#### ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT

		1101 01111 01110111	
DEPARTMENT NAME	CONTACT PERSON	EMAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER
CA Alt. Energy & Adv. Transp. Fin. Auth.	Matt Jumps	mjumps@sto.ca.gov	(916) 651-5103
DESCRIPTIVE TITLE FROM NOTICE REGISTER OR FORM 400  Sales and Use Tax Exclusion Program			NOTICE FILE NUMBER
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Z
A. ESTIMATED PRIVATE SECTOR COST IMPA	CTS Include calculations and	d assumptions in the rulemaking record.	
1. Check the appropriate box(es) below to indicate	e whether this regulation:		
a. Impacts business and/or employees	e. Imposes rep	porting requirements	
b. Impacts small businesses	f. Imposes pre	scriptive instead of performance	
c. Impacts jobs or occupations	g. Impacts ind		
d. Impacts California competitiveness	∴ None of the	e above (Explain below):	
	See STD 39	9 attachment	
If any box in Items 1	a through g is checked, co	omplete this Economic Impact Statem	ent.
		iscal Impact Statement as appropriate	
. Th.	المناف المالية		alcala and a fee and a second
!. The(Agency/Department)	estimates that the e	conomic impact of this regulation (which in	cludes the fiscal impact) is:
Below \$10 million			
Between \$10 and \$25 million			
Between \$25 and \$50 million			
	s over \$50 million, agencies are	required to submit a <u>Standardized Regulator</u> y	· Impact Assessment
	nt Code Section 11346.3(c)]	-	
Entartha total number of husinesses impacted			
<ol> <li>Enter the total number of businesses impacted:</li> </ol>			
Describe the types of businesses (Include nonp	rofits):		
Enter the number or percentage of total			
businesses impacted that are small businesses:			
·			
I. Enter the number of businesses that will be crea	ated:	eliminated:	
Explain:			
екрипъ			
5. Indicate the geographic extent of impacts:	Statewide Statewide		
· <u>-</u>	•		
	1 2 (		<del></del>
i. Enter the number of jobs created:	and eliminated:	· <del></del>	
Describe the types of jobs or occupations impa	ctod:		
Describe the types of Jobs of occupations impa			
. Will the regulation affect the ability of California	businesses to compete with		
other states by making it more costly to produc		YES NO	
If YES, explain briefly:			
ii 125, explain onelly.			

# STATE OF CALIFORNIA — DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE ECONOMIC AND FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

(REGULATIONS AND ORDERS) STD. 399 (Rev. 10/2019)

## ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

B. ESTIMATED COSTS Include calculations and assump	tions in the rulemaking record.	
What are the total statewide dollar costs that businesses	and individuals may incur to comply with this regula	ition over its lifetime? \$
a. Initial costs for a small business: \$		
b. Initial costs for a typical business: \$		
c. Initial costs for an individual:	Annual ongoing costs: \$	Years:
d. Describe other economic costs that may occur:		
2. If multiple industries are impacted, enter the share of to	tal costs for each industry	
2. I maniple massiles are impacted, error are state or to		
If the regulation imposes reporting requirements, enter to include the dollar costs to do programming, record keeping		
4. Will this regulation directly impact housing costs?	res No	
If YE	S, enter the annual dollar cost per housing unit: \$	
	Number of units:	
5. Are there comparable Federal regulations?	ES NO	
Explain the need for State regulation given the existence	or absence of Federal regulations:	
Enter any additional costs to businesses and/or individua	ls that may be due to State - Federal differences: \$	
C. ESTIMATED BENEFITS Estimation of the dollar value	of benefits is not specifically required by rulemaking	law, but encouraged.
Briefly summarize the benefits of the regulation, which n health and welfare of California residents, worker safety	and the Ctatale and income ant.	
2. Are the benefits the result of: specific statutory requ	irements, or goals developed by the agency ba	sed on broad statutory authority?
Explain:		
3. What are the total statewide benefits from this regulation	n over its lifetime? \$	
	<del></del>	
4. Briefly describe any expansion of businesses currently do	oing business within the State of California that would	d result from this regulation:
		<del></del>
D. ALTERNATIVES TO THE REGULATION Include calcustation specifically required by rulemaking law, but encouraged		
List alternatives considered and describe them below. If	no alternatives were considered, explain why not:	

### ECONOMIC IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

2. Summarize the	total statewide costs and be	nefits from this regulation and each	alternative considered:	
Regulation:	Benefit: \$	Cost: \$		
Alternative 1:	Benefit: \$	Cost: \$	<del></del>	
Alternative 2:	Benefit: \$	Cost: \$		
	ny quantification issues that osts and benefits for this re-	are relevant to a comparison gulation or alternatives:		
regulation man	dates the use of specific te edures. Were performance	ider performance standards as an a chnologies or equipment, or presc standards considered to lower cor	ribes specific npliance costs? YES	□ NO
E MAIOR REGIII	ATIONS Include calculation	ons and assumptions in the ruleme	aking record	
E. MAJOR REGUL		•		
		ntal Protection Agency (Cal/E. lowing (per Health and Safety		
1. Will the estimate	ed costs of this regulation to	California business enterprises exc	eed \$10 million? YES	□ NO
		If YES, comple If NO, sk		
2. Briefly describe	each alternative, or combina	ation of alternatives, for which a cos	•	erformed:
Alternative 1:				
Alternative 2:				
(Attach addition	al pages for other alternatives			
		described, enter the estimated total		
	otal Cost \$		ess ratio: \$	
		Cost-effectivene		
	otal Cost \$		ess ratio: \$	
exceeding \$50 n	on subject to OAL review hav million in any 12-month peri regulation is estimated to be	od between the date the major reg	business enterprises and inc ulation is estimated to be filed	lividuals located in or doing business in California d with the Secretary of State through 12 months
YES [	NO			
		<u>lardized Regulatory Impact Assessme</u> nclude the SRIA in the Initial Statemer		
5. Briefly describe t	he following:			
The increase or o	decrease of investment in th	ne State:		
The incentive for	r innovation in products, ma	aterials or processes:		
The benefits of to	he regulations, including, be er safety, and the state's envi	ut not limited to, benefits to the hear ironment and quality of life, among	alth, safety, and welfare of Cal any other benefits identified	ifornia by the agency:

### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT

A. FISCAL EFFECT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT Indicate current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.	appropriate boxes	1 through 6 and attach calculations	and assumptions of fiscal impact for the
1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Y (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the Californ			ment Code).
\$			
a. Funding provided in			, 
Budget Act of	or Chapter	, Statutes of	
b. Funding will be requested in the Governor's Bu	dget Act of		·
	Fiscal Year:		
2. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Y (Pursuant to Section 6 of Article XIII B of the Californ			
\$			
Check reason(s) this regulation is not reimbursable and p	rovide the appropri	ate information:	
a. Implements the Federal mandate contained in			
b. Implements the court mandate set forth by the			Court.
Case of:		VS	
c. Implements a mandate of the people of this Sta	ite expressed in the	ir approval of Proposition No.	
Date of Election:			
d. Issued only in response to a specific request fro	m affected local en	tity(s).	
Local entity(s) affected:			
e. Will be fully financed from the fees, revenue, etc.	c. from:		
Authorized by Section:		of the	Code;
f. Provides for savings to each affected unit of loc	al government whi	ch will, at a minimum, offset any addit	cional costs to each;
g. Creates, eliminates, or changes the penalty for a	a new crime or infra	action contained in	
3. Annual Savings. (approximate)			•
\$			
4. No additional costs or savings. This regulation makes of	only technical, non-	substantive or clarifying changes to cur	rent law regulations.
5. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect	any local entity or p	orogram.	
6. Other. Explain			
			·
			PAGE 4

### FISCAL IMPACT STATEMENT (CONTINUED)

<b>B. FISCAL EFFECT ON STATE GOVERNMENT</b> Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and attach calculations and a year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.	assumptions of fiscal impact for the curren
1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)	
\$	
It is anticipated that State agencies will:	
a. Absorb these additional costs within their existing budgets and resources.	
b. Increase the currently authorized budget level for theFiscal Year	
Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)	
\$ \$20,962	
3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any State agency or program.	
X 4. Other. Explain The ongoing savings for CAEATFA are estimated to increase to appro-	ximately \$26,000 over the next
two years. See STD 399 attachment.	
C. FISCAL EFFECT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF STATE PROGRAMS Indicate appropriate boxes 1 through 4 and atteimpact for the current year and two subsequent Fiscal Years.	ach calculations and assumptions of fisca
1. Additional expenditures in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)	
\$	
2. Savings in the current State Fiscal Year. (Approximate)	
\$	
3. No fiscal impact exists. This regulation does not affect any federally funded State agency or program.	
4. Other. Explain	
FISCAL OFFICER SIGNATURE	DATE
Karma Manni	December 2, 2021
The signature attests that the agency has completed the STD. 399 according to the instructions in SAM sect he  impacts of the proposed rulemaking. State boards, offices, or departments not under an Agency Secreta highest  ranking official in the organization.	ions 6601-6616, and understands ary must have the form signed by the
AGENCY SECRETARY	DATE
& Dodg C	December 2, 2021
Finance approval and signature is required when SAM sections 6601-6616 require completion of Fiscal Im	pact Statement in the STD. 399.
DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE PROGRAM BUDGET MANAGER	DATE
	7-16-72
	···

#### STD 399 Attachment

### **Economic Impact Statement**

#### Section A.1.h:

The Authority has determined that there will be no significant adverse economic impact on any California businesses as participation in the Sales and Use Tax Exclusion ("STE") Program is voluntary. The additional fees proposed in these regulations are to cover the ongoing costs of administration, which is necessary to accommodate the increased scope of work under the program and comply with CAEATFA's current budget projections. Participation in the Program is voluntary for eligible businesses; therefore, the regulations will not have an adverse impact on California businesses. In fact, the incentive provided by the Program is likely to have a positive effect on California businesses by reducing their capital purchasing costs, and the fee structure is designed so that the incentive exceeds the cost of participation.

### Fiscal Impact Statement

#### Section B.2:

The proposed regulations increase Program fees to help cover the costs of ongoing program operations and maintenance.

Existing regulations require Applicants to pay an Application Fee to cover the costs of reviewing the Application. Current regulations provide that the Application Fee is not refundable unless an Application is not reviewed by Staff due to the STE Program being oversubscribed. Because the proposed regulations switch the STE Program to specific application periods that will enable CAEATFA to know whether the Program is oversubscribed before a subsequent application period, CAEATFA will no longer accept Applications if there is no STE available to award. Therefore, all Applications will at least be reviewed to determine Competitive Criteria scores. Determining the Competitive Criteria score of an Application requires Staff to review the Qualified Property list, estimated number of employees, and production-related information provided in the Application. To reflect the amount of time spent on this initial review of the Application, the proposed regulations provide that 75% of the Application Fee will be refunded if the Application is (1) reviewed to only determine its Competitive Criteria ranking and (2) not fully reviewed by Staff due to the Applicant's Competitive Criteria ranking and the oversubscription of the Statutory Cap.

Current regulations require an Applicant to pay a \$500 fee for any modification made to an existing award (e.g. name changes, award transfers, extension of the timeframe to meet the 15% purchase requirement, and extension of the three-year initial term to purchase all Qualified Property). To adjust the fees to better reflect the amount of time spent reviewing and processing requests for extensions and Board consideration, and to account for the additional years of reporting and administration, the proposed regulations increase the administrative fee to \$1,500 for requests to extend the 15% purchase requirement timeframe, to \$2,000 for requests to extend the three-year initial term to use the STE award, and to \$2,250 if an Applicant requests extensions the 15% purchase requirement timeframe and the three-year initial term for consideration at the same CAEATFA Board meeting.

Aside from certain savings for CAEATFA, there are no other costs or savings to any other state agency.

## Assumptions:

Application Fee Refunds				
	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	
Number of Applications Not Fully Reviewed Projection; based on historical average	2	2	2	
\$7,924 Application Fee Projection; based on historical average over last three years	\$15,848	\$15,848	\$15,848	
Less 75% of Application Fee Refunded	-\$11,886	-\$11,886	-\$11,886	
Total Net Increase in Fee Revenue	\$3,962	\$3,962	\$3,962	

15% Purchase Requirement Extension Requests				
	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	
Number of 15% Purchase Timeframes Expiring	28	32	32	
Extensions Granted (based on actual requests)	2	-		
7% Request Extension (Rounded) (FY2022-23				
& FY2023-24)		2	2	
Projection; based on historical average				
Total Fees Received	\$3,000	\$3,000	\$3,000	
Minus Fees Based on Previous Fee Amount	-\$1,000	-\$1,000	-\$1,000	
Total Net Increase in Fee Revenue	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	

Initial Term Extension Requests				
	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24	
Number of Initial Terms Expiring (no previous extension)	17	24	31	
Number of Initial Terms Expiring (previous extension granted)	4	8	6	
Number of Initial Term Extensions Granted (actual)	4			
30% Request First Extension (Rounded) Projection; based on historical average	5	7	9	
17% Request Second Extension (Rounded) Projection; based on historical average	1	1	1	
Total Number of Initial Term Extension Requests	10	8	10	
Total Fees Received	\$20,000	\$16,000	\$20,000	
Minus Fees Based on Previous Fee Amount	-\$5,000	-\$4,000	-\$5,000	
Total Net Increase in Fee Revenue	\$15,000	\$12,000	\$15,000	

	FY2021-22	FY2022-23	FY2023-24
Number of 15% Purchase Timeframes Expiring (no more expiring in FY2021-22 after			
regulations become effective)	0	32	32
10% Request both extensions to be considered at same meeting (Rounded) (FY2022-23 & FY2023-24)	0	3	3
Projection; based on historical average  Total Fees Received	0	\$6,750	\$6,750
Minus Fees Based on Previous Fee Amount	0	-\$1,500	-\$1,500
Total Net Increase in Fee Revenue	\$0	\$5,250	\$5,250

## Fiscal Year Impact:

• Current FY2021-22: \$20,962

FY2022-23: \$23,212FY2023-24: \$26,212