



Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

June 5, 2001

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #635

Organization of the Department of Natural Resources (DNR -- Departmentwide)

CURRENT LAW

Currently, DNR is organized into seven divisions: (1) land, (2) forestry, (3) air and waste, (4) enforcement and science, (5) water, (6) administration and technology and (7) customer assistance and external relations (CAER). In addition, there are three other budgetary programs in the agency that are administered within those seven divisions for payment of conservation aids, environmental aids and debt service. The organizational structure of the Wisconsin DNR is similar to that of the Iowa Department of Natural Resources in that responsibilities for conservation and environmental policy are generally vested in the same agency. The other three states that border on Wisconsin, however, place general responsibility for conservation policy in a Department of Natural Resources and for environmental policy in a separate agency (Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency). Michigan recently had a structure similar to Wisconsin's, but the Department of Environmental Quality was split from the Department of Natural Resources in October, 1995. DNR has a base budget of \$462.5 million and 3,000.5 positions annually.

DISCUSSION POINTS

1. The Department of Natural Resources was created in 1967 by the Legislature and Governor Warren Knowles based on the recommendations of the Kellet Commission. The reorganization combined the former Wisconsin Conservation Department (whose functions included fish, wildlife, forestry, parks, law enforcement, and other conservation functions) with the former Department of Resource Development (whose responsibilities included water pollution, drinking water, solid waste and air pollution programs).

2. The organization of the state's Natural Resource agency has been the subject of considerable debate in recent years. In 1995, the agency underwent a major internal reorganization. In addition, the 1995-97 budget gave the Governor, rather than the Natural Resources Board, the authority to appoint and dismiss the DNR Secretary. In 1999, the Assembly Natural Resources Committee established a special subcommittee to review the possibility of creating two agencies from the current Department of Natural Resources. In the spring of 2001, the Assembly Natural Resources Committee again held hearings on a proposal to create separate conservation and environmental agencies out of the current DNR. This paper discusses this most recent proposal.

Division of Responsibilities

3. As drafted in LRB 2147/3, the current Department of Natural Resources would be divided into two separate agencies (a conservation agency and an environmental agency) on July 1, 2002. A Department of Fish, Wildlife, Parks and Forestry (DFWP&F) would be responsible for state parks, forests and trails, fish and wildlife programs, and outdoor recreation (including recreational boat, snowmobile and ATV programs and enforcement activities). A Department of Environmental Management (DEM) would have authority for environmental protection, pollution control and environmental regulatory functions (such as navigable waters, dams, wetlands, shoreland zoning, wharves, piers, boathouses, ski ramps, fishing rafts, fill, construction and dredging permits).

4. The core of the conservation agency would consist of the current DNR Division of Land (which includes the Bureaus of Wildlife Management, Parks and Recreation, Endangered Resources and Facilities and Lands), the Division of Forestry, the part of the Bureau of Fisheries Management and Habitat Protection relating to fisheries and the Mississippi/Lower St. Croix subprogram in the Division of Water. Also included would be fish, wildlife and recreational vehicle enforcement. In addition, the conservation aids distributed by DNR (such as snowmobile and all-terrain vehicle trail aids, recreational boating project aids, aids in lieu of taxes and wildlife damage aids) and natural resource-related debt service (such as that paid for the stewardship program) and resource acquisition and development funding would also be placed in the conservation agency. Further, current DNR responsibilities relating to the Lower Wisconsin State Riverway (subchapter IV of chapter 30 of the statutes) and the Lake Winnebago comprehensive project would be assigned to this agency.

5. All current DNR funding from 9 of the 10 conservation fund accounts would be provided to the conservation agency, as would recreational boating project aids, boat access and aquatic and terrestrial inventory funding from the water resources account (motorboat gas tax revenues).

6. LRB 2147/3 would also include the provisions of 1999 AB 490 relating to the Joint Legislative Council's Special Committee on Conservation Laws Enforcement recommendations for chief warden authority (as modified to create an unclassified chief warden position). The Secretary of the conservation agency would designate a chief warden and may designate one or more deputy chief wardens. The chief warden would have the duty to direct, supervise and control conservation

wardens in the performance of their duties. The chief warden would designate an internal affairs officer to investigate complaints against conservation wardens when the chief warden determines an investigation is necessary and would designate a complaint officer to resolve complaints against conservation wardens.

7. The conservation agency would have three divisions. The Division of State Parks and Trails would be responsible for maintenance and operations of approximately 44 state parks, 14 state trails and five recreational areas. This Division would also have primary responsibility for seven state forests generally referred to as the "southern forests" (Point Beach, Havenwoods and five units of the Kettle Moraine State Forest). In addition, the DNR owns a number of state parks and trails that are operated and maintained by local governments. The Division of Forestry would be responsible for the operation of six major state forests and several smaller forest properties; three tree nurseries; local governmental and private forestry assistance; forest health and fire management; and grants, loans and payments to certain towns, counties and private forest owners. The Division of Fish, Wildlife and Recreation would be responsible for state fishing, hunting and recreational lands and programs (including the stewardship program); wildlife damage; invasive species; habitat management; endangered resources; recreational and conservation law enforcement; and recreational vehicle programs.

8. The core of the environmental agency would be formed by the current Division of Air and Waste (which includes the DNR Bureaus of Air Management, Waste Management, and Remediation and Redevelopment), as well as the Bureaus of Watershed Management and Drinking Water and Groundwater. It would also include the part of the Bureau of Fisheries Management and Habitat Protection that relates to dam, lake, river and wetland regulation under the Division of Water, and the Bureau of Cooperative Environmental Assistance (which provides a contact point for businesses on pollution prevention, waste minimization and small business assistance) in the CAER Division. In addition, the environmental aids administered by DNR (such as grants for nonpoint source water pollution abatement, lake and river protection, drycleaner environmental response reimbursement, recycling, well compensation, clean water fund, safe drinking water, land recycling and brownfields) and all environmental and water quality-related debt service would be placed in the environmental agency (such as nonpoint source, environmental remediation, wastewater treatment programs that preceded the clean water fund and former drinking water programs).

9. Segregated funding from the environmental, recycling, petroleum inspection, drycleaner environmental response and environmental improvement funds would be transferred to the environmental agency. In addition, funding from the water resources account of the conservation fund related to dam safety, water regulation, and lake and river grants and associated administration would be transferred. Program revenue and general purpose revenue funding that is identifiable as being for an environmental purpose, such as fees for air management, solid and hazardous waste, storm water management and wastewater discharge would be transferred to the environmental agency. Federal grants related to environmental purposes would also be transferred to this agency, including those for air management, hazardous waste administration, Superfund, wastewater and drinking water.

10. The Division of Air and Waste under the environmental agency would include programs such as air management, solid and hazardous waste management, landfill licensing, recycling, mining, contaminated site cleanup, brownfields, hazardous substances spills response, federal Superfund and federal Resources Conservation and Recovery Act corrective action. The Division of Water would include programs related to nonpoint source and runoff management; surface and groundwater quality standards; wastewater facility and discharge permits; public sewer system plan review; water quality modeling; dam safety; water regulation and zoning; wetland, floodplain and shoreland management; watershed planning; and public and private drinking water system plan review.

Governance Issues

11. Currently, the Governor, with the advice and consent of the Senate, appoints the DNR Secretary. Prior to 1995 Act 27, the DNR Secretary was appointed by the Natural Resources Board and served solely at the Board's pleasure.

12. As proposed, the Governor would appoint a seven-member Fish, Wildlife, Parks and Forestry Board with Senate confirmation for staggered six-year terms. At least three members would be from the territory north, and at least three from the territory south, of a line running east and west through the southern limits of Stevens Point (similar to the current DNR Board). A Secretary appointed by the Board with the approval of the Governor would head the conservation agency. The Secretary would appoint three unclassified Division administrators and an unclassified chief warden (in addition to a Deputy Secretary and an executive assistant).

13. The Governor would appoint a seven-member Environmental Management Board as well, with Senate confirmation for six-year terms. A Board member could not be the holder of a permit issued by the environmental agency (similar to the current DNR Board). The Board would appoint the Secretary, subject to the Governor's approval, to administer the environmental agency. The Secretary would appoint an unclassified Deputy Secretary, executive assistant and two unclassified Division administrators. Under the bill, the Governor could appoint, and the Senate could confirm, members to each of the Boards beginning on January 1, 2002. Once constituted, each Board could appoint a Secretary, subject to the Governor's approval, who could take office beginning on July 1, 2002.

14. The presence of a Board may be viewed as allowing an open discussion of policies and citizen involvement in the decision-making process. Board members publicly discuss issues and vote on their recommendations. Since they do not all live in Madison, they are personally accessible to more of the state's population. Further, the staggered six-year tenure of Board members would provide continuity in the operations of the Department despite changes in the individuals occupying the positions of Governor and Secretary.

Conservation and Environmental Agency Funding

15. The Divisions of Enforcement and Science, Administration and Technology and

Customer Assistance and External Relations all contain functions that would be necessary for both an environmental and a conservation agency. All of the funding appropriated and positions authorized for these purposes from the conservation fund would be assigned to the conservation agency (except that a portion of water resources account funding relating to lake and river management, dam safety and wetland mapping, and associated administrative expenses would be provided to the environmental agency), while segregated funding for environmental purposes (including the environmental, recycling, petroleum inspection and drycleaner environmental response funds) would be assigned to the environmental agency. To the extent that federal, program revenue and general purpose revenue funding are identifiable as being for either an environmental purpose (such as program revenue funding from air management fees) or a conservation purpose (federal funding providing for boating law enforcement), the funding and positions would be assigned to the respective agencies.

16. With respect to the current DNR Division of Enforcement and Science, the funding and positions in the GPR and PR general program operations appropriations would be divided between the proposed agencies based on the proportion of positions in the GPR or PR general program operations appropriation more closely identifiable with a conservation purpose (such as a conservation warden or a natural resources research scientist) or with an environmental purpose (such as an environmental enforcement specialist or environmental analysis and review specialist). Functions in the Division of Enforcement and Science that would be transferred to the environmental agency include (a) environmental enforcement, (b) laboratory certification, (c) certification of operators of wastewater treatment systems, water supply systems, incinerators, sanitary landfills and septage servicing operators, and (d) collection of environmental fees.

17. Federal funding in the Division of Administration and Technology and the Division of Customer Service and External Relations would be primarily divided between the proposed agencies based on past expenditure patterns (under current law an agency may seek DOA approval to adjust staffing levels and spend the amounts actually received by that agency from federal grants). GPR general program operations funding and positions in these two divisions would be divided based either on the proportion of GPR staff in each of the proposed agencies or on past expenditure patterns where available. PR general program operations funding and positions that were not readily identifiable with a single agency would be divided based on the proportion of all funding in each of the proposed agencies.

18. Under the proposal, on July 1, 2002, the staff, assets, liabilities and obligations primarily associated with each agency would vest in that agency. If the agencies were unable to agree on an equitable division, the Joint Committee on Finance would settle the dispute at a meeting of the Committee under s. 13.10. The DNR employees who would be transferred to one of the new agencies would maintain all their civil service and other employee rights held prior to transfer. In addition, some minor transfers in appropriations may be necessary as the agencies determine the actual division of staff, facilities and duties. Such transfers, if necessary, could be accomplished either by the Joint Committee on Finance under s. 13.10, separate legislation or in the 2003-05 biennial budget.

Fiscal Effect

19. Dividing DNR into two agencies, as proposed, would have no direct fiscal effect in 2002-03, as current appropriations and positions would be allocated to one agency or another. Any move-related costs that may arise as a result of splitting DNR into two agencies would be absorbed in the agencies' base budgets. The resulting split between the conservation and environmental agencies is shown in the attachment. The attachment demonstrates how the 2002-03 funding under the Governor's biennial budget recommendations (SB 55) for DNR (\$469.5 million and 2,959 positions) would be allocated between the two agencies on July 1, 2002 (fiscal year 2002-03). The operational budget of the conservation agency (excluding aids and debt service appropriations) would be almost \$181 million and 1,900 positions (64% of operations staff and funding of the current DNR), while the operational budget of the environmental agency would be over \$100 million and almost 1,060 positions (36%). When aids and debt service appropriations are included, the total budget of the conservation agency would be \$257.3 million (55% of the current DNR), while the total budget of the environmental agency would be \$212.2 million (45%).

20. While the proposed division would have no direct fiscal effect, it is likely that dividing the agency could make it desirable to reallocate some bureaus within the two new agencies in a structure different than that under a single natural resources agency, based on the resulting staffing and funding in each of the two separate agencies. This could create either efficiencies or inefficiencies between or within the operations of the two separate agencies, as compared to a single agency. Further, while this proposal would have no net fiscal impact, future impacts may occur based on agency, gubernatorial or legislative directives and future funding initiatives of the two agencies.

21. According to DNR officials, splitting the Department could cause some financial inefficiency. Separating Department networks (internet and intranet) may result in one-time costs. DNR officials believe there could be some moving, remodeling and accounting/payroll system costs to separate staff into two distinct agencies in each of the agencies' shared buildings (including regional offices) as well. The same could hold true for equipment, such as fax machines, where a regional office may now only have one machine, as each Department may desire their own technology and communications devices. Further, there would be the costs of supporting the additional Board that would be created in the new agency. As no new funds would be provided under the proposal, Department officials have indicated that any costs that came out of splitting the agency (such as reallocating a position to an additional secretary position or other costs) would be taken from field staff allocations and equipment. However, the Legislature and the Governor control the types of positions provided to any agency. In addition, it could be argued that splitting the agency may create other efficiencies from which to allocate any additional costs incurred. For example, under the proposal, the DNR would be split from a seven-division agency to two agencies totaling five divisions, eliminating two division administrator positions.

22. Further, other state agencies have been split or reorganized without being provided additional funding. For example, DNR itself was reorganized in 1995 with the goals of reducing managerial and administrative staff and to decentralize the agency. This reorganization included

cost-savings and associated staff reductions as directed by the Legislature. The Department of Corrections was created out of the Department of Health and Social Services in the 1989-91 budget act and ensuing legislation and no additional revenues were provided at that time for the new department.

Other Issues for Consideration

23. The 1995 internal reorganization of the DNR was intended to (a) increase efficiency and effectiveness; (b) manage resources on a geographic basis; (c) better integrate environmental and conservation programs; and (d) provide better customer service. DNR indicated the benefits of restructuring would include more staff in field offices for faster local response to questions and needs; and fewer internal layers and fewer positions allocated to supervisory duties, thus making more staff available for "front-line" activities. As a result of the reorganization, six new divisions were formed from the prior four (a seventh, the forestry division, was created in 1999 Act 9). A Division of Customer Assistance and External Relations (CAER) was created to focus on the customer service improvements under the plan. Further, an Administration and Technology Division was created to elevate technology and support functions and to allow for better access and priority setting to assist internal programs. Some argue that the reorganization has advanced the goal of integrated resource management, improved consistency and made the agency more responsive to interested groups and regulated parties. Others express frustration that rather than increasing field staff (such as fishery, wildlife and forest managers) to implement agency programs, field staff have been reallocated to other duties in the Department. Some have also expressed concern that due to reorganization, some staff no longer report to a supervisor with expertise in their particular field. Further, some believe the administrative, technology, customer service and overhead functions of the agency have grown at the expense of field staff.

24. It also has been suggested that certain fees charged by DNR (such as for hunting and fishing) have been used for activities outside the core purpose for which the fees are collected. Splitting DNR would ensure that funds appropriated for an environmental management purpose in one Department would not be used for a conservation purpose in the other agency, and vice versa. Further, dividing DNR may facilitate the tracking of funds used in each agency, in particular, funds used for administration. However, while splitting an agency would keep funds provided to that Department within the Department, it would not guarantee that these funds would not be used for other purposes within the agency. In addition, to the extent that recreational activities under the proposed conservation department may be related to environmental regulations under the planned environmental protection agency, some believe using a portion of recreational fees for pollution-reduction activities may be appropriate. From this view, using fish and wildlife funds (hunting and fishing license fees) for example, for nonpoint water pollution reduction to improve, protect or maintain fish and wildlife habitat on a stream may be acceptable. Further, while it may be difficult to track funds in a larger agency such as DNR, the Department also has more funding sources from which to allocate monies to meet unexpected emergencies or agency priorities. A split agency may have less flexibility in this regard.

25. In addition to displaying how current DNR resources would be divided between the

two new agencies under the proposal, the attachment compares the percentage of the staff and dollars that are currently budgeted in DNR for the five direct program divisions ("Program") and from the two divisions that provide agency-wide services ("Overhead"). The attachment excludes amounts appropriated for debt service from the Department-wide calculations. While the overhead divisions (Administration & Technology and Customer Assistance & External Relations) provide a number of services that are arguably of a direct benefit to field programs (such as registration and license sales, regional office rent and maintenance, and some information technology services), the attachment indicates that the conservation functions of DNR generally support a higher level of these functions (approximately 22% of staff or 423 of 1,900 staff and 21% of dollars or \$44 million of \$213.2 million) than do the environmental functions (16% of staff or 165 of 1,060 staff and 17% of dollars or \$21.3 million of \$125.9 million). A portion of this difference may be attributed to service intensive functions of the conservation agency (such as the sale of hunting and fishing licenses at DNR service centers or the registration of recreational vehicles). Further, DNR notes that many of the environmental permitting functions of the agency are done in each program (such as air permits by the Air Management Bureau or water pollution or regulation permits by the Water Division) while arguably similar conservation functions such as licensing and registration are generally performed by the CAER Division. If two agencies were created, the actual staff and funding levels allocated to administration and overhead may increase or decrease as efficiencies or inefficiencies due to the split are realized. The Governor and Legislature would review and determine any such allocations in future budgets.

26. Some have argued that the current DNR has too many responsibilities to operate efficiently as a single agency. The Secretary and other higher level management staff are required to stay abreast of a large range of issues as one agency, which necessarily reduces the amount of specialization those individuals may have in their management areas. Dividing DNR could more clearly define the roles and specialization of each Department, allowing one to focus on environmental management and the other to focus on the state's wildlife, parks, forests and recreation. In addition, with a larger Department, it may be more difficult for top management officials to be familiar with the array of issues within the Department. Further, splitting DNR into two separate agencies could be viewed as increasing the public and governmental profile of the activities performed by each of the two new agencies.

27. However, others would counter that conservation and environmental regulation are interrelated subjects, and that management staff necessarily need to understand the broader context of how the actions that occur under their jurisdiction affect the state's natural resources as a whole. In addition, some staff persons perform duties that would be split into different agencies. While the current workload and position authority would be transferred to each agency, the incumbent in each of these positions would remain in one agency or the other (potentially requiring additional training). However, to the extent that agencies currently train new employees as a result of promotion, reassignment and standard turnover, these transfers may not be onerous.

28. Due to the size of the DNR, some have claimed it is difficult for customers to find the correct person in the agency to address a given topic. Further, personnel within a large agency presumably have less access to the Secretary than staff would have in two smaller agencies. Thus,

decisions that require input from the Secretarial level may be expedited if DNR were split. Conversely, with two agencies, decisions that would require input from both agencies could be delayed.

29. Some have suggested that the Department struggles with maintaining internal consistency due to the number of people involved in a given project. On the other hand, having one Secretary responsible for a broad range of issues makes that one person responsible for specifying the agency's position, after taking into consideration the different viewpoints from within the agency. With two agencies working on sometimes-related issues, it may be more difficult to find a plan of action that is agreeable to both departments. Further, staff in each of the proposed agencies may not communicate with each other as readily as they may in the same Department. However, staff from different state agencies currently work on related issues, such as DNR and the Department of Commerce on brownfields and PECFA issues and DNR and the Department of Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection on nonpoint water pollution abatement activities.

30. According to DNR officials, some businesses, such as the pulp and paper industry, may appreciate the benefits of dealing with one agency. If the Department were split in two, these industries would need to work with both agencies (for the pulp and paper industry, DEM on regulatory issues and DFWP&F on the forestry side). However, many industries currently work with multiple state governmental agencies.

31. Some view the recent experience of the state of Michigan as a reason to support or oppose splitting DNR into two agencies. In August, 1995, Michigan Governor John Engler issued an executive order to split the Department of Environmental Quality from the Department of Natural Resources. The environmental regulatory functions were moved from the DNR and other agencies to the new Department of Environmental Quality. In subsequent executive orders issued in 1996 and 1997, the Michigan Governor transferred the following additional functions to DEQ: (a) environmental health programs related to drinking water and radiological protection from the Department of Public Health; (b) the Low Level Radioactive Waste Authority from the Department of Commerce; (c) the above ground storage tank program and the inspection of dry cleaning establishments from the Department of State Police; and (d) the Environmental Science Board and Environmental Administration Division from the Department of Management and Budget.

32. Some argue that the Michigan split is an example of how a split agency increases the politicization of environmental regulatory decisions. Others view the new Michigan Department of Environmental Quality as a more responsive regulator of environmental matters than under the previous structure. Some would argue that the Michigan split has strengthened program administration by having separate agencies focus on issues. Others argue that concerns that may have existed about intra-departmental communication prior to the split are still valid related to communication between the two agencies. The split of the Michigan DNR into two agencies continues to be a topic of disagreement among people in that state.

33. Prior to the Michigan split, the Michigan DNR was under the policy direction of a Natural Resources Commission appointed by the Governor. After the split, the Michigan DNR

continued to have the same structure. However, policy direction in the new Michigan Department of Environmental Quality is provided by a Director appointed by the Governor. Some argue that the Michigan example does not apply in the Wisconsin case because under LRB 2147/3, each of the DEM and DFWP&F would be directed by a seven-member Board appointed by the Governor with Senate confirmation, and each Board would appoint a Secretary with the approval of the Governor. The Wisconsin DNR is currently directed by a Secretary appointed by the Governor, with cabinet-level status and with a Natural Resources Board providing policy advice. Prior to 1995, the Wisconsin DNR was lead by a Secretary appointed by, and serving solely at the pleasure of, the DNR Board, and the Governor appointed the Board.

34. The Michigan Senate Fiscal Agency found that first-year implementation of the split of the Michigan DNR required transitional administrative costs of approximately \$2 million, which were funded by an internal reallocation of natural resources and environmental program budgets from program functions. In 1996-97, in the first budget approved by the Legislature after the split, administration comprised 1% more of the combined Department of Natural Resources and Department of Environmental Quality budgets than in the year before the split (1994-95). This represented an increase of approximately 15% in administrative funding, or over \$4.2 million (of a combined \$630 million budget for the two agencies). The 1996-97 budget included the requests made by the two Michigan agencies, advanced by the Governor and ultimately provided by the Michigan Legislature. It should be noted that the 1996-97 budget includes functions moved into DEQ that were not previously in DNR and that it is difficult to make year-to-year cost comparisons in Michigan because of the many organizational changes that have occurred. Michigan continues to review the administrative costs in the two agencies, and this effort includes a review currently underway by the Michigan Auditor General. In Wisconsin both the executive and legislative branches would review any shifts in the funding allocated to administration, overhead and programs either in DNR or under separate agencies.

ALTERNATIVES TO BASE

1. Divide DNR into two separate agencies (a conservation agency and an environmental agency) on July 1, 2002, as provided in LRB 2147/3.
2. Maintain current law.

Prepared by: Daryl Hinz, Rebecca Hotynski, David Schug and Kendra Bonderud

ATTACHMENT 1

	<u>Conservation Agency</u>		<u>Environmental Agency</u>				
	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Positions</u>	<u>Funding</u>	<u>Positions</u>			
State Parks and Trails	\$15,033,800	165.50					
Southern Forests	4,372,900	46.75			Program	82%	80%
Parks Administration and Technology	3,511,300	27.10					
Parks Customer Service and Education	<u>1,276,800</u>	<u>18.33</u>			Overhead	18%	20%
Division Total	\$24,194,800	257.68					
Division of Forestry							
Forestry	\$34,640,300	412.44			Program	79%	76%
Forestry Administration and Technology	8,167,200	78.02					
Forestry Customer Service and Education	<u>2,767,600</u>	<u>29.91</u>			Overhead	21%	24%
Division Total	\$45,755,100	520.58					
Division of Fish, Wildlife, and Recreation							
Facilities and Lands Management	\$14,239,100	144.70					
Fisheries Management	20,539,100	266.82					
Wildlife Management	15,455,500	147.50					
Endangered Resources	2,436,400	21.50					
Conservation Law Enforcement & Integrated Science Services	30,127,000	271.67			Program	76%	75%
Administration and Technology	14,656,900	128.46					
Customer Service and Licensing	<u>13,582,500</u>	<u>140.80</u>			Overhead	24%	25%
Division Total	\$111,036,500	1,121.46					
Conservation Aids & Development							
Debt Service and Development	44,164,500				<u>Conservation Agency</u>		
Conservation Aids	32,366,600				Program	78%	79%
					Overhead	22%	21%
Dept. of Environmental Management							
Division of Air and Waste							
Air Management	-	-	\$15,931,300	175.50			
Waste Management	-	-	7,060,700	100.61			
Remediation and Redevelopment	-	-	12,265,100	105.00			
Air and Waste Program Management	-	-	815,900	7.00			
Environmental Law Enforcement and Integrated Science Services			5,824,700	67.83	Program	86%	80%
Air & Waste Administration and Technology			7,951,200	41.29			
Air & Waste Customer Service and External Relations			<u>2,595,800</u>	<u>30.64</u>	Overhead	14%	20%
Division Total			\$52,444,700	527.87			
Division of Water							
Watershed Management and Regulation			\$27,376,500	332.96			
Drinking Water and Groundwater			9,794,600	105.75	Program	83%	77%
Water Administration and Technology			7,726,600	54.18			
Water Customer Service and External relations			<u>3,068,100</u>	<u>38.74</u>	Overhead	17%	23%
Division Total			\$47,965,800	531.63			
Environmental Aids & Development							
Debt Service and Development			86,330,800		<u>Environmental Agency</u>		
Environmental Aids			25,445,700		Program	84%	83%
					Overhead	16%	17%
TOTAL	257,337,500	1,899.52	212,187,000	1,059.50			
Total by Fund Source:							
GPR	51,246,700	149.00	122,091,700	377.28			
FED	23,560,500	173.53	21,433,600	275.43			
PR	10,182,300	36.12	23,240,100	237.51			
SEG	172,348,000	1,540.87	45,421,600	169.27			
Total--All Funds	\$257,337,500	1,899.52	\$212,187,000	1,059.50			
	55%	64%	45%	36%			