

**LEGISLATIVE BUDGET BOARD**

**Austin, Texas**

**FISCAL NOTE, 78TH LEGISLATIVE REGULAR SESSION**

**March 24, 2003**

**TO:** Honorable Harvey Hilderbran, Chair, House Committee on State Cultural and Recreational Resources

**FROM:** John Keel, Director, Legislative Budget Board

**IN RE: HB2477** by Callegari (Relating to the provision of parks and recreational facilities by certain conservation and reclamation districts.), **As Introduced**

**No significant fiscal implication to the State is anticipated.**

The bill would authorize certain conservation and reclamation districts to finance parks and recreational facilities by issuing bonds. If the bonds were to be financed by ad valorem taxes, an election would be required to obtain approval by the voters in the district. Bonds supported solely from revenue would not require an election. Development and maintenance of a swimming pool could not be financed by issuing bonds supported by ad valorem taxes.

The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) would be required to adopt rules regarding the provision and financing of recreational facilities. Further, the bill would repeal a section of the Water Code that provides complete authority to a municipal utility district to develop and maintain recreational facilities.

The bill would take effect on the date on which the constitutional amendment proposed by the 78th Legislature, 2003, Regular Session, relating to the provision of parks and recreational facilities by certain conservation and reclamation districts is approved by the voters; otherwise, the provisions of the bill would have no effect.

The TCEQ estimates that the provisions of the bill may result in an increase of 10 to 20 additional bond issues per year for which the agency processes applications, which would have an insignificant fiscal impact. Adopting rules concerning recreational facilities would also have an insignificant fiscal impact.

Districts that would choose to issue bonds using ad valorem taxes would incur the costs of preparing the bond applications and of an election; however, if the issue was on the ballot as part of a general election, there would be no additional election cost. A district election costs approximately \$1,200. Costs associated with developing and maintaining recreational facilities would be covered by the bond revenue.

**Local Government Impact**

No significant fiscal implication to units of local government is anticipated.

**Source Agencies:** 304 Comptroller of Public Accounts, 352 Bond Review Board, 582 Commission on Environmental Quality, 802 Parks and Wildlife Department

**LBB Staff:** JK, CL, JB, DLBa