FISCAL ESTIMATE 1999 Session

DOA-2048 N(R10/98) ☒ ORIGINAL ☐ UPDATED ☐ CORRECTED ☐ SUPPLEMENTAL

LRB No. and Bill/Adm. Rule No. SB 271 **LRB# 3157/1**

Amendment No. If Applicable

Subject

Noxious Weed Law

Fiscal Effect

State: ☒ No State Fiscal Effect

Check columns below only if bill makes a direct appropriation or affects a sum certain appropriation

☐ Increase Existing Appropriation ☐ Increase Existing Revenues

☐ Decrease Existing Appropriation ☐ Decrease Existing Revenues

☐ Create New Appropriation

☐ Increase Costs - May be possible to Absorb Within Agency's Budget ☐ Yes ☐ No

☐ Decrease Costs

Local: ☐ No Local Government Costs

1. ☐ Increase Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
2. ☐ Decrease Costs ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
3. ☐ Increase Revenues ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
4. ☐ Decrease Revenues ☐ Permissive ☐ Mandatory
5. Types of Local Governmental Units Affected: ☐ Towns ☐ Villages ☐ Cities ☐ Counties ☐ Others ☐ School Districts ☐ WTCS Districts

Fund Sources Affected ☐ GPR ☐ FED ☐ PRO ☐ PRS ☐ SEG ☐ SEG-S

Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Enforcement of the noxious weed law is done at the local level. This bill will add one weed (garlic mustard) to the list bringing the total to four. The impact on most counties most likely would be negligible. Counties in the southern part of the state where the weed is locally abundant may see some impact.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)	Authorized Signature/Telephone No.	Date
Dept of Agriculture, Trade & Consumer Protection Bob Dahl (608) 224-4571	Barbara Knapp Barbara Knapp (608) 224-4746	11/9/99