STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE

# ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

## (REGULATIONS AND ORDERS)

399 (REV. 12/2008)

***See SAM Section 6601 - 6616 for Instructions and Code Citations***

| DEPARTMENT NAME | CONTACT PERSON | TELEPHONE NUMBER |
|---|---|---|
| CA Dept of Food & Agriculture (CDFA) | Dr. Douglas Hepper, Branch Chief | (916) 900-5004 |
| **DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400** | | **NOTICE FILE NUMBER** |
| Transporters of Inedible Kitchen Grease ((IKG) | | Z-2012-0529-07 |

## ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

### A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPACTS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.)

1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate whether this regulation:

- [x] a. Impacts businesses and/or employees
- [x] b. Impacts small businesses
- [ ] c. Impacts jobs or occupations
- [ ] d. Impacts California competitiveness
- [x] e. Imposes reporting requirements
- [ ] f. Imposes prescriptive instead of performance
- [ ] g. Impacts individuals
- [ ] h. None of the above (Explain below. Complete the Fiscal Impact Statement as appropriate.)

h. (cont.) _____

(If any box in Items 1 a through g is checked, complete this Economic Impact Statement.)

2. Enter the total number of businesses impacted: apprx 393 Describe the types of businesses (Include nonprofits.): Registered transporters of inedible kitchen grease

Enter the number or percentage of total businesses impacted that are small businesses: unknown

3. Enter the number of businesses that will be created: 0 eliminated: 0

Explain: This proposal does not affect the creation or elimination of businesses.

4. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts: [x] Statewide [ ] Local or regional (List areas.): _____

5. Enter the number of jobs created: 0 or eliminated: 0 Describe the types of jobs or occupations impacted: This proposal does not affect the creation or elimination of jobs.

6. Will the regulation affect the ability of California businesses to compete with other states by making it more costly to produce goods or services here?

[ ] Yes [x] No If yes, explain briefly: _____

### B. ESTIMATED COSTS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.)

1. What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses and individuals may incur to comply with this regulation over its lifetime? $ Negligible*

a. Initial costs for a small business: $ 94.75/wk Annual ongoing costs: $ 4,548.00 Years: *

b. Initial costs for a typical business: $ 94.75/wk Annual ongoing costs: $ 4,548.00 Years: *

c. Initial costs for an individual: $ N/A Annual ongoing costs: $ N/A Years:

d. Describe other economic costs that may occur: *Estimated only; Economic Impact Assessment is included in the file. IKG transporters may not incur costs per week depending on their business practices.

## ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of total costs for each industry: _____

3. If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter the annual costs a typical business may incur to comply with these requirements. (Include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping, reporting, and other paperwork, whether or not the paperwork must be submitted.): $ negligible

4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs? ☐ Yes ☑ No If yes, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: _____ and the number of units: _____

5. Are there comparable Federal regulations? ☐ Yes ☑ No Explain the need for State regulation given the existence or absence of Federal regulations: Clarify requirements for IKG transporters per FAC 19310 and 19316.5.

Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individuals that may be due to State - Federal differences: $ 0

C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS (Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)

1. Briefly summarize the benefits that may result from this regulation and who will benefit: The proposal benefits the health and welfare of California residents, worker safety and the environment by serving to reduce the amount of IKG and wastewater that is illegally dumped in sewers and streams, and preventing sewer blockages and pollution of waterways.

2. Are the benefits the result of : ☐ specific statutory requirements, or ☑ goals developed by the agency based on broad statutory authority?
Explain: Clarify requirements for IKG transporters per FAC 19310 and 19316.5.

3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation over its lifetime? $ unknown

D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record. Estimation of the dollar value of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged.)

1. List alternatives considered and describe them below. If no alternatives were considered, explain why not: No alternative were presented to CDFA or considered at this time. The Department is clarifying requirements for IKG transporters per Food and Agricultural Code sectioons 19310 and 19316.5.

2. Summarize the total statewide costs and benefits from this regulation and each alternative considered:

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Regulation: | Benefit: $_____ | Cost: $_____ |
| Alternative 1: | Benefit: $_____ | Cost: $_____ |
| Alternative 2: | Benefit: $_____ | Cost: $_____ |

3. Briefly discuss any quantification issues that are relevant to a comparison of estimated costs and benefits for this regulation or alternatives: _____

4. Rulemaking law requires agencies to consider performance standards as an alternative, if a regulation mandates the use of specific technologies or equipment, or prescribes specific actions or procedures. Were performance standards considered to lower compliance costs? ☐ Yes ☑ No
Explain: This proposal does not mandate the use of specific technologies or equipment

E. MAJOR REGULATIONS (Include calculations and assumptions in the rulemaking record.) Cal/EPA boards, offices, and departments are subject to the following additional requirements per Health and Safety Code section 57005.

## ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

1. Will the estimated costs of this regulation to California business enterprises exceed $10 million ? ☐ Yes ☑ No (If No, skip the rest of this section.)

2. Briefly describe each equally as an effective alternative, or combination of alternatives, for which a cost-effectiveness analysis was performed:

Alternative 1: _____

Alternative 2: _____

3. For the regulation, and each alternative just described, enter the estimated total cost and overall cost-effectiveness ratio:

Regulation: $ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ _____

Alternative 1: $ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ _____

Alternative 2: $ _____ Cost-effectiveness ratio: $ _____

## FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes1 through 6 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

☐ 1. Additional expenditures of approximately $ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year which are reimbursable by the State pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code. Funding for this reimbursement:

☐ a. is provided in _____, Budget Act of _____ or Chapter _____, Statutes of _____

☐ b. will be requested in the _____ (FISCAL YEAR) Governor's Budget for appropriation in Budget Act of _____

☐ 2. Additional expenditures of approximately $ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year which are not reimbursable by the State pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the California Constitution and Sections 17500 et seq. of the Government Code because this regulation:

☐ a. implements the Federal mandate contained in _____

☐ b. implements the court mandate set forth by the _____

court in the case of _____ vs. _____

☐ c. implements a mandate of the people of this State expressed in their approval of Proposition No. _____ at the _____ (DATE) election;

☐ d. is issued only in response to a specific request from the _____

_____, which is/are the only local entity(s) affected;

☐ e. will be fully financed from the _____ (FEES, REVENUE, ETC.) authorized by Section

_____ of the _____ Code;

☐ f. provides for savings to each affected unit of local government which will, at a minimum, offset any additional costs to each such unit;

☐ g. creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a new crime or infraction contained in _____

☐ 3. Savings of approximately $ _____ annually.

☐ 4. No additional costs or savings because this regulation makes only technical, non-substantive or clarifying changes to current law regulations.

## ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT cont. (STD. 399, Rev. 12/2008)

☐ 5. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any local entity or program.

☐ 6. Other.

B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT (Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

☐ 1. Additional expenditures of approximately $ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year. It is anticipated that State agencies will:

☐ a. be able to absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.

☐ b. request an increase in the currently authorized budget level for the _____ fiscal year.

☐ 2. Savings of approximately $ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year.

☑ 3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any State agency or program.

☐ 4. Other.

C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS (Indicate appropriate boxes1 through 4 and attach calculations and assumptions of fiscal impact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.)

☐ 1. Additional expenditures of approximately $ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year.

☐ 2. Savings of of approximately $ _____ in the current State Fiscal Year.

☑ 3. No fiscal impact exists because this regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.

☐ 4. Other.

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE | Jody Lusby, Budget Officer | DATE 5/15/12 |
| AGENCY SECRETARY[1] APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE | Dr. Annette Whiteford, State Veterinarian & Director, AHFSS | DATE 5/23/12 |
| DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE[2] APPROVAL/CONCURRENCE | PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER | DATE |

1. *The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD.399 according to the instructions in SAM sections 6601-6616, and understands the impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or department not under an Agency Secretary must have the form signed by the highest ranking official in the organization.*

2. *Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Impact Statement in the STD.399.*