

LRB or Bill No./Adm. Rule No.  
SB 228 (-190013)  
Amendment No. if Applicable

**FISCAL ESTIMATE**

DOA-2048 N(R10/96)

- ORIGINAL
- CORRECTED
- UPDATED
- SUPPLEMENTAL

**Subject**  
Water Service Disputes Between Municipalities

**Fiscal Effect**

State:  No State Fiscal Effect

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

- Increase Existing Appropriation
- Decrease Existing Appropriation
- Create New Appropriation
- Increase Existing Revenues
- Decrease Existing Revenues

- 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**

20.155(l)(g)

**Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate**

**This bill proposes to eliminate the involvement of the Public Service Commission (PSC) in water system location or extension disputes between municipalities. Removing the PSC's jurisdiction would not have a impact on state costs because on an annual basis the PSC only receives one or two complaints of this type. In most cases, these complaints are settled before the Commission makes a formal decision on the issue.**

**Based on the PSC experience, the need for municipalities to pursue disputes in court, instead of the PSC, would be the exception rather than the rule and could not be quantified.**

**Long-Range Fiscal Implications**

Agency/Prepared by: (Name & Phone No.)

PSC/Gordon Grant 267-9086

Authorized Signature/Telephone No.

*Ave M. Bie*

Date

09/14/99