



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

March 4, 2002

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #1237

Shared Revenue Modifications -- Utility Aid Distribution for 2003 and Thereafter (Shared Revenue and Tax Relief)

[LFB Summary of the Governor's Budget Reform Bill: Page 77, #1]

CURRENT LAW

The shared revenue program is comprised of two separate distributions and funding levels -- one for municipalities and one for counties. For 2002, the funding levels are set at \$769,092,800 for municipalities and \$170,671,600 for counties, or \$939,764,400 in total. Payments are calculated under a formula that consists of four components: (1) public utility; (2) aidable revenues; (3) per capita; and (4) minimum guarantee/maximum growth. Act 16 suspended the shared revenue distribution formula for municipalities for payments in 2002 and 2003. Instead, each municipality's shared revenue payment in 2002 and 2003 will equal 101% of the amount the municipality received in the prior year. This Act 16 provision will not affect county shared revenue payments. For 2001, \$28,344,170 was distributed as utility aid. This comprised 3.0% of the total shared revenue appropriation.

Under the public utility component, municipalities and counties receive aid equal to the net book value of qualifying utility property multiplied by a rate of nine mills. Qualifying utility property is defined to include production plants, substations and general structures, such as office buildings. If the qualifying property is in a city or village, the municipality's payment is calculated at a rate of six mills, and the county receives a payment based on three mills. If the qualifying property is located in a town, the town's payment is calculated at a rate of three mills, and the county receives a payment based on six mills. The value of a utility's property at any single site is limited to \$125 million, and payments are further limited to no more than \$300 per capita for municipalities and \$100 per capita for counties. The values used in these calculations are limited to no less than the values used to calculate aid payments in 1991, for property that has remained in operation since that time. Each municipality and county is guaranteed \$75,000 if a

production plant with a capacity of 200 megawatts or more is located within its borders. The \$75,000 payment for municipalities is phased-out at the rate of 10% per year when plants are decommissioned (this phase-out is not extended to counties, so their aid on decommissioned plants drops to \$0). The phase-out is terminated when the plant is returned to the local property tax roll. By definition, decommissioned property cannot be operating utility property and, therefore, is subject to local taxation. As a result, the phase-out of aid on decommissioned property is not likely to occur. Finally, each municipality and county where spent nuclear fuel is stored receives an annual payment of \$50,000.

GOVERNOR

The Governor's proposal would make a number of modifications to the funding levels, distribution formulas, payment dates and funding sources for shared revenue, expenditure restraint, county mandate relief and small municipalities shared revenue programs. The Governor's proposal is described in full in LFB Paper #1235. However, this paper covers only the distribution of utility aid under the shared revenue program for 2003 and thereafter. Other Legislative Fiscal Bureau papers address other aspects of the Governor's proposal.

Specify that total payments in 2003 under the shared revenue program and under three related programs (expenditure restraint, county mandate relief and small municipalities shared revenue) for each municipality and county would equal the amount received in 2002, after any aid reductions enacted for 2002. Establish a sunset after 2003 for distributions under the shared revenue program, including all four of the program's payment components [per capita, aidable revenues, public utility (including payments for spent nuclear fuel storage) and minimum guarantee/maximum growth].

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the Governor's proposal, no utility aid payments would be made as of 2004. The public utility component of the shared revenue program compensates local governments for costs they incur in providing services to electric utilities. These costs cannot be directly recouped through property taxation since public utilities are exempt from local taxation and, instead, are taxed by the state.

2. State law requires utilities to secure a certificate of public convenience and necessity from the Public Service Commission (PSC) before they can construct a generating plant with a rating of 100 megawatts or more. In addition to the PSC, plant owners and operators must receive approvals and permits from various federal agencies, other state government departments and local governments. Municipalities and counties grant approvals relative to land use, zoning, water and sewer connection, and drainage. Also, they issue building and occupancy permits. Without public utility aid serving as an incentive for local governments to host production plants within their boundaries, counties and municipalities may not grant the various approvals and permits necessary to build and operate new production plants.

3. The PSC reports that recent megawatt sales of electricity have been increasing at a rate of approximately 2% each year. In Wisconsin, production plants that are more than 25 years old account for more than half of the state's generated electricity, and no "base load" plants have been constructed since 1985. Base load plants, which produce approximately 80% of the state's electricity, are designed to run almost constantly because they have relatively low per unit costs. Intermediate load and peak load plants are used to supplement the production of base load plants. In response to increases in demand and the aging infrastructure of existing plants, utilities and independent power producers have proposed building more than 8,000 megawatts (MW) of new generation for the state. Based on PSC records, this could involve as many as 19 facilities, although not all 19 are likely to be built.

4. A reliable energy supply has been cited as an essential ingredient for the state's continued economic growth. If the utility aid distribution is considered an effective incentive for local governments to host production plants, its continuation may be worthwhile. Even if the Governor's proposal to eliminate the shared revenue distribution in 2004 is adopted, the Legislature could create a separate utility aid program with its own appropriation to distribute aid payments beginning in 2003 or 2004. A similar provision is contained in AB 584, which the Assembly has passed.

5. In addition to creating a separate utility aid appropriation, AB 584, as amended, contains a number of other provisions. It would increase the \$125 million value limit to \$250 million, increase the per capita payment limits from \$100 to \$600 for counties and from \$300 to \$1,200 for municipalities and revise the payment schedule for decommissioned plants.

6. Also under the bill, incentive payments would be made to local governments that contain newly constructed plants that meet three conditions. First, the plant must be built on, or adjacent to, the site of an existing or decommissioned plant or on, or adjacent to, the site of a brownfield, as defined under current law. Second, the plant must be operating at a total production capacity of at least 50 megawatts. Third, the plant cannot be nuclear-powered. Payments would be based on the plant's construction cost less depreciation and less the value of treatment plant and pollution abatement equipment. For municipalities, payments would be calculated at a rate of two mills if the plant is a coal-powered plant and one mill for all other eligible plants. For counties, payments would be calculated at a rate of one mill, regardless of the type of qualifying plant.

7. If the Legislature's primary policy objective is to encourage local governments to allow new production plants to be cited in their jurisdiction, a more effective aid formula could be developed. Under the current formula, aid payments decrease over time due to depreciation. This diminishes the incentive for local governments to allow plants to be located in their boundaries and can result in inequitable treatment between local governments. Greater disamenities are often associated with older plants, but those plants typically generate smaller aid payments than comparably sized plants that are newer and operate more efficiently. Also, some utility aid payments are so small that they are unlikely to have any impact on local governments' decisions to allow utility property to be located in their boundaries. In these instances, there are probably few disamenities associated with the utility property. For example, the Town of Lincoln (Burnett

County) received a utility aid payment of 19 cents in 2001. Finally, some utility aid payments are made for property that causes few disamenities, such as general structures, which are primarily office buildings. Aid payments are not made to other units of local government for general structures, nor is aid paid for general structures owned by other utilities, such as telephone companies.

8. In its deliberations on Act 16, the Committee considered an alternate distribution formula that would compensate local governments based on the generating capacity of plants within their boundaries. Under this alternative, aid would be paid only on properties that are accompanied by disamenities. This distribution formula could be designed to encourage local governments to accept production plants and provide higher incentives for locating additional production capacity. Such a system could eliminate the inequities of the current system that result from depreciated values and inflated construction costs, and administration of the payment system would be simplified.

9. The following payment schedule is structured to distribute approximately the same amount of utility aid statewide (\$28 million) as was distributed in 2001 (Alternative 2.b.). Payment increases would occur for a number of the municipalities that host production plants, but payment decreases would occur for municipalities that contain other types of property that would no longer qualify for aid payments.

<u>Megawatt Rating of Electric Production Plant</u>	<u>Combined Municipal and County Payment Amount</u>
Over 3,000	\$2,500,000
2,400 to 3,000	2,000,000
1,800 to 2,400	1,500,000
1,300 to 1,800	1,325,000
800 to 1,300	1,250,000
400 to 800	1,000,000
300 to 400	900,000
200 to 300	800,000
100 to 200	600,000
50 to 100	200,000
25 to 50	100,000
10 to 25	50,000
Under 10	25,000

10. An alternate structure could be developed that would distribute about \$20 million (Alternative 2.c.). This distribution would more closely approximate the amount paid in 2001 for production plants.

Megawatt Rating of
Electric Production Plant

Combined Municipal and County
Payment Amount

Over 3,000	\$2,000,000
2,400 to 3,000	1,500,000
1,800 to 2,400	1,300,000
1,300 to 1,800	1,150,000
800 to 1,300	1,000,000
400 to 800	800,000
300 to 400	700,000
200 to 300	500,000
100 to 200	300,000
50 to 100	150,000
25 to 50	50,000
10 to 25	25,000
Under 10	15,000

11. Aid distributions under the two preceding alternatives are displayed on the attachment to this paper. If there is a desire to expend less aid, payments under the new system could be limited to a specified percentage of the amount received in 2001. The amounts on the attachment are based on information supplied by utility officials and data bases maintained by the U.S. government. However, the amounts should be regarded as estimates and would be subject to change upon actual implementation by DOR.

12. Under these alternative aid structures, payments would be based on the total capacity within each municipality's boundaries. In instances where a municipality contains more than one plant, the capacities of the plants would be combined. In instances where the generating facility is in more than one municipality, such as hydroelectric generating stations, the payments would be divided between the municipalities where the plant is located. A similar procedure could be employed for plants with related facilities, such as fly ash disposal pits, in adjoining municipalities. Because disamenities may be associated with these facilities, the payment on the production plant could be divided between the municipality where the plant is located and the adjoining municipality where the related facility is located. The division could be based on the net book value of the property.

13. Although aid would be calculated on a municipal-by-municipal basis, the resulting amounts could be divided between municipalities and counties under a method similar to that employed under current law. One-third of the payment generated by each city or village would be distributed to the overlying county, and two-thirds of the payment generated by each town would be distributed to the overlying county.

14. Finally, additional payments could be structured for new plants built on, or adjacent to, the site of an existing or decommissioned plant or on, or adjacent to, the site of a brownfield, as proposed in AB 584.

15. If the Committee wishes to continue the utility aid distribution, a series of alternatives are presented for the Committee with respect to distribution formulas, appropriations, timing and incentive payments. Otherwise, the Governor's recommendation (Alternative 1) could be adopted to discontinue utility aid payments.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to discontinue the utility aid distribution, effective with payments in 2004.

2. *Distribution Formula.* Delete the Governor's recommendation and, instead, adopt one or more of the following with regard to the formula for distributing utility aid:

a. Retain the utility aid distribution formula authorized under current law.

b. Modify the utility aid distribution formula's valuation and per capita limits and payments for decommissioned plants as specified in AB 584.

c. Repeal the current law formula for distributing utility aid on the basis of net book value and rates of three mills or six mills, effective with payments for 2003. Create a distributional formula based on the capacity of light, heat and power production plants as follows: (1) extend payments to municipalities and counties that contain, within their boundaries, light, heat and power production plants used by a light, heat and power company, a qualified wholesale electric company, a wholesale merchant plant or an electric cooperative subject to state license fees imposed under Chapter 76 of the statutes or by municipal electric companies subject to ad valorem payments in lieu of taxes under s. 66.0825(16) of the statutes; (2) exclude property of municipal light, heat and power companies from the payments unless the production plant is located outside the municipality owning the plant; (3) specify that payments be calculated on the basis of total megawatt capacity of eligible production plants within each municipality, as reported by the plant's owner or operator, but distribute two-thirds of each municipal payment to the county where the municipality is located if the municipality is a town and distribute one-third of each municipal payment to the county where the municipality is located if the municipality is a city or village; (4) set municipal payments equal to \$2,500,000 if capacity is over 3,000 megawatts, \$2,000,000 if capacity is over 2,400, but not more than 3,000, megawatts, \$1,500,000 if capacity is over 1,800, but not more than 2,400, megawatts, \$1,325,000 if capacity is over 1,300, but not more than 1,800, megawatts, \$1,250,000 if capacity is over 800, but not more than 1,300, megawatts, \$1,000,000 if capacity is over 400, but not more than 800, megawatts, \$900,000 if capacity is over 300, but not more than 400, megawatts, \$800,000 if capacity is over 200, but not more than 300, megawatts, \$600,000 if capacity is over 100, but not more than 200, megawatts, \$200,000 if capacity is over 50, but not more than 100, megawatts, \$100,000 if capacity is over 25, but not more than 50, megawatts, \$50,000 if capacity is over 10, but not more than 25, megawatts, and \$25,000 if capacity is 10 megawatts, or less; (5) specify that if a production plant is located in more than one municipality or county, the

capacity associated with that plant shall be attributed to the municipality where the majority of the plant is located; however, provide that the resulting municipal payment be divided between the two municipalities based on the net book value of the plant as of December 31, 2002, or as of the date the property becomes operational, whichever is later; and finally, specify that only that portion of a municipal payment that is attributable to the plant that is located in two municipalities be divided, if the municipality to which the capacity is attributable contains more than one production plant; (6) specify that the payment division under (5) shall apply to property that is classified as production plant, under the system of accounts established by the PSC, but which is not an electric generating facility if the net book value of the related facility exceeds \$800,000; (7) eliminate aid payments on substations and general structures; (8) retain the distribution for nuclear storage facilities and the per capita payment limits authorized under current law; and (9) specify that in the case of a facility under construction, the megawatts associated with the facility shall be prorated for inclusion in the municipality's capacity based on the percentage of construction completed on December 31 of the prior year, as determined by DOR.

c. Adopt the changes under "b.", except replace "b.(4)" with the following payment schedule:

Set municipal payments equal to \$2,000,000 if capacity is over 3,000 megawatts, \$1,500,000 if capacity is over 2,400, but not more than 3,000, megawatts, \$1,300,000 if capacity is over 1,800, but not more than 2,400, megawatts, \$1,150,000 if capacity is over 1,300, but not more than 1,800, megawatts, \$1,000,000 if capacity is over 800, but not more than 1,300, megawatts, \$1,000,000 if capacity is over 400, but not more than 800, megawatts, \$700,000 if capacity is over 300, but not more than 400, megawatts, \$500,000 if capacity is over 200, but not more than 300, megawatts, \$300,000 if capacity is over 100, but not more than 200, megawatts, \$150,000 if capacity is over 50, but not more than 100, megawatts, \$50,000 if capacity is over 25, but not more than 50, megawatts, \$25,000 if capacity is over 10, but not more than 25, megawatts, and \$10,000 if capacity is 10 megawatts, or less.

d. Limit any payment for a municipality or county under "b." or "c." to the utility aid payment received in 2001, multiplied by one of the following:

- (1) 100%;
- (2) 150%; or
- (3) 200%.

e. Modify either "b." or "c." by repealing the current law per capita aid limits.

3. *Appropriations.* Adopt one of the following with regard to the appropriation for the utility aid distribution:

a. Retain the current law structure where utility aid is included in the shared revenue

appropriation; or

- b. Create a separate, sum sufficient appropriation for making utility aid payments.

4. *Incentive Aid.* Extend payments to municipalities and counties where production plants are sited that begin operation on, or after, January 1, 2004, provided the plant meets three conditions: (1) the plant must be built on, or adjacent to, the site of an existing or decommissioned plant or on, or adjacent to, the site of a brownfield, as defined under current law; (2) the plant must be operating at a total production capacity of at least 50 megawatts; and (3) the plant cannot be nuclear-powered. Calculate the payments according to one of the following options:

- a. Base payments on the plant's construction cost less depreciation and less the value of treatment plant and pollution abatement equipment. For municipalities, calculate payments at a rate of two mills if the plant is a coal-powered plant and one mill for all other eligible plants. For counties, calculate payments at a rate of one mill, regardless of the type of qualifying plant. Specify that payments would not be made for construction work-in-progress, as under the current law distribution formula.

- b. Set payments equal to the following amounts based on the total megawatt capacity of the new plant: (1) if the plant has a capacity of at least 50 megawatts, but less than 100 megawatts, \$45,000 each for counties and municipalities; (2) if the plant has a capacity of at least 100 megawatts, but less than 200 megawatts, \$90,000 each for counties and municipalities; (3) if the plant has a capacity of at least 200 megawatts, but less than 400 megawatts, \$180,000 each for counties and municipalities; (4) if the plant has a capacity of at least 400 megawatts, but less than 600 megawatts, \$300,000 each for counties and municipalities; and (5) if the plant has a capacity of 600 megawatts, or more, \$420,000 each for counties and municipalities. Specify that payments would not be made for construction work-in-progress, as under the current law distribution formula. Double the preceding municipal amounts if the production plant is coal-powered.

5. *Timing.* Adopt one of the following with regard to when utility aid payments are to commence:

- a. Authorize the preceding changes, effective with payments in 2003; or
- b. Authorize the preceding changes, effective with payments in 2004.

Prepared by: Rick Olin
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Production Plant Inventory and State Aid Under Current Law and Under Capacity-Based Alternatives

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Plant Name</u>	<u>Owner/Operator</u>	<u>Capacity (MW)</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 1</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 2</u>	<u>Aid on Plant at 9 Mills*</u>
V. Pleasant Prairie	Kenosha	Pleasant Prairie Power Plant	WEPCo/WPL/WPS	1,235.2	\$1,250,000	\$1,000,000	\$1,125,000
C. Oak Creek	Milwaukee	Oak Creek	WEPCo/WPL/WPS	1,211.2	1,250,000	1,000,000	921,849
T. Two Creeks	Manitowoc	Point Beach Nuclear	WEPCo	1,072.6	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,125,000
T. Pacific	Columbia	Columbia	WPL/WPS/MGE	1,023.0	1,250,000	1,000,000	922,593
C. Sheboygan	Sheboygan	Edgewater	WPL/WEPCo/WPS	830.0	1,250,000	1,000,000	1,125,000
C. Alma	Buffalo	Alma and Madgett	Dairyland	562.0	1,000,000	800,000	701,186
T. Carlton	Kewaunee	Kewaunee	WPS/WPL/WEPCo	535.0	1,000,000	800,000	874,869
V. Rothschild	Marathon	Weston	WPS	456.6	1,000,000	800,000	613,042
T. Christiana	Dane	RockGen	Polisky/SkyGen	450.0	1,000,000	800,000	1,125,000
C. Port Washington	Ozaukee	Port Washington Power Plant	WEPCo/WPL/WPS	419.6	1,000,000	800,000	147,157
T. Watertown	Jefferson	Concord Generation Station	WEPCo	381.4	900,000	700,000	760,832
T. Paris	Kenosha	Paris	WEPCo	381.4	900,000	700,000	1,023,579
C. Green Bay	Brown	Pulliam	WPS	372.5	900,000	700,000	352,554
T. Neenah	Winnebago	Neenah	Southern Energy Inc.	350.0	900,000	700,000	930,742
T. Genoa	Vernon	Genoa	Dairyland	346.0	900,000	700,000	352,569
T. Wheaton	Chippewa	Wheaton	NSP	345.0	900,000	700,000	313,424
T. Fond du Lac	Fond du Lac	South Fond du Lac	WPL & WPPS	344.0	900,000	700,000	811,383
C. Madison	Dane	Blount Street, Sycamore & Other	MGE	303.6	900,000	700,000	288,210
T. Beloit	Rock	Rock River	WPL	294.0	800,000	500,000	68,775
C. Whitewater	Jefferson	Whitewater	Cogentrix	288.0	800,000	500,000	1,125,000
C. Milwaukee	Milwaukee	Valley	WEPCo/WPL/WPS	274.8	800,000	500,000	283,021
V. Germantown	Washington	Germantown Generation	WEPCo	244.8	800,000	500,000	479,127
V. Cassville	Grant	Nelson Dewey	WPL	200.0	800,000	500,000	89,031
V. Cassville	Grant	Stoneman	MidAmerican Power	48.0	See Above	See Above	103,890
C. La Crosse	La Crosse	French Island	NSP/MGE/WPS/WPL	183.0	600,000	300,000	154,050

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Plant Name</u>	<u>Owner/Operator</u>	<u>Capacity (MW)</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 1</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 2</u>	<u>Aid on Plant at 9 Mills*</u>
C. De Pere	Brown	DePere	SkyGen (WPL&WPS)	180.0	\$600,000	\$300,000	\$505,811
T. Peshtigo	Marinette	West Marinette	WPS/Marshfield/MG&E	167.2	600,000	300,000	430,241
T. Eagle Point	Chippewa	Jim Falls Hydro/Wissota	NSP	94.0	200,000	150,000	60,830
C. Ashland	Ashland	Bayfront	NSP	74.5	200,000	150,000	62,312
C. Fitchburg	Dane	Fitchburg	MGE	59.2	200,000	150,000	7,395
T. Anson	Chippewa	Jim Falls Hydro	NSP	57.0	200,000	150,000	698,365
T. Lafayette	Chippewa	Wissota	NSP	37.0	100,000	50,000	82,421
T. Birch Creek	Chippewa	Holcombe Hydro	NSP	35.4	50,000	25,000	4,594
T. Lake Holcombe	Chippewa	Holcombe Hydro	NSP	35.4	50,000	25,000	27,399
T. Washington	Rusk	Holcombe Hydro	NSP	33.9	50,000	25,000	14
T. Willard	Rusk	Holcombe Hydro	NSP	33.9	50,000	25,000	192
C. Cornell	Chippewa	Cornell Hydro	NSP	30.3	100,000	50,000	99,020
T. Prairie du Sac	Sauk	Prairie du Sac	WPL	28.5	100,000	50,000	13,264
C. Saint Croix Falls	Polk	Saint Croix Hydro	NSP	24.5	50,000	25,000	20,668
C. Chippewa Falls	Chippewa	Chippewa Falls Hydro	NSP	23.1	50,000	25,000	77,289
T. Stephenson	Marinette	Caldron, High, Johnson & Sandstone Falls	WPS	22.0	50,000	25,000	5,665
T. Rock Falls	Lincoln	Grandfather Falls	WPS	17.2	50,000	25,000	6,348
T. Dewey	Rusk	Flambeau	Dairyland	15.0	50,000	25,000	38,177
C. Wauwatosa	Milwaukee	Milw. Co. Grounds Power Plant	WEPCo/WPL/WPS	11.0	50,000	25,000	103,151
T. Linwood	Portage	WI. River Dr. & Stevens Point	Consolidated WP	10.6	50,000	25,000	395
T. Lincoln	Kewaunee	Wind Generator Units	MGE/WPS	10.4	50,000	25,000	143,048
C. Wisconsin Dells	Columbia	Kilbourn	WPL/WPS/MGE	10.0	50,000	25,000	8,338
C. Wisconsin Rapids	Wood	Wisconsin Rapids Hydro	Consolidated /WPS	9.1	25,000	10,000	12,510
T. Swiss	Burnett	Danbury Dam	N.W. WI. Electric	9.0	25,000	10,000	12,917
C. Eau Claire	Eau Claire	Dells Hydro	NSP	8.8	25,000	10,000	10,741
V. Solon Springs	Douglas	Solon Diesel	Dahlberg L&P	8.0	25,000	10,000	7,761
C. Middleton	Dane	Unknown	MGE	7.9	25,000	10,000	24,526
T. Big Falls	Rusk	Big Falls Hydro	NSP	7.5	25,000	10,000	10,927
T. Dewey	Portage	Dubay Hydro	Consolidated WP	7.2	25,000	10,000	1,845
V. Frederic	Polk	Frederic Diesel	NW WI Electric	7.1	25,000	10,000	15,215

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Plant Name</u>	<u>Owner/Operator</u>	<u>Capacity (MW)</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 1</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 2</u>	<u>Aid on Plant at 9 Mills*</u>
T. Red Cedar	Dunn	Cedar Falls Hydro	NSP	6.8	\$25,000	\$10,000	\$28,212
T. Biron	Wood	Biron Hydro	Consolidated WP	6.4	12,500	5,000	9,663
T. Rudolph	Wood	Biron Hydro	Consolidated/WPS	6.4	12,500	5,000	1,992
C. Wausau	Marathon	Wausau Hydro	WPS	6.2	25,000	10,000	1,632
V. Combined Locks	Outagamie	Combined Locks	Kaukana Elec & Water	6.2	25,000	10,000	100,854
V. Whiting	Portage	WI. River Drive Hydro	Consolidated WP	5.8	25,000	10,000	12,368
T. Washington	Door	Washington Island	Washington Island	5.3	25,000	10,000	12,436
V. Grantsburg	Burnett	Grantsburg Diesel	N.W. WI. Electric	5.3	25,000	10,000	3,708
T. Menomonie	Dunn	Menomonie Hydro	NSP	5.1	25,000	10,000	8
C. Menomonie	Dunn	Menomonie Hydro	NSP	5.1	25,000	10,000	12,245
C. Stevens Point	Portage	Stevens Point Hydro	Consolidated WP	4.8	25,000	10,000	8,179
T. Commonwealth	Florence	Big Quinnesec Hydro	WEPCo	3.6	25,000	10,000	184
T. Florence	Florence	Pine Hydro	WEPCo	3.6	25,000	10,000	4,190
T. Saxon	Iron	Saxon/Superior Falls Hydro	NSP	3.3	25,000	10,000	4,729
V. Little Chute	Outagamie	Little Chute	Kaukana Elec & Water	3.3	25,000	10,000	5,037
C. Ladysmith	Rusk	Ladysmith Hydro	NSP	3.1	25,000	10,000	27,161
T. Westport	Dane	Unknown	MG&E	3.1	25,000	10,000	6,513
T. Somerset	Saint Croix	Apple River Hydro	NSP	2.9	25,000	10,000	9,357
C. Monona	Dane	Unknown	MGE	2.6	25,000	10,000	13,191
T. Buchanan	Outagamie	Rapide Croche	Kaukana Elec & Water	2.4	25,000	10,000	7,077
C. Merrill	Lincoln	Merrill Hydro	WPS	2.2	25,000	10,000	702
C. Appleton	Outagamie	Appleton Hydro	WEPCo	1.9	25,000	10,000	5,898
T. Cloverland	Vilas	Hat Rapids	WPS	1.7	25,000	10,000	2,876
T. Gordon	Douglas	Gordon	Dahlberg L & P	1.7	25,000	10,000	11,074
T. Red River	Kewaunee	Wind Generators, Units	MG&E	1.6	25,000	10,000	62,158
T. Thornapple	Rusk	Thornapple Hydro	NSP	1.5	25,000	10,000	10,969
T. Round Lake	Sawyer	Arpin Dam	North Central Power	1.5	25,000	10,000	5,048
T. Byron	Fond du Lac	Windmills	WEPCo	1.3	25,000	10,000	12,137
T. Union	Burnett	Clam River Dam	N.W. WI. Electric	1.2	25,000	10,000	6,278
T. Winter	Sawyer	East Fork	North Central Power	1.2	25,000	10,000	2,772

<u>Municipality</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Plant Name</u>	<u>Owner/Operator</u>	<u>Capacity (MW)</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 1</u>	<u>Aid Under Alternative 2</u>	<u>Aid on Plant at 9 Mills*</u>
V. Cross Plains	Dane	Unknown	MG&E	1.1	\$25,000	\$10,000	\$4,023
T. White River	Ashland	White River Hydro	NSP	1.0	25,000	10,000	4,846
T. Stiles	Oconto	Stiles	Oconto REA	1.0	25,000	10,000	3,412
C. Peshtigo	Marinette	Peshtigo Hydro	WPS	0.7	25,000	10,000	311
T. Black Brook	Polk	Black Brook Dam	NW WI Electric	0.7	25,000	10,000	1,520
T. Star Prairie	Saint Croix	Riverdale Hydro	NSP	0.6	25,000	10,000	3,487
T. Minong	Washburn	Nancy -- Minong Flowage	Dahlberg L & P	0.5	25,000	10,000	278
T. Clam Falls	Polk	Clam Falls Dam	NW WI Electric	0.2	25,000	10,000	909
C. New Richmond	Saint Croix	Unknown	NSP	0.2	25,000	10,000	270
C. Hayward	Sawyer	Hayward Hydro	NSP	0.2	25,000	10,000	1,189
T. Balsam Lake	Polk	Balsam Lake Dam	NW WI Electric	0.1	25,000	10,000	3
C. Montreal	Iron	Gile Hydro	NSP	Under 0.1	25,000	10,000	1,404
T. Eau Pleine	Portage	Hydro	WPS/Consolidated WP	Unknown	25,000	10,000	7,810

* Current law aid amounts reflect the \$125 million value limit, but not the \$100 and \$300 per capita limits. Also, the calculations are based on net book values as of December 31, 2000, which may differ from the minimum values from the 1991 payment calculations.