# **Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary**

Bill Number: 6561 SB Title: Excise tax/gambling

## **Estimated Cash Receipts**

Agency Name	2001	-03	2003-	-05	2005-	07
	GF- State	Total	<b>GF- State</b>	Total	GF- State	Total
Department of Revenue	71,100,000	71,100,000	150,200,000	150,200,000	152,000,000	152,000,000
Total \$	71,100,000	71,100,000	150,200,000	150,200,000	152,000,000	152,000,000

Local Gov. Courts *				
Local Gov. Other **	Indeterminate			
Local Gov. Total				

## **Estimated Expenditures**

Agency Name		2001-03			2003-05			2005-07	
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	<b>GF-State</b>	Total	FTEs	<b>GF-State</b>	Total
Washington State Gambling Commission	.0	0	1,000	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Revenue	1.0	143,600	143,600	2.3	289,900	289,900	2.3	278,600	278,600
Total	1.0	\$143,600	\$144,600	2.3	\$289,900	\$289,900	2.3	\$278,600	\$278,600

Local Gov. Courts *					
Local Gov. Other **					
Local Gov. Total					

Prepared by: Doug Jenkins, OFM	Phone:	Date Published:
	360-902-0563	Final 2/6/2002

<sup>\*</sup> See Office of the Administrator for the Courts judicial fiscal note

<sup>\*\*</sup> See local government fiscal note

# **Individual State Agency Fiscal Note**

<b>Bill Number:</b> 6561 SB	Title:	Exci	se tax/gambl	ing			Agen	<b>cy:</b> 117-Wash Gambling	nington State g Comm
Part I: Estimates	•								
No Fiscal Impact									
Estimated Cash Receipts to:									
FUND									
	Total	\$							
Estimated Expenditures from:									
		F	Y 2002	FY 2003		2001-03		2003-05	2005-07
FTE Staff Years			0.0		0.0		0.0	0.0	0.0
Fund					1 222				
Gambling Revolving Account-Non-Appropriated	884-6		0		1,000	1,	000	0	0
	Total \$		0		1,000	1.	000	0	0
The cash receipts and expenditure e and alternate ranges (if appropriate				the most likely j	fiscal im	apact. Factor.	s impaci	ting the precision o	f these estimates,
Check applicable boxes and follo				:					
If fiscal impact is greater than form Parts I-V.	-				nium o	or in subsequ	ent bie	nnia, complete er	ntire fiscal note
X If fiscal impact is less than \$	50,000 pe	r fiscal	year in the c	current bienni	um or i	n subsequen	t bienni	ia, complete this	page only (Part I)
Capital budget impact, comp	lete Part l	IV.							
X Requires new rule making, c	omplete I	Part V.							
Legislative Contact:					Pl	none:		Date: 01	/25/2002
Agency Preparation: Cam Dig	htman				Pl	hone: (360)	186-349	97 Date: 02	2/05/2002
Agency Approval: Rick Day	/				Pl	none: (360)4	86-344	6 Date: 02	2/06/2002
OFM Review: Doug Jer	nkins				Pl	hone: 360-90	02-0563	B Date: 02	2/06/2002

Request # 117-02-05-2 Bill # 6561 SB

Form FN (Rev 1/00)

### Part II: Narrative Explanation

### II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

Sec. 4(1) of SB6561 imposes a state tax equal to 10% of gross receipts for all punchboard/pull-tab and 10% of net win for social card room licensees. Because local jurisdictions have been permitted to tax up to 20% of net win of social card rooms, Sec. 4(3) establishes a maximum tax rate of 25% for these activities, and sets the state tax equal to 10% of net win less any percent above 15% being imposed by local taxing jurisdictions for social card game licensees.

Relatively few punchboard/pull-tab licensees derive net income in excess of 10% of gross from punchboard/pull-tab activity, with some experiencing net losses. Because punchboard/pull-tab activity is a "stimulant" activity, it is probable that licensees expect marginal income or losses from the activity as part of their overall business plan. A 10% state tax will make this "stimulant" less attractive, and some may decide to cease offering punchboards/pull-tabs to their customers. To the extent that any licensees decide to do this, revenue to the Gambling Revolving Fund (884-6) will be reduced, and the punchboard/pull-tab regulatory workload will contract.

#### II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

#### II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

Rule making activity to adopt the revised wagering limit will consume 16 staff hours at an estimated cost of \$1,000.

While there would be some reduction in expenditures related to regulation of punchboard/pull tab licensees if current licensees drop this activity, it is not possible to develop an estimate of the number who might do so.

### **Part III: Expenditure Detail**

#### III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTE Staff Years		0.00			
A-Salaries and Wages		750	750		
B-Employee Benefits		200	200		
C-Personal Service Contracts					
E-Goods and Services		50	50		
G-Travel					
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
Total \$	0	1,000	1,000	0	0

III. B - Detail: List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
Rules Coordinator	45,600		0.0			
Total FTE's			0.0			0.0

### Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

### Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Sec. 1 (11) increases the maximum single wager in Phase II house-banked card games from \$100 to \$300. The Commission would revise its rules (WAC 230-40-120(6)) to conform to this revised limit if it is enacted.

# **Department of Revenue Fiscal Note**

00 - 00 -         Total \$         71,100,000         71,100,000         150.200.000         152.000.000           Sstimated Expenditures from:           FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07	No Fiscal Impact	1			Agency	: 140-Departme Revenue	ent or
FY 2002	-				<del>,</del>		
FUND         FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07           GF-STATE-State 00 - 00 -         71,100,000         71,100,000         150,200,000         152,000,000           Total \$         71,100,000         71,100,000         150,200,000         152,000,000           Stimated Expenditures from:           FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07           FTE Staff Years         1.0         1.0         1.0         2.3           Fund         01-1         79,500         64,100         143,600         289,900         278,6							
FUND         FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07           GF-STATE-State 00 - 00 -         71,100,000         71,100,000         150,200,000         152,000,000           Total \$         71,100,000         71,100,000         150,200,000         152,000,000           stimated Expenditures from:           FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07           FTE Staff Years         1.0         1.0         1.0         2.3           Fund         0         64,100         143,600         289,900         278,6	stimated Cash Receipts to						
Total			FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
Total \$         71,100,000         71,100,000         150,200,000         152,000,000           stimated Expenditures from:           FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07           FTE Staff Years         1.0         1.0         1.0         2.3           Fund         0         143,600         289,900         278,6           GF-STATE-State         001-1         79,500         64,100         143,600         289,900         278,6	GF-STATE-State		1,7,2,7,2	<del> </del>			152,000,00
FY 2002         FY 2003         2001-03         2003-05         2005-07           FTE Staff Years         1.0         1.0         1.0         2.3           Fund         CF-STATE-State         001-1         79,500         64,100         143,600         289,900         278,6	00 - 00 -	Total \$	1	71,100,000	71,100,000	150.200.000	152.000.00
FTE Staff Years 1.0 1.0 1.0 2.3  Fund  GF-STATE-State 001-1 79,500 64,100 143,600 289,900 278,6	stimated Expenditures from:				•		
FTE Staff Years         1.0         1.0         1.0         2.3           Fund         5         64,100         143,600         289,900         278,6			FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
GF-STATE-State 001-1 79,500 64,100 143,600 289,900 278,6	FTE Staff Years			1.0			2.
10,000 1,000 10,000 10,000 1.0,000							
79,500 64,100 143,600 289,900 2/8,0	GF-STATE-State 001-1	Total ¢					
The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.							
Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:				nost likely fiscal impaci	t. Factors impacting	g the precision of the	se estimates,
If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.	and alternate ranges (if appropria	ate), are explained	d in Part II.	nost likely fiscal impaci	t. Factors impacting	g the precision of the	se estimates,
If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  If fiscal impact is greater tha	ate), are explained	ing instructions:				
	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  If fiscal impact is greater that form Parts I-V.	ate), are explained llow correspond an \$50,000 per	in Part II. ing instructions: fiscal year in the cu	urrent biennium or in	subsequent bienn	ia, complete entire	fiscal note
Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  If fiscal impact is greater that form Parts I-V.  If fiscal impact is less than S	ate), are explained allow correspond an \$50,000 per \$50,000 per fisc	in Part II. ing instructions: fiscal year in the cu	urrent biennium or in	subsequent bienn	ia, complete entire	fiscal note
Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.  X Requires new rule making, complete Part V.	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  If fiscal impact is greater that form Parts I-V.  If fiscal impact is less than some Capital budget impact, com	ate), are explained llow correspond an \$50,000 per \$50,000 per fisc aplete Part IV.	in Part II.  ing instructions:  fiscal year in the cu  cal year in the curre	urrent biennium or in	subsequent bienn	ia, complete entire	fiscal note
	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  X If fiscal impact is greater that form Parts I-V.  If fiscal impact is less than S  Capital budget impact, com  X Requires new rule making,	ate), are explained llow correspond an \$50,000 per \$50,000 per fisc aplete Part IV.	in Part II.  ing instructions:  fiscal year in the cu  cal year in the curre	ent biennium or in	subsequent bienn bsequent biennia,	ia, complete entire complete this page	fiscal note e only (Part I)
X Requires new rule making, complete Part V.	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  If fiscal impact is greater that form Parts I-V.  If fiscal impact is less than some Capital budget impact, com  Requires new rule making,  Legislative Contact:	ate), are explained allow correspond an \$50,000 per \$50,000 per fiscaplete Part IV.	in Part II.  ing instructions:  fiscal year in the cu  cal year in the curre	ent biennium or in su	subsequent biennia, bsequent biennia,	Date: 01/25/	fiscal note e only (Part I)
X Requires new rule making, complete Part V.     Legislative Contact: Phone: Date: 01/25/2002	and alternate ranges (if appropria  Check applicable boxes and foll  If fiscal impact is greater that form Parts I-V.  If fiscal impact is less than some Capital budget impact, com  X Requires new rule making, Capital budget impact, Capital budget impa	ate), are explained allow correspond an \$50,000 per \$50,000 per fiscaplete Part IV.  complete Part V	in Part II.  ing instructions:  fiscal year in the cu  cal year in the curre	ent biennium or in su Phone	subsequent biennia, bsequent biennia, e:	Date: 02/01/	fiscal note e only (Part I) 2002 2002

1

Request # 6561-1-1 Bill # 6561 SB

Form FN (Rev 1/00)

### Part II: Narrative Explanation

#### II. A - Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

- Section 1. Provides that the maximum single wager for house-banked card games is increased from \$100 to \$300.
- Section 2. Reduces the maximum city and county gambling tax rate on card rooms from 20% to 15%.
- Section 3. Restricts local jurisdictions from increasing the tax rate on card rooms above 15% unless adopted before January 1, 2002.
- Section 4. Imposes a state gambling tax at ten percent of the gross receipts of punchboards and pulltabs without deduction for amounts awarded as cash or merchandize prices. A state tax on social card rooms is imposed at 10% of gross receipts, but is reduced if the local tax exceeds 15 percent such that the combined state and local rate is twenty-five percent. The tax imposed by the state is in addition to any tax imposed under Title 82 RCW on the business of operating punchboards, pulltabs, or social card games.
- Section 5. Effective date of this act is June 1, 2002.
- Section 6. Effective date of the provision limiting the local rate on card rooms is January 1, 2002.

#### II. B - Cash receipts Impact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

#### ASSUMPTIONS/DATA SOURCES

Based on information supplied by the Washington State Gambling Commission and gambling tax rates reported by municipals to the Association of Washington Cities.

AUDIT ASSESSMENTS (Impact resulting from recent audit activity)

There are no current audit assessments because this will be a new tax.

CURRENTLY REPORTING TAXPAYERS (Impact for taxpayers who are known or estimated to be currently paying the tax in question)

According to the Commission, receipts of card rooms, punchboards and pulltabs totaled \$728.5 million in FY 2001. The Commission has issued 2,227 licenses for punchboards and pulltabs and 94 for card rooms. In the last five years there has been rapid growth in card room activity because of legislation allowing house-banked card rooms and up to 15 card tables per establishment. Revenues are expected to increase gradually because of the increase in the share of higher volume house-banked card rooms and the increase in the table amount from \$100 to \$300. Punchboard and pulltab revenues appear to be leveling based on historical trends.

The gain to the general fund is estimated at \$71.1 million in FY 2003. Because the effective date is June 1, 2002, the Department expects collections on a full 12 months of activity in the first fiscal year.

TAXPAYERS NOT CURRENTLY REPORTING (Although some taxpayers may not now be paying the tax in question,

Request # 6561-1-1 Form FN (Rev 1/00) 2 Bill # 6561 SB some of them will become aware of their liability in the future, as a result of normal enforcement activities or education programs by the Department. The impact for such taxpayers is based on the Department's studies of average tax compliance)

Approximately 25% of the state gambling revenues will generated in jurisdictions that do not currently impose a local tax. Gambling establishments located in these jurisdictions will be reporting a gambling tax for the first time. While, most of these businesses are believed to be registered and reporting excise taxes to the Department, approximately two-thirds of them are incorrectly identified on Gambling Commission records. It is assumed that this group would present a compliance problem for the Department and would become aware of their tax obligation at a rate of 13% a year up to a maximum of 52% after 4 years. This is a standard compliance assumption in tax-related fiscal notes for currently non-reporting taxpayers.

#### TOTAL REVENUE IMPACT:

State Government (cash basis, \$000):

FY 2002 - 0 FY 2003 - \$71,100 FY 2004 - 74,500 FY 2005 - 75,700 FY 2006 - 75,800 FY 2007 - 76,100

Local Government, if applicable (cash basis, \$000): None

#### II. C - Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or savings resulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or savings). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how workload assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

The Department will incur costs of approximately \$73,400 in FY 2002 to implement this legislation. These costs include the following:

This bill would have the State of Washington administering and collecting a new state gambling tax. The tax would take effect at the start of the last month of the current fiscal year. In addition, the Department will need to revise current combined excise tax returns to allow businesses to report and remit the state tax to the Department. This effort involves software programming and form development with an estimated immediate ITAS 3 & 4 combined FTE impact of 0.88.

Specific information about the tax will be sent to businesses that engage in conducting punchboard, pulltab and card game gambling activities. The cost of developing and printing the forms and the information sent to businesses and local governments will total \$1,000.

There is an expected impact on the Department's Compliance and Audit Divisions as a result of this new tax. The Compliance Division expects an additional 0.5 FTE impact at the revenue officer level starting in the second year for collection purposes, as well as an additional 0.5 FTE at the Taxpayer Service Rep classification for additional taxpayer service and education. The Audit Division expects an impact starting in the third year after implementation of this tax of an additional 1.3 FTEs for audit purposes.

Unless the Department receives an appropriation to cover the expenditure impact, the level of effort required to fully implement this legislation will not be possible.

### Part III: Expenditure Detail

#### III. A - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTE Staff Years	1.0	1.00	1.0	2.3	2.3
A-	51.400	39,600	91,000	197,800	197,800
B-	13.400	10,300	23,700	51,400	51,400
E-	6.600	5,700	12,300	26,400	26,400
G-				3,000	3,000
J-	8.100	8,500	16,600	11,300	
Total \$	\$79,500	\$64,100	\$143,600	\$289,900.00	\$278,600

III. B - Detail: List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FISCAL TECH	28,869		0.0			
HEARINGS SCHEDULER	30,900	0.0				
INFO TECH APP SPEC 3	49,088	0.4		0.2		
INFO TECH APP SPEC 4	54,189	0.4		0.2		
REVENUE AGENT 3	44,482		0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5
REVENUE AUDITOR 3	45,593				1.3	1.3
REVENUE AUDITOR 4	52,864	0.0				
Rules Manager	68,598	0.0				
RULES POLICY SPECIALIST	67,568	0.0				
TAX POLICY SPEC 2	52,839	0.0				
TAX POLICY SPECIALIST 3	59,740	0.1				
TAX SERVICE REP 2	32,417		0.5	0.3	0.5	0.5
Total FTE's	·	1.0	1.0	1.0	2.3	2.3

### Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

None.

# Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

WAC 458-20-131 would need to be modified as a result of this new legislation. Those parties interested in a rule revision would be restaurants, taverns, and various other establishments operating pulltab, punch board and card room activities.

# LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

<b>Bill Number:</b> 6561 SB	Title: Excise t	ax/gambling							
Part I: Jurisdiction-Loca	tion, type or statu	ıs of political subo	division defines r	range of fiscal imp	acts.				
<b>Legislation Impacts:</b>									
X Cities:									
X Counties:									
Special Districts:									
Specific jurisdictions only:									
Variance occurs due to:									
Part II: Estimates									
No fiscal impacts.									
Expenditures represent one-tim	e costs:								
Legislation provides local optic	on:								
X Key variables cannot be estimat									
Estimated revenue impacts to:									
	Inde	terminate Impact							
Estimated expenditure impacts t	to:								
Jurisdiction	FY 2002	FY 2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07				
City									
County									
Special District TOTAL \$					+				
GRAND TOTAL \$	<b>-</b>	<u>-</u>			0				

## Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Steve Salmi	Phone: (360) 725-5038	Date: 01/25/2002
Leg. Committee Contact:	Phone:	Date: 01/25/2002
Agency Approval: Val Richey	Phone: 360-725-5036	Date: 02/04/2002
OFM Review: Mike Cheney	Phone: 360-902-0582	Date: 02/04/2002

Page 1 of 2 Bill Number: 6561 SB

# Part IV: Analysis

#### A. SUMMARY OF BILL

Provide a clear, succinct description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.

Sect. 1 provides that the maximum single wager for house-banked card games is increased from \$100 to \$300.

Sect. 2 reduces the maximum city and county gambling tax rate on card rooms from 20 percent to 15 percent.

Sect. 3 restricts local jurisdictions from increasing the tax rate on card rooms above 15 percent unless adopted before January 1, 2002.

Sect. 4 imposes a state gambling tax at 10 percent of the gross receipts of punchboards and pulltabs without deduction for amounts awarded as cash or merchandise prizes. A state tax on social card rooms is imposed at 10 percent of gross receipts, but is reduced if the local tax exceeds 15 percent such that the combined state and local rate is 25 percent. The tax imposed by the state is in addition to any tax imposed under RCW 82 on the business of operating punchboards, pulltabs or social card games.

#### B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

Briefly describe and quantify the expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the expenditure provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

This bill has no expenditure impacts to local government.

#### C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS

Briefly describe and quantify the revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the revenue provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

This bill could have an indeterminate revenue impact on cities and counties with gambling taxes.

#### DISCUSSION:

The higher cumulative local and state tax rate could put financial pressure on some gambling operators. Jurisdictions near tribal gambling operations could see negative impacts to their revenues if gambling operators increase charges to offset higher total state and local tax rates, and this leads a portion of their customer base to patronize lower-prized tribal operations. Other outcomes may be that the higher cumulative rate may lead to calls for local jurisdictions to lower their gambling taxes, or some operators could go out of business. In either case, according to some city officials, the result could be a loss of local gambling tax revenue.

#### Note:

Jurisdictions would lose future taxing potential due to the taxing levels proposed in the bill.

#### SOURCES OF DATA:

Department of Revenue Association of Washington Cities Washington State Association of Counties LGFN survey of cities and counties

Page 2 of 2 Bill Number: 6561 SB