

**Contaminated Land and
Brownfields Cleanup Programs**

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau

January, 2009

Contaminated Land and Brownfields Cleanup Programs

Prepared by

Kendra Bonderud

Wisconsin Legislative Fiscal Bureau
One East Main, Suite 301
Madison, WI 53703

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Introduction..... | 1 |
| <i>CHAPTER 1: FEDERAL CLEANUP INITIATIVES ADMINISTERED BY DNR.....</i> | <i>2</i> |
| Superfund Cleanup Program..... | 2 |
| Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program..... | 6 |
| Federal Brownfields Grant Program..... | 8 |
| Hazardous Waste Cleanup Program..... | 10 |
| <i>CHAPTER 2: STATE-FUNDED CLEANUP PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY DNR.....</i> | <i>11</i> |
| Remediation and Redevelopment Organizational Structure..... | 11 |
| Environmental Cleanup Requirements..... | 12 |
| Hazardous Substance Spills Program..... | 14 |
| Abandoned Containers Actions..... | 15 |
| State-Funded Response Actions..... | 15 |
| Liability Exemptions and Assurances..... | 20 |
| Local Government Negotiation and Cost Recovery..... | 26 |
| Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Program..... | 27 |
| Brownfield Site Assessment Grant Program..... | 34 |
| Sustainable Urban Development Zone Program..... | 35 |
| Brownfields Green Space and Public Facilities Grant Program..... | 36 |
| Funding for DNR Administration..... | 37 |
| <i>CHAPTER 3: PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY OTHER STATE AGENCIES.....</i> | <i>44</i> |
| Brownfields Grant Program..... | 44 |
| Agricultural Chemical Cleanup Program..... | 44 |
| Appendices..... | 45 |
| Appendix I Superfund Site Status in Wisconsin, October, 2008..... | 47 |
| Appendix II State-Funded Response Actions Funded by the Wisconsin Environmental Fund as of October, 2008..... | 48 |
| Appendix III DNR Brownfield Site Assessment Grant Awards as of January 1, 2009..... | 50 |
| Appendix IV Appropriations From the Environmental Management Account, 2006-07 Through 2008-09..... | 53 |

Contaminated Land and Brownfields Cleanup Programs

The cleanup of hazardous substances discharges and environmentally contaminated land in Wisconsin is regulated through a combination of federal and state laws. Chapter 292 of the Wisconsin statutes regulates remedial action at sites with discharges of hazardous substances. This generally includes any substance which may cause, or significantly contribute to, an increase in mortality or serious irreversible or incapacitating reversible illness, or which may pose a substantial threat to human health or the environment.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is responsible for implementation of the state's direct response hazardous substances cleanup programs, establishment and administration of cleanup standards for contaminated groundwater and soil and implementation of most federal programs in cooperation with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). DNR has established, since 1995, a consolidated organizational structure under the Remediation and Redevelopment program, which integrates all aspects of the cleanup process.

This paper describes the programs administered by DNR, including program requirements, funding sources and state program expenditures. These federal and state programs are intended to clean up sites with spills, leaks, abandonment and discharge of hazardous substances. The responsible party (the person, company or governmental entity that may be held responsible for the hazardous conditions) or DNR makes an initial assessment of the site, which may be in cooperation with local emergency government or EPA staff, to determine if emergency response is needed. DNR then works with site owners, communities and other governmental entities to attempt to ensure that contaminated soils, debris, groundwater and

surface water are restored to a condition that is safe.

The majority of hazardous substance cleanups underway in Wisconsin are being financed by the owner of a contaminated property or the party who caused the contamination. When the responsible party finances a cleanup, DNR may provide technical review, management and oversight and if necessary, enforcement. When responsible parties do not finance the cleanup, DNR can allocate state and federal funds to do so, initiating cost recovery later, if the site is a priority for use of those funds. There are also financial assistance programs available to persons to assist with the investigation and cleanup of contaminated properties.

Several statutory changes have been made in recent years to promote the cleanup and development of brownfields sites, which are abandoned, idle or underused industrial or commercial properties, the expansion or redevelopment of which is adversely affected by actual or perceived environmental contamination.

The Department of Commerce (Commerce) and Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) also administer contaminated land cleanup programs. For more information, see the Legislative Fiscal Bureau informational papers entitled, "Petroleum Environmental Cleanup Fund Award (PECFA) Program," "Environmental Improvement Fund" (for a description of the land recycling loan program), "State Economic Development Programs Administered by the Department of Commerce" (for a description of the brownfields grant program), and "Agricultural Chemical Fees and Programs" (for a description of the agricultural cleanup program).

FEDERAL CLEANUP INITIATIVES ADMINISTERED BY DNR

The four key federal contaminated land cleanup programs utilized in Wisconsin are: (a) the Superfund program; (b) the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) leaking underground storage tank (LUST) program; (c) federal brownfields programs; and (d) the RCRA program to cleanup hazardous waste sites. The programs are administered by DNR's remediation and redevelopment program, except that Commerce administers cleanup at most medium- and low-risk LUST sites.

EPA is working with states on an initiative called One Cleanup Program, under which states would coordinate the federal programs described in this chapter with state-authorized programs. EPA and DNR signed a memorandum of agreement in November, 2006, to implement One Cleanup Program. Under the program, DNR and EPA coordinate which agency takes the lead in cleanup at specific sites, how cleanup rules will apply, and how DNR will take the lead in reviewing requests for approval of the cleanup.

Superfund Cleanup Program

The federal Superfund program was established in 1980 by the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), as amended by the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA) of 1986. The Superfund program was up for consideration of reauthorization in 1995. While Congress has not reauthorized the program, the program has continued to operate with federal funding primarily from general purpose revenues

and cost recoveries. Superfund includes three cleanup components: (a) an emergency response program for sites posing an immediate and substantial danger; (b) a site assessment program to evaluate potential Superfund sites; and (c) a remedial action program for longer-term cleanup remedies.

Emergency Response Program

Immediate actions to remove hazardous substances can be carried out by EPA under its emergency response program. Immediate removals are triggered by significant emergencies involving hazardous substances, such as fires, explosions, spills or direct human contact. Immediate removals involve: (a) minimizing unacceptable exposures at the site as necessary to protect life and human health; (b) stopping the hazardous release; and (c) minimizing the damage or threat. Specific responses may include: collecting and analyzing samples; controlling the release; removing hazardous substances from the site and storing the substances; treating or destroying the substances; providing alternate water supplies; deterring the spread of the pollutants; and evacuating threatened citizens.

EPA emergency response actions generally include three types of situations: (a) classic emergencies are situations where the release of a hazardous substance requires action at the site within minutes or hours of the incident; (b) time critical actions are situations where, after an evaluation of the site is completed, EPA determines that removal of the hazardous substance must begin within six months; and (c) non-time critical actions are infrequent situations where, after an evaluation of the site, EPA determines that work

can be postponed for at least six months after the incident due to the low risk.

EPA has contracted with private firms to perform emergency response and removal work at approximately two sites per year in Wisconsin. In Wisconsin, EPA has provided emergency response assistance or helped leverage cleanups by responsible party at a cumulative total of over 103 sites as of June 30, 2008. EPA's cumulative costs totaled more than \$30.7 million, including \$653,500 between 2006 and 2008.

Site Assessment Program

Except where an emergency response is required, a site must be listed on the national priority list (NPL) in order to be considered for federal remedial action. The site assessment process involves gathering historical and field data to determine if the site poses a great enough risk for nonemergency Superfund response. The information gathered during the site assessment is used to assign a score, based on EPA criteria related to actual contamination and health and environmental effects. If a site scores above a designated cutoff, it is eligible for the NPL and may be nominated by DNR.

After the site has been nominated, EPA considers the priority of the site and decides whether it should be proposed for inclusion on the NPL. If proposed, following a public comment process, a site is listed on the NPL as a Superfund site. As of October, 2008, 1,257 sites nationwide are on the NPL. Thirty seven (3%) of these sites are in Wisconsin. (In addition, six Wisconsin sites have been deleted from the NPL and one site has been proposed for listing.) Appendix I lists the Wisconsin sites and their locations.

EPA may also propose that a site be listed on the NPL. In the summer of 1998, EPA proposed listing a 39-mile stretch of the Fox River from Lake Winnebago to Green Bay on the NPL because of contamination from PCBs (polychlorinated

biphenyls). EPA has postponed a decision to list the site on the NPL as long as the responsible parties (several paper companies) make progress in the design and implementation of a remedial action. In 2004 through 2008, dredging and removal of PCB-contaminated sediments was conducted in Little Lake Butte des Morts. In 2008, dredging and removal began at a site below the De Pere Dam, which had been found to contain the highest known levels of PCBs in the River. A combination of dredging and capping is expected to continue in the Lower Fox River from Appleton to Green Bay over the next decade. Dewatered sediments from dredging are being disposed of in a Wisconsin landfill. Sediments with high levels of PCBs are being hauled out-of-state to a federally-regulated hazardous waste landfill.

Before a site is listed, DNR attempts to identify the responsible party or parties and have that party undertake the cleanup process. If these efforts are successful, the case is managed by DNR under the state's environmental repair program and the site is generally not placed on the NPL. If these efforts are unsuccessful or the responsible party is not known, the Superfund listing process for that site may continue. After a site is listed, EPA contracts with a firm to conduct a search for potentially responsible parties to fund the remedial action. If a responsible party is found after listing on the NPL, the responsibility for funding the cleanup is transferred from Superfund to the responsible party.

Under the Superfund law, EPA may establish liability of a responsible party if it can prove that the party disposed of hazardous substances at a particular site and that those substances are now being released from the site. At sites with multiple responsible parties, Superfund can require all identified responsible parties to fund the remedial action. If some responsible parties cannot be identified, or are identified and cannot pay (for example, are bankrupt), the remaining responsible parties may be held liable for all of the cleanup costs. For example, if a responsible party caused

50% of the contamination, and no other responsible parties are identified who can pay, that party may be held liable for 100% of the cleanup costs.

EPA has also implemented a Superfund Alternatives Program, under which one or more of the responsible parties for a site may undertake a cleanup and pursue recovery of cleanup costs from other responsible parties. As long as the responsible parties who are working on the site continue to do so, EPA does not add the site to the NPL. Under this program, EPA, rather than DNR, takes the lead role in administering the cleanup. As of October, 2008, nine Wisconsin sites are participating in this program.

Remedial Action Program

EPA and DNR will negotiate with potentially responsible parties to fund the investigation and cleanup before spending any federal or state dollars on the site. Responsible parties are currently partially or fully financing investigations and cleanup at 27 Wisconsin Superfund sites and Superfund revenues are financing work at the remaining 10 Wisconsin sites. Appendix I lists these sites. The remedial investigation, design and remedial action activities have been completed at 34 of the 37 Wisconsin sites.

These 34 sites are in the operation and maintenance (O&M) phase of actions, which means the actions needed to continue to operate and maintain the cleanup remedy that has already been constructed. Examples of O&M are operating pumps to extract contaminated groundwater as part of a groundwater treatment system, pumping leachate and operating a methane extraction flare at a landfill where a cap has been installed over contamination, operating water treatment systems or analyzing samples from groundwater monitoring wells.

To date, if a site is financed with Superfund dollars, EPA has generally taken the lead role, although DNR has assumed the lead role at four of

the 10 sites funded with federal Superfund dollars. In cases where the responsible parties agree to pay for the necessary work, those parties may request that DNR take the lead role. However, if DNR takes the lead role in a case financed by a responsible party who fails to provide for appropriate cleanup, the lead may need to be renegotiated after EPA commits funding for that site.

Investigation and Feasibility Study

After the site is listed and the preliminary negotiations are completed, a private consultant conducts a remedial investigation and feasibility study to determine the nature and extent of the problem and methods of dealing with the problem. The study considers engineering, environmental and economic factors to determine the cleanup procedures that will protect public health and the environment, meet cleanup requirements and be the most cost-effective method for a particular site.

Cleanup

After review and approval of the remedial investigation and feasibility study, the site enters the remedial design and action phase. EPA or DNR (for sites where DNR has assumed the lead role) approves the cleanup alternative. EPA and the state must select remedial actions that meet federal and state environmental standards and that result in permanent cleanup. Alternative treatment technologies (such as alternatives to excavating contaminated soil and hauling it to a landfill) must be used where technically feasible. If any hazardous substances remain on the site after cleanup, the site must be reviewed every five years.

Specific actions may include the removal of containers containing wastes from a site, the installation of a clay or synthetic cap over the site, removal of contaminated soil, the construction of ditches and dikes to control surface water, the construction of drains and liners or extraction wells to treat groundwater. Private contractors perform the bulk of the work under federal or state

supervision.

Other State and Federal Requirements. Under Superfund, remedial actions must meet the substantive requirements of all other federal and state environmental laws and state facility siting laws, if applicable. These include the maximum contaminant levels established under the federal Safe Drinking Water Act, administrative code Chapter NR 140 groundwater quality criteria, NR 103, 104 and 105 water quality criteria, the administrative code NR 700 series environmental cleanup criteria and federal Clean Water Act water quality criteria. Remedial actions selected under Superfund are specifically exempt from the administrative permit requirements of applicable laws for all on-site activities. EPA may waive standards under specified circumstances.

Interim Remedial Actions. In addition to the long-term remedial actions, EPA may choose to implement interim measures to minimize damages or risks and preclude future emergency response actions. For example, construction of a new water supply system needed because of groundwater contamination would be an initial remedial measure, and finding and stopping the source of the groundwater contamination would be the long-term cleanup solution. Interim measures have been implemented at several Superfund sites in Wisconsin. Interim remedial actions are sometimes accomplished by breaking a site into "operable units," and taking a distinct action at one or more of the operable units prior to selecting the long-term or final remedial action at the site, or by doing an emergency removal action, such as removing drums of hazardous waste.

Federal Funding

Federal funding for the Superfund program came from various taxes on crude oil and chemical feedstocks, cost recoveries from site operators, generators and current and past owners, interest and general revenues. Superfund taxing authority expired on December 31, 1995, and had not been

reinstated as of January 1, 2009.

Superfund pays 90% of the cost of treatment and other measures until completion of the cleanup or until 10 years after operation of those measures begins for groundwater restoration. The state pays the remaining 10%. In most cases, after the first year of post-cleanup maintenance, the state pays 100% of all operation and maintenance costs. At waste sites operated by a state or its political subdivisions, Superfund pays 50% and the state pays 50%.

State Funding

In Wisconsin, the state share comes from the spills cleanup appropriation from the environmental management account of the segregated environmental fund or from general obligation bonds authorized for this purpose (with debt service payments from the environmental management account). DNR is authorized, under the environmental repair program, to take actions to implement the Superfund program in the state. The Department is required to review the remedial investigation and feasibility study to evaluate proposed repair actions. The Department may not commit the required state share unless it agrees with EPA's assessment of the effectiveness of the proposed repair action. Federal and state expenditures for Superfund cleanup projects in Wisconsin are shown in Table 1.

State law requires DNR to promulgate rules that will determine whether or not a municipality will be required to pay a portion of the state share at a Superfund cleanup site. Administrative rule Chapter NR 730 includes criteria for DNR's expenditure of moneys for Superfund state cost share purposes and to determine a municipality's responsibility to pay a share of the state's Superfund cost share in cases where a municipality will benefit from the proposed remedial action.

NR 730 states that DNR may require a municipality to pay up to 50% of the amount expended by

Table 1: State and Federal Expenditures for Wisconsin Superfund Cleanup Projects through June 30, 2008

| Expenditures | State Share | Federal Share |
|--|---------------------|---------------------|
| Pentawood Products (Burnett County) | \$1,310,000 | \$11,791,800 |
| Schmalz Landfill (Calumet County) | 336,800 | 3,030,800 |
| Stoughton City Landfill (Dane County) | 1,293,100 | 1,293,100 |
| Oconomowoc Electroplating Co. (Dodge County) | 1,505,000 | 19,255,500 |
| Eau Claire Municipal Well Field | 175,700 | 5,868,000 |
| Onalaska Municipal Landfill (La Crosse County) | 4,200,000 | 4,620,000 |
| Mid-State Disposal Landfill (Marathon County - Special agreement with potential responsible party, federal expense not required) | 992,000 | 0 |
| N.W. Mauthe Co. (Outagamie County) | 626,200 | 5,652,000 |
| Scrap Processing Inc. (Taylor County) | <u>61,100</u> | <u>549,900</u> |
| TOTAL EXPENDITURES | \$10,499,900 | \$52,061,100 |
| Committed but not yet Expended | | |
| Pentawood Products | \$990,000 | \$8,908,200 |
| Oconomowoc Electroplating Co. | 694,500 | 2,439,000 |
| Onalaska Municipal Landfill | 420,000 | 0 |
| N.W. Mauthe Co. | 313,100 | 2,809,000 |
| Scrap Processing Inc. | <u>122,200</u> | <u>1,100,100</u> |
| TOTAL COMMITTED BUT NOT EXPENDED | \$2,539,800 | \$15,256,300 |

DNR for the state's Superfund cost share, but not more than \$3 per capita in any year. DNR determines the portion of the state's Superfund cost share a municipality shall be required to pay based on the following factors: (a) the municipality's property value per capita divided by the average property value per capita for all Wisconsin municipalities; (b) the municipality's per capita income divided by the average per capita income for all Wisconsin municipalities; and (c) the benefit of the remedial action to the municipality, defined as the cost savings to the municipality resulting from implementation of the remedial action and measured as a percentage of the most recent annual budget.

Leaking Underground Storage Tank Program

The federal leaking underground storage tank

(LUST) trust fund was established in 1986 to provide funding for states to manage the cleanup of leaks from underground petroleum storage tanks. EPA provides federal funding to states to manage the cleanup at LUST petroleum sites. EPA can also choose to take the lead in cleanup of a LUST site.

Prior to 2001, DNR acted as the lead state agency in all cleanup actions and was the state recipient of the EPA LUST grant. Beginning with the federal year 1999 grant, a portion of the federal grant was transferred to the Department of Commerce to administer cleanup at medium- and low-risk petroleum sites. Beginning in federal fiscal year 2001, DNR and Commerce received separate LUST grants from EPA.

DNR is authorized to enforce owner-financed cleanups at high-risk LUST petroleum spills and at any non-petroleum spills and to manage cleanups in cases where the owner is unknown or cannot or will not finance the necessary action. Commerce is authorized to administer cleanup at low- and medium-risk sites that are contaminated by petroleum products. As with the Superfund program, actual cleanups are carried out by private contractors. Similar to the Superfund program, federal LUST program dollars may be used for emergency action, investigation and cleanup work in cases where the responsible party is unknown or cannot or will not finance appropriate actions.

Major exclusions from the federal LUST program include: (a) home and farm tanks with 1,100 gallons or less capacity; and (b) heating oil tanks where the oil is consumed on the premises; and (c) all tanks with capacity less than 110 gallons. Other spills are covered by the state's hazardous spills program (discussed under a later section on state-funded cleanup programs). The state hazardous substances spills law (s. 292.11 of the statutes) and the NR 700 administrative rule series are used to implement federal LUST requirements and respond to both federally-regulated and non-federally regulated leaking tanks.

The LUST program complements the federal underground storage tank program (UST) which is intended to prevent contamination of groundwater and vapor migration caused by leaks from underground storage tanks. These regulations require certain tank owners to provide evidence that they can finance cleanups necessitated by any possible future leaks and to upgrade or abandon tanks on an age-based schedule.

The Department of Commerce (Commerce) has responsibility for regulation and enforcement of storage tank standards and financial responsibility requirements in the UST program. The UST regulations are established in administrative rule Chapter Comm 10 to regulate flammable and combustible liquids. However, state law also requires Commerce to regulate tanks not included under federal regulations (aboveground tanks, farm and residential motor fuel underground storage tanks with less than 1,100 gallons and heating oil underground storage tank systems). Commerce regulates approximately 177,900 underground petroleum storage tank systems under federal and state requirements and 32,800 aboveground tank systems under state requirements.

Commerce also administers the petroleum environmental cleanup fund award program (PECFA). This program reimburses eligible owners and operators of petroleum storage tanks for certain costs incurred due to tank leakage. In general, PECFA reimburses certain cleanup costs for all federally-regulated tanks plus aboveground tanks, some farm tanks with 1,100 gallons or less and home, public school district and technical college heating oil tanks. A separate informational paper describes the PECFA program.

LUST Sites

Approximately 177,900 former and existing petroleum product underground storage tanks were regulated by Commerce under federal and state requirements as of December, 2008. Of this total, approximately 53,100 tanks are active in-use,

of which 12,400 are regulated under federal underground storage tank requirements and the LUST program. Cleanup standards for LUST sites are established by DNR under the state hazardous substances spills law and under the administrative rule NR 700 series and Chapter NR 140. All LUST sites are regulated under the state hazardous substances spills law.

DNR administers the cleanup at high-risk petroleum LUST sites and sites with non-petroleum contamination. Commerce administers the cleanup at medium- and low-risk petroleum sites. Most LUST sites will be eligible for PECFA reimbursement for cleanup of petroleum contamination. As of June 30, 2008, there were 17,110 petroleum-contaminated sites in the reconciled databases of both DNR and Commerce. Of the total, 1,944 were open sites, of which DNR administered 1,392 and Commerce administered 552. Cleanup at 15,166 petroleum-contaminated sites had been completed, of which DNR administered 8,960 sites and Commerce administered 6,206. In addition to the reconciled sites, there are 5,191 petroleum-contaminated sites (including 602 open and 4,589 closed sites) in the DNR database that have not yet been matched to a site in the Commerce database.

Funding

Federal funding provides 90% of the cost of implementing the LUST program and the state must pay the remaining 10%. Federal funding comes from a 0.1 cent per gallon excise tax on motor fuels. Table 2 shows the amount of federal LUST program funding received by Wisconsin during the ten years from state fiscal year 1999-00 through 2008-09. This includes \$10.1 million granted to DNR and \$8.2 million granted to Commerce during the ten years.

In 2008-09, federal LUST funding is sufficient to support approximately 10.5 DNR program staff (9.5 in Remediation and Redevelopment and one in Enforcement) and 10.3 Department of Commerce staff. The majority of site cleanups under the LUST

Table 2: Federal LUST Funding for Wisconsin, 2000 Through 2009

| State Fiscal Year | Federal Funding DNR* | Federal Funding Commerce* |
|-------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|
| 1999-00 | \$1,342,600 | \$763,400 |
| 2000-01 | 1,261,800 | 797,200 |
| 2001-02 | 862,600 | 797,200 |
| 2002-03 | 862,600 | 847,200 |
| 2003-04 | 916,700 | 847,200 |
| 2004-05 | 1,001,800 | 927,200 |
| 2005-06 | 984,000 | 797,200 |
| 2006-07 | 947,300 | 814,700 |
| 2007-08 | 953,100 | 814,700 |
| 2008-09 | <u>924,100</u> | <u>822,200</u> |
| Total | \$10,056,600 | \$8,228,200 |

* Includes ongoing and one-time grants.

program are funded by responsible parties and are reimbursed by the state PECFA program.

Federal Brownfields Grant Program

The federal Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act was signed into law by the President on January 11, 2002. The main provisions of the Act included: (a) codify and expand EPA's brownfields program by authorizing funding for assessment and cleanup of brownfields properties; (b) exempt certain contiguous property owners and prospective purchasers from Superfund liability; (c) authorize funding for state response programs; and (d) provide limited Superfund liability for certain properties cleaned up under state programs.

The federal brownfields legislation authorizes up to \$200 million per year nationwide for grants for brownfields assessment and cleanup, of which up to \$50 million per year (or 25% of the appropriated amount) would be set aside for brownfields with petroleum contamination. In the six federal fiscal years 2003 through 2008, EPA

awarded a total of \$439 million in grants nationwide in the following categories: (a) brownfields assessment grants of up to \$200,000 each over two years to inventory, assess and plan at brownfields sites; (b) brownfields revolving loan fund grants to grantees that would capitalize a revolving loan fund and provide subgrants to carry out cleanup activities at brownfields sites owned by the subgrant recipient; and (c) brownfields cleanup grants of up to \$200,000 each over three years to carry out cleanup activities at brownfields sites owned by the grant recipient.

Under the 2002 federal act, in the six federal grant cycles 2003 through 2008, the federal grants have included \$25.08 million to 18 grantees in Wisconsin, with the grants equaling 5.7% of the funds awarded nationwide. The grant amounts and recipients are shown in Table 3. The EPA deadline for submission of applications for the 2009 grant year was November, 2008. It is anticipated EPA will announce 2009 grant recipients in the spring of 2009.

In 2004, 2003 Wisconsin Act 314 was enacted to authorize DNR to enter into an agreement with EPA to establish and administer a federally-funded brownfields revolving loan program under which DNR would make loans or grants for the cleanup of brownfields. The act also authorized DNR to, at the request of another governmental entity, administer funds received from EPA by the other governmental entity for the establishment of a brownfields revolving loan program. The act also created the necessary state appropriations to receive the federal funds, make loans or grants, receive funds from another governmental entity, receive repayments of loans made with federal funds, and make loans or grants from the loan repayments.

In April, 2008, 2007 Wisconsin Act 188 was enacted to authorize local governments that borrow under the DNR brownfields revolving loan program to issue municipal obligations or promissory notes in anticipation of receiving funding under the program. The obligations must be repaid within 10 years, or, if refinanced, within 20 years.

Table 3: Federal Brownfields Grants, Federal Fiscal Years 2003 Through 2008

| | Assessment | Revolving Loan Fund | Cleanup | Total |
|--|--------------------|---------------------|--------------------|---------------------|
| WI DNR | \$800,000 | \$5,500,000 | | \$6,300,000 |
| Ashland, City | 200,000 | | | 200,000 |
| Ashwaubenon, Village | 400,000 | | | 400,000 |
| Baraboo, City | 400,000 | | | 400,000 |
| Brown County Planning Commission | 400,000 | | | 400,000 |
| Delavan, City | | | \$1,400,000 | 1,400,000 |
| Green Bay, City | 400,000 | | | 400,000 |
| Kenosha, City | 400,000 | | | 400,000 |
| Madison, Town | 200,000 | 1,000,000 | | 1,200,000 |
| Marinette, City | 200,000 | | | 200,000 |
| Milwaukee, City Redevelopment Authority | 2,000,000 | 5,000,000 | 2,380,000 | 9,380,000 |
| Oshkosh, City | 800,000 | | 800,000 | 1,600,000 |
| Prairie du Chien, City | 200,000 | | | 200,000 |
| Racine, City | 200,000 | | | 200,000 |
| Ripon, City | 200,000 | | | 200,000 |
| St. Croix Chippewa Indians of WI | 200,000 | | 200,000 | 400,000 |
| West Allis, City | 400,000 | | 400,000 | 800,000 |
| West Allis Community Development Authority | | | 400,000 | 400,000 |
| Total | \$7,400,000 | \$11,500,000 | \$6,180,000 | \$25,080,000 |

The promissory notes must be repaid within 20 years.

DNR and the Wisconsin Brownfields Coalition, a partnership with the Wisconsin Departments of Commerce and Administration, and the state's nine Regional Planning Commissions, developed the Ready for Reuse Loan and Grant Program with the \$5.5 million that EPA awarded to DNR for a revolving loan fund. Local governments were able to submit applications for funds to DNR beginning in February, 2006. Local governments may use the ready for reuse grants or loans for: (a) cleanup of contamination from hazardous substances or hazardous substances commingled with petroleum; or (b) cleanup of petroleum contamination that is not eligible for reimbursement under the PECFA program. Funds may not be used for site assessment or investigation.

Up to 40% of funds under the Ready for Reuse program may be used for grants. The remaining

60% is available for loans with an interest rate of 0%. The maximum grant is \$200,000 per property. Grants are available for projects that can be completed in two years. Applicants must be a local government or tribe. The applicant can not have caused the contamination and must not have liability for environmental contamination under federal CERCLA provisions. The program gives preference to projects that have a DNR-approved site investigation report and a complete remedial action plan.

DNR makes decisions on funding Ready for Reuse projects as applications are received. As of November 1, 2008, DNR had awarded \$2.9 million in financial assistance, including 11 grants for a total of \$1,897,650 and two loans for a total of \$1,034,977, and had received \$50,000 in loan repayments. Funding recipients and amounts are shown in Table 4. The Department was also reviewing four applications totaling \$3,028,000.

Table 4: DNR Ready for Reuse Program Under Federal Brownfields Grant Program Awards As of November 1, 2008

| | Number of Grants | Grant Amount |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------|
| Loan Recipient | | |
| Fond du Lac, City | 1 | \$352,477 |
| Prairie du Chien, City | 1 | <u>682,500</u> |
| Subtotal | 2 | \$1,034,977 |
| Grant Recipient | | |
| Elkhorn, City | 1 | \$152,504 |
| Kaukauna, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Mauston, RA | 1 | 200,000 |
| Merrill, RA | 1 | 142,646 |
| Milwaukee, City RA | 1 | 200,000 |
| Prairie du Chien, City | 1 | 172,500 |
| Prairie du Chien, RA | 2 | 400,000 |
| Sheboygan, City RA | 1 | 200,000 |
| Waunakee, Village | 2 | <u>400,000</u> |
| Subtotal | 11 | \$1,897,650 |
| Total | 13 | \$2,932,627 |

RA = Redevelopment Authority

Hazardous Waste Cleanup Program

The federal Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) regulates facilities which transport, store, treat, dispose of, or generate hazardous waste. These facilities are typically businesses that use hazardous substances as part of their manufacturing process or other activities, and generate quantities of hazardous wastes as a result. RCRA is intended to: (a) prevent hazardous waste problems; and (b) require facilities and generators to clean up contamination resulting from intentional or accidental release of hazardous waste at their sites.

DNR incorporated RCRA provisions into Wisconsin's hazardous waste regulations and was authorized by EPA in 1992 to take the lead in administering most aspects of the RCRA corrective action program. DNR has implemented the RCRA corrective action program consistent with EPA rules and the NR 700 rule series.

There are approximately 150 facilities in Wisconsin that are subject to RCRA corrective action provisions. Most of the facilities are being addressed under the NR 700 rule series, if a release of a hazardous substance has occurred.

STATE-FUNDED CLEANUP PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY DNR

The Legislature has enacted several state initiatives that complement the federal programs and provide additional remedies and state funds to clean up contamination. The state-funded programs provide both emergency response and long-term environmental repair at contaminated sites. All programs require that cleanups be conducted in accordance with state environmental cleanup requirements set by statute and administrative rule. DNR holds primary responsibility for administering contaminated land cleanup programs. These programs are administered by DNR's remediation and redevelopment program and are discussed in the following sections.

**Remediation and Redevelopment
Organizational Structure**

The DNR responsibilities for cleanup of contaminated land are accomplished through the Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment in the Air and Waste Division, plus staff in the five DNR regions. Regional staff report to a Remediation and Redevelopment Team Supervisor in each region, who reports to an Air and Waste Leader in each region. The program is responsible for cleanup of contaminated sediment sites and closed wastewater facilities as well as for the DNR-administered cleanup activities described in the following sections.

DNR Remediation and Redevelopment central office staff are assigned to one of three sections: (a) the Fiscal and Information Technology Section oversees the fiscal management of state and federal

funding sources, manages the environmental repair state-funded response program, and coordinates information technology initiatives; (b) the Policy and Technical Resources Section is responsible for the development of policy, rules, and guidance documents, provides technical expertise to support program implementation, and serves as the contact with EPA on federally-funded cleanup programs; and (c) the Brownfields and Outreach Section develops policy associated with encouraging the cleanup and reuse of contaminated property, manages state and federal grants and loans, coordinates the advisory Brownfields Study Group, manages statewide outreach, and coordinates brownfields programs with other agencies.

DNR regional staff are assigned to geographic boundaries and provide assistance for all contamination incidents within that area, including LUST sites, spills, emergency responses, abandoned containers, Superfund sites, abandoned landfills, brownfields sites, state-funded cleanup or emergency response contracts and hazardous waste corrective actions. Regional staff perform oversight of site investigations, technical assistance, project management and plan review.

The remediation and redevelopment program utilizes six statewide standing teams to promote integration, assure program continuity, involve DNR staff throughout the state, involve customers and support the increased decentralization to regional operations. The standing teams include: (a) hazardous substances spills; (b) outreach; (c) land recycling; (d) standards and streamlining; (e) automation; and (f) petroleum. The program also utilizes several ad hoc teams to address specific issues.

Environmental Cleanup Requirements

Section 292.11 of the statutes requires that persons who possess or control a hazardous substance which is discharged or who cause the discharge of a hazardous substance shall take the actions necessary to restore the environment to the extent practicable and minimize the harmful effects from the discharge to the air, lands or waters of the state. DNR is responsible for establishing environmental cleanup standards for groundwater and soil. DNR promulgated the NR 700 administrative rule series to cover responses to discharges of hazardous substances at contaminated sites. NR 700 allows responsible parties to choose an appropriate cleanup method for their properties. DNR provides rules and technical guidance on a variety of methods.

The NR 700 administrative rule series went into effect in 1994 and 1995, with subsequent revisions, as a comprehensive framework to govern environmental cleanups conducted by DNR, persons who caused or possess environmental contamination, or other parties conducting a cleanup. The rules govern cleanups conducted under the spills, environmental repair and abandoned containers laws administered by DNR. The rules also govern cleanups under the drycleaner environmental response program administered by DNR, the PECFA program and brownfields grant program administered by the Commerce and the agricultural management program administered by the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP).

The NR 700 rules address specific steps in the cleanup process, including hazardous substance discharge notification, site investigation, remedial action selection, design, construction and operation and case closure. A key aspect of the NR 700 rule series is the option of using natural attenuation for remedial action. Natural attenuation means allowing naturally-occurring physical, chemical or biological processes to degrade contamination over

a period of time. There is no requirement for post-closure monitoring. (This has been done to address PECFA program cost control issues.) DNR has published technical guidance regarding use of natural attenuation for cleanup of petroleum contamination in groundwater.

The rules contain criteria DNR will use to prioritize sites, especially sites that need state funds for cleanup. The rules also contain criteria to be used when DNR cost-shares with the federal government at Superfund sites.

DNR expects responsible parties and environmental consultants to follow the provisions of the administrative rule NR 700 series without detailed review and approval from DNR. DNR provides a number of technical guidance documents and training to consultants and responsible parties. DNR performs detailed review of the work at a site when a request for case closeout is submitted to DNR.

Groundwater

Contaminated groundwater can affect human health by adversely impacting drinking water supplies, surface water and the migration of explosive or toxic vapors into basements. Cleanup standards for groundwater contamination at contaminated sites are established under Chapter 160 of the statutes and Chapter NR 140 of the administrative code. The statutes require DNR to establish enforcement standards for substances of public health concern and public welfare concern. The enforcement standard is a numerical value for the concentration of a contaminant in groundwater. It is based on federally-determined contaminant limits for specific compounds, including consideration of health risk and other factors. If no federal contaminant limit has been established for a specific compound the state calculates an enforcement standard. Most petroleum contamination occurs from compounds that have federally-established limits.

Chapter 160 of the statutes requires DNR to

establish, by administrative rule, a preventive action limit (PAL) for each substance for which an enforcement standard is established. The PAL is a contamination limit that is more stringent than the groundwater enforcement standard and is intended as a warning level to allow action to be taken prior to violation of the enforcement standard. Each state agency that regulates activities that may affect the groundwater is required to promulgate rules that establish the range of responses that the agency may take or require the party responsible for the contamination to take if the PAL is exceeded.

The DNR administrative rule chapter NR 140 and the NR 700 series include a groundwater cleanup goal of the PAL. DNR allows cleanups to achieve a standard less stringent than the PAL if achieving the PAL is determined not to be technically or economically feasible. DNR does this by granting an exemption to NR 140 for contamination above the PAL but below the enforcement standard. This has become a routine approach in the cleanup of PECFA-eligible sites.

In addition, DNR administrative rule chapters NR 140 and NR 726 allow flexible closure of contaminated sites. Flexible closure means that cleanup activities can be stopped and the site closed when groundwater contamination levels exceed enforcement standards if the following conditions are met: (a) the source of contamination has been adequately cleaned up; (b) groundwater contamination exceeding NR 140 PALs will not migrate across the property line on to any property for which a PAL exemption has been granted, or which has been included on the GIS registry for an enforcement standard exceedence and for which a notification letter has been provided by DNR to the property owner regarding residual contamination, or has a recorded groundwater use restriction on the deed; (c) natural processes will break down the contamination in a reasonable amount of time to meet state groundwater standards; (d) there is no threat to human health and the environment as a result of selecting natural attenuation as the

remedial option; and (e) except for NR 140, all applicable public health and environmental laws have been complied with.

A DNR administrative rule, effective November 1, 2001, created a geographic information system (GIS) registry that includes information about contaminated sites that have been closed with a groundwater enforcement standard exceedence. The rule requires that sites with residual groundwater contamination in excess of the NR140 enforcement standard be placed on a GIS registry. The site information is available on the DNR Internet web site. A DNR administrative rule, effective August 1, 2002, requires inclusion on the GIS registry of sites approved for closure with residual soil contamination.

As of October 1, 2008, 6,114 sites have been placed on the GIS registry of closed sites with a groundwater enforcement standard exceedence, residual soil contamination, or both. Of this total, 4,652 are PECFA-eligible. Of the 6,114 sites: (a) 2,273 sites have a groundwater enforcement standard exceedence, of which 1,944 are PECFA-eligible; (b) 1,356 sites have soil contamination only, of which 698 are PECFA-eligible; and (c) 2,485 sites have both groundwater and soil contamination, of which 2,010 sites are PECFA-eligible.

Soil

Contaminated soil can affect human health if a person has direct contact with contaminated soil or if the contamination degrades groundwater or air quality. Soil remediation standards are contained in Chapter NR 720, which includes numerical values for a limited number of specific compounds that represent concentrations of contaminants that can remain in soil at a site and not cause groundwater to become contaminated above groundwater quality standards in NR 140. NR 720 also includes numerical values for a limited number of compounds that represent the amount of contaminants that can remain at a site and not cause a risk to human health through eating or breathing con-

taminated soil particles. NR 720 also allows consultants to develop site specific soil cleanup standards, which are based on conditions at the site and can allow most or all of the contaminated soil to remain in place at certain sites. DNR administrative rules also include standards for the one-time landspreading of petroleum contaminated soils at certain suitable locations, with natural degradation of the contaminants by soil microorganisms.

Hazardous Substance Spills Program

Under state law, DNR must be notified immediately of any discharge of hazardous substances (s. 292.11 of the statutes, known as the spills statute). "Discharge" includes spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying and dumping. The first report of a discharge is typically made to a DNR regional office, the local DNR warden, or a 24-hour telephone hotline staffed by the state Division of Emergency Government. Leaking underground storage tanks are included in the definition of "spills," but are discussed under the section on the LUST program.

Administrative rule NR 706 establishes notification requirements for reporting a non-LUST discharge of hazardous substances. It also establishes notification exemptions for discharges of certain substances if the discharge does not adversely impact or threaten to impact human health, safety or the environment, if the substances are immediately cleaned up or evaporate before they can be cleaned up and are below specified quantities. The rule includes petroleum compounds, agrichemicals and substances for which there are federally-established reportable quantities.

Responsible Party

The responsible party is required to take necessary action to restore the air, land or water to the condition it was in before the release occurred

to the extent practicable, in compliance with the hazardous substances spills law. Responsible parties take the appropriate action in response to a discharge in over 95% of all reported spills. DNR can take action if the responsible party is not known or does not take appropriate action. The NR 700 administrative rule series establishes which actions are necessary to respond to the discharge.

If the responsible party is identified, the party is required to reimburse DNR for any expenses the Department incurs in the response. Reimbursements are credited to the environmental management account of the environmental fund. When responding under this program, DNR has the authority to enter any property with permission of the owner or a special inspection warrant if necessary to prevent increased damage to the air, land or water. DNR employees or contractors may enter private property without prior permission if the delay involved in obtaining permission will result in an imminent risk to public health or safety or the environment. DNR may require, through an administrative order, that preventive measures, such as the installation or testing of equipment or a designated way of performing an operation, be taken by anyone possessing or controlling a hazardous substance if the Department finds that existing control measures are inadequate.

DNR Response Options

DNR makes two types of responses at spills sites. First, DNR provides oversight support for cleanups by responsible parties, which can include evaluating the effectiveness of the response effort by a responsible party and offering technical assistance to the responsible party or their contractor. Second, if there is no responsible party or other local or federal governmental resources available to manage the cleanup, DNR uses the environmental fund to pay a zone contractor to provide emergency response services throughout the state or, in non-emergency responses, to procure the cleanup of a spill. On significant spills, DNR may request EPA assistance under the

Superfund emergency removal program.

Number and Type of Reported Spills

Approximately 960 spills are reported to DNR annually, including 868 spills reported in 2006, 926 reported in 2007, and 749 in 2008 as of September, 2008. DNR estimates that approximately 58% of the hazardous substances spilled are petroleum products, 4% are agricultural chemicals such as fertilizers, pesticides, herbicides, and insecticides, 3% are industrial chemicals such as acid, base, paint and bleach, and the remaining 35% are other substances such as volatile organic compounds, solvents, metals, wastewater, and manure.

The largest sources of spills are spills at industrial facilities (23%), transportation accidents such as releases of diesel fuel or spills from loads of semi trucks (19%), and spills on private property (12%). The other spills are categorized as occurring on private property, public property, gasoline or automotive facilities, agricultural cooperative facilities, or are not categorized. The largest percentage of hazardous substances spills impact soil (36%). In addition, 16% of spills occurred in a building or on an impervious surface such as a roadway, 15% impact surface water, and the remainder impact contained areas, groundwater, storm sewers, or air.

DNR responded to 37 spill sites in 2007 through October 1, 2008, with a total DNR response cost of approximately \$188,500 from the environmental fund. When DNR is able to identify the responsible party for the spill, the Department recovers all or part of its costs. The cost recovery process can take a few years, depending on the timing and results of legal actions related to the spill.

Abandoned Containers Actions

DNR may contain, remove or dispose of

abandoned containers and their contents or take any other necessary related emergency action. An "abandoned container" is defined as any container that holds a hazardous substance and is not being monitored and maintained (section 292.41). The definition does not apply to buried containers or containers located in a waste disposal facility. DNR has the authority to enter any property with either permission of the owner or a special inspection warrant, if necessary to prevent increased damage to the air, land or water.

In most cases, DNR becomes aware of abandoned containers from public tips that containers of unknown material have been abandoned without the consent of the property owner, on public property, or into or adjacent to surface water. Except in emergency situations, requests to DNR to deal with abandoned containers are not approved if a responsible party is known and has the financial resources to respond to the problem. If the responsible parties are identified after a state-funded response has occurred, the Department may recover its costs.

DNR responded to 28 abandoned container sites from 2007 through October 1, 2008, that had abandoned containers holding hazardous substances, with a total DNR response cost of approximately \$48,000 from the environmental fund. Most of the abandoned containers are found in the most populated areas of the state, including the Milwaukee and Fox Valley regions.

State-Funded Response Actions

DNR administers a program of state-funded response actions that can be considered the state equivalent to the Superfund program. The program has authority for all types of hazardous substances sites, including approved and unapproved solid and hazardous waste disposal facilities, and waste sites, under s. 292.31 of the

statutes, the environmental repair statute. Typical sites cleaned up under s. 292.31 are sites that were designed as a component of a specific waste management process and became contaminated (for example, old landfills), industrial sites, and contaminated municipal water supplies. Most state-funded response actions are accomplished under s. 292.11 of the statutes, the hazardous substance spill law. Typical sites cleaned up under s. 292.11 are leaking underground storage tanks, pipeline spills, train spills and spills of hazardous substances at industrial sites.

Responsible Party

DNR tries to determine what parties are responsible for contamination problems at hazardous substance sites. Under the environmental repair statute, a person is a responsible party if that person: (a) knew or should have known at the time disposal occurred that the disposal would cause or contribute to a substantial danger to public health or the environment; (b) violated any applicable law, plan approval or administrative order and the violation caused or contributed to the condition at the site; or (c) took actions which caused or contributed to the condition at the site and would result in liability under common law in effect at the time the disposal occurred.

DNR requires the responsible party to fund the costs of the site investigation and cleanup if the responsible party is able to do so. In the majority of contamination cases, the responsible party works cooperatively with DNR, and completes and pays for the cleanup.

Under the spills law and environmental repair law, a person who contributes to contamination may be held liable for the entire cost of cleanup. However, if a local government has initiated the local governmental unit negotiation process under s. 292.35 of the statutes (described in a later section), responsible parties are liable for costs in proportion to the percentage of contamination they caused. For example, if a responsible party caused

50% of the contamination and no other responsible parties are identified who can pay, it is liable for 50% of the cleanup costs.

The liability provisions of Superfund, s. 292.11 (spills statute) and s. 292.31 (the environmental repair statute) require the responsible party to pay all of the cleanup costs (even if it caused 50% of the contamination) if no other responsible parties are identified, and if the responsible party is unable to differentiate between the contamination caused by the responsible party and the contamination caused by other parties. This differs from the local governmental unit negotiation process under s. 292.35 of the statutes, which would require the responsible party to pay only 50% of the cleanup costs if it caused 50% of the contamination if an agreement has been reached or a recommended agreement has been issued. DNR state-funded response actions use the stricter liability provisions of the spills statute and the environmental repair statute.

If DNR cannot identify the responsible party or if the responsible party cannot or will not pay cleanup costs (for example, if the company is insolvent), the state pays for cleanup. If DNR identifies responsible parties at a later date, it can seek recovery of its cleanup costs from the responsible parties.

Generally, sites that do not score high enough on EPA's hazard ranking system to become a Superfund site, but are considered a significant risk to human health, safety or the environment, are considered for state-funded response. Because of delays in the Superfund process, the Department also identifies some potential Superfund sites for state-funded response action when it determines that postponing action at these sites could significantly increase the magnitude of an existing problem.

Inventory of Contaminated Sites

Under the environmental repair statute, DNR is

required to compile, maintain and make available to the public a database of sites or facilities and other properties at which the discharge of a hazardous substance or other environmental pollution has been reported to the Department. DNR is required to update the database regularly.

DNR has developed information about sites with contamination or sites with a history of activity related to solid waste disposal or contamination. In addition, the Department developed and maintains a comprehensive database called BRRTS (Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System) that allows people to search for information about sites that may have contamination. This is available to the public on the Department's Internet web site as "BRRTS on the Web." All known contaminated sites are listed on the BRRTS database.

State agencies are prohibited from providing lists of 10 or more individuals that include personal information, such as name and address, about individuals who do not want to be identified. DNR has implemented the provisions by excluding personal identifiers about individuals (name, home address and telephone number) from Internet web site information about contaminated sites if not in conflict with DNR duties under other laws. Other information about individual sites is included on the web site, such as the property address, type of contamination, cleanup actions taken at the site, and whether the cleanup has been completed.

DNR has a system of evaluating contaminated sites which includes environmental and socio-economic criteria to determine whether sites are high-, medium-, or low-priority for purposes of selecting sites to be funded under state-funded response. The system is also used to determine reimbursement funding priority (high-, medium- or low-category) in the dry cleaner environmental response program. DNR has not codified the system in administrative rule.

Investigation and Remedial Action

If a site or facility presents a substantial danger to public health, welfare or the environment, DNR is authorized to take specific remedial action. This authority includes: (a) taking direct action to remedy the pollution; (b) repairing or restoring the environment; (c) establishing a long-term monitoring and maintenance program for the facility; (d) providing temporary or permanent replacement of private water supplies damaged by the facility; (e) assessing the potential health effects of the occurrence; or (f) any other action necessary to protect public health, safety or the environment.

The process of investigation and cleanup is similar, but somewhat less complex, than it is for Superfund sites. A preliminary site investigation is done by DNR. If the site is considered an imminent hazard based on this investigation, emergency action may be undertaken. If the site does not present an imminent danger, but is determined to be a significant environmental hazard, the site is recommended for long-term cleanup.

When DNR is ready to proceed with the cleanup process at the site, it contracts for a complete investigation. DNR then contracts to have a remedial options plan developed which details the possible cleanup alternatives. After the appropriate option is selected (including the public hearing process), the remediation is initiated. Costs associated with these activities are funded from the environmental management account of the state segregated environmental fund and from general obligation bonding.

Since 1988, DNR has initiated response actions at hundreds of contaminated sites. The level of DNR response depends on the amount of contamination. If there is a relatively low level of contamination, DNR may conduct initial sampling of private water supplies, groundwater, or soil to verify that no significant threat exists. If there is a moderate to high level of contamination, DNR will fund or oversee a larger investigation to determine the

degree and size of contamination. After the investigation is completed, an appropriate remedial action plan is developed. The response can vary from monitoring the contamination level, to a larger active cleanup, with long-term operation and maintenance of a remedy, and a case closure. Sometimes emergency actions are necessary to remove the contamination. An alternative to a DNR-lead cleanup is a partnership with a municipality through an intergovernmental agreement, where DNR and the municipality each agree to undertake specific components and costs of the cleanup.

In addition, there are several hundred sites where remedial action currently underway is being financed by responsible parties. DNR is overseeing a portion of that work, in part based on the overall priority of the case.

Appendix II lists the state sites that had been, or were being, investigated or cleaned up under the state-funded response action program through October, 2008. The list does not contain the sites where responsible parties are financing cleanup and DNR is overseeing the work. (Some of these sites are also listed in the Superfund national priority list.) DNR anticipates that during the 2007-09 biennium it will expend approximately \$7 million for cleanup activities at these sites. Expenditures are made from the state-funded response environmental segregated (SEG) appropriation and general obligation bonding authority described in subsequent sections.

State-Funded Response Appropriation

DNR administers a state-funded response appropriation through the environmental management account of the environmental fund. The appropriation had \$6,717,400 available for expenditures in the 2007-09 biennium. This included expenditure authority of \$2,440,800 in 2007-08 and \$2,441,700 in 2008-09, encumbrances at the beginning of 2007-08 totaling \$1,300,200 and an unencumbered carry-in balance of \$534,700. Expenditures from the appropriation totaled \$2,553,200 in

2006-07 and \$1,978,400 in 2007-08, and have averaged \$2.3 million annually for the five years from 2003-04 through 2007-08.

The appropriation is used for DNR expenditures related to: (a) DNR-lead cleanups of contaminated sites where the responsible party is unknown or can not or will not clean up the site (see Appendix II for a list of sites with cleanup funded from the appropriation); (b) the state share at certain Superfund site cleanups; (c) the state match to federal LUST expenditures; (d) emergency spill response and cleanups; (e) response and cleanup of abandoned containers of hazardous substances where the responsible party can not be identified; (f) \$3 per capita payments to certain municipalities for groundwater monitoring and equipment purchases; (g) provision of temporary emergency water supplies; (h) DNR-lead remedial actions at abandoned privately-owned landfills; (i) DNR-lead cleanups resulting from responsible party payment of court settlements; and (j) limited term employee costs related to DNR-lead cleanups.

Municipal Monitoring Cost Reimbursements

Under certain conditions, DNR is directed to reimburse costs incurred by a municipality for groundwater monitoring. The reimbursement is for costs in excess of \$3 per capita annually for monitoring mandated by the Department at municipally owned or operated "nonapproved" solid waste sites. (An "approved" facility is defined by statute as one that had a plan of operation approved by DNR after May 21, 1978, or had its plan approved between May 21, 1975, and May 21, 1978, and had its plan subsequently reviewed and reapproved by DNR. All other facilities are classified "nonapproved.")

Reimbursements are paid out of the state-funded response appropriation from the environmental fund before any other appropriation expenses are paid. Between 1987 and 2004, almost \$1.8 million in payments were made to 12 local governments. No payments have been made since

2004. DNR indicates the reason is all operating municipally-owned landfills have developed adequate routine monitoring of groundwater, and municipal landfills that are not currently operating generally have monitoring in place.

Provision of Temporary Emergency and Permanent Water Replacement Supplies

DNR provides temporary emergency water supplies to persons with water supplies that have been adversely affected by contamination from a site or facility subject to cleanup requirements under the hazardous substance spills statute or environmental repair statute. Provisions are contained in administrative rule NR 738. Temporary emergency water supplies include potable water obtained in bottles, by tank truck or by other similar means, or a temporary connection to an existing water supply, supplied at a capacity sufficient to satisfy water use functions impaired by the contaminated water supply.

The environmental fund pays for temporary emergency water supplies if the following criteria are met: (a) the source of potable water is from a contaminated well or contaminated water supply; (b) the contamination is known or is suspected by DNR to be from environmental pollution or a hazardous substance discharge subject to the spills statute (s. 292.11) or the environmental repair statute (s. 292.31); (c) water sampling is conducted in accordance with specific requirements; and (d) DNR or the Department of Health Services has issued a drinking water advisory notice for the water supply. DNR has paid a cumulative total of approximately \$240,600 as of October 1, 2008, for temporary emergency water supplies, including \$2,846 in 2006-07 and \$11,904 in 2007-08.

The environmental fund also pays for permanent replacement water supplies instead of temporary emergency water supplies under certain circumstances. DNR may grant a variance to the rule in order to allow payment of a portion of the costs of a permanent replacement water supply if: (a) the

owner of the contaminated well demonstrates financial hardship; and (b) DNR determines that the cost of the permanent replacement water supply would create an unreasonable financial hardship for the well owner. DNR has paid approximately \$617,200 from 1984 through October 1, 2008, for 188 permanent replacement water supplies where there was a demonstrated financial hardship for the well owner. This included expenditures of \$187,366 for 20 wells in 2006-07, \$107,197 for 39 wells in 2007-08, and \$21,480 for five additional wells as of October 1, 2008.

General Obligation Bonds for Remediation of Contaminated Land and Sediments

DNR has been authorized \$47 million in general obligation bonding (including \$3 million authorized in the 2007-09 budget) to fund the state's cost-share for cleanup of federal Superfund and LUST sites and state-funded cleanups under the environmental repair statute (s. 292.31) and hazardous substances spills statute (s. 292.11). Bonding authority can be used for public purpose projects such as cleanup of contaminated groundwater, soils and sediments, and activities such as investigation, remedial design and cleanup of a specific site when the responsible party is unknown, unable or unwilling to fund the cleanup. Bonding authority cannot be used for general preliminary investigations or cleanups funded by responsible parties.

DNR has expended or encumbered \$41.7 million of the available \$47 million in bonding authority as of October 1, 2008. DNR has committed or is expecting to commit, by the end of 2008-09, approximately \$1 million in additional bonding authority for work at sites where investigative work has been completed and remedial design work is completed or underway, and implementation of the selected remedy may occur.

DNR has also been authorized \$7 million in general obligation bonding for contaminated sediment cleanup in Lake Michigan or Lake

Superior or a tributary of one of the two lakes. As of October 1, 2008, DNR has expended or encumbered \$5.7 million of the available \$7 million.

Beginning in 2001-02, payment of the debt service repayment for the general obligation bonding authority for both remedial action and contaminated sediment cleanup was converted from general purpose revenue (GPR) to segregated (SEG) revenue from the environmental management account of the environmental fund. In 2007-08, \$3,531,300 SEG was expended on general obligation bond debt service for remedial action and contaminated sediment cleanup. In 2008-09, debt service costs are anticipated to be \$4.1 million. Table 5 shows debt service costs for the two purposes from 2003-04 through 2008-09.

Table 5: General Obligation Bond Debt Service Costs for Remediation of Contaminated Land and Sediments

| Year | Expenditure |
|-------------------|-------------|
| 2003-04 | \$1,601,400 |
| 2004-05 | 2,182,000 |
| 2005-06 | 3,006,900 |
| 2006-07 | 3,216,300 |
| 2007-08 | 3,531,300 |
| 2008-09 estimated | 4,086,000 |

General Obligation Bonds for Great Lakes Harbor Cleanup

Under 2007 Wisconsin Act 20, DNR was authorized \$17 million in general obligation bonding authority, with debt service costs paid from the environmental management account, for removal of contaminated sediment from Lake Michigan or Lake Superior or their tributaries if federal funds are provided for the project under the Great Lakes Legacy Act. The first use of funding under this provision will be approximately \$7.7 million of bonding for the required 35% match for a \$22 million PCB-contaminated sediment dredging project in the Kinnickinnic River in

Milwaukee, beginning in 2009. The second use of funding will also be in Milwaukee, where the remaining \$9.3 million in bonding is expected to be used toward the required 35% match for a project to remove PCB-contaminated sediment from the Estabrook impoundment in Lincoln Park along the west shore of the Milwaukee River north of the Estabrook Dam, beginning in 2010. The total project costs have not been determined.

Liability Exemptions and Assurances

Several limitations on liability for cleanup of contamination under the hazardous substances spills law were enacted in 1993 Wisconsin Act 453, and modified in several subsequent legislative sessions. The provisions were established in order to encourage persons to voluntarily cleanup contamination and restore properties to productive use. These provisions are generally intended to encourage the cleanup and redevelopment of brownfields. Brownfields are abandoned, idle or underused industrial or commercial properties, the expansion or redevelopment of which is adversely affected by actual or perceived environmental contamination.

DNR is authorized to charge fees to offset its costs for providing various types of technical assistance and assurance letters related to the environmental liability of owning a property. For example, persons who want to obtain a written assurance letter that DNR approves an exemption from future liability for cleanup of a property under certain circumstances, must pay a fee to DNR for the cost of providing the review and assurance.

Voluntary Party Limited Liability Provisions

Parties who conduct voluntary cleanups of contaminated property are able to limit their environmental liability if they enter DNR's voluntary party liability exemption (VPLE) program and meet cer-

tain conditions. The provisions are found in s. 292.15 of the Statutes. Voluntary parties may obtain an exemption from further remedial action on the property. The Department of Justice is prohibited from commencing an action under the federal Superfund law against the voluntary party if the voluntary party takes certain actions to investigate and clean up the property.

A "voluntary party" is defined as any person who submits an application to obtain an exemption from liability and who pays the required fees to offset DNR costs for providing the voluntary party exemption certification.

Exemption Process

A voluntary party is exempt from certain hazardous substance discharge and solid and hazardous waste statutory requirements if: (a) the party enters DNR's VPLE program by filling out an application and paying the appropriate fees; (b) their property is eligible for the exemption; (c) an environmental investigation of the property is conducted and it is approved by DNR; (d) the property is cleaned up by restoring the environment and minimizing the harmful effects from a release of a hazardous substance in accordance with DNR rules and any contract entered into under those rules; (e) the voluntary party obtains a certificate of completion from DNR that the property has been satisfactorily restored and that the harmful effects from a release of a hazardous substance have been minimized; (f) if the voluntary party owns or controls the property, the voluntary party maintains and monitors the property as required by DNR; (g) the voluntary party does not engage in activities that are inconsistent with the maintenance of the property; and (h) the voluntary party has not obtained the DNR certification by fraudulent methods.

The voluntary party's exemption from liability continues in the future even if any of the following happen: (a) future statutes, rules or regulations impose greater responsibilities on property owners;

(b) the voluntary party's remediation is not completely successful; (c) the contamination from a hazardous substance that is the subject of remediation is discovered to be more extensive than anticipated by the voluntary party and DNR; (d) if the voluntary party does not own or control the property, the person who owns or controls the property fails to maintain and monitor the property as required by DNR; or (e) if the voluntary party does not own or control the property, the person who owns or controls the property fails to allow DNR and other specified parties to enter the property to determine whether natural attenuation has failed and to take action to respond to the discharge if natural attenuation has failed. The exemption applies to the voluntary party's successor if the successor maintains the property and, if the voluntary party obtained the DNR certification by fraudulent means, the successor was unaware of the fraud.

A voluntary party is exempt from the requirements of certain hazardous and solid waste statutes for property affected by discharges that originated off-site if all of the following occur at any time before or after the date of acquisition: (a) the property is cleaned up by restoring the environment to the extent practicable and minimizing the harmful effects from the discharges in accordance with DNR rules and any contract entered into under those rules, except for the hazardous substance originating off-site for which the voluntary party is exempt under off-site liability provisions; (b) the voluntary party obtains a certificate of completion from DNR that the environment has been satisfactorily restored to the extent practicable and the harmful effects from a release have been minimized, except for the discharge originating off-site for which the voluntary party is exempt from liability under the off-site liability provisions; (c) the voluntary party obtains a written determination concerning liability from DNR under current off-site liability provisions; and (d) the voluntary party continues to meet provisions under the off-site discharges liability exemption (discussed in a later section).

A voluntary party is also exempt from liability

under the hazardous substances and solid waste laws if there exists a hazardous substance in groundwater on a property in a concentration that exceeds a groundwater enforcement standard and DNR determines that natural attenuation will restore groundwater quality in accordance with DNR rules. Natural attenuation means the reduction in the mass and concentration in groundwater of a substance, and the products into which the substance breaks down, due to naturally occurring physical, chemical and biological processes, without human intervention.

The exemption from liability in the case of a groundwater enforcement standard exceedence, and where natural attenuation is being used, is available if the release of the hazardous substances occurred prior to the date DNR approves the environmental investigation of the property and if all of the following occur at any time before or after the date of acquisition: (a) the party enters the program and pays the appropriate fees to DNR; (b) the property is eligible for the exemption; (c) an environmental investigation of the property is conducted that is approved by the Department; (d) the hazardous substances discharges identified by the investigation are cleaned up by restoring the environment to the extent practicable and minimizing the harmful effects from the discharges in accordance with DNR rules and any contract entered into under those rules, except that the requirement does not apply with respect to the hazardous substance in groundwater that DNR has determined will be brought into compliance with DNR rules through natural attenuation; (e) if required by DNR, the voluntary party obtains insurance to cover the costs of cleanup of the hazardous substance that DNR has determined will be brought into compliance with DNR rules through natural attenuation, in case natural attenuation fails, the insurance complies with DNR rules and names the state as the insured, and the voluntary party pays the required insurance fee; (f) the voluntary party obtains a certificate of completion from DNR that the property has been satisfactorily restored to the extent practicable and

that the harmful effects from the discharges have been minimized, except with respect to the hazardous substance in groundwater that DNR has determined will be brought into compliance with DNR rules through natural attenuation; (g) if the voluntary party owns or controls the property, the voluntary party maintains and monitors the property as required by DNR; (h) the voluntary party does not engage in activities that are inconsistent with the maintenance of the property; (i) the voluntary party has not obtained the DNR certification by fraudulent methods; and (j) if the voluntary party owns or controls the property, the voluntary party allows DNR and other specified parties to enter the property to determine whether natural attenuation has failed and to take action to respond to the discharge if natural attenuation has failed. This provision does not exempt the property from any lien for recovery of cleanup costs incurred by DNR prior to the date that DNR issues the natural attenuation certification.

DNR promulgated rules related to requirements for insurance at sites where voluntary parties are using natural attenuation in cases of groundwater contamination and a liability exemption is sought. The rules are found in Chapter NR 754, which took effect in March, 2001. As of December 1, 2008, DNR has received insurance premiums and fees totaling \$219,100 for 16 sites, and has issued certificates of completion for all 16 sites.

DNR is authorized to approve a partial cleanup by a voluntary party and issue a certificate of completion that states that not all of the property has been satisfactorily restored or that not all of the harmful effects from a discharge of a hazardous substance have been minimized. Approval of a partial cleanup would exempt a voluntary party, with respect to the portion of the property subject to the partial approval, from certain environmental cleanup requirements. A certificate for partial cleanup can be issued only if: (a) an investigation is conducted of the property; (b) public health, safety or the environment will not be endangered by any hazardous substances remaining on or originating

from the property after the partial cleanup; (c) the activities associated with any proposed use or development of the property will not aggravate or contribute to the discharge of a hazardous substance and will not interfere with or increase the costs of cleaning up the property; and (d) the owner of the property agrees to cooperate with DNR to address problems caused by hazardous substances remaining on the property.

The exemption or partial exemption from liability for a voluntary party does not apply to: (a) certain hazardous waste treatment, storage or disposal facilities; (b) to certain licensed solid waste facilities; and (c) to solid waste facilities or waste sites at which active remediation is required. The exemption or partial exemption does not exempt the property from any lien for recovery of costs filed by DNR prior to the date DNR issues a certificate of exemption or partial exemption.

Participation

As of December 1, 2008, DNR received 271 applications for participation in the voluntary party liability program. Of this total, 82 properties have received a certificate of completion and received an exemption from DNR from future liability for the site. Eight were denied because the site or applicant was not eligible for the voluntary party liability exemption, and 55 applications were withdrawn. The remaining 126 properties are in the process of completing the investigation and cleanup needed to receive a certificate of completion.

After applying for the exemption, a voluntary party must conduct an environmental assessment to provide information about the known or suspected contamination at the site and to determine what actions will be necessary to cleanup the property to comply with state laws. The voluntary party must then complete an environmental investigation and must conduct a cleanup. After completion of the cleanup, the voluntary party must request and receive DNR close out under administrative

rule Chapter NR 726. At that time DNR certifies the exemption from future liability.

Persons who want to participate in the voluntary party process may request a number of types of assurances. Prospective purchasers of property may request a letter from DNR certifying that they are entitled to the voluntary party liability exemptions. The voluntary party may request that DNR approve a partial cleanup and issue a certificate of completion approving an environmental investigation and a portion of the cleanup. DNR issues a certificate of completion for an entire property after it approves the investigation and cleanup of a property.

Local Government and Economic Development Corporation Liability

Local governments and certain economic development corporations are not liable for cleanup under the hazardous substances spills and solid waste management law for discharges of hazardous substances on or originating from property they acquired in certain ways, or if the contamination resulted from an unlicensed solid waste site or facility. They are also exempt from the requirement to reimburse DNR for any cleanup expenses incurred by DNR at these sites. These provisions are found in s. 292.11 (9), s. 292.24, s. 292.26, and s. 292.23 (related to certain solid waste management statutes under chapter 289) of the statutes.

Local governmental units include a city, town, village, county, county utility district, town sanitary district, public inland lake protection and rehabilitation district, metropolitan sewage district, redevelopment authority, public body designated by a municipality, community development authority and housing authority. An economic development corporation would have to be one described in section 501 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code that is exempt from federal taxation under section 501 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, or an entity wholly owned by such a corporation.

The local government exemption from liability would apply if the local government acquired the property: (a) through tax delinquency proceedings or as the result of an order by a bankruptcy court; (b) from another local government that is exempt under the local government exemption provision; (c) through condemnation or other eminent domain proceedings; (d) for the purpose of slum clearance or blight elimination; (e) through escheat (where there is no heir to the property); or (f) using funds appropriated under the Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson Stewardship or Warren Knowles-Gaylord Nelson Stewardship 2000 program. The economic development corporation exemption would apply if the corporation acquired the property to further the economic development purposes that qualify the corporation as exempt from federal taxation.

A local government or economic development corporation is not eligible for the exemption from liability if the discharge of the hazardous substance was caused by: (a) an action taken by the local government or corporation; (b) a failure of the local government or corporation to take appropriate action to restrict access to the property in order to minimize costs or damages that may result from unauthorized persons entering the property; (c) a failure of the local government or corporation to sample and analyze unidentified substances in containers stored aboveground on the property; or (d) a failure of the local government or corporation to remove and properly dispose of, or to place in a different container and properly store, any hazardous substance stored above ground on the property in a container that is leaking or is likely to leak. In addition, if the local government or corporation intends to use or develop the property, the exemption does not apply if the local government or corporation does not take actions that the DNR determines are necessary to reduce threats to public health or safety related to the reuse of the property.

Local governments that meet the specified conditions are exempt from environmental liability and do not have to receive approval from DNR. Thus, DNR

does not have data about how many sites are eligible for the exemption. DNR estimates that, as of October 1, 2008, approximately 50 local governments have requested that DNR provide a letter of general liability clarification, which is a written determination by DNR on the local government's eligibility for the exemption. In addition, applications for site assessment grants (described in a later section) indicate many other local governments are acquiring contaminated properties for which they might use a local government liability exemption.

DNR began implementing a pilot program in 2003, under provisions of an EPA grant, where local governments and economic development corporations that qualify for the liability exemption may be exempted from the chapter NR 600 hazardous waste management requirements. DNR can use enforcement discretion, on a case-by-case basis, at such sites with a history of hazardous waste management activities. As of October 1, 2008, six sites have been granted letters documenting DNR's decision to use enforcement discretion. DNR requested EPA to approve the program on a permanent basis. As of December, 2008, EPA was reviewing the DNR request.

Lender Limited Liability Provisions

A lender that acquires title to, or possession or control of property when it is enforcing a security interest is exempt, under s. 292.21 of the statutes, from environmental liability under the hazardous substances spills law if the lender: (a) does not intentionally or negligently cause a new discharge of a hazardous substance or exacerbate an existing discharge; (b) notifies DNR of any known discharge of a hazardous substance; (c) conducts an environmental assessment at any time up to 90 days after acquiring the property and follows certain procedures related to the assessment; (d) is not engaged in the operation of a business at the property and implements an emergency response action in response to the discharge of a hazardous substance released on or after the date the lender acquires title to, or possession or control of, the

property; (e) allows DNR or other specified parties to enter the property to respond to the discharge; (f) agrees to avoid any interference with action undertaken to respond to the discharge and to avoid actions that worsen the discharge; and (g) agrees to any other condition that DNR determines is reasonable and necessary to ensure that DNR or other persons can adequately respond to the discharge.

The lender is required to reimburse DNR for the costs of reviewing materials if the lender requests a written clarification of their liability status. As of December 1, 2008, DNR has issued 32 lender assessment review letters.

Liability Exemption for Off-Site Discharges

A person is exempt, under s. 292.13 of the statutes, from liability for remedial action under the hazardous substances spills law with respect to the existence of a hazardous substance in the groundwater or soil, including sediments, on property possessed or controlled by the person if: (a) the discharge of the hazardous substance originated from a source on property that is possessed or controlled by another; (b) the person did not possess or control the hazardous substance on the property on which the discharge originated or cause the original discharge; (c) the person conducts an investigation or submits other information that DNR determines is adequate to determine that (a) and (b) are met; (d) the person agrees to allow DNR and other specified parties to enter the property and take action to respond to the discharge; (e) the person agrees to avoid any interference with action undertaken to respond to the discharge and to avoid actions that worsen the discharge; and (f) the person agrees to other specified conditions that DNR determines are reasonable and necessary to ensure that DNR or other specified persons can adequately respond to the discharge.

In addition, a person is exempt from liability for remedial action under the spills law with respect to the existence of a hazardous substance in the soil,

including sediments, on property possessed or controlled by the person, if the same conditions are met. Further, the person must agree to take one or more of the following actions at the direction of DNR, if after DNR has made a reasonable attempt to notify the party who caused the discharge of the hazardous substance about the party's responsibilities under the spills law, DNR determines that the action or actions are necessary to prevent an imminent threat to human health, safety or welfare or to the environment: (a) limit public access to the property; (b) identify, monitor and mitigate fire, explosion and vapor hazards on the property; and (c) visually inspect the property and install appropriate containment barriers.

Property owners who qualify for the off-site exemption do not have to request or receive approval from DNR in order to be exempt. However, DNR is authorized to, upon request, issue a written determination that the person is not required to respond to the discharge or reimburse DNR for the costs of responding to the discharge if DNR determines that the person qualifies for the exemption from liability. DNR may assess and collect fees from a person to offset the costs of issuing determinations to persons who request them. As of December 1, 2008, DNR had issued 253 off-site liability exemption letters.

DNR Technical Assistance

DNR is authorized, under s. 292.55 of the statutes, to provide various types of technical assistance and to assess and collect fees from the requester of services to offset the costs of providing assistance. Examples of types of technical assistance would include, upon request: (a) assisting persons who want to determine who is liable for environmental pollution of properties; (b) assisting in, or providing comments on the planning and implementation of an environmental investigation of a property or the environmental cleanup of a property; (c) determining whether further action is necessary to remedy environmental pollution of a property; and (d) issuing a letter to a person concerning the environmental li-

ability of owning or leasing the property, the type and extent of contamination on the property or the adequacy of an environmental investigation of the site. As of December 1, 2008, DNR had issued 398 general liability clarification letters, 26 letters concerning the environmental liability of leasing a property, and 1,352 letters regarding other types of technical assistance or fee issues.

Cancellation of Delinquent Taxes

Wisconsin Counties and the City of Milwaukee are authorized to cancel part or all of delinquent property taxes, interest and penalties on a contaminated property. In order to be eligible, an environmental assessment would have to show that contamination exists on a property and the property owner or potential owner would have to enter into an agreement with DNR to investigate and clean up the property. As of October 1, 2008, DNR has entered into 24 cleanup agreements for tax delinquent contaminated sites. The agreement is submitted to the taxing authority, either a County or the City of Milwaukee, and that taxing authority determines whether all or a portion of the delinquent taxes will be canceled.

Local Government Negotiation and Cost Recovery

Local governments (counties, cities, villages or towns) are authorized, under s. 292.35 of the statutes, to negotiate with parties responsible for environmental pollution to share the costs of remedial action at the site of a facility where either: (a) the environmentally contaminated land is owned by the local government; or (b) a local government owns a portion of the site and commits itself to paying more than 50% of the amount equal to the costs of the investigation and remedial action costs less any financial assistance received for the site or facility. The negotiation procedure first applied to landfills beginning

January 1, 1996, and to all other sites or facilities beginning May 13, 1994.

Before the local government may begin the negotiation procedure, it must attempt to identify responsible parties, draft a remedial action plan, conduct a public hearing and obtain DNR approval of the plan. A responsible party would include: (a) an owner or operator at the time the property is taken for tax delinquency or at the time that the disposal or discharge of a hazardous substance at the site or facility occurs; (b) a generator; (c) a transporter; or (d) a person who possesses, controls or causes the discharge or disposal of a hazardous substance.

After DNR approves the remedial action plan, the local government may begin a negotiation process with any identified responsible parties by serving them with an offer to settle regarding the contribution of funds for the investigation and remedial action. The statutes set forth procedures for the negotiation process, including a method by which DNR selects a disinterested umpire to facilitate the negotiation. The local government and responsible parties may make an agreement regarding the contribution of funds. If they do not reach an agreement, the umpire makes a recommendation and the local government and responsible parties may choose whether or not to accept the recommendation.

The negotiation procedure has incentives to encourage the cooperation of responsible parties. If a responsible party enters into an agreement with a local government regarding the extent of the party's contribution of funds for the investigation or remedial action, or if the responsible party accepts the umpire's recommendation, the responsible party is not liable for any additional costs of the investigation or remedial action.

The negotiation procedure has disincentives for responsible parties who do not enter into an agreement or do not comply with the agreement. The local government may sue noncooperating re-

sponsible parties to recover a portion of the costs of the investigation and remedial action. In any lawsuit by the local government against noncooperating responsible parties, the percentage of the total costs of the investigation and remedial action that are allocated to the responsible party equals the percentage of that party's contribution to the environmental pollution resulting from the discharge or disposal of hazardous substances at the site or facility.

In September, 1997, DNR created a pilot cost-sharing program to allocate \$3,000,000 of existing general obligation bonding authority for construction projects at the landfills participating in the negotiation procedure. All of the pilot program funds have been allocated to four communities. All four communities have completed the process necessary to receive pilot program reimbursement and have received reimbursement. The communities and funding amounts are: (a) Rice Lake, \$750,000; (b) Amery, \$350,000; (c) Grafton, \$400,000; and (d) City of Waukesha, \$1,500,000.

No other sites have been entered in the negotiation procedure. DNR staff and interested persons met several years to discuss potential improvements to the process. The parties were not able to resolve issues related to allocating the orphan share at municipal landfills, that is, how to allocate cleanup costs for the share of responsibility of unknown parties or parties that are unable to finance cleanup costs.

Administrative rule Chapter NR 749 establishes a fee schedule used to offset DNR costs related to the negotiation and cost recovery process. The fees vary depending on the services that the local government requests from the Department.

Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Program

The dry cleaner environmental response program

was created in 1997 Act 27 to provide financial assistance awards for reimbursement of certain eligible costs of investigation and remedial action of contamination from dry cleaning solvents at current and certain former dry cleaning facilities. DNR administers the financial assistance and remediation components of the program. The Department of Revenue (DOR) collects the fees created to support the program.

Statutes related to reimbursement of claims under the program are contained in s. 292.65. The program is also administered through rule Chapter NR 169, effective February 1, 2000. DNR began paying awards in the summer of 2000.

Revenue

The segregated dry cleaner environmental response fund provides revenues for the dry cleaner environmental response program. Revenues received under the program totaled \$11,645,900 in 1997-98 through 2007-08, including \$938,300 in 2006-07 and \$1,087,800 in 2007-08. Revenues are anticipated to generate approximately \$1.5 million in 2008-09.

DOR is required to issue a dry cleaning facility license to each person who submits the required application form. The license is valid until surrendered or transferred by the dry cleaner, or revoked by DOR. If a dry cleaning facility is sold, the seller is authorized to transfer the license to the buyer. Suppliers of dry cleaning solvent are prohibited from selling and delivering dry cleaning solvent to a dry cleaning facility that does not hold a valid dry cleaner facility license.

DOR is required to collect the following revenues from operators of dry cleaning facilities and sellers of dry cleaning products and deposit them into the dry cleaner environmental response fund:

1. A dry cleaning fee paid by every operator of a dry cleaning facility equal to 2.8% of the gross receipts from the previous three months from dry

cleaning, due on April 25, July 25, October 25, and January 25; (The fee increased from 1.8% to 2.8%, effective January 1, 2008, under 2007 Wisconsin Act 20.)

2. A dry cleaning products fee imposed on persons who sell a dry cleaning solvent to a dry cleaning facility equal to \$5.00 per gallon of perchloroethylene sold and \$0.75 per gallon of any dry cleaning product other than perchlorethylene sold, which is due on April 25, July 25, October 25, and January 25 for the previous three months;

3. A late filing fee, interest, and negligency penalty after the due date of the quarterly due date for the dry cleaning facility license fee; and

4. Any recovery of fraudulent awards.

For purposes of the fees under the program, "dry cleaning facility" is defined as a facility that dry cleans apparel or household fabrics for the general public using a dry cleaning product, other than the following facilities: (a) coin-operated facilities; (b) facilities that are located on U.S. military installations; (c) industrial laundries; (d) commercial laundries; (e) linen supply facilities; (f) facilities that are located at a prison or other penal institution; (g) facilities that are located at a nonprofit hospital or at a nonprofit health care institution; (h) facilities that are located on property that is owned by the U.S. government or by the state of Wisconsin; and (i) formal wear rental firms.

Eligible Applicants

Owners or operators of dry cleaning facilities can apply for financial assistance to clean up contamination from dry cleaning products associated with their facility. An "owner" is defined as: (a) a person who owns, or has possession or control of, and who receives or received direct or indirect consideration from the operation of any of the following: (1) a dry cleaning facility that has a dry cleaning facility license issued by DOR; (2) a dry cleaning facility that has ceased operation, but

that if it ceased operation on or after October 14, 1997, was licensed before it ceased operation; (b) a subsidiary or parent corporation of the owner described under (a); or (c) a person who owns the property on which one of the following is located: (1) a licensed dry cleaning facility; or (2) a dry cleaning facility that has ceased operation but that was licensed before it ceased operation and was licensed and operating while the person owned the property.

An "operator" is defined as: (a) a person who holds a dry cleaning facility license issued by DOR; (b) a subsidiary or parent corporation of a person who holds a dry cleaning facility license; (c) a person who operated a dry cleaning facility that ceased operating before October 14, 1997; or (d) a person who operated a dry cleaning facility that ceased operation after October 13, 1997, if the facility had a dry cleaning facility license before it ceased operation.

Owners or operators of dry cleaning facilities who want to participate in the program are required to do the following: (a) report a dry cleaning product discharge to DNR in a timely manner; (b) notify DNR, before conducting a site investigation or any remedial action activity, of the potential for submitting an application for an award under the program; (c) conduct an investigation to determine the extent of environmental impact of the dry cleaning solvent discharge; (d) prepare a remedial action plan that identifies specific remedial action activities proposed to be conducted; and (e) conduct remedial action activities, including recover any recoverable dry cleaning product, manage any residual solid or hazardous waste in accordance with law, and restore groundwater in accordance with DNR administrative rules.

An owner or operator may enter into a written agreement with another person where the person acts as an agent for the owner or operator to conduct the cleanup activities.

Owners or operators of dry cleaning facilities

must implement certain enhanced pollution prevention measures in order to be eligible for a financial assistance award. In general, an owner or operator must implement the following: (a) the owner or operator manages wastes involving dry cleaning products in compliance with certain federal laws; (b) the dry cleaning facility does not discharge dry cleaning product or wastewater from dry cleaning machines into a sanitary sewer, septic system or waters of the state; (c) all machines or equipment that use dry cleaning products have appropriate containment structures that are able to contain any leak, spill or other release of dry cleaning products from the machines or other pieces of equipment; (d) floors are sealed or otherwise impervious to dry cleaning products; and (e) dry cleaning products are delivered to the facility by means of a closed, direct-coupled delivery system.

Owners or operators of dry cleaning facilities had until August 30, 2008, to submit a notification to DNR of the potential for submitting a claim under the program. DNR received 230 notifications of potential claims by that date.

Eligible and Ineligible Costs

Eligible reimbursable costs under the program include reasonable and necessary costs paid for the following items only: (a) removal of dry cleaning products from surface waters, groundwater or soil; (b) investigation and assessment of contamination caused by a dry cleaning product discharge from a dry cleaning facility; (c) preparation of remedial action plans; (d) removal of contaminated soils; (e) soil and groundwater treatment and disposal; (f) environmental monitoring; (g) laboratory services; (h) maintenance of equipment for dry cleaning product recovery performed as part of remedial action activities; (i) restoration or replacement of a private or public potable water supply; (j) restoration of environmental quality; (k) contractor costs for remedial action activities; (l) inspection and supervision; (m) other costs that DNR determines to be reasonable and necessary; and (n)

costs up to \$15,000 incurred by a third party in the discovery of a discharge of a dry cleaning product from an eligible owner's or operator's dry cleaning facility before the owner or operator discovered the discharge.

Ineligible costs include the following: (a) costs incurred before October 14, 1997, (The original act allowed applicants to request reimbursement of "past costs" incurred between January 1, 1991, and October 13, 1997, and DNR administrative rule required submittal of applications for past costs by April 30, 2000); (b) costs of retrofitting or replacing dry cleaning equipment; (c) other costs that DNR determines to be associated with, but not integral to, the investigation and remediation of a dry cleaning products discharge from a dry cleaning facility; (d) unreasonable or unnecessary costs; (e) costs for investigations or remedial action activities conducted outside Wisconsin; (f) costs for discharges from hazardous substances other than dry cleaning products; and (g) costs of financing eligible activities.

DNR is required to deny an application for an award if any of the following applies: (a) the application is not within the scope of the program; (b) the applicant submits a fraudulent application; (c) the applicant has been grossly negligent in the maintenance of the dry cleaning facility; (d) the applicant intentionally damaged the dry cleaning equipment; (e) the applicant falsified records; (f) the applicant willfully failed to comply with laws or rules of the state concerning the use or disposal of dry cleaning solvents; (g) the fees required under the program have not been paid, unless an agreement has been entered into with the Department of Revenue establishing a payment schedule for all of the required fees; and (h) the dry cleaning products discharge was caused on or after October 14, 1997, by a person who provided services or products to the owner or operator including a person who provided perchloroethylene to the owner or operator using a system other than a closed, direct-coupled delivery system.

DNR is required to subtract an amount equal to one-half of ineligible costs claimed by an owner from the eligible costs of the claim, after removing the ineligible costs from the claim. NR 169 identifies the ineligible costs to which the penalty would apply.

DNR is authorized to establish a schedule of usual and customary costs for any eligible costs and use the schedule to determine the amount of a claimant's eligible costs. DNR is authorized to promulgate rules under which it selects service providers to provide investigation or remedial action activities in specified areas. DNR may limit reimbursement of eligible costs to the amount that the selected service provider would have charged, if an owner or operator uses a different service provider than the one selected by DNR. As of January 1, 2009, DNR had not promulgated rules related to these provisions, and the Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Council had not requested that such rules be developed.

DNR established, in NR 169, requirements for soliciting bids for completing a site investigation and remedial action. In addition, NR 169 includes provisions which require claimants to obtain DNR approval of all actions for which a claimant will seek reimbursement, including immediate and interim actions, which do not require bidding, site investigation and remedial action bid selection, and any change orders exceeding \$3,000.

Award and Deductible Provisions

The Department pays an award to reimburse an applicant for eligible costs paid if DNR finds that the applicant meets the requirements of the program and rules promulgated under the program. DNR is required to approve the completed site investigation and remedial action activities before paying an award.

DNR is required to first allocate 9.7% of the financial assistance funds appropriated in each year for awards for immediate action activities and applications that exceed the amount anticipated.

An immediate action is a remedial action that is taken within a short time after a discharge of dry cleaning product occurs, or after the discover of the discharge, to halt the discharge, contain or remove discharged dry cleaning product, or remove contaminated soil or water in order to restore the environment to the extent practicable and to minimize the harmful effects of the discharge to air, lands, and waters of the state and to eliminate any imminent threat to public health, safety, or welfare. As of October 1, 2008, DNR reimbursed \$19,500 for one site for immediate action activities.

DNR uses the remaining funds for reimbursement of site investigations and remedial actions. DNR establish a method for determining the order in which it pays awards, based on environmental factors and on the order in which applications are received. Under Chapter NR 169, DNR assigns applications to one of three site hazard categories after reviewing an interim action options report or remedial action options report. DNR allocates the funds for interim remedial action equipment, site investigations and remedial actions between the three categories. The categories and allocation are:

1. High-priority sites are allocated 25% of available funds and consist of sites that DNR determines pose an imminent risk to human health or the environment. Examples include sites where the dry cleaning product has contaminated public or private drinking water supplies in concentrations that exceed the health-based standard for the contaminant or where contamination of the drinking water supply is imminent.

2. Medium-priority sites are allocated 60% of available funds and consist of sites that DNR determines pose a significant risk to human health or the environment, or both. Examples include sites where there is contamination of a water supply below health standards or impacts above an environmental standard to surface water or wetlands.

3. Low-priority sites are allocated 15% of available funds and consist of sites that pose a risk to

human health or the environment, or both. Examples include sites with soil contamination that is not migrating to groundwater or surface water or where contamination levels are below health-based standards and are not expected to increase over time.

The maximum award is \$500,000 for reimbursement for costs incurred at a single dry cleaning facility. The owner or operator must pay a deductible equal to the following: (a) if eligible costs are \$200,000 or less, \$10,000; (b) if eligible costs are \$200,001 to \$400,000, \$10,000 plus 8% of the amount by which eligible costs exceed \$200,000; and (c) if eligible costs exceed \$400,000, \$26,000 plus 10% of the amount by which eligible costs exceed \$400,000.

DNR may waive collection of the deductible if the owner or operator is unable to pay. If the deductible is waived, DNR records a lien on the property until the deductible amount is paid. DNR has waived the deductible and filed a lien for two properties as of October, 2008.

An owner or operator may submit up to three interim reimbursement requests during the site investigation phase of the cleanup project, if: (a) the reimbursable costs are at least \$15,000; (b) the reimbursement request is accompanied by a change order to the site investigation scope of work and a progress report of work done to date; and (c) DNR approves the change order and progress report before paying the reimbursement. Only one reimbursement request can be submitted per fiscal year during the site investigation phase. An owner or operator may submit applications for site investigation and remedial action during the same year, but no more than two applications per year.

If an owner or operator receives payment from another person, including an insurance company, or receives a tax credit, for any eligible cleanup costs before submitting a claim for reimbursement under the program, DNR is required to reduce the award by the amount by which the payments from the other person exceed the sum of the deductible

and any eligible costs that exceed the maximum reimbursement amount, up to the maximum award. If an owner or operator receives payment from another person, including from an insurance company or as a tax credit based on eligible costs, after receiving an award under the program, the owner or operator must pay to DNR the amount by which the payment or tax credit exceeds the difference between the total amount of eligible costs and the amount of the award. DNR is required to deposit any amounts collected under these provisions in the dry cleaner environmental response fund.

Appropriations

In 2008-09, DNR is provided with \$240,300 with 3.0 positions from the segregated dry cleaner environmental response fund for administration of the financial assistance and remediation components of the program. This includes \$162,700 with 2.0 positions in the Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment to administer cleanup requirements and \$77,600 with 1.0 position in the Bureau of Community Financial Assistance to administer financial assistance requirements. DNR is appropriated \$1,050,000 in 2007-08 and \$1,220,000 in 2008-09 in a biennial appropriation for financial assistance awards under the program. In 2008-09, DOR is provided with \$61,300 with 1.0 position to collect the revenues under the program.

The estimated condition of the segregated dry cleaner environmental response fund is shown in Table 6. Revenues totaled \$1.1 million in 2007-08 and are expected to total approximately \$1.5 million in 2008-09. Expenditures totaled \$773,600 in 2007-08, including \$488,700 for dry cleaner environmental response awards and \$284,900 for DNR and DOR administration. While \$2,225,000 is appropriated for financial assistance during the 2007-09 biennium, awards under the program will be approximately \$1,820,000 because of insufficient revenues for full expenditure of the appropriated amount.

Table 6: Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Fund Condition, 2006-07 through 2008-09 (\$ in Millions)

| | 2006-07 Actual | 2007-08 Actual | 2008-09 Estimated |
|-------------------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Opening Balance, July 1 | \$1.2 | -\$0.1 | \$0.2 |
| Revenue | <u>0.9</u> | <u>1.1</u> | <u>1.5</u> |
| Total Revenue Available | \$2.1 | \$1.0 | \$1.7 |
| Expenditures | <u>-2.2</u> | <u>-0.8</u> | <u>-1.7</u> |
| Closing Balance | -\$0.1 | \$0.2 | \$0.0 |

Table 7 shows the cumulative amount of program costs for financial assistance awards and administration by fiscal year.

Table 7: Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Program Costs Paid by Fiscal Year

| | Dry Cleaner Awards | DNR & DOR Administration | Total |
|----------|--------------------|--------------------------|------------------|
| 1997-98 | \$0 | \$51,900 | \$51,900 |
| 1998-99 | 0 | 136,100 | 136,100 |
| 1999-00 | 0 | 154,600 | 154,600 |
| 2000-01 | 1,102,500 | 180,600 | 1,283,100 |
| 2001-02 | 592,500 | 201,700 | 794,200 |
| 2002-03 | 1,218,700 | 245,100 | 1,463,800 |
| 2003-04 | 508,000 | 256,100 | 764,100 |
| 2004-05 | 1,592,000 | 248,600 ** | 1,840,600 |
| 2005-06 | 1,715,100 | 249,900 | 1,965,000 |
| 2006-07 | 1,934,900 | 281,900 | 2,216,800 |
| 2007-08 | 488,700 | 284,900 | 773,600 |
| 2008-09* | <u>1,331,300</u> | <u>301,600</u> | <u>1,632,900</u> |
| Total | \$10,483,700 | \$2,593,200 | \$13,076,900 |
| Percent | 80.2% | 19.8% | 100.0% |

* Estimated.

** Of this amount, \$3,000 was lapsed to the general fund under the 2003-05 biennial budget.

Participation

As of October 1, 2008, DNR had paid \$9,472,402 for 245 claims for 92 eligible dry cleaner facility sites. The distribution of the category of claims is shown in Table 8. Of the 245 claims paid, \$2,186,928 (23%) and 51 claims were for high

Table 8: Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Program Claims Paid by Category, as of October 1, 2008

| | Claims* | Amount |
|------------------|----------|---------------|
| Past Costs | 11 | \$549,340 |
| High Priority | 51 | 2,186,928 |
| Medium Priority | 117 | 5,015,622 |
| Low Priority | 65 | 1,700,965 |
| Immediate Action | <u>1</u> | <u>19,548</u> |
| Total | 245 | \$9,472,402 |

* The 245 claims were paid for 92 sites. Of the 92 sites, cleanup work and reimbursement has been completed at 37 sites.

priority sites.

As of October, 2008, DNR had also reviewed, or was reviewing 52 other claims totaling \$1,834,900. This included 33 claims totaling \$1,018,900 that have been approved for payment and will be paid as sufficient revenues are received by the program. It also includes 19 claims totaling \$816,000 that are being reviewed. Claims received in November, 2008, are expected to be paid in the spring of 2010.

Reimbursement has been requested for a total of 105 of the 230 sites that filed notices of potential claims, of which 37 sites have received final payment, 55 have received partial payment, 12 are waiting for review or payment of the claim, and one was denied as ineligible. Of the 230 potential sites, 125 have not filed an initial claim.

DNR estimates the total potential cumulative cost of the program will be approximately \$35.8 million, including \$9.5 million paid as of October 1, 2008, \$1.8 million in claims received and waiting for payment, and \$24.5 million in anticipated future reimbursement claims for 193 open sites. DNR anticipates claim demand may exceed available funds by up to \$10 million by June 30, 2011.

Use of Environmental Fund

If DNR uses the state-funded response

appropriation from the segregated environmental fund to pay for a cleanup of a discharge of dry cleaning solvent at a dry cleaning facility and there is a person who would be an eligible owner or operator for the dry cleaning facility, DNR is required to transfer an equal amount of money from the dry cleaner environmental response financial assistance appropriation to the environmental fund when sufficient funds are available. DNR has determined that owners of three dry cleaning facilities are unable to pay for the cleanup. The dry cleaner financial assistance appropriation reimbursed the environmental fund for \$64,300 of cleanup expenditures in 2002-03. An additional \$728,435 in investigation and cleanup costs has been (\$324,435) or will be incurred (approximately \$404,000) by the environmental fund for three sites and will be reimbursed by the dry cleaner environmental response appropriation at an indefinite future time when funds are available to do so. With the environmental fund costs, outstanding claims on the dry cleaner fund (backlog) total over \$2.5 million.

Liability

Under the program, conducting a cleanup or applying for an award under the program is not an admission of liability for environmental pollution. The program does not supersede common law or statutory liability for damages from a dry cleaning facility. An award under the program would be the exclusive method for the recovery of eligible costs. If a person conducts a remedial action activity for a discharge at a dry cleaning facility site, whether or not the person files an application under the program, the remedial action activity conducted and any application filed under the program would not be evidence of liability or an admission of liability for any potential or actual environmental pollution.

Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Council

A six-member Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Council advises DNR concerning the program. The Council consists of the following mem-

bers appointed by the Governor for three-year terms: (a) one representative of dry cleaning operations with annual gross receipts of less than \$200,000; (b) two representatives of dry cleaning operations with annual gross receipts of at least \$200,000; (c) one representative of wholesale distributors of dry cleaning solvent; (d) one engineer or hydrogeologist with knowledge, experience or education concerning environmental remediation; and (e) one representative of manufacturers and sellers of dry cleaning equipment.

The Council is required to evaluate the program at least every five years, based on criteria developed by the Council. In December, 2001, the Council included an addendum to the DNR report described in the following section. The Council supported the recommendations of the DNR report. On December 20, 2006, the Council submitted a five-year evaluation report to the Governor and Legislature. The report included the following recommendations: (a) that the state increase the dry cleaner gross receipt fee from 1.8% to 2.8% of gross receipts from dry cleaning; (b) that the state implement revenue bonding sufficient to provide funding during the next three to four year peak demand, with debt service payments to be paid by the 2.8% dry cleaner gross receipts fee; and (c) that DNR and DOR more closely cooperate regarding administration of the program, particularly with respect to identifying unlicensed dry cleaners in the state. 2007 Act 20 raised the gross receipt fee to 2.8% effective January 1, 2008.

Program Sunset and Review

The program and fees have a statutory sunset of June 30, 2032 (35 years after creation). DNR was required to complete a review of the program and submit a report on the results of the review to the Joint Committee on Finance and the appropriate standing committees of the Legislature. DNR submitted the required report to the Legislature in December, 2001. The report included the following recommendations: (a) maintenance of adequate program funding is crucial; (b) the partnership that

exists between DNR, DOR and the dry cleaning industry needs to be maintained; (c) DNR, DOR and the industry need to continue and enhance the communication and outreach related to the program; (d) DOR should streamline its management, implementation and enforcement of revenue collections for the program; (e) DNR should continue to participate in the States Coalition for the Remediation of Dry Cleaners (a coalition of several states); and (f) DNR, DOR and industry should pursue statutory changes to improve the program. DNR and industry representatives recommended several changes, many of which were enacted in 2003 Act 312.

Brownfield Site Assessment Grant Program

The brownfield site assessment grant program was created in 1999 Act 9 to provide local governments with grants to perform the initial investigation of contaminated properties and certain other eligible activities. DNR administers the program from a biennial appropriation from the environmental management account of the environmental fund. DNR awarded the first site assessment grants in 2000-01. The program is appropriated \$1,700,000 annually. Cumulative funding for the program is \$13,350,000 through 2008-09.

Statutes related to grants under the program are contained in s. 292.75. The program is also administered through administrative rule Chapter NR 168, effective July 10, 2000.

Eligible Applicants and Sites

Local governments may apply for a site assessment grant for eligible sites or facilities. A local government includes a city, village, town, county, tribe, redevelopment authority, community development authority and housing authority.

A local government is not eligible for a grant if it caused the environmental contamination that is the basis of the grant request. DNR may only award a grant if the person that caused the environmental contamination that is the basis for the grant request is unknown, cannot be located or is financially unable to pay the cost of the eligible activities.

A site or facility is eligible for a grant if it is an abandoned, idle or underused industrial or commercial facility or site, the expansion or redevelopment of which is adversely affected by actual or perceived environmental contamination. A local government does not have to own the site but must have access to it to complete the grant activities.

Eligible Costs and Grant Criteria

The following activities are eligible for a site assessment grant at an eligible site or facility: (a) phase I and II environmental assessments; (b) site investigation of environmental contamination; (c) demolition of structures, buildings or other improvements; (d) asbestos abatement, if it is a necessary part of demolition activity; and (e) removal and proper disposal of abandoned containers, underground petroleum product storage tank systems or underground hazardous substance storage tank systems.

The local government is required to contribute matching funds equal to 20% of the grant amount, which may be in the form of cash or an in-kind contribution or both. Grants to an individual local government may not exceed 15% of the total amount appropriated for the program in the fiscal year.

Before awarding a grant, DNR is required to consider the local government's commitment to completing the remediation activities on the eligible site, the degree to which the project will have a positive impact on public health and the environment, and other criteria. Administrative rule NR 168 establishes a point scoring system to rank ap-

plications when grant requests exceed available funding. Points are awarded for the following criteria: (a) location within a source water protection area for certain drinking water supplies; (b) close to a school, park or residence; (c) an eligible site that has contamination readily accessible to the public or if the applicant has taken action to limit access to a hazard or contamination at the site; (d) a site that will remain under the ownership of a local government or non-profit organization; (e) a site for which the local government has initiated the formal acquisition process or holds title to the site; (f) if more than \$2,000 in eligible past costs have been incurred; (g) additional matching funds provided by the applicant or any local government above the required 20% match; (h) a vacant or abandoned site or facility; and (i) if a site or facility is or was tax delinquent during certain time periods. In addition, an applicant may assign a one-time bonus of 29 points to one application for a large project and one application for a small project that it considers to be a priority. If two or more applications receive the same score, applications requesting the smallest dollar amounts are funded first.

NR 168 allocates 60% of the grant funds to small grants between \$2,000 and \$30,000. The remaining 40% of grant funds are allocated to large grants between \$30,001 and \$100,000.

Participation

DNR made the first grant awards under the site assessment grant program in the fall of 2000. Site assessment grant awards as of January 1, 2009, are listed in Appendix III and include 387 grants to 174 different communities for \$13,400,400 awarded under the eight fiscal years of 2000-01 through the 2007-08 grant cycles. The cumulative grant award amount exceeded the cumulative appropriation amount of \$13,350,000 because some unexpended grant funds were awarded to different municipalities. The City of Milwaukee and City of Milwaukee Redevelopment Authority in combination received the largest amount of grants, with 72 grants for \$1,970,800, equaling 14.7% of awarded grant dol-

lars.

DNR had a November 3, 2008, application deadline for 2008-09 awards. DNR received 78 applications for \$3.38 million in grants. DNR will make grant funding decisions for the \$1,700,000 in the 2008-09 appropriation in approximately February, 2009.

Sustainable Urban Development Zone Program

A sustainable urban development zone pilot program was created in 1999 Act 9 and repealed in 2003 Act 33. The pilot program provided specific funding to seven specific cities to promote the use of financial incentives to cleanup and redevelop contaminated properties in the cities. The state funds could be used to investigate environmental contamination and cleanup brownfields properties in the cities. Funding was provided from the environmental management account of the environmental fund. Table 9 shows the final grant expenditures for each city.

Table 9: Sustainable Urban Development Zone Program Grantees

| Municipality | Amount Spent |
|--------------|----------------|
| Beloit | \$194,286 |
| Fond du Lac | 250,000 |
| Green Bay | 342,550 |
| La Crosse | 342,796 |
| Milwaukee | 971,429 |
| Oshkosh | 242,857 |
| Platteville | <u>103,399</u> |
| Total | \$2,447,317 |

Grant work was completed in five of the seven of the cities between January of 2003 and March of 2005. Work included investigation and cleanup of contamination at former railroad yards, a bus station, foundry, manufactured gas plant,

refrigerator manufacturing plant, and other industrial sites. Properties were redeveloped into new industrial facilities, bank, hotel, restaurants, retail uses, mixed housing and office uses, student housing, and recreational uses.

The La Crosse project was completed in July of 2007, and included investigation and cleanup of areas along the La Crosse River. The areas are being redeveloped as recreational, commercial, and housing uses.

The Platteville project was completed in May, 2008, and included investigation and limited cleanup of three former commercial and light industrial properties. Redevelopment included moving existing houses onto the property and selling them to individuals.

**Brownfields Green Space and Public
Facilities Grant Program**

2001 Act 16 created a brownfields green space grant program and required that DNR make awards to local governments for brownfields remediation projects that have a long-term public benefit, including the preservation of green space, the development of recreational areas, or the use of a property by the local government. DNR calls the program the brownfields green space and public facilities grant program.

Statutes and regulations for grants under the program are contained in s. 292.79 of the statutes and administrative rule Chapter NR 173, effective August, 2002. Remedial action activities are eligible for reimbursement.

DNR made the first grants under the greenspace and public facilities grant program in 2003-04. The program is appropriated \$500,000 in each of 2007-08 and 2008-09. During the 2007-09 biennium, applications are accepted until February,

2009, or until the \$1,000,000 available during the biennium is awarded. Under the program, DNR has awarded 21 grants totaling \$2,033,000 as of November 1, 2008. These grants are shown in Table 10.

Table 10: Greenspace and Public Facilities Grant Awards as of November 1, 2008

| Grant Recipient * | Number of Grants | Grant Amount |
|---|------------------|--------------------|
| Chippewa Falls | 1 | \$19,000 |
| Delavan | 1 | 200,000 |
| Eau Claire | 1 | 5,000 |
| Fond du Lac | 1 | 50,000 |
| Geneva, Town of | 1 | 25,449 |
| Green Bay | 1 | 200,000 |
| Kaukauna | 2 | 150,000 |
| Kenosha | 1 | 84,585 |
| Madison | 1 | 87,745 |
| Milwaukee City Redevelopment Authority | 2 | 325,000 |
| Milwaukee City | 1 | 138,165 |
| Oshkosh | 1 | 200,000 |
| Racine | 2 | 240,075 |
| Shell Lake | 1 | 19,000 |
| Superior | 1 | 88,000 |
| Waukesha | 1 | 4,000 |
| West Allis | <u>2</u> | <u>196,981</u> |
| Total | 21 | \$2,033,000 |

* Cities unless otherwise noted

NR 173 requires the local government applicant to provide a match equal to 20% of the grant amount if the grant is \$50,000 or less, 35% if the grant is greater than \$50,000 and less than \$100,000, or 50% if the grant is \$100,000 to \$200,000. The rule sets a maximum grant amount of \$200,000. The local government may include as match, grant eligible expenses and non-reimbursable expenses such as costs for property acquisition, site investigation, demolition of buildings or structures, asbestos abatement associated with demolition, removal of debris or waste, environmental assessment, and planning and design of the green space or local government use.

The rule requires DNR to award at least 20% of the total funding to applications for \$50,000 or less. DNR scores applications based on criteria including the demonstrated need for the project, commitment of the applicant, environmental benefits and financial commitment to the project.

from the Wisconsin Department of Transportation. In 2008-09, DNR has 91.59 staff and appropriations of \$9.3 million in the remediation and redevelopment program for administration of contaminated land and brownfields cleanup programs, as shown in Table 11.

Funding for DNR Administration

DNR Appropriations

Funding for DNR administration for state and federal contaminated land and brownfields cleanup programs comes from general purpose revenues, program revenues from fees for certain requests for DNR actions related to contaminated properties, payments from responsible parties, segregated revenues from the environmental management account of the environmental fund, petroleum inspection fund, and dry cleaner environmental response fund, federal funds, and payments

In addition, Department staff perform administrative or support functions in the Division of Air and Waste, and in the Divisions of Enforcement and Science, Administration and Technology and Customer Assistance and External Relations. These staff positions are funded from the general fund, environmental fund, dry cleaner environmental response fund and federal funds.

Environmental Fund Revenues

The segregated environmental fund is primarily used for DNR program activities related to groundwater management, remediation and redevelopment and nonpoint source water pollution abatement programs. [Further information about the nonpoint program can be found in the Legisla-

Table 11: Authorized Staff and Administrative Appropriations for DNR's Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment and Regional Remediation and Redevelopment Staff -- 2008-09

| Funding Source | Permanent Positions | Appropriation |
|---|---------------------|----------------|
| General Fund | | |
| Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment - administration | 6.0 | \$517,500 |
| Program Revenue | | |
| Purchaser liability and municipality negotiation and cost recovery | 9.0 | 815,500 |
| Solid and hazardous waste administration | 2.5 | 191,600 |
| Department of Transportation Contract | --- | 236,700 |
| Segregated Funds | | |
| Environmental Fund – remediation and redevelopment and brownfields administration | 24.59 | 2,500,700 |
| Petroleum Inspection Fund - PECFA cost control and brownfields administration | 14.0 | 1,296,100 |
| Dry Cleaner Environmental Response Fund – administration | 2.0 | 162,700 |
| Federal Funds | | |
| Superfund administration | 7.5 | 1,042,300 |
| Brownfields administration | 14.0 | 1,409,500 |
| Hazardous waste administration | 1.5 | 287,900 |
| LUST – administration | 9.5 | 779,100 |
| Other Federal funds | <u>1.0</u> | <u>102,400</u> |
| Total | 91.59 | \$9,342,000 |

tive Fiscal Bureau Informational Paper entitled, "Nonpoint Source Water Pollution and Soil Conservation Programs."] The environmental management account of the environmental fund includes appropriations for DNR administrative, enforcement, preventative, cleanup and groundwater management activities. It also funds environmental programs administered by other state agencies, including the Department of Commerce, the Department of Health and Family Services, the Department of Military Affairs and the University of Wisconsin System.

The estimated condition of the environmental management account of the environmental fund is shown in Table 12. Revenues to the environmental management account of the environmental fund are generated from several fees that totaled approximately \$23.9 million in 2006-07 and \$28.9 million in 2007-08, as shown in Table 13. These revenues are described in the following section. Table 14 shows the types and amount per ton of landfill fees paid to the environmental management account. Appendix IV lists appropriations from the environmental management account of the environmental fund during 2006-07 through 2008-09.

Table 12: Environmental Management Account of the Environmental Fund Condition, 2006-07 Through 2008-09 (\$ in Millions)

| | 2006-07 Actual | 2007-08 Actual | 2008-09 Estimated |
|--|-------------------|-------------------|----------------------|
| Opening Balance, July 1 | \$28.3 | \$24.7 | \$22.0 |
| Revenue | <u>23.9</u> | <u>28.9</u> | <u>28.4</u> |
| Total Available | \$52.2 | \$53.6 | \$50.4 |
| Expenditures | -\$26.5 | -\$31.5 | -\$26.4* |
| Transfer to General Fund | -1.0 | -0.1 | -2.7 |
| Encumbrances, Continuing Balances and Reserves | <u>0.0</u> | <u>0.0</u> | <u>-21.3</u> |
| Closing Balance, June 30 | \$24.7 | \$22.0 | -\$0.0* |

* Agencies will need to reduce expenditures from \$31.5 million in authorized appropriations by approximately \$5.1 million to make the required transfers to the general fund and to maintain a positive balance in the account.

Table 13: Environmental Fund Revenues for the Environmental Management Account, 2006-07 and 2007-08

| Revenue Source | 2006-07 Revenue | 2007-08 Revenue |
|---|--------------------|--------------------|
| Vehicle Environmental Impact Fee | \$12,070,500 | \$11,739,200 |
| Site Specific (Fox River) Remediation | 192,500 | 5,832,800 |
| Environmental Repair Tipping Fee | 4,267,500 | 4,368,000 |
| Petroleum Inspection Fund | 1,816,300 | 1,816,300 |
| Pesticide and Fertilizer Fees | 1,366,900 | 1,457,600 |
| Groundwater Waste Generator Tipping Fee | 952,500 | 923,700 |
| Hazardous Waste Generator Fee | 607,800 | 536,900 |
| Well Compensation Tipping Fee | 401,500 | 392,600 |
| Sanitary Permit Groundwater Fee | 390,600 | 328,100 |
| Hazardous Spill Reimbursement | 252,800 | 187,200 |
| Nonmetallic Mining Fees | 165,400 | 182,400 |
| Environmental Assessment | 90,200 | 171,400 |
| Civil Action Damages | 2,200 | 76,700 |
| Land Disposal Permit | 69,500 | 66,900 |
| Bulk Tank Surcharge | 25,300 | 19,900 |
| Septic System Servicing Fee | 42,700 | 7,200 |
| Environmental Repair Surcharge | 3,200 | 4,800 |
| Environmental Repair Base Fee | 3,100 | 3,100 |
| Cooperative Remedial Action | 1,400 | 600 |
| Investment Income | 1,132,700 | 703,900 |
| Miscellaneous Revenue | <u>500</u> | <u>102,600</u> |
| Total | \$23,855,100 | \$28,921,900 |

Table 14: Landfill Fees for the Environmental Fund*

| | Approved Landfills Per Ton | Nonapproved Landfills | |
|---|----------------------------------|---|--|
| | | With Closure Agreement Per Ton | Without Closure Agreement Per Ton |
| Environmental Repair Fee: | | | |
| Municipal and Non High-Volume Industrial ** | 85¢ | 85¢ | 85¢ |
| High-volume Industrial | 20¢ | 20¢ | 20¢ |
| Groundwater Fee | 10¢ | 10¢ | 10¢ |
| Well Compensation Fee | 4¢ | 4¢ | 4¢ |
| Nonapproved Facility Fees and Surcharge: | | | |
| Solid Non-Hazardous Waste | --- | 1.875¢ | 2.25¢ |
| Hazardous Waste | --- | 18.75¢ | 22.5¢ |
| | | Annual Fee | Annual Fee |
| Environmental Repair Base Fee*** | --- | \$100 | \$1,000 |

* In addition to the fees deposited in the environmental fund, waste facilities pay a Solid Waste Facility Siting Board fee of 0.7¢ per ton; a program revenue fee for landfill administration of 15¢ per ton, and a recycling tipping fee of \$4.00 per ton (\$3.00 prior to November 1, 2007).

** The fee was 50¢ per ton prior to November 1, 2007.

*** The amount of the environmental repair base fee is deducted from the total tonnage and surcharge fees.

Vehicle Environmental Impact Fee. A \$9 per vehicle fee is assessed at the time of titling new and used vehicles. Beginning on December 1, 1997, the fee was \$5 per vehicle. It was raised to \$6 on December 1, 1999, and to \$9 beginning October 1, 2001. The Department of Transportation collects the fees and deposits them in the environmental fund. The \$9 fee is repealed on December 31, 2009.

Site Specific (Fox River) Remediation. Certain revenues are deposited in the environmental management account for remediation at specific sites. The moneys can only be expended for the purposes received. The revenues include all moneys received: (a) in settlement of actions initiated under federal CERCLA regulations (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act); and (b) all moneys received under court approved settlement agreements or orders, in settlement of actions or proposed actions for violations of environmental statutes, that are designated to be used to restore or develop environmental resources, to provide restitution or to make expenditures required under the order or agreement. Almost all of the revenues received to date relate to cleanup of PCBs (polychlorinated biphenyls) in a stretch of the Fox River from Lake Winnebago to Green Bay.

Environmental Repair Tipping Fee. Fees paid by a waste facility into the environmental management account are based on: (a) annual tonnage; (b) whether the facility disposes of high-volume industrial waste or other waste; and (c) whether the facility is an "approved" or "nonapproved" facility.

Solid and hazardous waste facilities (landfills) pay a tipping fee for each ton of waste, except materials used for lining, daily cover, capping or constructing berms, dikes or roads within the facility. Facilities pay a fee for municipal, hazardous, or non-high volume industrial waste of 85¢ per ton and a fee for high-volume industrial waste of 20¢ per ton. The fee for waste other than high-volume industrial waste was increased under 2007 Wisconsin Act 20, from 50¢ to 85¢ per ton, effective for

waste disposed of on or after November 1, 2007. High-volume industrial waste includes paper mill sludge, bottom ash, foundry process waste and fly ash.

In addition, nonapproved facilities pay 1.5¢ per ton of solid non-hazardous waste disposed and 15¢ per ton of hazardous waste. (There are no hazardous wastes disposed of in Wisconsin at this time and thus, no revenue is generated from hazardous waste tonnage fees.) Nonapproved facilities also pay an environmental repair surcharge equal to 25% of the tonnage fee if the facility has a closure agreement, or 50% of the tonnage fee if the facility does not have a closure agreement.

Petroleum Inspection Fund. An annual transfer of \$1,816,300 is made from the petroleum inspection fund to the environmental fund. The appropriation includes \$766,900 in each year for groundwater management and \$1,049,400 in each year (including \$80,000 for well compensation) for environmental repair. A petroleum inspection fee of 2¢ per gallon is assessed on all petroleum products brought into the state. The fee generates approximately \$74 million annually. Fee revenues are deposited in the segregated petroleum inspection fund and are used primarily to fund cleanup of petroleum-contaminated sites under the Petroleum Environmental Cleanup Fund Award (PECFA) program.

Pesticide and Fertilizer Fees. License fees are assessed annually on manufacturers and labelers of pesticides and collected by DATCP. The fees are deposited in the environmental management account. Of the total registration fee (which ranges from \$265 to \$3,060 based on the annual sales), \$124 per each household pesticide product licensed and \$94 per each nonhousehold pesticide product licensed is deposited in the environmental fund. The remaining fees are deposited in the segregated agricultural management fund.

License applicants also pay a cleanup surcharge, which is deposited in the environmental

fund, for nonhousehold pesticide products that are wood preservatives solely labeled for use on wood and that contain pentachlorophenol or coal tar creosote. The surcharge ranges from \$5 if sales of the product in the state are less than \$25,000 to 1.1% of gross revenues if sales of the product exceed \$75,000 in the state.

Further, persons who sell or distribute fertilizer or who distribute a soil or plant additive in Wisconsin are required to pay a groundwater fee, which is deposited in the environmental fund, of 10¢ per ton of fertilizer, with a minimum fee of \$1 for aggregate sales of 10 tons or less.

Finally, producers of pesticides must pay a well compensation fee of \$150 annually. The fees are collected by DATCP and deposited in the environmental fund.

Groundwater Waste Generator Fee. To support groundwater programs, solid and hazardous waste disposal facilities pay a waste generator fee of 10¢ per ton of waste disposed of at the facility, except materials used for lining, daily cover, capping or constructing berms, dikes or roads within the facility. The fee is 1¢ per ton for prospecting or mining waste, including tailing solids, sludge or waste rock.

Hazardous Waste Generator Fee. A \$210 base fee plus \$20 per ton is charged to all generators of hazardous waste that are required to report annually to DNR under the state's hazardous waste law. Producers of at least 220 pounds of hazardous waste in any month report annually and pay the fee unless the waste is: (a) recovered for recycling or reuse; (b) leachate being transported to a wastewater treatment plant; or (c) removed from the site as part of an environmental cleanup project. The minimum fee for a single generator is \$125 and the maximum is \$17,000.

Well Compensation Tipping Fee. An owner or operator of a licensed solid or hazardous waste disposal facility collects a well compensation fee of

4¢ per ton of non-mining waste from the generator for payment to the environmental management account.

Sanitary Permit Groundwater Fee. Local governments are required to issue a sanitary permit and charge a fee before a person may install any septic tank or private sewage system. In addition, the local government that issues the sanitary permit is required to collect a \$25 groundwater fee and pay it to Commerce, which then deposits the surcharge in the environmental fund. Commerce rules require the local government to charge a sanitary permit fee that totals at least \$141 (\$116 prior to December 1, 2008), and send \$100 (\$75 prior to December 1, 2008) of the total to Commerce. The \$100 (\$75) includes the \$25 groundwater fee and \$75 (\$50 prior to December 1, 2008), which is deposited in a Commerce program revenue account for Commerce administration of the sanitary permit program. (The local government keeps \$41 of the \$141, or more if the local government sets a higher total fee.)

Hazardous Spill Reimbursement. When DNR cleans up hazardous substances spills with state funds, it seeks compensation from responsible parties. The compensation is deposited in the environmental fund and varies considerably by year. DNR may also recover its costs of remedying adverse effects upon the waters of the state resulting from the unlawful discharge or deposit of pollutants in the waters.

Nonmetallic Mining Fees. All 71 counties that were required to enact and administer a nonmetallic mining reclamation ordinance did so by June 1, 2001. (Milwaukee County is not required to adopt an ordinance because all municipalities within the county with nonmetallic mines adopted ordinances.) A total of 21 towns, villages and cities are administering local ordinances. A county or municipality with an ordinance collects annual fees to cover the local and DNR costs of administering the program. The DNR share of the fees, established in administrative rule, equals \$35 to \$175, depending

on the mine size in unreclaimed acres. The counties and municipalities collect the DNR share of fees and pay them to DNR for deposit in the environmental fund.

Environmental Assessment. When a court imposes a fine or forfeiture for violation of administrative rules or DNR orders related to pollution discharge, drinking water or septic tank statutes, it also imposes an environmental assessment. The court transfers the assessment to DNR and DNR deposits the assessment in the environmental fund. The assessment is equal to 10% of the fine or forfeiture. Fifty percent of the assessments are deposited in the University of Wisconsin System's environmental education appropriation within the environmental fund to fund environmental education grants. While Table 11 shows the total amount of environmental assessment revenue, half of the amount is statutorily designated to be used solely for UW System environmental education grants.

Civil Action Damages. The fund receives compensation resulting from court ordered payments by responsible parties for specific cleanup activities.

Land Disposal Permit. Persons who discharge certain pollutants into the waters of the state are required to obtain a water pollutant discharge elimination system permit from DNR. The permit holder is also required to pay a \$100 annual groundwater fee to DNR if the permittee discharges effluent on land or produces sludge from a treatment work that is disposed of on land. The permittee is required to pay a \$200 annual groundwater fee if the permittee discharges effluent on land and disposes of sludge from a treatment work on land.

Bulk Tank Surcharge. Persons must receive approval from Commerce of plans for installation of or change in the operation of a previously approved installation for the storage, handling or use of flammable or combustible liquids. In addition to any plan review fees, a groundwater

fee of \$100 per plan review submittal for tanks with a capacity of 1,000 gallons or more is collected and deposited in the environmental fund.

Septic System Servicing Fee. Persons who remove and dispose of septage from septic tanks, soil absorption fields, holding tanks, grease traps or privies must pay DNR a septic servicing groundwater fee of \$100 for a two-year period. DNR deposits the fee in the environmental management account. In addition, DNR collects program revenue fees of \$50 per resident servicing vehicle for two years.

Environmental Repair Base Fee and Surcharge. Owners of approved solid waste facilities do not pay a base fee into the environmental fund. There are two different annual base fees for non-approved facilities. If the owner of a nonapproved facility has signed an agreement with DNR to close the landfill on or before July 1, 1999, the annual base fee is \$100. If no closure agreement has been signed, the annual base fee is \$1,000. The amount of the base fee is deducted from the tipping fees for nonapproved facilities described previously. Non-approved facilities with a closure agreement pay a fee of 1.875¢ per ton of solid non-hazardous waste or 2.25¢ per ton without a closure agreement.

Cooperative Remedial Action. DNR is authorized to seek and receive voluntary contributions of funds from a municipality or any other public or private source for all or part of the costs of remedying environmental contamination if the activities being funded are part of a cooperative effort by DNR and the person providing the funds, to remedy the contamination. Any funds received are deposited into the environmental fund. Any cooperative remedial action revenues may only be used for the activities agreed on by DNR and the person providing the funds.

Investment Income. Interest earned on state investments is distributed to various funds, including the environmental fund, based on its monthly cash balance.

Program Revenues

DNR is authorized to assess and collect fees to offset the costs for DNR activities related to approving requests for certain exemptions from future liability for cleanup of contaminated property.

Administrative rule NR 750, effective March 1, 1996, includes a system of hourly fees to be paid by a voluntary party who seeks an exemption from liability or limit on future remediation costs. The initial fees include a non-refundable application fee of \$250 and an advance deposit to cover DNR oversight and review, which is \$1,000 if the property is less than one acre or \$3,000 if the property is one acre or greater. DNR must return any amount in excess of DNR's oversight costs when the Department's review activities are completed. If the advance deposit is depleted and additional DNR review is needed, DNR is authorized to bill applicants quarterly according to an hourly rate based on the average hourly wages of program staff, fringe benefits and associated costs.

The hourly billing rate is \$95 per hour effective December, 2008, and can be recalculated annually. (Between July, 2007, and December, 2008, the hourly billing rate was \$90 per hour.) After DNR approves a final remedial design, an applicant can choose to cover remaining DNR review costs, including DNR issuance of a certificate of completion, by either continuing quarterly billing or paying a final fee that equals 40% of the total DNR oversight costs incurred up to and including the approved final remedial design.

Since September, 1998, administrative rule NR 749 has contained a fee schedule of fixed fee amounts for a number of services provided by DNR to persons who request certain departmental assistance. Fees authorized in NR 749 offset the costs for much of the technical and redevelopment assistance provided by DNR. Persons who request the voluntary party exemption would pay the NR 750 hourly fees instead of the NR 749 fixed fees.

When a person requests that DNR review certain documents, the person must pay the applicable flat fee. When the NR 700 rules require that a document be submitted to DNR, but the person does not specifically request review of the document, then no fee is required.

Examples of types of requests for which a fee is charged under NR 749 are: (a) \$750 for issuance of a case closure letter that provides the DNR's determination that, based on information available at the time of the department's review, no further action is necessary after a site investigation and cleanup has been completed; (b) \$250 for adding sites to an online geographic information system (GIS) registry of sites approved for closure where a groundwater enforcement standard is exceeded (effective November 1, 2001); (c) \$200 for adding sites to the GIS registry of sites approved for closure with residual soil contamination (effective August 1, 2002); (d) \$500 for issuance of an off-site letter that clarifies who is not responsible when contamination is migrating on to a property from an off-site source; (e) \$750 for approval of the use of site specific soil cleanup standards; (f) \$250 for issuance of a no further action letter for a spill site where an immediate action was undertaken; (g) \$500 for issuance of a letter to clarify liability for site-specific matters related to the environmental pollution and remediation of a property; (h) \$500 for issuance of a letter to a lender explaining the potential liability associated with acquiring a contaminated property; and (i) \$1,000 for negotiation of an agreement containing a schedule for conducting non-emergency actions with a person who possesses or controls a hazardous substance that was discharged or who caused the discharge.

DNR collected cumulative revenues of \$7,736,200 through June 30, 2008, for deposit in a program revenue account that funds DNR staff who administer the liability exemption provisions. DNR is authorized \$815,500 PR and 9.0 PR positions funded from the fees in 2008-09. Program revenues received under the appropriation included \$852,100 in 2006-07 and \$724,700 in 2007-08.

In 2006-07 and 2007-08, most of the fees collected were from a \$750 fee for issuance of case closure letters, many of which were for PECFA-eligible petroleum-contaminated sites, and for

adding sites to the online GIS registry of sites closed with a groundwater enforcement standard exceedence or with residual soil contamination.

PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY OTHER STATE AGENCIES

Brownfields Grant Program

The Department of Commerce administers the brownfields grant program, which was created in 1997 Wisconsin Act 27 to provide financial assistance for brownfields redevelopment and related environmental remediation projects. Grants can be used to fund the costs of brownfields redevelopment projects and associated environmental remediation activities. For purposes of the brownfields grant program, "brownfields" are abandoned, idle or underused industrial or commercial facilities or sites, the expansion or redevelopment of which is adversely affected by actual or perceived environmental contamination.

In the 2007-09 biennium, \$13 million is provided for brownfields grants from the environmental management account of the environmental fund. This includes \$6 million in 2007-08 and \$7 million in 2008-09. [Further information about the program can be found in the Legislative Fiscal Bureau Informational Paper entitled, "State Economic Development Programs Administered by the Department of Commerce."]

Agricultural Chemical Cleanup Program

The Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection administers the agricultural chemical cleanup program, which was created in 1993 Wisconsin Act 16. The act transferred responsibility for the investigation and remediation of agricultural chemical spills from DNR to DATCP. The act also established a grant program to fund a portion of cleanup costs and increased current DATCP pesticide and fertilizer fees to partially fund the program. 1997 Wisconsin Act 27 split agrichemical revenues into base fees deposited to the agrichemical management (ACM) fund and surcharges deposited to the agricultural chemical cleanup program (ACCP) fund. [Further information about the program can be found in the Legislative Fiscal Bureau Informational Paper entitled, "Agricultural Chemical Fees and Programs."]

Appendices

Four appendices provide additional information about contaminated land cleanup programs in Wisconsin. These include:

- Appendix I lists the Superfund sites in Wisconsin and shows the status of cleanup actions.
- Appendix II lists the state-funded response projects in Wisconsin where cleanup is partially or fully funded by the segregated environmental fund.
- Appendix III lists the DNR brownfield site assessment grants awarded as of January 1, 2009.
- Appendix IV lists appropriations from the environmental management account of the environmental fund during 2006-07 through 2008-09.

APPENDIX I

Superfund Site Status in Wisconsin (October, 2008)

| <u>Wisconsin Sites on EPA's National Priority List (NPL)</u> | <u>Municipality</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Funding</u> | <u>Status</u> |
|--|---------------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|
| Ashland NSP | Ashland | Ashland | PRP | RI/FS |
| Better Brite Chrome & Zinc* | De Pere | Brown | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Pentawood Products | Daniels, Town | Burnett | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Schmalz Landfill | Harrison | Calumet | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Hagen Farm | Stoughton | Dane | PRP | O&M |
| City Disposal Corp Landfill | Dunn, Town | Dane | PRP | O&M |
| Stoughton City Landfill * | Stoughton | Dane | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Madison Metro Sludge Lagoons | Madison | Dane | PRP | O&M |
| Refuse Hideaway | Middleton | Dane | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Oconomowoc Electroplating Co. | Ashippun | Dodge | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Hechimovich Landfill* | Williamston | Dodge | PRP | O&M |
| Eau Claire Municipal Well Field | Eau Claire | Eau Claire | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| National Presto Industries | Eau Claire | Eau Claire | PRP | O&M |
| City of Ripon Landfill* | Ripon | Fond du Lac | PRP | O&M |
| Algoma, City of, Landfill | Algoma | Kewaunee | PRP | O&M |
| Onalaska Municipal Landfill* | Onalaska | La Crosse | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Lemberger Fly Ash Landfill | Whitelaw | Manitowoc | PRP | O&M |
| Lemberger Transport/Recycling | Whitelaw | Manitowoc | PRP | O&M |
| Mid-State Disposal Inc. Landfill | Cleveland | Marathon | PRP | O&M |
| Wausau, City of, Water Supply | Wausau | Marathon | PRP | O&M |
| Spickler Landfill | Spencer | Marathon | PRP | O&M |
| Moss-American (Kerr McGee Oil) | Milwaukee | Milwaukee | PRP | RD/RA |
| Tomah Armory | Tomah | Monroe | PRP | O&M |
| Tomah Sanitary Landfill | Tomah | Monroe | PRP | O&M |
| N.W. Mauthe Co.* | Appleton | Outagamie | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Hunts Disposal/Caledonia Landfill | Caledonia | Racine | PRP | O&M |
| Janesville Ash Beds | Janesville | Rock | PRP | O&M |
| Janesville Old Landfill | Janesville | Rock | PRP | O&M |
| Sauk County Landfill* | Excelsior | Sauk | PRP | O&M |
| Kohler Co. Landfill* | Kohler | Sheboygan | PRP | O&M |
| Sheboygan River & Harbor | Sheboygan | Sheboygan | PRP | RD/RA |
| Scrap Processing Inc.-Potaczek | Medford | Taylor | SUPERFUND | O&M |
| Delevan Municipal Well No. 4* | Delevan | Walworth | PRP | O&M |
| Waste Management of WI-Brookfield* | Brookfield | Waukesha | PRP | O&M |
| Lauer I Sanitary Landfill (Boundary Road) * | Menomonee Falls | Waukesha | PRP | O&M |
| Master Disposal Service Landfill | Brookfield | Waukesha | PRP | O&M |
| Muskego Sanitary Landfill | Muskego | Waukesha | PRP | O&M |

PRP—Potential Responsible Party; RI/FS--Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study; RD--Remedial Design; RA—Remedial Action; O&M—Operation and Maintenance.

* Designates DNR lead; all others, EPA lead.

APPENDIX II

State-Funded Response Actions Funded by the Wisconsin Environmental Fund as of October, 2008

Ashland

Ashland NSP Coal Gasification
Shroeder Lumber/Kreher Park

Barron

Lemler Landfill
Rice Lake Landfill

Bayfield

Barksdale Dump

Brown

H&R Landfill
Better Brite Chrome Shop
Better Brite Zinc Shop
Scray's Hill

Burnett

Piotrowski
Village of Webster Water Supply
Penta Wood Products

Calumet

Abhold's Garage
City of Chilton Well #5
Schmalz Landfill
Hayton Millpond

Chippewa

North Eau Claire
Better Brite Chippewa Falls
Rihn Oil

Clark

Granton
Neillsville Foundry
Town of Chili
Arlene's Restaurant

Columbia

Ken La Grange
Glacier Oil
Charles Matthews
Nemitz Laundry

Crawford

Bell Center

Dane

Deerfield
Refuse Hideaway Landfill
Stoughton Landfill
New Pinery Road
Rimrock Road Well
Watts/Seybold Road
McFarland Terminal Drive

Dane (cont.)

Rimrock Road Volatile Organic
Compounds
Town of Madison-Fish Hatchery
Madison First Street Garage
Madison Municipal Well #3
Wade Residence

Dodge

Oconomowoc Electroplating
Davy Creek
Mayville Iron & Coke
Hechimovich
Watertown Tire Fire

Door

Door County Lead Arsenic Mixing
Stations

Douglas

Solon Springs
Superior Wood Systems
Newton Creek
Hog Island Inlet
Howards Bay

Eau Claire

City of Augusta
Eastenson Salvage
Eau Claire Municipal Well Field
Eau Claire Lead Site

Fond du Lac

Waupun Public Water Supply
Fond du Lac #12
QuicFrez
Otto Stiedaman Property
Ripon Wells #6 and #9
Old Dutch Mill

Grant

Ellenboro Store

Green

Leck Property

Iowa

Dodgeville Water Supply
Mineral Point Roaster Piles

Jackson

Home Oil
Melrose Well #3
Village of Merrilan Water Supply

Jefferson

Sanitary Transfer and Landfill

Juneau

Hustler Hardware

Kenosha

Frost Manufacturing

Kewaunee

Kewaunee Marsh

La Crosse

Holmen I and Holmen II
Lacrosse Water Supply
Onalaska Municipal Landfill
Tarco South, Onalaska
National Auto Wrecking

Lafayette

New Diggings

Langlade

Former Langlade Oil Company

Lincoln

Tomahawk Tissues
Koch Dry Cleaners
Kwaterski Millwork
IGA - Merrill

Manitowoc

Kasson Cheese
Lemberger Transport and Recycling
Two Rivers Petroleum
Manitowoc Two Rivers
Trichloroethylene

Marathon

Town of Weston-Mesker #2 Well
Gorski Landfill
Town of Stettin
Town of Weston
Holtz-Krause Landfill (mixed funding)
City of Wausau/Marathon Electric
Landfill
Mid-State Disposal Landfill
Standard Container
Weisenberger Tie and Lumber
Murray Machine
Halder Water Supply
Elderon Water Supply
Abbotsford Perchloroethylene
Village of Halder
Unity Auto Mart

APPENDIX II (continued)

State-Funded Response Actions Funded by the Wisconsin Environmental Fund as of October, 2008

Marinette

Dunbar
American Graphics/FLS Graphics
Leo Tucker Salvage Yard
Fairgrounds Road/Cedar Street
Wausaukee Well #2
Boehm Property

Milwaukee

Blue Hole Landfill
3033 W. Walnut; Hydro-Platers
Lubricant, Inc.
BOC Property
Betz Trust
Custom Plating
A-1 Bumper
Presidio
Mobile Blasting Off-Site Investigation
Mobile Blasting Remediation
Moss American
Glendale Tech East
Lincoln Park - Estabrook Impoundment
Babcock and Wilcox
Phillips 66/Grace Church

Monroe

Ashwander Site
Wittig Oil
Tomah Well #5
Tomah Well #8
Southside Lumber

Oconto

Lakewood Water Supply
New Lindwood
Peterson Petroleum

Oneida

Minocqua Water Supply
Rhineland Landfill
Rhineland Lincoln Street
Herrick Well

Outagamie

Wanglin Barrel
Wisconsin Chromium
Brad Porter Well
Midwest Plating
Kaphingst Property
N W Mauthé
Malchow Dry Cleaning
IGA - Freedom Sanitary District

Ozaukee

Cedarburg Water Supply
Grafton Water Supply
Cedar Creek

Polk

Dan Roth Property
Thompson Machine
Amery Landfill
Osceola Creek Millpond

Portage

Amherst Perchloroethylene

Price

Flambeau Garage
Dragovich & Boho

Racine

Tappa Property
City of Racine Brownfields Pilot
Golden Books/Clint's Auto Salvage
Rowe Oil

Richland

IGA - Richland Center

Rock

Dwyer Fire
Edgerton Sand and Gravel
Rock Paint and Chemical
Riverside Plating
Borgerding

St. Croix

Junker Landfill
Trout Brook
Town of Warren

Sawyer

Price Rite Soil Vapor Extraction
Village of Couderay Site

Sheboygan

Sheboygan Manufacturer Gas/Camp
Marina
IGA - Oostburg

Taylor

Doberstein
Village of Donald Well
Scrap Processing

Trempealeau

Village of Arcadia Water Supply

Vernon

Viroqua Well
Westby Drycleaners

Vilas

Boulder Junction

C.M. Christiansen

Walworth

Former Getzen Site
Elkhorn Metal Finishers

Washburn

Beaver Brook Water Supply Phase I & II
Springbrook
Sarona
Mortensen Enterprises

Washington

West Bend Water Supply
Town of Jackson Garage

Waukesha

Barrett Landfill
Delafield Sanitary Transfer
Waukesha West Avenue Landfill
Super Excavators

Waupaca

Waupaca Well #4

Waushara

Union State Bank Wautoma

Winnebago

Fox River Risk Assessment
Oshkosh North
Smedena
Panzen Transfer
Leo's Service
Shilobrit Cleaners, Oshkosh
Shilobrit Cleaners, Neenah
American Quality Fibers
Moder Well

Wood

Luchterhand Disposal
Pittsville Well #6
Food Tree

No. Central District

Clandestine Methcathinone (CAT)
Labs

Statewide

Statewide Pesticide Study
Statewide Soil Standard Criteria
Modeling
Statewide Natural Attenuation Study
Statewide Clean Soils Sites
Statewide Closure Protocol Study

IGA = Intergovernmental agreement

APPENDIX III

DNR Brownfield Site Assessment Grant Awards As of January 1, 2009

| <u>County</u> | <u>Recipient*</u> | <u>Number of Grants</u> | <u>Grant Amount</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Recipient*</u> | <u>Number of Grants</u> | <u>Grant Amount</u> |
|---------------|------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Adams | Adams County | 1 | \$29,990 | Douglas | Douglas County | 4 | \$100,534 |
| Ashland | Ashland, City | 4 | 190,000 | Douglas | Solon Springs, Village | 1 | 30,000 |
| Ashland | Ashland, City HA | 1 | 100,000 | Douglas | Superior, City | 2 | 27,500 |
| Ashland | Mellen, City | 1 | 30,000 | Dunn | Menomonie, City | 3 | 57,800 |
| Barron | Barron County | 1 | 29,150 | Eau Claire | Eau Claire, City | 2 | 200,000 |
| Barron | Cumberland, City | 1 | 61,040 | Florence | Florence, Town | 1 | 100,000 |
| Bayfield | Bayfield County | 1 | 2,100 | Fond du Lac | Fond du Lac, City | 1 | 100,000 |
| Brown | Ashwaubenon, CDA | 2 | 60,000 | Fond du Lac | Fond du Lac, County | 2 | 50,900 |
| Brown | Ashwaubenon, Village | 1 | 98,490 | Fond du Lac | Lamartine, Town | 1 | 30,000 |
| Brown | Green Bay, City | 2 | 130,000 | Fond du Lac | North Fond du Lac, Village | 1 | 12,450 |
| Brown | Green Bay, City RDA | 1 | 30,000 | Forest | Crandon, City | 1 | 25,250 |
| Brown | Ledgeview, Town | 1 | 8,975 | Grant | Boscobel, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Burnett | Burnett County | 2 | 32,275 | Grant | Cuba City, City | 1 | 29,800 |
| Calumet | Chilton, City | 7 | 178,450 | Grant | Platteville, City | 3 | 54,160 |
| Chippewa | Bloomer, City | 1 | 29,500 | Grant | Platteville, City RDA | 1 | 29,900 |
| Chippewa | Chippewa County | 3 | 153,000 | Grant | Potosi, Village | 1 | 30,000 |
| Chippewa | Chippewa Falls, City | 2 | 60,000 | Green | Brodhead, CDA | 2 | 108,800 |
| Clark | Clark County | 1 | 30,000 | Green | New Glarus, Village | 1 | 15,175 |
| Clark | Colby, City | 1 | 30,000 | Green Lake | Berlin, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Clark | Loyal, City | 1 | 16,000 | Iowa | Dodgeville, City | 1 | 20,000 |
| Clark | Neillsville, City | 1 | 100,000 | Iowa | Iowa, County | 1 | 29,669 |
| Columbia | Cambria, Village | 1 | 25,250 | Iowa | Mineral Point, City | 1 | 29,320 |
| Columbia | Columbus, City | 1 | 29,000 | Iron | Iron County | 1 | 25,000 |
| Columbia | Portage, City | 1 | 55,000 | Iron | Pence, Town | 1 | 17,000 |
| Columbia | Wisconsin Dells, City | 2 | 97,639 | Jackson | Black River Falls, City | 4 | 120,000 |
| Crawford | Crawford, County | 1 | 75,000 | Jefferson | Fort Atkinson, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Crawford | Prairie du Chien, City | 3 | 135,000 | Jefferson | Jefferson, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Crawford | Prairie du Chien RDA | 2 | 130,000 | Jefferson | Lake Mills, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Dane | Cross Plains, Village | 2 | 104,762 | Juneau | Mauston, City | 1 | 100,000 |
| Dane | DeForest, Village RA | 1 | 20,224 | Kenosha | Kenosha, City | 12 | 385,200 |
| Dane | Madison, Town | 2 | 42,648 | Kewaunee | Algoma, City | 2 | 60,000 |
| Dane | Oregon, Village | 1 | 29,500 | Kewaunee | Kewaunee, City | 1 | 75,000 |
| Dane | Sun Prairie, City | 1 | 30,000 | La Crosse | Bangor, Village | 2 | 85,241 |
| Dane | Waunakee, Village | 6 | 249,380 | La Crosse | Onalaska, City | 1 | 11,760 |
| Dane | Windsor, Town | 2 | 59,880 | Lafayette | Shullsburg, City RA | 1 | 29,000 |
| Dodge | Dodge County | 1 | 93,000 | Langlade | Antigo, City | 3 | 77,000 |
| Dodge | Lomira, Village | 1 | 29,840 | Lincoln | Merrill, City RA | 1 | 30,000 |
| Dodge | Mayville, City | 1 | 30,000 | Manitowoc | Manitowoc, City | 4 | 120,832 |
| Door | Door County | 1 | 12,750 | Manitowoc | Mishicot, Village | 1 | 14,157 |
| Door | Sturgeon Bay, City | 1 | 100,000 | Marathon | Hamburg, Town | 1 | 23,100 |

APPENDIX III (continued)

**DNR Brownfield Site Assessment Grant Awards
As of January 1, 2009**

| <u>County</u> | <u>Recipient*</u> | <u>Number of Grants</u> | <u>Grant Amount</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Recipient*</u> | <u>Number of Grants</u> | <u>Grant Amount</u> |
|---------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|---------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| Marathon | Marathon County | 1 | \$15,000 | Ozaukee | Ozaukee County | 1 | \$30,000 |
| Marathon | Plover, Town | 1 | 52,388 | Ozaukee | Thiensville, Village | 1 | 30,000 |
| Marathon | Wausau, City | 3 | 160,000 | Polk | Clayton, Village | 1 | 29,375 |
| Marathon | Wausau, City RDA | 1 | 30,000 | Polk | Dresser, Village | 1 | 26,300 |
| Marinette | Crivitz, Village | 1 | 27,600 | Polk | Polk County | 1 | 30,000 |
| Marinette | Marinette, City | 4 | 189,880 | Portage | Rosholt, Village | 2 | 80,000 |
| Marinette | Marinette, County | 2 | 120,000 | Price | Fifield, Town | 1 | 100,000 |
| Marinette | Peshtigo, City | 2 | 80,000 | Racine | Burlington, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Marquette | Neshkoro, Village | 1 | 26,000 | Racine | Racine, City | 2 | 59,790 |
| Marquette | Shields, Town | 1 | 30,000 | Racine | Racine, City RA | 3 | 76,000 |
| Milwaukee | Brown Deer, CDA | 1 | 39,000 | Richland | Richland Center, City | 8 | 252,771 |
| Milwaukee | Cudahy, City | 4 | 94,760 | Richland | Richland County | 1 | 20,000 |
| Milwaukee | Glendale, CDA | 1 | 30,000 | Richland | Westford, Town | 1 | 30,000 |
| Milwaukee | Greenfield, City | 5 | 307,450 | Rock | Beloit, City | 2 | 34,800 |
| Milwaukee | Milwaukee County | 2 | 60,000 | Rock | Clinton, Village | 1 | 25,000 |
| Milwaukee | Milwaukee, City | 29 | 836,702 | Rock | Edgerton, City | 2 | 44,165 |
| Milwaukee | Milwaukee, City RA | 43 | 1,134,099 | Rock | Evansville, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Milwaukee | St. Francis, City | 1 | 29,998 | Rock | Janesville, City | 4 | 138,901 |
| Milwaukee | South Milwaukee CDA | 1 | 30,000 | Rusk | Rusk, County | 2 | 43,500 |
| Milwaukee | Wauwatosa, City | 1 | 30,000 | Sauk | Baraboo, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Milwaukee | West Allis, City | 11 | 591,303 | Sauk | Washington, Town | 1 | 22,600 |
| Milwaukee | West Allis, City CDA | 6 | 318,925 | Sawyer | Ojibwa, Town | 1 | 29,000 |
| Milwaukee | West Milwaukee, Village | 1 | 30,000 | Sawyer | Sawyer, County | 2 | 43,190 |
| Milwaukee | Whitefish Bay, Village | 2 | 50,000 | Sheboygan | Sheboygan, City RA | 4 | 177,928 |
| Oconto | Gillett, City | 1 | 30,000 | St. Croix | North Hudson, Village | 1 | 2,750 |
| Oconto | Mountain, Town | 1 | 20,000 | St. Croix | River Falls, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Oconto | Oconto, City | 4 | 120,837 | Taylor | Taylor County | 1 | 25,000 |
| Oconto | Oconto, City CDA | 1 | 100,000 | Trempealeau | Trempealeau County | 1 | 26,950 |
| Oconto | Oconto Falls, City | 1 | 30,000 | Vernon | De Soto, Village | 1 | 24,750 |
| Oconto | Suring, Village | 2 | 60,000 | Vernon | Hillsboro, City | 1 | 5,000 |
| Oneida | Oneida County | 1 | 30,000 | Vernon | Vernon County | 2 | 15,304 |
| Oneida | Rhineland, City | 1 | 41,065 | Walworth | Delavan, City | 10 | 332,160 |
| Outagamie | Appleton, City RA | 3 | 150,000 | Walworth | Geneva, Town | 1 | 24,684 |
| Outagamie | Kaukauna, City | 5 | 118,667 | Walworth | Sharon, Village | 2 | 34,000 |
| Outagamie | Little Chute, Village | 1 | 7,800 | Walworth | Whitewater, CDA | 2 | 120,000 |
| Outagamie | Outagamie County | 3 | 73,987 | Washburn | Birchwood, Village | 1 | 33,000 |
| Outagamie | Seymour, City | 1 | 27,493 | Washburn | Washburn County | 1 | 11,428 |
| Ozaukee | Fredonia, Village | 2 | 40,000 | Washington | West Bend RA | 1 | 100,000 |
| Ozaukee | Grafton, City CDA | 2 | 56,775 | Waukesha | Elm Grove, Village | 1 | 5,681 |
| Ozaukee | Mequon, City | 1 | 30,000 | Waukesha | New Berlin, City | 1 | 10,000 |

APPENDIX III (continued)

**DNR Brownfield Site Assessment Grant Awards
As of January 1, 2009**

| <u>County</u> | <u>Recipient*</u> | <u>Number of Grants</u> | <u>Grant Amount</u> | <u>County</u> | <u>Recipient*</u> | <u>Number of Grants</u> | <u>Grant Amount</u> |
|---------------|---------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|---------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------|
| Waukesha | Sussex, Village | 1 | \$30,000 | Wood | Marshfield, City | 1 | \$30,000 |
| Waupaca | Clintonville, City | 1 | 99,799 | Wood | Pittsville, City | 1 | 20,000 |
| Waupaca | New London, City | 1 | 30,000 | Wood | Wisconsin Rapids, City | 1 | 30,000 |
| Waupaca | Ogdensburg, Village | 1 | 18,000 | Wood | Wood County | <u>1</u> | <u>30,000</u> |
| Waupaca | Waupaca, County | 2 | 55,000 | | | | |
| Winnebago | Menasha, City | 1 | 30,000 | | Total Grant Awards ** | 387 | \$13,400,446 |
| Winnebago | Neenah, City | 1 | 30,000 | | Appropriation ** | | \$13,350,000 |
| Winnebago | Oshkosh, City | 3 | 192,000 | | | | |
| Winnebago | Oshkosh, City RA | 2 | 108,500 | | | | |
| Winnebago | Winnebago County | 3 | 81,000 | | | | |

* Municipalities located in more than one county are listed under the county in which the largest portion of the property value is located.

** Grant awards exceed the appropriation because unexpended grant funds may be awarded to a different municipality later.

RA = Redevelopment Authority
CDA = Community Development Authority
HA = Housing Authority

APPENDIX IV

**Appropriations from the Environmental Management Account
Of the Environmental Fund,
2006-07 through 2008-09**

| | <u>2006-07</u> | <u>Positions</u> | <u>2007-08</u> | <u>Positions</u> | <u>2008-09</u> | <u>Positions</u> |
|--|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Natural Resources (370) | | | | | | |
| (2)(dv) Environmental repair; spills; abandoned containers | \$2,440,800 | | \$2,440,800 | | \$2,441,700 | |
| (2)(mq) Air and waste operations | 3,200,200 | 32.25 | 3,198,000 | 32.25 | 3,201,200 | 32.25 |
| (2)(mr) Brownfields operations | 252,700 | 3.00 | 367,500 | 3.00 | 367,600 | 3.00 |
| (2)(du) * Site specific remediation | 192,500 | | 5,832,800 | | 4,000,000 | |
| (2)(fq) Indemnification agreements | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| (3)(mq) Enforcement and science operations | 990,600 | 8.08 | 1,183,800 | 8.08 | 1,182,200 | 8.08 |
| (4)(ar) Groundwater management | 91,900 | | 91,900 | | 91,900 | |
| (4)(mq) Water operations | 3,124,300 | 29.67 | 3,519,400 | 29.67 | 3,526,100 | 29.67 |
| (4)(au) * Cooperative remedial action; contributions | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| (4)(av) * Cooperative remedial action; interest on contributions | 1,400 | | 600 | | 0 | |
| (6)(cr) Well compensation grants | 294,000 | | 294,000 | | 294,000 | |
| (6)(et) Brownfield site assessment grants | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | | 1,700,000 | |
| (6)(eu) Brownfields green space grants | 500,000 | | 500,000 | | 500,000 | |
| (7)(bq) ** Remedial action debt service | 3,216,300 | | 3,531,300 | | 4,086,000 | |
| (7)(er) ** Administrative facilities debt service | 301,000 | | 346,700 | | 469,900 | |
| (7)(br) ** Contaminated sediment cleanup debt service | 0 | | 0 | | 0 | |
| (8)(mv) Administration and technology operations | 674,600 | | 935,000 | | 937,300 | |
| (9)(mv) Customer assistance and external relations operations | 849,100 | 4.94 | 797,700 | 4.21 | 797,800 | 4.21 |
| Commerce (143) | | | | | | |
| (1)(qm) Brownfields grant program | 7,000,000 | | 6,000,000 | | 7,000,000 | |
| Health and Family Services (435) | | | | | | |
| (1)(q) Groundwater and air quality standards | 287,300 | 2.00 | 306,000 | 2.00 | 306,000 | 2.00 |
| Military Affairs (465) | | | | | | |
| (3)(t) Emergency response training | 7,700 | | 7,700 | | 7,700 | |
| University of Wisconsin System (285) | | | | | | |
| (1)(r) * Environmental education; environmental assessments | <u>45,100</u> | | <u>85,700</u> | | <u>95,000</u> | |
| Total SEG Environmental Management Account Appropriations | \$25,169,500 | 79.94 | \$31,138,900 | 79.21 | \$31,194,200 | 79.21 |

* Appropriations are continuing and show the currently estimated revenue that would be available solely for the purposes of the appropriation, rather than the Chapter 20 amount.

** Debt service appropriations are sum sufficient and show actual expenditures in 2006-07 and 2007-08 and estimated expenditures in 2008-09.