# COMMITTEE ON LEGISLATIVE RESEARCH OVERSIGHT DIVISION

### **FISCAL NOTE**

L.R. No.: 0313-09

Bill No.: SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Subject: Taxation and Revenue - Property; Utilities

Type: Original Date: May 8, 2019

Bill Summary: This proposal modifies provisions relating to the taxation of companies

regulated by the public service commission and telecommunication taxes.

# **FISCAL SUMMARY**

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON GENERAL REVENUE FUND					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022		
General Revenue	(Unknown greater than \$2,400)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)		
Total Estimated Net Effect on General Revenue	(Unknown greater than \$2,400)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)		

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON OTHER STATE FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022		
School District Trust (0688)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)		
Conservation Commission (0609)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)		
Parks, Soil & Water (0613 & 0614)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)		
Total Estimated Net Effect on Other State Funds	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)		

Numbers within parentheses: ( ) indicate costs or losses. This fiscal note contains 14 pages.

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Page 2 of 14 May 8, 2019

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022		
Total Estimated Net Effect on <u>All</u> Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0		

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON FULL TIME EQUIVALENT (FTE)					
FUND AFFECTED	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022		
Total Estimated Net Effect on FTE	0	0	0		

Estimated Net Effect (expenditures or reduced revenues) expected to exceed \$100,000 in any of the three fiscal years after implementation of the act.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON LOCAL FUNDS					
FUND AFFECTED FY 2020 FY 2021 FY 2022					
Local Government	\$0 or Unknown to (Unknown) \$0 or Unknown (Unknown) (Unknown) (Unknown)				

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 3 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### FISCAL ANALYSIS

# **ASSUMPTION**

### §153.030 and §153.034 Wind Farm Assessment

In response to the previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Office of Administration Division of Budget and Planning (B&P)** assumed this proposal will not impact Total State Revenue and will not impact the calculation under Article X, Section 18(e).

This section states that if any public utility company has ownership of any property used to generate electricity from wind, that property shall be taxed under Chapter 137.

Beginning January 1, 2020 any public utility company assessed under Chapter 153 that has a wind energy project shall be assessed using the following methodology:

- Wind energy property shall be assessed at the local level, and not by the State Tax Commission.
- Land and buildings shall be assessed under Section 137.076.
- All other business or personal property shall be assessed using Section 137.122.

B&P notes that currently, public utilities are assessed property taxes under Chapter 153. In the event that a public utility were to purchase or build wind turbines they would instead be assessed under Chapter 137. B&P further notes that the two methods are not identical and may have a significant positive or negative impact on local revenues depending on the physical location of the public utility's property. Further, if the assessed value for property (other than wind turbines) of such public utility were to increase or decrease when changing from the assessment method in Chapter 153 to Chapter 137, there would be a corresponding increase or decrease to the Blind Pension Trust Fund. Therefore, B&P estimates that this section could have an unknown impact to the Blind Pension Trust Fund.

This proposal would require any real or tangible personal property associated with the production of wind energy to be valued and taxed under the provisions of Chapter 137 and not under Section 153.030.2.

This section defines wind farms as "local property". B&P notes that currently all wind farms are assessed and taxed as local property. Therefore, B&P estimates that this section will not impact Total State Revenue or the Blind Pension Fund.

Officials at the **State Tax Commission** (**STC**) assume this proposal would remove wind farm facilities owned and operated by electric utility companies from distributable property and include it in local property. Currently windfarms not owned and operated by a public utility

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 4 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

company are locally assessed. School and other taxing districts where the wind farm is located would realize an unknown positive fiscal impact with the inclusion of the entire value of the wind farm as part of their tax base. School and other taxing districts that may have miles of line within their district, but not the wind farm, would lose that valuation in their tax base. The fiscal impact would be unknown in both circumstances as it would be dependent on the number, size and scope of such projects.

The State Tax Commission stated there are currently four counties that have privately held wind farms. They are Atchison, DeKalb, Gentry and Nodaway counties. Currently, there are no publicly held wind farms. Those 6 privately held wind farms have 630 turbines. The wind farms are assessed based on the number of turbines they own.

Under current law, property of electric companies (centrally assessed) are categorized as "local property" or "distributable property" for ad valorem purposes. The value of all distributable property is apportioned to the local taxing districts according to the number of miles of line in the counties and districts. All taxing districts with miles of line in a county that a centrally assessed company serves, shares the ad valorem valuation of all distributable property. In contrast, the value of local property stays with the local taxing districts in which the property is located. Distributable property currently includes property used in the generation and distribution of electric power.

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Page 5 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

Table 1: Showing total assessed valuations for 2017 and 2018 property taxes

	Total Assessed Valuation for Tax Year 2017		Total Assessed Valuation for Tax Year 2018			
Property Type	Real	Personal	Total	Real	Personal	Total
Real Property	82,025,086,772	0	82,025,086,772	83,186,620,371	0	83,186,620,371
Tangible Personal Property	0	20,226,071,288	20,226,071,288	0	20,924,550,116	20,924,550,116
Property of Centrally Assessed Companies	4,319,346,707	1,063,603,431	5,382,950,138	4,227,043,146	1,077,005,667	5,304,048,813
Total Assessed Valuation for the State of Missouri	86,344,433,479	21,289,674,719	107,634,108,198	87,413,663,517	22,001,555,783	109,415,219,300

Source: State Tax Commission

In response to the previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Department of Revenue** (**DOR**) and the **Office of the State Auditor** each assumed there was no fiscal impact from this proposal.

**Oversight** notes that the Department of Revenue and the Office of the State Auditor have stated the proposal would not have a direct fiscal impact on their organizations. Oversight does not have any information to the contrary. Therefore, Oversight will reflect a zero impact on the fiscal note for them.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Barton County Assessor's Office** stated at the present time we do not have any Wind Turbines in our county, Empire is telling us they will put 140 in a county area Barton, Lawrence, Dade and Jasper. At this time we do not know how many will be in Barton County. We also do not know the Mega watt size of what the towers will be. This proposal used the multiplier of 5900 times the mega watt of the tower to be used as a constant tax amount to be used each year on the tower if it is local assessed. If state assessed, it would go by lines of miles with Empire in which we have 1% but we do not know how the State would tax them.

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 6 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Fairfax R-III School District** assumed this would increase revenue by \$638,875 annually. The district is a rural district in Northwest MO that has experienced financial difficulties for the past decade. While our supportive community recently passed a significant tax levy increase, that additional revenue will not cover all of the Board Priorities regarding facilities and fiscal expenditures. In our district, the revenue gleaned from local tax payments of future wind farms will ensure the financial, physical, and educational success and solidity of our district.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at **Atchison County** assumed revenue from wind energy has had a huge economic impact on the County. This proposal is estimated to increase revenue by \$1,600,000 annually. Currently all the wind farms in the County are developer owned. When the ownership moves from a developer to a public owned utility the turbines become state assessed which removes over 90% of the revenue from the County.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Monroe County Assessor Office** assumed this would not impact them as they do not have any tangible personal property in their county associated with wind energy.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Tarkio R-I School District** assumed this would impact the district by \$36,133 annually from the Brickyard Hill wind project. The Outlaw Wind Project is expected to begin construction in 2019, and the projected financial impact of this project is estimated at \$720,000 per year for the district.

In response to a previous version of this proposal, officials at the **Rock Port R-II School District** assumed this would increase revenue by \$416,583 annually.

Officials at the **Harrison County Assessor** state Harrison County does not have any wind farms.

Oversight notes this proposal outlines how a public utility that owns a wind farm (or farms) will be assessed in the future. Oversight notes that under current law should a public utility purchase or construct a wind farm that wind farm would be centrally assessed just as the public utility is centrally assessed. However, this proposal would allow a publicly owned utility to purchase or construct a wind farm that would be treated like the privately owned wind farms and all their property to be locally assessed. A locally assessed utility and wind farm keeps the property tax in the city, county and school district of the utility or wind farm. A centrally assessed wind farm would distribute property tax to additional cities, counties and school districts in the area of the state the wind farm is located and lines reached. Oversight will show that the locally assessed political subdivisions will gain revenue while the centrally assessed political subdivisions will

L.R. No. 0313-09
Bill No. SS for SCS

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Page 7 of 14 May 8, 2019

# <u>ASSUMPTION</u> (continued)

lose revenue.

**Oversight** notes there are 9 centrally assessed electric companies in Missouri. They are Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois, Empire District Electric Company, Entergy Arkansas Inc., ITC Midwest LLC, Kansas City Power & Light Company, KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company, Mid American Energy Company, Transource Missouri LLC, and Union Electric Company dba Ameren Missouri. There is only one nuclear plant in Missouri that is owned by Union Electric Company.

Electric Company	Number of Counties Located In	Total Assessed Value of those Company in those Counties
Ameren Transmission Company of Illinois	1	\$16,414,822
Empire District Electric Company	17	\$252,449,652
Energy Arkansas Inc	5	\$2,389,430
ITC Midwest LLC	1	\$862,355
Kansas City Power & Light Company	17	\$517,918,507
KCP&L Greater Missouri Operations Company	32	\$458,405,743
Mid American Energy Company	1	\$972,465
Transource Missouri LLC	10	\$63,918,534
Union Electric Company dba Ameren Missouri	67	\$1,326,972,426
Total		\$2,640,303,932

Source: State Tax Commission Annual Report for 2018

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 8 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

**Oversight** notes this proposal is changing the assessment of wind farms that may or may not be constructed or purchased in the future. Therefore, Oversight will show the impact as \$0 (none built or purchased) to Unknown positive or negative depending on the tax rate for local political subdivisions. Oversight will assume regardless of the assessment method, the state's Blind Pension Trust Fund will not be materially impacted.

**Oversight** only reflects the responses that we have received from state agencies and political subdivisions; however, other county assessors were requested to respond to this proposed legislation but did not. For a general listing of political subdivisions included in our database, please refer to <a href="https://www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov">www.legislativeoversight.mo.gov</a>.

### §393.1073 Task Force on Wind Energy

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HCS SB 72, officials at the **B&P** assumed this section creates the "Task Force on Wind Energy". The tax force shall submit a report, including any recommended legislation, by December 31, 2019. The task force shall terminate on December 31, 2019. This section will not impact Total State Revenue or the calculation under Article X, Section 18(e).

In response to similar legislation filed this year, HCS SB 72, officials at the **Missouri Senate** anticipated a negative impact to reimburse travel for 3 senators to attend the task force meetings. The Senate assumes a cost of \$300 per meeting for the Senators.

Officials at the **State Tax Commission** assume no impact from this portion of the proposal.

**Oversight** notes this proposal creates a Task Force on Wind Energy that is made up of members of the Missouri House of Representatives and Senators as well as assessors whose purpose is to develop a report on the benefits of wind turbines to the state and local communities. The members are to serve without compensation and can be reimbursed for expenses. This task force is to deliver their report by December 31, 2019 (FY 2020).

**Oversight** notes this proposal did not indicate who would reimburse the eight members of the task force. Oversight notes that House and Senate members are generally reimbursed out of funds for the purpose of task forces/committees. Using the Missouri Senate's estimate of \$100 per member per meeting, Oversight will assume a cost to the General Revenue Fund of \$2,400 (eight task force members x \$100 x 3 meetings) in FY 2020.

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 9 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

# §144.020 Telecommunication Billing (Senate Amendment 1)

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at the **B&P** assumed this amendment would require sales taxes to be applied to nontaxable telecommunications services if they are bundled with taxable telecommunications services, unless the provider can identify and verify the portion of the bundle that originated from nontaxable services. B&P notes that telecommunications providers may already be doing this. Therefore, B&P estimates that this amendment may have a \$0 to unknown impact on Total State Revenue. B&P defers to DOR for more detailed information.

This amendment may impact Total State Revenue by an unknown amount. This amendment may impact the calculation under Article X, Section 18(e).

Officials at the **DOR** assume that currently, §144.020 imposes a tax in an amount equal to 4% on the basic rate paid or charged on all sales of local and long distance telecommunications service to telecommunications subscribers and to others through equipment of telecommunications subscribers for the transmission of messages and conversations and upon the sale, rental or leasing of all equipment or services pertaining or incidental thereto; except that, the payment made by telecommunications subscribers or others, pursuant to §144.060, and any amounts paid for access to the internet or interactive computer services shall not be considered as amounts paid for telecommunications services.

The proposed legislation adds to §144.020 the following language, "If local and long distance telecommunications services subject to tax under this subdivision are aggregated with and not separately stated from charges for telecommunications service or other services not subject to tax under this subdivision, including, but not limited to, interstate or international telecommunications services, then the charges for nontaxable services may be subject to taxation unless the telecommunications provider can identify by reasonable and verifiable standards such portion of the charges not subject to such tax from its books and records that are kept in the regular course of business for other purposes, including, but not limited to, financial statement, general ledgers, invoice and billing systems and reports, and reports for regulatory tariffs and other regulatory matters."

While the statutory change in  $\S144.020$  is new, without audits the Department is unable to determine, based on the data we have, what, if any, impact the statutory change may have. The impact will be  $\S0 - (Unknown)$ .

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 10 of 14 May 8, 2019

#### ASSUMPTION (continued)

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at the **Department of Conservation** assumed an unknown fiscal impact but greater than \$100,000. The Conservation Sales Tax funds are derived from one-eighth of one percent sales and use tax pursuant to Article IV Section 43 (a) of the Missouri Constitution. Any increase in sales and use tax collected would increase revenue to the Conservation Sales Tax funds. However, the initiative is very complex and may require adjustments to Missouri sales tax law which could cause some downside risk to the Conservation Sales Tax. The Department assumes the Department of Revenue would be better able to estimate the anticipated fiscal impact that would result from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at the **Department of Natural Resources** assumed the Department's Parks and Soils Sales Tax Funds are derived from one-tenth of one percent sales and use tax pursuant to Article IV Section 47(a) of the Missouri Constitution. Any increase in sales tax collected could increase revenue to the Parks and Soils Sales Tax Funds. The Department assumes any increase in revenue to the Parks and Soils Sales Tax fund would be used for the purposes established in Article IV Section 47(a) of the Missouri Constitution.

The Department assumes the Department of Revenue would be better able to estimate the anticipated fiscal impact that would result from this proposal.

**Oversight** notes that Article IV, Section 47 of the Missouri Constitution, allows revenue received from an additional sales tax of one-tenth (1/10) of percent (1%) to be used for the conservation and management of the soil and water resources of Missouri and for the proper management of the state parks. The Parks Sales Tax Fund (0613) and the Soil and Water Sales Tax Fund (0614) each are to receive 50% of this additional sales tax funding.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at the **Public Service Commission** assumed there was no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at the **City of Kansas City** assumed this may have a positive impact on the City to the extent a telecommunications provider can't identify charges that aren't covered in customer's bills.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at the **City of Springfield** assumed there was no fiscal impact from this proposal.

In response to similar legislation filed this year, SB 483, officials at **St. Louis County** assumed the impact was unknown.

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Page 11 of 14 May 8, 2019

# ASSUMPTION (continued)

Currently, some telecommunications companies bundle their taxable and nontaxable services together and therefore, collects tax on the total cost of bundled services even if some of the services may have been nontaxable. This proposal establishes a way for a telecommunications companies to separate the taxable and nontaxable services and to only collect taxes on the taxable services. **Oversight** is unable to determine how many companies are currently collecting and may continue to collect taxes on bundled services; as well as how many will choose to separate their services and reduce the tax they collect. Oversight will show the impact as \$0 to Unknown loss to the state sales tax funds.

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON SCHOOL DISTRICT TRUST FUND	<u>\$0 or</u>	<u>\$0 or</u>	<u>\$0 or</u>
	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Revenue Reduction - §144.020 (SA 1) reduction in sales tax collected if telecommunication companies are allowed to separate services p. 9-11	<u>\$0 or</u>	<u>\$0 or</u>	\$0 or
	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
SCHOOL DISTRICT TRUST FUND			
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT TO THE	(Unknown greater than \$2,400)	<u>\$0 or</u>	<u>\$0 or</u>
GENERAL REVENUE FUND		(Unknown)	(Unknown)
Revenue Reduction - §144.020 (SA 1) reduction in sales tax collected if telecommunication companies are allowed to separate services p. 9-11	<u>\$0 or</u>	<u>\$0 or</u>	<u>\$0 or</u>
	(Unknown)	(Unknown)	(Unknown)
<u>Cost</u> - Task Force on Wind Energy - reimbursed expenses §393.1073 p. 8	(\$2,400)	\$0	\$0
GENERAL REVENUE			
FISCAL IMPACT - State Government	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Page 12 of 14 May 8, 2019

May 8, 2019			
FISCAL IMPACT - State Government (continued)	FY 2020 (10 Mo.)	FY 2021	FY 2022
CONSERVATION COMMISSION			
FUND			
Revenue Reduction -§144.020 (SA 1) reduction in sales tax collected if			
telecommunication companies are allowed to separate services p. 9-11	\$0 or (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON CONSERVATION COMMISSION	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)
PARKS, SOIL & WATER FUND			
Revenue Reduction - §144.020 (SA 1) reduction in sales tax collected if	ΦO	00	<b>0</b> 0
telecommunication companies are allowed to separate services p. 9 -11	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON PARKS, SOIL & WATER FUND	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)

Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220

Page 13 of 14 May 8, 2019

FISCAL IMPACT - Local Government	FY 2020	FY 2021	FY 2022
	(10 Mo.)		

### LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS

Revenue - Locally Assessed Political Subdivisions from change to wind farm assessments §153.034 p. 8	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
Loss - Centrally Assessed Political Subdivisions from change to wind farm assessments §153.034 p. 8	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)	\$0 or (Unknown)
Revenue Reduction - §144.020 (SA 1) reduction in sales tax collected if telecommunication companies are allowed to separate services p. 9-11	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)	<u>\$0 or</u> (Unknown)

ESTIMATED NET EFFECT ON	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown	\$0 or Unknown
LOCAL POLITICAL SUBDIVISION	to (Unknown)	to (Unknown)	to (Unknown)

### FISCAL IMPACT - Small Business

No direct fiscal impact to small businesses would be expected as a result of this proposal.

# FISCAL DESCRIPTION

This bill specifies how any real or tangible personal property associated with a project which uses wind energy will be assessed in the future.

This creates the Task Force on Wind Energy.

This proposal clarifies telecommunication billing.

This legislation is not federally mandated, would not duplicate any other program and would not require additional capital improvements or rental space.

L.R. No. 0313-09 Bill No. SS for SCS for HCS for HB 220 Page 14 of 14 May 8, 2019

# **SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

**Atchison County Barton County Assessor** City of Kansas City City of Springfield Department of Conservation Department of Natural Resources Department of Revenue Fairfax R-III School District Harrison County Assessor Missouri Senate Monroe County Assessor Office of Administration Division of Budget and Planning Office of the State Auditor **Public Service Commission** Rock Port R-II School District State Tax Commission St. Louis County Tarkio R-I School District

Kyle Rieman Director May 8, 2019

Type Rione

Ross Strope Assistant Director May 8, 2019