MultipleAgencyFiscalNoteSummary

BillNumber: 2245HB	Title: Electricityproduction
--------------------	------------------------------

EstimatedCashReceipts

AgencyName	2001-03		2003-05		2005-07	
	GF-State	Total	GF-State	Total	GF-State	Total
DepartmentofRevenue	(16,033,013)	(16,033,013)	(24,154,824)	(24,154,824)	(23,829,109)	(23,829,109)
Total:	(16,033,013)	(16,033,013)	(24,154,824)	(24,154,824)	(23,829,109)	(23,829,109)

LocalGov.Courts*			
LocalGov.Other**	(3,794,000)	(3,987,000)	(2,999,000)
LocalGov.Total	(3,794,000)	(3,987,000)	(2,999,000)

EstimatedExpenditures

AgencyName	2001-03			2003-05			2005-07		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
DepartmentofRevenue	.1	19,700	19,700	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total:	0.1	\$19,700	\$19,700	0.0	\$0	\$0	0.0	\$0	\$0

LocalGov.Courts*						
LocalGov.Other**	Indete	erminate				
LocalGov.Total						

Preparedby: TristanWise,OFM	Phone:	DatePublished:
	360-902-0546	Final4/26/2001

 $* \quad See Office of the Administrator for the Court sjudicial fiscal note$

DepartmentofRevenueFiscalNote

PartI:Estimates

NoFiscalImpact

EstimatedCashReceiptsto:

Fund	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
GF-STATE-State	(6,207,606)	(6,771,934)	(12,979,540)	(13,637,305)	(10,258,117)
01-Taxes01-RetailSalesTax					
GF-STATE-State	(1,017,824)	(2,035,649)	(3,053,473)	(10,517,519)	(13,570,992)
01-Taxes35-PublicUtilitiesTax					
Tota	(7,225,430)	(8,807,583)	(16,033,013)	(24,154,824)	(23,829,109)

EstimatedExpendituresfrom:

	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTEStaffYears	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Fund					
GF-STATE-State 001-1	19,700	0	19,700	0	0
Total	19,700	0	19,700	0	0

eq:thm:thm:thm:thm:thm:thm:thm:thm:thm:thm	tes,
andalternateranges(ifappropriate), are explained in PartII.	

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

 $\frac{1}{\sqrt{1-1}}$ If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 perfiscally early the current biennium or insubsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.

If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 perfiscal year in the current bien niumor in subsequent bien nia, complete this page only (Part I).

Capitalbudgetimpact,completePartIV.

 $\sqrt{}$ Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

LegislativeContact:	MarkMatteson	Phone: 360-786-7145	Date: 04/13/2001
AgencyPreparation:	RayPhilen	Phone: 570-6078	Date: 04/19/2001
AgencyApproval:	DonTaylor	Phone: 360-570-6083	Date: 04/19/2001
OFMReview:	TristanWise	Phone: 360-902-0546	Date: 04/20/2001

PartII:NarrativeExplanation

II.A-Brief Description Of What The Measure Does That Has Fiscal Impact

Briefly describe, by section number, the significant provisions of the bill, and any related workload or policy assumptions, that have revenue or expenditure impact on the responding agency.

Section1istheintentsectionofthebill.

Section2extendsthemanufacturingmachineryandequipmentsales/usetaxexemptionto"centralstationgenerationusing renewableresourcesorbydistributivegeneration."RenewableresourcesaredefinedinRCW19.29A.010(26)andinclude facilitiesfueledby;water,wind,solarenergy,geothermalenergy,landfillgas,andbiomassenergy.

Removed is the restriction that a generating facility becapable of generating not less than two hundred kilowatts of electricity. This extends the exemption to very small generating facilities suitable to residential use.

Theterms"fuelcell,"principalsourceofpower,"and"distributivegeneration"aredefined.

Section3isthecompanionusetaxsection.

Section 4 establishes a public utility tax deduction for "the cost of the purchase or lease of a facility used for the distributive generation of electricity" and for "the cost of electrical energy generated from renewable resources."

II.B-CashreceiptsImpact

Briefly describe and quantify the cash receipts impact of the legislation on the responding agency, identifying the cash receipts provisions by section number and when appropriate the detail of the revenue sources. Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the cash receipts impact is derived. Explain how work load assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

ASSUMPTIONS/DATASOURCES

DataSources: Washingtoncombinedexcisetaxreturns. FederalEnergyRegulatoryCommissiondata(Form1) Dept.ofEnergy,EnergyInformationAdministration. Financialstatementsoflightandpowerbusinesses.

It is assumed that the effective date of this legislation is July 1,2001.

AUDITASSESSMENTS(Impactresultingfromrecentauditactivity)

Thislegislationdoesnotresultfromrecentaudits.

 $\label{eq:currently} CURRENTLY REPORTING TAXPAYERS (Impact for tax payers who are known or estimated to be currently paying the tax inquestion)$

Sections2and3

HydroelectricPower:

 $\label{eq:exempted} Exempted from sales/uset ax a remachinery and equipment used directly inhydroelectric generating facilities. Using data from FERC, EIA, financial statements and Washington excise tax returns it is estimated that future spending on equipment for existing hydroelectric facilities will be approximately $39 million peryear. The general fundloss in revenue is estimated to be $2.5 million infiscal year 2002.$

Using data provided by Northwest Power Planning Council (NPPC) it is estimated that 300 MW of additional hydroelectric generating capacity will be built over a five year period. It is estimated this additional capacity will cost the set of the set of

 Request#
 2245-1-1

 Bill#
 2245HB

approximately \$1.5 million per MW. Using these assumption, the general fundloss in revenue is estimated to be \$4.0 million in each off is calyears 2002 through 2006.

Windpower:

The currents ales/use tax exemption for windpower facilities includes all known and potential projects. There is no additional revenue impact for windpower edfacilities.

SolarPower:

Assumptions

Approximately1,000solargeneratingfacilitieswillbeinstalledinthestateeachyear.

Theaveragecapacity of each facility is 500 watts.

Theaveragecostforeachfacilityis\$5.00perwatt

The impact of removing the restriction that a generating facility becapable of generating not less than two hundred kilowatts of electricity, is a lossing eneral fundre venue of approximately \$149,000 (cashbasis) in fiscal year 2002. The local taximpact is a loss in revenue of approximately \$37,000.

FuelCells:

 $\label{eq:stothelistothelistofexemptedgeneratingtechnology has no revenue impact until fiscal year 2004 when the loss ingeneral fundre venue is approximately $200,000 increasing to $260,000 in FY 2007. This is based on the Energy Information Administration's (EIA) for ecast of fuelcelluse found in the Annual Energy Outlook 2001. Cost per megawatt of generating capacity for fuelcells is assumed to be $3 million.$

Biomass:

 $\label{eq:linear} Adding the term "biomass" does not increase the revenue impact of the fiscal note. According to information obtained from Dept. of Community Trade and Economic Development, there is a possibility that 3 biomass fueled power plants could be built over the next two to three years. However, each of the seplants is relatively small and would qualify for existing sales and use taxe xemptions.$

The reare currently 24 biomass fueled plants in existence in Washington although not all of the seplants are in operation. The large standmost numerous types of biomass fueled power plants are cogeneration plants fueled by wood waste; the large structure facility has a generating capacity of 67 mega watts.

If it is assumed that a cogeneration plant fueled by wood was te is built in the near future, the potential fiscal impact of this legislation is much larger. If a 70 mega wattcogeneration plant we reconstructed at a cost of \$35 million, the general fund loss in revenue would be approximately \$2.3 million.

Section4

Section 4 establishes a public utility tax deduction for the costs of operating a generating facility using renewable resources.

HydroelectricPower:

FormFN(Rev1/00)

Using datagathered for Sections 2 and 3 and assuming that operating costs for new hydroelectric generating facilities is \$50 per MWh, the lossing eneral fundre venues is approximately \$1 million in fiscal year 2002 rising to \$5 million in fiscal year 2006. This assumes that 300 MW of new hydroelectric capacity is built over a five year period beginning in

fiscalyear2002.

Wind:

Assuming that 100 MW of generating capacity powered by wind is on line in the later part of 2003, and that operating costs are \$40.00 per MW, the lossing eneral fundre venues is approximately \$1.7 million in fiscal year 2004.

TAXPAYERSNOTCURRENTLYREPORTING (Although some tax payers may not now be paying the tax inquestion, some of the mwill be come aware of their liability in the future, as a result of normal enforcement activities or education programs by the Department. The impact for such tax payers is based on the Department's studies of average tax compliance)

Tax payers affected by this legislation are believed to be reporting correctly.

TOTALREVENUEIMPACT:

StateGovernment(cashbasis,\$000):

FY2002	-	\$(\$7,225)
FY2003	-	(\$8,808)
FY2004	-	(\$11,566)
FY2005	-	(\$12,588)
FY2006	-	(\$13,651)
FY2007	-	(\$10,178)

LocalGovernment, if applicable (cashbasis, \$000):

FY2002	-	\$(1,815)
FY2003	-	(1,979)
FY2004	-	(1,993)
FY2005	-	(1,994)
FY2006	-	(2,007)
FY2007	-	(992)

II.C-Expenditures

Briefly describe the agency expenditures necessary to implement this legislation (or saving sresulting from this legislation), identifying by section number the provisions of the legislation that result in the expenditures (or saving s). Briefly describe the factual basis of the assumptions and the method by which the expenditure impact is derived. Explain how work load assumptions translate into cost estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

The Department will incurcosts of approximately \$19,700 in FY 2002 to implement this legislation. These costs include staff time, printing and postage to a mend two administrative rules.

The Department will attempt to absorb the rule costs. However, if this bill and other similar bills should pass, then et impact may result in costs above the level the Department can reasonably absorb. In that event, the Department will need additional resources to implement this and the other pieces of legislation.

PartIII:ExpenditureDetail

III.A-ExpendituresByObjectOrPurpose

	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
FTEStaffYears	0.1		0.1		
A-	7,900		7,900		
B-	2,100		2,100		
E-	8,500		8,500		
J-	1,200		1,200		
Total:	19,700		19,700		

III.B-FTEDetail: ListFTEsbyclassificationandcorrespondingannualcompensation.TotalsneedtoagreewithtotalFTEsinPartI andPartIIIA.

JobClassification	Salary	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
HEARINGSSCHEDULER	30,043	0.0				
RULESMANAGER	62,640	0.0				
RULESPOLICYSPECIALIST	60,800	0.0				
TAXPOLICYSPEC2	51,324	0.0				
TAXPOLICYSPECIALIST3	58,071	0.1		0.1		
Total		0.1		0.1		

PartIV:CapitalBudgetImpact

None.

PartV:NewRuleMakingRequired

 ${\it Identify} provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.$

The Department will a mend WAC 458-20-179 and WAC 458-20-263. Affected tax payers include light and power businesses and persons operating electric generating facilities that user enew able resources.

LOCALGOVERNMENTFISCALNOTE

Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development

BillNumber: 2245HB	Title: Electricityproduction
PartI:Jurisdiction- La	cation,typeorstatusofpoliticalsubdivisiondefinesrangeoffiscalimpacts.
LegislationImpacts:	
Cities:	
Counties:	
SpecialDistricts:	
Specificjurisdictionsonly:	
Varianceoccursdueto:	
PartII:Estimates	
Nofiscalimpacts.	
Expendituresrepresentone-tim	ecosts:
Legislationprovideslocaloptio	n:
Keyvariablescannotbeestimate	dwithcertaintyatthistime:

Estimated revenue impacts to:

Jurisdiction	FY2002	FY2003	2001-03	2003-05	2005-07
City	\$(767,745)	\$(837,117)	\$(1,604,862)	\$(1,686,501)	\$(1,268,577)
County	\$(626,175)	\$(682,755)	\$(1,308,930)	\$(1,375,515)	\$(1,034,655)
SpecialDistrict	\$(421,080)	\$(459,128)	\$(880,208)	\$(924,984)	\$(695,768)
TOTAL	\$(1,815,000)	\$(1,979,000)	\$(3,794,000)	\$(3,987,000)	\$(2,999,000)
GRANDTOTAL	•				\$(10,780,000)

Estimated expenditure impacts to:

IndeterminateImpact

PartIII:PreparationandApproval

FiscalNoteAnalyst: JohnLindberg	Phone: (360)725-5038	Date: 04/13/2001
Leg.CommitteeContact: MarkMatteson	Phone: 360-786-7145	Date: 04/13/2001
AgencyApproval: ValRichey	Phone: 360-725-5036	Date: 04/23/2001
OFMReview: LindaSwanson	Phone: 360-902-0541	Date: 04/23/2001

PartIV:Analysis A.SUMMARYOFBILL

 $\label{eq:provideaclear} Provideaclear, succinct decription of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.$

ItisassumedthattheproposaliseffectiveJuly1,2001.

DESCRIPTIONOF WHAT THE MEASURE DOES THAT HAS FISCALIMPACT:

Section 2: Extends the manufacturing machinery and equipments ales/use taxe xemption to central station generation using renewable resources or by distributive generation. Removes the restriction that agenerating facility must be capable of generating not less than two hundred kilowatts of electricity. The terms "fuelcell, "principal source of power," and "distributive generation" are defined.

Section3isthecompanionusetaxsection.

The tax incentive soutline din the sections 2 and 3 extend the June 30,2005 expiration date associated with RCW 82.08.02567 and 82.12.02567 to June 30,2016.

Section 4: Establishes a public utility tax deduction for the cost of the purchase or lease of a facility used for the distributive generation of electricity and for the cost of electricit

B.SUMMARYOFEXPENDITUREIMPACTS

Briefly describe and quantify the expenditure impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the expenditure provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of expenditures. Deline at ebetween city, county and special district impacts.

Indeterminate

ASSUMPTIONS:

The expenditure impacts from this bill are indeterminate in the aggregate.

Should a public utility district choose to use alternative energy sources for the generation of electrical power, they would incure xpenditure savings from the public utility tax deduction and sales and use tax exemption. This deducation is contingent on the purchase or lease of a facility used for the distributive generation of electricity and for the cost of electrical energy generated from renewable resources. The extent to which the expenditure savings from the tax deducation may occur is not known with certainty.

DATASOURCES:

NotApplicable

C.SUMMARYOFREVENUEIMPACTS

Briefly describe and quantify the revenue impacts of the legislation on local governments, identifying the revenue provisions by section number, and when appropriate, the detail of revenue sources. Deline at each extension of the second section of the second second

The revenue impacts of the sales and use tax exemption is an estimated loss of \$1.8 million in FY 2002 and \$3.8 million for the 2001-2003 biennium.

There is no revenue impact from the public utility tax deduction.

ASSUMPTIONS:

Sections2and3-

HydroelectricPower:

 $\label{eq:constraint} Exempted from sales/uset axare machinery and equipment used directly inhydroelectric generating facilities. The impact of the tax exemption consists of two components - spending on equipment for existing hydroelectric facilities (\$39 million per year); and the estimated 300 MW of additional hydroelectric generating capacity to be built over a five year period (\$1.5 million per MW).$

Windpower:

The currents ales/use tax exemption for windpower facilities includes all known and potential projects. There is no additional revenue impact for windpower edfacilities.

SolarPower:

The Department of Revenue makes three assumptions. Approximately 1,000 solar generating facilities will be installed in the state each year. The average capacity of each facility is 500 watts. The average cost for each facility is \$5.00 per watt.

The impact of removing the restriction that a generating facility be capable of generating not less than two hundred kilowatts of electricity, is aloss of approximately \$37,000 to local governments.

FuelCells:

The Department of Revenue assumes adding fuel cells to the list of exempted generating technology has no revenue impact until fiscal year 2004.

Biomass:

The Department of Revenue assumes adding the term "biomass" does not increase there venue impact of the fiscal note. There is a possibility that 3 biomass fueled power plants could be built over the next two to three years. Each of the seplant size latively small and would qualify for existing sales and use taxe exemptions. There are currently 24 biomass-fueled plants in existence in Washington although not all of the seplants are in operation. The large stand most numerous types of biomass fueled power plants are cogeneration plants fueled by wood waste; the large stsuch facility has a generating capacity of 67 mega watts. If it is assumed that a cogeneration plant fueled by wood waste is built in the near future, the potential fiscal impact of this legislation is much larger.

RevenueImpact to Local Governments (\$000) -

FY2002(1,815) FY2003(1,979) FY2004(1,993) FY2005(1,994) FY2006(2,007) FY2007(992)

Section4-

This section establishes a public utility tax deduction for the costs of operating a generating facility using renewable resources. There is no revenue impact to local governments from this tax incentive program. There may be an expenditure savings (see section B).

DATASOURCES:

 $Department of Revenue's HB2245 Fiscal Note \\ LGFNS ales and Use Tax Revenue Impact Model$