



## FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The SHTD has no reliable information regarding the number of 2-year vehicle registration option transactions on which a “doubled” beautification fee would be applied. However, the beautification fee revenue for FY00 was approximately \$1.2 million, but dropped to \$829.0 in FY01. The majority of that revenue loss was likely related to the loss of fees imposed in connection with the heavy vehicle annual filing fee (cab card fee). Some amount, however, is probably attributable to vehicles registered under the 2-year option during FY00.

The SHTD reports that no substantial revenue gain is expected to result from this bill.

This bill contains an emergency clause, thus a small revenue gain may be realized in FY02 as a result.

## TECHNICAL ISSUES

With implementation of the 2-year vehicle registration option, the statute is currently unclear as to whether the beautification fee should be \$0.50 or \$1.00 for a 2-year vehicle registration. This bill seeks to address that issue.

The SHTD notes the following technical concerns:

Section 4, Subsection A, Paragraph (3)(a) adds a specification to Section 66-6-23 NMSA 1978 that “... *the fees collected pursuant to Section 66-7-413.4 NMSA 1978*” be distributed to the state road fund. The SHTD requests a reference to Section 66-7-413 be added here: “... *the fees collected pursuant to **Section 66-7-413 and Section 66-7-413.4 NMSA 1978***”.

Section 66-7-413.4 NMSA 1978 allows an excessive weight permit for liquid hauling tank vehicles, and that 2001 legislation also repealed Section 66-7-413.3. However, Section 66-7-413.3 (repealed) used to contain a vague provision that “*Any fees collected pursuant to special permits authorizing over-size or over-weight transportation ... be transferred to the state road fund.*” It is unclear whether there now exists any specific statutory distribution of the fees collected under Section 66-7-413 NMSA 1978 (over-size and over-weight permits), and this should be made clear.

**RLG/njw**