



E C O S

GREEN REPORT

STATUS OF STATE ENVIRONMENTAL AGENCY BUDGETS Fiscal Years 2016 to 2019

By Andrew Pratt, Intern, under the direction of Beth Graves, Executive Project Manager

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

State environmental agencies operate the majority of federally delegated or authorized programs and manage funds to implement related environmental regulations. In February 2020, ECOS sought state environmental agency budget (EAB) data from the 50 states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, American Samoa, and the U.S. Virgin Islands, hereinafter referred to as “states.” The Environmental Council of the States (ECOS) received 47 responses.¹ This *ECOS Green Report* provides information on state EABs for fiscal years (FY) 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019. It focuses on changes and trends in these budgets, including analysis of changes to the three main funding sources: state general funds, federal funding, and fees or other sources.

ECOS hopes that given the expected negative impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on state budgets in FY2020 – FY2021, the report will serve as a useful benchmark for future budget planning in less extraordinary circumstances.

In reviewing this information, it is important to note that the California Environmental Protection

¹ AK, AL, AR, AZ, CA, CO, DE, FL, GA, IA, ID, IL, KS, KY, LA, MA, MD, ME, MI, MN, MO, MS, MT, NC, ND, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NV, NY, OK, OR, PA, PR, RI, SC, SD, TN, TX, UT, VA, VT, WA, WI, WV, WY provided responses. American Samoa, CT, DC, Guam, HI, IN, OH, and the U.S. Virgin Islands did not provide a response.

Agency (CalEPA) budget is significantly larger than that of other states – as much as \$1.1B more than the next largest state EAB – and that it experienced substantial expansion during this reporting period. As such, information on state environmental agency budgets is reflected with and without CalEPA funding.

Overall, from FY2016 to FY2019:

- 1. The sum total of state EABs of the 47 reporting states rose 18.9% or \$2.56B.**
 - The average state EAB rose by 18.9% or \$54M.
 - If CalEPA is excluded, the total of the 46 remaining state EABs rose 11.8% or \$1.16B, with an average state EAB increase of 11.8% or \$25.17M.
 - The average state EAB in FY2019 is \$239M, and the median is \$122M without CalEPA (see Table 1 and Figure 1).
 - The average state EAB per capita spending rose from \$46.42 in FY2016 to \$49.61 in FY2019, an increase of 6.9%. (see Appendix 8)
- 2. Looking at individual funding sources over four years, total state EAB general fund support comprises on average 11.47% of state EABs and increased 7.9% without CalEPA or \$93M (see Appendices 1a. and 1b.).**
 - Including CalEPA doubles the general fund support total increase to 15.7% or \$199M.
 - Overall, general fund support is the smallest of the three major funding sources to state EABs.
- 3. Federal government funding comprises on average 27.53% of state EABs without CalEPA and totals increased 8.2%, rising \$226M over the four years (see Appendices 2a. and 2b.).**
 - With CalEPA included, federal funding only increased from \$3.1B to \$3.31B, or \$210M, between FY2016 and FY2019 as CalEPA saw a decrease in federal funding of \$15M over the reporting period.
 - States depend on federal funding to do shared work and to fulfill commitments to their communities. Federal funds remain an important source of support to implement authorized or delegated programs.
- 4. Fees and other fund support was the largest major funding source of state EABs, comprising on average 60.84%, with totals rising 14.1% or \$832M, from \$5.89B in FY2016 to \$6.72B in FY2019 (without CalEPA). (see Appendices 3a. and 3b.).**
 - With CalEPA included, funding from the fees and other category experienced a much larger increase of 24.6%, rising from \$9.09B to \$11.32B.

Specific questions regarding any state's program or activities should be directed to individual states. Any errors or omissions in this report are the responsibility of ECOS and should be brought to our attention.

Table of Contents

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
METHODOLOGY.....	4
FINDINGS.....	4
A. State EABs Increased	4
Table 1. National Total State EABs and Funding Sources for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019	6
Table 2: Breakdown of State EAB Changes between FY16-FY17, FY17-FY18, and FY18-FY19	7
B. General Funding Contributions Increased.....	8
C. Fees and Other Contributions Increased.....	8
D. Federal Funding Contributions Increased.....	9
E. Possible Explanations for Increase in Federal Funding Contributions.....	11
Table 3. Breakdown of How States Included SRF Obligations in Their EABs in Relation to Changes in Federal Funding from FY2016 to FY2019.....	16
F. State EAB Funding Category Composition Varies.....	17
G. State Average EAB per Capita Spending Increased.....	19
CONSIDERATIONS.....	19
CONCLUSION.....	22
APPENDICES.....	23

This publication was developed under Assistance Agreement No. X5-83596001-5 awarded by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. It has not been formally reviewed by EPA. The findings and views expressed in this document are solely those of the Environmental Council of the States, and EPA does not endorse any products or commercial services mentioned in this publication.

METHODOLOGY

The following describes ECOS' methodology and data review in preparing analyses within this report:

- **This report covers a four-year period.**
Trends in state EABs may arise over longer time scales and may not be apparent from a four-year view with three observable budget cycle changes.
- **ECOS did not adjust for inflation.**
This means that the value of the dollars reported could be lower when expended.
- **States provided funding amounts based on their accounting preferences.**
States were able to describe their budget statuses with one of the following terms: appropriated, actual, enacted, approved, spent, or final.
- **ECOS cautions against comparing overall state EAB totals in this report to previous ECOS state EAB report totals.**
Responses to the 2020 ECOS budget survey may have been completed by different individuals than those who completed the previous ECOS budget survey in 2016. For this and other reasons, it is possible that the methods used by state environmental agencies to complete their responses may vary from the methods used to complete the 2016 budget survey.

FINDINGS

A. State EABs Increased

Table 1 includes details of total state EABs and their major funding sources. The following text reflects figures found in this table.

ECOS asked states to report figures for three major funding sources comprising their total EAB:


- 1) General Funds
- 2) Federal Government
- 3) Fees/Other Sources

The sum total of all 47 reported state EABs rose from \$13.5B in FY2016 to \$16.1B in FY2019, an increase of 18.9%. This large observed increase is primarily due to changes in California's budget

over the same period.² California's state EAB grew from approximately \$3.7B in FY2016 to \$5.1B in FY2019, an increase of 37.8%, accounting for \$1.4B of the overall \$2.6B national increase of state budgets. Considering state EABs without CalEPA, the overall national state EAB total increased from approximately \$9.8B in FY2016 to \$11B in FY2019, \$1.2B or 11.8%.

Average state EABs grew from \$213M in FY2016 to \$239M in FY2019, approximately \$25M, an 11.8% increase without CalEPA. If CalEPA is included, the average state EAB increased from \$288M in FY2016 to \$342M in FY2019, an increase of 18.9%. The median state EAB rose from \$106M in FY2016 to \$122M in FY2019 or a 14.8% increase without CalEPA.

Figure 1. Average State EAB and Median State EAB Change in Dollars, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA)



For all calculations, ECOS used the state EABs reported shown in Appendix 9. Subcategory average percentages in Table 1 are calculated by dividing the average subtotal by the average state EAB.

² CalEPA's budget significantly increased from FY2016 to FY2019 for several reasons. First, in 2014, California voters passed Proposition 1. This proposition authorized \$7.5B in general obligation bonds to address the impacts of the drought, including \$1.8B appropriated to the Water Board for water storage, water quality, flood protection, watershed restoration and protection, and safe drinking water improvements in disadvantaged communities. California's drought response continued into 2019 despite recent rain and snowfall. Second, increased auction revenues from an expanded cap-and-trade expenditure plan meant more money was appropriated for programs. Third, the agency received an influx of almost \$300M to complete remediation work at residential properties that were contaminated by a lead acid battery facility. Finally, CalEPA received more than \$500M the last couple years for cleanup and debris removal in the wake of three major wildfires.

Table 1. National Total State EABs and Funding Sources for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018 and FY2019³

		FY2016	FY2017	FY2018	FY2019
A	Total State EABs ⁴	\$13,512,598,527	\$14,602,377,287	\$14,925,357,296	\$16,071,466,981
B	Total State EABs (without CalEPA)	\$9,812,598,527	\$10,602,377,287	\$10,325,357,296	\$10,971,466,981
C	Average State EAB	\$287,502,096	\$310,688,878	\$317,560,794	\$341,946,106
D	Average State EAB (without CalEPA)	\$213,317,359	\$230,486,463	\$224,464,289	\$238,510,152
E	Median EAB (without CalEPA)	\$106,112,974	\$112,969,969	\$124,009,645	\$121,790,122
F	Total General Fund Support to State EAB	\$1,263,657,604	\$1,234,142,987	\$1,345,058,425	\$1,462,442,579
G	Total General Fund (without CalEPA)	\$1,174,057,604	\$1,136,542,987	\$1,212,058,425	\$1,266,842,579
H	Average General Fund Amount	\$26,886,332 (9.35%)	\$26,258,361 (8.5%)	\$28,618,264 (9.0%)	\$31,115,800 (9.1%)
I	Average General Fund Amount (without CalEPA)	\$25,522,991 (11.96%)	\$24,707,456 (10.7%)	\$26,349,096 (11.7%)	\$27,540,056 (11.5%)
J	Total Federal Government Support to State EAB	\$3,100,276,169	\$3,306,208,359	\$3,178,494,440	\$3,310,808,619
K	Total Federal Government (without CalEPA)	\$2,738,776,169	\$2,943,608,359	\$2,831,994,440	\$2,964,308,619
L	Average Federal Government Amount	\$68,888,855 (22.9%)	\$69,949,114 (22.6%)	\$68,021,158 (21.3%)	\$70,453,375 (20.60%)
M	Average Federal Government Amount (without CalEPA)	\$59,538,612 (27.9%)	\$63,991,486 (27.8%)	\$61,565,097 (27.4%)	\$64,441,492 (27.0%)
N	Total Fees, Other	\$9,089,948,741	\$10,008,608,370	\$10,366,295,698	\$11,321,662,253
O	Total Fees, Other (without CalEPA)	\$5,889,948,741	\$6,508,608,370	\$6,266,295,698	\$6,721,662,253
P	Average Fees, Other Amount	\$193,403,165 (67.3%)	\$212,949,114 (68.5%)	\$220,559,483 (69.5%)	\$240,886,431 (70.45%)
Q	Average Fees, Other (without CalEPA)	\$128,042,364 (60.0%)	\$141,491,486 (61.4%)	\$136,223,820 (60.7%)	\$146,123,092 (61.26%)

³ For the 47 reporting states.


⁴ Massachusetts includes capital spending in its EAB as an additional category. ECOS added this to fees/other for national consistency.

Table 2: Breakdown of State EAB Changes between FY16 and FY17, FY17 and FY18, and FY18 and FY19

	FY2016- FY2017	FY2017- FY2018	FY2018- FY 2019
Row A. Number of states with increasing budgets (>2%)	28 (59.6%)	18 (38.3%)	26 (55.3%)
Row B. Number of states with budgets with an increase or decrease less than 2%	10 (21.3%)	9 (19.1%)	12 (25.5%)
Row C. Number of states with decreasing budgets (>2%)	9 (19.1%)	20 (42.6%)	9 (19.1%)
Total Number of States	47 (100%)	47 (100%)	47 (100%)

Table 2 shows 28 state EABs (59.6%) increased from FY2016 to FY2017, 18 state EABs increased (38.3%) from FY2017 to FY2018, and 26 state EABs increased (55.3%) from FY2018 to FY2019. Which states increased or decreased varied within these timeframes. From FY2016 to FY2017, nine states (19.1%) showed declining budgets, while 20 state EABs (42.6%) decreased from FY2017 to FY2018 and nine (19.1%) states EABs decreased from FY2018 to FY 2019. Ten states (21.3%) stayed within a two percent increase or decrease change from FY2016 to FY2017, nine (19.1%) were within the range from FY2017 to FY2018, and 12 (25.5%) were within the range from FY2018 to FY2019. Figure 2 summarizes percent change of state budget information.

Figure 2. Summary of Percent Change of Total State EABs in FY2016 to FY2017, FY2017 to FY2018, and FY2018 to FY2019



The following trends show average percentage change across states with a greater than two percent increase (Row A) between years as shown in Table 2. Note that these percentages do not include changes that stayed within a two percent increase or decrease change (Row B).

- From FY2016 to FY2017, the average state EAB increase was 11.9%.
- From FY2017 to FY2018, the average state EAB increase was 12.0%.
- From FY2018 to FY 2019, the average state EAB increase was 11.4%.

The following trends show average percentage change across states with a greater than two percent decrease (Row C) between years as shown in Table 2.

- From FY2016 to FY2017, the average state EAB decrease was 6.9%.
- From FY2017 to FY2018, the average state EAB decrease was 10.5%.
- From FY2018 to FY2019, the average state EAB decrease was 12.9%.

B. General Funding Contributions Increased

Total state EAB general fund support increased from \$1.17B in FY2016 to \$1.27B in FY 2019 or \$93M, an increase of 7.9% without CalEPA. With CalEPA included, general fund support totals increased from \$1.26B to \$1.46B, or a 15.7% increase as shown in Table 1, Row F (see Appendix 5a. for percent change in general funding for each state from FY2016 to FY2019).

The average general fund amount increased 7.9% from \$25.5M in FY2016 to \$27.5M in FY2019 without CalEPA. With CalEPA included, the average general fund amount increased by 15.7% from \$26.9M in FY2016 to \$31.1M in FY2019.

Without CalEPA, general funds make up on average 11.47% of state EABs over four years.

The Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FL DEP) saw an increase of \$217.6 million in general funding support from FY2016 to FY2019, the largest dollar increase next to CalEPA. The increase in general funding support to FL DEP was attributed to an increase in funding for the Florida Forever Program, Florida's premier conservation and recreation lands acquisition program. Additional funding was also provided to expedite the repair of the Herbert Hoover Dike.

In a small counter trend, Louisiana reported \$419K in general fund support for FY2016 and reported receiving no general fund support in subsequent fiscal years (see Appendix 5a.).

C. Fees and Other Contributions Increased

State EAB fees and other fund support totals rose from \$5.89B in FY2016 to \$6.72B in FY2019 or 14.1%, or \$832M without CalEPA. With CalEPA included, funding from the fees and other category increased from \$9.09B to \$11.32B or \$2.23B, a much larger increase of 24.6%, as shown by Table 1, Rows N and O (see Appendix 5b. for percentage change in fees and other funding for each state from FY2016 to FY2019).

Without CalEPA's state EAB included, the average fees and other funding support rose from \$128M in FY2016 to \$146M in FY2019, or a 14.1% increase. With CalEPA, the average fees and other support rose from \$193M in FY2016 to \$241M in FY2019, a 24.6% increase. In addition to fees and other funds constituting the largest major state EAB funding source, this category also had the largest dollar amount increase of all three categories from FY2016 to FY2019, with or without CalEPA.

For some programs, the responsible state, local, tribal, or EPA permitting authority may be obligated by statute to collect fees sufficient to fund all reasonable permit program costs from those sources required to obtain operating permits.

Overall, fees and other sources are the largest major funding source for state EABs, comprising on average 60.84% of state EAB support without CalEPA over four years.

ECOS notes that Idaho experienced the largest percent increase in fees or other funds (see Appendix 5b.). In June 2018, Idaho became the 47th state to receive National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System program authorization, transferring from EPA to the state authority to issue various permit classes in four phases occurring from July 2018 to July 2021. This at least in part contributes to its increased fee collection.

FL DEP experienced the largest dollar increase in the fees and other funding category behind CalEPA. Between FY2016 and FY2019 funding from the fees and other category increased by \$239.8 million. This increase can be attributed to growth in funding for Florida's Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan for the restoration of the Everglades ecosystem in South Florida. The increase in the fees and other category from FY2016 to FY2017 is also due to the practice of "double budgeting," in which the Florida legislature appropriated a transfer of approximately \$156.8 million in revenue from one funding source to another.

The New York Department of Environmental Conservation (NY DEC) experienced the third largest dollar increase in the fees and other funding category. From FY2016 to FY2019, funding from the fees and other category increased by \$206.2M. This increase is due to growth in funding related to capital spending projects. For example, in 2017 and 2018 New York State enacted the \$2.5B Clean Water Infrastructure Act and followed up with \$500M in additional funding the subsequent year.

D. Federal Funding Contributions Increased

Federal government fund support to state EAB totals increased 8.2% without CalEPA included, increasing \$226M over the three budget periods as shown by Table 1, Row K. With CalEPA, it increased less from \$3.10B to \$3.31B from FY2016 to FY2019 or \$210M, as shown in Table 1, Row J (see Appendix 5c. for percent change in federal funding for each state from FY2016 to FY2019).

Without CalEPA, the average funding from the federal government increased from \$59.5M in FY2016 to \$64.4M in FY2019, an 8.2% increase.

It should be noted that many federal grants require state matching funds.

Federal funds make up on average 27.53% of state EABs without CalEPA over the four years.

Figures 3a. and 3b. show the dollar change in total funding from general funds, federal funding, and fees and other sources for each fiscal year. Appendices 5a., 5b., and 5c. show the percent change in funding category for each state from FY2016 to FY2019.

Figure 3a. State EAB funding by Source for 47 states in FY2016-FY2019






Figure 3b. State EAB funding by Source for 46 states (without CalEPA) in FY2016-FY2019



E. Possible Explanations for Increase in Federal Funding Contributions

State environmental agencies depend on federal funding to do the shared work to meet federally authorized and delegated obligations and to fulfill their obligations to home communities. In addition, the U.S. Congress included provisions in the major air, clean water, drinking water, and hazardous waste statutes to provide assistance to states to operate these federal programs primarily through State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG), in particular Categorical Grants. The STAG account includes several sources of funding for states, significantly the Categorical Grants comprising 20 individual grant categories, as well as Clean Water and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds, and other funds. Congressionally enacted funds for Categorical Grants from FY 2003 to FY 2019 declined overall; FY 2013 is the lowest Categorical Grant enacted level in the 17-year period (see Figure 4). Despite the decline in federal funding from Categorical Grants, states reported an overall increase in federal funding support along with increased support from fees and other funds and from general funds between FY16 to FY19.

Figure 4. U.S. Congressional Enacted Funding Levels for Categorical Grants (in millions of dollars)⁵




Source: FY2021 EPA Budget in Brief p.89, ECOS 2017 Green Report p.11

The Multipurpose Categorical Grant was enacted in FY2016 at \$21M, not funded in FY17, and then funded at \$10M in FY2018 and \$11M in FY2019. Meanwhile, the Categorical Grant enacted amount increased from FY2015 to FY2016 by \$27M. (See Figure 5) Multipurpose Grants were again funded in FY18 at \$10M, and the overall Categorical Grant appropriation also rose by \$10M

⁵ Trend line based on linear regression calculation for Categorical Grant funding FY2003-FY2019.
 $y = -5.4583x + 12,071$; $R^2 = 0.6091$

from FY2017 to FY2018 from \$1.066B to \$1.076B. In both these instances, Multipurpose funds accounted for the majority of the total increase for all Categorical Grants.


Figure 5. Multipurpose Categorical Grant Enacted Funding Levels, FY2016 – FY2019 (in millions of dollars)



In addition, EPA provides states funding for Superfund cleanups, underground storage tank cleanups, brownfields cleanup and redevelopment, geographic programs, targeted airsheds, and other projects separate from Categorical Grants; some of which are included in the STAG account and other funds which are from separate EPA accounts.

State EABs may also receive federal funding from EPA for clean water and drinking water infrastructure, a significant source of funding. Both clean water and drinking water SRFs saw an increase from FY2016 to FY2019 of \$549M (see Figure 6). From FY2016 to FY2019 clean water SRF obligations increased by \$274M and drinking water SRF obligations increased by \$276M.

Figure 6. Total Actual State Revolving Fund Obligations (in thousands of dollars)



Source: EPA Budget in Briefs for Fiscal Years 2018-2021

The DW SRF saw an increase over the four-year period from \$856M to \$1.13B. States can draw up to 31% of the DW SRF as set-aside funds. The net increase of \$276.12M overall increased the states' collective available set-aside by \$85.6M (see Figure 7).

The CW SRF also saw an increase over the four-year period from \$1.35B to \$1.63B or a net increase of \$274M. The states may draw up to 4% for administrative fees. The net increase of \$273.59M increased the states' collective available administrative fees by \$10.94M (see Figure 7).

The increased available set-aside funds may or may not have been taken by states and reflected in their EAB.

Figure 7. Available Collective DW SRF Set-Aside and Available Collective CW SRF Administrative Fee, FY2016 – FY2019




Figure 8 shows the net dollar change in federal funding for the 47 states that reported from FY2016 to FY2019. Table 3 shows how many states included their SRF obligations in their EABs in relation to the changes in federal funding dollars. Taken together, Figure 8 and Table 3 support the notion that the inclusion of SRF obligations in state EABs is at least partially responsible for the overall increase in federal funding, as more states that included their SRF obligations saw an increase in their federal funding from FY2016 to FY2019. Additionally, ECOS followed up with the states that experienced the largest increases in federal funding from FY2016 to FY2019 and asked them to clarify the increases to provide additional context to the readers of this report. These accounts of new or expanded programs help provide further explanation.

Figure 8. Net Dollar Change in Federal Funding, FY2016 – FY 2019




Table 3. Breakdown of How States Included SRF Obligations in Their EABs in Relation to Changes in Federal Funding from FY2016 to FY2019

	Included Both SRF Funds	Included CWSRF Only	Included DWSRF Only
Number of states with increase in federal funding	17 (63.0%)	4 (66.7%)	2 (100%)
Number of states with decrease in federal funding	10 (37.0%)	2 (33.3%)	0 (0%)
Total	27 (100%)	9 (100%)	2 (100%)

Looking at individual states, the NY DEC experienced the largest increase in net federal funding dollars from FY2016 to FY2019, increasing \$64.6M (See Figure 8). The increase in federal funding is largely due to NY DEC's spending on the Clean Water SRF Program. NY DEC saw a substantial increase in the drawdown of a multiyear Clean Water SRF disaster recovery grant associated with Hurricane Sandy that rose from \$8.4M in FY2018 to \$43.6M in FY2019, an increase of \$35.2M. Additionally, the regular annual CW SRF Program Grant drawdown rose from \$146M in FY2018 to \$177M in FY2019, an increase of \$31M.

The Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection (PA DEP) had the second largest increase in net federal funding dollars from FY2016 to FY2019, rising \$34.7M (Figure 8). This increase can be broken down further to a \$29.5M increase from FY2018 to FY2019 and another \$5.58M increase from FY2017 to FY2018. These funds are related to the expenditure of multi-year drinking water grants for public water supply program administration, which includes providing technical assistance, developing and implementing a capacity development strategy and an operator certification program, and related indirect draws; to the expenditure of new multi-year mining grants related to the alleviation of public health and safety hazards; and to the award of new dam safety related grants (for the Cooperative Technical Partners and High Hazard Potential Dams). PA DEP also had a small decrease of \$347,000 from FY2016 to FY2017 due to a decrease in the award of funds to PA DEP through the Department of Health subgrant related to the surveillance of chemical and radiological agents.

The Virginia Department of Environmental Quality (VA DEQ) had the largest percent change (Appendix 5c) and third largest net increase in federal funding dollars (Figure 8) from FY2016 to FY2019. VA DEQ included appropriations for the Virginia Revolving Loan Fund (VRLF) program under the federal funding category. Appropriations for the VRLF program represented \$24.43M of the \$52.49M in federal funding for FY2016. From FY2018 to FY2019 total reported federal funding increased from \$57.43M to \$77.49M. This increase in federal funds is due to process by which Virginia draws SRF funds. In FY2019, VA DEQ funded a land conservation project that contributed to an increase in SRF appropriations for the drawdown of more than one open grant.

The Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality had the second largest percentage increase in federal funding (Appendix 5c) for the time period, increasing in FY2018 from \$22.3M to \$29.6M

in FY2019 due to increased support for the Tar Creek Superfund site work and inclusion on the EPA Administrator’s Emphasis List.

These and perhaps other factors may provide some insight as to why the federal fund dollars increased from FY2016 to FY2019.

F. State EAB Funding Category Composition Varies

Figures 9a., 9b., and 9c. demonstrate funding by category to states as a percentage of their EAB for FY2019:

- When provided, general fund support ranged from 1.0% in Alabama to 47.4% in Rhode Island. Arizona, Illinois, and Nevada reported receiving no general fund support. Louisiana reported receiving no general fund support in FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019.
- Federal funding ranged from 6.8% in California to 59.4% in Missouri, a wide range. Federal funds make up on average 27.53% of state EABs without CalEPA over the four years.
- Fees and other ranged from 14.9% in Puerto Rico to 90.2% in California.

Figure 9a. State EAB Percentage of General Funding Support, FY 2019




Figure 9b. State EAB Percentage of Federal Funding Support, FY 2019⁶





Figure 9c. State EAB Percentage of Fees and Other Funding Support, FY 2019⁷



⁶ SRF was included in federal funding if the state reported SRF as included in its federal funding and overall EAB. Percentage of federal funding calculated by dividing federal fund by the total EAB for the state in FY2019.

⁷ Percentage of fees and other funding calculated by dividing fees and other fund by the total EAB for the state in FY2019.

G. State Average EAB per Capita Spending Increased

ECOS considered the total EAB for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019 compared to U.S. Census population data in each state for each respective year to determine state EAB per capita values. These normalized amounts by state are located in Appendix 8.

ECOS notes the per capita funding range increased comparing FY2016 to FY2019. The range in FY2016 was \$11.17 to \$205.03, and the range in FY2019 was \$11.05 to \$211.16. The average state EAB per capita spending increased from \$46.42 in FY2016 to \$49.61 in FY2019, an increase of 6.9%.

In addition, ECOS used normalization by comparing each state's gross domestic product (GDP) with the EAB for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019. No states had a percentage for their EABs higher than 0.5% of their GDP in any given year. Appendix 7 shows that from FY2016 through FY 2019 total state GDP consistently increased. As the average EAB as a percentage of total GDP remained fairly static from FY2016 to FY2019, this helps explain the similar increase in total state EABs during the same time period.

CONSIDERATIONS

- **There is variance in how states receive SRFs.**

Some states receive SRFs fully through the environmental agency. In others, the state environmental agency receives only Drinking Water (DW) or Clean Water (CW) SRFs. Sometimes a state environmental agency receives no SRF monies.

Twenty-seven states⁸ "included" both CW and DW SRF in their overall budget totals. Nine states⁹ "included" only CW SRF in their budget. Another two states¹⁰ "included" only DW SRF in their budgets. Nine states did not include SRF funds in their overall EABs.¹¹ Individual state responses are found in Appendix 9. States that did not include SRF in their total budget had the option of reporting the amount received for reference. However, these specific reported SRF figures were not used in any calculations.

- **SRF inclusion in state EABs may only represent a portion of the total SRF amount received.**

States that "included" CW and/or DW SRF in their EAB may only include a portion of the total SRF money received by the state. This may be as some of the funds are distributed to other state departments. The state may have only included SRF administrative costs in its budget totals. Within specific guidance, environmental agencies may take up to 4% of CW SRF money and up to 31% of DW SRF money to cover administrative and

⁸ The twenty-seven states are: AK, FL, GA, IL, IA, KS, KY, LA, MD, MA, MI, MO, MT, NE, NH, NJ, NM, NC, ND, PA, RI, SC, TN, TX, VT, WI, and WY.

⁹ The nine states are DE, ME, MN, MS, NY, OR, PR, VA, and WV.

¹⁰ The two states are AZ and OK.

¹¹ The nine states are AL, AR, CA, CO, ID, NV, SD, UT, and WA.

other costs. ECOS did not request this information in detail.

- **Variance in how states reported SRF funds.**

The ECOS budget update request did not specify in which funding category states should list the SRF amount if the SRF was designated “included.” In subsequent correspondence in response to individual inquiries, ECOS requested that reporting states add “included” SRF amounts to the federal funding category. If the state added the SRF amounts in another category, ECOS requested that the state include a footnote explaining why. States that listed their SRF as “included” may have added their SRF amounts as either a portion of their federal funding or one of the other funding categories.

- **State fiscal years vary.**

A number of states use a July 1 to June 30 fiscal year cycle, whereas EPA uses the federal fiscal year cycle from October 1 to September 30. A more limited number of states use a calendar fiscal year or also follow the federal fiscal year cycle. One state uses an April 1 to March 31 cycle. Thus, the exact months comprising a given fiscal year may vary slightly across all respondents. However, each state is reporting on a twelve-month cycle.

- **Three states have a biennial budget.**

Oregon, North Dakota, and Wyoming have biennial budgets. Oregon calculated its annual agency budget by dividing its biennial budget in half. North Dakota provided actual figures as opposed to appropriated figures to better reflect the realistic internal budget. Wyoming also responded with unique annual budget totals for each fiscal year. For Wyoming, each year varies depending on the amount of SRF loans or SRF grant amounts received. In addition, Wyoming has a supplemental legislative session that may adjust its budget in the second fiscal year of the biennium.

- **Multipurpose Categorical Grants**

In FY2016, Congress created the new Multipurpose Categorical Grant and allocated \$21 million (minus rescissions and grants to tribes) to assist with implementing environmental programs. EPA’s 2016 grant guidance directed states, territories, and tribes to use at least 65% of their funding to support air work and up to 35% of their funding on other state-identified priority activities. It is likely these FY16 funds are reflected in FY2017 state budget reports due to the timing of their award from EPA to states by September 2016.

Congress did not allocate Multipurpose funding in FY2017. For FY2018 and FY2019, Congress again provided funding, with states determining where funds would be of most value. Congress provided \$10M in FY2018 and \$11M in FY2019 for Multipurpose grants. EPA issued combined FY2018 and FY2019 Multipurpose grant guidance in August 2019, with funds awarded in late 2019 and early 2020. As such, these funds would not be reflected in FY2019 state budget reports.

- **Reported budget information may represent only a portion of a state’s total environmental spending.**

For instance, many states fund pesticides work through their departments of agriculture. Some states fund drinking water activities through a state department of health. While some states include either public health or natural resource functions within their environmental agencies and others do not, ECOS asked states to only report environmental program budget information. For example, the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control includes both natural resource and environmental functions, but the budget information shown is for environmental activities only exclusive of natural resource functions.¹²

- **Comparisons from one state to another may yield inaccurate results.**

For instance, state EABs may differ because of:

- Different environmental programs targeted to features/local priorities such as beaches, mountains, drought, wildfires, hurricane response, etc.
- Different programs in which a state has sought delegation or authorization.
- Specific programs administered by different state agencies from state-to-state. Of the approximately 19 individual Categorical Grants funded by EPA, funds may go to a single state agency, to four or five state agencies, or up to eight state agencies or offices. For instance, the Texas Railroad Commission, Arkansas State Plant Board, Clemson University, and Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry are all recipients of Categorical Grant funding from EPA in addition to traditional state environmental agencies.
- Different composition of state regulatory or compliance assistance services.
- The number and breadth of regulated facilities.
- Different industry sectors such as mining, manufacturing, agriculture, etc.
- State-specific revenue sources such as dedicated state taxes, landfill tipping fees, etc.
- State-specific requirements for regulated facilities.

- **Volkswagen Environmental Mitigation Funds**

States were eligible for environmental mitigation funds stemming from the June 2016 partial consent decree related to the Volkswagen settlement. State agencies began receiving funds from the trust in approximately FY2018, and therefore state environmental agencies would not reflect VW Settlement funding in their budgets until FY2019, if at all. ECOS suggested if a state reported using a portion of the VW settlement funding for operating costs, for the state to include these funds under the “fees and other category” and include a specific footnote explaining the funding use. Otherwise, states would not report these funds, as they may not be directly managed by the state environmental agency or may be pass-through only. See Appendix 11 for additional information regarding the Volkswagen settlement.

¹² "DNREC Organizational Chart." Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. January 19, 2017. Accessed February 8, 2017. http://dnrec.alpha.delaware.gov/wp-content/uploads/sites/12/2017/01/dnrec_org_chart_20170119.pdf.

CONCLUSION

Overall, from FY2016 to FY2019:


1. The sum total of state EABs of 46 reporting states (without CalEPA) rose 11.8% or \$1.16B. ECOS notes CalEPA's budget is significantly larger than that of other states and experienced substantial expansion during this reporting period. If CalEPA is included, the total of 47 reporting state EABs rose 18.9% or \$2.56B. Average state EAB in FY2019 without CalEPA is \$239M, and the median is \$122M without CalEPA.
2. Considering individual funding sources, total state EAB general fund support increased 7.9% without CalEPA or \$93M. With CalEPA included, general fund support totals increased 15.7%. Over four years, general fund support comprises on average 11.47% of state EAB support without CalEPA. Overall, general fund support is the smallest of the three major funding sources considered in this report.
3. Federal government funding support to state EAB totals increased 8.2% without CalEPA included, increasing \$226M over the three budget periods. (With CalEPA, it increased from \$3.10B to \$3.31B from FY2016 to FY2019). Federal funds make up on average 27.53% of state EABs without CalEPA over four years. Federal funds remain an important source of support to states to implement authorized or delegated programs and accomplish shared work to protect human health and the environment.
4. Fees and other fund support totals rose 14.1%, \$832M, from \$5.89B in FY2016 to \$6.72B in FY2019 without CalEPA. (With CalEPA included, funding from the fees and other category experienced a much larger increase of 24.6%, increasing from \$9.09B to \$11.32B). Overall, fees and other sources are the largest major funding source for state EABs comprising on average 60.84% of state EABs without CalEPA from FY2016-FY2019.

State environmental agencies reported increases in all funding sources from FY2016 to FY2019. Although federal fund support rose overall, Categorical Grant funding is below its FY2017 levels and well below FY2003 levels. ECOS recognizes that states receive funding from other EPA sources in addition to Categorical Grants, such as SRFs. Twenty-seven of the forty-seven reporting states indicated that they "included" their DW and CW SRF contributions in their federal funding and overall budgets. Both clean water and drinking water obligations saw an increase from FY2016 to FY2019. The increase in SRF contributions and the new Multipurpose Categorical Grant with FY2016 funds awarded during this reporting period could be largely responsible for the reported increase in federal funding contributions to state EABs.


APPENDICES

Appendix 1a. Percent Change in Total State General Funding, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA).....	24
Appendix 1b. Dollar Change in Total State General Funding, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA).....	24
Appendix 2a. Percent Change in Total Federal Government Funding Support to States, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA).....	25
Appendix 2b. Dollar Change in Total Federal Government Funding Support to States, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA).....	25
Appendix 3a. Percent Change in Total State Fees and Other Funding, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA).....	26
Appendix 3b. Dollar Change in Total State Fees and Other Funding, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA).....	26
Appendix 4. Percent of Average Funding Category Support, FY2016 – FY2019.....	27
Appendix 5a. Percent Change in General Funding by State, FY2016 – FY 2019.....	28
Appendix 5b. Percent Change in Fees and Other Funding by State, FY2016 – FY2019..	29
Appendix 5c. Percent Change in Federal Funding by State, FY2016 – FY2019.....	30
Appendix 6. State EAB Funding Sources by EPA Region, FY2019.....	31
Appendix 7. Total State GDP, FY2016 – FY2019.....	36
Appendix 8. State EAB Normalized on a Per Capita Basis for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019.....	37
Appendix 9. State EAB Information by State for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019..	40
Appendix 10. Example State Budget Response Form.....	69
Appendix 11. Volkswagen Settlement.....	70


Appendix 1a. Percent Change in Total State General Funding, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA)




Appendix 1b. Dollar Change in Total State General Funding, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA)




Appendix 2a. Percent Change in Total Federal Government Funding Support to States, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA)




Appendix 2b. Dollar Change in Total Federal Government Funding Support to States, FY2016 – FY2019 (Without CalEPA)




**Appendix 3a. Percent Change in Total State Fees and Other Funding, FY2016 – FY2019
(Without CalEPA)**




**Appendix 3b. Dollar Change in Total State Fees and Other Funding, FY2016 – FY2019
(Without CalEPA)**




Appendix 4. Percent of Average Funding Category Support, FY2016 – FY2019




Appendix 5a. Percent Change in General Funding by State, FY2016 – FY 2019



Appendix 5b. Percent Change in Fees and Other Funding by State, FY2016 – FY2019






Appendix 5c. Percent Change in Federal Funding by State, FY2016 – FY2019







Appendix 6 includes a series of ten graphs, one for each EPA Region, comparing FY2019 state EAB funding sources as a percentage of the sum of all funding sources for all states. States for which data were not obtained are indicated in the title of each graph.



Appendix 6. State EAB Funding Sources by EPA Region, FY2019












Appendix 7. Total State GDP, FY2016 – FY2019



Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of Economic Analysis

Appendix 8. State EAB Normalized on a Per Capita Basis for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019¹³

Appendix 8a. State EAB Normalized on a Per Capita Basis for FY2016 and FY2017

State Environmental Agency	FY2016 EAB	FY2016 Pop.	FY2016 per capita	FY2017 EAB	FY2017 Pop.	FY2017 per capita
Alabama	\$54,318,146	4,863,525	\$11.17	\$54,810,857.00	4,874,486	\$11.24
Alaska	\$76,053,300	741,456	\$102.57	\$73,652,500.00	739,700	\$99.57
Arizona	\$131,465,900	6,941,072	\$18.94	\$157,315,800.00	7,044,008	\$22.33
Arkansas	\$106,114,781	2,989,918	\$35.49	\$115,734,680.00	3,001,345	\$38.56
California	\$3,700,000,000	39,167,117	\$94.47	\$3,900,000,000.00	39,358,497	\$99.09
Colorado	\$81,297,450	5,539,215	\$14.68	\$79,903,046.00	5,611,885	\$14.24
Delaware	\$72,367,954	948,921	\$76.26	\$78,589,505.00	956,823	\$82.14
Florida	\$1,319,841,941	20,613,477	\$64.03	\$1,590,359,902.00	20,963,613	\$75.86
Georgia	\$127,295,435	10,301,890	\$12.36	\$150,745,080.00	10,410,330	\$14.48
Idaho	\$64,620,900	1,682,380	\$38.41	\$67,332,600.00	1,717,715	\$39.20
Illinois	\$346,210,024	12,820,527	\$27.00	\$349,300,800.00	12,778,828	\$27.33
Iowa	\$58,629,319	3,131,371	\$18.72	\$55,596,410.00	3,141,550	\$17.70
Kansas	\$65,588,718	2,910,844	\$22.53	\$67,861,397.00	2,908,718	\$23.33
Kentucky	\$102,932,538.82	4,438,182	\$23.19	\$103,989,427.72	4,452,268	\$23.36
Louisiana	\$113,077,796	4,678,135	\$24.17	\$119,706,225.00	4,670,560	\$25.63
Maine	\$82,615,609	1,331,317	\$62.06	\$80,760,248.00	1,334,612	\$60.51
Maryland	\$377,719,665	6,003,323	\$62.92	\$410,219,295.00	6,023,868	\$68.10
Massachusetts	\$106,111,166	6,823,608	\$15.55	\$116,191,850.00	6,859,789	\$16.94
Michigan	\$540,662,800	9,950,571	\$54.33	\$620,336,400.00	9,973,114	\$62.20
Minnesota	\$196,813,663	5,522,744	\$35.64	\$233,131,633.00	5,566,230	\$41.88
Mississippi	\$307,845,384	2,987,938	\$103.03	\$351,282,806.00	2,988,510	\$17.54
Missouri	\$420,750,438	6,087,135	\$69.12	\$442,249,801	6,106,670	\$72.42
Montana	\$89,716,339.19	1,040,859	\$86.19	\$85,059,942.41	1,052,482	\$80.82
Nebraska	\$64,213,096	1,905,616	\$33.70	\$89,165,168.00	1,915,947	\$46.54
Nevada	\$40,984,689	2,917,563	\$14.05	\$38,450,020.00	2,969,905	\$12.95
New Hampshire	\$275,206,519	1,342,307	\$205.03	\$203,224,646.00	1,348,787	\$150.67
New Jersey	\$493,243,000	8,870,827	\$55.60	\$519,536,000.00	8,885,525	\$58.47
New Mexico	\$84,821,175	2,091,630	\$40.55	\$88,038,741.00	2,091,784	\$42.09
New York	\$628,314,657	19,633,428	\$32.00	\$757,143,170.00	19,589,572	\$38.65
North Carolina	\$610,086,275	10,154,788	\$60.08	\$580,451,194	10,268,233	\$56.53
North Dakota	\$20,860,650	754,434	\$27.65	\$21,055,929.00	754,942	\$27.89
Oklahoma	\$77,163,896	3,926,331	\$19.65	\$75,976,008.00	3,931,316	\$19.33
Oregon	\$107,256,747	4,089,976	\$26.22	\$107,256,747.00	4,143,625	\$25.88
Pennsylvania	\$696,289,000	12,782,275	\$54.47	\$671,991,000.00	12,787,641	\$52.55
Puerto Rico	\$54,070,000	3,406,672	\$15.87	\$54,343,000.00	3,325,286	\$16.34
Rhode Island	\$27,319,460	1,056,770	\$25.85	\$25,808,330.00	1,055,673	\$24.45
South Carolina	\$94,821,949	4,957,968	\$19.13	\$110,205,257.00	5,021,268	\$21.95
South Dakota	\$24,084,654	862,996	\$27.91	\$24,572,867.00	872,868	\$28.15
Tennessee	\$178,557,700	6,646,010	\$26.87	\$201,052,200.00	6,708,799	\$29.97

¹³ Source: US Census Bureau, Annual Estimates of the Resident Population for the United States, Regions, States, and Puerto Rico: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2019

Texas	\$431,900,347	27,914,410	\$15.47	\$474,045,329.00	28,295,273	\$16.75
Utah	\$50,733,200	3,041,868	\$16.68	\$52,441,500.00	3,101,042	\$16.91
Vermont	\$63,384,488	623,657	\$101.63	\$63,940,888.00	624,344	\$102.41
Virginia	\$251,409,067	8,410,106	\$29.89	\$253,386,025.00	8,463,587	\$29.94
Washington	\$188,887,235	7,294,771	\$25.89	\$212,969,603.00	7,423,362	\$28.69
West Virginia	\$233,897,346	1,831,023	\$127.74	\$285,722,920.00	1,817,004	\$157.25
Wisconsin	\$234,332,469	5,772,628	\$40.59	\$241,969,700.00	5,790,186	\$41.79
Wyoming	\$38,711,641	584,215	\$66.26	\$45,500,840.00	578,931	\$78.59

Appendix 8b. State EAB Normalized on a Per Capita Basis for FY2018 and FY2019

State Environmental Agency	FY2018 EAB	FY2018 Pop.	FY2018 per capita	FY2019 EAB	FY2019 Pop.	FY2019 per capita
Alabama	\$55,920,271.00	4,887,681	\$11.44	\$57,990,793.00	4,903,185	\$11.83
Alaska	\$73,088,200.00	735,139	\$99.42	\$74,083,600.00	731,545	\$101.27
Arizona	\$155,825,100.00	7,158,024	\$21.77	\$160,696,850.00	7,278,717	\$22.08
Arkansas	\$127,356,469.00	3,009,733	\$42.31	\$136,288,549.00	3,017,804	\$45.16
California	\$4,600,000,000.00	39,461,588	\$116.57	\$5,100,000,000.00	39,512,223	\$129.07
Colorado	\$80,185,712.00	5,691,287	\$14.09	\$76,726,927.00	5,758,736	\$13.32
Delaware	\$101,971,600.00	965,479	\$105.62	\$73,941,472.00	973,764	\$75.93
Florida	\$1,352,168,931.00	21,244,317	\$63.65	\$1,622,875,592.00	21,477,737	\$75.56
Georgia	\$134,728,374.00	10,511,131	\$12.82	\$117,371,706.00	10,617,423	\$11.05
Idaho	\$67,889,900.00	1,750,536	\$38.78	\$66,960,100.00	1,787,065	\$37.47
Illinois	\$379,175,900.00	12,723,071	\$29.80	\$386,924,600.00	12,671,821	\$30.53
Iowa	\$53,428,552.00	3,148,618	\$16.97	\$57,123,724.00	3,155,070	\$18.11
Kansas	\$76,680,153.00	2,911,359	\$26.34	\$70,717,031.00	2,913,314	\$24.27
Kentucky	\$99,411,922.95	4,461,153	\$22.28	\$107,027,689.03	4,467,673	\$23.96
Louisiana	\$126,860,579.00	4,659,690	\$27.23	\$126,208,538.00	4,648,794	\$27.15
Maine	\$73,746,346.00	1,339,057	\$55.07	\$76,539,191.00	1,344,212	\$56.94
Maryland	\$391,064,278.00	6,035,802	\$64.79	\$449,525,409.00	6,045,680	\$74.35
Massachusetts	\$121,158,710.00	6,882,635	\$17.60	\$131,640,242.00	6,892,503	\$19.10
Michigan	\$571,575,200.00	9,984,072	\$57.25	\$501,302,600.00	9,986,857	\$50.20
Minnesota	\$315,556,463.00	5,606,249	\$56.29	\$215,897,512.00	5,639,632	\$38.28
Mississippi	\$290,744,308.00	2,981,020	\$97.53	\$308,443,713.00	2,976,149	\$103.64
Missouri	\$440,746,774	6,121,623	\$72.00	\$442,211,759	6,137,428	\$72.05
Montana	\$69,087,246.68	1,060,665	\$65.14	\$71,256,693.37	1,068,778	\$66.67
Nebraska	\$72,687,394.00	1,925,614	\$37.75	\$72,528,802.00	1,934,408	\$37.49
Nevada	\$41,213,685.00	3,027,341	\$13.61	\$40,233,205.00	3,080,156	\$13.06
New Hampshire	\$234,337,274.00	1,353,465	\$173.14	\$287,253,707.00	1,359,711	\$211.26
New Jersey	\$574,489,000.00	8,886,025	\$64.65	\$576,568,000.00	8,882,190	\$64.91
New Mexico	\$84,597,945.00	2,092,741	\$40.42	\$79,161,523.00	2,096,829	\$37.75
New York	\$714,103,026.00	19,530,351	\$36.56	\$903,617,555.00	19,453,561	\$46.45
North Carolina	\$603,390,104	10,381,615	\$58.12	602,889,653	10,488,084	\$57.48
North Dakota	\$19,617,430.00	758,080	\$25.88	\$21,179,127.00	762,062	\$27.79
Oklahoma	\$74,883,040.00	3,940,235	\$19.00	\$81,461,639.00	3,956,971	\$20.59
Oregon	\$129,655,151.00	4,181,886	\$31.00	\$129,655,151.00	4,217,737	\$30.74
Pennsylvania	\$710,431,000.00	12,800,922	\$55.50	\$810,132,000.00	12,801,989	\$63.28
Puerto Rico	\$50,803,000.00	3,193,354	\$15.91	\$57,594,000.00	3,193,694	\$18.03
Rhode Island	\$25,519,881.00	1,058,287	\$24.11	\$25,327,466.00	1,059,361	\$23.91
South Carolina	\$105,975,827.00	5,084,156	\$20.84	\$107,176,226.00	5,148,714	\$20.82
South Dakota	\$24,596,080.00	878,698	\$27.99	\$24,807,503.00	884,659	\$28.04
Tennessee	\$207,219,900.00	6,771,631	\$30.60	\$207,740,500.00	6,829,174	\$30.42
Texas	\$413,757,594.00	28,628,666	\$14.45	\$440,070,739.00	28,995,881	\$15.18
Utah	\$55,085,200.00	3,153,550	\$17.47	\$62,107,700.00	3,205,958	\$19.37
Vermont	\$74,754,386.00	624,358	\$119.73	\$85,958,048.00	623,989	\$137.76
Virginia	\$224,683,429.00	8,501,286	\$26.43	\$267,966,534.00	8,535,519	\$31.39
Washington	\$205,340,067.00	7,523,869	\$27.29	\$234,282,457.00	7,614,893	\$30.77
West Virginia	\$250,635,922.00	1,804,291	\$138.91	\$224,032,859.00	1,792,147	\$125.01
Wisconsin	\$238,687,697.00	5,807,406	\$41.10	\$258,853,128.00	5,822,434	\$44.46
Wyoming	\$30,522,274.00	577,601	\$52.84	\$39,115,169.00	578,759	\$67.58

Appendix 9. State EAB Information by State for FY2016, FY2017, FY2018, and FY2019

*Note: States with a number in the “Amount of Reported SRF” category did **not** include this amount in their EAB. States with “included” in this category, however, include SRF in their overall EAB.*

Alabama	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$54,318,146	\$54,810,857	\$55,920,271	\$57,990,793
Budget Status	Actual Expenses	Actual Expenses	Actual Expenses	Actual Expenses
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF) Federal Grant Amount	DWSRF \$15,876,000	DWSRF \$15,740,000	DWSRF \$23,944,000	DWSRF \$23,721,000
	CWSRF \$14,940,000	CWSRF \$14,825,000	CWSRF \$17,948,000	CWSRF \$17,767,000
Amount from General Fund	\$280,000	\$400,000	\$575,000	\$575,000
Amount from Federal Gov’t (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$18,112,231	\$18,199,899	\$18,247,625	\$20,551,150
Amount from Fees, Other	\$35,925,915	\$36,210,958	\$37,097,646	\$36,864,643

Alaska	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$76,073,300	\$73,652,500	\$73,088,200	\$74,083,600
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$19,903,500	\$16,834,800	\$15,276,000	\$15,385,800
Amount from Federal Gov’t (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$19,976,600	\$19,614,100	\$18,973,000	\$19,937,000
Amount from Fees, Other	\$36,173,200	\$37,203,600	\$38,839,200	\$38,760,800
Enter additional information/notes here:	SRF funding is included in state EAB. State provided below SRF amounts as additional information: FY2016 DWSRF: \$8,787,000 CWSRF: \$8,333,000 FY2017 DWSRF: \$8,312,000 CWSRF: \$7,977,000 FY2018 DWSRF: \$8,241,000 CWSRF: \$7,915,000 FY2019 DWSRF: \$11,107,000 CWSRF: \$9,603,000			

Arizona	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$131,465,900	\$157,315,800	\$155,825,100	\$160,696,850
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF N/A	CWSRF N/A	CWSRF N/A	CWSRF N/A
Amount from General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$20,051,700	\$21,221,260	\$20,282,900	\$20,327,760
Amount from Fees, Other	\$111,414,200	\$136,094,540	\$135,542,200	\$140,369,090
Enter additional information/notes here:	VW Settlement funding utilized in FY2019 was \$78,750. Remaining amount of \$914,750 is not included in above amount.			

Arkansas	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$106,114,781	\$115,734,680	\$127,356,469	\$136,288,549
Budget Status	FINAL	FINAL	FINAL	FINAL
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Excluded	DWSRF Excluded	DWSRF Excluded	DWSRF Excluded
	CWSRF Excluded	CWSRF Excluded	CWSRF Excluded	CWSRF Excluded
Amount from General Fund	\$5,127,142	\$5,129,143	\$5,036,257	\$5,214,484,
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$19,815,673	\$19,447,035	\$19,007,835	\$26,095,607
Amount from Fees, Other	\$81,171,966	\$91,158,502	\$103,312,377	\$104,978,458
Enter additional information/notes here:	Trust funds such as, Solid Waste Post Closure Trust Fund, Regulated Storage Tank Trust Fund, and State Remedial Action Trust Fund are included in the budget numbers.			

California	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$3.7B	\$4.0B	\$4.6B	\$5.1B
Budget Status	enacted	enacted	enacted	enacted
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF \$8.3 m	DWSRF \$8.3 M	DWSRF \$8.3 M	DWSRF \$7.1 M
	CWSRF \$21 m	CWSRF \$21 M	CWSRF \$21 M	CWSRF \$21.9 M
Amount from General Fund	\$89.6 M	\$97.6 M	\$133 M	\$195.6 M
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$361.5 M	\$362.6 M	\$346.5 M	\$346.5 M
Amount from Fees, Other	\$3.2 B	\$3.5 B	\$4.1 B	\$4.6 B
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>For each FY under “fees, other,” we have included reimbursements, local assistance and bond funding; all figures are “rounded.” VW settlement included in budget (\$25 million for Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program and \$2.3 million for staffing to implement provisions within consent decree)</p> <p>CalEPA’s budget significantly increased from FY2016 to FY2019 for several reasons. First, in 2014, California voters passed Proposition 1. This proposition authorized \$7.5B in general obligation bonds to address the impacts of the drought, including \$1.8B appropriated to the Water Board for water storage, water quality, flood protection, watershed restoration and protection, and safe drinking water improvements in disadvantaged communities. California’s drought response continued into 2019 despite recent rain and snowfall. Second, increased auction revenues from an expanded cap-and-trade expenditure plan meant more money was appropriated for programs. Third, the agency received an influx of almost \$300M to complete remediation work at residential properties that were contaminated by a lead acid battery facility. Finally, CalEPA received more than \$500M the last couple years for cleanup and debris removal in the wake of three major wildfires.</p>			

Colorado	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$81,297,450	\$79,903,046	\$80,185,712	\$76,726,927
Budget Status	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF \$14,468,000	DWSRF \$14,344,000	DWSRF \$21,946,000	DWSRF \$21,741,000
	CWSRF \$10,795,000	CWSRF \$10,712,000	CWSRF \$12,969,000	CWSRF \$12,838,000
Amount from General Fund	\$4,396,271	\$4,209,494	\$5,450,766	\$4,705,670
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$29,657,027	\$26,696,918	\$26,616,265	\$26,598,546
Amount from Fees, Other	\$47,244,152	\$48,996,634	\$48,118,681	\$45,422,711
Enter additional information/notes here:	SRF funding is not reflected in the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment (CDPHE) budget. A separate state entity serves as the grantee for the SRF. CDPHE's role with the SRF program is to provide technical and administrative management.			

Delaware	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$72,367,954	\$78,589,505	\$101,971,600	\$73,941,472
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF/Non-Fed Admin)	DWSRF Excluded	DWSRF Excluded	DWSRF Excluded	DWSRF Excluded
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$18,960,878	\$20,566,133	\$17,921,130	\$25,283,576
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$15,219,016	\$25,926,861	\$52,874,290	\$15,897,451
Amount from Fees, Other	\$38,188,060	\$32,096,511	\$31,176,180	\$32,760,445
Enter additional information/notes here:	2016-2019 Delaware Environmental Budget Data Includes: The Office of the Secretary (prorated by 55% for environmental personnel only); OTS Environmental Finance (CW/DW); OTS Community Services (EPO/FOIA/Ombudsman); and Divisions of Air Quality, Water, Waste, and Watershed. Does not include the OTS (natural resource compliment of 45%) or the Divisions of Parks and Recreation, Fish and Wildlife, & Energy and Climate.			

Florida	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	1,319,841,941 FY 2015-16	1,590,359,902 FY 2016-17	1,352,168,931 FY 2017-18	1,622,875,592 FY 2018-19
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	141,830,415	151,193,013	183,483,538	217,586,665
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	366,052,111	304,612,822	291,235,038	353,530,525
Amount from Fees, Other	811,959,415	1,134,554,067	877,450,355	1,051,758,402
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>VW funds excluded.</p> <p>Florida's Department of Environmental Protection (FL DEP) saw an increase of \$217.6 million in general funding support from FY2016 to FY2019. The increase in general funding support to FL DEP was attributed to an increase in funding for the Florida Forever Program, Florida's premier conservation and recreation lands acquisition program. Additional funding was also provided to expedite the repair of the Herbert Hoover Dike.</p> <p>Between FY2016 and FY2019 funding from the fees and other category increased by \$239.8 million. This increase can be attributed to growth in funding for Florida's Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan for the restoration of the Everglades ecosystem in South Florida. The increase in the fees and other category from FY2016 to FY2017 is also due to the practice of "double budgeting," in which the Florida legislature appropriated a transfer of approximately \$156.8 million in revenue from one funding source to another.</p>			

Georgia	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$127,295,435	\$150,745,080	\$134,728,374	\$117,371,706
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$30,054,296	\$30,508,349	\$30,795,827	\$31,102,464
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$38,107,130	\$59,873,670	\$42,415,486	\$33,069,652
Amount from Fees, Other	\$59,134,009	\$60,363,061	\$61,517,061	\$53,199,590

Idaho	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$64,620,900	\$67,332,600	\$67,889,900	\$66,960,100
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF \$7,824,751	DWSRF \$7,778,384	DWSRF \$9,004,445	DWSRF \$13,404,161
	CWSRF \$8,305,995	CWSRF \$7,703,137	CWSRF \$7,871,147	CWSRF \$9,455,316
Amount from General Fund	\$16,449,600	\$17,908,000	\$19,621,100	\$20,461,700
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$37,443,300	\$38,133,800	\$36,464,300	\$28,940,800
Amount from Fees, Other	\$10,728,000	\$11,290,800	\$11,804,500	\$17,557,600

Illinois	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$346,210,024	\$349,300,800	\$379,175,900	\$386,924,600
Budget Status	Final	Final		Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$0	\$0	\$500,000	\$0
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$65,607,600	\$65,607,600	\$82,085,600	\$81,906,200
Amount from Fees, Other	\$280,602,424	\$283,693,200	\$296,590,300	\$305,018,400

Iowa	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	58,629,319	55,596,410	53,428,552	57,123,724
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	3,335,161	3,155,484	3,086,318	3,292,662
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	29,086,306	25,585,273	25,557,653	29,115,638
Amount from Fees, Other	26,207,852	26,855,653	24,784,581	24,715,424
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>Budgets are estimated projections of revenue and expenses. Actual revenue and expenses are typically lower than budget projections.</p> <p>SRF funding is included in state EAB. State provided below SRF amounts as additional information:</p> <p>FY2016 DWSRF: \$994,224 CWSRF: \$3,762,555</p> <p>FY2017 DWSRF: \$1,057,188 CWSRF: \$3,746,905</p> <p>FY2018 DWSRF: \$851,596 CWSRF: \$4,286,219</p> <p>FY2019 DWSRF: \$336,979 CWSRF: \$4,054,274</p>			

Kansas	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	65,588,718	67,861,397	76,680,153	70,717,031
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	4,378,457	4,292,462	4,091,331	4,443,941
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	19,328,779	19,709,242	21,734,037	19,653,568
Amount from Fees, Other	41,881,482	43,859,693	50,854,785	46,619,522

Kentucky	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$102,932,538.82	\$103,989,427.72	\$99,411,922.95	\$107,027,689.03
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$20,837,500.00	\$22,012,200.00	\$19,841,700.00	\$24,125,400.00
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$21,690,201.04	\$23,387,535.91	\$22,596,776.95	\$25,774,671.79
Amount from Fees, Other	\$60,404,837.78	\$58,589,691.81	\$56,973,446.00	\$57,127,617.24

Louisiana	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
------------------	----------------	----------------	----------------	----------------

Environmental Agency Budget	\$113,077,796	\$119,706,225	\$126,860,579	\$126,208,538
Budget Status	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$419,364	\$0	\$0	\$0
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$24,883,179	\$24,885,647	\$24,914,915	\$22,257,933
Amount from Fees, Other	\$87,775,253	\$94,820,578	\$101,945,664	\$103,950,605
Enter additional information/notes here:	Interagency transfers include funding from other state agencies for NRDA type activities. Statutory dedication includes funding collected from departmental fees for all agency activities.			

Maine	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$82,615,609	\$80,760,248	\$73,746,346	\$76,539,191
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$7,641,017	\$7,631,386	\$7,860,985	\$9,474,599
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$18,248,904	\$17,825,039	\$14,750,559	\$14,455,559
Amount from Fees, Other	\$56,725,688	\$55,303,823	\$51,134,802	\$52,609,033

Maryland	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$377,719,665	\$410,219,295	\$391,064,278	\$449,525,409
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$32,117,337	\$29,885,460	\$28,868,614	\$30,985,752
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$74,785,088	\$74,210,900	\$70,863,231	\$75,467,381
Amount from Fees, Other	\$270,817,240	\$306,122,935	\$291,332,433	\$343,072,276
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>'Amount from Fees, Other' category includes reimbursable funds from other state agencies and the matching funds for the SRF programs. 'Environmental Agency Budget' does not include GO bond funds for non-SRF capital grant programs.</p>			<p>Same general note as included for FY16-FY18; increase in 'fees, other' is largely attributed to an increase in projects funded through the SRF loan programs, and to the inclusion of \$6million for the Clean Water Commerce Act.</p>

Massachusetts	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$106,111,166	\$116,191,850	\$121,158,710	\$131,640,242
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$48,778,459	\$48,920,922	\$49,531,578	\$56,127,623
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$18,998,635	\$20,600,165	\$19,919,889	\$21,278,179
Amount from Fees, Other	\$28,518,058	\$33,053,192	\$36,698,510	\$35,550,910
Capital Spending Included in the Env. Agency Budget ¹⁴	\$9,816,014	\$13,617,571	\$15,008,733	\$18,683,530
Enter additional information/notes here:	Massachusetts includes Capital Spending in its EAB. Massachusetts reported SRF funds under Fees/Other category because the Massachusetts Clean Water Trust is the primary recipient of SRF funds. Capital Spending included in the EAB and under Fees' Other (Annual Breakdown: FY 2016 - \$9,816,014; FY 2017 - \$13,617,571; FY 2018 - \$15,008,733; FY 2019 - \$18,683,530).			

¹⁴ ECOS included MA's capital spending under the Fees and Other category for all calculations for national consistency.

Michigan	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$540,662,800	\$620,336,400	\$571,575,200	\$501,302,600
Budget Status	Enacted	Enacted	Enacted	Enacted
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$87,104,200	\$49,273,400	\$81,151,500	\$58,546,500
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$138,079,100	\$239,022,800	\$170,042,600	\$160,225,400
Amount from Fees, Other	\$315,479,500	\$332,040,200	\$320,381,100	\$282,530,700
Enter additional information/notes here:	FY16 general fund increase due to Flint emergency. FY18 general fund increase due to Flint emergency and PFAS response. FY17 federal increase due to WIIN allocation.			*Amount includes \$506,600 from Volkswagen settlement used for administrative and other support costs. Funds expended to grantees from the settlement are disbursed directly from the trust and are not reflected in any of the values.

Minnesota	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$196,813,663	\$233,131,633	\$315,556,463	\$215,897,512
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF 0	DWSRF 0	DWSRF 0	DWSRF 0
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$8,541,783	\$7,676,791	\$6,105,978	\$8,064,631
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$21,076,925	\$20,327,914	\$18,579,671	\$15,734,503
Amount from Fees, Other	\$167,194,955	\$205,126,928	\$290,870,814	\$192,098,378
Enter additional information/notes here	VW Operations Inc: SRF Admin Inc: \$1,564,454	VW Operations Inc: State Bonds Inc: \$26,565,392 SRF Admin Inc: \$1,566,608	VW Operations Inc: 3M Settlement Inc: \$125,363,859 (this amount is out of the \$850M settlement that will fund projects for upwards of 10 years. Future expenditures are all tied to this one settlement.) SRF Admin Inc: \$1,609,777	VW Operations Inc: \$524,930 3M Settlement Inc: \$4,739,353 State Bonds Inc: \$10,013,408 SRF Admin Inc: \$1,654,668

Mississippi	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$307,845,384	\$351,282,806	\$290,744,308	\$308,443,713
Budget Status	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$11,793,699	\$10,132,875	\$9,980,940	\$10,011,182
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$117,728,932	\$134,019,573	\$127,378,700	\$135,797,950
Amount from Fees, Other	\$178,322,753	\$207,130,358	\$153,384,668	\$162,634,581

Missouri	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$420,750,438	\$442,249,801	\$440,746,774	\$442,211,759
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$8,403,325	\$8,547,170	\$8,050,036	\$7,822,320
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$264,029,525	\$264,576,091	\$262,856,187	\$262,492,872
Amount from Fees, Other	\$148,317,588	\$169,126,540	\$169,840,551	\$171,896,567
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>The data includes environmental operating budgets. It does not include fringe benefits or administrative costs (including information technology and real estate) that are budgeted in other agencies' budgets.</p> <p>Volkswagen (VW) operating costs of \$164,465 are included in the FY 2019 Fees/Other category (FY2019 was the first year of appropriation). VW pass-through funding is not included in the data above.</p> <p>New federal investment and set-aside portions of SRF funding are included in the Federal category. SRF revolving funds are excluded. (continued on following page)</p> <p>The removal of estimated appropriations several years ago necessitated increased appropriation levels in many areas, primarily pass-through programs involving multi-year projects. As a result, the department's environmental budget for fiscal years 2016 through 2019 includes \$153,489,999 encumbrance authority (not spending authority) for tracking and obligating several of our multi-year pass-through programs (\$139,400,000 Federal and \$14,089,999 Fees/Other).</p>			

Montana	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$89,716,339.19	\$85,059,942.41	\$69,087,246.68	\$71,256,693.37
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$5,370,240.63	\$5,672,572.65	\$4,841,764.38	\$4,735,439.25
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$16,837,325.58	\$19,483,328.35	\$18,683,641.56	\$18,129,297.39
Amount from Fees, Other	\$67,508,772.98	\$59,904,041.41	\$45,561,840.74	\$48,391,956.73

Nebraska	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$64,213,096	\$89,165,168	\$72,687,394	\$72,528,802
Budget Status	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$5,483,798	\$6,854,864	\$3,994,702	\$3,652,217
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$32,434,035	\$46,025,238	\$36,538,467	\$36,633,904
Amount from Fees, Other	\$26,295,263	\$36,285,066	\$32,154,225	\$32,242,681

Nevada	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget Includes SRF Operating Budget	\$40,984,689	\$38,450,020	\$41,213,685	\$40,233,205
Budget Status	Legislatively Approved	Legislatively Approved	Legislatively Approved	Legislatively Approved
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF) (Loan Funds Only)	DWSRF \$43,488,390	DWSRF \$28,149,914	DWSRF \$33,304,592	DWSRF \$31,286,503
	CWSRF \$45,785,504	CWSRF \$34,113,598	CWSRF \$38,260,373	CWSRF \$35,502,138
Amount from General Fund	-0-	-0-	-0-	-0-
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA) Total SRF Federal Grant	Operating- \$15,684,068 SRF- \$41,731,751	Operating- \$13,388,226 SRF- \$24,082,592	Operating- \$16,410,903 SRF- \$18,080,941	Operating- \$14,151,475 SRF- \$21,883,911
Amount from Fees, Other Total SRF: interest/bonds/loan repay etc.	Operating- \$25,300,621 SRF- \$47,542,143	Operating- \$25,061,794 SRF- \$38,180,920	Operating- \$24,802,782 SRF- \$53,484,024	Operating- \$26,081,730 SRF- \$44,904,730
Enter additional information/notes here:	*\$330,840.00 VW funds were used in FY2019 for operating costs associated with administering the VW settlement funds.			

New Hampshire	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$275,206,519	\$203,224,646	\$234,337,274	\$287,253,707
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$18,049,168	\$21,892,854	\$18,779,542	\$19,129,352
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$69,668,325	\$71,574,461	\$65,778,144	\$60,694,491
Amount from Fees, Other	\$187,489,026	\$109,757,331	\$149,779,588	\$207,429,864
Enter additional information/notes here:	The budget amounts include SRF funds. SRF funds account for, on average, approximately 45% of the NHDES Operating Budget.			*Includes \$500,350 received from VW emissions settlement (\$120,000 used for agency staff costs and \$380,350 used for grants); NH DES not the primary agency for VW moneys

New Jersey	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$493,243,000	\$519,536,000	\$574,489,000	\$576,568,000
Budget Status	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$111,591,000	\$103,352,000	\$111,872,000	\$105,168,000
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$132,394,000	\$146,628,000	\$146,930,000	\$142,005,000
Amount from Fees, Other	\$249,258,000	\$269,556,000	\$315,687,000	\$329,395,000
Enter additional information/notes here:	Trust Fund balances account for the fluctuation in Environmental Agency Budget.			

New Mexico	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$84,821,175	\$88,038,741	\$84,597,945	\$79,161,523
Budget Status	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated	Appropriated
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Set-asides included	DWSRF Set-asides included	DWSRF Set-asides included	DWSRF Set-asides included
	CWSRF 4% included	CWSRF 4% included	CWSRF 4% included	CWSRF 4% included
Amount from General Fund	\$8,437,645	\$7,590,786	\$7,022,195	\$7,182,290
Special Appropriations	\$3,300,000	\$2,400,000	\$2,800,000	\$4,132,600
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$25,589,066	\$28,960,231	\$26,956,866	\$23,105,690
Amount from Fees, Other ¹⁵	\$47,494,464	\$49,087,724	\$47,818,884	\$44,740,943
Enter additional information/notes here:	SRF funding is included in state EAB. State provided below SRF amounts as additional information: FY2016 CWSRF: \$4,644,372 FY2017 CWSRF: \$4,762,582 FY2018 CWSRF: \$5,363,272 FY2019 CWSRF: \$5,624,275			

¹⁵ ECOS included NM Special Appropriations the in Fees and Other Category for all calculations.

New York	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$ 628,314,657	\$ 757,143,170	\$ 714,103,026	\$ 903,617,555
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$ 66,365,191	\$ 63,152,599	\$ 62,244,963	\$ 70,789,720
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$ 190,134,082	\$ 244,164,120	\$ 188,746,097	\$ 254,775,286
Amount from Fees, Other	\$ 371,815,384	\$ 449,826,451	\$ 463,111,966	\$ 578,052,549
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>FY 2016 is 4/1/15-3/31/16; FY 2017 is 4/1/16-3/31/17; FY 2018 is 4/1/17-3/31/18; FY 2019 is 4/1/18-3/31/19. CW SRF Federal and Match are included in the Federal and Other sections above respectively.</p> <p>Expenditures from the following Divisions are excluded from the Environmental Agency Budget: Fish & Wildlife, Marine Resources, Lands & Forests, Forest Protection, and Mineral Resources. These Divisions were deemed to be involved in Natural Resource Management, and the request below instructed those costs not be included.</p> <p>The increase in federal funding is largely due to NY DEC's spending on the CW SRF Program. NY DEC saw a substantial increase in the drawdown of a multiyear CW SRF disaster recovery grant associated with Hurricane Sandy that rose from \$8.4M in FY2018 to \$43.6M in FY2019, an increase of \$35.2M. Additionally, the regular annual CW SRF Program grant drawdown rose from \$146M in FY2018 to \$177M in FY2019, an increase of \$31M.</p> <p>The increase in the fees and other category is due to an increase in funding related to capital spending projects. For example, in 2017 to 2018 New York State enacted the \$2.5B Clean Water Infrastructure Act and followed up with an additional \$500M the following year.</p>			

North Carolina	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$610,086,275	\$580,451,194	\$603,390,104	\$602,889,653
Budget Status	Enacted	Enacted	Enacted	Enacted
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$65,009,487	\$65,164,586	\$59,628,216	\$59,118,149
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$143,499,066	\$149,773,265	\$159,249,543	\$150,905,053
Amount from Fees Other (Transfers, Reimbursements, etc.)	\$264,331,623	\$265,914,134	\$227,619,415	\$234,514,687
<i>Fees, Other Total¹⁶</i>	\$137,246,099 <i>\$401,577,722</i>	\$99,599,209 <i>\$365,513,343</i>	\$156,892,930 <i>\$384,512,345</i>	\$158,351,764 <i>\$392,866,451</i>
Enter additional information/notes here:	Other (Transfers, Reimbursements, etc.) are the net transfers in and out from other agencies and fund sources, some of which are state statutory requirements, that supplement the actual fees we are allowed charge, to complete our agency budget.			

North Dakota	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$20,860,650	\$21,055,929	\$19,617,430	\$21,179,127
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$5,229,011	\$6,415,065	\$4,527,120	\$6,645,068
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$11,300,944	\$10,140,117	\$9,741,408	\$10,700,325
Amount from Fees, Other	\$4,330,695	\$4,500,747	\$5,348,902	\$3,833,734
Enter additional information/notes here:	For the DWSRF and CWSRF only administrative funds portion included in budget amounts.			

¹⁶ NC "Fees, Other Total" used by ECOS for all calculations.

Oklahoma	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$77,163,896	\$75,976,008	\$74,883,040	\$81,461,639
Budget Status	Enacted	Enacted	Enacted	Enacted
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF NA	CWSRF NA	CWSRF NA	CWSRF NA
Amount from General Fund	\$6,776,896	\$5,987,388	\$5,657,985*	\$6,493,879
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$21,000,000	\$23,564,228	\$22,252,330	\$29,562,612**
Amount from Fees, Other	\$49,387,000	\$46,424,392	\$46,972,725	\$45,405,148
Enter additional information/notes here:	*FY2018 Amount listed from General Fund received \$1,000,000 from Other Funds based upon HB1020 and then later it was decreased by \$37,781 due to an amended General Appropriations bill reducing FY2018 funding levels			**FY2019 Amount from Federal Gov't increased due to a Tar Creek Project (VW Settlement Funds are not reflected above)

Oregon	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$107,256,747	\$107,256,747	\$129,655,151	\$129,655,151
Budget Status	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General & Lottery Funds	\$18,987,924	\$18,987,924	\$23,765,757	\$23,765,757
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$11,894,029	\$11,894,029	\$13,550,543	\$13,550,543
Amount from Fees, Other	\$76,374,794	\$76,374,794	\$92,338,851	\$92,338,851

Pennsylvania	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$696,289,000	\$671,991,000	\$710,431,000	\$810,132,000
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Available (Enacted)
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$148,356,000	\$146,447,000	\$158,539,000	\$137,721,000
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$218,228,000	\$217,881,000	\$223,456,000	\$252,944,000
Amount from Fees, Other	\$329,705,000	\$307,663,000	\$328,436,000	\$419,467,000

Puerto Rico	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$54,070,000	\$54,343,000	\$50,803,000	\$57,594,000
Budget Status	Spent	Spent	Spent	Spent
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$7,083,000	\$6,710,000	\$5,405,000	\$24,010,000
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$28,447,000	\$29,093,000	\$27,247,000	\$24,983,000
Amount from Fees, Other	\$18,540,000	\$18,540,000	\$18,151,000	\$8,601,000
Enter additional information/notes here:	FY 2018 to FY 2019 General Fund increase due to new employee retirement plan contributions and state share for federal grants.			

Rhode Island	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$27,319,460	\$25,808,330	\$25,519,881	\$25,327,466
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$11,792,235	\$11,659,583	\$11,729,067	\$11,979,283
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$8,101,776	\$7,013,974	\$6,084,005	\$7,762,000
Amount from Fees, Other	\$7,425,449	\$7,134,773	\$7,706,809	\$5,586,183

South Carolina	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$94,821,949	\$110,205,257	\$105,975,827	\$107,176,226
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$36,960,517	\$40,398,464	\$42,143,061	\$42,535,617
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$23,577,231	\$24,472,511	\$24,240,218	\$26,277,179
Amount from Fees, Other	\$34,284,201	\$45,334,282	\$39,592,548	\$38,363,430

South Dakota	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$24,084,654	\$24,572,867	\$24,596,080	\$24,807,503
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF \$8,312,000	DWSRF \$8,241,000	DWSRF \$11,107,000	DWSRF \$11,004,000
	CWSRF \$6,525,000	CWSRF \$6,474,000	CWSRF \$7,859,000	CWSRF \$7,779,000
Amount from General Fund	\$6,445,415	\$6,626,659	\$6,634,641	\$6,714,350
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$8,202,621	\$8,495,257	\$8,342,796	\$8,420,978
Amount from Fees, Other	\$9,436,618	\$9,450,951	\$9,618,643	\$9,672,175

Tennessee	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$178,557,700	\$201,052,200	\$207,219,900	\$207,740,500
Budget Status	Approved	Approved	Approved	Approved
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$26,260,000	\$24,877,400	\$32,516,900	\$32,518,100
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$59,044,300	\$79,757,000	\$76,525,200	\$76,553,500
Amount from Fees, Other	\$ 93,253,400	\$96,417,800	\$98,177,800	\$ 98,668,900

Texas	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$431,900,347	\$474,045,329	\$413,757,594	\$440,070,739
Budget Status	Final	Final	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$9,905,230	\$12,491,302	\$16,417,343	\$19,986,615
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$48,428,230	\$50,109,468	\$44,571,219	\$48,748,194
Amount from Fees, Other	\$373,566,887	\$411,444,559	\$352,769,032	\$371,335,930
Enter additional information/notes here:	The TCEQ receives the 2% set aside, the 10% set aside and a portion of the 15% set aside of the DWSRF. The TCEQ also receives 1% CWSRF for the 604(b) Water Quality Management Grant. These funds are reported in the Federal category.			

Utah	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$50,733,200	\$52,441,500	\$55,085,200	\$62,107,700
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF \$7,130,000	DWSRF \$4,291,760	DWSRF \$6,660,060	DWSRF \$5,821,600
	CWSRF \$3,251,000	CWSRF \$2,861,865	CWSRF \$6,043,915	CWSRF \$2,235,800
Amount from General Fund	\$14,254,300	\$14,477,800	\$15,165,000	\$20,501,200
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$16,779,400	\$17,037,900	\$18,103,600	\$23,495,000
Amount from Fees, Other	\$19,699,500	\$20,925,800	\$21,816,600	\$18,111,500
Enter additional information/notes here:	Budgets are from COBI Reports from Legislature. Budget amounts include admin costs and set aside funding from SRF grants. SRF amounts are actual federal amounts drawn down that year for loans.			

Vermont	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$63,384,488	\$63,940,888	\$74,754,386	\$85,958,048
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$8,315,537	\$8,093,383	\$8,920,239	\$9,645,537
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$27,638,952	\$25,519,480	\$26,856,080	\$31,438,508
Amount from Fees, Other	\$27,429,999	\$30,328,025	\$38,978,067	\$44,874,003
Enter additional information/notes here:	Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF) only includes the federal grant portion.			Total reduced by \$420,885 for VW

Virginia	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$251,409,067	\$253,386,025	\$224,683,429	\$267,966,534
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$40,235,427	\$41,211,049	\$41,218,434	\$40,724,633
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$52,487,150	\$51,433,744	\$57,433,744	\$77,488,278
Amount from Fees, Other	\$158,686,490	\$160,741,232	\$126,031,251	\$149,753,623
Enter additional information/notes here:	<p>\$2,135,780 in SRF is included in the grand total for each year. This \$2,135,780 in state SRF matching falls under the general fund category.</p> <p>The change in federal funding from FY2016 to FY2019 is due to the process by which Virginia draws SRF funds. States can have multiple grants active. In FY2019 VADEQ funded one very land conservation project that contributed to SRF appropriations increase for drawdown of more than one open grant.</p>			

Washington	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$188,887,235	\$212,969,603	\$205,340,067	\$234,282,457
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A	DWSRF N/A
	CWSRF \$168,627,334	CWSRF \$145,972,098	CWSRF \$117,644,767	CWSRF \$76,645,744
Amount from General Fund	\$24,455,367	\$24,436,795	\$19,082,365	\$21,231,481
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$35,664,480	\$36,601,796	\$36,664,647	\$33,613,626
Amount from Fees, Other	\$128,767,388	\$151,931,012	\$149,593,055	\$179,437,350
Enter additional information/notes here:	Amounts included in budget are the agency's actual operating expenditures. Actual expenditures for SRF loans from the capital budget are shown separately in the Amount from SRF.			

West Virginia	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$233,897,346	\$285,722,920	\$250,635,922	\$224,032,859
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)				
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$5,908,869	\$5,875,639	\$5,786,422	\$5,956,487
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$86,778,220	\$79,064,012	\$101,502,231	\$94,808,996
Amount from Fees, Other	\$141,210,257	\$200,783,269	\$143,347,269	\$123,267,376

Wisconsin	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$234,332,469	\$241,969,700	\$238,687,697	\$258,853,128
Budget Status	Final	Final	Final	Final
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$35,277,742	\$33,620,541	\$32,673,015	\$36,771,208
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$70,785,748	\$82,377,629	\$83,035,010	\$88,759,115
Amount from Fees, Other	\$128,268,979	\$125,971,530	\$122,979,672	\$133,322,805

Wyoming	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget	\$38,711,641	\$45,500,840	\$30,522,274	\$39,115,169
Budget Status	Actual	Actual	Actual	Actual
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included	DWSRF Included
	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included	CWSRF Included
Amount from General Fund	\$17,155,200	\$16,269,651	\$16,265,096	\$16,657,228
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)	\$6,200,158	\$5,672,200	\$5,698,189	\$5,664,223
Amount from Fees, Other	\$15,356,283	\$23,558,989	\$8,558,989	\$16,793,718
Amount from Fees, Other	<p>State Revolving Fund loans are received by the agency from the Office of State Lands and Investments (OSLI) for remediation of hydrocarbon contamination from underground storage tanks. The source of the loans is SRF Capitalization Grants received by OSLI, however, the budget for this report is recorded under "fees/other" because DEQ is not the grantee. The Fees/Other numbers above include SRF Loans of: 2016 \$8,000,000; 2017 \$15,000,000; 2018 \$0, 2019 \$9,000,000. These additional amounts are one-time funds and not for core programs.</p> <p>Decrease in 2016 through 2019 General Funds is due to fact that in 2013; 2014; 2015 separate legislatively mandated Landfill Remediation Program was funded with State general funds that are not part of the agency's "standard" budget. The General Fund numbers included Landfill Remediation dollars of: 2013 \$15,000,000; 2014 \$15,000,000; 2015 \$17,000,000.</p>			

Appendix 10. Example State Budget Response Form

**State Environmental Agency Budgets, Fiscal Years 2016-2019
Update Request for U.S. Virgin Islands**

Contact Name: _____
Contact Phone Number: _____ **Email:** _____
Fiscal Year Begins: _____ **Fiscal Year Ends:** _____

(See below for explanatory notes)	FY 2016	FY 2017	FY 2018	FY 2019
Environmental Agency Budget+				
Budget Status++				
Amount from State Revolving Fund (SRF)+++	DWSRF	DWSRF	DWSRF	DWSRF
	CWSRF	CWSRF	CWSRF	CWSRF
Amount from General Fund++++				
Amount from Federal Gov't (e.g., U.S. EPA)				
Amount from Fees, Other				
Enter additional information/notes here:				

Explanatory Notes:

+Agency Budget. This amount should not include funds for parks, natural resource management (e.g., forestry, fish and wildlife). The amount should include all delegated or authorized (e.g., RCRA) federal programs and related state programs that address air, water, drinking water, waste/land issues. Only include programs within your agency. ECOS realizes this may exclude drinking water, pesticides, and other programs for some states agencies and thus will not be fully captured by this budget update.

++Budget status. Please use the term your agency uses to describe the status of the budget, e.g., final, adopted, current, proposed, enacted, or other.

+++State Revolving Fund (SRF). If SRF monies are included in your agency budget calculation, write "included" in the "Amount from SRF" box. If SRF monies are provided to the state environmental agency, but not included in the budget calculation, write this dollar value in the "Amount from SRF" box.

++++General Funds. When accounting for general funds, please use direct appropriations only. Designated funds generated by the agency which go into the general fund and then are returned to the agency should be listed under **Fees, Other.**

Appendix 11. Volkswagen Settlement

The United States (U.S.) Department of Justice issued a partial consent decree in June 2016 settling claims by EPA and the Federal Trade Commission against Volkswagen AG (VW).¹⁷ Separate partial settlements were approved for VW vehicles with 2.0-liter diesel engines and VW vehicles containing 3.0-liter diesel engines.¹⁸ One requirement of the settlements is that VW must invest \$2.9 billion in an environmental mitigation trust. The goal of the trust is to fund projects that reduce diesel emissions in order to mitigate the environmental damage done by VW while it was violating the Clean Air Act. Portions of the trust have been allocated to states, tribes, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.¹⁹

The Trust Effective Date was October 2, 2017. Puerto Rico, the District of Columbia, and states were given 60 days (until December 1, 2017) from the Trust Effective Date to apply to be beneficiaries of the Trust. The court-designated trustee, Wilmington Trust, N.A., then had 120 days (until January 30, 2018) from the Trust Effective Date to review applications and designate beneficiaries. Once designated a beneficiary, the state had 30 days to submit a Beneficiary Mitigation Plan with funding requests to the trustee for approval. It was estimated that beneficiaries could expect to receive funds beginning six months after the Trust Effective Date (after April 2018).²⁰ The importance of the timeline to this report is that state agencies would have begun receiving funds from the trust at the earliest in the middle of or end of fiscal year 2018. Therefore, state environmental agencies would not reflect VW Settlement funding in their budgets until fiscal year 2019.

There are a variety of ways these funds are being deployed by states, which may include the environmental agency or another state agency. There are also a variety of ways states are approaching reduction of diesel emissions. The National Association of State Energy Officials and the National Association of Clean Air Agencies created the VW Clearinghouse, which catalogs different emission mitigation initiatives the states are funding with their allocations from the environmental mitigation trust.²¹ For example:

- Arizona submitted its Beneficiary Management Plan to the trustee on June 8, 2018. The plan dedicated \$13M to the replacement of state agency on-road vehicles and the remaining \$38M to the replacement of all state school buses. As of December 2019, 37 vehicles and 185 buses have been reimbursed.²²
- Delaware has implemented Phase 1 of its VW Environmental Mitigation Plan, which involved the replacement of diesel school buses with propane-fueled school buses.²³ In

¹⁷ VW Settlement Clearinghouse. NASEO & NACAA. <https://vwclearinghouse.org/>

¹⁸ “Volkswagen Clean Air Act Civil Settlement.” *United States Environmental Protection Agency*. EPA. <https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/volkswagen-clean-air-act-civil-settlement>

¹⁹ VW Settlement Clearinghouse. NASEO & NACAA. <https://vwclearinghouse.org/>

²⁰ “FAQ: Beneficiaries to the VW Mitigation Trust.” *United States Environmental Protection Agency*. EPA. <https://www.epa.gov/enforcement/faqs-beneficiaries-vw-mitigation-trust>

²¹ VW Settlement Clearinghouse. NASEO & NACAA. <https://vwclearinghouse.org/>

²² “Settlement-Related Progress and State Contacts.” VW Settlement Clearinghouse. NASEO & NACAA. https://vwclearinghouse.org/public/Settlement_Related_Progress_and_State_Contacts.pdf

²³ “VW Mitigation Plan.” *Delaware Department of Resources and Environmental Control*. <https://dnrec.alpha.delaware.gov/air/mobile-sources/vw-mitigation-plan/>

Phase 2 of Delaware’s Mitigation Plan, DNREC will issue a request for proposals for projects that will reduce NOx emissions in the transportation sector. Projects that best encapsulate the criteria outlined in the Mitigation Plan will be awarded funds.²⁴

- Kansas has provided 15 awards for the partial reimbursement of eligible school buses as of October 31, 2019. The Kansas Department of Health and Environment (KDHE) has since posted a new request for proposals and applications for a second round of school bus replacements.²⁵ Other spending options listed in the Kansas Mitigation Plan include allocation for electric vehicle charging infrastructure, replacement of government and non-government fleet vehicles, and engine replacement on pre-Tier 4 locomotives.²⁶

Additionally, the states that reported using a portion of their VW Settlement allocation in their responses to the ECOS budget survey included descriptions of how the funding is being used. For example:

- California reported that \$25M from its VW Settlement was used to fund its Enhanced Fleet Modernization Program. An additional \$2.3 million was used for staffing to implement provisions within the Consent Decree (See response p.42)
- Michigan reported that \$506,600 of their VW Settlement allocation was used for administrative and other support costs (See response p.50).
- New Hampshire reported that in fiscal year 2019, the \$500,350 the state received from the VW emissions settlement was used for agency staff costs (\$120,000) and for grants (\$380,350) (See response p.56).

For reference, state VW Environmental Mitigation Trust Allocations follow:²⁷

No.	State	Total Funding	2.0L Funding	3.0L Funding
1	Alabama	\$25 Million	\$24 Million	\$1 Million
2	Alaska	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand
3	Arizona	\$57 Million	\$53 Million	\$4 Million
4	Arkansas	\$15 Million	\$14 Million	\$697 Thousand
5	California	\$423 Million	\$381 Million	\$41 Million
6	Colorado	\$69 Million	\$61 Million	\$7 Million
7	Connecticut	\$56 Million	\$52 Million	\$4 Million
8	Delaware	\$10 Million	\$9 Million	\$625 Thousand
9	District of Columbia	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand
10	Florida	\$166 Million	\$152 Million	\$14 Million
11	Georgia	\$64 Million	\$58 Million	\$6 Million
12	Hawaii	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand
13	Idaho	\$17 Million	\$16 Million	\$1 Million
14	Illinois	\$109 Million	\$98 Million	\$11 Million

²⁴ “VW Mitigation Plan.” *Delaware Department of Resources and Environmental Control*.

<http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/Air/Documents/delaware-vw-mitigation-plan.pdf>

²⁵ “Volkswagen Settlement – Environmental Mitigation Trust.” *Kansas Department of Health and Environment*.

<https://www.kdheks.gov/bar/air-monitor/dieselgrant/dieselvw.html>

²⁶ “Volkswagen Settlement – Environmental Mitigation Trust.” *Kansas Department of Health and Environment*.

<https://www.kdheks.gov/bar/air-monitor/dieselgrant/ks-beneficiary-mitigation-plan.pdf>

²⁷ Environmental Mitigation Trust Allocation amounts provided by NASEO & NACAA VW Settlement Clearinghouse Funding Dashboard at <https://vwclearinghouse.org/>

15	Indiana	\$41 Million	\$39 Million	\$2 Million
16	Iowa	\$21 Million	\$20 Million	\$1 Million
17	Kansas	\$16 Million	\$15 Million	\$871 Thousand
18	Kentucky	\$20 Million	\$19 Million	\$1 Million
19	Louisiana	\$20 Million	\$18 Million	\$2 Million
20	Maine	\$21 Million	\$20 Million	\$797 Thousand
21	Maryland	\$76 Million	\$71 Million	\$5 Million
22	Massachusetts	\$75 Million	\$69 Million	\$6 Million
23	Michigan	\$65 Million	\$60 Million	\$4 Million
24	Minnesota	\$47 Million	\$44 Million	\$3 Million
25	Mississippi	\$10 Million	\$9 Million	\$625 Thousand
26	Missouri	\$41 Million	\$39 Million	\$2 Million
27	Montana	\$13 Million	\$12 Million	\$1 Million
28	Nebraska	\$12 Million	\$12 Million	\$720 Thousand
29	Nevada	\$25 Million	\$22 Million	\$3 Million
30	New Hampshire	\$31 Million	\$30 Million	\$1 Million
31	New Jersey	\$72 Million	\$65 Million	\$7 Million
32	New Mexico	\$18 Million	\$17 Million	\$1 Million
33	New York	\$128 Million	\$117 Million	\$10 Million
34	North Carolina	\$92 Million	\$87 Million	\$5 Million
35	North Dakota	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand
36	Ohio	\$75 Million	\$71 Million	\$4 Million
37	Oklahoma	\$21 Million	\$19 Million	\$2 Million
38	Oregon	\$73 Million	\$68 Million	\$5 Million
39	Pennsylvania	\$119 Million	\$111 Million	\$8 Million
40	Puerto Rico	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand
41	Rhode Island	\$14 Million	\$13 Million	\$874 Thousand
42	South Carolina	\$34 Million	\$32 Million	\$2 Million
43	South Dakota	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand
44	Tennessee	\$46 Million	\$42 Million	\$3 Million
45	Texas	\$209 Million	\$192 Million	\$17 Million
46	Utah	\$35 Million	\$32 Million	\$3 Million
47	Vermont	\$19 Million	\$18 Million	\$891 Thousand
48	Virginia	\$94 Million	\$88 Million	\$6 Million
49	Washington	\$113 Million	\$104 Million	\$9 Million
50	West Virginia	\$12 Million	\$12 Million	\$625 Thousand
51	Wisconsin	\$67 Million	\$64 Million	\$4 Million
52	Wyoming	\$8 Million	\$8 Million	\$625 Thousand