

Multiple Agency Fiscal Note Summary

Bill Number: 1114 HB	Title: Food waste reduction
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

Estimated Cash Receipts

NONE

Estimated Operating Expenditures

Agency Name	2019-21			2021-23			2023-25		
	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total	FTEs	GF-State	Total
Department of Commerce	.1	114,510	114,510	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Health	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Superintendent of Public Instruction	Fiscal note not available								
Department of Ecology	1.8	0	517,278	.0	0	5,582	.3	0	163,499
Department of Agriculture	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	1.9	114,510	631,788	0.0	0	5,582	0.3	0	163,499

Local Gov. Courts *									
Loc School dist-SPI	Fiscal note not available								
Local Gov. Other **									
Local Gov. Total									

Estimated Capital Budget Expenditures

Agency Name	2019-21			2021-23			2023-25		
	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total	FTEs	Bonds	Total
Department of Commerce	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Health	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Superintendent of Public Instruction	Fiscal note not available								
Department of Ecology	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Department of Agriculture	.0	0	0	.0	0	0	.0	0	0
Total \$	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0	0.0	0	0

Estimated Capital Budget Breakout

NONE

Prepared by: Linda Steinmann, OFM	Phone: 360-902-0573	Date Published: Preliminary 1/22/2019
--	-------------------------------	---

* See Office of the Administrator for the Courts judicial fiscal note

** See local government fiscal note

ENPID: 53393

FNS029 Multi Agency rollup

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1114 HB	Title: Food waste reduction	Agency: 103-Department of Commerce
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	---

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
FTE Staff Years	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0
Account					
General Fund-State 001-1	114,510	0	114,510	0	0
Total \$	114,510	0	114,510	0	0

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jacob Lipson	Phone: 360-786-7196	Date: 01/14/2019
Agency Preparation: Pouth Ing	Phone: 360-725-2715	Date: 01/21/2019
Agency Approval: Joyce Miller	Phone: 360-725-2723	Date: 01/21/2019
OFM Review: Gwen Stamey	Phone: (360) 902-9810	Date: 01/21/2019

Part II: Narrative Explanation

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.

Section 2 (4) would direct the Department of Commerce (department) to contract for an independent evaluation of the state's food waste and wasted food management system. This would be in support of the overall intent to develop a plan to reduce the state's food waste generation by 50 percent by 2030 (over 2015 levels). The plan would be developed by the Department of Ecology, in consultation with Health and Agriculture.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

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 workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

None

II. C - Expenditures

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

Section 2 (4) directs the department to contract for an independent evaluation of the state's food waste and wasted food management system.

Commerce assumes the contracted study would begin and be completed in Fiscal Year 2020, to allow for the study data to be incorporated into the overall plan being led by Ecology. The cost of the study is assumed to be \$100,000, which assumes that the food waste experts at Ecology and Agriculture are able to share available data and information, and also assist in scoping the study. Assumptions for the contractors are the following:

Project Manager: 590 hours at \$125 per hour

Researcher: 350 hours at \$75 per hour

Contracts

FY20 \$100,000

0.10 FTE Commerce Specialist 3 (300 hours) in FY 20-FY21 for contract management and project oversight.

Salaries and Benefits

FY20: \$9,867

Goods, Services, and Equipment

FY20: \$4,643

Total Cost

FY20: \$114,510

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
001-1	General Fund	State	114,510	0	114,510	0	0
Total \$			114,510	0	114,510	0	0

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
FTE Staff Years	0.1		0.1		
A-Salaries and Wages	7,201		7,201		
B-Employee Benefits	2,666		2,666		
C-Professional Service Contracts	100,000		100,000		
E-Goods and Other Services	4,643		4,643		
G-Travel					
J-Capital Outlays					
M-Inter Agency/Fund Transfers					
N-Grants, Benefits & Client Services					
P-Debt Service					
S-Interagency Reimbursements					
T-Intra-Agency Reimbursements					
9-					
Total \$	114,510	0	114,510	0	0

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
Commerce Specialist 3	72,010	0.1		0.1		
Total FTEs		0.1		0.1		0.0

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

None

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

None

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1114 HB	Title: Food waste reduction	Agency: 303-Department of Health
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	---

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jacob Lipson	Phone: 360-786-7196	Date: 01/14/2019
Agency Preparation: Jodine Sorrell	Phone: (360) 236-3015	Date: 01/15/2019
Agency Approval: Stacy May	Phone: (360) 236-4532	Date: 01/15/2019
OFM Review: Bryce Andersen	Phone: (360) 902-0580	Date: 01/15/2019

Part II: Narrative Explanation

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.

Section 2: Directs the Department of Ecology, in consultation with the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Health (DOH) to develop a food waste reduction plan, including, among other strategies, to match edible food that would otherwise be wasted with food banks and other distributors. This work falls within DOH's normal consulting work; therefore, there is no fiscal impact to DOH.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

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 workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

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

Part III: Expenditure Detail

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Bill Number: 1114 HB	Title: Food waste reduction	Agency: 461-Department of Ecology
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	--

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

Estimated Cash Receipts to:

NONE

Estimated Expenditures from:

	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
FTE Staff Years	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.0	0.3
Account					
Waste Reduction/Recycling/Litter Control-State 044-1	270,306	246,972	517,278	5,582	163,499
Total \$	270,306	246,972	517,278	5,582	163,499

Estimated Capital Budget Impact:

NONE

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jacob Lipson	Phone: 360-786-7196	Date: 01/14/2019
Agency Preparation: My-Hanh Mai	Phone: 360-407-6996	Date: 01/18/2019
Agency Approval: Erik Fairchild	Phone: 360-407-7005	Date: 01/18/2019
OFM Review: Linda Steinmann	Phone: 360-902-0573	Date: 01/18/2019

Part II: Narrative Explanation

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.

HB 1114 relating to reducing the wasting of food in order to fight hunger and reduce environmental impacts is substantially similar to SHB 2411 from the 2018 session. Compared to 2018 SHB 2411, the fiscal note assumptions for Ecology are substantially the same as last session's fiscal note.

Background: The litter tax was created in 1971 to prevent and pick up litter and to develop waste reduction and recycling programs in Washington State. Revenue from the tax is deposited in the Waste Reduction Recycling and Litter Control Account (WRRLCA). The funding is dedicated for youth employment programs for litter pickup along Washington's highways, and for waste reduction and recycling programs. RCW 70.93.180 directs how WRRLCA is distributed, with 50 percent to Ecology and state agencies for litter pickup and prevention, 30 percent to Ecology to develop waste reduction and recycling programs and for education and outreach on waste reduction and recycling, and 20 percent to local county governments to operate litter pick up programs on city and county roads. Since the 2009-11 Biennium, diversions from WRRLCA to the State General Fund and State Parks have resulted in cuts to these programs. Ecology's appropriation was reduced but is fully restored in the 2019-21 carryforward budget. Funding for the work in this bill is available at the 2019-21 carryforward level.

Bill Summary:

Section 2 would add a new section to chapter 70.95 RCW, Solid Waste Management – Reduction and Recycling.

Section 2(1) would establish a goal of reducing wasted food in the state by 50 percent annually by 2030, relative to 2015 levels.

Section 2(2) would require the Department of Ecology (Ecology) to adopt standardized metrics and processes for measuring or estimating volumes of wasted food and food waste generated in the state to measure the progress toward the state's goal established in section 2(1).

Section 2(3) would require Ecology to work with the Departments of Health (DOH) and Agriculture (WSDA) to develop and adopt a state wasted food reduction and food waste diversion plan by October 1, 2020, to achieve the 2030 wasted food reduction goal. The plan must include strategies to 1) reduce wasted edible food, 2) match edible food with food banks and other distributors, and 3) support other productive uses. The plan must be designed to recommend a regulatory environment that optimizes the rescue of edible food and a stable, predictable funding environment that allows for capacity expansion and new technologies, and satisfy other specified outcomes. The plan must also include suggested best management practices that local governments may incorporate into local solid waste management plans under RCW 70.95.080.

Ecology would be required to solicit feedback from the public and stakeholders throughout the process of developing and adopting the plan. Ecology would be authorized to designate a stakeholder advisory panel to assist with the plan development. In conjunction with the plan's development, Ecology, and the departments of Agriculture and Health must consider recommending changes to state law to achieve the goals established in section 2(1). By December 1, 2020, Ecology would have to report to the Legislature these recommended changes to state law.

Section 2(4) would require the Department of Commerce to contract for an independent evaluation of the state's food waste and wasted food management system in support of the plan development.

Section 3 would amend RCW 70.93.180 to authorize wasted food reduction and food waste diversion programs to be funded from the Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account, both under the grant program established in section (b) and for Ecology's work in section (c).

Section 4 would amend RCW 70.95.090 to add food waste and wasted food reduction strategies to the list of waste reduction strategies that local governments can consider in the waste reduction and recycling element of their local solid waste plans. It would also add food waste collection to the list of source separation strategies that local governments can consider in the waste reduction and recycling element of their local solid waste plans.

Section 5 would amend RCW 70.105D.070 to authorize wasted food reduction and food waste diversion programs as eligible uses of grant funding provided to local government solid waste plans and programs, and public participation grants under the Model Toxics Control Act.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

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 workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

II. C - Expenditures

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

Section 2(2) would require Ecology to adopt standardized metrics or processes for measuring or estimating volumes of wasted food or food waste generated in Washington State in 2015. Ecology may use any combination of reporting data and surveys and studies measuring wasted food and food waste. Ecology assumes periodic measures of the wasted food and food waste relative to the 2015 baseline would be required through 2030.

Ecology assumes we would use reported numbers from regulated solid waste handling facilities and recycling survey respondents and our existing waste characterization analysis to arrive at an estimate of food waste and wasted food entering the solid waste system for 2015. Ecology assumes Ecology staff would assemble and review the data, resolve any data anomalies, analyze and calculate the numbers, and make recommendations for standardized metrics or processes. Ecology estimates 0.05 FTE of an Environmental Specialist 3 (ES3), with review and other assistance from the data lead, 0.05 FTE Environmental Specialist 5 (ES5) and an organics specialist, 0.05 FTE ES5 in FY 20.

Ecology assumes we would also need to measure wasted food that is outside the solid waste handling system, including agricultural waste and food diverted to food banks. Measuring food waste outside the solid waste system would require a consultant study as Ecology does not have a system established to collect this data, and there is no requirement for entities outside the solid waste handling system to report this data. This consultant study would be used to establish a baseline, and to determine a system of measuring this sector going forward. Ecology further assumes conducting this study once every four years would be required to obtain data outside the solid waste handling system to measure ongoing progress towards meeting the reduction goal.

Based on other consultant studies we've done in the past with similar scope, Ecology estimates the initial consultant study to measure wasted food outside of the solid waste handling systems would cost \$80,000, and it would take about 18 months starting in FY 20. Ecology assumes future studies would cost more because as we

learn more, we may need to refine future studies to answer additional specific questions. Ecology estimates future studies would cost \$100,000 per study starting in FY24 and every four years thereafter. Contract management and engaging with the outside agencies, businesses, industry and local governments would require 0.25 FTE of an ES5 in FY 20 and 0.125 FTE of an ES5 in FY 21, and every four years thereafter.

For purposes of measuring ongoing progress towards the goal in section 2(1), Ecology assumes a data lead would review the annual data and calculate the annual progress for all wastes in FY21, FY25 and FY29, while measuring progress of the annual data within the solid waste handling system the agency collects would be conducted every year. Ecology estimates this effort would require 0.04 FTE of an ES5 in FY21 (and every four years thereafter), and 0.02 FTE of an ES5 in FY 22, and annually thereafter.

Section 2(3) would require Ecology to work with the DOH and the WSDA to develop and adopt a state wasted food reduction and food waste diversion plan by October 1, 2020.

Ecology assumes it would create and oversee the stakeholder advisory panel to include staff from WSDA and DOH and other relevant stakeholders including local governments, food banks, hunger-focused nonprofit organizations, and food businesses or associations. Ecology staff would coordinate quarterly meetings with the advisory panel to develop the required elements of the plan and the report on recommended changes to state laws. Ecology staff would draft the plan and the report, soliciting content, ideas, and review from the panel. Ecology would also share the plan and recommended changes to law with other stakeholders outside of the advisory panel. This could be done via existing meetings, as well as webinars and list-serves, and comments could be gathered via online surveys.

To accomplish the work in this section, Ecology assumes efforts from staff with organics expertise would be required to facilitate and coordinate the stakeholder meetings, develop the plan and write the legislative report. Ecology further assumes the program policy lead would review recommended changes to state law, and administrative staff would transcribe notes, and extra travel costs would be required. Ecology estimates this effort would require 1.0 FTE of an ES5, 0.25 FTE of an ES4, and 0.04 FTE of a Secretary Senior, in addition to \$3,000 in travel costs in FY 20 and FY 21, and 0.05 FTE of an Environmental Planner 5 (EP5) in FY21.

Ecology has sufficient funding to support this new effort in the agency's carryforward level restoration in the Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account.

Notes on costs by object:

Salary estimates are current biennium actual rates at Step L.

Benefits are the agency average of 37.1% of salaries.

Personal Service Contracts are \$40,000 each year in FY 20, FY21, and \$50,000 each year in FY24, FY25 for consultant studies.

Goods and Services are the agency average of \$4,230 per direct program FTE.

Travel is the agency average of \$2,577 per direct program FTE in addition to \$1,500 in FY20 and \$1,500 in FY21 for stakeholders work.

Equipment is the agency average of \$1,319 per direct program FTE.

Agency Administrative Overhead is calculated at the federally approved agency indirect rate of 29.7% of direct program salaries and benefits, and is shown as object 9. Agency Administrative Overhead FTEs are included at 0.15 FTE per direct program FTE, and are identified as Fiscal Analyst 2 and IT Specialist 2.

Part III: Expenditure Detail

III. A - Operating Budget Expenditures

Account	Account Title	Type	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
044-1	Waste Reduction/Recycling /Litter Control	State	270,306	246,972	517,278	5,582	163,499
Total \$			270,306	246,972	517,278	5,582	163,499

III. B - Expenditures by Object Or Purpose

	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
FTE Staff Years	1.9	1.7	1.8	0.0	0.3
A-Salaries and Wages	120,949	108,673	229,622	2,956	33,630
B-Employee Benefits	44,873	40,319	85,192	1,096	12,476
C-Professional Service Contracts	40,000	40,000	80,000		100,000
E-Goods and Other Services	7,150	6,367	13,517	170	1,926
G-Travel	5,855	5,378	11,233	104	1,173
J-Capital Outlays	2,230	1,986	4,216	52	600
9-Agency Administrative Overhead	49,249	44,249	93,498	1,204	13,694
Total \$	270,306	246,972	517,278	5,582	163,499

III. C - Operating FTE Detail: *List FTEs by classification and corresponding annual compensation. Totals need to agree with total FTEs in Part I and Part IIIA*

Job Classification	Salary	FY 2020	FY 2021	2019-21	2021-23	2023-25
ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNER 5	85,671		0.1	0.0		
ENVIRONMENTAL SPEC 3	57,718	0.1		0.0		
ENVIRONMENTAL SPEC 4	66,894	0.3	0.3	0.3		
ENVIRONMENTAL SPEC 5	73,910	1.4	1.2	1.3	0.0	0.2
FISCAL ANALYST 2		0.2	0.2	0.2		0.0
IT SPECIALIST 2		0.1	0.1	0.1		0.0
SECRETARY SENIOR	38,991	0.0	0.0	0.0		
Total FTEs		1.9	1.7	1.9	0.0	0.3

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

None

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

None

Individual State Agency Fiscal Note

Revised

Bill Number: 1114 HB	Title: Food waste reduction	Agency: 495-Department of Agriculture
-----------------------------	------------------------------------	--

Part I: Estimates

No Fiscal Impact

The cash receipts and expenditure estimates on this page represent the most likely fiscal impact. Factors impacting the precision of these estimates, and alternate ranges (if appropriate), are explained in Part II.

Check applicable boxes and follow corresponding instructions:

- If fiscal impact is greater than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete entire fiscal note form Parts I-V.
- If fiscal impact is less than \$50,000 per fiscal year in the current biennium or in subsequent biennia, complete this page only (Part I).
- Capital budget impact, complete Part IV.
- Requires new rule making, complete Part V.

Legislative Contact: Jacob Lipson	Phone: 360-786-7196	Date: 01/14/2019
Agency Preparation: Steve Fuller	Phone: 902-1945	Date: 01/18/2019
Agency Approval: Natasha Roberts	Phone: (360) 902-1988	Date: 01/18/2019
OFM Review: Leslie Connelly	Phone: (360) 902-0543	Date: 01/18/2019

Part II: Narrative Explanation

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.

This bill establishes a goal for the state to reduce by fifty percent the amount of food waste generated annually by 2030, relative to 2015 levels.

Section 2 adds a new section to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 70.95 requiring the Department of Ecology (ECY), in consultation with the Department of Agriculture (WSDA) and the Department of Health, (DOH) to develop and adopt a state wasted food reduction and food waste diversion plan designed to achieve the goal of fifty percent food waste reduction. The deadline for development and adoption of this plan is October 2020.

Section 2 (d) ECY, WSDA and DOH must consider recommending changes to state law in order to achieve the goal established in subsection (1). Any such recommendations must be explained via a report to the legislature submitted consistent with RCW 43.01.036 by December 1, 2020.

II. B - Cash receipts Impact

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 workload assumptions translate into estimates. Distinguish between one time and ongoing functions.

This proposed legislation would have no cash receipt impact on the WSDA.

II. C - Expenditures

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

The WSDA assumes that four staff members would participate in the stakeholder advisory panel that ECY will create and lead. The program staff listed below from the Food Safety Program, Food Assistance Program and the Feed Program would participate in quarterly meetings held by ECY. The attendance and participation in these meetings will be absorbed within current agency resources.

Commerce Specialist 3 - 0.05 FTE
WMS 02 - Policy and Performance Administrator - 0.05 FTE
WMS 02 - Feed Program Manager - 0.05 FTE
WMS 03 - Food Safety Program Manager - 0.05 FTE

Part III: Expenditure Detail

Part IV: Capital Budget Impact

This proposed legislation has no capital budget impacts to the WSDA.

Part V: New Rule Making Required

Identify provisions of the measure that require the agency to adopt new administrative rules or repeal/revise existing rules.

The WSDA requires no rule making at this time because of the proposed legislation.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT FISCAL NOTE

Department of Commerce

Bill Number: 1114 HB	Title: Food waste reduction
-----------------------------	------------------------------------

Part I: Jurisdiction

Location, type or status of political subdivision defines range of fiscal impacts.

Legislation Impacts:

- Cities:
- Counties:
- Special Districts:
- Specific jurisdictions only:
- Variance occurs due to:

Part II: Estimates

- No fiscal impacts.
- Expenditures represent one-time costs:
- Legislation provides local option: To adopt recommended best practices to reduce food waste; participate in stakeholder meetings, if they are established by the Dept. of Ecology; and use competitive grant funds from the Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Account to achieve the goals of this legislation in accordance with a food waste production plan to be developed by the Dept. of Ecology in consultation with the departments of Agriculture and Health by 2020
- Key variables cannot be estimated with certainty at this time: Whether the Department of Ecology will form a stakeholder group; how many local governments would participate; how many local governments may incorporate recommended best practices; whether clarifying that competitive grant funds can be used for food waste reduction purposes will increase the number of grant applicants.

Part III: Preparation and Approval

Fiscal Note Analyst: Austin Scharff	Phone: 360-725-3126	Date: 01/15/2019
Leg. Committee Contact: Jacob Lipson	Phone: 360-786-7196	Date: 01/14/2019
Agency Approval: Alice Zillah	Phone: 360-725-5035	Date: 01/15/2019
OFM Review: Linda Steinmann	Phone: 360-902-0573	Date: 01/15/2019

Part IV: Analysis

A. SUMMARY OF BILL

Provide a clear, succinct description of the bill with an emphasis on how it impacts local government.

Sections of this legislation that may have a fiscal impact on local governments include :

SECTION 2:

Local governments may incorporate into their solid waste management plans recommended best practices from the food waste production plan to be developed by the Dept. of Ecology with consultation from the departments of Agriculture and Health. To assist with its food waste reduction plan development responsibilities, the Dept. of Ecology may designate a stakeholder advisory panel, which would include representatives of local governments.

SECTION 3:

This section clarifies that local governments may use competitive grant program funds from the Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account to reduce wasted food and food waste to achieve the goals of reducing wasted food in the state by 50 percent by 2030 and that are consistent with the proposed food waste reduction plan.

B. SUMMARY OF EXPENDITURE IMPACTS

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. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

This bill would have no fiscal impact on local governments because they have no responsibilities under this legislation. Local governments may incorporate into their solid waste management plans recommended best practices from the food waste production plan to be developed by the Dept. of Ecology. If the Dept. of Ecology designates a stakeholder panel, representatives of local government health departments and solid waste departments would serve on it.

C. SUMMARY OF REVENUE IMPACTS

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. Delineate between city, county and special district impacts.

This legislation would have no impact on local government revenues because they have no responsibilities under this legislation. Local governments may use competitive grant program funds from the Waste Reduction, Recycling, and Litter Control Account to reduce wasted food and food waste to achieve this legislation's goals.

SOURCES:

Dept. of Ecology

Local Government Fiscal Note SHB H-4319.1 (2018)