Fiscal Estimate - 2003 Session

Original Updated	Corrected Supplemental				
LRB Number 03-3319/1	Introduction Number SB-471				
Subject Brownfields revolving loan program					
Diowinicids revolving loan program					
Fiscal Effect					
Appropriations Reve	lncrease Costs - May be possible to absorb within agency's budget language where the costs are considered to absorb within agency's budget language. Increase Costs				
Permissive Mandatory Perm 2. Decrease Costs 4. Decr Permissive Mandatory Perm	5.Types of Local ase Revenue assive Mandatory ease Revenue assive Mandatory bissive Mandatory assive Mandatory assive Mandatory 5.Types of Local Government Units Affected Towns Counties Others School WTCS Districts				
Fund Sources Affected GPR FED PRO PRS	Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations SEG SEGS				
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signature Date				
DNR/ Stacey Fietz (608) 261-0744 Stacey Fietz (608) 261-0744					

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 2/23/2004

LRB Number 03-3319/1	Introduction Number	SB-471	Estimate Type	Original						
Subject										
Brownfields revolving loan program										

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

SUMMARY OF BILL: Provide authority to the Department of Natural Resources to create a federally funded brownfields revolving loan program, to provide loans and grants for environmental cleanups to local governments and tribes. This would be done in partnership with other state agencies or local governmental entities.

FISCAL IMPACT: The fiscal impact of the bill would be to create a new, federal revenue source in the state for environmental cleanups at brownfield sites. Brownfields are generally described as abandoned or under utilized properties whose reuse is challenged by real or perceived environmental contamination. At a minimum, the state can request \$1 million in annual grant funds, that do not need to be repaid to the EPA. If the State enters into a coalition with other eligible governmental agenices, they can request \$1 million per eligble entity. There is a 20% cost-share for these funds, which can be paid by the loan or grant recipients (i.e., the persons receiving the DNR loan or grant), by matching other state grants, in-kind services or funds. Thus, the state does not need to provide a grant match to the EPA from its revenues. The repayments to the state of the loan proceeds would "revolve"; the repayments would be collected by DNR and would be loaned or granted out to communities.

These funds would serve as an additional revenue source for priority brownfields projects. Currently, the state brownfield grant programs at DNR, Commerce and DOA (i.e., Coastal Management) are oversubscribed. This would give local governments an additional revenue source for brownfields projects that involve economic development, public facilities, green space, and waterfront revitalization. Having these funds would decrease a community's "out-of-pocket" costs, as most of these projects are initiated on a voluntary basis. The overall fiscal impact is that these federal moneys could leverage \$7 in additional investment in the brownfields project, for every \$1 of RLF funds, creating a total of \$28 million in project investment. This estimate is based on our experience with Wisconsin's Commerce grants, of which there was \$14 in investment for every state grant dollar. Further, the use of the funds for green space and other public facilities will increase neighboring property values and lead to investment in the public projects.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

As mentioned, these EPA grants would be available from EPA to the State on an annual basis, and in the first several years generate an additional economic impact of \$28 million, and result in an additional cleanup and reuse of 12 to 20 brownfields.

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2003 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

X	Original		Updated			Corrected			Supplemental	
LRB Number 03-3319/1					Introduction Number SB-471					
	nfields revolvir	ng loan progra								
I. One annua	e-time Costs alized fiscal e	or Revenue I effect):	mpacts for	State	and/or	Local Gov	ernmer	nt (do	not include in	
II. Anr	nualized Cos	ts:			Annualized Fiscal Impact on funds from:					
						Increased C			Decreased Costs	
	te Costs by									
-		- Salaries and	d Fringes				\$			
	E Position Ch									
_		- Other Costs	}							
	al Assistance					1,000	,000			
		s or Organiza								
T(OTAL State (Costs by Cat	egory			\$1,000	,000		\$	
		Source of Fu	nds							
GPF	₹									
FED						1,000	,000			
PRC)/PRS									
SEG	S/SEG-S									
III. Sta revenu	te Revenues Jes (e.g., tax	- Complete increase, de	this only w	hen pro	oposal fee, et	will increa s.)	se or d	ecreas	se state	
Topp						Increased	Rev		Decreased Rev	
	R Taxes						\$		\$	
	REarned									
FED						1,000,	000			
)/PRS									
	S/SEG-S									
TO	OTAL State F	Revenues				\$1,000,	000		\$	
		N	IET ANNUA	LIZED	FISCA	L IMPACT				
						<u>s</u>	<u>tate</u>		Local	
NET CHANGE IN COSTS					\$1,000,	000	\$			
NET C	HANGE IN R	EVENUE				\$1,000,	000		\$1,000,000	
Agenc	y/Prepared E	3v		Autho	rized [©]	Signaturo			Dete	
					thorized Signature acey Fietz (608) 261-0744				Date 2/20/2004	
Ota					'	. , 0			212012004	