STATE OF HAWAI‘I
OFFICE OF PLANNING
& SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR

SCOTT J. GLENN
DIRECTOR

235 South Beretania Street, 6th Floor, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96813
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu, Hawai‘i 96804

Telephone: (808) 587-2846
Fax: (808) 587-2824
Web: https://planning.hawaii.gov/

Statement of
SCOTT GLENN, Director

before the
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS
Thursday, February 9, 2023, 2:00 PM
State Capitol, Conference Room 325

in consideration of
HB 997
PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE VII, SECTIONS 12 AND 13, OF THE HAWAII CONSTITUTION TO EXPRESSLY PROVIDE THAT THE LEGISLATURE MAY AUTHORIZE THE COUNTIES TO ISSUE TAX INCREMENT BONDS AND TO EXCLUDE TAX INCREMENT BONDS FROM DETERMINATIONS OF THE FUNDED DEBT OF THE COUNTIES.

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and Members of the House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs, the Office of Planning and Sustainable Development (OPSD) **strongly supports** HB 997 which proposes amendments to the State Constitution to expressly provide that the legislature may authorize the counties to issue tax increment bonds; and exclude tax increment bonds in calculating the debt limit of the counties.

Tax increment financing (TIF) would help finance regional public infrastructure to facilitate transit-oriented development on state and private lands. It allows a portion of property taxes in excess of a base assessed value to be dedicated to finance costs of a project through issuance of bonds.

While HRS §46-103 permits a county council to provide for tax increment financing, and HRS §46-104(2) grants a county the power to issue tax increment bonds, tax increment bonds do not fit neatly within the types of bonds that counties may issue under Hawaii’s Constitution.

This bill proposes a ballot question asking whether the Constitution should be amended to expressly allow counties to issue tax increment bonds. The constitutional amendment proposed by this bill would clarify that use of TIF is authorized and would exclude tax increment bonds in calculating the debt limit of the counties. Allowing the use of TIF is supported by state and county agencies and developers.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

DEPARTMENT OF BUSINESS, ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT & TOURISM

KA ʻOIHANA HOʻOMOHALA PĀʻOIHANA, ʻIMI WAIWAI A HOʻOMĀKAʻIKAʻI

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR

CHRIS J. SADAYASU
DIRECTOR

DANE K. WICKER
DEPUTY DIRECTOR

No. 1 Capitol District Building, 250 South Hotel Street, 5th Floor, Honolulu, Hawaii 96813
Mailing Address: P.O. Box 2359, Honolulu, Hawaii 96804
Web site: dbedt.hawaii.gov

Telephone: (808) 586-2355
Fax: (808) 586-2377

Statement of
CHRIS J. SADAYASU
Director
Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism
before the
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY AND HAWAIIAN AFFAIRS

Thursday, February 9, 2023
2:00 PM
State Capitol, Conference Room 325

In consideration of
HB 997
PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE VII, SECTIONS 12 AND 13, OF THE HAWAII CONSTITUTION TO EXPRESSLY PROVIDE THAT THE LEGISLATURE MAY AUTHORIZE THE COUNTIES TO ISSUE TAX INCREMENT BONDS AND TO EXCLUDE TAX INCREMENT BONDS FROM DETERMINATIONS OF THE FUNDED DEBT OF THE COUNTIES.

Chair Tarnas, Vice Chair Takayama, and Members of the Committee.

The Department of Business, Economic Development and Tourism (DBEDT) **strongly supports** HB 997, an Administration Bill, which proposes amendments to the State Constitution to expressly provide that the legislature may authorize the counties to issue tax increment bonds; and exclude tax increment bonds in calculating the debt limit of the counties.

The ability for counties to use tax increment bonds as a value capture financing tool has been hampered by uncertainty in the allowance of its use in the State Constitution, although they are authorized under HRS Chapter 46. This constitutional cloud would be lifted by passage of this bill, which includes a ballot question to be posed to the electorate in the upcoming election.

Tax increment financing (TIF) is widely used in other states to capture the increased property values in dense, mixed-use transit-oriented development, and used to fund the required regional public infrastructure improvements.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.

JOSH GREEN, M.D.
GOVERNOR

TESTIMONY BY:

EDWIN H. SNIFFEN
DIRECTOR

Deputy Directors
DREANALEE K. KALILI
TAMMY L. LEE
ROBIN K. SHISHIDO
JAMES KUNANE TOKIOKA

STATE OF HAWAII
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
869 PUNCHBOWL STREET
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-5097

Thursday, February 9, 2023
2:00 P.M.
State Capitol
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE

H.B. 997
PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO ARTICLE VII, SECTIONS 12 AND 13 OF THE HAWAII CONSTITUTION TO EXPRESSLY PROVIDE THAT THE LEGISLATURE MAY AUTHORIZE THE COUNTIES TO ISSUE TAX INCREMENT BONDS AND TO EXCLUDE TAX INCREMENT BONDS FROM DETERMINATIONS OF THE FUNDED DEBT OF THE COUNTIES

House Committee on Judiciary and Hawaiian Affairs

The Department of Transportation (DOT) **supports** this measure that proposes amendments to the Constitution of the State of Hawaii to expressly provide that the legislature may authorize political subdivisions, such as counties, to issue tax increment bonds and to exclude tax increment bonds in calculating the debt limit of the political subdivisions.

The DOT receives Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) federal funds for its Capital Improvement Projects (CIP). Additionally, the DOT issues Revenue Bonds for the State match to the FHWA federal funds in support of its CIP program. Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Tax Increment Bonds differs greatly from Revenue Bonds and the DOT is interested in TIF as an innovative financing strategy to complement federal funds, and Revenue Bond proceeds as appropriate.

The DOT understands that implementing Tax Increment Financing (TIF) and Tax Increment Bonds is complicated, however, this innovative financing may be another financing tool to provide for infrastructure improvements under the purview of the DOT as guidance from the FHWA states, “Although TIF has not been used extensively to fund transportation infrastructure, some state laws specifically authorize the use of TIF for transportation purposes.”[1]

The DOT supports housing and have been working with developers to fulfill our infrastructure requirements and see TIF as an opportunity for the State and Counties to collaborate on areas that have been historically difficult to develop.

---

[1] https://www.fhwa.dot.gov/ipd/value_capture/defined/tax_increment_financing.aspx

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

LEGISLATIVE TAX BILL SERVICE

TAX FOUNDATION OF HAWAII

126 Queen Street, Suite 305 Honolulu, Hawaii 96813 Tel. 536-4587

SUBJECT: CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT, Allow Counties to Issue Tax Increment Bonds and Exclude from County Debt Limit

BILL NUMBER: SB 935, HB 997 [BED-12]

INTRODUCED BY: SB by KOUCHI; HB by SAIKI (Governor's Package)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY: Proposes amendments to the Constitution of the State of Hawai'i to expressly provide that the legislature may authorize political subdivisions, such as counties, to issue tax increment bonds and to exclude tax increment bonds in calculating the debt limit of the political subdivisions.

SYNOPSIS: Amends Article VII, Section 12 of the Constitution to add the definition of "tax increment bonds" as all bonds, the principal of and interest on which are payable from and secured solely by all real property taxes levied by a political subdivision, such as a county, on the assessed valuation of the real property in a tax increment district established by the political subdivision that is in excess of the assessed valuation of the real property for the fiscal year prior to the effective date specified by resolution of the political subdivision of the specified public works, public improvements or other actions by the political subdivision within the tax increment district.

Authorizes counties to issue tax increment bonds.

Amends Article VII, Section 13 of the Constitution to exclude from the debt limit tax increment bonds, but only to the extent that the principal of and interest on the bonds are in fact paid from the real property taxes levied by a political subdivision, such as a county, on the assessed valuation of the real property in a tax increment district established by the political subdivision that is in excess of the assessed valuation of the real property for the fiscal year prior to the effective date specified by resolution of the political subdivision of the specified public works, public improvements or other actions by the political subdivision within the tax increment district.

EFFECTIVE DATE: Upon compliance with article XVII, section 3, of the Constitution of the State of Hawaii.

STAFF COMMENTS: This is an Administration measure sponsored by DBEDT and designated BED-12 (23).

The proposed measure would allow each of the counties to issue tax increment bonds and utilize the concept of tax increment financing as another means of financing capital improvements. The concept of tax increment financing is based on increased property tax revenue generated from rising property tax assessments which result from the improvements. Under a tax increment financing plan, a specific geographic area would be designated as a tax increment district for which tax increment bonds would be sold to cover capital improvement project costs within that district.

Upon the designation of a tax increment district an “assessment base” is established, based on the total assessed value of taxable real property in a tax increment district at that time. A “tax increment,” which is the amount by which the current valuation of the real property exceeds the assessment base, is then determined. The revenues derived from the assessment base would be paid into the county’s general fund while the revenues derived from the tax increment would be deposited into the tax increment fund. In addition to the revenues derived from the determination of the tax increment, the proceeds of tax increment bonds are also to be deposited into the tax increment fund. The total revenues in the tax increment fund are then be used to finance capital improvements including debt repayment made to the tax increment district which, in turn, will result in increased property valuations due to renovation and increased capital improvements within the designated district.

While this concept provides another means for the financing of capital improvements, caution should be exercised to ensure that the amount of revenues generated within a tax increment district will be enough to cover the debt service of the tax increment bonds issued. Provisions should be made to ensure that this method of financing is not abused as it has been in other states. Specifically, it should be provided that once a tax increment financing district has been designated and the project costs estimated, such districts may not be enlarged nor shall expenditures exceed projections to include purposes other than originally authorized without specific local government approval.

In other words, in designating such districts, certification of assessment values should be done to ensure that valuations of properties within the tax increment district will increase sufficiently to generate enough revenues to repay the cost of the bonds sold. Conversely, specific provisions should be made to ensure that any excess revenues are returned to the county general fund.

The measure also provides that tax increment bonds shall be excluded from the determination of funded debt of the counties for purposes of the constitutional spending ceiling. It is questionable why tax increment bonds should be treated differently from any other debt of the counties.

As the Hawaii Supreme Court explained in *Convention Center Authority v. Anzai*, 78 Haw. 157, 890 P.2d 1197 (1995), Hawaii’s Constitution has had some form of debt limitation in place essentially from its inception. Under the Organic Act, the debt limit was set at ten percent of the assessed value of real property. The limit was subsequently increased to fifteen percent at the 1950 Constitutional Convention. The present structure of the debt limit and its exceptions was adopted by the 1968 Constitutional Convention, where the delegates were particularly wary of the implications of pledging the full faith and credit of the state behind an undertaking that was not “self-sustaining” or whose revenues, and/or the user taxes derived from the undertaking, could not cover the debt service charges. That is why the present constitutional provisions provide for the excludability of reimbursable general obligation bonds from the debt limit to the extent that “reimbursements are in fact made from the net revenue, or net user tax receipts, or combination of both, as determined for the immediately preceding fiscal year.” Haw. Const. art.

VII, § 13(6). In other words, the amounts that are not directly reimbursed to the general fund by revenue and/or user taxes are not excludable from the debt limit. This compromise position carefully balances the competing interests of flexibility and security.

We question the wisdom of writing an exception into our constitutional debt limit safeguards for debt that is supposed to be paid back by increased property tax revenues from development that has yet to occur. If the development does not deliver as advertised, government remains on the hook to repay the bonds, meaning that all of us suffer.

Digested: 2/5/2023