Fiscal Estimate - 2007 Session

Original Dpdated	Correc	ted	Supplemental				
LRB Number 07-0197/3	Introduction	n Number 🛚 🖊	AB-0076				
Description Relating to: increasing the recycling fee imposed on the disposal of solid waste, the program of financial assistance for local recycling programs, and making an appropriation							
Fiscal Effect							
Appropriations Rev	ease Existing enues rease Existing enues		: - May be possible to igency's budget ☐ No s				
□ No Local Government Costs □ Indeterminate 1. □ Increase Costs □ Permissive □ Mandatory □ Permissive □ Pe	ease Revenue nissive Mandatory rease Revenue	Counties	Village 🔲 Cities				
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations ☐ GPR ☐ FED ☒ PRO ☐ PRS ☒ SEG ☐ SEGS 20.370(6)(bu)							
Agency/Prepared By	Authorized Signatur	е	Date				
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794	Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 3/27/2007						

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DNR 3/28/2007

LRB Number	07-0197/3	Introduction Number	AB-0076	Estimate Type	Original		
Description Relating to: increasing the recycling fee imposed on the disposal of solid waste, the program of financial							
assistance for local recycling programs, and making an appropriation							

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

Bill Summary: This bill would increase the state Recycling Fee on landfilled waste from the current \$3 per ton to \$10 per ton. High volume wastes, as defined in s. 289.01(16), Stats., remain exempt from this fee under the proposed bill. In addition, the proposed bill increases the appropriation for recycling grants to responsible units (RUs) by \$48 million for FY 08-09, and provides at least a 75% increase in recycling grant awards to all RUs.

Fiscal Estimate: Calendar year 2005 tonnages are used as a base for the calculation in this fiscal estimate. In calendar year 2005, 7.9 million tons of landfilled waste was subject to the recycling fee. (Approximately 1.9 million of these tons were generated outside of Wisconsin.) It is assumed the increase in recycling tipping fee to \$10/ ton will result is a 10% reduction in the amount of waste being landfilled.

State Estimate:

Revenues:

Increasing the recycling fee to \$10/ton and assuming that this leads to a reduction in landfilled tonnages of 10% results in an estimated revenue increase to the Recycling Fund of \$47.3 million. Calculated as follows: 7.9 million tons x (.9) x \$10/ton = \$71 million -23.7 million (\$3 existing fee) = \$47.3 million.

The assumed 10% decrease in tonnage will also affect the five other tonnage-based environmental fees: Environmental SEG: Groundwater, Well Compensation, and Environmental Repair; and Program Revenue: Waste Facility Siting Board, and Landfill License Fee Surcharge. This drop in landfilled tonnages would reduce combined revenues environmental fees by \$630,000.

A 10% drop in tonnages = 7.9 million tons $x \cdot 10 = 790,000$ tons

The five tonnage-based environmental fees mentioned above sum to \$0.797/ton.

790,000 tons x \$0.797/ton = \$630,000

Costs:

Increasing the RU grants by \$48 million in local assistance from the Department, up from the current \$24.5 million in RU grants.

The increase in the tipping fee will result in significantly greater costs for landfilling of waste materials generated at brownfields and other remediation sites. The effect of this increased cost may mean that some projects are not undertaken at brownfield sites.

Local Estimate:

Revenues:

The bill increases recycling grants to RUs by \$48 million annually.

Costs to Local Governments:

An estimate of the cost to local government can be obtained by: 1.) estimating the tons of waste disposed of by households where garbage collection is performed or provided by a municipality and 2.) determining tonnages of other types of waste generated and landfilled by municipalities and would be subject to the Recycling Fee.

Local Government Costs for 1.) Above

An accepted industry rule of thumb is that households generate approximately 1 ton of waste per year. (Verification of this rule of thumb using 2005 tonnage data is included at the end of this narrative.) We are assuming that this amount would decrease by 10% should the Recycling Fee be increased to \$10/ton. Based on population data for urban and rural responsible units, we estimate that 80% of Wisconsin households have garbage service either performed by or provided by the municipality.

Number of households in Wisconsin: 5.5 million people/2.5 persons per household = 2.2 million households X 80% municipal services = 1.76 million households.

at 3/ton: 1.76 million households x 1 ton waste/hh x 3/ton = 5.3 million paid by LG in Recycling Fee at 10/ton: 1.76 million households x 0.9 ton waste/hh x 10/ton = 1.8 million paid by LG in Recycling Fee

Additional cost to Local Gov't = \$15.8 - \$5.3= \$10.5 million

Local Government Costs for 2.) Above

In 2005, approximately 150,000 tons of sewage sludge were landfilled. Assuming this disposal continued unchanged, the additional cost to local governments would be 150,000 tons x \$7/ton = \$1.0 million.

Total Local Government Cost for 1.) and 2.) = \$10.5 M plus \$1.0 million = \$11.5 million

Verification of 1 Ton per Household Waste Generation Rate

For calendar year 2005, a total of 7.93 million tons of waste were subject to the Recycling Fee. Of this, 6.02 million tons were generated in Wisconsin and 1.91 million tons out of state. Separately, the latest waste sort performed in 2003 indicated that 44% of waste received by municipal solid waste landfills was industrial/commercial/institutional, 33% was residential and 23% was construction and demolition waste.

7.93 million tons subject to Recycling Fee

- 1.91 million tons out of state
- 2.65 million tons industrial/commercial/institutional (6.02 million tons x .44)
- 1.38 million tons construction and demolition ((6.02 million tons x .23)

Long-Range Fiscal Implications

^{= 1.99} million tons residential which is within approximately 10% of the 2.2 million tons from the 1/ton per household rule of thumb.

Fiscal Estimate Worksheet - 2007 Session

Detailed Estimate of Annual Fiscal Effect

	\boxtimes	Original] (Updated			Corrected	t		Supplemental
LF	3B	Number	07-019) 7/3	}		Intro	duction I	Numb	er ,	AB-0076
Re	elatin (i ption ng to: increas al assistance	sing the rec e for local re	ycline ecycl	g fee impe ling progra	osed or ams, ar	n the di nd mak	isposal of si ing an appi	olid was ropriatio	ite, the	program of
l. (an	One-t nual	time Costs lized fiscal (or Revenu effect):	ie Im	pacts for	State	and/or	Local Gov	/ernmei	nt (do	not include in
11.	Annı	ualized Cos	sts:					Annualize	d Fisca	ıl İmpa	ct on funds from:
L							ļ:	Increased C	Costs		Decreased Costs
		te Costs by									
-		e Operations		and F	Fringes				\$		\$
_	·	Position Ch									
		Operations		sts							
\vdash		l Assistance						48,000	,000		
4		to Individual									
Щ		OTAL State						\$48,000,	,000		\$
		e Costs by	Source of	Func	<u>ak</u>						*
-	GPR										
-	FED										
┝		/PRS									-
=		/SEG-S						48,000,			
III. rev	State /enu	te Revenues les (e.g., tax	s - Complet c increase,	te thi	is only w rease in I	hen pr icense	oposal fee, e	l will increats.)	ase or d	lecrea	se state
								Increased	Rev		Decreased Rev
-		Taxes							\$		\$
		Earned									
-	FED								_		
_	PRO/					—					-124,000
+		/SEG-S						47,300,			-506,000
上	TO	TAL State F	Revenues	~ 1 400		<u></u>		\$47,300,			\$-630,000
				NE	T ANNUA	LIZED	FISC	AL IMPACT			
NET OUT OF THE COURT			+-			tate	Local				
NET CHANGE IN COSTS NET CHANGE IN REVENUE			$+\!\!\!\!-$		\$48,000,		\$\$11,500,000				
NE	I CH	IANGE IN H	EVENUE	***************************************				\$46,670,0	000	:	\$\$48,000,000
Age	ency	//Prepared E	Ву			Autho	orized !	Signature			Date
DNR/ Joe Polasek (608) 266-2794 Jo				Joe P	olasek	(608) 266-2	-2794 3/27/2007				