Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

Original Updated	Correcte	·d	Supplemental			
LRB Number 03-3411/1	Introduction	Number S	SB-280			
Subject						
Retention of energy conservation funding by p	ublic utilities					
Fiscal Effect						
Appropriations Rev	rease Existing venues crease Existing venues	Increase Costs to absorb within Yes Decrease Cost	s - May be possible n agency's budget No			
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 Cities Counties Others School WTCS Districts						
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS s.20.505(3)(q) & (3)(s)						
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature		Date			
DOA/ Mary Massey (608) 267-2099 Martha Kerner (608) 266-1359						

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DOA 11/13/2003

LRB Number 03-3411/1	Introduction Number SB-280	Estimate Type	Original					
Subject								
Retention of energy conservation funding by public utilities								

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Relating to contributions by electric and gas utilities to the utility public benefits fund.

The bill potentially reduces the amount of revenue deposited in the Public Benefits Fund.

The Public Benefits Fund receives revenue in several ways. First, a customer fee established in October 2000 generates approximately \$40.5 million per year. The exact amount varies slightly each year since the fee is based in part on a fixed statutory amount and in part on a formula with variables that test the amount of federal funds received and the number of low-income households in the state among others.

Second, the fund receives a small amount of voluntary contributions from customers and voluntary transfers from municipally owned electric utilities and electric cooperatives that have opted to join the state energy efficiency and low-income assistance programs.

Third, utilities are required to deposit \$67,155,050 each year into the fund from what is commonly called their "transition funds". This amount, set in 2000 by the Public Service Commission and phased in over three years, is now fixed and will not change in future years under current law.

Of the \$67.2 million in transition funds, \$45,826,000 is deposited for use with energy efficiency programs and \$21,329,000 for programs to assist low-income households though weatherization and bill payment assistance.

The bill would allow a utility to retain a portion of the \$45.8 million "if the commission determines that the portion is used by the utility for energy conservation programs for industrial, commercial and agricultural customers in the utility's service area and that the programs comply with rules promulgated by the commission."

Although the option to retain funds potentially applies to the entire \$67.2 million in transition funds, the department assumes that the low-income program portion would not be considered by the Commission as eligible. That is because the transition funds provided for low-income programs have their historic origin in those programs and have never been associated with commercial, industrial or agricultural uses.

Each of the six utilities that provide transition funds is eligible to seek a Commission determination that would allow them to retain their share of the energy conservation portion of the transition funds. The requests could total nearly all of the \$45,826,000. In each case, the actual amount would be reduced by the percentages set aside for the renewable energy program (4.5%) and environmental research (1.75%). Those set asides are in current law and SB 280 preserves them even if other funds are retained. The net effect would be to reduce the funds administered by the department by \$42,961,900.

The bill also requires the PSC to establish rules for grants made by DOA for energy conservation. The rules must require projects to have a positive economic value within a period of time to be determined by the commission. The effect of this would be to deny grants to projects that have a long payback period. The fiscal effect cannot be determined until the commission has developed the rules.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

Unknown

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	Original		Updated			Corrected		Supple	emental	
	LRB Number 03-3411/1 Introduction Number SB-280						0			
Subjec)t									
		y conservatior								
annua	iized fiscal (Impacts for	State	and/or	Local Gove	ernment (d	o not incl	ude in	
II. Ann	ualized Cos	sts:				Annualized	Fiscal Imp	oact on fu	ınds from:	
						Increased Co	osts	Decrea	ased Costs	
	te Costs by									
		s - Salaries an	id Fringes			\$				
-	Position Ch									
		- Other Cost	S							
Н—	l Assistance							_		
		ls or Organiza						-4	42,961,900	
		Costs by Cat			777		\$	\$-4	12,961,900	
		Source of Fu	ınds							
GPR										
FED	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									
PRO	/PRS									
SEG	/SEG-S (SE	G)						-4	12,961,900	
III. Stat revenu	te Revenues les (e.g., tax	s - Complete c increase, de	this only w ecrease in l	hen pı icense	roposal e fee, et	will increas s.)	se or decre	ease state)	
						Increased F	Rev	Decr	eased Rev	
	Taxes						\$		\$	
	Earned									
FED										
	/PRS									
	SEG/SEG-S (SEG)						-4	12,961,900		
TOTAL State Revenues					\$	\$-42,961,900				
		<u> </u>	NET ANNUA	ALIZE	FISCA	L IMPACT				
						St	ate	Local		
NET CHANGE IN COSTS				\$-42,961,9	900	\$				
NET CHANGE IN REVENUE				\$-42,961,9	900		\$			
Agency/Prepared By Au		Autho	thorized Signature			[Date			
DOA/ Mary Massey (608) 267-2099 M			Marth	artha Kerner (608) 266-1359			1	1/12/2003		