## Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

Original Updated	Corrected Supp	plemental						
LRB Number <b>03-2667/2</b>	Introduction Number SB-19	8						
Subject								
Exempt certain removal of topsoil from nometallic mining regulations								
Fiscal Effect								
Appropriations Rev	rease Existing venues crease Existing venues  Increase Costs - May to absorb within agen yenues  Decrease Costs							
Local:  No Local Government Costs  Indeterminate  1. Increase Costs Permissive Mandatory  2. Decrease Costs Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Permissive Mandatory Districts  5. Types of Local Government Units Affected Towns Village Counties Counties Others School Districts Districts								
Fund Sources Affected  Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations  GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS								
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature	Date						
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794	Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794	7/2/2003						

# Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 7/2/2003

LRB Number 03-2667/2	Introduction Number SB-198	Estimate Type	Original					
Subject								
Exempt certain removal of topsoil from nometallic mining regulations								

#### Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

#### Bill Summary:

This legislation exempts from nonmetallic mining reclamation requirements the removal of soils for the purpose of creating a pond or wetland that has an area of three acres or less.

#### Loss of State Revenues:

The portion of the fees that fund the DNR costs are collected by county and local regulatory authorities (RA) and forwarded to the Department. In this funding arrangement the fiscal impact to the Department would be minimal (probably less than \$12,000.00/yr.) This estimate assumes 5 new exemptions per county x 70 counties = 350 operations x \$30 = \$10,500. It also assumes 1 exemption per city village or town RA x 25 x 30 = \$750. In summary, \$10,500 + \$750 = \$11,250.

#### Loss of Local Revenues:

Fiscal impacts to local government, while not major, will be a factor in funding such mandatory reclamation programs (\$750 to \$1,500 depending on the geology in the county). This is made worse since regulatory staff must still visit the site to verify acreage-based exemption (but without being able to recoup these costs).

Assuming 5 new exempt operations per county x \$150 = \$750 in lost revenues per county (\$750 x 70 counties = \$52,500) or \$150.00 per city village or town (if there was one operation that did not pay \$150).

#### Loss of State Revenues

The portion of the fees that fund the DNR costs are collected by county and local regulatory authorities (RA) and forwarded to Department. In this funding arrangement the fiscal impact to the Department would be minimal (probably less than \$12,000.00/yr.) Assuming 5 new exemptions per county x 70 counties = 350 operations x \$30 = \$10,500.00 + Assuming 1 per city village or town RA x 25 x 30 = \$750.00; \$10,500.00 + \$750.00 = \$11,250.00

#### Loss of Local Revenues

On the other hand, fiscal impacts to local government, while not major will be a factor in funding such mandatory reclamation programs (\$750.00 to \$1,500.00 depending on the geology in the county). This is made worse since regulatory staff must still visit the site to verify acreage-based exemption (but without being able to recoup these costs).

Assuming 5 new exempt operations per county x \$150.00 = \$750.00 in lost revenues per county (\$750 x 70 counties = \$52,500) or \$150.00 per city village or town (if there was one operation that did not pay \$150.00).

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

### Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	Original		Updated			Corrected		Supplemental	
LRB	Number	03-2667	/2		Intro	duction Nu	umber	SB-198	
Exemp	Subject  Exempt certain removal of topsoil from nometallic mining regulations								
I. One-time Costs or Revenue Impacts for State and/or Local Government (do not include in annualized fiscal effect):									
II. Ann	ualized Cos	ts:		I		Annualized	Fiscal Imp	act on funds from:	
				$\prod$		Increased Co	sts	Decreased Costs	
A. Stat	te Costs by	Category							
State	Operations	s - Salaries an	d Fringes				\$		
(FTE	Position Ch	nanges)							
State	Operations	- Other Cost	S						
Loca	ıl Assistance	;							
Aids	to Individua	ls or Organiza	ations						
TC	OTAL State	Costs by Cat	tegory	$\perp$			\$	\$	
B. Stat	e Costs by	Source of Fu	ınds						
GPR									
FED									
PRO	/PRS								
SEG	SSEG-S								
		s - Complete k increase, de				ts.)		ase state	
<u> </u>				4		Increased R	lev	Decreased Rev	
	Taxes			_ _	··-		\$	\$	
┝-┼	Earned			4	····				
FED				4					
<del></del>	/PRS			$\bot$	η.				
⊢	/SEG-S			$\bot$				-11,250	
L TO	TOTAL State Revenues		$\perp \!\!\! \perp$			\$	\$-11,250		
			NET ANNUA	LIZE	D FISC				
		_		<u>Sta</u>	****	<u>Loca</u>			
NET CHANGE IN COSTS		4			\$	\$			
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE		丄		\$-11,2	250 \$-\$52,500				
Agenc	y/Prepared	Ву		Auth	horized	Signature		Date	
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 Joe		Joe	e Polasek (608) 266-2794			7/2/2003			