Communication from the Department of Administration Regarding Environmental Impacts of the 2011-2013 Proposed Biennial Budget

> Department of Administration June 9, 2011

## **Communication Outline**

- Federal, state and local budget impacts on environmental and energy policy
- Overview of environmental impacts of the 2011-2013 biennial budget
  - Major indirect budgetary impacts
  - Major direct budgetary impacts
- Next Steps

Federal, state and local budget impacts on environmental and energy policy

- Major energy efficiency and renewable energy cuts at the federal level
- State policy impacts outside the budget process
- Local outlook for energy efficiency and renewable energy

# Major Indirect Budgetary Impacts

- Eliminate Office of Energy Independence
- Cost-effective statewide energy policy
- Eliminates certain fuel and energy efficiency state gov't requirements
- Others, like mass transit
- Push back on recycling
- Some positives like bond revenues for nonpoint/urban runoff or contaminated site repair

#### **Indirect Budgetary Impact: Mass Transit**

### Mass Transit Governor's Budget Proposal

Decrease funding for mass transit (\$7 million cut to Milwaukee County)
Move transit funding to the general fund

## Joint Committee on Finance

•Maintain transit funding in the transportation fund

## Southeast WI Regional Transit Authority (SERTA)

## **Governor's Budget Proposal**

•Eliminated \$100 million in bonding authority to provide capital improvement grants to SERTA

## Joint Committee on Finance

•Eliminated all regional transit authorities

## **Direct Budgetary Impact: NR 151**

•Original rule: Require municipalities to reduce total suspended solids in storm water by 40% by 2012

•Cost-effectiveness issue: ~ \$1.5 million/per percentage point of TSS removal, & other pollutants are of greater concern to SE WI water quality

#### •Governor's Budget Proposal

•Repeal and recreation of NR 151 to not contain requirements more stringent than those under the federal Clean Water Act.

#### •Joint Committee on Finance (JCF)

•After budget introduction, Governor recommended that NR 151 not be deleted and recreated, but make certain provisions not enforceable

•JCF adopted the following motion:

•Prohibit DNR from enforcing any reduction greater than 20%

•If a municipality has achieved a reduction in total suspended solids exceeding 20% from no controls on the effective date of the bill, they are to, to the maximum extent practical, maintain all BMPs

•City meets > 20% removal via MMSD treatment of storm water from the Combined Sewer Area

•Maintaining other rule provisions such as those pertaining to new construction erosion control are favorable

•City can reallocate \$1 million of planned storm water BMPs in capital improvement plan to higher priorities

## **Direct Budgetary Impact: Recycling**

## **Governor's Budget Proposal**

- •Elimination of recycling mandate on municipalities
- •Elimination of recycling grant
- •Raid tipping fees to help finance economic development fund

## Joint Committee on Finance

- •Restored the recycling mandate with modifications to current landfill disposal restrictions. Persons would be prohibited from placing certain materials in garbage containers whose contents will be disposed of in a landfill, converted into fuel, or burned at an incinerator
- •Restored the recycling grant program at \$19 million annually (previously budgeted at \$32 million in 2011)
- •Under this scenario, Milwaukee would receive about \$2.1 million annually (initial 2011 Budget was ~ \$3.4 million)
- •Tipping fees would not be used to help finance economic development fund
- If no other changes made, offsetting grant loss through solid waste base charge amounts to + \$6.85 annually/household
  - Administration will analyze several service and funding alternatives for 2012 City Budget

## **Direct Budgetary Impact: Clean Water Fund**

- 1. Clean Water Fund provides below market rate financing for local government projects
- 2. The City has used over \$30 million in Clean Water Fund financing in each of the past two years for the sewer program
- 3. Two year debt service savings over life of term =  $\sim$  \$2 million

## **Governor's Budget Proposal**

• Modify the subsidized interest rate from 60% to 80%

## Joint Committee on Finance

• Modify the Governor's proposal to a 75% level

## Impact:

- Increase in the subsidized interest rate => \$225,000 annual increase in debt service, assuming \$30 million is borrowed via the program annually
- Costs for a \$30 million annual program over 3 years will increase by \$1.4 million over current repayment costs

## Next Steps

- Continued monitoring of legislative process and policy advocacy
  - Influence State non-point policy towards implementing research-based priorities found in MMSD/SEWRPC regional water quality plan
  - Ensure City is credited under NR 151 for treatment of TSS from the combined sewer area
- Work in the region with partners to achieve common goals
  - OES formed informal MKE regional sustainability group and founding member of the WI/MN North Star Network