



## Legislative Fiscal Bureau

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

---

May 11, 2005

Joint Committee on Finance

Paper #553

### **Nonpoint Program Bonding (Agriculture, Trade and Consumer Protection and DNR -- Water Quality)**

[LFB 2005-07 Budget Summary: Page 61, #6 (part); Page 373, #6; & Page 373, #7]

---

#### **CURRENT LAW**

DATCP is authorized \$20,575,000 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.

DNR is authorized \$85,310,400 in general obligation bonding for nonpoint source water pollution abatement grants under its priority watershed and targeted runoff management (TRM) programs. In addition, DNR is authorized \$22,400,000 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 \$7,000,000 for the DATCP soil and water resource management program (for a total of \$27,575,000).

Provide \$6,000,000 BR for DNR cost-share grants for rural landowners (for a total of \$91,310,400).

Provide \$4,700,000 BR for the DNR urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement, storm water management, municipal flood control, and riparian restoration programs (for a total of \$27,100,000).

**DISCUSSION POINTS**

1. Table 1 shows the amount of bonding revenue (BR) authorized to DATCP and DNR for nonpoint source water pollution abatement related efforts in prior biennia, the current biennium and the amount under the bill.

**TABLE 1**

**Nonpoint Source Bonding Authority**

	<u>Prior Biennia</u>	<u>2003-05</u>	<u>AB 100 2005-07</u>	<u>Total</u>
DATCP	\$13,575,000	7,000,000	7,000,000	\$27,575,000
DNR Rural/TRM	\$75,763,600	9,546,800**	6,000,000	\$91,310,400
DNR Urban/Flood	<u>\$17,700,000*</u>	<u>4,700,000</u>	<u>4,700,000</u>	<u>\$27,100,000</u>
	\$107,038,600	\$21,246,800	\$17,700,000	\$146,985,400

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

\*\*Includes \$250,000 that was earmarked for bluff mitigation.

2. Table 2 shows the amount of funding available for DATCP and DNR nonpoint source related efforts in the 2003-05 biennium, and the amount expected in the 2005-07 biennium under the bill.

**TABLE 2**

**Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Appropriations**

	<u>2003-05 Biennium</u>	<u>AB 100 2005-07 Biennium</u>
<b>DATCP SWRM:</b>		
GPR	\$10,163,800	\$10,163,800
SEG	7,450,200	9,490,200
BR	<u>7,000,000</u>	<u>7,000,000</u>
DATCP Subtotal	\$24,614,000	\$26,654,000
<b>DNR Nonpoint:</b>		
GPR-rural	1,678,800	1,678,800
SEG-urban	2,798,000	2,798,000
BR-rural	9,546,800	6,000,000
BR-urban	<u>4,700,000</u>	<u>4,700,000</u>
DNR Subtotal	\$18,723,600	\$15,176,800
FED*	57,466,900	64,600,000
Total	\$100,804,500	\$106,430,800

\*Estimated

3. In a March 9, 2005, letter, Department of Administration Secretary Marotta, on the Governor's behalf, recommended modifying the bonding provisions in the bill to provide \$2 million in general obligation bonding authority for the targeted runoff management (TRM) grant program and \$2.7 million (instead of \$4.7 million under the bill) in general obligation bonding authority for the urban nonpoint and municipal flood control programs. While the Governor recommended that \$6,000,000 in general obligation supported bonding be provided to DNR for rural nonpoint source water pollution abatement grants, which may be used to provide funds under its priority watershed and TRM program, DOA and DNR staff have indicated that this funding would be needed for priority watershed grants.

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 2005 grants (funded in fiscal year 2004-05), 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.

### **Rural Nonpoint Funding**

5. For 2005, DATCP allocated a total of \$12.8 million for land and water conservation, with \$8.5 million being GPR and SEG for staffing support, and \$4.3 million in bonding that was used to provide grants to landowners for the installation of nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices. Although SEG and GPR funding may be used for staffing or landowner grants, DATCP has chosen to allocate all to staffing grants. These grants are shown in Attachment 1. Staffing grants are used to pay for salary, supply and training costs of county employees for land and water conservation efforts, and to administer cost-share grants. For 2005, 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.

6. Bonding under DATCP's soil and water resource management program is used to provide cost-share grants to counties for the 2003-05 biennium (with \$3.5 million awarded in each fiscal year, in addition to under-spent funds from prior years that became available). For 2005, all counties were eligible to apply for a base award of up to \$30,000 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, as defined by rule. DATCP will carryover approximately \$700,000 of bonding revenue into the 2005-07 biennium. If additional bonding authorization is not provided, there will likely be little state funding available for cost-share grants for the abatement of nonpoint source water pollution.

7. DATCP allocates over \$8.5 million a year to counties to fund land and water conservation staff, in part so they can distribute state funding for cost-share grants to landowners to install pollution abatement practices. As a result, if the Committee does not authorize bonding increases, 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.

8. For 2005, DNR allocated \$7.6 million GPR, FED and bonding revenue for priority watershed (primarily rural) cost-share reimbursement awards (ACRAs) and \$1.7 million for rural TRM grants. Nonpoint bonding is used to provide grants to install nonpoint source pollution abatement projects in designated priority watersheds. Attachment 1 shows these awards by county for 2005. Currently, there are 36 active priority watershed projects.

9. 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. Both urban and rural projects can be funded through a TRM grant, with up to 70% of an eligible project's costs funded by the grant, with a maximum of \$150,000 in state funding. These grants may not be used to pay for staffing, studies, or designs. For 2005, DNR awarded \$1.9 million under the TRM program, with \$150,000 in cost-share grants awarded to urban projects. These grants are shown by project in Attachment 2.

10. DNR staff indicate that the amount of TRM grants awarded to urban areas has been decreasing due to the Federal Phase II storm water rules, which generally require most municipalities with a population of 10,000 or more people to have a storm water discharge permit. Once a municipality has a storm water discharge permit, it is classified as a point source of water pollution, as opposed to a nonpoint source, under federal law, and therefore ineligible for a grant under the TRM program.

11. DNR will carryover \$2.4 million in authorized bonding into the 2005-07 biennium for priority watershed and TRM grants, but most of this funding will be used for priority watersheds. Therefore, under the bill, at least \$10.1 million (\$8.4 million in bonding and \$1.7 million GPR) would be available for the 2005-07 biennium. DNR estimates eligible ACRA's for priority watersheds of \$12 million for the biennium (\$6.5 million in 2005-06 and \$5.5 million in 2006-07). While DNR could be almost \$2 million short of funding priority watershed commitments under the bill, significant amounts of unspent funds from prior years typically become available to fund additional projects in future years. However, without an increase in bonding authority beyond that provided in the bill, funding for TRM grants may be substantially diminished in 2005-07.

12. DNR staff argue that given the amounts of funding available in the budget, funding could be more effective if used for TRM grants. They argue the program has an under-spending rate of between 10% and 20%, as opposed to 30% to 50% for other nonpoint water pollution abatement programs administered by the Department, and they are able to target the limited revenue to areas where the greatest potential for water quality improvement exists. They state that, for

example, under the municipal flood control program, revenues are often used to purchase land and conservation easements, which can require a large amount of funding given the size of the targeted water quality area.

13. In addition, the Department has argued that additional TRM funding could be used to cover a potential gap in state matching funds for a federal clean water act grant in 2006-07. However, carryover funds from unspent prior year grant awards are likely to be adequate to meet federal match requirements.

### **Urban Nonpoint and Flood Control Programs**

14. Bonding of \$4.7 million would be authorized under the bill for both the urban nonpoint source and storm water grant program and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration program for the 2005-07 biennium.

15. Urban Nonpoint. In 2005, DNR allocated \$4.1 million (bonding and segregated revenue) for urban nonpoint source and storm water project grants. Under the urban nonpoint source and storm water grant program, DNR provides cost-share and local assistance grants for urban nonpoint source 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.

16. 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 2004-05 (the January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2006, general grant period), the urban nonpoint source and storm water grant program made awards of nearly \$4 million, of this, \$2.5 million was bonding revenue used to fund the construction costs of nonpoint source water pollution abatement practices (the remaining funding was segregated revenue used to fund planning costs). These grants are shown in Attachment 3.

17. 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 and ground water. Grants may be used for facilities and structures, including the purchase of perpetual flowage and conservation easement rights on land within a flood way 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. For the municipal flood control grants made in 2003-04 (for the period generally lasting from January 1, 2004, through December 31, 2005), DNR's total grants of \$1.97 million included \$1.95 million in bonding revenue, with the remaining \$20,000 from nonpoint SEG. These grants are shown in Attachment 4. The Department will carry-over approximately \$1.8 million in bonding revenue for fiscal year 2005-06 grants (made for January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2007) under the municipal flood control program. Without additional bonding authority, funding for grants in 2007-09 will be greatly diminished.

18. Were the Governor's recommended modification adopted, DNR staff indicate that they would provide a majority of the remaining \$2.7 million of new bonding revenue for grants under the urban nonpoint and storm water program. Under this scenario, DNR staff would plan to provide fiscal year 2005-06 urban nonpoint and storm water program grants (from January 1, 2006, through December 31, 2007) of \$3.3 million (\$2 million BR and \$1.3 million SEG). The remaining \$0.7 million BR, \$1.8 million in carry-over BR and \$100,000 SEG would be used to make \$2.6 million in grants under the municipal flood control program. Funding for the two programs in 2006-07 would be made from the \$1.4 million SEG appropriation and unspent funds from prior years.

19. Were the Governor's original recommendation (AB 100) adopted, DNR staff would plan to divide the bonding revenue evenly between the programs for 2006 grants, meaning urban nonpoint funding would total approximately \$3.65 million (\$2.35 million bonding revenue and \$1.3 million SEG) and municipal flood control funding would total approximately \$4.25 million (\$2.35 million bonding revenue, \$1.8 million in carry-over bonding revenue and approximately \$100,000 SEG).

### **Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Funding Level**

20. Some might argue that transferring revenues from the municipal flood control program to the TRM grant program shifts available funding from urban areas to rural areas. However, others argue that the TRM grant program is open to both urban and rural areas, and that the competitive grant process of the program ensures that funding will be awarded to areas with the greatest potential for water quality improvement.

21. DNR staff indicate that while both large and small municipalities may apply for grants under the urban nonpoint source and storm water program, awards from the program are typically awarded to large municipalities, which tend to score the highest on the Department's application ranking procedure. However, DNR staff state that only municipalities with populations of less than 10,000 may apply for TRM grants. As a result, one effect of the Governor's

recommended modification would be to provide additional funding for grants to rural communities and small municipalities from funding that would likely have otherwise gone to larger municipalities.

22. Providing an additional \$2 million in general obligation bonding authority for the TRM grant program, and reducing authorized bonding by an equivalent \$2 million for the urban nonpoint source and storm water and municipal flood control programs under the bill (Alternative #2) would implement the administration's revised recommendation. However, the Committee could also consider providing a variety of other amounts of bonding authority for the state's nonpoint water pollution abatement programs. These could include reducing bonding revenue for DATCP's soil and water resource management program or priority watershed grants in order to provide bonding authority for TRM grants, or only providing \$1 million of bonding revenue for TRM grants, as opposed to the \$2 million recommended by the Governor. Alternative #3 offers a variety of options that could be combined to provide the \$17.7 million BR under the bill, or some other level of general obligation bonding.

### **Federal Land and Water Conservation Funding**

23. Table 3 provides a breakdown of the different sources and amounts of federal funding that is expected to be available to Wisconsin landowners annually in the 2005-07 biennium. 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 States 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 costs-shares, for which NRCS generally pays between 50 and 75 percent of the cost of eligible conservation practices.

**TABLE 3**

### **Estimated Annual Federal Program Funding Available to Wisconsin Landowners (2005-07 Biennium)**

<u>Program</u>	<u>Funding</u>
Environmental quality incentive program	\$16,000,000
Section 319 (Clean Water Act)	2,600,000
Conservation security program	1,900,000
Farm and ranch lands protection program	2,600,000
Grassland reserve program	1,100,000
Wildlife habitat incentives program	600,000
Wetlands reserve program	<u>7,500,000</u>
Total	\$32,300,000

24. In 2005-06 and 2006-07, DNR is expected to be eligible for \$2.6 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). Under the budget, DNR estimates that it will have sufficient funds available to match federal funding in 2005-06, but could be up to \$200,000 short of the state match requirement in 2006-07, meaning the state could receive up to \$300,000 less than the \$2.6 million for which it is expected to be eligible. However, DNR staff acknowledge the amount of state funds estimated to be available for matching in this instance is very conservative. Additional funds are likely to be available from a variety of sources to allow the agency to meet its match requirement. Nonetheless, adopting the Governor's revised recommendation to provide the TRM grant program with \$2 million BR could assist the state in meeting the federal match requirements, depending on the geographic areas in which grant recipients were located.

25. 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 grassland reserve program (GRP); 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. The GRP offers landowners an easement or rental payment for the implementation of practices to protect, restore, and enhance grasslands on their property. 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.

26. However, it should be noted that the amounts shown in Tables 2 and 3 are the amounts of funding that are expected to be made available to Wisconsin. The actual amount received by Wisconsin landowners may be less depending on the amount of local government and landowner participation. Further, while the tables assume the amount of federal funding will remain relatively constant with the amount available in federal fiscal year 2005, it is possible that Congress and the President could modify the amount of funding allocated to the state.

27. In addition to amounts identified in the tables, 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 and 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 restorations, 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 June 30, 2004, nearly 30,000 acres of land have been enrolled in CREP (25,500 acres in 15-year easements and 4,800 acres in perpetual easements). The Farm Service Agency projects that total federal payments associated with these 30,000 acres over their CREP contracts (generally 15 years, unless a permanent easement is granted) will total about \$57 million. In addition, through June 30, 2004, the state had expended about \$8 million on incentive payments to enroll this land into the program and on cost-share grants to landowners for the installation of conservation practices (with additional state expenditures of over \$3 million expected for future state cost-share payments associated with this enrolled land). As a result, expenditures of approximately \$68 million (out of the total \$240 million available) are expected over the life of the CREP contracts for the 30,000 acres enrolled in CREP as of June 30, 2004. 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**

1. Approve the Governor's original recommendation (AB 100) to provide the following increases in general obligation bonding: (a) \$7,000,000 for DATCP's soil and water resource management program; (b) \$6,000,000 for DNR cost-share grants primarily for priority watersheds; and (c) \$4,700,000 for the DNR urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management program, and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration programs.

2. Adopt the Governor's revised recommendations to provide the following bonding revenue: (a) \$7,000,000 for DATCP's soil and water resource management program; (b) \$6,000,000 for DNR cost-share grants primarily for priority watersheds; (c) \$2,700,000 for the DNR urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management and the municipal flood control and riparian restoration programs; and (d) \$2,000,000 specified for targeted runoff management grants.

3. Modify the Governor's budget recommendation by providing one or more of the following amounts of general obligation bonding authority:

a. \$7,000,000 for DATCP's soil and water resource management program (Governor's recommendation).

b. \$6,000,000 for DATCP's soil and water resource management program.

c. \$6,000,000 for DNR cost-share grants primarily for priority watersheds (Governor's

recommendation).

- d. \$5,000,000 for DNR cost-share grants primarily for priority watersheds.
  - e. \$4,700,000 for the urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management, and municipals flood control and riparian restoration programs (AB 100 level).
  - f. \$3,700,000 for the urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management, and municipals flood control and riparian restoration programs.
  - g. \$2,700,000 for the urban nonpoint source water pollution abatement and storm water management, and municipals flood control and riparian restoration programs (Governor's revised recommendation).
  - h. \$2,000,000 specified for targeted runoff management (TRM) grants (Governor's revised recommendation).
  - i. \$1,000,000 specified for TRM grants.
4. Maintain current law.

<b>Alternative 4</b>	<b>BR</b>
<b>2005-07 REVENUE</b> (Change to Bill)	- \$17,700,000

Prepared by: Christopher Pollek  
Attachment

## ATTACHMENT 1

### 2005 Rural Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Grants

<u>County</u>	<u>Staffing and Support</u>	<u>Landowner Cost Sharing</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>2005 Allocation Total</u>
Adams	\$85,000	\$60,000	\$145,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$145,000
Ashland	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Barron	85,000	60,000	145,000	0	0	0	145,000
Bayfield	85,000	50,000	135,000	0	37,173	37,173	172,173
Brown	334,108	60,000	394,108	0	499,958	499,958	894,066
Oneida Tribe	89,549	0	89,549	0	30,451	30,451	120,000
Buffalo	85,000	60,000	145,000	0	0	0	145,000
Burnett	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	53,287	53,287	168,287
Calumet	85,000	85,248	170,248	130,200	0	130,200	300,448
Chippewa	283,082	30,000	313,082	28,820	294,305	323,125	636,207
Clark	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Columbia	126,754	85,248	212,002	0	86,044	86,044	298,046
Crawford	85,000	47,500	132,500	0	0	0	132,500
Dane	213,178	73,888	287,066	273,530	299,449	572,979	860,045
Dodge	240,764	30,000	270,764	0	340,949	340,949	611,713
Door	234,411	85,248	319,659	0	530,572	530,572	850,231
Douglas	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	16,442	16,442	131,442
Dunn	176,598	30,000	206,598	0	115,547	115,547	322,145
Eau Claire	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Florence	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Fond du Lac	140,577	30,000	170,577	0	587,799	587,799	758,376
Forest	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Grant	85,000	60,000	145,000	150,000	0	150,000	295,000
Green	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Green Lake	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Iowa	85,000	63,157	148,157	41,910	0	41,910	190,067
Iron	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Jackson	113,384	85,248	198,632	0	386,715	386,715	585,347
Jefferson	85,000	50,000	135,000	0	0	0	135,000
Juneau	85,000	50,000	135,000	0	0	0	135,000
Kenosha	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Kewaunee	85,000	30,000	115,000	118,610	119,514	238,124	353,124
La Crosse	85,000	30,000	115,000	125,500	0	125,500	240,500
Lafayette	85,000	60,000	145,000	0	0	0	145,000
Langlade	85,000	60,000	145,000	0	72,064	72,064	217,064
Lincoln	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248

**ATTACHMENT 1 (continued)**

**2005 Rural Nonpoint Source Water Pollution Abatement Grants**

<u>County</u>	<u>Staffing and Support</u>	<u>Landowner Cost Sharing</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>2005 Allocation Total</u>
Manitowoc	\$231,488	\$82,093	\$313,581	\$0	\$425,034	\$425,034	\$738,615
Marathon	151,101	85,248	236,349	78,890	224,083	302,973	539,322
Marinette	116,488	85,248	201,736	450,000	102,761	552,761	754,497
Marquette	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	43,174	43,173	158,173
Menominee	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Milwaukee	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Monroe	85,000	72,626	157,626	0	0	0	157,626
Oconto	96,272	85,248	181,520	0	87,028	87,028	268,548
Oneida	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Outagamie	145,463	30,000	175,463	0	322,728	322,728	498,191
Ozaukee	85,000	78,937	163,937	49,320	0	49,320	213,257
Pepin	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Pierce	91,124	85,248	176,372	0	80,128	80,128	256,500
Polk	237,149	30,000	267,149	0	308,035	308,035	575,184
Portage	116,810	85,248	202,058	0	169,816	169,816	371,874
Price	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Racine	85,000	50,000	135,000	0	16,893	16,893	151,893
Richland	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Rock	85,000	75,781	160,781	0	0	0	160,781
Rusk	111,781	30,000	141,781	0	71,987	71,987	213,768
Saint Croix	212,483	60,000	272,483	0	308,063	308,063	580,546
Sauk	155,447	85,248	240,695	0	163,140	163,140	403,835
Sawyer	85,000	60,000	145,000	0	0	0	145,000
Shawano	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	235,910	235,910	350,910
Sheboygan	115,067	85,248	200,315	0	95,893	95,893	296,208
Taylor	85,000	85,248	170,248	0	0	0	170,248
Trempealeau	113,784	85,248	199,032	0	75,310	75,310	274,342
Vernon	110,736	82,093	192,829	0	60,694	60,694	253,523
Vilas	85,000	30,000	115,000	0	0	0	115,000
Walworth	145,562	60,000	205,562	0	329,937	329,937	535,499
Washburn	85,000	60,000	145,000	0	0	0	145,000
Washington	85,000	75,781	160,781	0	0	0	160,781
Waukesha	150,121	30,000	180,121	0	33,090	33,090	213,211
Waupaca	174,657	85,248	259,905	0	330,444	330,444	590,349
Waushara	114,567	60,000	174,567	0	367,299	367,299	541,866
Winnebago	109,568	30,000	139,568	294,400	187,785	482,153	621,753
Wood	<u>85,000</u>	<u>85,248</u>	<u>170,248</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>170,248</u>
County Subtotals	\$8,392,073	\$4,307,808	\$12,699,881	\$1,741,180	\$7,509,501	\$9,250,681	\$21,950,562
Lake Districts					47,078	47,078	47,078
Non-counties	<u>114,300</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>114,300</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>114,300</u>
Total	\$8,506,373	\$4,307,808	\$12,814,181	\$1,741,180	\$7,556,579	\$9,297,759	\$22,111,940

## ATTACHMENT 2

### Targeted Runoff Management (TRM) Project Grants made in Calendar Year 2005

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
Balsam Lake, Village of	\$150,000
Calumet County	130,200
Chippewa County	28,820
Dane County [A]	140,350
Dane County [B]	133,180
Grant County	150,000
Iowa County	41,190
Kewaunee County [A]	105,980
Kewaunee County [B]	12,630
La Crosse County	125,500
Marathon County	78,890
Marinette County [A]	150,000
Marinette County [B]	150,000
Marinette County [C]	150,000
Ozaukee County	49,320
Winnebago County [A]	147,900
Winnebago County [B]	<u>146,500</u>
Total TRM	\$1,891,180

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



### ATTACHMENT 3

#### Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Project Grants made in Calendar Year 2005

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Grant Type</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
Allouez, Village [A]	Construction	BOND	\$150,000
Allouez, Village [B]	Construction	BOND	120,250
Allouez, Village [C]	Construction	BOND	150,000
Allouez, Village [D]	Construction	BOND	200,000
Appleton, City	Construction	BOND	85,350
Brown Deer, Village	Construction	BOND	150,000
Cedarburg, City [A]	Construction	BOND	96,000
Cedarburg, City [B]	Construction	BOND	18,000
Cross Plains, Village	Planning	SEG	42,000
Cudahy, City	Construction	BOND	45,000
DeForest, Village	Planning	SEG	70,000
Fond du Lac, City	Planning	SEG	68,580
Geneva, Town	Planning	SEG	31,500
Glendale, City	Construction	BOND	150,000
Grand Chute, Town	Planning	SEG	58,820
Howard, Village	Construction	BOND	105,500
Howards Grove, Village	Planning	SEG	38,500
Kimberly, Village	Planning	SEG	59,000
Kohler, Village	Planning	SEG	35,720
La Crosse, City	Planning	SEG	80,000
Lawrence, Town	Construction	BOND	51,390
Little Chute, Village	Planning	SEG	76,720
Madison, City	Construction	BOND	101,050
Manitowoc, City	Planning	SEG	85,000
Middleton, City	Construction	BOND	65,000
Middleton, City	Planning	SEG	85,000
Middleton, Town	Planning	SEG	65,290
Milwaukee, City	Construction	BOND	150,000
Milwaukee, City	Planning	SEG	25,000
Monroe, City	Planning	SEG	74,040
Oak Creek, City	Construction	BOND	82,000
Oshkosh, City	Planning	SEG	73,120
Pewaukee, City	Construction	BOND	47,250
Pewaukee, City	Planning	SEG	36,190
Poynette, Village	Planning	SEG	35,000
Racine, City	Construction	BOND	89,750
Reedsburg, City	Planning	SEG	40,000
Roberts, Village	Planning	SEG	56,000
SE Regional Plan	Construction	BOND	69,500
Sheboygan, Town	Planning	SEG	42,530
Sheboygan County	Planning	SEG	14,000
Sheboygan Falls, City	Construction	BOND	93,360
Sherwood, Village	Construction	BOND	122,250
Sherwood, Village	Planning	SEG	57,960
Stevens Point, City	Planning	SEG	56,610
Stoughton, City	Planning	SEG	75,000
Sussex, Village	Planning	SEG	21,800

**ATTACHMENT 3 (continued)**

**Urban Nonpoint Source and Storm Water Project Grants made in Calendar Year 2005**

<u>Grantee Name</u>	<u>Grant Type</u>	<u>Funding Source</u>	<u>Funding Designated</u>
UW-Madison [A]	Construction	BOND	149,000
UW-Madison [B]	Construction	BOND	150,000
Waukesha, City	Construction	BOND	40,000
Wilson, Town	Planning	SEG	35,720
Woodville, Village	Planning	SEG	23,800
Wrightstown, Village	Planning	SEG	<u>37,100</u>
Total Grant Amount			\$3,980,650
Total SEG			\$1,500,000
Total Bonding			\$2,480,650

Letters listed after the grantee denote separate grant awards to the recipient.



## ATTACHMENT 4

### Municipal Flood Control Grants -- Calendar Year 2004 Awards

<u>Applicant</u>	<u>Grant Award</u>
Bruce, Village of	\$283,424
Cassville, Village of	50,135
Monroe, City of	369,443
Monroe, City of	68,180
Mount Pleasant, Village of	394,040
Oshkosh, City of	698,500
Oshkosh, City of	<u>101,500</u>
Total Grant Amount	\$1,965,222