million in fiscal 1989. $\$ 20.1$ million in fiscal 1990, and $\$ 19.8$ million in fiscal 1991. Shortterm investments are anticipated to earn interest at the rate of 8.5 percent in fisca: 1989 and 8 percent in both fiscal 1990 and 1991. The averago casi balance available for investment is anticipated to total $\$ 248$ million in fiscal 1989, $\$ 251.2$ million in fiscal 1990, and $\$ 247.6$ million in fiscal 1991. Included in the fiscal 1990 balance is $\$ 51$ million from the sale of tax and revenue anticipation notes (TRANS), while the fiscal 1991 balance contains $\$ 62$ million from TRANS. The decline in the average balance without TRANS proceeds between fiscal 1989 and 1990 is attributable to increased highway spending that reduces cash available for investment.

## Coal Irust Interest Income

General fund interest from the permanent coal trust fund is forecast to

be $\$ 39.7$ million in fiscal 1989. $\$ 36.5$ million in fiscal 1990, and $\$ 38.6$ t/ IR $/ 3$ million in fiscal 1991. The decline in fiscal 1990 is the result of the general fund's share of total interest falling from 98 percent to 85 percent. The forecasts of interest income are consistent with the outlook for coal severance taxes and long-term interest rates on deposits to the trust averaging 9.75 percent in fiscal 1989, 10 percent in fiscal 1990, and 10 percent in fiscal 1991.

## SCHOOL FOUNDATION REVENUES

Revenue to the School Foundation Program is forecast to be $\$ 278.4$ million in fiscal 1989, $\$ 255.8$ million in fiscal 1990 , and $\$ 262.3$ million in fiscal 1991. Table 2 summarizes the Subcommittee's forecasts. The allocations shown for individual income taxes, corporate license taxes, and coal severance taxes are consistent with the estimates shown for the general fund. Similarly, Foundation Program revenues that derive from the same sources as general fund revenues, e.g. natural resource prices and production, on like economic assumptions.

## Common School Interest and Income

Approximately two-thirds of common school interest and income is derived from interest earned by the common school trust fund. Another one-third is derived from income collected from rentals and leases on state lands. Revenues are projected to increase approximately $\$ 1$ million each year of the biennium with the growth of the common school trust fund. Revenue from rentals and leases is not projected to grow during the fiscal 1989-91 period.

| Fiscal 1990 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Executive | LFA | HJR 13 |
| \$0.000 | \$0.000 | \$0.000 |
| \$76.042 | \$81. 294 | \$81.604 |
| 11.271 | 11.744 | \$11.692 |
| 2.010 | 1.972 | \$2.010 |
| 33.485 | 34.341 | \$33.699 |
| 22.686 | 17.594 | \$17.119 |
| 0.926 | 2.064 | \$1.564 |
| 0.000 | 0.000 | \$0.000 |



Beginning Balance
31 8s Individual Income Tax
31.8\% Individual Income Tax

Coel Soverance Tax
Intereat and income
U.S. Mineral Royalties
Education Trust Interest
Education Trust withdrawel
Total State Equalization

## County Equalization

| $\$ 85.499$ | $\$ 84.209$ | $\$ 85.635$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 6.797 | 8.727 | $\$ 6.914$ |
| 1.465 | 1.163 | $\$ 1.465$ |
| 0.102 | 0.108 | $\$ 0.102$ |
| $(\$ 3.717)$ | $(\$ 3.700)$ | $(\$ 3.717)$ |
| $(\$ 0.838)$ | $(\$ 0.759)$ | $(\$ 0.838)$ |

$\$ 89.308 \quad \$ 89.748 \quad \$ 89.561$
$\$ 17.127$ \$18.252 \$18.537



## U.S. Mineral Royalties



The state receives 50 percent of the royalties paid for mineral production on federal lands, including coal, oil, and natural gas production. Coal royalties comprise about one-half of the total royalties collected from production on federal lands. The revenue estimates for U.S. mineral royalties are based on declining coal production in fiscal years 1989 and 1990, relative to fiscal 1988. The revenue estimate declines in fiscal 1990 and 1991 due to federal legislation enacted as of March 1, 1989. The new federal provisions allow state severance taxes as a deduction from F.O.B. price before federal royalty is computed. Total impact of this change is $\$ 7.5$ million over the 1989 1991 period.

## Education Trust Fund Interest

The revenue estimates for education trust fund interest are based on current law. Under current law, 7.6 percent of coal severance tax revenue is allocated to the education trust fund in both fiscal 1990 and 1991, and 6.65 percent to the local impact account. The estimated growth in the amount of trust fund interest reflects the addition of these funds to the trust. The estimates also assume that $\$ 11.4$ million of unspent education trust funds, which were appropriated to the School Foundation Program for the 1989 biennium, revert to the trust fund. The interest applied to new long-term investments is 10 percent in fiscal years 1990 and 1991. The portion of the education trust fund invested in the short-term investment pool is estimated to earn 8 percent in each year of the 1991 biennium.

## Statewide Taxable Valuation and the 45 Mill Levy



Statewide taxable valuation for tax year 1988 is the final valuation certified by the Department of Revenue. Taxes are paid in November and May of fiscal 1989 based on tax year 1988 valuations. The statewide taxable valuation is projected to fall by 2.1 percent in tax year 1989 and by an additional 1.1 percent in tax year 1990. After increasing by 9 percent in tax year 1988, net and gross proceeds are projected to decline by 11 percent in tax year 1989 and 10 percent in tax year 1990. Statewide taxable valuation for all classes other than net and gross proceeds is projected to grow by 0.3 percent in tax year 1989 and 1 percent in tax year 1990.

## CONCLUSION

The Subcommittee will continue to review and refine the revenue estimates over the remaining five weeks of the regular session. Amendments to HJR 13 will be prepared to include the anticipated effects on estimated revenues that result from the passage of legislation. The Subcommittee intends that the amendments will be included in HJR 13 when it is finally adopted.

## M5024 9074DBHB

SENATE TAXATIGN

DATE
BILL NO.


## Estimates <br> INヨy <br> Fiscal Years 1988 through 1991 (Millions) <br> COMPARISON OF GEN Fis <br> (Millions) <br> COMPARISON OF GENERAL FUND REVENUES AND CURRENT ESTIMATES Fiscal Years 1988 through 1991 (Millions)

## Table 3




##  <br> 





| -Comm |
| :---: |
| 1990 |

隽


| Comm. |
| :---: |
| 1989 |






 0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0

 369.008000

FY 1989


## 

 | 08 |
| :---: |
| 08 |
| 08 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |
| 0 |

 302.622000
 8080
808
08
0
0
0
0
0 98
08
08
06
$0-1$ 178.537000 0
0
0
$\vdots$
0
0
0

 299.391000 $\begin{array}{rr}0.000000 & 0.000000 \\ 82.178000 & 87.365000 \\ 11.940000 & 11.783000\end{array}$ $\begin{array}{rr}1.632000 & 1.781000 \\ 35.815000 & 34.770000\end{array}$
 0.000000
0.000000
0.000000 154.934000 84. 699000
 0
0
0
0
0
0
0
0 88.976000

 $\infty$ | 80 |
| :--- |
| 80 |
| 80 |
| 80 |
| 0. |
| 0 | 10.908000

11.332000 88
0
0
0
0 umpar ison Foundation Program Revenue Est imate 1.688000




 0. 169.344000
 80.580000 87.431000
-3.717000
 -0.759000
91.296000 18.880000
 - MNNNOO
 .013431
 grano total



## Table 4

## general fund revenue comparison

Fiscal Year 1989
(Millions)


## Table 5

Ex:MBIT No $\qquad$
Bate
Bill NO $\qquad$

PUBLIC SCHOOL FOUNDATION PROGRAM REVENUE COMPARISON
Fiscal Years 1989 (Millions)

LEA
$\$ 1.022 \quad \$ 1.022 \quad \$ 1.022$

| $\$ 77.104$ | $\$ 80.797$ | $\$ 82.252$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 11.209 | 11.646 | $\$ 11.790$ |
| 9.781 | 9.878 | $\$ 9.997$ |
| 32.465 | 33.062 | $\$ 32.496$ |
| 23.524 | 20.864 | $\$ 20.955$ |
| 0.825 | 0.824 | $\$ 0.848$ |
| 15.857 | 11.034 | $\$ 9.767$ |
| - |  |  |
| $\$ 170.765$ | $\$ 168.105$ | $\$ 168.105$ |

County Equalization
45 Mill Levy
Miscellaneous
Forest Funds
Grazing Funds
Elem Transportation
High School Tuition

Total County Equalization

District Share of Permissive

| $\$ 87.431$ | $\$ 87.433$ | $\$ 87.433$ |
| ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 5.876 | 7.950 | $\$ 7.950$ |
| 1.465 | 1.163 | $\$ 1.163$ |
| 0.102 | 0.108 | $\$ 0.108$ |
| $(\$ 3.717)$ | $(\$ 4.419)$ | $(\$ 4.419)$ |
| $(\$ 0.838)$ | $(\$ 0.759)$ | $(\$ 0.759)$ |
| - |  |  |
| $\$ 90.319$ | $\$ 91.476$ | $\$ 91.476$ |





Table 6
ECONOMIC ASSUMPTIONS OF THE JOINT REVENUE ESTIMATING SUBCOMMITTEE

| cv/Fy |
| :---: |
| 1989 |






Fob 16
silmate
20.000
21.131
20.09
21.131
815.500 $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ}$
 87.460
815.000 4.700x
0.000x


 운 | 0 |
| :--- | 3330.800

 $\stackrel{~}{\grave{j}}$ 0.158






| vear | assumption |
| :---: | :---: |
| cv | Orl Production (militon Bbl.) |
| fr | Orl Production (million mbl.) |
| cr | 011 Prices/bol. |
| fv | 011 Price s/bul. |
| fv | Enompt "Now" Production (million Bbl) |
| fr | Exampt "Stripper" Production (militon bit, |
| cr | Coal Production (million tons) |
| cr | coat price ston |
|  | mt population on July |
| cr | Consumer price incex (x enange) |
| Fr | Short-torm Intorest Rate (stip) |
| Fr | Long-term intorest ma |
| cr | mT Total porsonal income (Billions) |
| cr | mT Mon-farm Employment (Thousanas) |
| cr | mT Total Non-farm Labor Income (atilion s) |
| ar | Individual income tan Auatts (militon s) |
| cr | Fedoral ran Rotorm -- Individuals (militon $)^{\text {) }}$ |
| cr | W.s. Total Corporste Proftis (athlions) |
| cr | Corporation Liconae tex Audite (militons) |
| cr | Fodorsi Tan Refora -- Corporate (milion s) |
| fr | Trasaury Casm Batance (milition s) |
| fv | trans (million s) |



