



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

May 10, 2007

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #585

Nonpoint Program Bonding (DATCP and DNR -- Water Quality)

Bill Agency

[LFB 2007-09 Budget Summary: Page 49 and 50, #2 (part); Page 425, #6; & Page 425, #7]

CURRENT LAW

The Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection (DATCP) is authorized \$26,075,000 in general obligation bonding for grants to counties and landowners for the installation of nonpoint source pollution abatement practices under its soil and water resource management (SWRM) program.

The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) is authorized \$89,310,400 in general obligation bonding for nonpoint source water pollution abatement grants for rural landowners in designated priority watersheds. These bond revenues may also be used for competitive projects under the targeted runoff management (TRM) program. In addition, DNR is authorized \$4 million in general obligation bonding for competitive grants to local government units for the TRM program. Further, DNR is authorized \$23,900,000 in general obligation bonding to provide cost-share grants for urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management projects and to provide municipal flood control and riparian restoration cost-share grants.

GOVERNOR

Increase general obligation bonding revenue (BR) by \$25 million as follows: (a) \$7,000,000 for the DATCP soil and water resource management program; (b) \$5,000,000 for DNR cost-share grants for rural landowners; (c) \$7,000,000 for the DNR targeted runoff management (TRM) grant program; and (d) \$6,000,000 for the DNR urban nonpoint source

water pollution abatement and storm water management program and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration program.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. Table 1 shows the amount of bonding revenue authorized to DATCP and DNR for nonpoint source water pollution abatement related efforts in the past three biennia and the amount under the bill. As shown in Table 1, the bill would provide an increase in bonding authority, compared to the prior two biennia. In addition, it should be noted that while the amount of funding for DNR's priority watershed/TRM program has generally declined, this reflects the amount of funding required in order to make payments to counties for all eligible priority watershed payments (discussed later in this paper).

TABLE 1
Nonpoint Source Bonding Authority

	<u>2001-03</u>	<u>2003-05</u>	<u>2005-07</u>	<u>SB 40 2007-09</u>
DATCP	\$7,000,000	\$7,000,000	\$5,500,000	\$7,000,000
DNR Priority Watershed/TRM	19,000,000	9,546,800	4,000,000	5,000,000
DNR TRM	0	0	2,000,000	7,000,000
DNR Urban/Flood	<u>4,700,000*</u>	<u>4,700,000</u>	<u>1,500,000</u>	<u>6,000,000</u>
	\$30,700,000	\$21,246,800	\$13,000,000	\$25,000,000

*Includes \$500,000 that was earmarked for federal dam rehabilitation.

2. Bonding authorized to DNR for rural nonpoint pollution abatement may be used for both priority watershed and targeted runoff management grants, while bonding authorized for the TRM program may only be used for grants under the TRM program.

3. Table 2 shows the amount of funding available for DATCP and DNR nonpoint source related efforts in the 2005-07 biennium, and the amount provided in the 2007-09 biennium under the bill. While the table shows \$61.8 million in federal funding as being available in the 2007-09 biennium, this funding is an approximation of the amount of funding expected to be made available to Wisconsin landowners over this time period. Also, unlike other funding shown in the table which is provided to DATCP and DNR and then distributed to landowners via local governments, this federal funding is primarily available directly to landowners and local governments.

TABLE 2

Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Appropriations

	2005-07 <u>Biennium</u>	SB 40 <u>2007-09 Biennium</u>
DATCP SWRM		
GPR	\$10,163,800	\$10,163,800
SEG	9,490,200	21,490,200
BR	<u>5,500,000</u>	<u>7,000,000</u>
DATCP Subtotal	\$25,154,000	\$38,654,000
DNR Nonpoint		
GPR-rural	\$1,678,800	\$1,678,800
SEG-urban	2,798,000	2,798,000
BR-rural	6,000,000	12,000,000
BR-urban	<u>1,500,000</u>	<u>6,000,000</u>
DNR Subtotal	\$11,976,800	\$22,476,800
FED*	55,036,000	61,800,000
Total	\$92,166,800	\$122,930,800

*Estimated

4. DNR and DATCP work jointly in controlling nonpoint source water pollution and soil erosion in the state. Each year, the two agencies develop a joint final allocation plan, which provides grant funding primarily to counties for conservation staff and support costs, landowner cost-sharing, and priority watershed and runoff management projects. For calendar year 2007 grants (funding in fiscal year 2006-07), DATCP allocated grants to county land conservation committees and other project cooperators through the soil and water resource management (SWRM) program and DNR allocated grants to counties through the priority watershed, TRM, and urban nonpoint source and storm water management programs. These allocations are shown in attachments to this paper.

5. The 1999-01 biennial budget act (1999 Act 9) made a number of major modifications to the state's nonpoint and soil and water resource management (SWRM) programs. Funding for grants to Wisconsin counties for county technical staff and administration was consolidated in DATCP while funding for cost-share grants to landowners for installation of pollution abatement projects in rural priority watersheds remained in DNR. (However, both agencies now administer cost-share funding for best management practice installation.) The two agencies are required to develop a unified funding allocation plan each year that distributes available state funding for the nonpoint and SWRM programs (both local staffing and landowner grants).

6. In order to implement the revised nonpoint source, storm water, and SWRM

programs, DNR and DATCP promulgated a number of administrative rules that generally became effective on October 1, 2002. However, some standards, such as that for nutrient management, were phased in more gradually (this rule takes full effect on October 1, 2008).

7. Past DATCP and DNR estimates have indicated the annual state cost of implementing the performance standards included in the administrative rules promulgated under the revised nonpoint, storm water, and SWRM programs over a 10-year period to be between \$42 million and \$70 million annually. While total funding available to Wisconsin landowners over the 2007-09 biennium is expected to be within this range, much of the federal funding expected to be available to Wisconsin landowners may only be used for certain practices or purposes. While the purposes may coincide with practices that may be used for nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices, this is often not the case. As a result, while the programs (which are discussed later in this paper) may fund the implementation of nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices, they only do so when these practices coincide with the goals of the programs. For example, the wildlife habitat incentives program funds the establishment and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat. While this may include the installation of grasses on streambanks that help abate nonpoint source water pollution in certain instances, these funds are not generally available for such purposes.

8. The bonding revenue authorized under the bill would be supported from GPR debt service appropriations in DATCP and DNR. As a result, while it would take some time for the full effects to be realized (due to the delays in issuing the bonds to reimburse landowners for installation of nonpoint practices), GPR debt service payments associated with \$25 million in 20-year bonds would be expected to be approximately \$2 million annually after a few years.

Rural Nonpoint Funding

9. *DATCP Allocation.* For 2007, DATCP allocated a total of \$13 million for land and water conservation, including \$9.3 million GPR and SEG for staffing support, \$3.2 million in bonding that was used to provide grants to landowners for the installation of nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices, and \$0.5 million SEG for nutrient management grants to landowners. Although GPR and SEG may be used for staffing or landowner grants, DATCP chose to allocate all of this funding, except for \$520,000 SEG specifically provided for nutrient management grants in the 2005-07 budget, to staffing grants. For 2007, staffing grants were the greater of: (a) \$85,000; or (b) the amount of funding awarded to the county for DNR priority watershed staffing in 2001, less any amount allocated in 2001 for a priority watershed that has subsequently closed. Allocations are shown in Attachment 1.

10. Bonding under DATCP's soil and water resource management (SWRM) program is used to provide cost-share grants to counties for the 2005-07 biennium (with \$2.75 million of the new bonding in each fiscal year, in addition to under-spent funds from prior years that became available). For 2007, all counties were eligible to apply for a base award of up to \$20,000 to provide cost-share grants to landowners in their counties for the installation of nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices, known as best management practices, with additional funds

being awarded by DATCP on a competitive basis. Cost-share rates generally equal 70% of the costs of the installation of the practice, although these rates may be increased to 90% in cases of economic hardship. DATCP will carryover approximately \$408,000 of bonding revenue into the 2007-09 biennium. If additional bonding of \$7 million is provided under the bill, Department officials indicate the Department will provide \$3.5 million each in 2007-08 and 2008-09 and use it to provide grants to counties for cost-share grants to landowners.

11. However, if the Committee desired to reduce the amount of bonding authorized in the bill, bonding authority for DATCP's SWRM program could be reduced to \$5.5 million to coincide with the amount of bonding provided in the 2005-07 biennium (Alternative 2a). On the other hand, DATCP officials argue a reduction would result in less funding being available to counties to provide cost-share grants to landowners, which could hamper nonpoint source water pollution abatement efforts. Further, rather than seen as an increase to the 2005-07 level, proponents of the bonding level provided in the bill argue the bill restores bonding available for DATCP's SWRM program to the level it was in the 2001-03 and 2003-05 biennia.

12. Under 2005 Act 25, DATCP was provided \$520,000 nonpoint account SEG annually for counties to make cost-share grants to landowners for the implementation of nutrient management plans required by ATCP 50 (which are currently required of farmers near outstanding or exceptional resource waters, and all farmers by 2008). However, these funds may also be used for cost-share grants for other "soft practices" (non-bondable) that will reduce nutrient runoff. DATCP awarded these funds to: (1) areas that have experienced manure runoff incidents; or (2) sensitive areas that will benefit from preventative practices.

13. The Wisconsin Constitution generally restricts the issuance of public debt to long-term capital projects. As a result, bond revenue generally may not be used to pay for staff or cropping practices, such as nutrient management and conservation tillage, known as "soft practices." Rather, it is used for water pollution abatement or conservation practices, such as diversions (structures installed to divert water from areas where it is in excess to sites where it can be used or transported safely), riparian buffers (an area in which vegetation is enhanced or established to reduce or eliminate the movement of sediment, nutrients and other nonpoint source pollutants to an adjacent surface water resource), and filter strips (an area of herbaceous vegetation that separates an environmentally sensitive area from cropland, grazing land or disturbed land). Bond revenue is also available for traditional building projects such as manure storage facilities, concrete barnyards and roofed feedlots. The state tries to use federal Section 319 funds (which are not restricted in the type of practices they may fund) to install "soft practices" when possible. This funding is provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency through the Clean Water Act and is associated with Great Lakes basin projects and selected cost-share and local staffing grants. As a result, the Governor recommended providing an additional \$12 million of nonpoint account SEG over the biennium (\$5 million in 2007-08 and \$7 million in 2008-09) for the implementation of soft practices, predominantly nutrient management planning for farmers. However, this funding could also be used for the implementation of bondable, or "hard practices."

14. DATCP allocates over \$9 million a year to counties to fund land and water

conservation staff, in part so they can provide technical assistance and distribute state funding for cost-share grants to landowners to install pollution abatement practices. As a result, if the Committee does not authorize increases for landowner grants, it may consider reducing the staffing grants to counties as well. Conversely, counties argue that even without state bonding (or with more limited state bonding) county staff are needed to encourage no or low-cost conservation practices by landowners to meet state nonpoint pollution abatement standards and to help ensure that available federal funding is utilized in the state.

15. DNR Priority Watersheds. For 2007, DNR allocated \$5.5 million from GPR, FED and bonding revenue for priority watershed (primarily rural) landowner cost-share reimbursement awards (ACRAs) and \$1.7 million for rural TRM grants. Bonding is used to provide grants to install nonpoint source water pollution abatement projects in designated priority watersheds. Attachment 1 shows these awards by county for 2007. Currently, there are 23 active priority watershed projects.

16. DNR officials indicate the Department will carryover \$1.2 million into the 2007-09 biennium for priority watershed grants. As a result, under the bill, at least \$6.2 million (\$5 million new bonding revenue, \$1.2 million carryover bonding) is expected to be available for priority watershed grants in the 2007-09 biennium. In addition, \$1.7 million GPR is also available to the DNR over the biennium for nonpoint grants. However, DNR officials indicate some of this GPR funding is used for TRM grants. Further, significant amounts of unspent funds from prior years typically become available to fund additional projects in future years. As a result, total funding of at least \$7.9 million could be used for priority watershed grants

17. DNR estimates eligible ACRAs for priority watersheds of \$6.4 million for the biennium (\$3.9 million in 2007-08 and \$2.5 million in 2008-09). However, as noted previously, bonding authorized to DNR for rural nonpoint pollution abatement may be used for both priority watershed and targeted runoff management grants. Therefore, at least \$1.5 million could be reallocated by DNR for TRM grants in the 2007-09 biennium. On the other hand, if the Committee wanted to reduce the amount of bonding authorized in the budget, at least \$1.5 million could be eliminated and DNR would still be expected to have sufficient authority to make all eligible ACRA payments in the 2007-09 biennium (Alternative 2b). By making this reduction from the TRM bonding authority, DNR would maintain the most flexibility in using these funds, as priority watershed bonding can be reallocated for TRM grants, but TRM bonding may not be reallocated for priority watershed grants.

18. Targeted Runoff Management. The TRM program offers competitive financial awards to support small-scale, short-term projects (generally one to three years) that are completed by local governmental units. TRM grants may fund up to 70% of an eligible project's costs funded by the grant, with a maximum of \$150,000 in state funding. TRM grants may not be used to pay for staffing, studies, or designs. Both urban and rural projects can be funded through a TRM grant, but grants must be made to combat nonpoint source water pollution. Under state and federal law, an entity that has a Wisconsin pollutant discharge elimination system (WPDES) permit is defined as a point source. With the implementation of revised federal storm water standards (revised

administrative rule NR 216, which took effect in July, 2004), DNR officials estimate over 250 municipalities in Wisconsin will be required to obtain a WPDES permit, and therefore be classified as a point source. Since municipalities that are required to obtain a WPDES permit are ineligible for a TRM grant, most grants made under the program are made to rural counties or smaller municipalities. For the grant period lasting from January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2008, DNR awarded TRM grants worth \$2.3 million. These grants are shown in Attachment 2.

19. DNR officials indicate the Department will carryover approximately \$100,000 into the 2007-09 biennium for TRM grants. Therefore, under the Governor's recommendations, at least \$8.6 million (\$7 million in new bonding, \$0.1 million in carryover bonding, and \$1.5 million reallocated from the priority watershed program) would be expected to be available for TRM grants in the 2007-09 biennium. While the Committee could consider reducing this bonding authority, DNR officials note the \$7 million for TRM grants provided under the bill is less than the \$10 million requested by the agency. Further, they argue these grants have been an effective tool for combating instances of rural nonpoint source water pollution. However, the Committee could reduce bonding authority for the TRM program by \$3 million, and still provide twice the bonding authority that was provided in the 2005-07 biennium (\$4 million vs. \$2 million). (Alternative 2c.)

Urban Nonpoint and Flood Control Programs

20. Bonding of \$6 million would be authorized under the bill for both the urban nonpoint source and storm water management grant program and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration program for the 2007-09 biennium. In addition, DNR officials expect to carryover approximately \$560,000 into the 2007-09 biennium for the urban nonpoint source water pollution program.

21. Urban Nonpoint. Under the urban nonpoint source and storm water grant program, DNR provides cost-share and local assistance grants for urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement projects. These grants promote urban runoff management for existing and developing urban areas. DNR urban nonpoint bonding revenue is used to provide cost-share grants for municipalities to install nonpoint source water pollution abatement projects and to provide financial assistance to municipalities and sewerage districts for the construction of facilities and structures that aid in the collection and transmission of storm water as part of the nonpoint source water pollution abatement, storm water management and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration programs.

22. Urban nonpoint grants can fund 70% of project costs for technical assistance (staff, engineering and associated costs). The maximum amount that can be awarded for a construction project is 50% of costs up to a maximum grant of \$150,000. Eligible cost-share activities include: (a) structural urban best management practices, including necessary land acquisition, storm sewer rerouting, removal of structures and associated flood management, but excluding new construction activities and new development; (b) stream bank and shore land stabilization; and (c) other activities, such as improved street sweeping, identified by DNR rule. The maximum amount that can be granted for a technical assistance project is \$100,000. While grants made under this program

are typically for two calendar years, DNR has made grants under the program every year, as additional funds are often available from past under-spending or from the annual SEG appropriation. For the grant period lasting from January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2007, DNR made grants of \$3.5 million under the program. This includes \$1.9 million of bonding revenue used to fund the construction costs of nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices, and \$1.6 million of nonpoint account SEG used to fund planning costs. For the grant period lasting from January 1, 2007, through December 31, 2008, the urban nonpoint source and storm water grant program made awards of \$1 million (all of which was nonpoint SEG for planning grants). These grants are shown in Attachment 3.

23. *Flood Control.* The municipal flood control and riparian restoration program provides financial assistance to cities, villages, towns or metropolitan sewerage districts for the collection and transmission of storm water. Grants may be used for facilities and structures, including the purchase of perpetual flowage and conservation easement rights on land within a floodway and flood proofing of public or private structures remaining in a 100-year flood plain. DNR may provide grants for up to 70% of eligible costs for construction and real estate acquisition for an approved project. DNR may also provide local assistance grants of up to 70% of eligible costs, including planning and design costs, but may not provide any applicant more than 20% of the funding available for the program. Grants have typically been made every two years under this program. The most recent grants made under the municipal flood control program were made in 2005-06 (for the period generally lasting from January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2007) and totaled \$2.2 million. These grants are shown in Attachment 4. The Department will not carryover any bonding revenue into the 2007-09 biennium related to the municipal flood control program.

24. Under the bill, DNR staff indicate that they would provide \$3 million of new bonding revenue for urban nonpoint and storm water management grants and \$3 million for municipal flood control and riparian restoration grants. DNR staff further indicate they would likely use at least 70% of available SEG funds for urban nonpoint source grants, and remaining SEG funds for municipal flood control grants.

25. If the Committee wanted to reduce the amount of bonding provided in the bill, it could consider reducing bonding for DNR's urban programs to the 2001-03 and 2003-05 biennia levels of \$4.7 million (Alternative 2d).

26. However, DNR officials argue that as more municipalities move forward with their efforts to comply with state and federal storm water regulations, demand for grants under the urban nonpoint and municipal flood control programs will increase. Under federal law, nearly all municipalities with a population of at least 10,000 are required to obtain a storm water permit. As a result, DNR officials estimate up to 250 municipalities, from 70 previously, could require permits. As part of the permitting processes, municipalities are required to develop storm water management plans that include plans for handling storm water discharges. These plans can require the implementation of best management practices, which can be funded from DNR's urban nonpoint program. DNR officials argue that insufficient funding in these programs could hamper municipal compliance with NR 216 regulations.

27. Further, DNR officials indicate that the Department has received average biennial requests under the urban nonpoint source and municipal flood control programs of approximately \$11 million. They argue the amount provided is already a reduction from the historic demand level, and any additional reductions could further hamper municipal NR 216 compliance efforts.

Federal Land and Water Conservation Funding

28. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the different source and amounts of federal funding that is primarily available to Wisconsin landowners in 2006-07. Federal funding may be received by landowners via local governments, who may receive federal funds directly for conservation practices under a variety of federal programs administered by the United State Department of Agriculture's Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS). The environmental quality incentive program (EQIP) offers financial and technical help to assist eligible participants install or implement structural and management practices on eligible agricultural land through the use of incentive payments and cost-shares, for which NRCS generally pays between 50 and 75 percent of the cost of eligible conservation practices.

TABLE 3

2006-07 Federal Program Funding Available to Wisconsin Landowners

<u>Program</u>	<u>Funding</u>
Environmental quality incentive program	\$17,100,000
Section 319 (Clean Water Act)	1,300,000
Conservation security program	4,200,000
Farm and ranch lands protection program	1,400,000
Wildlife habitat incentives program	400,000
Wetlands reserve program	<u>6,500,000</u>
 Total	 \$30,900,000

29. As Congress is currently contemplating passage of the next farm bill, it is uncertain how much federal funding will be available to landowners for conservation practices. However, under the recommendations of the USDA Secretary, funds available to Wisconsin landowners in 2007-08 and 2008-09 for the implementation of conservation practices would be expected to be comparable to 2006-07 levels (over \$30 million annually).

30. In 2007-08 and 2008-09, DNR officials indicate they expect to be eligible to receive up to \$1.3 million annually for grants to landowners under federal Section 319 (Clean Water Act) grants. This funding is provided for the implementation of total maximum daily load plans for federally-identified critically impaired water quality sites. Under this program, the state is required to match every \$1.50 of federal funding with \$1 of state funds (a 40/60% state/federal match).

31. In addition to federal funds specifically for nonpoint source water pollution

abatement, Wisconsin landowners may also receive federal funding under other programs, including: the conservation security program (CSP); the farm and ranch lands protection program (FRPP); the wildlife habitat incentive program (WHIP); and the wetlands reserve program (WRP). The CSP provides financial and technical assistance by awarding incentive payments to landowners for the conservation and improvement of soil, water, air, energy, plant and animal life, and other conservation purposes on private land. Under the farm and ranch lands protection program, the NRCS provides matching funds to help purchase development rights to keep productive farm and rangeland in agricultural uses. The NRCS provides up to 50% of the purchase costs of permanent easements on eligible farmland. The other 50% must come from the state or another entity. WHIP provides private landowners with technical assistance and up to 75% cost-share assistance for the establishment and improvement of wildlife and fish habitat. The WRP provides technical and financial assistance to eligible landowners to address wetland, wildlife habitat, soil, water and related natural resource concerns on private lands.

32. In addition to amounts identified in Table 3, under the conservation reserve enhancement program (CREP), the USDA and the state of Wisconsin entered into a \$240 million agreement to protect environmentally sensitive land and improve impaired water resources for enhancing wildlife habitat in two designated geographic areas known as "grassland areas." CREP is a voluntary land retirement program in which landowners may enroll agricultural lands into conservation practices in order to protect environmentally sensitive land, decrease erosion, restore wildlife habitat, and safeguard ground and surface water. Eligible conservation practices under CREP include riparian buffers, filter strips, wetland restoration, and establishment of native grasslands in the grassland project area. The land may be enrolled through a 15-year agreement or a perpetual easement. Under the program, the state is required to match a federal grant of \$200 million with at least \$40 million of state funds. The state has authorized \$40 million in general obligation bonding authority for the program. Through October 1, 2006, over 35,000 acres of land have been enrolled in CREP (29,800 acres in 15-year easements and 5,400 acres in perpetual easements). The Farm Service Agency projects that total federal payments associated with these 35,000 acres over their CREP contracts (generally 15 years, unless a permanent easement is granted) will total about \$71 million. In addition, state incentive payments to enroll this land into the program and on cost-share grants to landowners for the installation of conservation practices related to this land are expected to be approximately \$10.2 million. As a result, expenditures of approximately \$81.2 million (out of the total \$240 million available) are expected over the life of the CREP contracts for the 35,000 acres enrolled in CREP as of October 1, 2006. Under the current agreement with the USDA, state landowners are allowed to participate in CREP provided they have signed a federal contract by December 31, 2007.

ALTERNATIVES TO BILL

1. Approve the Governor's recommendations to: (a) provide an additional \$7,000,000 in general obligation bonding revenue for the DATCP soil and water resource management program; (b) provide an additional \$5,000,000 BR for DNR cost-share grants for rural landowners (primarily for priority watersheds); (c) provide an additional \$7,000,000 BR for the DNR targeted

runoff management (TRM) grant program; and (d) provide \$6,000,000 BR for the DNR urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management program and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration program.

ALT 1	Change to Bill Funding	Change to Base Funding
BR	\$0	\$25,000,000

2. Adopt the Governor's recommendation as modified by one or more of the following:

a. reduce by \$1.5 million BR the amount for DATCP's soil and water resource management program (\$5.5 million would remain).

b. reduce by \$1.5 million BR the amount for targeted runoff management (TRM) grants (\$5.5 million would remain specifically for TRM grants, but additional funds provided predominantly for priority watershed grants could also be used for TRM grants).

c. reduce by \$3 million BR the amount for targeted runoff management (TRM) grants (\$4 million would remain specifically for TRM grants, but additional funds provided predominantly for priority watershed grants could also be used for TRM grants).

d. reduce by \$1.3 million BR the amount for the urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management program and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration program (\$4.7 million would remain).

3. Delete provisions.

ALT 3	Change to Bill Funding	Change to Base Funding
BR	-\$25,000,000	\$0

Prepared by: Chris Pollek
Attachment

ATTACHMENT 1

2007 Rural Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Grants

<u>County</u>	<u>Staffing and Support</u>	<u>Landowner Cost Sharing Bonding</u>	<u>Landowner Cost Sharing SEG</u>	<u>Total DATCP Allocation</u>	<u>Targeted Runoff Mgmt. (TRM) Cost Sharing</u>	<u>Priority Watershed Cost Sharing (ACRAs)</u>	<u>Total DNR Allocation</u>	<u>2007 Allocation Total</u>
Adams	\$99,259	\$55,942	\$0	\$155,201	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$145,000
Ashland	85,000	46,957	0	131,957	0	0	0	115,000
Barron	103,941	20,000	17,333	141,274	0	0	0	145,000
Bayfield	85,000	20,000	0	105,000	0	0	0	172,173
Brown	221,564	55,942	28,000	295,506	300,000	262,515	562,515	894,066
Oneida Tribe	89,549	0	0	89,549	0	30,451	30,451	120,000
Buffalo	109,977	55,942	0	165,919	0	0	0	145,000
Burnett	91,459	20,000	0	111,459	0	53,287	53,287	168,287
Calumet	118,235	55,942	17,333	191,510	0	0	0	300,448
Chippewa	181,795	55,942	0	237,737	170,957	0	170,957	637,737
Clark	131,542	55,942	0	187,484	0	0	0	170,248
Columbia	135,808	55,942	35,000	226,750	0	24,256	24,256	298,046
Crawford	90,932	44,710	0	135,642	0	0	0	132,500
Dane	213,178	55,942	30,000	299,120	102,935	299,449	402,384	818,935
Dodge	143,979	20,000	0	163,979	0	0	0	611,713
Door	234,411	55,942	28,000	318,353	498,013	530,573	1,028,586	850,231
Douglas	85,000	20,000	0	105,000	0	16,442	16,442	131,442
Dunn	147,369	20,000	0	167,369	0	0	0	322,145
Eau Claire	138,019	55,942	35,000	228,961	0	0	0	170,248
Florence	85,000	20,000	0	105,000	0	0	0	115,000
Fond du Lac	151,232	20,000	28,000	199,232	0	587,799	587,799	758,376
Forest	88,601	20,000	0	108,601	0	0	0	115,000
Grant	103,681	55,942	0	159,623	0	0	0	295,000
Green	113,337	55,942	28,000	197,279	0	0	0	170,248
Green Lake	111,185	55,942	35,000	202,127	0	0	0	170,248
Iowa	111,703	55,942	15,000	182,645	0	0	0	191,907
Iron	85,000	20,000	0	105,000	0	0	0	115,000
Jackson	124,605	55,942	0	180,547	0	0	0	585,347
Jefferson	147,486	20,000	28,000	195,486	0	0	0	135,000
Juneau	95,656	46,957	0	142,613	0	0	0	135,000
Kenosha	116,596	28,986	0	145,582	0	0	0	115,000
Kewaunee	114,804	20,000	17,335	152,139	0	117,479	117,479	247,139
LaCrosse	140,677	20,000	0	160,677	149,800	0	149,800	265,000
Lafayette	98,865	55,942	0	154,807	0	0	0	145,000
Langlade	85,000	20,000	0	105,000	0	72,064	72,064	217,064
Lincoln	106,802	55,942	0	162,744	0	0	0	170,248

ATTACHMENT 1 (continued)

2007 Rural Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Grants

<u>County</u>	<u>Staffing and Support</u>	<u>Landowner Cost Sharing Bonding</u>	<u>Landowner Cost Sharing SEG</u>	<u>Total DATCP Allocation</u>	<u>Targeted Runoff Mgmt. (TRM) Cost Sharing</u>	<u>Priority Watershed Cost Sharing (ACRAs)</u>	<u>Total DNR Allocation</u>	<u>2007 Allocation Total</u>
Manitowoc	\$231,488	\$28,986	\$17,335	\$277,807	\$0	\$425,034	\$425,034	\$738,615
Marathon	154,879	55,942	35,000	245,821	220,500	224,083	444,583	539,322
Marinette	133,961	55,942	0	189,903	0	48,471	48,471	754,497
Marquette	106,821	45,164	0	151,985	0	0	0	158,173
Menominee	85,000	20,000	0	105,000	0	0	0	115,000
Milwaukee	91,221	20,000	0	111,221	0	0	0	115,000
Monroe	130,107	55,942	0	186,049	0	0	0	157,626
Oconto	118,497	55,942	0	174,439	0	87,028	87,028	268,548
Oneida	105,470	55,942	0	161,412	0	0	0	170,248
Outagamie	156,472	55,942	0	212,414	0	322,728	322,728	498,191
Ozaukee	161,511	55,942	0	217,453	0	0	0	215,702
Pepin	101,138	55,942	0	157,080	0	0	0	170,248
Pierce	134,956	55,942	0	190,898	0	80,128	80,128	256,500
Polk	126,381	20,000	0	146,381	0	143,837	143,837	575,184
Portage	127,305	55,942	0	183,247	0	169,816	169,816	371,874
Price	85,132	55,942	0	141,074	0	0	0	170,248
Racine	153,212	46,957	0	200,169	0	0	0	151,893
Richland	99,260	55,942	0	155,202	0	0	0	170,248
Rock	143,779	55,942	0	199,721	0	0	0	160,781
Rusk	113,322	20,000	0	133,322	13,300	71,987	85,287	213,768
Saint Croix	168,274	20,000	0	188,274	0	243,014	243,014	580,546
Sauk	168,760	55,942	28,000	252,702	0	163,140	163,140	403,835
Sawyer	90,593	55,942	0	146,535	0	0	0	145,000
Shawano	119,019	55,942	17,333	192,294	0	235,907	235,907	350,910
Sheboygan	161,737	55,942	0	217,679	0	95,893	95,893	296,208
Taylor	134,280	55,942	0	190,222	0	0	0	170,248
Trempealeau	135,176	55,942	0	191,118	0	0	0	274,342
Vernon	118,023	55,942	17,333	191,298	0	0	0	253,523
Vilas	118,280	55,942	0	174,222	0	0	0	115,000
Walworth	156,923	20,000	0	176,923	0	329,937	329,937	535,499
Washburn	120,625	55,942	0	176,567	0	0	0	145,000
Washington	135,869	55,942	0	191,811	149,940	0	149,940	160,781
Waukesha	157,298	20,000	0	177,298	0	0	0	213,211
Waupaca	126,387	55,942	0	182,329	128,219	262,290	390,509	590,349
Waushara	121,906	28,991	28,000	178,897	0	367,299	367,299	541,866
Winnebago	142,814	20,000	35,000	197,814	0	187,785	187,785	627,353
Wood	128,669	55,942	0	184,611	0	0	0	170,248
County Subtotals	<u>\$9,240,792</u>	<u>\$3,107,272</u>	<u>\$520,000</u>	<u>\$12,868,064</u>	<u>\$1,733,664</u>	<u>\$5,452,692</u>	<u>\$7,186,356</u>	<u>\$20,054,400</u>
Lake Districts						0	0	0
Non-counties	<u>90,402</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>90,402</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>90,402</u>
Total	<u>\$9,331,194</u>	<u>\$3,107,272</u>	<u>\$520,000</u>	<u>\$12,958,466</u>	<u>\$1,630,000</u>	<u>\$5,452,692</u>	<u>\$7,186,356</u>	<u>\$20,144,822</u>

ATTACHMENT 2

Targeted Runoff Management Project Grants for Calendar Year 2007

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
Brown County [A]	\$150,000
Brown County [B]	150,000
Chippewa County [A]	57,510
Chippewa County [B]	113,500
Chippewa County [C]	126,420
Dane County	102,940
Door County [A]	147,520
Door County [B]	81,120
Door County [C]	131,370
Door County [D]	138,010
La Crosse County	149,800
Marathon County [A]	49,300
Marathon County [B]	96,000
Marathon County [C]	75,200
Marinette County [A]	150,000
Marinette County [B]	150,000
Richland County	150,000
Rusk County	13,300
Washington County	149,940
Waupaca County	<u>128,220</u>
Total TRM	\$2,310,150

Letters listed after the grantee denote separate grant awards to the governmental unit.

ATTACHMENT 3

Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Project Grants for Calendar Year 2006

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Grant Type</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
Appleton, City [A]	Construction	BOND	\$140,000
Appleton, City [B]	Construction	BOND	25,500
Appleton, City [C]	Construction	BOND	43,000
Baraboo, City	Planning	SEG	32,305
Brown Deer, Village	Construction	BOND	150,000
Caledonia, Town [A]	Construction	BOND	130,875
Caledonia, Town [B]	Planning	SEG	58,870
Chetek, City	Planning	SEG	40,250
Combined Locks, Village	Planning	SEG	39,060
Dane County	Planning	SEG	65,000
Dodgeville, City	Planning	SEG	21,600
Fontana, Village	Planning	SEG	16,860
Freedom, Town	Planning	SEG	78,400
Grafton, Town	Planning	SEG	67,485
Grafton, Village [A]	Construction	BOND	38,400
Grafton, Village [B]	Planning	SEG	39,300
Grand Chute, Town [A]	Construction	BOND	85,000
Grand Chute, Town [B]	Construction	BOND	90,000
Grand Chute, Town [C]	Construction	BOND	60,000
Harrison, Town	Planning	SEG	85,000
Hartland, Village	Construction	BOND	150,000
Hartland, Village	Planning	SEG	42,000
Jefferson, City	Planning	SEG	75,000
Lake Mills, City	Planning	SEG	55,860
Little Chute, Village [A]	Construction	BOND	150,000
Little Chute, Village [B]	Construction	BOND	150,000
Maple Bluff, Village	Planning	SEG	12,600
Marshfield, City	Planning	SEG	23,800
McFarland, Village	Planning	SEG	81,500
Menasha, City	Planning	SEG	71,232
Menasha, Town	Planning	SEG	85,000
Milwaukee, City	Construction	BOND	27,350
Mukwonago, Village	Planning	SEG	60,500
New Glarus, Village	Planning	SEG	18,900
Omro, Town	Planning	SEG	12,250
Pewaukee, Village	Construction	BOND	43,875
Portage, City	Planning	SEG	50,000

ATTACHMENT 3 (continued)

Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Project Grants for Calendar Year 2006

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Grant Type</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
Port Washington, City	Construction	BOND	32,500
Prairie du Chien, City	Planning	SEG	35,750
Racine, City	Construction	BOND	30,000
Rib Mountain, Town	Planning	SEG	43,050
Sheboygan County	Planning	SEG	82,635
Shorewood Hills, Village	Planning	SEG	63,982
Sister Bay, Village	Planning	SEG	43,439
UW-Ext. Milwaukee County	Construction	BOND	88,975
UW-Madison	Construction	BOND	150,000
Waunakee, Village	Planning	SEG	43,610
Wauwatosa, City [A]	Construction	BOND	149,650
Wauwatosa, City [B]	Construction	BOND	149,975
Whitewater, City	Planning	SEG	57,500
Wisconsin Rapids, City	Planning	SEG	<u>76,733</u>
Total Grant Amount			\$3,464,571
Total SEG			\$1,579,471
Total Bonding			\$1,885,100

*Letters listed after the grantee denote separate grant awards to the governmental unit.

ATTACHMENT 3 (continued)

Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Project Grants for Calendar Year 2007

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Grant Type</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
Algoma, Town	Planning	SEG	\$17,990
Amery, City	Planning	SEG	45,150
Appleton, City [A]	Planning	SEG	11,300
Appleton, City [B]	Planning	SEG	18,500
Appleton, City [C]	Planning	SEG	14,350
Ashland, City	Planning	SEG	65,000
Beloit, Town	Planning	SEG	72,210
Bristol, Town	Planning	SEG	57,770
Cudahy, City	Planning	SEG	33,800
Fort Atkinson, City	Planning	SEG	70,600
Grand Chute, Town	Planning	SEG	40,460
Janesville, City	Planning	SEG	76,570
Johnson Creek, Village	Planning	SEG	53,730
Kaukauna, City	Planning	SEG	85,000
Lawrence, Town	Planning	SEG	85,000
Lodi, City	Planning	SEG	32,610
Menomonie, City	Planning	SEG	28,000
Oshkosh, Town	Planning	SEG	57,770
Scott, Town	Planning	SEG	16,540
Suamico, Village	Planning	SEG	60,000
Winnebago, County	Planning	SEG	<u>50,000</u>
Total Grant Amount			\$992,350
Total SEG			\$992,350
Total Bonding			\$0

*Letters listed after the grantee denote separate grant awards to the government

ATTACHMENT 4

Municipal Flood Control Grant Awards for Calendar Year 2006

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant Award</u>
Beloit, City of	\$800,000
Jamestown, Town of	62,930
New Berlin, City of	147,070
Paris, Town of	45,780
Prescott, City of	222,233
Wauwatosa, City of	800,000
Wheatland, Town of	<u>147,094</u>
Total Grant Amount	\$2,225,107