

AGENCY: DNR - Water Quality

PAPER: #680

ISSUE: Dam Safety Program

RECOMMENDATION: Part A - Alternative 1
Part B - Alternative 2
Part C - Alternative 2

SUMMARY: Most important thing here is to make sure there is some money appropriated for the dam repair and removal grant program - I especially favor removal.

BY: Barry

Decker -
A.3
B. 2 or 1 (2)
C - C - (6) (1 not B2)



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 16, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #680

Dam Safety Program (DNR -- Water Quality)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 490, #15 & #16]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Natural Resources administers a municipal dam repair and removal grant program. This program provides grants to counties, cities, villages, towns and public inland lake protection and rehabilitation districts. To qualify for a grant, the locality must own a dam that has been inspected by DNR and be under a DNR directive to repair or remove the dam. The program provides 50% matching grants with a limit of \$200,000 per project.

A total of \$11,850,000 in bonding has been made available for municipal dam repair and removal grants for up to 50% of local costs not to exceed \$200,000. Of that total, \$250,000 is allocated to small dam removal and \$100,000 is dedicated to abandoned dams. With the exception of the \$250,000 for small dam removal and stream restorations (which has not yet been awarded), all available bonding authority has been committed.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$250,000 of segregated revenue supported bonding from the water resources account of the conservation fund for the dam safety program. Further, require DNR to provide the amount necessary, up to \$250,000, to repair the dam located in the Village of Cazenovia. The Village would not need to apply for a grant. In addition, it would be exempted from both the grant cap of \$200,000 and the matching funds requirement of the dam safety grant program.

In addition, provide \$50,000 annually from the water resources account of the conservation fund for costs associated with emergency safety actions, such as breaches and drawdowns of failing dams, in situations that pose an imminent threat to life and property.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Municipal Dam Safety Grant Program Funding

1. The Legislature created the municipal dam repair and removal grant program in the 1989-91 biennial budget and authorized \$2.5 million in bonding revenues for dam safety grants. While neither the DNR nor the Governor have included recommendations for continued funding when submitting budgets in the next five biennia, the Legislature included and the Governor signed increased bonding levels in the next four biennial budgets, ending with \$2.35 million in 1997-99, for a total of \$11.85 million in available bonding.

2. Of the approved bonding authority, \$5.5 million (46%) is funded with general purpose revenues. The debt service on the remaining \$6,350,000 (54%) is funded from the water resources account of the conservation fund. However, it should be noted that for the 1995-97 biennium only, approximately \$500,000 in debt service costs for the GPR-backed bonds were shifted to the water resources account.

3. When submitting its agency budget, DNR requested an additional \$3 million in bonding authority to address anticipated applications from municipalities for the 2001-03 biennium. Estimated water resources account debt service payments for \$3 million in bonding authority would total approximately \$5 million for a 20-year level-debt bond (approximately \$250,000 annually).

4. However, due to the timing of dam repair projects and bond issuance, significant debt retirement costs would not be anticipated in the 2001-03 biennium. If the municipal dam safety grant program is to be viewed as a permanent program (funding has been provided in five of the last six biennia) an ongoing appropriation for the program may be appropriate. From this perspective, annual water resources SEG could be provided in a continuing appropriation for municipal dam safety grants (similar to the recreational boating project aids appropriation). Under the budget bill, the water resources account is expected to have a balance of \$310,000 on June 30, 2003. The Committee could provide \$200,000 annually for dam safety project grants.

Cazenovia Dam Repair Earmark

5. The Cazenovia Dam creates an approximately 46 acre impoundment known as Lee Lake in Richland County. DNR staff indicate that the Village of Cazenovia had hired a contractor to complete an application for a municipal dam safety grant, but that no application has been received to date. In the fall of 1999, some preliminary repair work was done on the dam spillway, but DNR staff indicate that further repairs to the spillway and powerhouse of the dam are needed. Estimates of the total cost and scope of the repairs are not available.

6. While the earmarking of projects under this appropriation has occurred in the past, it may be argued that DNR is in the best position to identify the relative need for program funding under its competitive grant program. The Village of Cazenovia has not applied for a grant under this program in the past. Therefore, it may be difficult to weigh the merits of this project in comparison to the projects of other applicants for dam repair funding.

7. While \$250,000 of bonding authority was earmarked for small dams in the 1999-01 biennial budget, these funds have not yet been awarded. DNR anticipates having administrative rules in place to administer a grant program for small dam repair within the year, and subsequently would begin to accept grant applications under this program. However, if it was determined that the Cazanovia Dam was a higher priority, these funds could be redirected.

Emergency Safety Actions

8. The \$50,000 in the water resources account for costs associated with emergency safety actions is provided in the Water Division's SEG appropriation for dam safety administration and wetland mapping. If this funding were not used for emergency dam actions on an annual basis, DNR would have the authority to expend the funds for other purposes. If a separate appropriation were created, more direction could be provided for the expenditure. An alternative would be to create a separate appropriation to first fund emergency actions with any remaining monies available for the municipal dam safety grant program. Or, if cash funding was approved for dam safety grants, these funds could also be managed under a new, combined appropriation.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Cazenovia Dam Repair Earmark

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to earmark \$250,000 to repair the dam located in the Village of Cazenovia. Specify that the Village would not need to apply for a grant. In addition, the village would be exempted from both the grant cap of \$200,000 and the matching funds requirement of the dam safety grant program.

2. Remove the requirement that \$250,000 in bonding authority for the municipal dam repair and removal grant program be set aside for small dams. Rather, make the \$250,000 available to provide the amount necessary, up to \$250,000, to repair the dam located in the Village of Cazenovia. The Village would not need to apply for a grant, and would be exempted from both the grant cap of \$200,000 and the matching funds requirement of the dam safety grant program.

3. Maintain current law.

B. Municipal Dam Safety Grant Program Funding

1. Provide additional segregated revenue (water resources account) supported general obligation bonding to continue funding for the municipal dam repair and removal grant program in one of the following amounts:

a. \$250,000 BR

Alternative B1a	SEG-BR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$250,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

b. \$1,500,000 BR

Alternative B1b	SEG-BR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$1,500,000
[Change to Bill]	\$1,250,000]

c. \$3,000,000 BR

Alternative B1c	SEG-BR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$3,000,000
[Change to Bill]	\$2,750,000]

2. Provide \$200,000 annually from the water resources account in a continuing appropriation for municipal dam safety grants and emergency safety actions. (An increase of \$150,000 annually to that provided in the bill.)

Alternative B2	SEG-BR	SEG	TOTAL
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0	\$400,000	\$400,000
[Change to Bill]	-\$250,000	\$300,000	\$50,000]

3. Maintain current law.

Alternative 3	SEG-BR
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	-\$250,000]

C. Emergency Safety Actions

1. Rather than Alternative B2, approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$50,000 annually from the water resources account of the conservation fund for costs associated with emergency safety actions, such as breaches and drawdowns of failing dams, in situations that pose an imminent threat to life and property from the following:

a. The Water Division's administrative appropriation (Governor's recommendation)

Alternative C1a	SEG
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$50,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

b. A new continuing appropriation, and direct the expenditures to be limited first to emergency safety actions with remaining funds available for municipal dam safety grants.

Alternative C1b	SEG
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$50,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Maintain current law.

Alternative C2	SEG
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$50,000]

Prepared by: Rebecca Hotynski

MO# A-1

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

MO# B-1(C) B-2
C-1(b)

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

NATURAL RESOURCES -- WATER QUALITY

Dam Safety Program

[LFB Paper #680]

Motion:

Move to provide \$1 million in segregated revenue (water resources account) supported general obligation bonding to continue funding for the municipal dam safety grant program.

From this amount, earmark \$200,000 for repair and restoration work associated with the Cazenovia Dam. Require the Village of Cazenovia to submit an application to DNR, including the total anticipated scope and cost of the project. Direct DNR to provide a grant to the Village of Cazenovia for \$200,000 without requiring the Village to provide matching funding.

In addition, provide \$50,000 SEG annually from the water resources account of the conservation fund in a new continuing appropriation and direct expenditures to be limited first to emergency safety actions (such as breaches and drawdowns of failing dams, in situations that pose an imminent threat to life and property) with remaining funds available for municipal dam safety grants.

[Change to Base: \$1 million SEG-BR and \$100,000 SEG]
[Change to Bill: \$1 million SEG-BR]

MO# _____

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AGENCY: DNR - Water Quality

PAPER: #681

ISSUE: Invasive Species

RECOMMENDATION: Part A - Alternative 1(c)
Part B - Alternative 2 & 3

SUMMARY: No strong opinion here, but we definitely need to be vigilant in our attempts to keep invasive species out of our lakes and rivers. This combination of alternatives seems to be the most comprehensive approach.

BY: Barry

Dunker -
A-1(c)
B-1,2,3



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 16, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #681

Invasive Species (DNR -- Water Quality)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 490, #17]

CURRENT LAW

The water resources account of the conservation fund (motorboat gas tax revenue) supports DNR staff who provide technical and educational assistance to local governments, including public inland lake rehabilitation districts and lake and river associations. In addition, funding is used to conduct diagnostic studies, support demonstration projects, and to develop and distribute information on lakes and river management to lake districts and waterfront property owners.

Several exotic species, including Eurasian water milfoil, purple loosestrife, zebra mussels, carp, and rusty crayfish are already present in many inland Wisconsin waters. Invasive species that are currently present in the Great Lakes include spiny water flea, ruffe, round goby, and white perch. Under the 1999-01 biennial budget, \$25,000 was provided from the recreational boating program for 1999-01 only for informational and educational activities related to zebra mussels and other aquatic nuisance species.

GOVERNOR

Provide \$300,000 annually from the water resources account of the conservation fund to begin a comprehensive program to manage invasive species. In addition, authorize DNR to establish an invasive plants management program. The goal of the program would be to: (a) protect and develop diverse and stable communities of native aquatic plants; (b) regulate how aquatic plants are managed; and (c) provide education and conduct research concerning invasive aquatic plants. Further, the bill would authorize DNR to issue aquatic plant management permits, to charge fees and to enforce the provisions of the bill including the imposition of penalties for violations.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Funding

1. Funds provided would be used for watercraft inspection for invasive plants, information and educational efforts relating to the transport of invasive species, monitoring of affected ecosystems, and bio-control of purple loosestrife using *Galerucella* beetles.

2. Invasive species can disrupt native aquatic ecosystems and food chains. Current estimates of economic losses and expenditures resulting from non-native species in the United States approached \$138 billion in 2000. Expenditures nationwide to combat purple loosestrife are estimated at \$45 million annually; expenditures to combat zebra mussels approached \$3.1 billion over the last ten years.

3. It may be argued that invasive species pose a threat to fishing interests throughout the state. As an example, in the past, the introduction of sea lamprey and alewives into the Great Lakes lead DNR to initiate large-scale stocking of salmon and trout in order to control invasive populations. To the extent that invasive aquatic species are likely to have a negative effect on fish populations (and therefore, sport fish activities), it may be reasonable to contribute fish and wildlife account funds (hunting and fishing license revenues) to the management of invasive aquatic species.

Statutory Language Changes

4. The bill would address DNR's approach to managing invasive aquatic plants. The Department indicates that it is developing a management proposal for invasive species (other than plants) as well, but it was not prepared to request statutory language changes as part of its biennial budget proposal. However, given the impact of zebra mussels on Wisconsin water systems, it may be argued that authorization to address the management of this particular species should be included as well. Additional management authority for other invasive species could be addressed in subsequent legislation, when DNR was prepared to present a comprehensive invasive species management proposal.

5. Under the bill, DNR would be authorized to regulate the introduction, cutting, removal, destruction or suppression of invasive aquatic plants. Eurasian water milfoil, curly leaf pondweed, and purple loosestrife would be designated as invasive, and DNR would have the authority to designate any other aquatic plant as invasive by administrative rule if the plant (a) has the ability to cause significant adverse change to desirable aquatic habitat; (b) to significantly displace desirable aquatic vegetation; or (c) to reduce the yield of products produced by aquaculture.

6. DNR would also be authorized to issue aquatic plant management permits and assess penalties under the bill. Permits may specify (a) the quantity of the aquatic plant to be managed; (b) the species of the aquatic plant to be managed; (c) the areas in which the aquatic plants may be managed; (d) the methods that may be used for the management of aquatic plants; (e) the times during which aquatic plants may be managed; and (f) allowable methods for disposing of or using aquatic plants that are removed or controlled under an aquatic plant management permit.

The bill would require possession of a valid permit to do any of the following: (a) introduce non-native aquatic plants into the waters of this state; (b) manually remove aquatic plants from navigable waters; (c) control aquatic plants in any waters of the state by the use of chemicals or by the introduction of biological agents, or (d) control aquatic plants in navigable waters by any process that involves dewatering, desiccation, burning, or freezing or by mechanical means. A person violating these provisions would be subject to a forfeiture of not more than \$200. If a person has been convicted of violating this same provision within the last five years, they would forfeit not less than \$700 and not more than \$2,000, or could be imprisoned for not less than six months nor more than nine months, or both.

7. Under the bill, DNR would be authorized to establish fees for aquatic plant management permits; however, DNR would be allowed to establish a different fee for an aquatic plant management permit pertaining to plant management in a body of water that is entirely confined on the property of one owner. In addition, DNR could require that an application for an aquatic plant management permit contain a plan for the Department's approval as to how the aquatic plants will be introduced, removed, or controlled. The bill does not specify that the fees for aquatic plant management permits be established by rule. The bill could be clarified to specify this. Under the bill, a person who is convicted of a second or subsequent violation may be ordered by the court to abate any nuisance caused by the violation, restore any natural resource damaged by the violation, or take other appropriate action to eliminate or minimize any environmental damage caused by the violation.

8. The permit requirement would have several exceptions under the bill. Exemptions to the permit requirement would include: (a) manually removing aquatic plants from privately owned stream beds with the permission of the owner; (b) persons engaged in the harvesting of wild rice; and (c) persons engaged in the operation of an authorized fish farm. In addition, DNR could waive the permit requirement by rule for any of the following: (a) a person who owns property on which there is a body of water that is entirely confined on the property of that person; (b) a riparian owner who manually removes aquatic plants from a body of water that abuts the owner's property, provided that the removal does not interfere with the rights of other riparian owners; (c) a person who is controlling purple loosestrife; (d) a person who uses chemicals in a body of water for the purpose of controlling bacteria on bathing beaches; (e) a person who uses chemicals on plants to prevent the plants from interfering with the use of water for drinking purposes; or (f) a state agency or local governmental unit that uses a chemical treatment in a body of water for the purpose of protecting public health.

9. The distribution of an invasive aquatic plant would be prohibited under the bill. The forfeiture for distribution could not exceed \$100. In addition, removing, selling, or transporting any native plant or plant product commonly used to furnish food for game birds, including duck potato and wild celery, out of public waters would be prohibited. However, this would not apply to wild rice.

10. Under the bill, individuals would be required to remove aquatic plants from a boat, boat trailer, or boating equipment before placing it in a navigable water. Law enforcement officers

would be granted the authority to remove or prohibit the placement of a boat, boat trailer, or boating equipment in navigable water if the officer has reason to believe that that the equipment may have aquatic plants attached. DNR would be required to prepare a notice summarizing this information and to make the notices available. Further, owners would be required to post and maintain the notice at public boat access sites. The Department currently has the authority to prevent boats from entering the Lower St. Croix waterway if there is reason to believe that the boat may be carrying zebra mussels. Some have argued that this authority should be statewide in order to more effectively address the spread of zebra mussels in Wisconsin. Broadening the language under the bill to include zebra mussels as well as invasive plants would extend the authority that DNR currently has in the Lower St. Croix to other bodies of water, and may be effective in slowing the spread of the zebra mussel. On the other hand, it could be argued that invasive animal species should be addressed together in comprehensive legislation after DNR completes its review.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Funding

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to provide \$300,000 annually to begin a comprehensive program to manage invasive species. Funds provided would be used for watercraft inspection for invasive plants, information and educational efforts relating to the transport of invasive species, monitoring of affected ecosystems, and bio-control of purple loosestrife using *Galerucella* beetles. Specify that funding would come from one of the following:

- a. Water resources account (Governor's recommendation).
- b. Fish and wildlife account.
- c. Funded equally from the water resources and the fish and wildlife accounts.

<u>Alternative A1</u>	<u>SEG</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$600,000
[Change to Bill]	\$0]

2. Maintain current law.

<u>Alternative A2</u>	<u>SEG</u>
2001-03 FUNDING (Change to Base)	\$0
[Change to Bill]	- \$600,000]

B. Statutory Language Changes

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to authorize DNR to establish an invasive plants management program. The goal of the program would be to: (a) protect and develop diverse and stable communities of native aquatic plants; (b) regulate how aquatic plants are managed; and (c) provide education and conduct research concerning invasive aquatic plants. In addition, authorize the DNR to remove or prohibit the placement of a boat, boat trailer, or boating equipment in navigable water if the officer has reason to believe that that the equipment may have aquatic plants attached. Further, authorize DNR to issue aquatic plant management permits, to charge fees and to enforce the provisions of the bill including the imposition of penalties for violations.

2. Approve the Governor's recommendation. In addition, authorize DNR to remove or prohibit the placement of a boat, boat trailer, or boating equipment in navigable waters if the officer has reason to believe that the equipment may have zebra mussels attached.

3. In addition, specify that fees for aquatic species management permits be established by administrative rule.

4. Maintain current law.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
Prep: PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A
AYE	NO	ABS	

MO# A-1(a), B-1, 2, 3

BURKE	<u>Y</u>	N	A
DECKER	<u>Y</u>	N	A
MOORE	<u>Y</u>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<u>Y</u>	N	A
PLACHE	<u>Y</u>	N	A
WIRCH	<u>Y</u>	N	A
DARLING	<u>Y</u>	N	A
WELCH	<u>Y</u>	N	A
<u>2</u> GARD	<u>Y</u>	N	A
KAUFERT	<u>Y</u>	N	A
ALBERS	<u>Y</u>	N	A
DUFF	<u>Y</u>	N	A
WARD	<u>Y</u>	N	A
HUEBSCH	<u>Y</u>	N	A
HUBER	<u>Y</u>	N	A
COGGS	<u>Y</u>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS 0

AGENCY: DNR - Water Quality

PAPER: #682

ISSUE: Premier Lakes Program

RECOMMENDATION: Part A - Alternative 2
Part B - Alternative 1

SUMMARY: The gov's recommendation is ok but alt. 2 in part A broadens eligibility for this designation to include public lake management organizations. Under part B just go with the gov - he has a good idea.

These recommendations are supported by the Wisconsin Lakes Association.

BY: Barry

Decker
A-4
B-1



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 16, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #682

Premier Lakes Program (DNR -- Water Quality)

[LFB 2001-03 Budget Summary: Page 492, #18]

CURRENT LAW

Under 1999 Act 9, funding for lake management and classification grants were merged with lake planning grants to form the consolidated lake protection grant program. Lake protection grants may be awarded for a variety of purposes, including management projects that will improve or protect the quality of water in lakes, flowages, or natural ecosystems.

A grant for a lake management planning project may be made for up to 75% of the cost of the project, with a maximum of \$10,000 per grant. Counties, municipalities, non-profit conservation organizations, qualified lake associations, town sanitary districts, and public inland lake protection and rehabilitation districts are all eligible to apply for grants. Eligible activities include data collection, mapping, water quality assessment, nonpoint source pollution evaluation, management strategy development, and other projects that would provide baseline information on the status of lakes.

Grants for lake management projects may be made for up to 75% of the cost of the project, with a maximum of \$200,000 per grant. Groups or organizations eligible for lake management planning grants may also apply for grants to support lake management projects. Eligible activities include: (a) the purchase of land or conservation easements if the purchase will substantially contribute to the protection or improvement of a lake or natural lake ecosystem's water quality; (b) wetland restoration; (c) development of local regulations or ordinances that will protect or improve the water quality of a lake or natural ecosystem; (d) an activity that is approved by the DNR, and that is needed to implement a recommendation made as a result of a plan to improve or protect the quality of water in a lake or natural lake ecosystem.

GOVERNOR

Establish a Premier Lakes program that allows lake associations which meet certain criteria to receive lake management planning grant funding for up to 75% of project costs, but no more than \$25,000 per grant. The current maximum allowable planning grant award of \$10,000 would remain for all other qualifying lake associations.

In addition, require DNR to give higher priority to any group that is designated a premier lake association in awarding grants under the lake management grant program (which provides for up to 75% of the cost of a project up to \$200,000 per grant). Expand the provisions of the lake management grant program to include restoration of shoreline habitat as an eligible activity. Permit DNR to expend up to \$5,000 each fiscal year for the design and manufacturing of signs, to be provided to premier lake associations, that identify the lakes for which the premier lake associations were incorporated.

To qualify for the premier lakes program, lake associations must be incorporated and meet all of the requirements of a qualified lake association. In addition, the premier lake associations would need to demonstrate that they (a) have as paid members at least 50% of the individuals that meet either of the following criteria: (1) own property on or within one mile of the lake; or (2) that live on or within one mile of the lake for at least one month of the year (but no less than 25 members); (b) held at least two regularly scheduled meetings of its members each year; (c) distribute at least one annual newsletter; (d) promote annual monitoring of private sewage systems, and encourage real estate owners who are eligible to be members to upgrade failing systems; (e) promote the use of phosphate-free or other environmentally safe soaps by residents and real estate owners who are eligible to be members; (f) promote water safety and the protection of the natural fish population in, as well as the wildlife population near, each inland lake for which the association was incorporated; (g) cooperate with any local, state, or federal programs that provide support for the protection or improvement of any of the inland lakes for which the association was incorporated; and (h) actively raise funds for all of the following activities: (1) signs at public access sites on inland lakes providing information on nuisance species; (2) washing stations for boats or boating equipment; (3) in-kind contributions to assist the DNR to control aquatic nuisance species; (4) manuals addressing the responsibility for managing the resources of inland lakes; and (5) surveys to monitor the water quality of inland lakes. Further, the bill would repeal the statutory \$10 minimum and \$25 maximum annual membership fee and grant DNR the authority to establish the minimum and maximum allowable membership fee requirements for eligibility by rule.

Expand the eligibility requirements to apply for a lake management planning grant to include school districts, provided that the district adopts a resolution to conduct a lake management planning project that would provide information or education on the use of lakes or natural lake ecosystems, on the quality of water in lakes, or on the quality of natural lake ecosystems. In addition, the school district would be required to allow another eligible recipient of lakes planning grants to cooperate with the school on the planning project. The scope of eligible planning projects would be expanded to include programs and materials that promote the

monitoring of private sewage systems, a reduction in the use of environmentally harmful chemicals, promotion of water safety activities and protection of natural lake ecosystems.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Under the bill, lake protection planning and management grants are funded at the base level of \$2,675,400 annually from the water resources account of the conservation fund.

2. According to the *Wisconsin Lake List* directory, there are currently 710 organizations whose specific purpose focuses on lake issues. Of these, 435 are lake associations. Lake districts and sanitary districts comprise 247 (or 35%) of the remaining organizations. The Department indicates that it is not uncommon for lake communities to undertake management efforts using different organizational forms, including public inland lake districts, as well as through town or county governments and non-profit organizations. These entities are all currently eligible for lake planning and management grants. Often, several organizations may collaborate to manage a lake in the manner desired under the "premier" designation. Broadening the language to include all lake organizations and municipalities as eligible applicants for premier status would increase opportunities for communities without an active lake association.

3. Under the bill, it would be difficult for existing associations to meet the requirements to qualify as a premier lake association. Specifically, the membership requirement may be prohibitive (requiring one-half of property owners within one mile of the lake, or individuals who live within one mile of the lake at least one month of the year to be members). When consulted, DNR was not able to readily identify an existing lake association that met all of the criteria for membership eligibility. It may be argued that the intent of the provision may be better accomplished if instead of defining qualifications in terms of public support (as demonstrated through membership requirements) and level of activity (as demonstrated through actions and programs), the applicants for premier status were required to demonstrate public support and commitment to lake protection through qualifications appropriate to their organizational structure. Since qualifications for lake associations are the only criteria currently provided for under the bill, additional criteria expanding eligibility qualifications could be addressed by DNR through administrative rule. Alternatively, the provision could be deleted at this time. DNR and interested groups could advance future legislation if statutory eligibility criteria for the various organizations is developed.

4. For fiscal year 1999-00, DNR awarded grants totaling over \$1.9 million to 20 local governments and non-profit lake management organizations for lake restoration and protection projects. Grants amounts ranged from \$10,950 to three communities receiving the maximum grant award of \$200,000. The Department indicates that approximately \$1 million in grant requests went unfunded. While base funding for this program did increase by \$742,200 in 2000-01, demand continues to exceed available funding. From this perspective, it could be argued that increasing the amount of the maximum available planning grant for premier lakes may decrease the number of projects (and communities) that receive funding for lake management projects. In addition, it may increase the size and scope of eligible projects that communities are willing to undertake based on

the possibility of receiving a higher level of funding. Further, expanding eligible projects to include restoration of shoreline habitat can also be expected to increase demand for grants under the program. Finally, including schools as eligible grant recipients is likely to increase applications for funding under the lake management planning grants program. From this perspective, expanding program eligibility may not be desirable.

5. On the other hand, since the lake planning grants programs are competitive, it could be argued that increased demand should still result in only the most worthy projects being funded (within appropriated amounts). However, under the bill, DNR would be required to give priority to grant applications from premier lake associations.

6. The bill would also expand eligibility for lake management planning grants to include schools working in cooperation with other currently eligible partners in recognition of the benefits of involving additional members of a lake community in efforts to study water quality and natural lake ecosystems. From DNR's perspective, this eligibility expansion would have the dual effect of increasing local interest in lake management planning projects as well as communicating lake stewardship values to participating students.

7. DNR indicates that, in the past, it has received requests from a variety of different groups (including non-profit conservation organizations, lake associations, and local governments) expressing an interest in working cooperatively to undertake larger scale shoreline habitat restoration projects. Currently, DNR does not have the authority to provide lake grants for this purpose (though it is an eligible project for river grants). The bill would expand eligible activities to include shoreline habitat restoration in order to encourage the continued formation and growth of organizational partnerships focused on improving lake environments. However, expanding eligibility to school districts and to shoreline restoration will also increase demand for fixed program funding.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

A. Premier Lakes

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to establish a Premier Lakes program that allows lake associations (which meet specified criteria) to receive lake management planning grant funding for up to 75% of project costs, but not more than \$25,000 per grant. In addition, require DNR to give higher priority to any group that is designated a premier lake association in awarding grants under the lake management grant program (which provides for up to 75% of the cost of a project up to \$200,000 per grant). Further, permit DNR to expend up to \$5,000 each fiscal year for the design and manufacturing of signs, to be provided to premier lake associations, that identify the lakes for which the premier lake associations were incorporated.

2. Approve the Governor's recommendation to establish a Premier Lakes program, as modified to expand eligibility to include counties, municipalities, non-profit conservation organizations, town sanitary districts, and public inland lake protection and rehabilitation districts, as well as qualified lake associations. Further, delete the statutory criteria in the bill and instead

specify that DNR promulgate administrative rules identifying eligibility requirements that the applicants for premier status would be required to meet, including an appropriate demonstration of public support and commitment to lake protection as these would apply to their organizational structure.

3. Delete the requirement that DNR give a higher priority to lake management grant applications from any group that is designated "premier".

4. Maintain current law.

B. Lake Management Grants

1. Approve the Governor's recommendation to expand the provisions of the lake management grant program to include restoration of shoreline habitat as an eligible activity. Further, expand eligibility requirements for lake management planning grants to school districts, provided that the district adopts a resolution to conduct an eligible lake management planning project, and the school district allows another eligible recipient of lakes planning grants to cooperate with the school on the planning project.

2. Maintain current law.

MO# A-4, B-1

Prepare	BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	A
	WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
	COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS 0

NATURAL RESOURCES AND AGRICULTURE, TRADE AND CONSUMER PROTECTION

South Fork of the Hay River

Motion:

Move to extend the statutorily designated South Fork of the Hay River priority watershed sunset date from June 30, 2001 to June 30, 2006 in order to provide additional cost-share grants to landowners in the watershed. Further, require DATCP to provide funding to counties for staffing in the South Fork of the Hay River priority watershed in the same manner as other continuing priority watersheds receive staffing funds.

Note:

The South Fork of the Hay River priority watershed area (in Barron, Dunn, Polk and St. Croix Counties) was statutorily designated a priority watershed until June 30, 2001, in the 1997 biennial budget act. The South Fork watershed area is exempt from nonpoint requirements related to cost-share rates and the types of best management projects installed. Instead, cost-shares are paid based on the amount of pollution reduced. Dunn County, with assistance from DNR, established guidelines for this pilot project related to cost-share rates and types of practices to be installed. At the completion of the project, DNR will evaluate the cost-effectiveness and the nonpoint source water pollution reduction associated with this pilot project. The watershed was originally designated priority in 1993. Extending this pilot project would use some revenues that would otherwise be available from DNR's competitive nonpoint grant program. The pilot project was allotted \$180,600 for landowner cost-share grants in 2000 and \$175,500 to the counties for staffing grants.

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

ENVIRONMENTAL IMPROVEMENT FUND

Federal Rural Communities Hardship Grant Program

Motion:

Move to modify the federal rural communities hardship grant program that is part of the clean water fund program as follows:

1. Delete the current eligibility criterion that requires that on the date the municipality applies for assistance, the unemployment rate for the county in which the municipality is located exceeds by 1% or more the average yearly national unemployment rate most recently reported by the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics.
2. Specify that if federal financial hardship assistance is not fully allocated at the time the clean water fund financial hardship assistance funding list is published, DNR may accept an application for federal hardship assistance after June 30.

Note:

The clean water fund program within the environmental improvement fund includes a financial hardship component for communities that have relatively low median household income and relatively high annual residential wastewater user charges. In March, 1999, DNR received a grant of \$1,300,000 under the federal rural communities hardship grant program. DNR would provide the required state match of \$67,800 for wastewater treatment projects under the program by reallocating existing general obligation bonding authority.

Municipalities are eligible for federal assistance for project costs that are eligible for assistance under the current state hardship program if the municipality meets all of the following criteria: (a) the population of the municipality is 3,000 or less; (b) the municipality is a rural

community, as determined by DNR; (c) the municipality lacks centralized wastewater treatment or collection systems or needs improvements to onsite wastewater treatment systems and federal financial hardship assistance will improve public health or reduce an environmental risk; (d) the per capita annual income of residents to be served by the project does not exceed 80% of the national per capita annual income, based on the most recent data available from the U.S. Census Bureau; and (e) on the date that the municipality applies for assistance, the unemployment rate for the county in which the municipality is located exceeds by 1% or more the average yearly national unemployment rate most recently reported by the federal Bureau of Labor Statistics.

DNR is authorized to include eligible applicants under the federal financial hardship assistance program on the same funding list that ranks applicants under the state hardship program. The application deadline for the state and federal financial hardship assistance programs is June 30 of the preceding fiscal year.

The U.S. EPA deadline for making binding commitments of grant funds under the program is June 30, 2001. (EPA extended the deadline from March 30, 2000.) DNR has identified one potential project under the current criteria, and has identified several municipalities that would qualify if the unemployment criterion would be removed. DNR indicates that the Department will probably request EPA approval of an extension of the deadline to make binding commitments of grant funds under the program to June 30, 2002. DNR also indicates that EPA might be willing to waive the unemployment criterion for Wisconsin because of the state's low unemployment rates.

The motion would delete the unemployment criterion from the statutory eligibility requirements for federal rural hardship grant assistance. It would also allow applicants to submit an application after June 30 if federal financial hardship assistance is not fully allocated at the time the clean water fund financial hardship assistance funding list is published.

MO#			
BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS

NATURAL RESOURCES – WATER QUALITY

Dam Inspection and Safety Program

Motion:

Move to eliminate statutory provisions that require DNR to inspect each large dam which is maintained or operated in or across navigable waters every ten years. Instead, require public and private owners of dams to have the dam inspected every ten years by a private engineering firm from a list of Department-approved inspectors. Require the owner to submit a record of the inspection to DNR within six months after the inspection. Specify that dam inspections performed by DNR prior to July 1, 2002, qualify under the ten year requirement.

Further, require DNR to work collaboratively with DOA and DATCP to establish an on-line, reverse-auction bid site where private and public dam owners may post requests for inspections and receive bids from potential inspectors.

Delete \$149,300 GPR in 2001-02 and \$199,000 GPR in 2002-03 to delete 3.5 positions related to dam inspections.

[Change to Base: -\$348,300 GPR and -3.50 GPR positions]
[Change to Bill: -\$348,300 GPR and -3.50 positions]

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

Motion #300 AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

DNR -- WATER QUALITY

Retaining Wall Construction Allowances

Motion:

Move to allow a riparian owner to construct a retaining wall (a vertical wall designed to prevent riparian land from eroding into a navigable water) above the ordinary high water mark regardless of any other current regulations or permitting requirements, if: (a) the area exposed by grading or removal of top soil does not exceed 10,000 square feet; (b) any material removed between the retaining wall and the ordinary high water mark during construction will be replaced with comparable material or riprap within 30 days; and (c) the retaining wall meets the following construction standards: (1) the wall incorporates adequate bracing and anchors to ensure structural stability; (2) a layer of gravel is placed in back of the landward side of the retaining wall in a filter fabric lining to facilitate drainage; (3) the base of the wall extends to a sufficient depth into the waterway bed to ensure structural stability and prevent wall failure; and (4) the ends of the wall are placed into the bank to prevent erosion or scouring.

Further, allow a riparian owner to construct a retaining wall in a navigable waterway in the Wolf River and Fox River basin area (defined to consist of all of Winnebago County; the portion and shoreline of Lake Poygan in Waushara County; the area south of STH 21 and east of STH 49 in Waushara County; that portion of Calumet County in the Lake Winnebago watershed; all of Fond du Lac County north of STH 23; that portion of Outagamie County south and east of USH 41; that portion of Waupaca County that includes the town of Mukwa, city of New London, town of Caledonia, town of Fremont, and the portion and shoreline of Partridge Lake and the Wolf River in the town of Weyauwega) that extends beyond the ordinary high water mark without obtaining a DNR waterway permit under s. 30.12 if it meets all of the standards outlined below.

Require that the retaining wall be either a new or replacement wall located in a connected artificial enlargement to a navigable water, or be a replacement of an existing retaining wall in a navigable water. Further require that if the retaining wall is a replacement wall, that it be constructed not more than two feet waterward of any existing retaining wall. Require riprap be placed at the base of the waterward side of the retaining wall up to the waterline, except for mooring locations where the level of riprap can be reduced to allow adequate space for the mooring of one or more watercraft. In addition to meeting the construction standards specified in 1-4 above, require that the retaining wall be constructed of treated wood and built at the lesser of: (a) the existing grade, (b) four feet above the ordinary high water mark, or (c) only high enough

to prevent overtopping by wave action.

Note:

Under current law, structures and deposits may not be placed in navigable waters without a waterway permit from DNR.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 15 NO 1 ABS

NATURAL RESOURCES -- WATER QUALITY

Lake Koshkonong Comprehensive Project

Motion:

Move to allow the Rock-Koshkonong Lake District, upon DNR approval, to implement a project developed and approved by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers to place structures and/or fill on the bed of Lake Koshkonong for any of the following purposes: (a) to improve navigation or to provide navigation aids; (b) to restore or protect wetland habitat or water quality; (c) to create, restore or protect fish and wildlife habitat; or (d) to enhance the natural aesthetic value or improve the recreational use of the lake. Specify that the location of any structure or fill placed as part of this project be located within the area that consists of sections 10, 13, 18, 19, 20, 24, 33, 34, 35 of T5N, R13. Further, require that any structure or fill placed as part of the project may only be used as a site for the placement of navigational aids approved by DNR, for activities to protect or improve wildlife or fish habitat, including the placement of DNR-approved fish or wildlife habitat structures, or for open space for recreational activities for the public, subject to reasonable restrictions approved by the District. In addition, exempt the District from meeting general waterway permitting requirements under s. 31.12 of the statutes for the implementation or maintenance of the project.

Require the District to submit plans and specifications before beginning any activity involving the placement of a structure or fill as part of the project to DNR. Require the Department to comply with current law environmental impact requirements and to review the plans and specifications and gather any other information necessary to effectively evaluate the structural and functional integrity of the proposed structures and fill. Further, require DNR to hold a public informational meeting to discuss the proposal and to approve the plan with conditions it determines necessary to protect the public interest in water, if the Department finds that the structure or fill is structurally and functionally sound and that the structure or fill will further a purpose specified under (a) to (d) above, and will not: (a) materially effect the flood flow capacity of the Rock River; (b) materially obstruct navigation; (c) cause material injury to the rights of an owner of lands underlying any such structure or fill or of riparian lands affected by the project; (d) cause environmental pollution; or (e) be detrimental to the public interest.

Require the Rock-Koshkonong Lake District to maintain all structures and fill that are part of the project to assure that the structures and fill do not impair the safety of the public and remain in compliance with above requirements. Provide that the District owns all structures or fill that are part of the project and that they are under DNR jurisdiction. In addition, prohibit the District from transferring ownership of any part of the project unless DNR provides written approval and the

transfer is to a public entity. Require DNR to monitor the Rock-Koshkonong Lake District project to assure that the project is furthering a purpose for which it is authorized. Further, give DNR continuing jurisdiction over the project and allow DNR to order the structure be modified, repaired or removed if necessary to comply with above requirements.

Note:

The motion is modeled on a current law provision regarding DNR's Lake Winnebago Comprehensive Project to address water quality concerns and restore fish, wildlife and wetland habitat primarily on Lakes Winnebago, Butte des Morts, Winneconne and Poygan. However, no funding would be provided under the provision. To date, DNR has spent approximately \$400,000 in general fund supported bonding, \$1.2 million in conservation fund supported bonding and \$100,000 SEG from the conservation fund on the Lake Winnebago Comprehensive Project. In addition, the project has received financial support from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

MO# _____

BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

AYE 16 NO 0 ABS _____

NATURAL RESOURCES -- WATER QUALITY

Recreational Boating Projects -- Dredging and Dock Wall Repair

Motion:

Move to earmark \$340,000 in 2001-02 from recreational boating project aids for dredging the area of the Manitowoc River where the submarine U.S.S. Cobia is moored, and to make dock wall repairs and improvements to the mooring area of the Cobia. Direct DNR to provide a grant for this amount to the City of Manitowoc.

MO#			
BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 8 NO 8 ABS _____

NATURAL RESOURCES -- WATER QUALITY

Regulation of High-Capacity Wells

Motion:

Move to adopt the provisions of SSA 1 (LRBs0046/1) to SB 44 relating to the authority of the Department of Natural Resources to regulate high-capacity wells on or after September 1, 2000.

In addition, request the Legislative Council to study the issue of the need to amend the statutes to address the impacts of groundwater usage. In addition to legislative representation, direct that the Study Committee include members that have an interest in agriculture, surface water usage, business and relevant science including experts from the United States Geological Survey, the Wisconsin Geological and Natural History Survey and the Groundwater Center at the University of Wisconsin - Stevens Point.

Note:

The statutes require that any well proposed to be constructed, installed or operated to withdraw water from underground sources for any purpose where the capacity and rate of withdrawal of all wells on one property is in excess of 100,000 gallons a day must receive the approval of DNR. DNR may impose conditions related to location, depth, pumping capacity, rate of flow and ultimate use so that the water supply of any public utility engaged in furnishing water to or for the public will not be impaired.

Senate Substitute Amendment 1 to Senate Bill 44 would require DNR to provide in each approval for a high capacity well that the water withdrawn from the well may not be used to produce bottled water unless DNR approves use of the well for that purpose. SSA 1 to SB 44 would require DNR to withhold, condition, or modify its approval in order to minimize adverse effects to the quality or quantity of waters of the state caused by a high-capacity well used to produce bottled drinking water. The substitute amendment would also require DNR to prepare an environmental impact statement for each decision by the Department to approve the use of a well to

produce bottled drinking water. These provisions would not apply to a withdrawal of water by a public utility engaged in furnishing water to or for the public.

SSA 1 to SB 44 would apply retroactively to an approval issued by DNR for a high-capacity well on or after September 1, 2000. DNR would be required to modify an approval issued by DNR for a high-capacity well on or after September 1, 2000, in order to incorporate into the approval the conditions required under the substitute amendment.

The motion would also request the Legislative Council to conduct a study related to the impacts of groundwater usage.

MO#

BURKE	Y	N	A
DECKER	Y	N	A
MOORE	Y	N	A
SHIBILSKI	Y	N	A
PLACHE	Y	N	A
WIRCH	Y	N	A
DARLING	Y	N	A
WELCH	Y	N	A
GARD	Y	N	A
KAUFERT	Y	N	A
ALBERS	Y	N	A
DUFF	Y	N	A
WARD	Y	N	A
HUEBSCH	Y	N	A
HUBER	Y	N	A
COGGS	Y	N	A

AYE 14 NO 2 ABS _____

NATURAL RESOURCES – WATER QUALITY

Recreational Boating Projects -- Portage Canal

Motion:

Move to earmark \$350,000 SEG annually in the 2001-03 biennium from recreational boating project aids for the renovation and repair of the Portage Canal. Direct DNR to provide a grant for this amount in each year to the City of Portage.

MO#			
BURKE	(Y)	(N)	A
DECKER	(Y)	(N)	A
MOORE	(Y)	(N)	A
SHIBILSKI	(Y)	(N)	A
PLACHE	(Y)	(N)	A
WIRCH	(Y)	(N)	A
DARLING	(Y)	(N)	A
WELCH	(Y)	(N)	A
GARD	(Y)	(N)	A
KAUFERT	(Y)	(N)	A
ALBERS	(Y)	(N)	A
DUFF	(Y)	(N)	A
WARD	(Y)	(N)	A
HUEBSCH	(Y)	(N)	A
HUBER	(Y)	(N)	A
COGGS	(Y)	(N)	A

AYE 7 NO 9 ABS _____

NATURAL RESOURCES

Water Quality

LFB Summary Items for Which No Issue Paper Has Been Prepared

Item #	Title	MO#			
4	Competitive Nonpoint Grant Selection Criteria	BURKE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
5	Lake District Nonpoint Staffing Grants	DECKER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
7	Storm Water Discharge Permits and Enforcement	MOORE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
9	Wetlands Mapping	SHIBILSKI	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
10	Great Lakes Remediation Bonding	PLACHE	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
11	Drinking Water -- Surveillance of Noncommunity Water System	WIRCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
12	Septage Management Staff	DARLING	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
13	FACTS System	WELCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
14	Laboratory Certification Staff	GARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		KAUFERT	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		ALBERS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		DUFF	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		WARD	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		HUEBSCH	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		HUBER	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A
		COGGS	<input checked="" type="radio"/>	N	A

LFB Summary Items to be Introduced as Separate Legislation

Item #	Title	AYE	NO	ABS
19	Fish Farm Water Usage Exemptions	16	0	0
20	Water Pollution Discharge Permit Variance to Water Quality Standards			



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873

May 16, 2001

TO: Members
Joint Committee on Finance

FROM: Bob Lang, Director

SUBJECT: Budget Issue Papers

Attached are 2001-03 budget issue papers, prepared by this office, on the following agencies:

- Public Service Commission -- Agencywide
- Historical Society
- Department of Administration -- General Agency Provisions
- Department of Health and Family Services -- Community Aids and Supportive Living

These agencies have been scheduled for executive action by the Joint Committee on Finance on Friday, May 18. The meeting will begin at 9:00 a.m. in Room 411 South, State Capitol.

BL/sas
Attachments

Baumgart for
Shibitski
all day

2001-03 BUDGET PAPERS

May 18, 2001

Paper #

Public Service Commission -- Agencywide

- 780 Electronic Filing of Documents
- 781 Stray Voltage Research Funding

Historical Society

- 535 Historical Legacy Trust Fund

Administration -- General Agency Provisions

- 125 Railroad Crossing Hearing Examiner
- 126 Transfer of Electrician Position to the Department of Administration
- 127 Division of Vocational Rehabilitation -- Position Transfer to DOA
- 128 Transfer of the State Fair Park Police Function to DOA
- 129 Task Force on Technology and Electoral Participation
- 130 State and Local Government Policy Coordination
- 131 Minor Policy and Technical Change -- School District Data and Video Line Connection Fees
- 132 Agency Appropriations Consolidations
- 133 Badger State Games Assistance
- 134 Funding Conversion of Certain Public Benefits Administrative Costs
- 135 Office of Federal-State Relations in Washington, D.C.
- 136 Volunteer Firefighter Service Award Program

Health and Family Services -- Community Aids and Supportive Living

- 515 Community Aids
- 516 Community Services for Individuals with Mental Illness
- 517 Urban/Rural Substance Abuse Treatment Grants for Women and Substance Abuse Services Grants
- 518 Family Support Program
- 519 Birth-to-Three Program

2001-03 BUDGET PAPERS

Cumulative List Thru May 18, 2001

Paper #

Administration -- General Agency Provisions

- 125 Railroad Crossing Hearing Examiner
- 126 Transfer of Electrician Position to the Department of Administration
- 127 Division of Vocational Rehabilitation -- Position Transfer to DOA
- 128 Transfer of the State Fair Park Police Function to DOA
- 129 Task Force on Technology and Electoral Participation
- 130 State and Local Government Policy Coordination
- 131 Minor Policy and Technical Change -- School District Data and Video Line Connection Fees
- 132 Agency Appropriations Consolidations
- 133 Badger State Games Assistance
- 134 Funding Conversion of Certain Public Benefits Administrative Costs
- 135 Office of Federal-State Relations in Washington, D.C.
- 136 Volunteer Firefighter Service Award Program

Administration -- Information Technology

Adolescent Pregnancy Prevention and Pregnancy Services Board

Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection -- Departmentwide and Resource Management

- 205 Information Technology
- 206 Federal Grant Levels
- 207 Convert Program Revenue Appropriations to Continuing

Arts Board

Board of Commissioner of Public Lands

- 230 Reimbursements for Certain Administrative Expenses

Paper #

Child Abuse and Neglect Prevention Board

- 270 Primary Prevention Staff
- 271 "Celebrate Children" License Plate Revenue and Segregated Revenue Reestimate
- 272 Miscellaneous Budget Adjustments

Circuit Courts

- 275 Court Interpreters
- 276 Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- GPR-Earned Reestimates
- 277 Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- Chapter 20 Schedule

Commerce -- Departmentwide and Economic Development

- 280 Forest Product Marketing
- 281 International Liaison Funding
- 282 Administrative Position Reallocation
- 283 Economic Development Administration Consolidation
- 284 Community-Based Economic Development Program Conversion to New Economy for Wisconsin Program
- 285 Rural and Minority Business Economic Development Programs -- Repayments Appropriations

Commerce -- Building and Environmental Regulation

- 300 Transfer Mobile Home Park Water and Sewer Service Regulation from the Public Service Commission to Commerce
- 301 Aviation Fuel Petroleum Inspection Fee Allowance
- 302 PECFA -- Revenue Obligation Authority
- 303 PECFA Staff
- 304 PECFA -- High-Cost Sites
- 305 PECFA -- Interest Cost Reimbursement
- 306 PECFA -- Farm Tank Eligibility
- 307 Groundwater Monitoring Near Onsite Wastewater Treatment Systems
- 308 Transfer Code Consultant Section to Administrative Services Division
- 309 Fire Dues Distribution

Court of Appeals

- 375 Staff Attorneys
- 376 Minor Policy and Technical Changes -- GPR-Earned Reestimates

Paper #

Electronic Government

400 Creation of the Department of Electronic Government

Employee Trust Funds

- 410 Benefits Payment System Redesign
- 411 Participant Services Staffing Increases
- 412 Customer Call Center Enhancements
- 413 Technical Change -- Retired Employees Benefit Supplement Reestimate
- 414 Group Insurance Board Authority to Modify or Expand State Employee Group Health Insurance Coverage
- 415 Additional Resources for Act 11 Implementation Costs
- 416 Group Health Insurance Ombudsperson Position
- 417 Funding for Accumulated Sick Leave Conversion Credits for Certain Retired State Employees

Employment Relations

- 420 Advance Labor Management Training Costs
- 421 Funding of Shared Human Resources System

Employment Relations Commission

- 425 Arbitration Award Affecting City of Milwaukee Police Officers
- 426 Staff Support for Collective Bargaining Training Activities

Environmental Improvement Fund

- 430 Clean Water Fund General Obligation and Revenue Bonding Authority, Present Value Subsidy Limit and Priority List Allocation
- 431 Environmental Improvement Fund Debt Service
- 432 Wisconsin Fund Residual Bonding Authority
- 433 Clean Water Fund - Unsewered Communities

Financial Institutions

- 440 Technology Initiatives
- 441 Business Association Fees

Governor

Paper #

- 455 Children's Cabinet Board
- 456 Rural Policy Advisor Position

Health and Family Services -- Community Aids and Supportive Living

- 515 Community Aids
- 516 Community Services for Individuals with Mental Illness
- 517 Urban/Rural Substance Abuse Treatment Grants for Women and Substance Abuse Services Grants
- 518 Family Support Program
- 519 Birth-to-Three Program

Higher Educational Aids Board

- 530 Academic Excellence Scholarship Program
- 531 Wisconsin Higher Education Grant and Tuition Grant Programs

Historical Society

- 535 Historical Legacy Trust Fund

Insurance

- 540 Standard Budget Adjustments
- 541 Information Technology -- Programming Services
- 542 Medigap Helpline
- 543 Treatment of Certain Revenues
- 544 Authority to Set Fees by Rule

Investment Board

Judicial Commission

Lieutenant Governor

Lower Wisconsin State Riverway Board

Marquette Dental School

Paper #

Military Affairs -- Agencywide

- 605 National Guard Tuition Grant Program
- 606 Creation of a Wisconsin Naval Militia

Military Affairs -- Emergency Management

- 610 Reimbursement of Certain County and Municipal Worker's Compensation and Liability Costs Due to Emergency Management Activities
- 611 Emergency Response Equipment Funding

Minnesota-Wisconsin Boundary Area Commission

Miscellaneous Appropriations

- 620 Repeal of Capitol Offices Relocation Appropriation
- 621 Buildout Costs for Senate, Retirement Committees and Law Library
- 622 Space Rental Costs for Law Library

Natural Resources -- Fish, Wildlife and Recreation

- 645 GPR-Supported Conservation Wardens
- 646 Fisheries Management Staffing
- 647 Wildlife Management Staffing
- 648 Managing Wildlife Diseases
- 649 Venison Processing Donation Program
- 650 Automated License Issuance System
- 651 Forestry and Law Enforcement Radio Equipment
- 652 Car-Killed Deer
- 653 Fuel Tax Transfer Reestimates
- 654 Snowmobile Registration Fees and Trail Aids
- 655 State Snowmobile Education and Enforcement
- 656 Dredging to Improve Great Lakes Recreational Access

Natural Resources -- Water Quality

- 675 Nonpoint Program Funding
- 676 Land and Water Resource Management and Rural Nonpoint Bonding
- 677 Urban Nonpoint and Flood Control Funding
- 678 Wetland Compensatory Mitigation Staff

Paper #

- 679 Wisconsin Waters Initiative
- 680 Dam Safety Program
- 681 Invasive Species
- 682 Premier Lakes Program

Personnel Commission

Program Supplements

- 715 Private Lease Space Supplements -- Appropriation Structure
- 716 Private Lease Space Supplements -- DOA Directed Moves
- 717 Private Lease Space Supplements -- Rent Increases Component
- 718 State-Owned Space Rent Supplements

Public Service Commission -- Agencywide

- 780 Electronic Filing of Documents
- 781 Stray Voltage Research Funding

Regulation and Licensing

- 790 Information Technology Initiatives
- 791 Examination Fee Vendor Payment Reestimate
- 792 Revised Agency Credential Fees
- 793 GPR-Earned Credited from Criminal Background Check Fees
- 794 Technical Change -- GPR-Earned Reestimate

Revenue -- Tax Administration

- 800 Administration of Local Exposition Tax
- 801 Business Tax Registration Administration and Debt Collection Funding
- 802 Status of Integrated Tax System Implementation

Revenue -- Lottery Administration

- 810 Lottery Sales, Retailer Compensation, Vendor Fees Reestimates and Lottery and Gaming Tax Credit Reestimate
- 811 Repeal GPR Appropriations for Lottery Operations

Secretary of State

Paper #

820 GPR-Earned Reestimate

Shared Revenue and Tax Relief -- Direct Aid Payments

825 Shared Revenue Modifications and Expenditure Restraint Funding Level

Shared Revenue and Tax Relief -- Property Taxation

Shared Revenue and Tax Relief -- Local Revenue Options

State Treasurer

855 Repayment of GPR Start-Up Administrative Funding -- College Savings and College Tuition & Expenses Programs

856 Administrative Funding for College Savings and College Tuition and Expenses Programs

857 Appropriations Structure -- College Savings and College Tuition and Expenses Programs

Supreme Court

860 Court Commissioner Judicial Education

Technology for Educational Achievement in Wisconsin Board

870 Public Library Financial Assistance for Communications Hardware

871 E-rate Funding

872 Eligibility for Secured Correctional Facilities

873 Eligibility for Charter Schools

874 Ameritech Settlement

Tobacco Control Board

880 Grant Funding

881 Staff

Tobacco Settlement Securitization

885 Discussion of Tobacco Settlement Securitization

Paper #

Tourism

- 890 Kickapoo Valley Reserve Law Enforcement Funding
- 891 Expand Heritage Tourism Grant Program
- 892 DNR Tourism Support

Transportation -- Motor Vehicles

- 930 Computer Database Redesign
- 931 Automated Oversize/Overweight Permit Issuance System
- 932 Special License Plate Issuance Fees

Transportation -- State Patrol

- 935 DNR Payments for DOT Radio Services

Transportation -- Other Divisions

- 940 Safe-Ride Grant Program
- 941 Funding for Payments for Municipal Services

University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics Authority

- 945 Bonding Authority

University of Wisconsin Hospital and Clinics Board

Veterans Affairs -- Homes and Facilities for Veterans

- 995 Standard Budget Adjustments - Night and Weekend Differential
- 996 Supplies and Services
- 997 Staffing at the Veterans Home at King

Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority

- 1005 Wisconsin Development Reserve Fund

Wisconsin Technical College System

- 1010 Technical and Occupational Program Grants
- 1011 Capacity Grant Program Transfer and Funding Reduction
- 1012 General Aids for Technical College Districts