	LEGISI							
Louisiana		Fiscal Note Fiscal N	ote On:	НВ	884	HLS	14RS	1284
: Legillative		Bill Text \	Version:	ORIGI	NAL			
Fiscale		Opp. Chamb.	Action:					
Fischer		Proposed						
		Sub. B	Bill For.:					
Date: March 17, 2014	4:58 PM	3 PM Author: ST. GERMAIN						
Dept./Agy.: Transportation								

Subject: Mineral Revenue Dedication To TTF

Analyst: Greg Albrecht

FUNDS/FUNDING

OR -\$42,000,000 GF RV See Note

Page 1 of 1

Provides with regard to dedications of certain excess mineral revenues and deposits into the Budget Stabilization Fund

<u>Present law</u> prioritizes the allocation of state mineral revenue receipts before subjecting the remaining receipts to potential deposit into the Budget Stabilization Fund. Those priority allocations are, the Bond Security & Redemption Fund, the parish severance tax and royalty distributions, the Wildlife & Fisheries Conservation Fund, the Education Quality Trust Fund {8(g) fund}, and an \$850 million "base" amount to the state general fund. Receipts in addition to these priorities flow to the Budget Stabilization Fund until it reaches its annual maximum balance or deposits are otherwise halted.

<u>Proposed law</u> adds the Transportation Trust Fund as a priority recipient of mineral revenue before the state general fund "base" amount. This bill is the statutory companion to HB 629 of this 2014 session proposing to amend the state constitution to provide for mineral revenue allocations to the TTF, and is effective only upon adoption by the electorate of that proposed amendment at the statewide election held on November 4, 2014.

EXPENDITURES	2014-15	<u>2015-16</u>	2016-17	<u>2017-18</u>	2018-19	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Annual Total	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
REVENUES	<u>2014-15</u>	2015-16	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	(\$42,000,000)	(\$58,000,000)	(\$50,000,000)	(\$50,000,000)	(\$200,000,000)
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$50,000,000	\$200,000,000
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>

EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION

There is no anticipated direct material effect on governmental expenditures as a result of this measure.

REVENUE EXPLANATION

The discussion below is from the fiscal note on HB 629, the proposed constitutional amendment to which this bill is the statutory companion. Under current law and the latest official forecast for FY16, mineral revenue collections (\$1.344 billion) first support the parish severance and royalty allocations (\$95.6 million). The next \$850 million of collections support the state general fund (this is the base amount referred to above). This leaves \$398 million of excess mineral revenue in FY16, of which, \$356 million is currently expected to flow into the Budget Stabilization Fund (Act 420 of 2013), and \$42 million would remain to flow into the state general fund. This bill would place its \$50 million allocation to the TTF ahead of the flow into the Budget Stabilization Fund. After this new flow into the TTF, \$348 million would remain to flow into the Budget Stabilization Fund can accept \$356 million before its maximum balance is reached. Thus, all the remaining \$348 million of mineral revenue would then flow into the Budget Stabilization Fund, and the state general fund would receive none of the \$42 million currently expected. At that point all mineral revenue collections would be allocated. The table above depicts the new deposit to the TTF, and its effective financing by the state general fund (with the \$8 million difference essentially reflecting financing by less of a flow into the Budget Stabilization Fund than expected under current law).

For FY17, forecasted mineral revenue (\$1.327 billion) would be allocated to the parishes first (\$95 million), then the next \$850 million to the state general fund. This leaves \$382 million of excess mineral revenue, of which, \$50 million would flow into the TTF and \$8 million would flow into the Budget Stabilization Fund to reach its maximum balance. This would leave \$324 million to support the state general fund. However, under current law, all \$382 million of excess mineral revenue would flow into the state general fund since the Budget Stabilization Fund would have been filled to its maximum in FY16 requiring no FY17 funds, and no dedication to the TTF from mineral revenue would exist. Thus, the bill reduces expected state general fund receipts in FY17 by \$58 million while it directs another \$50 million into the TTF.

For FY18, FY19, and subsequent years through FY25, the Budget Stabilization Fund is presumed filled to its maximum and the bill's \$50 million dedication to the TTF is funded entirely by the state general fund.

The Conservation Fund and 8(g) Fund are not affected by the bill as they have their own revenue flows, and are not included in the revenue flows discussed above. The maximum balance of the Budget Stabilization Fund is recalculated each year and forecasts of mineral revenue will change, as well. Thus, specific affected amounts in each fiscal will differ from those above.

<u>Senate</u>	Dual Referral Rules	<u>House</u>	x 6.8(F)(1) >= \$100,000 SGF Fiscal Cost {H & S}	John D. Capater
X 13.5.1 >=	\$100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S8	&H}	6.8(F)(2) >= \$500,000 State Rev. Reduc. {H & S}	
	\$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change {S&H}		6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease {S}	Legislative Fiscal Officer