

**Department of Legislative Services**  
 Maryland General Assembly  
 2012 Session

**FISCAL AND POLICY NOTE**

Senate Bill 240 (The President, *et al.*) (By Request - Administration)  
 Education, Health, and Environmental Affairs

**Environment - Bay Restoration Fund - Fees**

This Administration bill alters the bay restoration fee structure beginning July 1, 2012. The bill (1) increases the fee from \$2.50 to \$5 per month for those receiving an individual water or sewer bill from a billing authority without a water usage-based billing system; (2) increases the fee from \$30 to \$60 per year for each user of an on-site sewage disposal (septic) system or sewage holding tank that does not receive a water bill; and (3) replaces the current flat fee of \$2.50 per month for residential users receiving a usage-based water or sewer bill, with a new fee based on water usage, which is \$0.90 per 1,000 gallons per month for the first 2,000 gallons, and \$1.25 for each additional 1,000 gallons used per month. The bill repeals the existing fee structure for multi-unit residential users that do not receive an individual sewer bill and for nonresidential users; those users are instead subject to the same sliding scale described above for residential users.

The bill takes effect July 1, 2012.

**Fiscal Summary**

**State Effect:** Special fund revenues increase by *at least* \$66.5 million in FY 2013 from the bill's changes to the bay restoration fee amount and structure. Future year revenue increases generally reflect population growth. State expenditures (all funds) increase to pay the State's share of the bay restoration fee, as increased by the bill. The Governor's proposed FY 2013 budget assumes an additional \$64.0 million in fee revenue in FY 2013 due to this bill.

(\$ in millions)	FY 2013	FY 2014	FY 2015	FY 2016	FY 2017
SF Revenue	\$66.5	\$70.3	\$71.0	\$71.7	\$72.4
GF/SF Exp.	-	-	-	-	-
Net Effect	\$66.5	\$70.3	\$71.0	\$71.7	\$72.4

*Note:() = decrease; GF = general funds; FF = federal funds; SF = special funds; - = indeterminate effect*

**Local Effect:** Local expenditures increase in FY 2013 to reprogram billing system software, handle additional questions and complaints, and to otherwise implement the bill; however, it is assumed that any such increase is offset by the authority provided under current law to retain up to 5% of fees collected for administrative purposes. Although local revenues are not directly affected, local grant revenues increase by approximately \$360 million between FY 2013 and 2017 as a result of the increase in State funding for wastewater treatment plant upgrades and septic system upgrades.

**Small Business Effect:** The Administration has determined that this bill has minimal or no impact on small business (attached). Legislative Services disagrees with this assessment as discussed below.

---

## Analysis

**Current Law:** Chapter 428 of 2004 established the Bay Restoration Fund (BRF), which is administered by the Water Quality Financing Administration (WQFA) within the Maryland Department of the Environment (MDE). The main goal of BRF is to provide grants to owners of wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) to reduce nutrient pollution to the Chesapeake Bay by upgrading the systems with enhanced nutrient removal (ENR) technology, and to support septic system upgrades and the planting of cover crops. As a revenue source for the fund, Chapter 428 established a bay restoration fee on users of wastewater facilities, septic systems, and sewage holding tanks, as follows:

- for each user of a septic system or a sewage holding tank that does not receive a water bill, the fee is \$30 annually;
- for each residential dwelling that receives an individual sewer bill and for each user of a septic system or sewage holding tank that receives a water bill, the fee is \$2.50 per month (\$30 annually); and
- for a building or group of buildings under single ownership or management that receives a sewer bill and that contains multiple residential dwellings that do not receive individual sewer bills, or for a nonresidential user, the fee is based on a sliding scale for each “equivalent dwelling unit” (EDU).

An EDU is generally equivalent to 250 gallons of wastewater effluent generated daily. For those properties subject to the sliding scale, the fee is \$2.50 per month (\$30 annually) for each EDU, up to 3,000 EDUs, and \$1.25 per month (\$15 annually) for each additional EDU. The fee is capped at \$120,000 annually, which affects properties with an equivalent of 5,000 or more EDUs.

Generally, the bay restoration fee must be collected by the local government or the billing authority for the water or wastewater facility, as appropriate, on behalf of the State. For SB 240/ Page 2

users of septic systems and sewage holding tanks that receive a water bill, the fee is collected by the billing authority. For users of septic systems or sewage holding tanks that do not receive a water or sewer bill, the county must collect the fee, although the county may negotiate with a municipality to assume responsibility for collection within the municipal limits. With respect to users who receive a water or sewer bill, the fee is to be listed as a separate charge on the bill.

Fee revenues are required to be remitted by the billing authorities to the Comptroller who administers, collects, and enforces the fee. The revenue collected from WWTP users is used to provide grants to upgrade the State's major WWTPs with ENR technology. Of the revenue collected from users of septic systems and sewage holding tanks, 60% is distributed to MDE's Septics Account for the upgrade of septic systems and 40% is transferred to the Maryland Department of Agriculture (MDA) to provide assistance to farmers for planting cover crops.

**Background:** Upgrading the State's 67 major publicly owned WWTPs with ENR technology by 2017 is a key pollution-reduction strategy identified in the State's Phase II Watershed Implementation Plan (WIP), which is the State's roadmap to achieving the nutrient pollution limits required under the federally mandated Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), or "pollution diet" for the Chesapeake Bay watershed. Through January 31, 2012, a total of \$387.8 million has been collected from wastewater facility users and, after administrative costs, \$382.5 million has been deposited in MDE's Wastewater Account. As of January 2012, this revenue has supported ENR upgrades to 23 major facilities, with 3 more expected to be complete by the end of February. Additionally, 16 other facilities are under construction, and 25 are in the planning or design stages.

While the estimated capital costs of upgrading the major WWTPs with ENR technology were originally \$750.0 million to \$1.0 billion, engineering estimates now indicate total costs of about \$1.38 billion. However, based on data provided by MDE, projected revenues available for grant awards (from the bay restoration fee and bond proceeds) total only about \$1.0 billion. Thus, a deficit of roughly \$380 million is expected for the program. Unless addressed in some way, the funding shortfall may jeopardize the State's ability to meet the pollution limits identified in the TMDL. In order to comply with federal permits, any WWTP not upgraded with State funding will likely be required to upgrade using local funding.

The Bay Restoration Fund Advisory Committee (BRFAC), which was established by Chapter 428 of 2004, is charged with making recommendations regarding any increase in the bay restoration fee deemed necessary to meet the financing needs of the fund. BRFAC has explored a number of options for addressing the anticipated deficit in the Wastewater Account, including (1) increasing the bay restoration fee; (2) reducing grants

to WWTPs that are below 100% of eligible costs; (3) reprioritizing or strategically delaying some ENR upgrades for certain WWTPs; (4) spreading out debt service payments over 30 years, utilizing the longer repayment period authorized for local government bonds; and (5) redirecting \$5 million per year from operating grants to capital funding.

The committee's preferred solution, as reiterated in its January 2012 annual report, is to increase the fee by 100% (from \$30 to \$60 per year per EDU). Originally, it was thought that the additional revenue generated from such a fee increase could be used to leverage the issuance of additional BRF revenue bonds in order to eliminate the projected deficit. However, it is unlikely that MDE will now be able to leverage the amount of revenue bonds originally anticipated due to overall State debt capacity limitations. Therefore, a shortfall of at least \$75 million is estimated even with a 100% fee increase under the timeline of ENR upgrades required by the WIP and based on various data and assumptions provided by MDE.

The Task Force on Sustainable Growth and Wastewater Disposal, which was established by executive order in June 2011 and issued its final report in December 2011, has examined ways to fund many of the pollution reduction strategies identified in the WIP. One recommendation of the task force was to expand the authorized uses of BRF to address stormwater management and other urban best management practices. However, the final report's recommendation to expand the uses of BRF was made in conjunction with another recommendation to increase the bay restoration fee to a much greater extent than is accomplished by this bill, beginning in fiscal 2015.

Upgrades of septic systems and the planting of cover crops are also strategies identified in the State's WIP. Through January 31, 2012, a total of \$92.5 million has been collected from users of septic systems and sewage holding tanks; after administrative costs, \$50.3 million has been deposited into MDE's Septics Account, and \$42.2 million has been transferred to MDA for the Cover Crop Program.

**State Fiscal Effect:** Special fund revenues increase by *at least* \$66.5 million in fiscal 2013, and by about \$72.4 million by fiscal 2017 due to the increase in the bay restoration fee. As shown in **Exhibit 1**, in fiscal 2013, at least an additional \$53.2 million is estimated to be collected from WWTP users and at least an additional \$13.3 million is estimated to be collected from users of septic systems and sewage holding tanks. These estimates are based on the following information and assumptions:

- existing fee collections from the current fee amount and structure are anticipated to generate \$69.6 million in fiscal 2013 and \$70.3 million in fiscal 2014 in the absence of the bill;
- the average fee for all users doubles under the bill's structure;

- local billing authorities retain 5% of fees collected in fiscal 2013 to offset additional administrative costs under the bill, but they retain about 0.5% of fees annually beginning in fiscal 2014, which reflects current levels; and
- no increase in administrative expenses for the Comptroller.

---

**Exhibit 1**  
**Net Fee Revenue Increase and Distribution**  
**Fiscal 2013-2017**  
**(\$ in Millions)**

<b><u>Net Fee Revenues</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2014</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2015</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2016</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2017</u></b>
From WWTP Users	\$53.2	\$56.3	\$56.8	\$57.4	\$58.0
From Septic Users	<u>13.3</u>	<u>14.0</u>	<u>14.2</u>	<u>14.3</u>	<u>14.5</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$66.5</b>	<b>\$70.3</b>	<b>\$71.0</b>	<b>\$71.7</b>	<b>\$72.4</b>
<b><u>Distribution of Fee Revenues</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2013</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2014</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2015</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2016</u></b>	<b><u>FY 2017</u></b>
MDE – WWTP Account	\$53.2	\$56.3	\$56.8	\$57.4	\$58.0
MDE – Septics Account	8.0	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.7
MDA – Cover Crops	<u>5.3</u>	<u>5.6</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>5.7</u>	<u>5.8</u>
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$66.5</b>	<b>\$70.3</b>	<b>\$71.0</b>	<b>\$71.7</b>	<b>\$72.4</b>

Note: Totals may not sum due to rounding.

Source: Maryland Department of the Environment; Department of Legislative Services

---

These estimates assume net revenue increases of 1% annually, which generally reflects population growth. However, the estimate does not reflect any increase in the number of users that claim a hardship exemption authorized under current law, nor does it reflect any additional investment earnings that could accrue to BRF.

Despite the fact that an increase in hardship exemptions is not reflected in the estimates above, Legislative Services advises that the overall increase in fee revenue under the bill is likely to be higher than the estimates provided above for the following reasons:

- the bill only doubles the fee for a small segment of users that are served by a billing authority without a water usage-based billing system;
- for residential users that are currently subject to a flat fee of \$2.50 per month, the bill implements a sliding fee scale based on water usage that may result in an average increase of more than 100%; and

- for nonresidential users and multi-unit residential users that are currently subject to a sliding fee scale, the bill alters this sliding scale to match the fee structure for residential users, which is anticipated to result in a fee increase significantly greater than 100% for many multi-unit and nonresidential users.

The impact of the sliding scale on overall fee revenues cannot be reliably estimated at this time due to a lack of sufficient data on water usage, particularly with respect to the multi-unit residential and nonresidential sectors. Also, the bill's impact on water consumption is unknown. Thus, the total fee increase statewide is unknown, but it is assumed to at least double. Depending on water consumption, for some residential users, the fee could increase by more than 300%; for other residential users, the fee could actually decrease. **Exhibit 2** in the Additional Comments section shows several examples of the bill's impact on various types of users in the State.

The Governor's proposed fiscal 2013 budget assumes an increase in the fee for MDE's Wastewater and Septics accounts, but the proposed operating budget does not reflect any additional fee revenue for MDA's Cover Crop Program. Specifically, the proposed budget assumes \$64.0 million in fee revenue due to this bill, slightly more than the estimate above (\$61.2 million), since it does not reflect an offset for additional administrative costs retained at the local level. Finally, Legislative Services advises that the additional fee revenue recognized in the proposed budget is not contingent upon the enactment of this bill.

#### *MDE's Wastewater Account*

As noted above, special fund revenues to MDE's Wastewater Account are anticipated to increase by at least \$53.2 million in fiscal 2013. The additional revenue generated by the bill for this account will help the State meet its commitment to upgrade all the 67 major publicly owned WWTPs with ENR by 2017, including three plants that are owned/operated by the State. **Appendix A** shows the forecasted budget of MDE's Wastewater Account under the bill. Although a doubling of fee revenue does not completely address the projected deficit, the Administration has addressed the anticipated remaining shortfall within the proposed 2012 *Capital Improvement Program* through the planned issuance of an additional \$76.9 million in general obligation (GO) bonds between fiscal 2014 and 2017, as reflected in Appendix A.

To the extent fee revenue is higher than currently estimated, or to the extent interest rates on revenue bonds already authorized to be issued under the program are less than the rates currently assumed, or other costs decrease, it is possible that fewer GO bonds will be needed, but that is unclear at this time. Alternatively, to the extent that revenues are less than currently estimated or program costs are higher than currently projected, additional GO bonds may be needed to meet the requirement to upgrade the 67 WWTPs by 2017.

As shown in Appendix A, with the proposed fee increase, beginning in fiscal 2018 (once all the major publicly owned WWTPs have been upgraded), a fund balance is projected, as the only significant fund expenditure that remains is the debt service on the \$530 million in revenue bonds that have already been authorized for the program. Thus, beginning in fiscal 2018, the fee could be reduced back to \$30 per year per EDU or the fund could be used to support other strategies in the WIP.

#### *MDE's Septics Account*

As shown in Exhibit 1 above, the increase in the bay restoration fee attributed to septic system and sewage holding tank users is estimated to result in an increase of about \$8.0 million for the Septics Account in fiscal 2013 and of about \$8.7 million by fiscal 2017. In total, the increase in Septics Account revenues is expected to support nearly 3,300 additional upgrades between fiscal 2013 and 2017, assuming an average cost of \$13,000 per system upgrade.

#### *MDA's Cover Crop Program*

The increase in the bay restoration fee transferred to MDA for its Cover Crop Program is estimated to be about \$5.3 million in fiscal 2013 and about \$5.8 million by fiscal 2017. This increase may support the planting of over 562,000 additional acres of cover crops through fiscal 2017, assuming a cost of \$50 per acre.

#### *Agency Administrative Expenditures*

MDE, MDA, and the Comptroller each indicate that the bill can be handled with existing budgeted resources.

#### *State Also Subject to the Fee*

As a user of wastewater facilities, septic systems, and sewage holding tanks, State government facilities are subject to the bill's fee increase. However, the State's average annual water usage is unknown and the total cost to the State cannot be reliably estimated at this time. Nevertheless, the fee increase will likely exceed 100%, as expected for most nonresidential users; thus, the increase in State expenditures (all funds) may be significant.

**Local Fiscal Effect:** Several local governments advise that workloads and expenditures increase to implement the bill. For example, Carroll, Garrett, and Washington counties, and the City of Bowie indicate that they expect to handle a significant additional volume of complaints and questions, while Talbot County indicates that it would spend an additional \$30,000 on outreach costs. In addition, local expenditures may increase for

contractual assistance in reprogramming billing software. Estimated charges range from less than \$10,000 for Frederick and Garrett counties and the City of Bowie, to more than \$100,000 for Howard County. Finally, several jurisdictions note that if the quarterly billing cycle is changed to a monthly billing cycle, expenditures increase substantially for additional personnel and equipment; Washington County indicates that expenses increase by more than \$100,000 and Carroll County estimates additional expenditures of more than \$1 million. Legislative Services advises that the bill does not require a change in the billing cycle, however.

Legislative Services further advises that billing authorities are authorized to retain up to 5% of the costs of administering the collection of bay restoration fees. Currently, average annual cost recovery charges total about 0.55% of gross bay restoration fee revenues. It is assumed that the various local expenditures described above will generally not exceed the 5% cost recovery offset allowance and that, after the first year, administrative costs decrease back to the current level.

Although the bill does not directly affect local revenues, the increase in the bay restoration fee ultimately supports additional grant activity for local governments from BRF. As owners and operators of almost all of the 67 major publicly owned WWTPs, local grant revenues increase for ENR upgrades. Also, local governments administer the Septic System Upgrade Program supported by MDE's Septics Account; thus, local governments receive additional grant funds to distribute under that program as a result of the fee increase. Overall, approximately \$360 million in additional funding is estimated to be provided to local governments for these activities from fiscal 2013 through 2017.

**Small Business Effect:** The small business impact statement provided by the Administration states that the bill has a minimal impact on small businesses in Maryland. The statement specifies that small businesses providing goods or services related to BRF infrastructure projects may benefit, though all small businesses will also be subject to the increased fee.

Legislative Services advises that many small businesses will pay an increase of more than 250% in bay restoration fees, which may represent a meaningful adverse impact on at least some small businesses, particularly those engaged in operations that require significant water usage. Generally, however, the bay restoration fee comprises only a portion of total water and sewer bills, which, in turn, may represent only a fraction of the costs incurred by most businesses.

Legislative Services further advises that small business contractors involved in ENR upgrades of WWTPs or the upgrade of septic systems supported by BRF grants may realize a meaningful benefit under the bill. Additionally, small business farmers may benefit from an increase in funding for MDA's Cover Crop Program.

**Additional Comments:** Exhibit 2 provides several examples of the bill’s potential impact on various types of users subject to the bill’s sliding fee scale, their monthly water usage, the annual fees paid under current law, and the annual fees paid under the bill’s sliding scale. As shown in the exhibit, users that use very little water could actually pay less under the bill than under current law. However, residential users and nonresidential users that use significant amounts of water will pay more under the bill’s sliding fee scale. According to MDE, most households use between 4,000 and 6,000 gallons of water per month.

---

**Exhibit 2**  
**Examples of Bill’s Impact on Various Users Subject to Bill’s Sliding Fee Scale**

<u>User</u>	<u>Monthly Water Usage (Gallons)</u>	<u>Current Annual Fee</u>	<u>Proposed Annual Fee</u>	<u>Annual Increase (Decrease)</u>
Residential	2,000	\$30.00	\$21.60	(\$8.40)
Residential	5,000	30.00	66.60	36.60
Residential	9,000	30.00	126.60	96.60
Restaurant	42,560	168.00	630.00	462.00
Department Store	364,800	1,440.00	5,463.00	4,023.00
Hotel/motel	456,000	1,800.00	6,831.60	5,031.60
Supermarket	486,400	1,920.00	7,287.60	5,367.60
Hospital	2,082,400	8,220.00	31,227.60	23,007.60
Poultry Processor	27,360,000	99,000.00	120,000.00*	21,000.00

\*Subject to the existing cap of \$120,000 annually, which is unchanged by the bill.

Source: Maryland Department of the Environment, Department of Legislative Services

---

It should be noted, however, that because ENR upgrades, septic system upgrades, and the planting of cover crops are all components of the State’s WIP, these activities (or others that result in nutrient reductions) will likely be required regardless of whether the bill’s proposed fee increase is enacted. Thus, ultimately, significant costs are anticipated to filter down to individuals and businesses even in the absence of this bill.

---

**Additional Information**

**Prior Introductions:** None.

**Cross File:** HB 446 (The President)(By Request – Administration) – Environmental Matters.

**Information Source(s):** Baltimore, Calvert, Carroll, Cecil, Charles, Frederick, Garrett, Harford, Howard, Queen Anne’s, Somerset, Talbot, Washington, Wicomico, and Worcester counties; the cities of Bowie, Frederick, and Takoma Park; Maryland Department of Agriculture; Maryland Environmental Service; Maryland Department of the Environment; Comptroller’s Office; State Department of Assessments and Taxation; Department of General Services; Task Force on Sustainable Growth and Wastewater Disposal; Bay Restoration Fund Advisory Committee; Department of Legislative Services

**Fiscal Note History:** First Reader - February 13, 2012  
ncs/lgc

---

Analysis by: Evan M. Isaacson

Direct Inquiries to:  
(410) 946-5510  
(301) 970-5510

**Appendix A**  
**BRF Wastewater Account Forecast Under the Bill with Supplemental GO Bonds**  
**Fiscal 2005-2018**  
**(\$ in Millions)**

<b><u>Fiscal Year</u></b>	<b><u>2005</u></b>	<b><u>2006</u></b>	<b><u>2007</u></b>	<b><u>2008</u></b>	<b><u>2009</u></b>	<b><u>2010</u></b>	<b><u>2011</u></b>	<b><u>2012</u></b>	<b><u>2013</u></b>	<b><u>2014</u></b>	<b><u>2015</u></b>	<b><u>2016</u></b>	<b><u>2017</u></b>	<b><u>2018</u></b>
<b><i>Revenues</i></b>														
Fee Revenue	\$7.0	\$57.7	\$57.5	\$55.1	\$53.4	\$54.8	\$54.6	\$55.1	\$111.4	\$112.5	\$113.6	\$114.8	\$115.9	\$117.1
Net BRF Revenue Bond Sale Proceeds	-	-	-	51.6	-	-	-	-	128.7	163.4	158.4	24.8	-	-
State Bonds to BRF	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	18.0	7.9	43.0	8.0	-
GO Bonds (Repayment of BRFA Transfer)	-	-	-	-	-	125.0	146.8	18.2	-	-	-	-	-	-
Interest/Investment Earnings	0.0	1.0	4.0	6.0	5.8	4.2	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.0	1.0	2.0
<b>Total Revenues</b>	<b>\$7.1</b>	<b>\$58.6</b>	<b>\$61.4</b>	<b>\$112.7</b>	<b>\$59.2</b>	<b>\$184.0</b>	<b>\$203.3</b>	<b>\$75.3</b>	<b>\$242.1</b>	<b>\$295.9</b>	<b>\$281.9</b>	<b>\$183.5</b>	<b>\$124.9</b>	<b>\$119.1</b>
<b><i>Expenditures Planned</i></b>														
ENR Grant Payments	-	\$13.0	\$20.5	\$24.5	\$16.1	\$45.3	\$104.3	\$186.7	\$246.1	\$277.1	\$243.4	\$131.7	\$66.2	\$4.0
Cash Payment to General Fund (Per BRFA)	-	-	-	-	-	155.0	45.0	90.0	-	-	-	-	-	-
Debt Service – BRF Revenue Bonds	-	-	-	-	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.6	4.6	17.6	34.0	49.9	52.4	52.4
Sewer Infrastructure Grants	-	2.7	3.2	2.6	2.5	6.9	2.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Other	-	0.1	0.5	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.0	0.8	2.3	3.8	3.9	5.3	6.3	6.4
<b>Total Expenditures</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>\$15.8</b>	<b>\$24.2</b>	<b>\$27.8</b>	<b>\$24.1</b>	<b>\$213.0</b>	<b>\$157.1</b>	<b>\$282.3</b>	<b>\$253.3</b>	<b>\$298.8</b>	<b>\$281.6</b>	<b>\$186.9</b>	<b>\$124.9</b>	<b>\$62.8</b>
<b>Ending Balance</b>	<b>\$7.1</b>	<b>\$49.9</b>	<b>\$87.2</b>	<b>\$172.1</b>	<b>\$207.1</b>	<b>\$178.1</b>	<b>\$224.3</b>	<b>\$17.3</b>	<b>\$6.1</b>	<b>\$3.1</b>	<b>\$3.4</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$0.0</b>	<b>\$56.3</b>

BRF: Bay Restoration Fund

BRFA: Budget Reconciliation and Financing Act

ENR: enhanced nutrient removal

GO: general obligation

Note: This appendix includes GO bonds planned in the proposed 2012 *Capital Improvement Program* in fiscal 2014 through 2017. Totals may not sum due to rounding. Fiscal 2013 revenues may be less than estimated due to local billing authority administrative costs.

Source: Maryland Department of the Environment; Department of Legislative Services



**ANALYSIS OF ECONOMIC IMPACT ON SMALL BUSINESSES**

TITLE OF BILL: Department of the Environment – **Bay Restoration Fund - Fee Increase**

BILL NUMBER: SB 240

PREPARED BY: Department of the Environment  
(Dept./Agency)

**PART A. ECONOMIC IMPACT RATING**

This agency estimates that the proposed bill:

  X   WILL HAVE MINIMAL OR NO ECONOMIC IMPACT ON MARYLAND  
SMALL BUSINESS

OR

       WILL HAVE MEANINGFUL ECONOMIC IMPACT ON MARYLAND  
SMALL BUSINESSES

**PART B. ECONOMIC IMPACT ANALYSIS**

Small businesses providing goods or services related to BRF infrastructure projects may benefit. It is estimated the ENR expenditures will support over 3,300 jobs annually for next several years.

Both residential and non-residential (businesses) pay the fee and will have to pay the increased fee.