



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

One East Main, Suite 301 • Madison, WI 53703 • (608) 266-3847 • Fax: (608) 267-6873
Email: fiscal.bureau@legis.wisconsin.gov • Website: <http://legis.wisconsin.gov/lfb>

May 12, 2015

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #136

Nonpoint Account Management and Conservation Staffing (Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection)

[LFB 2015-17 Budget Summary: Page 51, #1 (part) and Page 60, #11]

CURRENT LAW

Nonpoint Account. The nonpoint account is one of two components of the segregated (SEG) environmental fund, the other account being the environmental management account. The nonpoint account supports state and local programs to identify and address nonpoint source water pollution, which is water pollution not from a defined source such as a wastewater treatment plant. Nonpoint source pollution abatement programs are intended to address runoff in rural or agricultural settings, as well as in urban settings from lawns, parking lots and other areas of development.

The nonpoint account funds two basic types of grants to assist local governments. First, the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) makes grants to county land conservation departments for costs associated with land and water conservation staff. Grants are generally intended to provide for costs of up to three staff persons at rates of 100% funding for a county's first position, 70% funding for a county's second position, and 50% for a third or subsequent position.

Second, DATCP and the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) make grants to landowners through counties, or directly to municipalities in some programs, for the installation of structures and practices to abate nonpoint source water pollution. In most cases, state law requires a minimum offer of cost-sharing if agricultural landowners are to be required to modify existing practices or structures to abate nonpoint source water pollution. This share typically must be at least 70% of the cost of installation. Construction projects for the management of urban storm water runoff are generally cost-shared at 50% of eligible project costs, while urban planning projects are eligible for 70% cost sharing.

In addition, the nonpoint account supports approximately 38 positions in DATCP and DNR related to state regulation of nonpoint source water pollution and the administration of nonpoint source-related grant programs. DNR also is appropriated nonpoint SEG for contracts with the University of Wisconsin–Extension and other organizations for educational and research activities related to nonpoint source water pollution.

Agricultural Chemical Cleanup Fund. The agricultural chemical cleanup program (ACCP) provides reimbursements to commercial fertilizer blending facilities, commercial pesticide application businesses and farm sites that require remediation of fertilizer or non-household pesticide spills or soil contamination. The cleanup program is supported by the segregated agricultural chemical cleanup fund, often referred to as the ACCP fund. ACCP fund revenues consist primarily of surcharges on annual licenses or product registrations required of manufacturers or users of fertilizers or pesticides, as well as a surcharge on each ton of fertilizer sold in Wisconsin.

GOVERNOR

Transfer \$1,000,000 each year from the ACCP fund to the nonpoint account in the 2015-17 biennium. Also, standard budget adjustments would remove from base funding \$815,900 nonpoint SEG each year for county conservation staff, which was part of one-time funding provided for those purposes in the 2013-15 biennium under 2013 Act 20.

In addition, the administration reports DATCP and DNR will be directed to reduce administrative expenditures by 10% from appropriated levels in each year of the biennium. These amounts would reduce nonpoint SEG expenditures by approximately \$460,000 annually.

DISCUSSION POINTS

Nonpoint Account Background

1. The interfund SEG transfer and other expenditure reductions recommended by the Governor for nonpoint account appropriations are intended to address a structural imbalance between base account expenditures and typical annual revenues. Table 1 shows the structural condition of the nonpoint account on the basis of: (a) 2014-15 revenues and budgeted expenditures, including one-time funding of approximately \$0.8 million for county conservation staffing grants; and (b) base revenues and 2016-17 expenditures under the bill, not including reductions in administrative operations that may be required from DATCP and DNR, as these would not affect base appropriation levels. As shown in Table 1, the reduction in the nonpoint account structural imbalance estimated under the bill would be attributable to \$2.4 million in reductions in grants and contracts. These amounts include approximately \$0.8 million for each of county conservation staffing grants, DNR nonpoint source contracts, and DNR urban nonpoint source abatement grants. (DNR grant and contract reductions are discussed in a separate budget paper.)

TABLE 1**Nonpoint Account Structural Condition**

	<u>Amount (Millions \$)</u>	
	Base (2014-15)	Bill (2016-17)
Revenues		
GPR Transfer	\$11.1	\$11.1
Tipping Fees	<u>17.2</u>	<u>17.1</u>
Subtotal	\$28.3	\$28.2
Expenditures		
Debt Service	- \$16.0	- \$15.9
Grants and Contracts	- 10.7	- 8.3
Administrative Costs	<u>- 4.4</u>	<u>- 4.5</u>
Subtotal	- \$31.1	- \$28.7
Structural (Revenues less Expenditures)	- \$2.8	- \$0.5

2. The estimated nonpoint account condition under the bill is shown in the attachment. The account is estimated to begin the 2015-17 biennium with a cash balance of approximately \$18.1 million and an available balance of approximately \$5.4 million, the latter of which accounts for \$12.7 million already obligated to grantees or other pledged expenditures. The June 30, 2017, cash balance under the bill would be estimated at \$18.5 million, with an available balance of \$5.8 million. Despite a projected structural imbalance of \$0.5 million in 2016-17, the one-time interfund transfers would be estimated to result in an overall nonpoint balance increase of perhaps \$0.4 million during the 2015-17 biennium. Given the expected balance, the 10% administrative reductions identified by the administration would not be required. However, if these reductions were implemented, the June 30, 2017, balance would increase by approximately \$920,000.

Agricultural Chemical Funds Background

3. The ACCP fund condition is shown in Table 2. The ACCP fund is anticipated to have annual surpluses continuing into the 2015-17 biennium. It should be noted DATCP is directed by statute to adjust surcharges in the ACCP fund through administrative rule to maintain a balance of no more than \$2.5 million at the end of each fiscal year. Under both current law and the bill, DATCP would be anticipated to exceed the \$2.5 million threshold. Although the \$2.5 million threshold has been exceeded since June 30, 2014, DATCP has not begun the administrative rule process to reduce ACCP fees.

TABLE 2**Agricultural Chemical Cleanup Fund Condition**

	<u>Actual</u> <u>2013-14</u>	<u>Estimated</u> <u>2014-15</u>	<u>Bill</u> <u>2015-16</u>	<u>Bill</u> <u>2016-17</u>
Opening Balance	\$1,863,600	\$3,826,800	\$4,676,800	\$4,326,800
Total Revenue	3,038,100	2,350,000	2,150,000	2,150,000
Cleanup Expenditures	- 1,074,900	- 1,500,000	- 1,500,000	- 1,500,000
Transfers	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>- 1,000,000</u>	<u>- 1,000,000</u>
Closing Balance	\$3,826,800	\$4,676,800	\$4,326,800	\$3,976,800

4. The agrichemical management (ACM) fund condition is shown in Table 3. Like the ACCP fund, the ACM fund receives revenues from several fees on annual licenses or product registrations required of manufacturers or other uses of fertilizers, pesticides, and other agricultural chemicals. However, ACM revenues derive from a larger number of fees than do those of the ACCP fund. The ACM fund primarily supports DATCP agricultural chemical regulatory programs, but it also in part supports DATCP animal health programs, the UW Discovery Farms program, and other grants. The ACM fund supports 47.45 positions in 2014-15, including 42.25 positions for DATCP agricultural chemical regulatory responsibilities, 4.0 positions for DATCP animal health inspectors, and 1.2 positions for Discovery Farms. As shown in Table 3, the June 30, 2017, available balance of the ACM fund would be estimated at \$7.2 million.

TABLE 3**Agrichemical Management Fund Condition**

	<u>Actual</u> <u>2013-14</u>	<u>Estimated</u> <u>2014-15</u>	<u>Bill</u> <u>2015-16</u>	<u>Bill</u> <u>2016-17</u>
Opening Balance	\$6,090,300	\$6,322,200	\$6,709,400	\$7,010,100
Total Revenue	\$7,975,100	\$7,880,000	\$7,880,000	\$7,880,000
Expenditures				
Agrichemical program operations	5,979,900	6,668,000	6,875,700	6,880,900
DATCP animal health staff	352,500	352,500	359,900	359,900
Discovery Farms	247,900	248,400	249,800	0
Grants and miscellaneous	<u>412,900</u>	<u>223,900</u>	<u>93,900</u>	<u>93,900</u>
Subtotal	\$6,993,200	\$7,492,800	\$7,579,300	\$7,334,700
Transfers	<u>- 750,000</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>
Cash Balance	\$6,322,200	\$6,709,400	\$7,010,100	\$7,555,400
Encumbrances	-480,900	-350,000	-350,000	-350,000
Available Balance	\$5,841,300	\$6,359,400	\$6,660,100	\$7,205,400

5. Table 4 shows the structural condition of the ACM and ACCP funds under the bill, based on anticipated annual revenues and the Governor's expenditure recommendations for 2016-17. The ACM fund would be estimated to have annual revenues exceed base expenditures by about \$545,000 annually. However, this amount would be reduced to approximately \$300,000, if the UW Discovery Farms program were restored. The ACCP fund would be estimated to have annual revenues exceed annual expenditures (cleanup reimbursements) by about \$650,000 annually under the bill.

TABLE 4

Agricultural Chemical Funds Structural Condition

	Amount	
	<u>ACM</u>	<u>ACCP</u>
Revenues	\$7,880,000	\$2,150,000
Expenditures	<u>- 7,335,000</u>	<u>- 1,500,000</u>
Structural (Revenues less Expenditures)	\$545,000	\$650,000

County Conservation Staffing Grants

6. Each county by statute is to have a land conservation committee. A land conservation committee may provide for staffing to carry out the powers and responsibilities of the land conservation committee. These functions include the creation of a county plan, known as a land and water resource management (LWRM) plan, by which the county will achieve state standards for water quality and soil erosion. Counties with a DATCP-approved LWRM plan may obtain state cost-sharing funds to assist with funding: (a) county staff engaged in land and water conservation activities; and (b) the implementation or construction of conservation practices, primarily by agricultural landowners, to prevent soil erosion or limit runoff of nutrients or pollutants to the waters of the state. County conservation staff generally identify sites at which conservation practices would generate benefits for water quality or soil conservation, and arrange for funding for landowners from available sources.

7. County conservation staffing grants are funded by GPR and nonpoint SEG appropriations. Table 5 shows the recent appropriations levels for each fund source. Included in the table are reductions DATCP made administratively in the 2011-13 biennium to meet required lapses from GPR and PR appropriations. Also, \$998,600 SEG in 2013-14 and \$815,900 SEG in 2014-15 were appropriated to offset GPR reductions of the same amounts made in those years. The additional nonpoint SEG funding was, in turn, offset by transfers of \$650,000 in 2013-14 and \$1,300,000 in 2014-15 from the environmental management account of the environmental fund. It should be noted the base-level GPR and nonpoint SEG amounts budgeted totaled \$9,307,000 in each fiscal year from 2006 to 2009.

TABLE 5**County Conservation Staffing Grant Funding**

	<u>2011-12</u>	<u>2012-13</u>	<u>2013-14</u>	<u>2014-15</u>	<u>2015-16</u>	<u>2016-17</u>
GPR	\$3,843,100	\$3,843,100	\$2,844,500	\$3,027,200	\$3,027,200	\$3,027,200
GPR Lapse	- 1,100,400	- 280,400	0	0	0	0
Nonpoint SEG	<u>5,036,900</u>	<u>5,036,900</u>	<u>6,035,500</u>	<u>5,852,800</u>	<u>5,036,900</u>	<u>5,036,900</u>
Net Amount	\$7,779,600	\$8,599,600	\$8,880,000	\$8,880,000	\$8,064,100	\$8,064,100

8. For 2014, the most recent year for which county reporting has been made, DATCP reports counties supported 112 full-time equivalent positions with state funding. (Staffing levels for the 2014 calendar year would have used funding primarily from the 2013-14 fiscal year.) Counties report 193 positions were funded locally, such as through local property taxes or other revenues, and 36 positions were funded with miscellaneous other sources. Total county staffing has ranged from 335 positions to 366 positions since 2006, while state-funded county conservation positions have ranged from 107 positions to 148 positions.

General Discussion

9. DATCP officials and others have argued in the past against transferring or appropriating ACCP SEG for purposes other than agricultural chemical cleanups. Supporters of this position argue that as surcharges are imposed on a limited number of products, business licenses or activities, and as resulting cleanup reimbursements are limited generally to the same industries or facilities involved, diverting ACCP fund revenues is inappropriate. Several appropriations changes under 2013 Act 20 diverted former ACCP SEG appropriations for DATCP animal health staff and the UW Discovery Farms program to the agrichemical management (ACM) fund. It was argued by DATCP officials and others at that time that the ACM fund was more appropriate for supporting various purposes, as its revenues from agricultural chemical-related licenses or product sales are more diverse than the surcharges funding the ACCP fund.

10. On the other hand, it could be argued the ACCP fund is appropriate to provide support for the nonpoint account. Goals of nonpoint SEG-funded programs and grants include addressing the management and application of nutrients, including both synthetic fertilizers and animal manure, which can be detrimental to surface-water quality if improperly applied or insufficiently contained by filtration or containment mechanisms on agricultural fields. From this perspective, collections from fertilizer production and use may be appropriate to direct toward nonpoint source programs. The ACCP fund could further be argued as an appropriate transfer source, given the ACCP fund is projected to generate significant annual surpluses.

11. Preserving funding for the SWRM grants for county staffing retains personnel that provide landowners with expertise and technical assistance. Continuity in conservation staffing also may allow for available staff, in some cases, to arrange for alternate cost-sharing funding for landowners, including: (a) the state-federal Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program, which

provides landowners with federal rental payments for land retired from production, as well as state-funded cost-sharing to establish cover vegetation to prevent soil loss on the land; and (b) the federal Environmental Quality Incentives Program, which provides cost-sharing to landowners for establishment of best management practices.

12. It should be noted current law allows for arrangements under which entities with wastewater discharge permits covering phosphorus content in discharges can meet permit requirements by providing funding to reduce phosphorus discharges elsewhere in the area of their discharge. Such arrangements are intended to facilitate achievement of water-quality standards by reducing phosphorus discharges from areas, such as agricultural operations, at which measures such as agricultural conservation practices would be more cost-effective for achieving water-quality standards than upgrades to facilities of a permitted point source. Administrative rule NR 217 (phosphorus effluent standards) allows for an adaptive management option for permit holders. DNR reports this option has been little used to date, although it anticipates permitted entities will consider adaptive management in the future, particularly as a general permit renewal takes place in 2016.

13. Also, 2013 Act 378 established provisions under which a statewide water quality variance may be made for state point sources, such as wastewater treatment plants, that are required to limit discharges of phosphorus to state waters. The act provides that if the Department of Administration (DOA) determines point sources cannot achieve water quality standards for phosphorus without undertaking major facility upgrades that would cause widespread adverse social and economic impacts, DNR is to seek a variance from water quality standards for phosphorus from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). If such a variance were granted, eligible point sources would be permitted to achieve interim phosphorus effluent limits while also providing financial and other support to achieve phosphorus runoff reductions elsewhere in the point source's watershed basin. One option for point sources to support in-basin phosphorus reductions would be to make payments to counties to support the county land and water conservation programs, particularly to achieve phosphorus runoff reductions at agricultural operations. Under an Act 378 variance, payments from point sources would begin at \$50 for each pound of phosphorus by which the point source exceeded the level of phosphorus discharges it was to achieve in the preceding year. Future adjustments would be made for inflation. Payments per point source would be capped at \$640,000 per year. Counties would be allowed to allocate variance payments to staffing costs, but at least 65% of payments from point sources would have to be allocated to cost-sharing grants to install runoff management practices at agricultural operations.

14. One could argue that the bill modifications to nonpoint-related funding are appropriate, given that counties may be able to realize additional funding for staffing and cost-sharing grants under existing provisions allowing adaptive management. However, NR 217 adaptive management has been seldom used to date, and DNR reports DOA is still in the process of making a preliminary determination required under Act 378 regarding the economic feasibility of current phosphorus water quality standards. A 30-day public comment period must follow the determination, followed by as much as a 30-day period for DOA to make a final determination. It remains unclear when the EPA would grant a variance, or if it would be granted at all. It is further unclear as to when point sources may begin making payments and in what amount payments would be.

15. The Committee could consider restoring some or all of the reductions the bill would

make in county staffing grant appropriations [Alternative A1]. The Committee could consider one of the following amounts: (a) \$535,500 annually, to restore the net 2012-13 amount of \$8,599,600 [Alternative A1a]; (b) \$815,900 annually, to restore the base reductions under the bill, and which would appropriate a total of \$8,880,000 annually [Alternative A1b]; or (c) \$1,242,900 annually, to restore the \$9,307,000 provided in 2010-11 [Alternative A1c].

16. If the Committee were to restore funding for county conservation staff, the Committee could also consider providing funding from either GPR [Alternative A2a] or nonpoint SEG [Alternative A2b], which are the current sources for funding. Additionally, the Committee also could consider providing funding from ACCP SEG [Alternative A2c] or ACM SEG [Alternative A2d]. Either could be viewed as appropriate, given the projected balances of each fund, and given the relationship between agricultural chemical-based surcharges and nonpoint programs intended to encourage proper uses of agricultural chemicals including fertilizers and pesticides. Providing ACCP or ACM SEG appropriations could allow for ongoing base funding for county conservation staffing commensurate with past appropriation levels, but without committing nonpoint SEG or GPR to future base funding.

17. However, the restoration of county conservation staffing funding may worsen, or result in, structural imbalances in each of the segregated funds, depending on the amount restored and future action the Committee may take regarding each fund. Consideration could be given to specifying funding provided under Alternatives A1 and A2 as one-time funding in 2015-17 [Alternative A3]. This would allow for the Committee to restore some county conservation staffing funding in the biennium but reevaluate subsequent funding in future budget legislation. Specifying one-time funding also would limit impacts to each fund's structural condition. However, similar to 2013-15 provisions, providing one-time funding would likely mean county conservation staffing grant levels would again need to be addressed in the next biennium.

18. The Committee could consider adopting the Governor's recommendation for transferring \$1,000,000 each year in the 2015-17 biennium from the ACCP fund to the nonpoint account [Alternative B1]. Transferring the full amount of ACCP funding may give the Committee greater ability to consider restoring part or all of the funding for various nonpoint-related grants, including county conservation staff and DNR grants and contracts discussed in a separate paper.

19. The Committee also could consider modifying the Governor's recommendation in several ways. For instance, if the Committee were to provide nonpoint SEG for conservation staffing grants, the Committee could also consider providing for a transfer to the nonpoint account in the same amount appropriated for grants [Alternative B2]. Transfers could be made from either the ACCP fund or the ACM fund [Alternative B3].

20. Because the nonpoint account would be projected to maintain a structural imbalance under the bill, and because the agricultural chemical funds would be projected to continue generating annual surpluses, consideration also could be given to permanently depositing portions of current agricultural chemical fees to the nonpoint account instead of the agricultural chemical funds. Further, because DATCP and DNR nonpoint regulatory and grant programs address factors such as fertilizer, pesticide and manure management, particular fees that could be considered may include those for the related agricultural inputs of feed (manure), fertilizer and nonhousehold

pesticides.

21. Table 6 shows several fees currently deposited to the ACM or ACCP funds under current law, and possible fee amounts that could be permanently transferred to the nonpoint account without creating structural imbalances in either of the agricultural chemical funds. The effective dates shown in Table 6 would begin the fee transfers to the nonpoint account in the 2015-16 fiscal year. The annual increase to the nonpoint account would be estimated at \$680,000 annually, if all transfers were made. The annual revenue decreases would be \$280,000 for the ACM fund and \$400,000 for the ACCP fund. The Committee could consider transferring all the fees shown, or any of the individual categories [Alternative B4].

TABLE 6

Agricultural Chemical Fee Transfers to Nonpoint Account [Alternative B4]

<u>Fee Category (Fund)</u>	<u>Current Fee</u>	<u>Fee Transfer</u>	<u>Annual Revenue (Est.)</u>	<u>Effective Date</u>
Commercial feed tonnage (ACM)	23¢/ton	2.5¢/ton	\$110,000	Sales begin. Jan. 1, 2015
Fertilizer tonnage (ACM)	23¢/ton	10¢/ton	170,000	Sales begin. July 1, 2014
Fertilizer tonnage (ACCP)	35¢/ton	15¢/ton	250,000	Sales begin. July 1, 2014
Nonhousehold pesticides (ACCP)	Various	10% of receipts	<u>150,000</u>	Sales est. w/ 2016 license year
		Total	\$680,000	

22. As the nonpoint account is estimated to have sufficient revenues and available balances to accommodate the total expenditures recommended by the Governor, the Committee could consider deleting the transfer [Alternative B5]. This would be estimated to reduce the June 30, 2017, available nonpoint account balance by \$2 million. However, were the Committee to delete the transfer and provide nonpoint SEG for county conservation staffing or other DNR programs for which funding reductions have been recommended, the available balance would decrease further.

ALTERNATIVES

A. County Conservation Staffing Grants

1. Restore one of the following amounts to appropriations for county conservation staffing grants:

- a. \$535,500 annually;
- b. \$815,900 annually; or
- c. \$1,242,900 annually.

2. In addition to one of Alternative A1, specify funding for county conservation staffing grants is to come from one of the following:

- a. GPR;
- b. Nonpoint SEG;
- c. ACCP SEG; or
- d. ACM SEG.

3. In addition to Alternatives A1 and A2, specify funding for 2015-17 is designated as one-time financing. (The amounts would be removed as a standard budget adjustment in the 2017-19 budget, and total continuing funding for conservation staffing grants would remain \$8.1 million.)

4. Take no action. (County conservation staffing grants would be appropriated a total of \$8,064,100 annually in 2015-17 as recommended by the Governor, including \$3,027,200 GPR and \$5,036,900 nonpoint SEG.)

B. Transfer to Nonpoint Account

1. Adopt the Governor’s recommendation to transfer \$1,000,000 each year from the agricultural chemical cleanup fund in the 2015-17 only. (Total transfers would be \$2,000,000.)

2. Adopt Alternative A2b. Modify the Governor’s recommendation by specifying one of the following transfers to the nonpoint account of the environmental fund in the 2015-17 biennium:

- a. \$535,500 annually (commensurate with Alternative A1a);
- b. \$815,900 annually (commensurate with Alternative A1b); or
- c. \$1,242,900 annually (commensurate with Alternative A1c).

3. In addition to one of Alternative B2, specify the transfer is to be made from one of the following:

- a. The agricultural chemical cleanup (ACCP) fund; or
- b. The agrichemical management (ACM) fund.

4. In addition to the alternatives above, decrease one or more of the following fees from the fund indicated, and instead specify the fee is to be deposited to the nonpoint account of the environmental fund:

a. 2.5¢ per ton of commercial feed from the ACM fund, for sales January 1, 2015, or after (revenue of \$110,000 annually would be shifted to the nonpoint account);

b. 10¢ per ton of fertilizer from the ACM fund, for sales July 1, 2014, or after (revenue of \$170,000 annually would be shifted to the nonpoint account);

c. 15¢ per ton of fertilizer from the ACCP fund, for sales July 1, 2014, or after (revenue of \$250,000 annually would be shifted to the nonpoint account); or

d. 10% of annual collections of cleanup surcharges on nonhousehold pesticides from the ACCP fund, beginning with sales estimates for the pesticide license year beginning January 1, 2016 (revenue of \$150,000 would be shifted to the nonpoint account).

5. Delete provision. (No transfer from the ACCP fund to the nonpoint account would occur.)

Prepared by: Paul Ferguson
Attachment

ATTACHMENT

Nonpoint Account Condition

	Actual 2013-14	Estimated 2014-15	Bill 2015-16	Bill 2016-17	2016-17 Staff
Opening Balance	\$18,320,600	\$16,741,200	\$18,071,000	\$18,025,500	
Revenue:					
GPR Transfer	\$11,143,600	\$11,143,600	\$11,143,600	\$11,143,600	
Tipping Fee	13,432,800	19,950,000*	17,100,000	17,100,000	
Interest and Miscellaneous Income	27,000	10,000	10,000	10,000	
Other Transfers **	<u>650,000</u>	<u>1,300,000</u>	<u>1,000,000</u>	<u>1,000,000</u>	
Total Revenue	\$25,253,400	\$32,403,600	\$29,253,600	\$29,253,600	
Total Available	\$43,574,000	\$49,144,800	\$47,324,600	\$47,279,100	
Expenditures:					
<i>Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection</i>					
Soil and water management administration	\$2,176,000	\$2,187,900	\$2,286,100	\$2,297,300	20.30
County staffing grants	4,981,100	5,852,800	5,036,900	5,036,900	0.00
Soil and water management grants	1,581,700	2,500,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	0.00
Debt service	3,555,500	3,707,600	3,967,200	4,087,700	0.00
<i>Natural Resources</i>					
Enforcement and science operations	--	--	\$37,500	\$37,500	0.38
Integrated science services	\$454,700	\$423,000	445,200	445,200	4.00
Nonpoint source contracts	31,800	997,600	227,600	227,600	0.00
TMDL and Wisconsin Waters	729,800	806,900	820,800	820,800	4.25
Animal feeding operations admin.	575,200	582,100	619,700	619,700	7.00
Urban nonpoint source grants	287,400	1,313,200	500,000	500,000	0.00
Debt service – Facilities	109,300	114,200	103,000	103,700	0.00
Debt service – Priority watershed	7,851,600	7,931,700	7,767,600	6,910,300	0.00
Debt service – TRM	1,226,800	1,283,700	1,523,800	1,722,400	0.00
Debt service – UNPS	2,894,700	2,988,000	3,132,800	3,152,500	0.00
Administrative operations	211,800	214,600	200,700	203,600	0.08
Customer assistance and communication	<u>165,400</u>	<u>170,500</u>	<u>130,200</u>	<u>130,200</u>	<u>0.60</u>
Total Expenditures	\$26,832,800	\$31,073,800	\$29,299,100	\$28,795,400	36.61
Cash Balance	\$16,741,200	\$18,071,000	\$18,025,500	\$18,483,700	
Encumbrances/Continuing	<u>- 12,705,100</u>	<u>- 12,705,100</u>	<u>- 12,705,100</u>	<u>- 12,705,100</u>	
Available Balance	\$4,036,100	\$5,365,900	\$5,320,400	\$5,778,600 ***	

* Tipping fee revenues for 2014-15 include \$17.2 million in current year (base) collections, and an estimated \$2.7 million in prior year collections.

** Transfers include \$1.95 million from the environmental management account in the 2013-15 biennium and \$2.0 million recommended by the Governor for the 2015-17 biennium from the agricultural chemical cleanup fund.

*** The June 30, 2017, balance would increase to approximately \$6.7 million if the administration implemented suggested 10% reductions to DATCP and DNR operations expenditures.