

**CONFERENCE COMMITTEE REPORT BRIEF
SENATE BILL NO. 17**

As Agreed to April 5, 2023

Brief*

SB 17 would update the designation of and references to the Kansas Rural Housing Incentive District Act to the Kansas Reinvestment Housing Incentive District Act and would create certain housing projects criteria in designated cities with a population of 60,000 or more; amend the Act to expand the list of costs that could be paid for by proceeds of special obligation bonds; and amend the Kansas Housing Investor Tax Credit Act (HITCA) to expand the transferability of tax credits that would be issued under that act.

The bill would be in effect upon publication in the *Kansas Register*.

Reinvestment Housing Incentive Districts

The bill would update the designation of and references to the Kansas Rural Housing Incentive District Act to the Kansas Reinvestment Housing Incentive District Act (Act). [Note: Enacted in 1998, the Kansas Rural Housing Incentive District Act was established with a purpose of encouraging the development and renovation of housing in rural cities and counties by authorizing these entities to assist directly in the financing of public improvements that support housing in rural areas of Kansas that experience a shortage of housing.]

Project Criteria for Certain Cities

Under the bill, cities establishing a Reinvestment Housing Incentive District (RHID) would not be able to, within the district:

- Designate more than 100 units as for-sale units in one year;
- Designate more than 100 units as for-rent units in one year;
- Designate more than 50 units associated with a single project as for-sale units within one year; or

*Conference committee report briefs are prepared by the Legislative Research Department and do not express legislative intent. No summary is prepared when the report is an agreement to disagree. Conference committee report briefs may be accessed on the Internet at <http://www.kslegislature.org/kIRD>

- Designate more than 50 units associated with a single project as for-rent units within one year.

For-sale units not sold within six months after the certificate of occupancy is granted would be eligible to be redesignated as for-rent units. The bill also indicates that the governing body would be able to designate for-sale and for-rent units for succeeding years as part of a proposed multi-phased, multi-year development plan.

The bill would require the average size of each residence constructed per project within a RHID to be no larger than 1,650 square feet, excluding any garage or other exterior area, such as a porch, patio, or unattached storage building.

The bill would make these new requirements a part of and supplemental to the Act.

Definitions. The meaning of “city” for these projects would be any city with a population of 60,000 or more, as certified by the Secretary of State to the Director of the Budget, except for the city of Topeka. [Note: The city of Topeka is included in requirements under current law specific to rural housing incentive districts.]

The bill would also modify within provisions applicable to RHIDs the term “county” to mean any county with a population of less than 85,000. Under current law (the Rural Housing Incentive District Act), the county’s population is limited to less than 80,000. Other definitions are modified to replace references to “rural” with “reinvestment.”

Purpose of Act, references. The bill would also modify the purpose of the Act to remove references to “rural” and continue law encouraging the development and renovation of housing in cities and counties in the state. The bill would make additional updates to remove and update references to “reinvestment.”

Use of Special Obligation Bonds, Expansion of Listed Costs

The bill would also expand the list of costs that may be paid for by proceeds of special obligations bonds, adding renovation or construction of residential dwellings, multi-family units, or buildings or other structures exclusively for residential use located on existing lots if either:

- The infrastructure, including streets, sewer, water, and utilities, has been in existence for at least ten years; or
- The lots on which the residential units are located have been subject to an improvement district tax assessment because the land is located in an improvement district already established by a city or county.

Kansas Housing Incentive Tax Credit Act

The bill would amend the HITCA to expand the transferability of tax credits issued under this act. Among changes addressing transferees, the bill would require transferees to provide information and documentation to claim the tax credit in the form and manner required by the Secretary of Revenue (qualified investors, project builders, and developers are subject to this requirement under current law).

Regarding the claiming of a tax credit, the bill would also specify:

- Any portion of the tax credit that is carried forward could be transferred to another taxpayer;
- All or a portion of the tax credit could be transferred by the qualified investor or any subsequent transferees to one or more persons; and
- There would be no limit on the number of times a credit or any portion of a credit can be transferred.

The bill would also remove a limitation that specified only the full amount of the tax credit for any one investment may be transferred and may be transferred only one time.

The bill would clarify that the transferee would receive all remaining rights and restrictions for the tax credit being transferred on the date of the transfer.

The bill would also provide for the calculation of any tax due under provisions in the Insurance Code pertaining to retaliatory taxes (taxes imposed on out-of-state insurance companies); the tax credit would be treated as a tax paid as part of the insurance company's premium tax owed.

[*Note:* Under the HITCA, for tax years 2022 and thereafter, a tax credit could be claimed against Kansas income tax liability, the privilege tax liability imposed upon certain financial institutions, and the premium tax liability imposed upon insurance companies. The tax credit could be claimed by qualified investors and project builders or developers of a qualified housing project.]

Conference Committee Action

The Conference Committee agreed to the Senate amendments in the bill and agreed further to remove and replace the contents of the bill with provisions pertaining to housing incentives and credits (SB 34, as amended by the House Committee on Financial Institutions and Pensions). SB 34, as amended, includes the provisions of SB 37 (Kansas Housing Investor Tax Credit Act amendments). The Conference Committee also agreed to amend provisions applicable to rural and urban housing incentive districts, to remove separate codification for these incentives and term these districts as "reinvestment" housing incentive districts, update the naming and purpose of the Kansas Reinvestment Housing Incentive District Act, modify the definition of "county" to increase the population specified from 80,000 to 85,000, and restore language deleted by House Committee action. Clarifying amendments were made to update applicable references from rural to reinvestment.

[*Note:* SB 17, as introduced and as passed the House, pertained to prepaid service plans and registration fees and reporting. A companion bill, HB 2089, has been inserted into the Conference Committee Report for HB 2090.]

Background

The bill, as agreed to by the Conference Committee, contains the provisions of SB 34 and SB 37.

SB 34 (Kansas Reinvestment Housing Incentive District Act)

SB 34 was introduced in the Senate Committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance at the request of Senator Olson.

Senate Committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance

In the Senate Committee hearing, **proponent** testimony was provided by Senator Olson; representatives of Heartland Housing Partners, Kansas Association of Realtors, and League of Kansas Municipalities; and a representative of Kansas Corn Growers Association, Kansas Farm Bureau, Northwest Kansas Economic Innovation Center, and Sunflower Electric Power Corporation. The proponents generally stated the bill would help address ongoing shortages of affordable housing, and the bill would provide another tool for cities to as they look for housing solutions.

Written-only proponent testimony was provided by representatives of The Chamber of Lawrence, Kansas; the city of Lawrence; the city of Overland Park; Haag Development Company; Kansas Bankers Association; Kansas Department of Commerce; Kansas Manufactured Housing Association; METL (Manhattan, Emporia, Topeka, and Lawrence Chambers of Commerce); Overland Park Chamber of Commerce; Sugar Creek Capital; and United Community Services of Johnson County, Inc.

No other testimony was provided.

House Committee on Financial Institutions and Pensions

In the House Committee joint hearing on SB 34 and SB 37, the **proponents** generally addressed efforts and incentives to create affordable and attainable housing statewide. The proponents included proponents of SB 34 and SB 37 appearing before the Senate Committee. The proponents speaking specifically to SB 34 addressed the addition of vertical construction as an eligible expense, the potential to increase infill housing development on existing lots, and support for larger cities creating affordable housing developments. The proponents addressing SB 37 highlighted the shortage of attainable housing, which serves as a barrier to economic growth and development for any community, rural or urban.

Neutral written-only testimony was provided by the Kansas Housing Resources Corporation (KHRC) regarding SB 37.

The House Committee amended the bill to:

- Create and separately codify provisions pertaining to urban housing incentive districts (UHIDs);

- Define the term “city” as it relates to the designation of UHIDs;
- Update the effective date to be upon publication in the *Kansas Register*, and
- Add provisions expanding the transferability of certain tax credits under the HITCA (SB 37, as amended by Senate Committee).

[*Note:* The Conference Committee did not retain separate codification or designation of UHIDs. Amendments to the publication date and inclusion of the HITCA provisions were retained.]

SB 37 (Kansas Housing Investor Tax Credit Act)

The bill was introduced by the Senate Committee on Federal and State Affairs at the request of Senator Olson. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance.

Senate Committee on Financial Institutions and Insurance

In the Senate Committee hearing, **proponent** testimony was provided by Senator Olson and representatives of the American Property Casualty Insurance Association (APCIA); Heartland Housing Partners; and Kansas Farm Bureau, Kansas Corn Growers Association, Sunflower Electric Power Corporation, and the Northwest Kansas Economic Innovation Center (termed “Coalition” in testimony). The proponents indicated the bill would remove a restriction in the Act to allow investors to sell more than one tax credit at a time. An example provided indicated an investor would be permitted to sell the tax credit to a banking trust department that could then, in turn, resell or transfer the benefits of the original tax credit to a banking client or other beneficiary. The APCIA representative requested consideration of an amendment regarding premium tax credit treatment for out-of-state insurance companies to provide retaliatory protections to these companies.

Written-only **proponent** testimony was submitted by representatives of the Kansas Department of Commerce, Haag Development Company, the Kansas Association of Realtors, Kansas Bankers Association, and Sugar Creek Capital.

Neutral testimony provided by a representative of the KHRC indicated the allowance of unlimited transfers and transfers of only a portion of the tax credits allocated to an investor would likely lead to more administrative work for the KHRC. The representative stated a limit to the number of transfers could alleviate this administrative burden while supporting the goals of the legislation.

Written-only **opponent** testimony was submitted by a representative of Americans for Prosperity Kansas. The testimony stated a concern for the limitation of the tax credit to only those making investments in qualified housing projects.

The Senate Committee amended the bill to address the retaliatory tax consideration of taxes paid by certain insurance companies. [*Note:* The Conference Committee retained this amendment.]

Fiscal Information

SB 34 (Kansas Rural Housing Incentive District Act)

According to the fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget on the bill, as introduced, the Kansas Development Finance Authority indicates the bill could reduce state tax revenues as the tax increment revenues would be pledged to pay debt service on bonds. The agency also indicates local governments could experience an increase in debt liabilities.

The Kansas Department of Revenue indicates that because revenues under the bill would come from future real property developments, the agency is unable to estimate what the fiscal effect would be.

The League of Kansas Municipalities indicates the bill could increase revenue to the cities because of the increased property taxes and sales taxes from the construction projects and renovations of property detailed by the bill.

The Kansas Department of Commerce and the Kansas Association of Counties indicate the bill would not have a fiscal effect.

Any fiscal effect associated with enactment of the bill is not reflected in *The FY 2024 Governor's Budget Report*.

SB 37 (Kansas Housing Investor Tax Credit Act)

According to the fiscal note prepared by the Division of the Budget on the bill, as introduced, the Kansas Department of Revenue indicates the bill would affect State General Fund (SGF) revenue. The bill would allow the Kansas Housing Investor Tax Credit to be transferred to multiple taxpayers; however, the total amount of these credits would continue to be capped at \$13.0 million per tax year.

The Department indicates enactment of the bill would require \$42,780 from the SGF in FY 2024 to implement the bill and for additional information technology expenditures. In addition, if the combined effect of implementing this bill and other enacted legislation exceeds the Department's programming resources, or if the time for implementing the changes is too short, additional expenditures for outside contract programmer services beyond the Department's current budget may be required.

A fiscal note was not immediately available regarding the effect of the inclusion of certain premium taxes paid in consideration of taxes owed by insurance companies.

Any fiscal effect associated with SB 37 is not reflected in *The FY 2024 Governor's Budget Report*.

Housing; economic development; residential housing; reinvestment housing incentive districts; Kansas Investor Tax Credit Act; transferability of credits; retaliatory taxes

ccrb_sb17_01_0000.odt