MINUTES

MONTANA SENATE
53rd LEGISLATURE - SPECIAL SESSION

COMMITTEE ON TAXATION

Call to Order: By Senator Halligan, Chair, on December 17, 1993, at 1:00 p.m.

ROLL CALL

Members Present:
Sen. Mike Halligan, Chair (D)
Sen. Dorothy Eck, Vice Chair (D)
Sen. Bob Brown (R)
Sen. Steve Doherty (D)
Sen. Lorents Grosfield (R)
Sen. John Harp (R)
Sen. Spook Stang (D)
Sen. Tom Towe (D)
Sen. Fred Van Valkenburg (D)
Sen. Bill Yellowtail (D)

Members Excused: Senator Gage

Members Absent: None.

Staff Present: Jeff Martin, Legislative Council
Beth Satre, Committee Secretary

Please Note: These are summary minutes. Testimony and discussion are paraphrased and condensed.

Committee Business Summary:
Hearing: None.
Executive Action: HB 29

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 29

Discussion:

Chair Halligan said the Committee was meeting to receive the information committee members had requested from the Department of Revenue (DOR) and would recess for the Senate's afternoon floor session after receiving that information. He stated the Committee would reconvene immediately after the floor session to take executive action. He asked **Mick Robinson, Director, DOR,** how the requested information could be best presented.

Mick Robinson said his staff was still compiling that information and would be bringing the data over as soon as it was ready.

Senator Harp asked **Senator Van Valkenburg** if he had received the fiscal information he had requested. **Senator Van Valkenburg** replied he had. He said property tax relief for those taxpayers who had more than a 25 percent increase in their property taxes which would be limited to 25 percent of the increase with a maximum of $500 and a minimum of $25 would only cost the state $838,000 in the coming year.

Senator Harp asked what the average rebate would be with those provisions. **Senator Van Valkenburg** answered $58. He stated the information had established some parameters for the Committee to use to "juggle the formulas" and arrive at a more satisfactory compromise on property tax relief. He stressed he and the other committee members were quite willing to work toward a compromise. He noted, however, that the Committee remained dependent upon DOR for the necessary data.

Senator Van Valkenburg noted that **Senator Harp** had indicated at the previous Committee meeting that he thought an appropriate amount for property tax relief would be in the neighborhood of $14 million. He stated, however, he thought the state could only afford to spend between $6 to $8 million on property tax relief. He agreed it would be great to give out a lot more tax relief, but said without chopping general funds across-the-board or decimating the Cultural and Aesthetic Projects Trust Fund (Arts Trust) the Legislature could not balance the budget and spend more than $6 to $8 million on property tax relief. He asked **Senator Harp** if he agreed that the necessary funds were not available.

Senator Harp said the free conference committee was still working on HB 22 which meant an additional $7 million could be taken out of K-12 education, making it possible to put $14 million into property tax relief. **Senator Van Valkenburg** noted **Senator Harp** could certainly propose that possibility to **Senator Brown** who was a member of the HB 22 free conference committee. He distributed copies of the information he had requested (Exhibit #1).

Senator Doherty stated that $171,212 of the $838,615 in total relief would go to Flathead County. **Senator Towe** noted that was 16.5 percent of the entire relief. **Senator Harp** stated that was where the property tax increases occurred from 1992 to 1993.

Senator Harp asked if the numbers in front of the Committee had the means test tied into them. After committee members had informed him no, **Senator Harp** asked whether any relief at all would be left after the means test was tied into the proposal. **Senator Van Valkenburg** repeated it was possible to work toward a satisfactory compromise. He added that just ridiculing the effort would not help the process.

Senator Harp asked if committee members were interested in his proposal to retain the 10 percent property tax increase by reduce the reimbursement from 75 percent to 50 percent. **Senator Van**

Valkenburg replied that proposal might move toward a possible point of agreement, but the Committee needed to see the fiscal impact.

Committee Recess:

Citing the time, **Chair Halligan** recessed the meeting at 1:08 p.m. The Committee was reconvened by **Chair Halligan** on December 17, 1993, at 3:41 p.m. **Senator Gage** was excused and all other committee members were present.

EXECUTIVE ACTION ON HOUSE BILL 29

Chair Halligan asked **Mick Robinson** to explain the information DOR had compiled (Exhibit #2). **Mr. Robinson** said the information on the first page stipulated an increase in assessed value statewide above 10 percent and the information on the second page increases about 25 percent. He explained the structure of the charts, which, he noted, were applicable to both pages: the figures in the box labeled "full cost no adjustments" would include all residential property; the figures in the middle box are adjusted to reflect only owner-occupied residences; and the figures in the last box reflect the costs if the relief were given as a personal income tax (PIT) credit. He explained that for each of the above three categories, the cost of four cap possibilities and three percentages of the excess property tax to be reimbursed had been calculated. He noted that the numbers were based only on reappraisal increases, did not include commercial properties, and assumed a minimum reimbursement of $25. **Mr. Robinson** said that owner occupancy was determined according to the nine-month residency requirement in HB 29 and HB 45. He added that DOR estimated that a PIT credit would result in about a 10 percent decline versus a rebate because some people would not file for that credit.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked **Mr. Robinson** to explain the source of the information (Exhibit #2). **Mr. Robinson** said the data base that DOR has been utilizing for all property tax information was comprised of 20 percent of all the items on the Computer Assisted Mass Appraisal System (CAMAS). He stated 20 percent represented a "very very large sample" of a particular population on which to base projections. He noted, however, that samples obviously held potential for statistical errors.

Citing the $20 million difference between the estimates made during the regular session on the guaranteed tax base cost and the actual cost of HB 667, **Senator Van Valkenburg** asked **Mick Robinson** whether he had enough confidence in the numbers supplied by his staff to assure the Committee that the difference could be taken out of DOR's budget at the next legislative session, if there were more than a 10 percent deviation. **Mr. Robinson** replied he could not make that guarantee. He stated, however, the data was the best that DOR could provide, even though it was necessary to realize it was subject to some error. He said he felt "real confident" in the figures in the "full cost, no adjustments" boxes because those numbers came directly from DOR's property tax data base. He noted he was not as confident about the figures which had been adjusted for owner occupancy and the PIT credit because it had been necessary to use census data to obtain them. He explained based on census data, DOR projected an owner-occupancy rate of 60 percent and estimated that 10 percent of those eligible would not take advantage of a PIT credit.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked if the numbers on the charts were for the biennium. **Mr. Robinson** replied yes.

Senator Van Valkenburg noted that the Legislature would be creating an entitlement program, and all those eligible would have to be paid. He stated he wanted to make sure that the costs of the program were not being underestimated. **Mr. Robinson** replied it would be possible to add on another 20 percent in order to make sure the costs were not underestimated. He reiterated that the information before the Committee represented the best work and the best approach that DOR could currently take. He stated he thought the estimates were reasonable, although there would probably be some variance in the actual from the estimate. He expressed his opinion that the percentage of error would be very small in the "full cost, no adjustments" boxes, but would increase in the other categories.

Senator Towe asked whether DOR had calculated the costs for an all-residential PIT credit. **Mr. Robinson** responded DOR had not. He noted, however, that if the amounts in the top box were reduced 10 percent, that would reflect DOR's estimate.

Senator Eck referred to the information in Exhibit #1. She asked whether the only difference between that and the comparable information in Exhibit #2 as the inclusion of mill levies. **Mr. Robinson** replied the comparable figure would be the full cost, adjusted for owner-occupancy with a 25 percent excess allowed and a $500 cap (Exhibit #2). He noted that total was $791,940 instead of the $838,615 cited in Exhibit #1. He said he could not explain exactly what caused the difference.

Senator Eck said if Exhibit #2 was based on assessed value only, but Exhibit #1 was also adjusted for mill levies that would probably account for the difference. **Mick Robinson** said he would try to find out for sure.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked **Mr. Robinson** how much it would cost to add commercial property so that it was not just a residential credit or rebate. **Mr. Robinson** replied that commercial property was included in both HB 29 and HB 45 with minimum of $25 and a maximum of $200. He stated that cost was calculated to be $1.3 to $1.4 million per year.

Senator Van Valkenburg noted that would be a cost of about $2.7

million for the biennium. **Mr. Robinson** responded the cost for the biennium would be about $2.1 million since HB 29 and HB 45 were structured so that the multiplier for the biennium would be 1.5. He explained the timing of the rebate credits dictated that three semi-annual tax payments would flow into the current biennium and the fourth payment would flow into fiscal year (FY) 1996.

Senator Grosfield asked whether the numbers in Exhibit #2 could be doubled to reflect the cost of including mill increases since approximately one-half of the property tax increase was due to mills. **Mick Robinson** replied about 45 percent of the property tax increase could be attributed to mills and 55 percent to assessment. He stated the costs would be approximately doubled if the mill levy impact was also included.

Senator Towe said if the Committee agreed upon reimbursing home-owners at a rate of 50 percent of the excess, that would cause an anomaly between residential and commercial property. He asked **Mick Robinson** if he had any idea of the costs associated with applying the 50 percent rate to commercial property along with a higher cap. **Mr. Robinson** replied he was unsure whether he had any data about caps for commercial properties. He said the total cost of reimbursing commercial property owners anything over a 10 percent increase was $7.3 million per year, and over a 25 percent increase would be $4.1 million per year.

Senator Towe said 50 percent of everything over 10 percent would be half of the $7.3 million figure. **Mick Robinson** replied he thought that was correct. He repeated he did not have any information on caps for commercial property.

Chair Halligan suggested the Committee start to focus on how to devise a package for property tax relief.

Senator Towe threw out a suggestion for Committee discussion. He started with **Senator Harp's** proposal of 50 percent and applied that to all, not just owner-occupied, residences which had experienced an increase of more than 25 percent, with no cap. He noted that would cost $2.9 million. He added that applying the 50 percent to commercial property would cost an additional $1 million, making a total cost of $7.8 million in property tax relief over the biennium. He explained he favored the 25 percent threshold over the 10 because it would better target those people who were "really hurting" because of their increased tax burden. He said the DOR numbers show that caps did not affect the final total very much and he would be willing to move off the caps altogether.

Mick Robinson informed the Committee that the costs on Exhibit #2 were annual instead of biennial as he had previously indicated. He also verified that the calculations done for Exhibit #1 had included mill levies.

Senator Towe asked if the annual figures included two or 1.5 tax payments. **Mr. Robinson** responded the numbers reflected two tax payments and since the cost for the biennium would include three tax payments it could be calculated by multiplying the numbers by 1.5.

Senator Van Valkenburg said he had understood that the proposals that came from the House would provide relief only in the first year of this biennium. He asked **Mr. Robinson** if that was the House's intent. **Mr. Robinson** replied the proposal that came from the House was structured as a two year rebate/credit program. He said the program's total cost was about $17.5 million, with $13 million paid during the current biennium and $4.5 to $5 million in FY96. He stated those costs were based on an owner-occupancy requirement, with reimbursement for 75 percent of any tax increase above 10 percent with a cap of $1000.

Senator Eck said the option that made the most sense would be going to the PIT credit full cost adjusted for owner-occupancy at the 25 percent increased value with no cap. She noted the 50 percent would cost only $1.741 million.

Chair Halligan said the Committee needed to become more specific; it was time for either a motion or some other direction of discussion.

Senator Doherty asked **Mick Robinson** whether he could delineate what the maximum amount of rebate relief would be, how many big checks would be sent, and who would be receiving them if the were relief was not capped. **Mr. Robinson** replied DOR had always calculated the average and never tried to isolate that specific information. He added that information could be computed, but it would be more time-consuming and complex.

Senator Doherty said he would be interested in having that information if the Committee was serious about moving away from a cap. He explained the Legislature had only a limited number of funds and if a "big chunk of that money would be eaten up by a few people", his position on caps on caps would be affected. **Mick Robinson** said the actual impact of caps could be traced using the information on Exhibit #2. He stated moving from a cap of $500 to a cap of $1000 would not add a significant amount of dollars to the total cost in any category. He said moving above the $1000 would obviously result in larger checks, but the overall additional cost would not be significant.

Senator Grosfield asked if the Committee were moving in the direction of dealing strictly with increases due to assessed value, and excluding mill levy increases. **Chair Halligan** stated local governments had control over the mills, and they and school districts were the ones that had raised the mills. He noted people might also have approved those increases. He asked why the state should assume the additional responsibility of mill levy increases.

Senator Grosfield noted that voted mill levies had never been considered. **Chair Halligan** replied some are voted levies, some are bonds that have been issued, and some of the voted school levies have obviously been included.

Senator Eck said the Legislature had really voted a lot of increased mills by decreasing school funding during the regular session; those schools which are below the 80 percent level were required to increase their mills without a vote. She stated, however, the pertinent question was what property tax relief would do to the equalization balance if mills were included. She said she believed problems would arise and school representatives did as well. She explained that if a district had chosen to increase their mills to the maximum allowed without a vote, there would be real benefits if a lot of people received rebates on what they paid. She said that is one reason it would be better to use changes in valuation rather than in mills.

Chair Halligan noted that reappraisal was the area in which the state shares some "blame". He said if the Legislature was going to address the state's share of the $65 million property tax increase from 1992 to 1993 it should focus on reappraisal.

Senator Eck stated that legislative action during the special session to free up money for property tax relief would once again force school districts to increase their mills. She noted the process would get complex if legislative action resulted in higher taxes which, in turn, required the Legislature to devise a new method of offering some relief.

Senator Harp stated **Governor Racicot's** initial proposal to the Legislature carried a price tag of $37 million. He admitted that was before the changes in the guaranteed tax base, the decrease in oil prices, the increases in school enrollment, and all the things that adversely affected the state budget. He said, however, the cost of the House's property tax relief package was $14 million, an amount which was not overwhelming when compared with the $134 million tax increase. He stated the Senate minority was "simply not interested" in tax relief that was small in nature and would not help people with large increases in taxes, no matter how it was packaged; if a tax relief measure were to enjoy support from both sides of the aisle, it needed to contain enough money for people to see some real benefit. He noted vehicles to fund property tax relief were still available and cautioned the Committee that it would not be a good idea to further upset taxpayers with a real small refund or credit.

Senator Van Valkenburg acknowledged **Senator Harp's** comments. He stated, however, Senate Democrats felt that there was only $6 to $8 million available in the budget to spend on property tax relief. He said their position was the extension of the property tax reduction for low income individuals should be part of property tax relief as well as some form of relief for people hit by big tax increases. He noted that it would most likely be necessary to negotiate with the House and it would be unwise either to give everything up before those proceedings or to leave no room for negotiation. He stated Senate Democrats were not insensitive to the concerns raised by **Senator Harp**, but that those concerns need to be adapted to fit the present situation in order to achieve some tax relief that people actually received rather than just heard about.

Senator Doherty referred to Exhibit #1. He asked **Mick Robinson** if the total number of people impacted, 14,387, was a good indicator of how many people in Montana who had experienced tax increases of more than 25 percent. **Mr. Robinson** replied that **Larry Finch, Program Manager, Office of Research and Information, DOR,** might be better equipped to answer **Senator Doherty's** question. He noted, however, that there were a total of 330,000 parcels in the state and, using the calculation in Exhibit #1, 14,387 parcels would portion of the 330,000 that would receive relief.

Senator Doherty asked if it were accurate to say that of the 330,000 total residential parcels in the state of Montana, 14,387 had experienced a jump in their property taxes greater than 25 percent last year. **Larry Finch** replied no. He explained that the minimum rebate was set at $25 and, as a result, those people who experienced up to $100 beyond a tax increase in excess of 125 percent of their prior year's tax liability would not be counted in the 14,387.

Senator Doherty asked how many people that would be. **Larry Finch** responded DOR could certainly provide the number of how many owner-occupied residential parcels experienced a tax increase greater than 125 percent of their 1992 property tax bills. He said there were a total of 60,000 Montana households and noted that a lot of households would be excluded by the $25 minimum.

Senator Doherty asked if the 60,000 households was out of 365,000 total residential parcels in the state. **Larry Finch** replied yes. He added that those residential parcels might or might not have a home or mobile home or some building on them.

Senator Eck asked whether it would be feasible to pay $25 to those persons whose refund did not meet the $25 minimum instead of disqualifying them. **Chair Halligan** asked noted it might be more cost effective to move from 25 percent to the 10 percent and catch more people that way. **Senator Eck** noted going to even 20 percent might be sufficient.

Senator Stang noted **Speaker Mercer** had asked him if the conference committee on HB 22 could wrap up its business this afternoon. He said that indicated that the House majority was satisfied with the amount of money in HB 22. He referred to **Senator Harp's** earlier comment that other sources of funding still existed for property tax relief. He asked **Senator Harp** if the Senate minority would resist the motion to fund the cut in education at $19 million so that more money could be taken from education to fund property tax relief.

Senator Harp replied HB 22 was one of the options to which he had referred and noted that he had earlier offered a $4 million transfer from the Arts Trust as a possibility. He stated those two options could provide about $11 million.

Senator Stang asked **Senator Harp** where he would find the necessary revenue to fund $14 million in property tax relief and balance the budget if he, as chair of HB 22 Conference Committee, should follow **Speaker Mercer's** and the majority of the Senate Democrats' advise and wrap HB 22 up at the $19 million cut. **Senator Harp** replied it would be necessary to move to one or two percent across-the-board cuts or to reduce the ending fund balance.

Senator Stang said another $7 or $8 million cut in education would undoubtedly require an across-the-board cut or use of local reserves. In either case, he said, using those funds to provide a rebate was tantamount to "fooling the people" because school districts would need to raise taxes again next year when the state did not adequately fund education. He asked **Senator Harp** if it made sense to ask the local taxpayers to fund tax relief. **Senator Harp** replied **Senator Stang** might have a point with respect to K-12 education. He said if the Legislature was serious about doing something with property tax relief, the better avenue would be across-the-board cuts at the state level.

Senator Towe said he had calculated the rebate a homeowner in Missoula would receive using **Senator Eck's** proposal. He noted if the home was worth $30,000 in 1992 and increased 33 percent, that homeowner would receive a credit of $80.13 on a $212.91 increase over the previous year. He stated the owner of a $30,000 home which increased 66 percent in value would receive $160 on a $427 increase, and the owner of a $30,000 home that increases 100 percent in value would receive $260 on a $641 increase. He stated the Committee was starting to target those people who really need the funds because of appraisal increases.

Senator Eck asked **Senator Towe** to run the numbers on a $200,000 house. She said those are more the people who have been complaining. She noted that commercial property should also be included in the Committee's proposal since there were people in both the House and Senate who considered it important.

Senator Van Valkenburg stated the proposal should respond to the concerns that the people who have been greatly affected by property tax increases receive help. He said if the Legislature was really concerned about people rising up and throwing out the property tax system, giving commercial enterprises a rebate capped at $200 would not help that effort. He stated he would rather invest that money in the owner-occupied area and would use HB 29 as the means to move this along.

Motion:

Senator Van Valkenburg moved TO AMEND HB 29 TO PROVIDE A OWNER-OCCUPIED PIT CREDIT TO ANYONE WHO HAS EXPERIENCED A 25 PERCENT OR GREATER INCREASE IN THEIR PROPERTY TAXES DUE TO ASSESSED VALUE INCREASES IN THE PAST YEAR AND TO ALLOW THEM 50 PERCENT OF THE AMOUNT THAT EXCEEDS THAT 25 PERCENT INCREASE WITHOUT ANY CAP.

Discussion:

Senator Van Valkenburg stated his motion would get the process moving. He assured committee members that it was not the last step, but was designed to move the process "much further down the road".

Senator Harp stated **Senator Van Valkenburg's** proposal would only provide $1.9 million in property tax relief.

Senator Van Valkenburg noted the fiscal information for his motion could be found in the last box on the second page of the DOR information (Exhibit #2). He stated his proposal would cost $1,741,260 for the year, and about $2.6 million over the biennium. **Mick Robinson** indicated his agreement. **Senator Van Valkenburg** noted there would be also be some cost in the first year of the second biennium. He asked **Mick Robinson** for that amount. **Mick Robinson** said that cost would be about $875,000.

Senator Towe noted he had just finished calculating the relief for the $200,000 home that **Senator Eck** had requested. He said with a 33 percent increase, a homeowner would receive a $544 refund on a tax increase of $1423; a 66 percent increase would mean a tax increase of $2849 and the credit would be $1068. He noted that might address **Senator Doherty's** question on whether or not a cap is necessary.

Senator Yellowtail stated he favored a $500 cap in view of the figures **Senator Towe** had quoted; it would cover most cases and would "certainly" not hurt a person who lives in that category.

Senator Towe agreed and asked **Senator Van Valkenburg** if he would accept a friendly amendment to his motion. **Senator Van Valkenburg** said he would agree to a $1000 cap. **Senator Yellowtail** noted $1000 cap was as good as no cap.

Amended Motion:

Senator Van Valkenburg agreed to amend his motion to include a $500 cap.

Discussion:

Senator Towe noted the motion did not necessarily represent the final word on the subject.

Senator Harp stated the $500 cap would cost $2.6 million over the biennium, which, when considered with the money for low income, puts the total property tax relief package at about $4 million over the biennium. He noted that sum was a long way from $6 to $8 million, but said he recognized that **Senator Van Valkenburg** was thinking about later negotiations; he agreed HB 29 was a long way from being finalized. **Senator Harp** stated, however, that the Senate minority would probably oppose HB 29 with the proposed amendments because it would not go far enough, particularly with the 25 percent threshold and the elimination of mill levy increases. He acknowledged the move from 25 percent to 50 percent excess, which, he said, was a movement in the right direction. He stated, however, that $4 million was not enough money to devote to the situation and there was a "long way to go yet for this thing to work".

Senator Grosfield said people's unhappiness with property taxes in Montana had not just started with the 1993 reappraisal and the following dramatic increase in property taxes; people, he said, had been getting increasingly dissatisfied and upset. He noted 90,000 people signed a petition because of a $72 million increase in property taxes and asked how many of those 90,000 people would not sign a petition on property taxes if the Legislature did not accomplish something "fairly significant" in property tax relief. He stated he was not sure that $14 million would even be significant enough.

Senator Towe replied it would not make any difference, the people who signed the Natelson petition would sign the property tax petition anyway. **Senator Van Valkenburg** expressed his agreement with **Senator Towe** and **Chair Halligan** noted nothing the Legislature could do would satisfy those people.

Senator Towe referred to the numbers he had run on the $30,000 house which increased in value to $60,000. He stated receiving a $240 credit on a $641 increase would not be a pittance especially since those are the people that really need the help. He noted that if the Legislature took money out of K-12 to stick into property tax relief, the result would be a lot of ballot issues for property tax increases at the local level to refill those school reductions, which would result, once again, in increased property taxes.

Senator Grosfield noted **Senator Towe** needed to remember that those proposals would be voted on at the local level which would be a big difference from the past session. **Senator Towe** agreed but said the person who voted against those ballot issues would be in the same position.

Senator Doherty said that Senate Democrats were attempting to accomplish something. He stated only 16.6 percent of all property taxpayers in Montana had experienced massive increases. He admitted that if a person was in that 16.6 percent, those increases were a big deal, but said the proposal made a good faith effort to respond to those people while targeting property tax relief. He stated legislators were also "spending a lot of time, money and political good, bad and ill will" to help those people who were suffering. He noted, however, the vast bulk of Montanans had not been so severely affected. He said there had been no hue, no cry and no effort to alleviate the real suffering in his community when it had experienced substantial property tax increases, even though there had been a hue and cry in Great Falls. He noted he had been aware of the suffering caused by increased taxes in his community and, as a result, was sensitive to the suffering in **Senator Harp's** part of Montana. He stated, however, the Legislature needed to work together to target that group of Montanans that really needed property tax relief.

Senator Van Valkenburg said the action the Committee was about to take would not necessarily be the "end of the road". He stated his motion responded to the genuine concerns of Republicans, the House, and to the people of Montana while simultaneously balancing the available funds. He said many of the property tax increases were brought about because people resisted providing adequate funding for the school equalization account or for timely reappraisals. He said there had also been much Republican opposition to adequately funding DOR's Property Tax Division. He said 90,000 people did sign the petition and quite a few voted for CI-27, but, he stated, how many voted for **Chair Halligan** and his partner, Dorothy Bradley, when they was running for lieutenant governor and governor and were labeled "big spenders". **Senator Van Valkenburg** stated Montana was a real divided state; there were people who were "in a whole different frame of mind about Montana's needs". He recognized that the Republican committee members might feel compelled to vote against the motion, but expressed his hope that they understood the proposal was made in good faith and should be considered an attempt to reach a legitimate compromise on this issue.

Vote:

The MOTION CARRIED 7 to 4 by ROLL CALL VOTE.

Motion:

Senator Van Valkenburg moved TO AMEND HB 29 TO INSERT THE PROVISIONS OF SB 25 AS IT LEFT THE SENATE DECEMBER 16, 1993.

Discussion:

Senator Harp noted that **Senator Van Valkenburg** had recently complained about how the House treated Senate Bills. **Senator Van Valkenburg** responded his motion would not be offensive to the House since the House had already approved those provisions.

Vote:

The MOTION CARRIED 7 to 4 by ROLL CALL VOTE.

Motion:

Senator Van Valkenburg moved TO AMEND HB 29 TO ADD AN APPROPRIATION FROM THE GENERAL FUND CONSISTENT WITH THE ACTION THE COMMITTEE HAD PREVIOUSLY TAKEN.

Discussion:

Senator Van Valkenburg stated an appropriation needed to be made to DOR to provide funding for administering the provisions now in HB 29. He noted that **Mick Robinson** could work with **Jeff Martin** to come up with the actual amount.

Senator Towe asked why an appropriation would be necessary. **Senator Van Valkenburg** replied DOR would need some appropriation for the provisions originally in SB 25. **Mr. Robinson** said did not yet fully understand the final mechanics associated with those provisions. He stated the low income exemption was a form which would be filed and handled at the local level and would be a local government issue.

Senator Van Valkenburg asked if the income tax credit would then be basically subtracted off of estimated revenue. **Mick Robinson** noted DOR had provided the Committee with information about the administrative costs necessary to facilitate tax credits. He said the Property Tax Division staff would have to calculate the tax credit for each qualifying parcel, send that to the owner of that parcel for use on their income tax return. He said that determination could be complicated and that was what DOR had anticipated in conjunction with HB 29 and HB 45. He added the Income Tax Division would also need to deal with an additional flow of paper as a result. **Mr. Robinson** noted that the current proposal would decrease the number of those who qualify, so it might be necessary to determine the actual cost for the Income Tax Division. He said, however, the costs to the Property Tax Division would remain consistent to those that had been previously indicated.

Senator Towe asked **Senator Van Valkenburg** whether he intended to fund local governments' share of the low income in SB 25. He noted that would not make sense, since it would cost about $4,325,000. **Senator Van Valkenburg** said he would favor funding local government's share for the first year, but not the costs associated with the second year of the biennium. He stated local governments should be able to plan for that reduction in local property tax revenues next year, something which was no longer possible for this year.

Chair Halligan asked if either **Senator Van Valkenburg** or **Mick Robinson** had an actual dollar amount for the appropriation. **Senator Van Valkenburg** asked that DOR work with **Jeff Martin** to provide a figure for an appropriation to DOR for the purposes of administering the credit that was being provided in HB 29 and for the costs in the first year associated with the extension of the low income property tax reduction.

Senator Towe informed the Committee that the last item was complex and **Jeff Martin** needed to have flexibility. He suggested that **Senator Van Valkenburg** and he could work with **Jeff Martin** to make sure that got back to the local governments.

Vote:

Senator Van Valkenburg's MOTION TO AMEND HB 29 CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Discussion:

Senator Harp stated he was not going to support HB 29, but suggested that it might be necessary to include a means to fund the personal property tax currently in HB 45 and had been part of HB 20 during the special session. **Senator Van Valkenburg** said it might be necessary to consider that issue when HB 29 came to the conference committee. He asked **Jeff Martin** if the Committee needed to take any other action on HB 29.

Jeff Martin replied it would be easiest to put together a substitute bill. **Senator Van Valkenburg** requested that **Jeff Martin** draw up a substitute bill.

Senator Towe noted the effective cost of HB 29 with the current amendments would be about $5 million.

Motion/Vote:

Senator Van Valkenburg moved HB 29 BE CONCURRED IN AS AMENDED. The MOTION CARRIED with **Senators Brown, Gage, Grosfield,** and **Harp** voting NO.

ADJOURNMENT

Adjournment: 5:05 p.m.

Mike Halligan
SENATOR MIKE HALLIGAN, Chair

BETH E. SATRE, Secretary

MH/bs

ROLL CALL

SENATE COMMITTEE TAXATION DATE December 17, 1994

NAME	PRESENT	ABSENT	EXCUSED
Sen. Halligan, Chair	X		
Sen. Eck, Vice Chair	X		
Sen. Brown	X		
Sen. Doherty	X		
Sen. Gage			X
Sen. Grosfield	X		
Sen. Harp	X		
Sen. Stang	X		
Sen. Towe	X		
Sen. Van Valkenburg	X		
Sen. Yellowtail	X		

FC8

Attach to each day's minutes

SENATE STANDING COMMITTEE REPORT

December 17, 1993

MR. PRESIDENT:

We, your committee on Taxation having had under consideration House Bill No. 29 (third reading copy -- blue), respectfully report that House Bill No. 29 be amended as follows and as so amended be concurred in.

Signed: M Halligan
Senator Mike Halligan, Chair

That such amendments read:

1. Title, line 6.
Strike: "REBATES"
Insert: "RELIEF"
Following: "~~RESIDENTIAL~~"
Insert: "RESIDENTIAL"

2. Title, line 7.
Strike: "A REBATE"
Insert: "TAX RELIEF"

3. Title, line 8.
Strike: "REBATES"
Insert: "TAX RELIEF"

4. Title, lines 9 and 10.
Following: "TAXES" on line 9
Strike: remainder of line 9 through "TAXES" on line 10
Following: ";"
Insert: "INCREASING INCOME LEVELS UNDER THE LOW-INCOME PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION PROGRAM; ALLOWING AN EXTENSION OF THE TIME FOR APPLICATION FOR THE 1993 PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION PROGRAM; APPROPRIATING MONEY TO THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE; AMENDING SECTIONS 15-6-134 AND 15-6-151, MCA;"

5. Page 1, lines 17, 18, and 20.
Strike: "REBATE"
Insert: "credit"

6. Page 1, line 19.
Strike: the first "REBATE"
Insert: "credit"
Strike: "REBATE"

7. Page 1, line 24 through page 6, line 12.
Strike: everything after the enacting clause

M Amd. Coord.
SB Sec. of Senate

Senator Halligan
Senator Carrying Bill

171910SC.Sma

Insert: "NEW SECTION. Section 1. **Property tax relief.** (1) It is the policy of the state to provide tax relief for the dollar amount of general property tax increase that exceeds 25% and that results from reappraisal on residential property currently classified as class four property that was assessed in 1992. The tax relief for property described in 15-6-134(1)(e) must be calculated as if the taxable percentage for the 1993 tax year were the same as the taxable percentage for this property in the 1994 tax year.

(2) In order to implement the policy, the department of revenue shall determine the amount of eligible property tax relief on each property for which a separate geocode exists. In order for residential property to be eligible for tax relief, the property must be occupied by the taxpayer for at least 9 months of each year. The department shall:

(a) compare the actual dollar amount of tax assessed by mill levies for the property in tax year 1993 to the actual dollar amount of tax assessed by mill levies in tax year 1992; and

(b) if the amount of tax assessed by mill levies in tax year 1993 is greater than the amount assessed in tax year 1992, determine the amount of the increase due to reappraisal.

(3)(a) If the amount determined under subsection (2)(b) exceeds the amount of tax assessed by mill levies in tax year 1992 by 25%, the property taxpayer is eligible for tax relief.

(b) The amount of the tax relief for eligible residential property is 50% of the amount by which the amount determined under subsection (2)(b) exceeds the amount of tax assessed by mill levies in tax year 1992 by 25%, up to a maximum of $500.

(4) A transfer of class four residential property after [the effective date of this act] removes the property from eligibility. A property taxpayer is eligible for tax relief upon payment of the property taxes assessed against the property. The tax relief must be by refundable income tax credit, as provided in [section 2], for the November 1993 payment, the May 1994 payment, the November 1994 payment, and the May 1995 payment.

(5) In order to provide a credit for the November 1993 property tax payment in calendar year 1994, the department shall calculate the entire amount of tax relief, as provided in subsection (3), and provide for a credit of one-half of the calculated amount. Payment, when due, of the first property tax installment is required for eligibility for one-half of the total credit. Payment of delinquent taxes does not make a property taxpayer eligible for a credit in the tax year in which the taxes were delinquent.

(6) If a taxpayer has paid property taxes under protest, a credit may not be issued until there has been a final determination. The credit must be calculated based on the finally

determined property value. Interest may not be paid.

(7) If a revised assessment is issued by the department, the credit must be redetermined based on the revised value. The department shall allow a credit if owed and collect any credit that was overpaid. Interest is not payable by the department or the taxpayer.

(8) The department shall:

(a) calculate the amount of tax relief as provided in subsection (3);

(b) provide for the payment of tax relief by granting refundable credits for the second one-half of the 1993 tax year payment; and

(c) grant the 1994 tax year credits for eligible properties as provided in [section 2].

NEW SECTION. **Section 2. Credit for property tax relief.** (1) Taxpayers who are entitled to property tax relief pursuant to [section 1] are entitled to a credit against taxes imposed by this chapter. Property taxes must be paid when due in the income tax year for which the credit is claimed. However, if a taxpayer paid all of the 1993 tax year property taxes in calendar year 1993, one-half of the 1993 tax year property taxes may be claimed in the succeeding tax year.

(2) If the amount of the credit is greater than the taxpayer's liability, the amount of unused credit must be refunded by state warrant or the taxpayer may elect to carry the unused credit forward to subsequent tax years. A refund warrant may not be issued for amounts less than $25.

(3) Interest may not be paid on credits, including any credits that are carried forward.

(4) The property tax relief provided for in [section 1] is not taxable income of the recipient.

Section 3. Section 15-6-134, MCA, is amended to read:

"15-6-134. Class four property -- description -- taxable percentage. (1) Class four property includes:

(a) all land except that specifically included in another class;

(b) all improvements, including trailers or mobile homes used as a residence, except those specifically included in another class;

(c) the first $80,000 or less of the market value of any improvement on real property, including trailers or mobile homes, and appurtenant land not exceeding 5 acres owned or under contract for deed and actually occupied for at least 10 months a year as the primary residential dwelling of any person whose total income from all sources, including net business income and otherwise tax-exempt income of all types but not including social security income paid directly to a nursing home, is not more than $10,000 for a single person or $12,000 for a married couple or a head of household, as adjusted according to subsection (2)(b)(ii). For the purposes of this subsection (c), net business income is gross income less ordinary operating expenses but before deducting depreciation or depletion allowance, or both.

(d) all golf courses, including land and improvements actually and necessarily used for that purpose, that consist of at least ~~9~~ nine holes and not less than 3,000 lineal yards; and

(e) all improvements on land that is eligible for valuation, assessment, and taxation as agricultural land under 15-7-202(2), including 1 acre of real property beneath the agricultural improvements. The 1 acre must be valued at market value.

(2) Class four property is taxed as follows:

(a) Except as provided in 15-24-1402 or 15-24-1501, property described in subsections (1)(a), (1)(b), and (1)(e) is taxed at 3.86% of its market value.

(b) (i) Property described in subsection (1)(c) is taxed at 3.86% of its market value multiplied by a percentage figure based on income and determined from the following table:

Income Income Percentage 1 Single Person Married Couple
Multiplier 1 Head of Household

$0 - ~~1,000~~ - 3,750	$0 - ~~1,200~~ - 5,000	0%
~~1,001 - 2,000~~	~~1,201 - 2,400~~	~~10%~~
3,751 - 7,500	5,001 - 10,000	25%
~~2,001 - 3,000~~	~~2,401 - 3,600~~	~~20%~~
7,501 - 12,250	10,001 - 15,000	50%
~~3,001 - 4,000~~	~~3,601 - 4,800~~	~~30%~~
12,251 - 15,000	15,001 - 20,000	75%
~~4,001 5,000~~	~~4,801 6,000~~	~~40%~~
~~5,001 6,000~~	~~6,001 7,200~~	~~50%~~
~~6,001 7,000~~	~~7,201 8,400~~	~~60%~~
~~7,001 8,000~~	~~8,401 9,600~~	~~70%~~
~~8,001 9,000~~	~~9,601 10,800~~	~~80%~~
~~9,001 10,000~~	~~10,801 12,000~~	~~90%~~

(ii) The income levels contained in the table in subsection (2)(b)(i) must be adjusted for inflation annually by the department of revenue. The adjustment to the income levels is determined by:

(A) multiplying the appropriate dollar amount from the table in subsection (2)(b)(i) by the ratio of the PCE for the second quarter of the year prior to the year of application to the PCE for the second quarter of ~~1986~~ 1993; and

(B) rounding the product thus obtained to the nearest whole dollar amount.

(iii) "PCE" means the implicit price deflator for personal consumption expenditures as published quarterly in the Survey of Current Business by the bureau of economic analysis of the U.S. department of commerce.

(c) Property described in subsection (1)(d) is taxed at one-half the taxable percentage rate established in subsection (2)(a).

(3) After July 1, ~~1986~~ 1993, an adjustment may not be made by the department to the taxable percentage rate for class four property until a revaluation has been made as provided in 15-7-111.

(4) Within the meaning of comparable property as defined in 15-1-101, property assessed as commercial property is comparable only to other property assessed as commercial property~~,~~ and property assessed as other than commercial property is comparable only to other property assessed as other than commercial property."

Section 4. Section 15-6-151, MCA, is amended to read:

"**15-6-151. Application for certain class four classifications.** (1) A person applying for classification of property described in subsection (1)(c) of 15-6-134 shall make an affidavit to the department of revenue, on a form provided by the department without cost, stating:

(a) ~~his~~ the applicant's income;

(b) the fact that ~~he~~ the applicant maintains the land and improvements as ~~his~~ the applicant's primary residential dwelling, ~~where~~ when applicable; and

(c) ~~such~~ other information ~~as~~ that is relevant to the applicant's eligibility.

(2) (a) ~~This~~ Except as provided in subsection (2)(b), the application must be made before March 1 of the year after the applicant becomes eligible. The application remains in effect in subsequent years unless there is a change in the applicant's eligibility. The taxpayer shall inform the department of any change in eligibility. The department may inquire by mail whether any change in eligibility has taken place and may require a new statement of eligibility at any time it considers necessary.

(b) For tax year 1993, application may be made until [90 days after the effective date of this act].

(3) The affidavit is sufficient if the applicant signs a statement affirming the correctness of the information supplied, whether or not the statement is signed before a person authorized to administer oaths, and mails the application and statement to the department of revenue. This signed statement ~~shall be~~ is treated as a statement under oath or equivalent affirmation for the purposes of 45-7-202, relating to the criminal offense of false swearing."

NEW SECTION. **Section 5. Requirements for state**

reimbursement of taxes to counties. (1) Based on information contained in the application provided for in 15-6-151(2)(b), the county treasurer shall mail a new tax notice to the taxpayer for the May 30, 1994, tax payment. If the taxpayer paid the entire amount of the 1993 tax year property tax in November 1993, the county treasurer shall provide a refund in the amount that the November 1993 payment exceeds the amount due on the revised amount of property tax due.

(2) A county shall calculate the entire amount due under subsection (1) for the county and shall submit a claim for that amount to the department of revenue by May 30, 1994. Failure to submit a claim by May 30, 1994, renders a county ineligible for reimbursement. The department shall make reimbursement payments by June 30, 1994.

<u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Section 6. Appropriation.** (1) There is appropriated from the general fund $1,125,000 to the department of revenue for the purpose of providing the additional tax relief contained in [section 4]. On July 1, 1994, any portion of the appropriation that has not been used reverts to the general fund.

(2) There is appropriated from the general fund $184,000 to the department of revenue for the purpose of calculating the amount of property tax relief due to reappraisal in calendar year 1994.

(3) There is appropriated from the general fund $92,000 to the department of revenue for the purpose of calculating the amount of property tax relief due to reappraisal in calendar year 1995.

<u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Section 7. Codification instruction.** (1) [Section 1] is intended to be codified as an integral part of Title 15, chapter 1, part 2, and the provisions of Title 15, chapter 1, part 2, apply to [section 1].

(2) [Section 2] is intended to be codified as an integral part of Title 15, chapter 30, and the provisions of Title 15, chapter 30, apply to [section 2].

<u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Section 8. Applicability.** [Section 3] applies to tax years beginning after December 31, 1993.

<u>NEW SECTION.</u> **Section 9. Effective date.** [This act] is effective on passage and approval."

-END-

ROLL CALL VOTE ①

SENATE COMMITTEE TAXATION BILL NO. HB 29

DATE December 17, 1993 TIME 4:52 A.M. P.M.

NAME	YES	NO
Sen. Brown		X
Sen. Doherty	X	
Sen. Eck	X	
Sen. Gage		X
Sen. Grosfield		X
Sen. Halligan	X	
Sen. Harp		X
Sen. Stang	X	
Sen. Towe	X	
Sen. Van Valkenburg	X	
Sen. Yellowtail	X	

Beth Satre
SECRETARY

Senator Mike Halligan
CHAIR

MOTION: Sen. Van Valkenburg amendment to allow an income tax credit for owner-occupied residences which have experienced a 25% increase in tax due to reappraisal, 50% of that amount exceeding the 25% increase

ROLL CALL VOTE 2

SENATE COMMITTEE TAXATION BILL NO. HB 29

DATE December 17, 1995 TIME 4:54 A.M. P.M.

NAME	YES	NO
Sen. Brown		X
Sen. Doherty	X	
Sen. Eck	X	
Sen. Gage		X
Sen. Grosfield		X
Sen. Halligan	X	
Sen. Harp		X
Sen. Stang	X	
Sen. Towe	X	
Sen. Van Valkenburg	X	
Sen. Yellowtail	X	

Beth Satre
SECRETARY

Mike Halligan
CHAIR

MOTION: Senator Van Valkenburg amendment to insert provisions of SB 25 as it left the Senate floor December 16.

Impact of Adjusting 1993 Increase in Residential Property Tax Liability - Owner Occupied

ALL Residential Property --- Adjusted for Voted Mill Levies

Credit is 25% of Amount of Taxes in Excess of 125% of 1992 Tax Liability (Min $25 / Max $500 Credit)

County	Total Parcels	Total 1992 Tax	Total 1993 Tax	# Impacted	Total Relief	Avg. Relief
Beaverhead	3,980	1,412,875	1,806,080	311	15,560	50
Big Horn	3,155	793,190	738,930	14	583	42
Blaine	2,600	760,525	769,890	82	3,756	46
Broadwater	1,905	506,380	618,735	35	1,372	39
Carbon	1,685	582,165	619,470	14	926	66
Carter	1,075	273,190	252,670	3	95	32
Cascade	26,065	18,612,005	19,761,465	1,159	66,512	57
Chouteau	3,820	1,336,085	1,251,210	29	1,658	57
Custer	5,070	2,341,670	2,566,340	94	3,983	42
Daniels	1,900	610,425	566,440	5	575	115
Dawson	4,525	1,862,050	1,816,430	27	1,931	72
Deer Lodge	4,705	1,853,245	2,202,285	278	12,974	47
Fallon	1,450	411,100	468,160	32	1,585	50
Fergus	7,005	2,307,915	2,232,280	46	2,352	51
Flathead	32,160	19,924,255	23,545,290	2,368	171,212	72
Gallatin	20,665	13,322,660	14,561,895	1,191	66,890	56
Garfield	1,045	259,910	261,810	3	470	157
Glacier	3,440	1,098,770	1,464,565	357	20,666	58
Golden Valley	650	131,985	124,535	8	1,345	168
Granite	3,050	496,165	744,345	252	14,504	58
Hill	6,905	3,141,340	3,557,175	370	16,043	43
Jefferson	4,085	1,539,265	1,903,490	303	13,900	46
Judith Basin	2,440	469,520	468,715	8	246	31
Lake	11,365	5,975,255	7,555,210	1,081	86,846	80
Lewis And Clark	21,580	13,146,635	14,956,705	972	50,350	52
Liberty	1,180	487,495	441,635	6	251	42
Lincoln	10,670	2,934,545	3,388,715	235	11,070	47
Madison	5,340	1,797,250	1,899,620	122	17,323	142
McCone	1,490	450,545	423,410	5	173	35
Meagher	1,725	330,740	365,825	49	1,585	32
Mineral	2,205	552,545	769,060	170	8,756	52
Missoula	30,640	25,618,315	28,793,240	926	58,882	64
Musselshell	3,165	731,985	700,495	3	73	24
Park	6,610	3,442,015	3,713,165	349	18,060	52
Petroleum	415	56,180	53,285	0	0	–
Phillips	2,855	743,180	853,030	73	3,043	42
Pondera	2,855	1,201,080	1,156,030	40	2,422	61
Powder River	1,180	478,765	501,405	30	1,652	55
Powell	2,760	993,565	1,114,180	49	2,317	47
Prairie	1,110	218,865	209,540	3	97	32
Ravalli	13,810	6,583,535	7,659,700	570	26,247	46
Richland	4,660	1,537,825	1,895,165	308	12,749	41
Roosevelt	3,990	941,255	1,053,960	46	1,669	36
Rosebud	3,825	703,750	698,250	16	680	43
Sanders	5,345	1,436,040	1,717,790	151	6,807	45
Sheridan	3,165	919,670	875,450	0	0	–
Silver Bow	14,990	8,893,170	9,497,015	692	29,678	43
Stillwater	3,960	1,509,005	1,710,630	94	4,064	43
Sweet Grass	1,490	801,850	731,815	14	837	60
Teton	3,370	1,503,195	1,328,765	14	713	51
Toole	2,860	971,755	943,760	78	3,170	41
Treasure	445	139,135	131,790	3	124	41
Valley	5,270	1,749,605	1,778,065	30	1,553	52
Wheatland	1,395	268,325	262,370	0	0	–
Wibaux	775	169,825	200,630	8	284	35
Yellowstone	45,475	29,576,350	33,204,950	1,261	68,008	54
TOTAL	365,350	190,909,940	212,886,860	14,387	838,615	58

REVENUE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE PROPERTY TAX REBATE PROPOSALS
ASSESSED VALUE INCREASED BY 10% OR MORE FOR ELIGIBILITY
(Assumes Minimum Rebate of $25)

SENATE TAXATION
EXHIBIT NO. 2
DATE December 17, 1993
BILL NO. HB 29

FULL COST, NO ADJUSTMENTS

all residential prop

Cap Level	Percentage of Excess Allowed as Rebate 25%	50%	75%
$0	2,770,865	6,654,560	10,439,925
$250	2,708,110	6,158,770	9,072,085
$500	2,758,300	6,529,050	10,001,600
$1,000	2,769,875	6,629,420	10,340,125

-above 10% → just reappraised
- minimum of $25 - no cap

FULL COST, ADJUSTED FOR OWNER-OCCUPANCY

Cap Level	Percentage of Excess Allowed as Rebate 25%	50%	75%
$0	1,662,519	3,992,736	6,263,955
$250	1,624,866	3,695,262	5,443,251
$500	1,654,980	3,917,430	6,000,960
$1,000	1,661,925	3,977,652	6,204,075

FULL COST, ADJ. FOR OWNER-OCCUPANCY, PIT CREDIT

Cap Level	Percentage of Excess Allowed as Rebate 25%	50%	75%
$0	1,496,267	3,593,462	5,637,560
$250	1,462,379	3,325,736	4,898,926
$500	1,489,482	3,525,687	5,400,864
$1,000	1,495,733	3,579,887	5,583,668

[illegible]
[illegible] Unsecured
[illegible]
[illegible] Info

Office of Research and Information
Department of Revenue

A:\OPTIONS

EXHIBIT 2
12-17-93
HB 29

REVENUE IMPACTS OF ALTERNATIVE PROPERTY TAX REBATE PROPOSALS
ASSESSED VALUE INCREASED BY 25% OR MORE FOR ELIGIBILITY
(Assumes Minimum Rebate of $25)

FULL COST, NO ADJUSTMENTS

Cap Level	Percentage of Excess Allowed as Rebate		
	25%	50%	75%
$0	1,325,720	3,224,555	5,097,420
$250	1,291,475	2,969,860	4,398,135
$500	1,319,900	3,156,065	4,869,380
$1,000	1,325,720	3,212,910	5,043,265

FULL COST, ADJUSTED FOR OWNER-OCCUPANCY

Cap Level	Percentage of Excess Allowed as Rebate		
	25%	50%	75%
$0	795,432	1,934,733	3,058,452
$250	774,885	1,781,916	2,638,881
$500	791,940	1,893,639	2,921,628
$1,000	795,432	1,927,746	3,025,959

FULL COST, ADJ. FOR OWNER-OCCUPANCY, PIT CREDIT

Cap Level	Percentage of Excess Allowed as Rebate		
	25%	50%	75%
$0	715,889	1,741,260	2,752,607
$250	697,397	1,603,724	2,374,993
$500	712,746	1,704,275	2,629,465
$1,000	715,889	1,734,971	2,723,363

Office of Research and Information
Department of Revenue

A:\OPTIONS