Fiscal Estimate - 2009 Session

☑ Origina	ıl 🔲	Updated	Corr	ected	Supplemental				
LRB Numbe	er 09-1837/	4	Introducti	on Number	SB-271				
Description Prohibiting the manufacture and sale at wholesale of certain baby bottles and cups for children that contain bisphenol A, creating labeling requirements, making an appropriation, and providing penalties									
Fiscal Effect		11.11.4.1.4.1.1							
Indetermi Increa Appro Decre Appro	Fiscal Effect nate use Existing priations ase Existing priations e New Appropriation	☐ Increase Revenue ☐ Decrease Revenue	s Existing						
Indeterm 1. Incl Per 2. Dec	Government Cos inate rease Costs missive Manda crease Costs missive Manda	3. Increase tory Permissiv 4. Decrease	ve Mandator	Towns ☐ Counties ☐ School	Units Affected Village Cities				
Fund Sources Affected Affected Ch. 20 Appropriations GPR FED PRO PRS SEG SEGS									
Agency/Prepa	red By	Aut	horized Signa	ture	Date				
			Walker (608) 2	11/10/2009					

Fiscal Estimate Narratives DATCP 11/10/2009

LRB Number	09-1837/4	Introduction Number	SB-271	Estimate Type	Original				
Description									
Prohibiting the manufacture and sale at wholesale of certain baby bottles and cups for children that contain									
bisphenol A, creating labeling requirements, making an appropriation, and providing penalties									

Assumptions Used in Arriving at Fiscal Estimate

This bill prohibits the manufacture, sale or offer to sell at wholesale, in Wisconsin, of baby bottles or spill-proof cups, primarily intended for use by children 5 years or younger, that contain bisphenol A (BPA). The bill also provides that the department may enforce the statute either as a civil forfeiture or as a request for injunctive relief.

Since one cannot see BPA, one has to test for it. The department's understanding is that there is no nationally agreed upon standard for testing which leave the evidentiary value of the test results in question. Moreover, testing would have to be conducted by an outside laboratory and preliminary inquiries indicate that each test could cost approximately \$500.

The legislation does provide that if a court imposes a fine or forfeiture, a BPA surcharge shall be imposed equal to 50% of the amount of the fine or forfeiture, of which money will come to the department.

At this time the department does not have the funding necessary to conduct testing. If it did have funds available, it is unknown how many tests would need to be conducted before determining a business was in violation of the law. The bill does provide for a labeling requirement, however, this is not an assurance of compliance by the business and it could be argued that even those bottles could be subject to testing for compliance.

Should a business be discovered through testing, it would then be left to the courts to decide on the evidentiary value of the test. Should the courts side in the departments favor, they still need to determine the amount of the forfeiture to be paid. Based on that amount, 50% could go into a fund to cover testing, which may or may not be enough to recover the initial costs of that testing and any other testing done.

Long-Range Fiscal Implications