

Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the NM Legislature. The LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

Current FIRs (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) are available on the NM Legislative Website (www.nmlegis.gov). Adobe PDF versions include all attachments, whereas HTML versions may not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

ORIGINAL DATE 2/14/15

SPONSOR SCORC LAST UPDATED _____ HB _____

SHORT TITLE Gross Receipts and Hold Harmless Tax Changes SB 101/SCORCS

ANALYST van Moorsel

REVENUE (dollars in thousands)

Estimated Revenue*					Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
FY15	FY16	FY17	FY18	FY19		
\$0.0	\$33,100.0	\$26,700.0	\$19,700.0	\$11,500.0	Recurring	General Fund
\$0.0	(\$140,200.0) - \$0.0	(\$138,500.0) - \$0.0	(\$136,000.0) - \$0.0	(\$132,600.0) - \$0.0	Recurring	Local Governments

(Parenthesis () indicate revenue decreases)

***See “Fiscal Implications.”**

Conflicts with HB 158 – Gross Receipts Rate & Deductions and SB 274 – Hold Harmless & Fund Deduction Changes

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

LFC Files

Responses Received From

Taxation and Revenue Department (TRD)

New Mexico Municipal League (NMML)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

Senate Corporations Committee Substitute for Senate Bill 101 amends current law to reduce the gross receipts tax (GRT) rate, repeals hold harmless distributions to municipalities and counties, reduce authority to impose municipal and county hold harmless gross receipts taxes, and requires local governments that have already imposed hold harmless gross receipts taxes in excess of the new limits to conform to the new limits unless the revenue is pledged to service the debt on revenue bonds.

Section 1 amends the Gross Receipts and Compensating Tax Act to reduce the state GRT rate by 0.25 percent from 5.125 percent to 4.875 percent.

Sections 2 and 3 create new sections of the statute governing municipal and county local option GRT to create the “Municipal New Hold Harmless Gross Receipts Tax” and the “County New Hold Harmless Gross Receipts Tax” limited to the lesser of 0.5 percent or the hold harmless rate, rounded to the nearest 1/16 percent, that would generate revenue equal to the food and medical deductions in the municipality or county. The section also reduces the minimum increment of imposition from 1/8 percent to 1/16 percent.

The hold harmless rate is the rate, rounded to the nearest 1/16 percent, that would generate revenue equal to the food and medical hold harmless distribution for that local government prior to any phaseout.

Local governments that impose hold harmless gross receipts taxes prior to January 1, 2016 that are still in effect, would only receive rate authority to the lesser of 0.25 percent or the hold harmless rate, rounded to the nearest 1/16 percent. The local governments impose the above taxes shall not repeal the taxes if the revenue is pledged to bonds.

Section 4 provides that any local option hold harmless GRT impositions in effect prior to January 1, 2016, those impositions shall remain in effect until they expire.

Section 5 requires TRD to calculate each local government’s hold harmless rate on or before December 1, 2015.

Section 6 repeals the municipal and county hold harmless GRT rate authority effective July 1, 2015, as well as the food and medical hold harmless distributions to municipalities and counties effective January 1, 2016. Current law provides these distributions are currently subject to a phaseout for large municipalities and counties, as well as those that have imposed the hold harmless gross receipts taxes.

The effective date of sections 5 and 6 is July 1, 2015. The effective date of Sections 1-4 is January 1, 2016.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

The fiscal impact analysis of the committee substitute is largely unchanged from the original bill. The main change is in the way the bill amends local option rate authority, but the effects continue to fall within the range presented in the revenue table. The effect on the general fund as described below is unchanged.

The two main changes in this bill would impact general fund revenue in offsetting directions. The reduction in the state GRT rate would reduce general fund revenue, while the repeal of the hold harmless distributions to counties and municipalities would have a positive effect on the general fund. ***The net general fund impact stays positive over the forecast period; however, potentially as soon as FY2021 the net impact becomes negative.***

Impacts on local governments are more ambiguous, as counties and municipalities may or may not elect to impose new local option gross receipts tax in an amount up to what would be lost from the repeal of Sections 7-1-6.46 and 7-1-6.47 NMSA 1978 (food and medical hold harmless distributions). The potential range of impacts is from the full amount of the hold harmless being repealed to zero if all entities enact the full amount of the tax.

General Fund Implications. Based on the current state gross receipts tax rate and FY2014 levels of taxable gross receipts, a change from a state rate of 5.125 percent to a state rate of 4.875 percent would have reduced FY2014 by about \$100 million. The estimate in subsequent years is based on the consensus growth rate of GRT.

This reduction would be more than offset by the repeal of the food and medical hold harmless distributions in early years. In 2014, hold harmless payments totaled approximately \$140 million. As such, these changes would have resulted in a net increase to the general fund of about \$40 million in FY2014. The net change is estimated to be \$33 million in FY16, diminishing in out years.

However, current law provides for a phaseout of the hold harmless payments to large municipalities and counties, as well as any local governments that enact a hold harmless tax. This means hold harmless distributions are going to decrease over time, as will the positive impact to the general fund from the hold harmless repeal.

The net general fund impact of the bill stays positive over the forecast period, but it is estimated to turn negative, perhaps as soon as FY21.

Local Government Implications. TRD points out that one side of the equation for local governments is simply the reverse of the positive general fund impact: the repeal of hold harmless distributions would have reduced local government revenues by \$140 million in FY2014. As with the general fund impact, the loss for each location subject to the phaseout decreases over time as the hold harmless distributions would be phased out under current law.

TRD reports the other side of the impact is more difficult to estimate, as it depends on the actions of the local governments. Local governments will be faced with a choice of either accepting the loss of revenue, or enacting a tax up to the amount equal the lost revenue from the repeal of hold harmless payments (within rounding error due to rounding to the nearest 1/16%). The tax may not to exceed 0.5% in 1/16% increments. Rather than attempt to predict which locations will enact taxes and at which rates, TRD provided the attached table that outlines the new hold harmless local option tax available by location, as well as the amount of hold harmless distribution received by each location in FY2014.

This bill may be counter to the LFC tax policy principle of adequacy. In the long term the revenue reduction pursuant to the GRT reduction is expected to exceed revenue savings from eliminating the hold harmless distributions to municipalities and counties, resulting in a net revenue loss in the long term. As such, revenues may be insufficient to cover growing recurring appropriations.

The New Mexico Municipal League reports that while this legislation is intended to allow a municipality or county to enact a gross receipts tax sufficient only to replace the current hold harmless distributions being made by the state the Municipal League believes that even with the imposition of a .5% increase in hold harmless gross receipts tax approximately 6 municipalities will still collect less than what is generated by the current distribution.

The NMML estimates that a majority of the incorporated municipalities in the state can replace the hold harmless distribution using no more than the 0.25 percent reduction in the state rate.

SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

The Gross Receipts and Compensating Tax Act provides for a large number of exemptions, credits, and deductions. These provisions have contributed to a narrowed tax base, and to maintain revenue adequacy, the state GRT rate of 5.125 percent, combined with local option GRT impositions, has increased to as high as 8.69 percent in some municipalities. This violates the LFC tax principle of efficiency, which states the tax base should be as broad as possible and avoid excess reliance on one tax. Legislation enacted in 2013 granting local governments additional rate authority (see below) could lead to even higher tax rates.

Further, pyramiding remains an issue in some industries as GRT applies to business-to-business purchases of supplies, raw materials, and equipment, creating an extra layer of taxation at each stage of production. Legislation enacted in 2012 to address tax pyramiding in the manufacturing and construction sectors was onerous to administer and more open-ended than intended, doubling its estimated impact. The manufacturing deduction allows firms to deduct tangible property consumed in manufacturing. The construction-service and equipment-leasing deductions apply to sales to a construction business for a taxable construction project. Future anti-pyramiding legislation should be carefully constructed to avoid ambiguity and uncertainty. Reducing the GRT rate will help to reduce the effects of pyramiding.

TECHNICAL ISSUES

TRD points out that the bill does not specify who should calculate the available hold harmless rate. To prevent confusion and disagreement, consider a provision for the department to publish the calculated rates, by location, at some interval. Also, as written, the calculation for the hold harmless rate is rounded to the nearest one sixteenth percent. For some local governments, standard rounding rules result in a rate of zero. TRD suggests this could be rewritten to allow those entities at minimum one sixteenth of a percent if desired.

TRD adds the language describing the calculation of the hold harmless rate should be clarified to reflect that the calculation is to determine the rate that would have resulted in an amount of revenue in the previous twelve months as calculated based on the taxable gross receipts from that time period. As written, the rate seems to refer to an amount of future revenue, and as such, can only be calculated ex post.

Does the bill meet the Legislative Finance Committee tax policy principles?

1. **Adequacy:** Revenue should be adequate to fund needed government services.
2. **Efficiency:** Tax base should be as broad as possible and avoid excess reliance on one tax.
3. **Equity:** Different taxpayers should be treated fairly.
4. **Simplicity:** Collection should be simple and easily understood.
5. **Accountability:** Preferences should be easy to monitor and evaluate

Table 1: Local Government Hold Harmless Rate Calculations

CITY / COUNTY	Location Code	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Hold Harmless Distribution	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Taxable Gross Receipts	Total GRT Rate as of 1/1/2015	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate Nearest 1/16%	Total GRT Rate With Enactment of Maximum HH Rate	Hold Harmless Tax Difference From Hold Harmless Distribution, Monthly Avg.
Bernalillo County	02-002	\$ 860,122.59	\$ 1,286,200,738.66	6.0625%	0.06687%	0.06250%	6.12500%	\$ (56,247.13)
Albuquerque	02-100	\$ 3,182,118.54	\$ 1,096,566,949.63	7.0000%	0.29019%	0.3125%	7.3125%	\$ 244,653.18
Los Ranchos	02-200	\$ 5,647.18	\$ 7,833,609.24	7.0625%	0.07209%	0.0625%	7.1250%	\$ (751.18)
Tijeras	02-318	\$ 257.21	\$ 1,953,022.03	7.4375%	0.01317%	0.0000%	7.4375%	\$ (257.21)
Catron County	28-028	\$ 1,036.57	\$ 2,542,055.91	5.6875%	0.04078%	0.0625%	5.7500%	\$ 552.21
Reserve	28-130	\$ 1,661.62	\$ 254,006.24	7.0000%	0.65416%	0.5000%	7.5000%	\$ (391.59)
Chaves County	04-004	\$ 68,375.56	\$ 98,946,739.53	6.0625%	0.06910%	0.0625%	6.1250%	\$ (6,533.85)
Dexter	04-201	\$ 4,593.05	\$ 1,909,107.32	6.9375%	0.24059%	0.2500%	7.1875%	\$ 179.72
Hagerman	04-300	\$ 2,446.98	\$ 936,228.78	7.1250%	0.26137%	0.2500%	7.3750%	\$ (106.40)
Lake Arthur	04-400	\$ 0.08	\$ 670,675.93	6.4375%	0.00001%	0.0000%	6.4375%	\$ (0.08)
Roswell	04-101	\$ 314,986.59	\$ 80,809,148.04	7.1250%	0.38979%	0.3750%	7.5000%	\$ (11,952.28)
Cibola County	33-033	\$ 26,627.44	\$ 26,857,487.47	6.5625%	0.09914%	0.1250%	6.6875%	\$ 6,944.42
Grants	33-227	\$ 62,257.66	\$ 16,803,019.66	7.8750%	0.37051%	0.3750%	8.2500%	\$ 753.67
Milan	33-131	\$ 11,478.93	\$ 5,541,660.00	7.5000%	0.20714%	0.1875%	7.6875%	\$ (1,088.31)
Colfax County	09-009	\$ 4,021.31	\$ 21,514,121.62	6.0833%	0.01869%	0.0000%	6.0833%	\$ (4,021.31)
Angel Fire	09-600	\$ 14,217.18	\$ 5,623,382.25	7.7708%	0.25282%	0.2500%	8.0208%	\$ (158.72)
Raton (39)	09-102	\$ 35,979.02	\$ 8,225,182.57	8.5208%	0.43743%	0.4375%	8.9583%	\$ 6.15
Springer	09-301	\$ 2,973.57	\$ 962,765.87	7.1458%	0.30886%	0.3125%	7.4583%	\$ 35.08
Curry County	05-005	\$ 50,054.12	\$ 80,160,142.08	6.1250%	0.06244%	0.0625%	6.1875%	\$ 45.97
Clovis	05-103	\$ 263,928.96	\$ 58,689,640.70	8.0625%	0.44970%	0.4375%	8.5000%	\$ (7,161.78)
Melrose	05-402	\$ 1,594.40	\$ 476,266.70	7.7500%	0.33477%	0.3125%	8.0625%	\$ (106.07)
Texico	05-302	\$ 1,648.03	\$ 497,788.71	7.5625%	0.33107%	0.3125%	7.8750%	\$ (92.44)
DeBaca County	27-027	\$ 1,835.05	\$ 1,917,332.36	6.3125%	0.09571%	0.1250%	6.4375%	\$ 561.61
Fort Sumner	27-104	\$ 6,577.94	\$ 1,062,479.72	7.6250%	0.61911%	0.5000%	8.1250%	\$ (1,265.54)
Dona Ana County	07-007	\$ 149,613.13	\$ 268,298,666.52	6.3750%	0.05576%	0.0625%	6.4375%	\$ 18,073.54
Anthony (61)	07-507	\$ 2,387.40	\$ 3,351,596.33	7.3750%	0.07123%	0.0625%	7.4375%	\$ (292.65)
Hatch	07-204	\$ 13,748.66	\$ 1,780,247.68	7.4375%	0.77229%	0.5000%	7.9375%	\$ (4,847.42)
Las Cruces	07-105	\$ 771,418.33	\$ 191,566,107.53	7.9375%	0.40269%	0.3750%	8.3125%	\$ (53,045.43)

CITY / COUNTY	Location Code	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Hold Harmless Distribution	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Taxable Gross Receipts	Total GRT Rate as of 1/1/2015	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate Nearest 1/16%	Total GRT Rate With Enactment of Maximum HH Rate	Hold Harmless Tax Difference From Hold Harmless Distribution, Monthly Avg.
Mesilla	07-303	\$ 2,147.87	\$ 2,505,746.10	7.8125%	0.08572%	0.0625%	7.8750%	\$ (581.78)
Sunland Park	07-416	\$ 9,210.57	\$ 9,135,710.74	7.6875%	0.10082%	0.1250%	7.8125%	\$ 2,209.07
Eddy County	03-003	\$ 29,485.18	\$ 328,640,475.30	5.7500%	0.00897%	0.0000%	5.7500%	\$ (29,485.18)
Artesia	03-205	\$ 111,195.47	\$ 62,234,162.95	7.4375%	0.17867%	0.1875%	7.6250%	\$ 5,493.59
Carlsbad	03-106	\$ 204,726.43	\$ 99,962,181.52	7.4375%	0.20480%	0.1875%	7.6250%	\$ (17,297.34)
Loving	03-403	\$ 4,355.74	\$ 7,709,876.79	6.8125%	0.05650%	0.0625%	6.8750%	\$ 462.93
Grant County	08-008	\$ 32,777.45	\$ 39,616,338.46	6.5625%	0.08274%	0.0625%	6.6250%	\$ (8,017.24)
Bayard	08-206	\$ 7,102.38	\$ 2,035,084.75	7.6250%	0.34900%	0.3750%	8.0000%	\$ 529.18
Santa Clara (31)	08-305	\$ 41.77	\$ 673,641.25	7.6250%	0.00620%	0.0000%	7.6250%	\$ (41.77)
Silver City	08-107	\$ 135,859.15	\$ 22,272,804.13	7.7500%	0.60998%	0.5000%	8.2500%	\$ (24,495.13)
Guadalupe County	24-024	\$ 4,484.00	\$ 7,236,078.96	6.4375%	0.06197%	0.0625%	6.5000%	\$ 38.55
Santa Rosa	24-108	\$ 10,777.50	\$ 4,733,725.84	8.0000%	0.22767%	0.2500%	8.2500%	\$ 1,056.82
Vaughn	24-207	\$ 1,580.74	\$ 526,956.13	7.7500%	0.29998%	0.3125%	8.0625%	\$ 66.00
Harding County	31-031	\$ 102.62	\$ 3,348,545.67	6.1250%	0.00306%	0.0000%	6.1250%	\$ (102.62)
Roy	31-109	\$ 874.30	\$ 120,696.58	7.3125%	0.72437%	0.5000%	7.8125%	\$ (270.81)
Hidalgo County	23-023	\$ 2,140.20	\$ 6,153,852.15	5.9375%	0.03478%	0.0625%	6.0000%	\$ 1,705.96
Lordsburg	23-110	\$ 10,149.18	\$ 3,808,204.76	7.2500%	0.26651%	0.2500%	7.5000%	\$ (628.67)
Lea County	06-006	\$ 29,118.71	\$ 418,863,265.68	5.5000%	0.00695%	0.0000%	5.5000%	\$ (29,118.71)
Eunice	06-210	\$ 9,073.66	\$ 17,218,615.94	6.8125%	0.05270%	0.0625%	6.8750%	\$ 1,687.98
Hobbs	06-111	\$ 244,121.12	\$ 240,826,937.02	6.8125%	0.10137%	0.1250%	6.9375%	\$ 56,912.55
Jal	06-306	\$ 12,074.67	\$ 4,717,616.11	7.0625%	0.25595%	0.2500%	7.3125%	\$ (280.63)
Lovington	06-405	\$ 39,297.44	\$ 26,641,456.94	7.2500%	0.14750%	0.1250%	7.3750%	\$ (5,995.62)
Tatum	06-500	\$ 4,497.60	\$ 1,962,138.43	6.8125%	0.22922%	0.2500%	7.0625%	\$ 407.75
Lincoln County	26-026	\$ 9,000.02	\$ 39,837,884.38	5.6875%	0.02259%	0.0000%	5.6875%	\$ (9,000.02)
Capitan	26-211	\$ 8,864.64	\$ 1,159,192.25	7.0000%	0.76473%	0.5000%	7.5000%	\$ (3,068.68)
Carrizozo	26-307	\$ 1,412.26	\$ 1,008,135.54	7.1875%	0.14009%	0.1250%	7.3125%	\$ (152.09)
Corona	26-406	\$ 40.71	\$ 210,054.06	7.1250%	0.01938%	0.0000%	7.1250%	\$ (40.71)
Ruidoso (40)	26-112	\$ 40,761.81	\$ 20,234,550.97	8.6250%	0.20145%	0.1875%	8.8125%	\$ (2,822.03)

CITY / COUNTY	Location Code	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Hold Harmless Distribution	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Taxable Gross Receipts	Total GRT Rate as of 1/1/2015	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate Nearest 1/16%	Total GRT Rate With Enactment of Maximum HH Rate	Hold Harmless Tax Difference From Hold Harmless Distribution, Monthly Avg.
Ruidoso Downs	26-501	\$ 58,324.43	\$ 6,623,147.20	7.6250%	0.88062%	0.5000%	8.1250%	\$ (25,208.69)
Los Alamos	32-032	\$ 166,718.31	\$ 95,476,248.87	7.3125%	0.17462%	0.1875%	7.5000%	\$ 12,299.66
Luna County	19-019	\$ 19,171.34	\$ 24,574,022.89	6.5000%	0.07801%	0.0625%	6.5625%	\$ (3,812.58)
Columbus	19-212	\$ 1,833.47	\$ 574,386.84	7.5625%	0.31921%	0.3125%	7.8750%	\$ (38.51)
Deming	19-113	\$ 85,630.14	\$ 19,331,863.47	7.5000%	0.44295%	0.4375%	7.9375%	\$ (1,053.23)
McKinley County	13-013	\$ 120,498.25	\$ 94,636,790.67	6.7500%	0.12733%	0.1250%	6.8750%	\$ (2,202.26)
Gallup	13-114	\$ 249,901.18	\$ 51,112,306.82	8.3125%	0.48893%	0.5000%	8.8125%	\$ 5,660.36
Mora County	30-030	\$ 910.56	\$ 2,381,451.68	6.3125%	0.03824%	0.0625%	6.3750%	\$ 577.84
Wagon Mound	30-115	\$ 104.58	\$ 139,563.95	7.3125%	0.07493%	0.0625%	7.3750%	\$ (17.35)
Otero County	15-015	\$ 34,579.05	\$ 70,206,336.64	6.1875%	0.04925%	0.0625%	6.2500%	\$ 9,299.91
Alamogordo	15-116	\$ 241,670.43	\$ 42,308,286.34	7.8750%	0.57121%	0.5000%	8.3750%	\$ (30,129.00)
Cloudcroft	15-213	\$ 2,691.46	\$ 1,611,645.75	7.6250%	0.16700%	0.1875%	7.8125%	\$ 330.37
Tularosa	15-308	\$ 10,105.48	\$ 1,683,708.75	7.6250%	0.60019%	0.5000%	8.1250%	\$ (1,686.93)
Quay County	10-010	\$ 10,754.72	\$ 11,645,588.04	6.6875%	0.09235%	0.0625%	6.7500%	\$ (3,476.22)
Logan	10-309	\$ 5,681.94	\$ 1,591,942.29	8.3750%	0.35692%	0.3750%	8.7500%	\$ 287.85
Tucumcari	10-117	\$ 21,827.48	\$ 7,059,067.75	8.3750%	0.30921%	0.3125%	8.6875%	\$ 232.11
Rio Arriba County	17-017	\$ 40,603.80	\$ 35,039,575.10	6.5000%	0.11588%	0.1250%	6.6250%	\$ 3,195.67
Chama	17-118	\$ 12,349.40	\$ 1,721,779.63	8.1875%	0.71725%	0.5000%	8.6875%	\$ (3,740.50)
Espanola (part)	17-215	\$ 118,755.85	\$ 18,205,134.88	8.5625%	0.65232%	0.5000%	9.0625%	\$ (27,730.17)
Roosevelt County	11-011	\$ 27,583.05	\$ 19,746,156.45	6.2500%	0.13969%	0.1250%	6.3750%	\$ (2,900.35)
Causey	11-408	\$ 0.12	\$ 22,305.08	6.7500%	0.00052%	0.0000%	6.7500%	\$ (0.12)
Elida	11-216	\$ 855.97	\$ 225,744.45	7.6250%	0.37918%	0.3750%	8.0000%	\$ (9.43)
Portales	11-119	\$ 71,257.72	\$ 15,577,018.74	7.8125%	0.45745%	0.4375%	8.2500%	\$ (3,108.26)
Sandoval County	29-029	\$ 43,934.44	\$ 116,895,958.95	6.2500%	0.03758%	0.0625%	6.3125%	\$ 29,125.54
Bernalillo	29-120	\$ 104,408.78	\$ 13,938,346.32	7.0625%	0.74908%	0.5000%	7.5625%	\$ (34,717.05)
Corrales (52)	29-504	\$ 2,327.00	\$ 5,806,955.01	7.5625%	0.04007%	0.0625%	7.6250%	\$ 1,302.35
Cuba	29-311	\$ 9,065.75	\$ 2,227,904.22	7.8125%	0.40692%	0.4375%	8.2500%	\$ 681.33
Rio Rancho (part)	29-524	\$ 334,583.07	\$ 76,413,226.12	7.4375%	0.43786%	0.4375%	7.8750%	\$ (275.21)

CITY / COUNTY	Location Code	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Hold Harmless Distribution	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Taxable Gross Receipts	Total GRT Rate as of 1/1/2015	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate Nearest 1/16%	Total GRT Rate With Enactment of Maximum HH Rate	Hold Harmless Tax Difference From Hold Harmless Distribution, Monthly Avg.
San Ysidro	29-409	\$ 2,054.27	\$ 703,093.76	6.7500%	0.29218%	0.3125%	7.0625%	\$ 142.90
San Juan County	16-016	\$ 222,903.29	\$ 286,810,510.93	6.5625%	0.07772%	0.0625%	6.6250%	\$ (43,646.72)
Aztec	16-218	\$ 52,221.37	\$ 11,512,687.12	8.0000%	0.45360%	0.4375%	8.4375%	\$ (1,853.36)
Bloomfield	16-312	\$ 35,179.22	\$ 18,723,633.52	7.9375%	0.18789%	0.1875%	8.1250%	\$ (72.41)
Farmington	16-121	\$ 484,799.85	\$ 152,673,615.44	7.3750%	0.31754%	0.3125%	7.6875%	\$ (7,694.80)
San Miguel County	12-012	\$ 25,173.38	\$ 29,806,953.08	6.5833%	0.08445%	0.0625%	6.6458%	\$ (6,544.03)
Las Vegas	12-122	\$ 103,756.04	\$ 21,190,942.47	8.1458%	0.48962%	0.5000%	8.6458%	\$ 2,198.67
Pecos	12-313	\$ 1,159.58	\$ 996,161.75	7.5208%	0.11640%	0.1250%	7.6458%	\$ 85.62
Santa Fe County	01-001	\$ 277,561.34	\$ 292,103,403.73	6.8750%	0.09502%	0.1250%	7.0000%	\$ 87,567.91
Edgewood	01-320	\$ 81,528.48	\$ 7,305,746.58	7.8750%	1.11595%	0.5000%	8.3750%	\$ (44,999.75)
Santa Fe	01-123	\$ 877,630.58	\$ 233,619,057.12	8.1875%	0.37567%	0.3750%	8.5625%	\$ (1,559.11)
Sierra County	21-021	\$ 17,466.38	\$ 14,737,876.33	6.6875%	0.11851%	0.1250%	6.8125%	\$ 955.96
Elephant Butte	21-319	\$ 692.50	\$ 1,192,086.96	7.9375%	0.05809%	0.0625%	8.0000%	\$ 52.56
T or C	21-124	\$ 46,219.45	\$ 7,957,293.82	8.2500%	0.58084%	0.5000%	8.7500%	\$ (6,432.98)
Socorro County	25-025	\$ 8,042.59	\$ 15,527,018.38	6.0000%	0.05180%	0.0625%	6.0625%	\$ 1,661.80
Magdalena	25-221	\$ 1,295.93	\$ 529,423.59	6.9375%	0.24478%	0.2500%	7.1875%	\$ 27.63
Socorro	25-125	\$ 47,536.84	\$ 11,090,095.28	7.0625%	0.42864%	0.4375%	7.5000%	\$ 982.32
Taos County	20-020	\$ 69,766.22	\$ 49,283,328.33	7.1250%	0.14156%	0.1250%	7.2500%	\$ (8,162.06)
Questa	20-222	\$ 4,663.62	\$ 987,376.08	8.1875%	0.47232%	0.5000%	8.6875%	\$ 273.26
Red River	20-317	\$ 6,062.59	\$ 3,432,186.27	8.4375%	0.17664%	0.1875%	8.6250%	\$ 372.76
Taos	20-126	\$ 170,249.35	\$ 24,800,692.62	8.1875%	0.68647%	0.5000%	8.6875%	\$ (46,245.88)
Taos Ski Valley	20-414	\$ 488.31	\$ 2,610,536.24	8.6875%	0.01871%	0.0000%	8.6875%	\$ (488.31)
Torrance County	22-022	\$ 5,875.70	\$ 9,807,931.41	6.5000%	0.05991%	0.0625%	6.5625%	\$ 254.25
Estancia*	22-503	\$ 4,417.22	\$ 2,384,515.61	7.5625%	0.18525%	0.1875%	7.7500%	\$ 53.75
Moriarty	22-223	\$ 13,643.28	\$ 5,910,441.49	7.4375%	0.23083%	0.2500%	7.6875%	\$ 1,132.83
Mountainair	22-127	\$ 1,412.89	\$ 654,636.81	7.6875%	0.21583%	0.1875%	7.8750%	\$ (185.44)
Union County	18-018	\$ 5,172.25	\$ 8,932,592.49	6.0625%	0.05790%	0.0625%	6.1250%	\$ 410.62

CITY / COUNTY	Location Code	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Hold Harmless Distribution	FY14 12 Mo. Avg. Taxable Gross Receipts	Total GRT Rate as of 1/1/2015	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate	"Hold Harmless" Local Option Rate Nearest 1/16%	Total GRT Rate With Enactment of Maximum HH Rate	Hold Harmless Tax Difference From Hold Harmless Distribution, Monthly Avg.
Clayton	18-128	\$ 16,758.08	\$ 4,381,556.04	7.8750%	0.38247%	0.3750%	8.2500%	\$ (327.24)
Valencia County	14-014	\$ 50,722.61	\$ 54,411,680.29	6.7500%	0.09322%	0.0625%	6.8125%	\$ (16,715.31)
Belen	14-129	\$ 91,695.96	\$ 12,213,754.06	8.1875%	0.75076%	0.5000%	8.6875%	\$ (30,627.19)
Bosque Farms	14-505	\$ 3,500.13	\$ 3,247,566.79	8.0625%	0.10778%	0.1250%	8.1875%	\$ 559.33
Los Lunas	14-316	\$ 152,543.87	\$ 25,660,514.34	7.9375%	0.59447%	0.5000%	8.4375%	\$ (24,241.30)
Peralta	14-412	\$ 883.15	\$ 2,199,260.70	7.8125%	0.04016%	0.0625%	7.8750%	\$ 491.38
Rio Communities	14-037	\$ 577.88	\$ 744,043.20	7.0625%	0.07767%	0.0625%	7.1250%	\$ (112.85)