



Florida Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations

Interim Project Report



Survey of Florida Department of Environmental Protection's Federal Grants Program Participation *July 2006*

I. Background¹

Federal grants represent an important source of revenue to Florida's state and local governments. In fiscal year 2002, federal grant expenditures to Florida totaled \$15 billion, or \$900 per capita.² In 2002, Florida ranked 5th among the 50 states for total federal grant expenditures. However, due in large part, to its large population, Florida ranked 47th in receipt of federal grant funds on a per capita basis.³ Florida's consistently low ranking on a per capita basis has been a cause of concern to policy makers. As a result, the Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations (LCIR) has had a continuing interest in developing a comprehensive strategy to assist the Legislature and Governor in efforts to increase Florida's share of federal grant funds.

II. Methodology

In 2004 LCIR staff developed a federal grant questionnaire to solicit state agency input on the federal grant programs in which the agency participated.⁴ The survey was designed to identify factors and possible action steps/strategies to improve Florida's receipt of federal funds. The survey included a chart listing the federal grant programs administered by a specific state agency⁵, Florida's ranking in these programs relative to other states, and requested the agency's input regarding criteria or other factors that would improve Florida's receipt of funds from the grant program.

The objective of the survey was to assist in developing a strategy for Florida to increase its receipt of federal funds. Using state agency expertise, viable changes to federal and state laws

and regulations could be identified to achieve that goal. This information would then be passed on to Florida's Congressional Delegation.

In September 2004, LCIR staff approached the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to field test the federal grant survey. LCIR staff met with DEP staff regarding the project and DEP agreed to participate. DEP responded to LCIR's federal funds survey and provided LCIR staff with detailed information regarding 51 separate federal programs that the agency participates in, as well as a general response identifying the agency's top federal priorities.

LCIR staff compiled and analyzed the information received. Additionally LCIR's Federal Consultant, Mr. Vic Miller⁶, subsequently reviewed and commented on the survey responses providing LCIR with a federal perspective on the survey responses. This report describes the process and the findings of this joint evaluation of the federal grant programs in which DEP participates.

A. Survey

DEP provided LCIR staff with information on 51 separate federal grant programs in which it participates. For each federal grant program, DEP identified the name of the grant program, the corresponding Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number, and the name and contact information of the agency employee responding to the survey.

DEP was asked several questions to assess how the following influence Florida's receipt of federal grant funding:

- formula grant factors or project criteria used to determine the amount of funds awarded;
- constraints built into the formula/criteria for the grant;
- state laws and administrative rules, state policies (including explicit state choices not to participate or participate at a low level, availability of limited state funds for required match);
- federal laws (including statutes and agency administrative rules);
- federal policies; and
- other factors or criteria.

Regarding the federal funds allocated under that program in FFY 2002 and 2003, DEP was asked: the amount awarded to Florida; the amount of federal funds expended; and whether the entire program allocation was expended and if not, why? The survey then inquired whether any program funding had been lost during the corresponding years and if so, how much?

In order to identify potential strategies to enhance Florida's receipt of federal funds, DEP was asked to identify possible changes in state or federal policies and laws that would achieve this goal. As a follow up, DEP was also asked to comment on the feasibility of accomplishing the identified changes and whether staff knew of any similarly situated states that would be interested in partnering with Florida to achieve the identified changes.

All of DEP's responses were compiled into Table 2, attached. Individual survey responses were then reviewed by LCIR's Federal Consultant, Mr. Vic Miller. Mr. Miller's comments were incorporated into Table 3, attached, which also lists DEP suggested changes in federal and/or state law to enhance Florida's receipt of federal funds. A summary of DEP's federal grant programs, including a program description, suggested federal and state factors, and funds allocated, expended and state match is also attached.

B. Survey Responses

DEP submitted 51 completed questionnaires regarding federal programs that the agency participated in FFY 2002 and 2003. Of these federal programs 31 were categorized as formula grants and the remaining federal programs were categorized as either specific projects grants or claims. A "formula grant" is an "allocation of money to a state or its subdivisions in accordance with distribution formulas prescribed by law or administrative regulation, for activities of a continuing nature not confined to a specific project."⁷ A "specific project grant" is typically a one time award for a project that meets the goals of a particular federal program. A "claim" is defined as a proposal submitted by an eligible participant under a specific federal program.

LCIR staff determined to concentrate on the formula grants in which DEP participates. Because formula grants are awarded based on criteria and factors that are applied to the state across the board, LCIR staff believed that a review of these grants, rather than competitive grants or specific project grants, would have a greater likelihood of increasing Florida's share of federal funding. LCIR supplemented its research and analysis of the survey responses with interviews of DEP staff, primarily focusing on identifying and clarifying changes that would enhance Florida's receipt of federal funds. The result of that research is summarized below.

III. Findings

A. Potential Federal Action. Because formula grants are awarded based on criteria and factors that are uniformly applied to all participants, they have the potential to affect the entire state. Accordingly, LCIR staff focused on formula grants in which either DEP or LCIR's federal consultant had identified a criteria or factor that disadvantaged Florida's receipt of federal funds. A review of these grants showed that no one formula factor or criterion consistently disadvantages Florida, but rather a combination of factors and criteria disadvantage Florida's receipt of federal funds. These factors include:

1. ***Outdated Population Data.*** The use of population as a grant factor would appear to function as an advantage to Florida, one of the most populated and rapidly growing states in the nation. However, EPA's Non-Point Source Implementation Grant uses population counts based on 1980 Census data. Additionally, DOI's Wildlife Restoration Grants (Pittman-Robertson Program) uses 2000 Census data. Consequently, awards under these programs do not take into account the substantial growth Florida has experienced in the last decades. It would be in Florida's best interest to partner with similarly situated states, such as Texas, California, New York, etc., to ensure that these and future grants use the most recent population counts or estimates available.
2. ***Tourism Impact.*** Florida's significant tourism industry creates a variety of demands on the state's infrastructure. In spite of this, EPA's Capitalization Grants for Clean Water State Revolving Fund focus on resident population and do not take into account the impact that tourism and seasonal residents have on Florida's anti-pollution measures, such as wastewater treatment and water system supervision. LCIR's federal consultant suggests that it would benefit Florida to examine the impact that tourism and seasonal residents have on these systems and help redesign the federal programs to take this impact into account.⁸ Such an effort would help guarantee that the state's environmental efforts are not compromised by the tourism industry.
3. ***Small State Minimums and Equal Allocations.*** EPA's Capitalization Grants for Drinking Water program includes a one percent "small state minimum," a legislatively imposed minimum award for each participating state, regardless of size. Small state minimums disadvantage large and rapidly growing states, such as Florida, because they reduce the amount of available funds for remaining larger state participants. Another case in point is the Wildlife Restoration Grant Program. Under that program, Wyoming, with 0.17 percent of the nation's population, receives 0.50 percent share, or almost three times Wyoming's population share. In some federal grant programs the small state minimums are as high as one percent. When a small state in those federal programs receives a small state minimum of as much as one percent, the federal program's entire allocation is reduced by that much and the remainder is left to be divided among the larger states. Other federal programs, such as the Land and Water Conservation Fund and the EPA Pollution Prevention Grants, distribute their funds equally among participating states regardless of need. Due to its population and size, Florida is disadvantaged when either criteria is present in a federal formula.
4. ***Federally Imposed Caps.*** A few formula grants, such as the Coastal Zone Management Award Administrative Grants, have federally imposed caps on awards. This negatively affects large and rapidly growing states such as Florida.
5. ***State Share Stagnation.*** In some programs the state's share has become stagnant regardless of the state's growth. An example is EPA's Section 105 Air Pollution Control Grant where Florida's share became stagnant from 2000 – 2004. The program is currently under threat of being substantially cut, which will further reduce Florida's share.
6. ***In-Kind Match.*** Many programs which require state matches, accept in-kind match efforts such as employee time and resources rather than a formal cash match. In kind matches typically require extensive cost allocations schemes, which then require administrative efforts to track. In programs, such as STATEMAP, tracking these costs has proven difficult. Accordingly, the state would benefit from investigating whether this system could be improved by either a centralized cost allocation structure or where a grant requires excess administrative time, a direct match.

Although none of these factors are present in all of the federal grants in which DEP participates,

they are present in enough federal grants to negatively affect Florida's receipt of federal funds. Consequently, steps should be taken to either propose removal of these criteria from corresponding federal programs or lessen their effect.

B. Potential State Action

1. **Legislative Branch: Double Budget Authority.** Florida law requires that the budget authority to expend federal funds be authorized for each agency that processes the funds, even if its role is only to pass the funds through.⁹ This means that in programs like the Coastal Zone Management Grant Program, where DEP administers the program in which multiple agencies participate, budget authority to spend those same funds must be obtained twice. First the authority must be obtained by DEP, and then again by the program agency. This creates double budget authority in the state budget which results in an administrative burden and may contribute to loss of funds. The Legislature may want to reconsider whether an alternative appropriations structure is feasible.
2. **Executive Branch: In-Kind Matches.** Much of the matching funds for small federal grants are provided in-kind, *i.e.*, Florida provides resources such as employee time rather than a cash match. In-kind matches require extensive cost-allocation schemes, which then require administrative efforts for tracking costs. The state may want to investigate whether this system can be improved either through a more centralized allocation structure or, where excess administrative time is required, by a direct match.
3. **Administrative Costs as In-Kind Matches.** In some federal grants, DEP appears to be "maxed-out" in terms of using their administrative costs as in-kind contributions for federal match requirements. DEP may benefit from better systems to identify and utilize contributions from other state, local and private sources.

4. **FO-876 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement.** Under this cooperative agreement, joint research is conducted by Florida and the U.S. Department of Interior to locate beach-quality sand offshore. Current research on this issue is limited and increased funds from both Florida and the federal government might be considered. DEP has been notified that due to Hurricane Katrina relief efforts funding for this program will be substantially cut in the near future. LCIR's Federal Consultant and DEP believe that a letter from Governor Bush stressing the importance of this program may allow Florida to maintain this funding stream. DEP also identified Alabama as a state that might also benefit from such research and as a result might be willing to cooperate in such an effort.

IV. Recommendations

- The findings of this review should be sent to Florida's Congressional Delegation so that appropriate congressional action regarding environmental acts may be made to benefit Florida. These include amending the federal environmental acts to: (1) use the most recent population data where applicable; (2) take into account the impact that tourism has on the state's infrastructure, especially water treatment plants; (3) eliminate or reduce small state minimums and equal allocations; (4) eliminate federally imposed caps; and (5) investigate the reasons behind state share stagnation in several federal programs.
- Similarly situated states should be identified and approached regarding formulating a coordinated strategy to accomplish changes in federal law to benefit the environment.
- The Florida Legislature should reconsider the double-budget authority requirement especially as it applies to federal grant funds.

- The Florida Legislature may want to research whether the current system of accounting for in-kind matches for federal programs is cost effective or whether a more centralized cost-allocation scheme would be more efficient.
- DEP should approach the Governor to write letters to pertinent federal agencies to further DEP's goals in specific programs, such as in the case of Florida's Offshore Beach Quality Sand Research Cooperative Agreement Project.

FLORIDA LCIR

Website: <http://www.floridalcir.gov/>

600 South Calhoun Street

Suite 4, Holland Building

Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1300

(850) 488-9627 (Voice) (850) 487-6587 (Fax)

Alton L. "Rip" Colvin, Jr., LCIR Executive Director

ENDNOTES

¹ Information contained in this section was largely taken from Review of Federal Funding to Florida In Fiscal Year 2002, Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations (March 2004).

² Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, Review of Federal Funding to Florida in Fiscal Year 2002 (March 2004), at p. ii.

³ Id.

⁴ See, Federal Grant Questionnaire and Instruction for Completing the Federal Grants Survey, Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, October 2004 (Appendix 3).

⁵ See Table 1 – “Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in Federal Fiscal Year 2002, includes U.S. EPA Grant Programs, as well as Other Non-EPA Grant Programs Administered by Florida’s Department of Environmental Protection,” prepared by Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations, July 25, 2005 (Appendix 2).

⁶ Mr. Vic Miller, a Senior Fellow with the Federal Funds Information for States (FFIS), was under contract as a Federal Consultant with the LCIR from February 2003 to January 2005.

⁷ Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance, at http://12.46.245.173/pls/portal30/CATALOG.TYP_ASSISTANCE_DYN.show, on September 1, 2005.

⁸ Mr. Vic Miller, LCIR Federal Consultant.

⁹ s. 216.212(3), F.S. (2005).

Appendix.

1. Letter to Florida Department of Environmental Protection Secretary Colleen Castille, dated October 18, 2004.
2. Table 1 – Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in FFY 2002.
3. DEP Federal Grant Questionnaire with Instructions.
4. Table 2 - Survey Response Chart (Excel)
5. Table 3 - Survey Response Chart - Formula Only (Excel)
6. DEP Federal Grant Summaries

APPENDIX 1

Letter to DEP Secretary Colleen Castille, Dated October 18, 2004

James E. King, Jr.
President



Johnnie B. Byrd, Jr.
Speaker



The Florida Legislature
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE
ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

% Legislative Mail Services, Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300 Ph. (850) 488-9627 Suncom 278-9627 Fax 487-6587

October 18, 2004

Secretary Colleen M. Castille
Florida Department of Environmental Protection
3900 Commonwealth Blvd., M.S. 49
Tallahassee, Florida 32399

Dear Secretary Castille:

We appreciate the Florida Department of Environmental Protection's participation in the Legislative Committee on Intergovernmental Relations (LCIR) federal grants survey. As you know, the LCIR is interested in assisting policymakers in developing strategies to maximize Florida's receipt of federal funds. Accordingly, the LCIR is conducting an analysis of federal grant programs to identify potential areas that the State may choose to target to access more federal funds. The LCIR's project objective is to work with state agencies to make specific recommendations that policymakers may determine to pursue to ultimately increase Florida's receipt of federal funds.

Detailed information and input from your agency and those that administer these federal grant programs are critical to the success of the project. Accordingly, the LCIR requests that your agency complete the enclosed Federal Grants Survey, which is comprised of three parts.

- **Part I** requests that your agency provide comments that address:

- (1) your agency's *current and viable* federal funding priorities;
- (2) a list of suggested *practicable* actions that the state may want to explore to increase receipt of federal grant funding;
- (3) if new or additional match or maintenance of effort would be required for those suggested actions, indicate potential sources (other than state General Revenue);
- (4) a description of the manner in which your agency tracks and pursues federal funding opportunities and whether any FTE's are assigned to this particular duty; and
- (5) your agency's Federal Grants contact person(s).

CHAIR

Sen. Burt L. Saunders
Naples

VICE CHAIR

Rep. David Rivera
Miami

LEGISLATIVE MEMBERS

Rep. Mary Brandenburg
Palm Beach

Rep. Adam Hasner
Delray Beach

Sen. Mike Haridopolos
Melbourne

Sen. Evelyn J. Lynn
Ormond Beach

Sen. Lesley "Les" Miller
Tampa

Rep. Irving Slosberg
Boca Raton

GUBERNATORIAL APPOINTMENTS

Colleen Castille
Tallahassee

Eduardo Gonzalez
Hiialeah

Tom Greer
St. Cloud

Travis E. Potter
Tallahassee

Paula L. Riggs
Fort Walton Beach

Shannon H. Staub
Carmela Starace

Royal Palm Beach

Executive Director

Marsha L. Hosack
Tallahassee

Secretary Colleen M. Castille
October 18, 2004
Page 2

- **Part II** requests that your agency complete the enclosed Federal Grants Questionnaire for each federal grant program listed in Table 1 and administered by your agency.
- **Part III** requests that your agency review and comment on a list of grants listed in Table 2 for which no federal funding obligation to the States occurred in FFY 2002.

In order to comply with the timeframe established for this project, we ask that your response to these requests be completed and returned to us **no later than November 8, 2004**. Please call Cris Martinez or me with questions at 850-488-9627.

It is recognized that this exercise will require a significant amount of work on the part of your agency. However, the information gathered as a result of this project will be useful to policymakers engaged in efforts to increase Florida's receipt of grant funding.

I greatly appreciate the time and cooperation we have received from your staff thus far. LCIR staff looks forward to working with them during this project. Thank you for your time and contribution to this important endeavor.

Sincerely,

Marsha Hosack
Executive Director

APPENDIX 2

*Table 1-Reported Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs
to the State of Florida in FFY
2002*

Table 1

Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in Federal Fiscal Year 2002

Includes U.S. EPA Grant Programs as Well as Other Non-EPA Grant Programs Administered in Part or Whole by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection

CFDA #	Name of Grant Program	Federal Agency	Administering State Agency or Agencies	Total Reported Obligation to All Participating States	# of States Having a Reported Obligation	Type of Grant Assistance Offered	Non-Federal Funding Commitment Required	Total Reported Obligation to Florida	Florida's Share of the Participating States' Total	Florida's Rankings: Total Obligation			Per Capita Obligation to Florida	Florida's Rankings: Per Capita Obligation		
										All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region		All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region
11.419	Coastal Zone Management Administration Awards	DOC	FDCA, FDEP, FFWCC, SCC, SU	\$ 195,719,686	30	Formula	Yes	\$ 16,605,806	8.48%	6th	3rd	5th	\$0.99	11th	2nd	6th
11.420	Coastal Zone Management Estuarine Research Reserves	DOC	FDEP, SU	\$ 22,036,827	23	Project	Yes	\$ 3,534,720	16.04%	1st	1st	1st	\$0.21	10th	1st	3rd
11.429	Marine Sanctuary Program	DOC	FDEP, FFWCC, SU	\$ 2,140,000	2	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
15.614	Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection and Restoration Act	DOI	FDEP, SU	\$ 1,472,000	3	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
15.616	Clean Vessel Act	DOI	FDEP	\$ 217,000	1	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
15.632	Conservation Grants Private Stewardship for Imperiled Species	DOI	FDEP	\$ 209,810	3	Project	Yes	\$ 100,000	47.66%	1st	1st	1st	\$0.01	3rd	1st	3rd
15.808	U.S. Geological Survey - Research and Data Collection	DOI	FDEP, FFWCC, SU	\$ 34,229,140	43	Project	Possible	\$ 592,442	1.73%	15th	5th	3rd	\$0.04	29th	5th	7th
15.810	National Cooperative Geologic Mapping Program	DOI	FDEP, SU	\$ 7,382,477	46	Project	Yes	\$ 154,606	2.09%	24th	3rd	5th	\$0.01	38th	3rd	12th
15.916	Outdoor Recreation - Acquisition, Development and Planning	DOI	FDEP, FFWCC	\$ 33,507,725	30	Project	Yes	\$ 3,752,975	11.20%	2nd	2nd	1st	\$0.22	13th	1st	5th
17.600	Mine Health and Safety Grants	DOL	FDEP	\$ 7,800,002	44	Project	Yes	\$ 154,537	1.98%	22nd	7th	7th	\$0.01	42nd	6th	13th
20.205	Highway Planning and Construction	DOT	FDEP, FDOT, SU	\$ 32,130,339,366	50	Formula, Project	Possible	\$ 1,378,855,180	4.29%	5th	4th	3rd	\$82.50	46th	4th	16th
20.219	Recreational Trails Program	DOT	FDEP, FFWCC, SU	\$ 53,398	6	Formula, Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.001	Air Pollution Control Program Support	EPA	FDEP, FDOH, SU	\$ 79,235,942	35	Project	Yes	\$ 3,113,025	3.93%	9th	6th	2nd	\$0.19	25th	5th	10th
66.032	State Indoor Radon Grants	EPA	-	\$ 6,460,049	38	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.033	Ozone Transport	EPA	FDOH	\$ 1,428,900	1	Project	Possible	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.034	Survey Studies, Investigations, Demonstrations, and Special Purpose Activities Related to the Clean Air Act	EPA	-	\$ 20,319,325	35	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.418	Construction Grants for Wastewater Treatment Works	EPA	-	\$ 5,717,990	18	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.419	Water Pollution Control - State and Interstate Program Support	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 85,306,729	38	Formula	Yes	\$ 5,955,193	6.98%	4th	3rd	1st	\$0.36	22nd	3rd	10th

Table 1

Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in Federal Fiscal Year 2002

Includes U.S. EPA Grant Programs as Well as Other Non-EPA Grant Programs Administered in Part or Whole by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection

CFDA #	Name of Grant Program	Federal Agency	Administering State Agency or Agencies	Total Reported Obligation to All Participating States	# of States Having a Reported Obligation	Type of Grant Assistance Offered	Non-Federal Funding Commitment Required	Total Reported Obligation to Florida	Florida's Share of the Participating States' Total	Florida's Rankings: Total Obligation			Per Capita Obligation to Florida	Florida's Rankings: Per Capita Obligation		
										All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region		All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region
66.432	State Public Water System Supervision	EPA	FDEP	\$ 57,155,151	31	Formula	Yes	\$ 3,482,650	6.09%	5th	4th	1st	\$0.21	25th	4th	8th
66.433	State Underground Water Source Protection	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 5,832,899	32	Formula	Yes	\$ 247,700	4.25%	9th	5th	4th	\$0.01	28th	4th	10th
66.454	Water Quality Management Planning	EPA	FDEP, FFWCC, SU	\$ 14,693,858	47	Formula	No	\$ 807,052	5.49%	6th	3rd	2nd	\$0.05	23rd	4th	4th
66.456	National Estuary Program	EPA	FFWCC, SU	\$ 12,604,340	16	Project	Yes	\$ 2,019,980	16.03%	1st	1st	1st	\$0.12	8th	1st	2nd
66.458	Capitalization Grants for Clean Water State Revolving Funds	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 1,301,221,874	45	Formula	Yes	\$ 45,000,648	3.46%	10th	7th	2nd	\$2.69	40th	7th	12th
66.460	Nonpoint Source Implementation Grants	EPA	FDACS, FDEP, SU	\$ 196,697,392	43	Formula	Yes	\$ 9,079,000	4.62%	3rd	3rd	2nd	\$0.54	36th	4th	14th
66.461	Wetlands Program Grants	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 11,086,785	43	Project	Yes	\$ 907,786	8.19%	2nd	2nd	1st	\$0.05	17th	2nd	7th
66.463	Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 15,227,651	44	Project	No	\$ 896,163	5.89%	4th	2nd	3rd	\$0.05	25th	1st	9th
66.466	Chesapeake Bay Program	EPA	-	\$ 12,527,193	7	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.467	Wastewater Operator Training Grant Program (Technical Assistance)	EPA	SU	\$ 2,442,690	41	Project	Possible	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.468	Capitalization Grants for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 806,986,151	47	Formula	Yes	\$ 18,841,300	2.33%	12th	6th	4th	\$1.13	46th	6th	16th
66.469	Great Lakes Program	EPA	-	\$ 5,920,558	9	Project	Possible	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.471	State Grants to Reimburse Operators of Small Water Systems for Training and Certification Costs	EPA	-	\$ 47,870,179	27	Formula	Possible	\$ 1,277,241	2.67%	12th	3rd	5th	\$0.08	25th	3rd	8th
66.472	Beach Monitoring and Notification Program Implementation Grants	EPA	FDOH	\$ 9,301,379	30	Project	No	\$ 589,576	6.34%	2nd	2nd	1st	\$0.04	21st	1st	10th
66.473	Direct Implementation Tribal Cooperative Agreements	EPA	-	\$ 626,367	5	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.474	Water Protection Grants to the States	EPA	FDEP	\$ 20,354,800	49	Formula	No	\$ 740,400	3.64%	6th	5th	2nd	\$0.04	46th	6th	15th
66.475	Gulf of Mexico Program	EPA	FDEP	\$ 365,166	3	Project	No	\$ 48,150	13.19%	3rd	2nd	3rd	\$0.00	3rd	2nd	3rd
66.476	Security Planning Grants for Large Drinking Water Utilities	EPA	-	\$ 43,346,178	45	Project	No	\$ 3,289,182	7.59%	3rd	3rd	2nd	\$0.20	9th	2nd	3rd

Table 1

Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in Federal Fiscal Year 2002

Includes U.S. EPA Grant Programs as Well as Other Non-EPA Grant Programs Administered in Part or Whole by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection

CFDA #	Name of Grant Program	Federal Agency	Administering State Agency or Agencies	Total Reported Obligation to All Participating States	# of States Having a Reported Obligation	Type of Grant Assistance Offered	Non-Federal Funding Commitment Required	Total Reported Obligation to Florida	Florida's Share of the Participating States' Total	Florida's Rankings: Total Obligation			Per Capita Obligation to Florida	Florida's Rankings: Per Capita Obligation		
										All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region		All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region
66.477	Vulnerability Assessments and Related Security Improvements at Large Privately-Owned Community Drinking Water Utilities	EPA	-	\$ 3,215,330	10	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.500	Environmental Protection - Consolidated Research	EPA	FFWCC, SU	\$ 169,315,786	49	Project	No	\$ 4,885,700	2.89%	14th	6th	6th	\$0.29	33rd	6th	11th
66.508	Senior Environmental Employment Program	EPA	-	\$ 21,397,274	3	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.600	Environmental Protection Consolidated Grants - Program Support	EPA	-	\$ 3,130,420	2	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.604	Environmental Justice Hazardous Substances Research Small Grants to Community Groups	EPA	SU	\$ 1,293,917	33	Project	No	\$ 60,894	4.71%	7th	3rd	2nd	\$0.00	23rd	4th	8th
66.605	Performance Partnership Grants	EPA	FDACS	\$ 263,914,567	48	Project	Yes	\$ 629,675	0.24%	37th	7th	9th	\$0.04	47th	7th	15th
66.606	Surveys, Studies, Investigations and Special Purpose Grants	EPA	FDACS, FDEP, FDOH, FFWCC, SU	\$ 476,783,082	50	Project	Possible	\$ 28,295,779	5.93%	4th	3rd	1st	\$1.69	24th	1st	8th
66.607	Training and Fellowships for the Environmental Protection Agency	EPA	SU	\$ 33,327,361	44	Project	No	\$ 661,910	1.99%	13th	4th	8th	\$0.04	28th	4th	8th
66.608	Environmental Information Exchange Network Grant Program	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 23,917,570	47	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.609	Protection of Children and Older Adults from Environmental Health Risks	EPA	SU	\$ 1,595,352	20	Project	Yes	\$ 118,172	7.41%	6th	4th	2nd	\$0.01	10th	3rd	3rd
66.700	Consolidated Pesticide Enforcement Cooperative Agreements	EPA	-	\$ 14,032,608	27	Project	Possible	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.701	Toxic Substances Compliance Monitoring Cooperative Agreements	EPA	-	\$ 1,701,350	19	Project	Possible	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.707	TSCA Title IV State Lead Grants: Certification of Lead-Based Paint Professionals	EPA	-	\$ 9,978,588	35	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.708	Pollution Prevention Grants Program	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 5,281,401	41	Project	Yes	\$ 60,000	1.14%	36th	7th	9th	\$0.00	41st	7th	14th
66.709	Capacity Building Grants and Cooperative Agreements for States and Tribes	EPA	FDEP	\$ 947,294	9	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.714	Pesticide Environmental Stewardship Regional Grants	EPA	-	\$ 570,597	13	Project	No	\$ 39,870	6.99%	9th	3rd	3rd	\$0.00	12th	3rd	3rd
66.715	Childhood Blood-Lead Screening and Lead Awareness (Educational) Outreach for Indian Tribes	EPA	-	\$ 566,484	5	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-

Table 1

Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in Federal Fiscal Year 2002

Includes U.S. EPA Grant Programs as Well as Other Non-EPA Grant Programs Administered in Part or Whole by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection

CFDA #	Name of Grant Program	Federal Agency	Administering State Agency or Agencies	Total Reported Obligation to All Participating States	# of States Having a Reported Obligation	Type of Grant Assistance Offered	Non-Federal Funding Commitment Required	Total Reported Obligation to Florida	Florida's Share of the Participating States' Total	Florida's Rankings: Total Obligation			Per Capita Obligation to Florida	Florida's Rankings: Per Capita Obligation		
										All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region		All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region
66.801	Hazardous Waste Management State Program Support	EPA	FDEP, SU	\$ 54,044,129	28	Formula	Yes	\$ 2,948,661	5.46%	6th	5th	1st	\$0.18	24th	5th	10th
66.802	Superfund State, Political Subdivision, and Indian Tribe Site-Specific Cooperative Agreements	EPA	FDEP	\$ 69,668,064	46	Project	Possible	\$ 1,773,795	2.55%	10th	3rd	2nd	\$0.11	32nd	4th	8th
66.804	State and Tribal Underground Storage Tanks Program	EPA	FDEP	\$ 5,395,231	36	Project	Yes	\$ 186,675	3.46%	19th	4th	6th	\$0.01	32nd	5th	12th
66.805	Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program	EPA	FDEP	\$ 52,146,810	50	Project	Yes	\$ 1,500,000	2.88%	11th	6th	5th	\$0.09	45th	6th	15th
66.806	Superfund Technical Assistance Grants for Citizen Groups at Priority Sites	EPA	-	\$ 1,187,393	21	Project	Possible	\$ (26,427)	-	46th	5th	15th	\$0.00	46th	5th	15th
66.808	Solid Waste Management Assistance	EPA	SU	\$ 7,237,928	34	Project	Possible	\$ 44,363	0.61%	24th	6th	7th	\$0.00	26th	6th	8th
66.809	Superfund State and Indian Tribe Core Program - Cooperative Agreements	EPA	-	\$ 16,210,112	33	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.810	Chemical Emergency Preparedness and Prevention (CEPP) Technical Assistance Grants Program	EPA	FDOEA	\$ 1,297,100	12	Project	Yes	\$ 20,000	1.54%	8th	2nd	3rd	\$0.00	12th	2nd	6th
66.812	Tribal Hazardous Waste Grants	EPA	-	\$ 404,500	3	Project	No	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.926	Indian Environmental General Assistance Program	EPA	-	\$ 43,210,938	28	Project	No	\$ 240,028	0.56%	19th	4th	3rd	\$0.01	26th	2nd	4th
66.950	Environmental Education and Training Program	EPA	-	\$ 1,815,000	1	Project	Yes	\$ -	0.00%	-	-	-	\$0.00	-	-	-
66.951	Environmental Education Grants	EPA	SCC, SU	\$ 4,711,719	50	Project	Yes	\$ 222,435	4.72%	2nd	1st	1st	\$0.01	20th	1st	4th
83.550 now 97.041	National Dam Safety Program	FEMA now DHS	FDEP	\$ 3,972,531	50	Project	Yes	\$ 47,700	1.20%	32nd	7th	9th	\$0.00	49th	6th	16th
94.006	AmeriCorps	CNCS	FDCFS, FDEP, FDOEA, SCC, SU	\$ 250,398,718	49	Project	Yes	\$ 6,022,124	2.41%	13th	6th	5th	\$0.36	48th	7th	16th

Table 1

Reported Federal Grant Obligations of Select Programs to the State of Florida in Federal Fiscal Year 2002

Includes U.S. EPA Grant Programs as Well as Other Non-EPA Grant Programs Administered in Part or Whole by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection

CFDA #	Name of Grant Program	Federal Agency	Administering State Agency or Agencies	Total Reported Obligation to All Participating States	# of States Having a Reported Obligation	Type of Grant Assistance Offered	Non-Federal Funding Commitment Required	Total Reported Obligation to Florida	Florida's Share of the Participating States' Total	Florida's Rankings: Total Obligation			Per Capita Obligation to Florida	Florida's Rankings: Per Capita Obligation		
										All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region		All States	7 Most Populous States	16 States in the "South" Region

Notes Regarding Table Columns

- 1) CFDA#: Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program ID#. [www.cfda.gov]
- 2) Federal Agency: CNCS, Corporation for National and Community Service; DHS, U.S. Department of Homeland Security; DOC, U.S. Department of Commerce; DOI, U.S. Department of the Interior; DOL, U.S. Department of Labor; DOT, U.S. Department of Transportation; EPA, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; FEMA, Federal Emergency Management Agency.
- 3) Administering State Agency or Agencies: FDACS, Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services; FDCA, Florida Department of Community Affairs; FDCFS, Florida Department of Children and Family Services; FDEP, Florida Department of Environmental Protection; FDOEA, Florida Department of Elder Affairs; FDOH, Florida Department of Health; FDOT, Florida Department of Transportation; FFWCC, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission; SCC, State Community Colleges; SU, State Universities. The identification of administering state agency or agencies was made using the Florida Auditor General's Audit Report 2004-168, "State of Florida - Compliance and Internal Controls Over Financial Reporting and Federal Awards." The Auditor General's report addresses only those programs it identified as major programs. Consequently, the identification of the administering state agency or agencies for those programs labeled with a "-" was not possible using this report.
- 4) Total Reported Obligation to All Participating States: The federal grants data were obtained from the U.S. Census Bureau and generally represent the federal obligations incurred at the time the grants were awarded. The dollar figures represent reported funding obligations to all states or the State of Florida specifically, during the federal fiscal year ended September 30, 2002. The dollar figures do not represent actual expenditures, since funding obligations in one time period may not have resulted in outlays during the same time period. Moreover, initial amounts obligated may have been adjusted at a later date, either through enhancements or deobligations. Any deobligations appear in this table as negative amounts.
- 5) # of States Having a Reported Obligation: Based on the LCIR's staff analysis of Consolidated Federal Funds Report datasets for states, the number represents only those states having either a positive or negative funding obligation.
- 6) Type of Grant Assistance Offered: Formula grants represent allocations of money to states or their subdivisions in accordance with distribution formulas prescribed by law or administrative regulation, for activities of a continuing nature not confined to a specific project. Project grants represent funding, for fixed or known periods, of specific projects. Such grants can include fellowships, scholarships, research grants, training grants, traineeships, experimental and demonstration grants, evaluation grants, planning grants, technical assistance grants, survey grants, and construction grants.
- 7) Non-Federal Funding Commitment Required: The response "Possible" indicates those situations in which a non-federal funding commitment may be required as a condition of the grant award.
- 8) Total Reported Obligation to Florida: The dollar figure represents the reported funding obligation or deobligation to Florida in federal fiscal year ended September 30, 2002.
- 9) Florida's Share of the Participating States' Total: As a point of reference, Florida's population represented 5.8 percent of the total population of the 50 states in 2002, according to the U.S. Census Bureau's estimates.
- 10) Florida's Rankings: In 2002, the seven most populous states, in descending order, were: California, Texas, New York, Florida, Illinois, Pennsylvania and Ohio. The calculation of per capita obligations was made using population estimates that represent the resident population as of July 1, 2002, according to the U.S. Census Bureau. As designated by the U.S. Census Bureau, Florida is one of 16 states in the South region. The other states in the South region are: Alabama, Arkansas, Delaware, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Mississippi, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, Virginia, and West Virginia.

APPENDIX 3
DEP Federal Grant Questionnaire with Instructions

FEDERAL GRANT QUESTIONNAIRE

Name of Grant Program: _____

CFDA No.: _____

State Agency Contact: _____; Phone: _____

E-mail: _____

Other State Agencies Involved (if relevant, please describe involvement):

1. Please identify and explain how the following influences Florida's receipt of federal grant funding in the program specified above.
 - a. Formula grant factors or project grant criteria used to determine the amount of funds allocated to state.
 - i. Do these factors/criteria serve as an advantage or disadvantage to Florida?
 - ii. Are there alternative factors/criteria that could be proposed to benefit Florida?
 - iii. Is the state required to make a non-federal funding commitment? If so, please *discuss the nature of* the federal requirement; how much Florida committed during federal fiscal years (FFYs) 2002 and 2003; *from what source*, and the basis for the computation? *Also, if appropriate, please address whether it would be feasible that the non-federal funding commitment come from another source, such as a local government or private entity?*
 - b. Constraints built into formulas or criteria for project grants (please identify).
 - c. State laws (including statutes and administrative rules).
 - d. State policies (including explicit state choices not to participate or participate at a low level; availability of limited state funds for matching).
 - e. Federal laws (including statutes and federal agency administrative rules, e.g. provisions for maintenance of effort, supplement-not-supplant provisions, etc.).
 - f. Federal policies.
 - g. Other factors.

2. What was the amount of funds available for Florida in FFY 2002 and FFY 2003? What were the expenditures those same fiscal years? Did Florida use the entire program allocation in FFY 2002 and FFY 2003? If not, how much was not used and why?
3. Did Florida lose program funds in FFY 2002 or FFY 2003 because of penalties? If so, how much was lost and why?
4. Please identify possible changes in state policies/laws that could enhance Florida's receipt of federal grant funding in this program (cite specific statutes).
5. Please identify possible changes in federal policies/laws that could enhance Florida's receipt of federal grant funding in this program (cite specific regulations or laws). Discuss potential funding, and advantages or disadvantages if appropriate.
 - a. Do you have any information on the feasibility of accomplishing the above-mentioned changes in the next two years.
 - b. Are you aware of similarly-situated states which you believe would be interested in partnering with Florida to achieve these programs changes? If so, please identify.
6. Are you confident that your currently available sources of information are sufficient to help your agency maximize these program funds? If not, what additional information would assist your agency in maximizing program funds?

Instructions for Completing the Federal Grants Survey

Part I – Federal Funding Priorities

Requested State Agency Actions:

Please prepare a written response to the following:

- Your agency's *current and viable* federal funding priorities.
- A list of *practicable* suggested actions that the state may wish to explore to increase receipt of federal grant funding. Please classify whether each suggested action should be pursued as a short-range goal (within 1 year), mid-range goal (between 1-2 years), or long-range goal (more than 2 years).
- If new or additional match or maintenance of effort would be required for those suggested actions, please indicate potential sources other than state General Revenue funds, such as a source within your agency or whether a private or local government match may be feasible.
- Describe the manner in which your agency tracks and pursues federal funding opportunities and whether any FTE's are assigned to this particular duty;
- Agency's federal grants coordinator or contact person.

Part II – Reported Grant Obligations in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2002

Table 1 provides summary statistics related to the reported funding obligations to Florida in FFY 2002 for:

(1) grant programs administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency as well as other programs administered in whole or in part by your agency, as indicated in the Florida Auditor General's Audit Report No. 2004-168 "Compliance and Internal Controls Over Financial Reporting and Federal Awards";

(2) grant programs having reported funding obligations to Florida in FFY 2002 for which the administering state agencies were not identified in the Auditor General's Audit Report; and

(3) grant programs having no reported funding obligations to Florida in FFY 2002, but having reported obligations to other states.

Requested State Agency Actions:

- Verify that your agency does administer, in whole or part, each of the grant programs listed in Table 1 and complete the questionnaire for each program administered by your agency.
- If you are aware that funding associated with any of these grant programs is allocated directly to a local government or other entity rather than your agency, please comment in writing.
- If your agency has made a deliberate policy decision not to pursue a particular grant program, please comment in writing.
- If any of these grant programs represent potential funding opportunities for the State of Florida, please comment in writing. If reasons for non-participation are due to either a federal regulation or a state statute, please comment.

Part III – No Reported Grant Obligations to any State in FFY 2002

Table 2 identifies those grant programs having no reported funding obligations to any state in FFY 2002. Based on the LCIR's data review, it is not known if the State of Florida **currently** participates in these grant programs. Therefore, the following state agency actions are requested.

Requested State Agency Actions:

- Review the grant programs listed in Table 2 and, if applicable, complete the questionnaire for each program administered by your agency.
- If you are aware that funding associated with any of these grant programs is allocated directly to a local government or other entity rather than your agency, please comment in writing.
- If your agency has made a deliberate policy decision not to pursue particular grant program funding, please comment in writing.
- If any of these grant programs represent potential funding opportunities for the State of Florida, please comment in writing. If reasons for non-participation are due to either a federal regulation or a state statute, please comment.
- Because the federal grant programs listed in Table 2 are taken from the current CFDA, please list any new federal grant program that your agency may be participating in.

Persons interested in completing and returning the questionnaire by electronic means can download the questionnaire (<http://fcn.state.fl.us/lcir/surveys/listing.html>) directly from the LCIR's website. Please return the completed questionnaire and any accompanying documentation to Cris Martinez, LCIR Analyst, by email at Martinez.Cris@leg.state.fl.us or by facsimile at 850-487-6587, or by mail to Florida LCIR, Attn: Cris Martinez, c/o Legislative Mail Services, Tallahassee, FL 32399-1300.

In order for the LCIR to comply with the timeframe established for this project, we ask that your responses to the requests outlined in Parts I, II, and III be completed and returned to us **no later than November 8, 2004**. Please call Cris Martinez or Marsha Hosack with questions at 850-488-9627.

APPENDIX 4
Table 2 - Survey Response Chart

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
11.419	NOAA	Coastal Zone Management Administrative Award	Y	Pop, Other	cap on CZMA 306 awards; conditional approval on FL non-point pollution control program	lifting the awards cap on s. 306 funds; adjusting allocation criteria to incl. geo area of coastal zone	elimination of state budget auth to spend fed funds and double budget authority	s. 6217 funds - approval of FL's coastal non point source pollution control program expected in 2005	50%	2910000 (721,082 unused)	2,945,000.0	785,000 (non fed. match by non state sources)	565,000 (non fed. match by non state sources)	1,551,448	1,720,000	double budget authority burdensome; state match #s are inconsistent	6:3;5	Lynn Griffin	850-245-2161
11.420	NOAA	Coastal Zone Management Administrative-US Coral Reef Task Force	N	Fixed amount				50%	400,000	400,000			400,000	400,000		1;1;1	Larry Nall	850-245-2094	
11.420	NOAA	Coastal Zone Mgt Estuarine Research Reserves	N	Fixed amount				30% (in kind expenses from existing app)	3,534,720	5,063,714			match from in-kind expenses from exist appropriation					Larry Nall	850-245-2094
11.429	NOAA	Marine Sanctuary Program	N				no other state receives sanctuary funding	N/A	955,936	1,213,255					no other state receives sanctuary funding			Larry Nall	850-245-2094
11.483	NOAA	Community Based Habitat Restoration	N	Competitive project grant				25% min.		250,000			280,000 (in kind land acquisition FFP match)*	280,000*				Larry Nall	850-245-2094
12.107	USACE	Navigation Projects (Invasive Plants)		Cooperative Agreement	capped at \$15 million, never fully funded	not funded since '96		50%											
12.113	Defense	State Memo of Agreement Program for Reimbursement of Technical Services	N	Cost reimbursement program	limited to installation sites contaminated prior to '84	Defense State Memo of Agmt Committee working on issue		N/A	\$836,184 (projected); \$653,999 (expended)	\$834,401 (projected); \$611,576 (expended)					DSMOA Memo: No immediate change expected.			Eric Nuzie	850-245-8978

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
15.611	DOI	Wildlife Restoration	N	Competitive project grant					min. 25%					\$1,000,000, in kind match - land acquisition through Florida Forever			Larry Nall	850-245-2094	
15.614	DOI	National Coastlands Wetlands Conservation	N	Competitive grant based on project proposal	state match				25% in kind match of land acquisition through Florida Forever		1,000,000			450,000	450,000			Larry Nall	850-245-2094
15.616	DOI	Clean Vessel Act	Y	use of reg. approved pumpout plan, private partners, innovative approach, education programs, sensitive water body impact, pumpout to boat ratio	no state may receive > 10% of total fed. funds; funds limited for installation pump out facilities & education programs	include consideration of: FL's long boating season, # marinas, # boats > 26 ft.			25% (80% private;20% state)	1,553,048* (4 grants, over 3 yr)	1747805*			49,541	50,789			Jan DeLaney	850-245-2847
15.623	DOI	Conservations Grants Private Stewardship for Imperiled Species	Y		state match required for salaries, supplies			more state resources would allow more federal resources	50% match required for some		49,296						1;1;1	Judy Baggett	850-245-3047
15.632	DOI	North American Wetlands Restoration (4 grants)	Y		state match required for salaries, supplies			more state resources would allow more federal resources	50% match required for some	40,000	169,670							Judy Baggett	850-245-3047
15.808	DOI	FO-876 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement	Y		avail state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%)	additional funds in FGS budget		50%	\$207,202 (6279 rolled over to '03)						Further input by FL state officials w/b welcome by MMS.	15;5;3	Robert Hicks	850-245-3145
15.808		FO-893 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement	Y		avail state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%)	additional funds in FGS budget		50%	\$399,702 (total - incl. match?)							15;5;3	Robert Hicks	850-245-3145

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
15.808		FO-910 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement	Y		avail state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%)	additional funds in FGS budget	additional appropriations to MMS budget	50%		\$170,000 (FY 2004)						15;5;3	Robert Hicks	850-245-3145
15.810	DOI	STATEMAP	Y		state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%), additional Congressional appropriation	additional funds in FGS budget, access OPS matching funds from other agencies for credit, OPS employee to track matching hours	See DEP response to Part I:(1) additional flexibility to get credit for OPS and other agency personnel time as match	50%	134,606	125,761					State Univ. resources could provide match for EDMAP program (unsure whether FL participates in EDMAP)	24;3;5	Robert Hicks, Rick Green	850-245-3145
15.916	Interior	Land and Water Conservation Fund	Y		50% state match	ability to use funds spent on land acquisition as match (\$300 million)	increased \$		50%	30,000	30,000			30,000	30,000	FL has match avail. for increased grant (c/b avail through increase appropriation or formula revision to better match allocations to areas of state.	2;2;1	John Outland	850-245-2089
17.600	DOI	Mine Health and Safety Grants	? Proposal w/ match		20% state match		n/a, FL is not a mining state		20%	153,214	155,134					FL receiving appropriate share of grant given its low level of mining.	22;7;7	Ben Hart	850-413-8192
20.009	Coast GD	Natural Resource Damage Program (ZZ082)	claim		for development of ZZ081 claim					\$19,700 deposited in CPTF.								Phil Wieczynski	850-245-2875
20.205	FHWA	DOT-Enhancement Grants (FKOHT and other trail grants 14)	Y		no match					7,000,000 (expended 3,000,000, bal. not contracted)	4,847,697 (expended 1,000,000)					Reason for unused funds s/b investigated	5;4;3	Judy Baggett	850-245-3047

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
20.219	FHWA	Recreational Trails Program	Y	non hwy recreational fuel use, light trucks, ATVs, Dirt Bikes,	40:30:30 requirement. (diverse use; motorized; nonmotorized).			FL:1 of 2 states that ensures funds used on motorized recreational trails; insufficient # of apps rec'd; rule writing	20% "soft" match (from tolls)	1,636,742 (\$839,063 obligated)	1,656,895 (none obligated)					fund use ltd by agency policy. Expanded use wd. Req. additional matching funds.		Alexandra H. Weiss	850-245-2052
20.999	Coastal	Natural Resource Damage Program (ZZ081)		claim for coastal damage due to 2000 oil spill	natural resource damage due to coastal oil spills from '92-'99			claim reimbursement		704,295 (none spent due to writing contracts)						0		Phil Wieczynski	850-245-2875
43.999	NASA	Cleanup Program--Technical Review and Oversight NASA1	N	contract reimbursement for NASA remedial work	only constraint = amount of NASA work requiring oversight				none	45,000	55,000			0				Eric Nuzie	850-245-8978
66.001	EPA	Section 105 Air Pollution Control Grants	Y	FL receives 7.91816% of EPA Region 4 funding	FL must commit to Air Planning Agreement w/ EPA			increase Region 4 funding	40% funding level, Maintenance of Effort - state must match prior yr funding by at least \$1	1,488,034	1,406,339			\$2,141,300 (from Motor Vehicle Registration fees)	\$2,142,600 (from Motor Vehicle Registration fees)	1) why is FL's (Region 4) share declining? 2) relief from MOE - req. FL expend more than it receives	9;6;2	Becky Ajhar	850-921-9604

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
66.419	EPA	Water Pollution Control - State and Interstate Program Support	Y	admin formula: (1) base funding = \$125,000; (2) focus on surface water area over groundwater use				in kind state match, annually state must expend amount = FY 1971 expenditures	5,863,400	5,821,000			in kind (salaries) state match of \$22.5 million from DEP Permit Fee and Water Quality Assurance Trust Funds	\$22.5 million	shifting formula focus to groundwater use v. surface water area would help FL and eliminating base appropriation	4;3;1	David Beebe	850-245-8340	
66.432	EPA	State Public Water System Supervision	Y	admin formula: (1) base funding = \$334,500; (2) focus on serving permanent populations (FL gets no credit for visitors)		incorporating visitors impact on water supplies would aid FL		in kind	3,482,650	3,493,000			in kind match of \$3.5 million (salaries)	in kind match of \$3.5 million (salaries)	Might be a value in raising the issue of visitor impact on water supply.	5;4;1	David Beebe	850-245-8340	
66.433	EPA	State Underground Water Source Protection	Y			federal funding of program stagnant	# of regulated underground injection wells continues to grow	in kind (salaries)	247,700	246,450			in kind \$1.4 million match (salaries)	in kind \$1.4 million match (salaries)	Contact congressional delegation for additional fed. funding of program.	9;5;4	David Beebe	850-245-8340	
66.454	EPA	Water Quality Management Planning	Y	1% of amount allotted/available for construction grants				None	247,700	246,450						6;3;2	David Beebe	850-245-8340	

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
66.458	EPA	Capitalization Grants for Clean Water State Revolving Fund	Y	allotments determined by table of decimal fraction (s. 205(c)(3) of the CWA)	formula based on 1970 population data	form coalition with other growth states to change formula and hold states harmless	State match c/b changed to come from wastewater fees rather than GR		20% cash match (comes from Gen. Rev)	44,550,642	44,261,022			8,910,128	8,852,204	Form coalition to amend Clean Water Act formula or withhold support for appropriations until amendment is effected	10;7;2	David Beebe	850-245-8340
66.460	EPA	Nonpoint Source Implementation Grants	Y		based on 1980 Census Data	encourage EPA to sue more recent data		Maintenance of Effort required	40%, comes from local sub grant sponsors, no state funds used	9,079,000	9,116,800			3,631,600	3,646,720	FL should continue to encourage EPA to use recent data.	3;3;2	Karl Kurka	850-245-8682
66.461	EPA	Wetlands Program Grants	Y?						25% in kind match (salaries)	49,560				16,520	*respondent believed that DEP district offices would provide this info.	2;2;1	David Beebe	850-245-8342	

DEP Survey Responses

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
66.463	EPA	Water Quality Cooperative Agreements	N	Competitive Grants		DEP discussing EPA Region IV's redirection of Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) development to TMDL Implementation with EPA			no match required, DEP typically offers to match salary assoc. indirectly for project mgr. and staff (b/c the more match an applicant offers, the greater the likelihood of award).	269,049	299,493					? (salary amount s/b here)			

APPENDIX 5

Table 3 - Survey Response Chart - Formula Only

DEP Survey Responses Formula Only

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
11.419	NOAA	Coastal Zone Management Administrative Award	Y	Pop, Other	cap on CZMA 306 awards; conditional approval on FL non-point pollution control program	lifting the awards cap on s. 306 funds; adjusting allocation criteria to incl. geo area of coastal zone	elimination of state budget auth to spend fed dunds and double budget authority	s. 6217 funds - approval of FL's coastal non point source pollution control program expected in 2005	50%	2910000 (721,082 unused)	2,945,000.0	785,000 (non fed. match by non state sources)	565,000 (non fed. match by non state sources)	1,551,448	1,720,000	double budget authority burdensome; state match #s are inconsistent	6:3;5	Lynn Griffin	850-245-2161
15.616	DOI	Clean Vessel Act	Y	use of reg. approved pumpout plan, private partners, innovative approach, education programs, sensitive water body impact, pumpout to boat ratio	no state may receive > 10% of total fed. funds; funds limited for installation of: FL's long boating season, # marinas, # boats > 26 ft.	include consideration of: FL's long boating season, # marinas, # boats > 26 ft.		25% (80% private; 20% state)	1,553,048* (4 grants, over 3 yr)	1747805*			49,541	50,789			Jan DeLaney	850-245-2847	
15.623	DOI	Conservations Grants Private Stewardship for Imperiled Species	Y		state match required for salaries, supplies		more state resources would allow more federal resources	50% match required for some		49,296							1;1;1	Judy Baggett	850-245-3047
15.632	DOI	North American Wetlands Restoration (4 grants)	Y		state match required for salaries, supplies		more state resources would allow more federal resources	50% match required for some	40,000	169,670								Judy Baggett	850-245-3047
15.808	DOI	FO-876 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement	Y		available state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%)	additional funds in FGS budget	50%	\$207,202 (6279 rolled over to '03)						Further input by FL state officials w/b welcome by MMS.	15;5;3	Robert Hicks	850-245-3145	
15.808		FO-893 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement	Y		available state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%)	additional funds in FGS budget	50%		\$399,702 (total - incl. match?)							15;5;3	Robert Hicks	850-245-3145
15.808		FO-910 FGS/MMS Cooperative Agreement	Y		available state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%)	additional funds in FGS budget	50%		\$170,000 (FY 2004)							15;5;3	Robert Hicks	850-245-3145

DEP Survey Responses Formula Only

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
15.810	DOI	STATEMAP	Y		state match funds	reduce match (currently 50%), additional Congressional appropriation	additional funds in FGS budget, access OPS matching funds from other agencies for credit, OPS employee to track matching hours	See DEP response to Part I:(1) additional flexibility to get credit for OPS and other agency personnel time as match	50%	134,606	125,761					State Univ. resources could provide match for EDMAP program (unsure whether FL participates in EDMAP)	24;3;5	Robert Hicks, Rick Green	850-245-3145
15.916	Interior	Land and Water Conservation Fund	Y		50% state match	ability to use funds spent on land acquisition as match (\$300 million)	increased \$		50%	30,000	30,000			30,000	30,000	FL has match avail. for increased grant (c/b avail through increase appropriation or formula revision to better match allocations to areas of state.	2;2;1	John Outland	850-245-2089
17.600	DOI	Mine Health and Safety Grants	? Proposal w/ match		20% state match		n/a, FL is not a mining state		20%	153,214	155,134					FL receiving appropriate share of grant given its low level of mining.	22;7;7	Ben Hart	850-413-8192
20.205	FHWA	DOT-Enhancement Grants (FKOHT and other trail grants 14)	Y		no match					7,000,000 (expended 3,000,000, bal. not contracted)	4,847,697 (expended 1,000,000)					Reason for unused funds s/b investigated	5;4;3	Judy Baggett	850-245-3047

DEP Survey Responses Formula Only

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
20.219	FHWA	Recreational Trails Program	Y	non hwy recreational fuel use, light trucks, ATVs, Dirt Bikes,	40:30:30 requirement. (diverse use; motorized; nonmotorized).			FL:1 of 2 states that ensures funds used on motorized recreational trails; insufficient # of apps rec'd; rule writing	20% "soft" match (from tolls)	1,636,742 (\$839,063 obligated)	1,656,895 (none obligated)					fund use ltd by agency policy. Expanded use wd. Req. additional matching funds.		Alexandra H. Weiss	850-245-2052
66.001	EPA	Section 105 Air Pollution Control Grants	Y	FL receives 7.91816% of EPA Region 4 funding	must commit to Air Planning Agreement w/ EPA	increase Region 4 funding		40% funding level, Maintenance of Effort - state must match prior yr funding by at least \$1		1,488,034	1,406,339			\$2,141,300 (from Motor Vehicle Registration fees)	\$2,142,600 (from Motor Vehicle Registration fees)	1) why is FL's (Region 4) share declining? 2) relief from MOE - req. FL expend more than it receives	9;6;2	Becky Ajhar	850-921-9604
66.419	EPA	Water Pollution Control - State and Interstate Program Support	Y	admin formula: (1) base funding = \$125,000; (2) focus on surface water area over groundwater use				in kind state match, annually state must expend amount = FY 1971 expenditures		5,863,400	5,821,000			in kind (salaries) state match of \$22.5 million from DEP Permit Fee and Water Quality Assurance Trust Funds	\$22.5 million	shifting formula focus to groundwater use v. surface water area would help FL and eliminating base appropriation	4;3;1	David Beebe	850-245-8340

DEP Survey Responses Formula Only

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
66.432	EPA	State Public Water System Supervision	Y	admin formula: (1) base funding = \$334,500 ; (2) focus on serving permanent populations (FL gets no credit for visitors)			incorporating visitors impact on water supplies would aid FL		in kind	3,482,650	3,493,000			in kind match of \$3.5 million (salaries)	in kind match of \$3.5 million (salaries)	Might be a value in raising the issue of visitor impact on water supply.	5;4;1	David Beebe	850-245-8340
66.433	EPA	State Underground Water Source Protection	Y				federal funding of program stagnant		in kind (salaries)	247,700	246,450			in kind \$1.4 million match (salaries)	in kind \$1.4 million match (salaries)	Contact congressional delegation for additional fed. funding of program.	9;5;4	David Beebe	850-245-8340
66.454	EPA	Water Quality Management Planning	Y	1% of amount allotted/avail for construction grants					None	247,700	246,450						6;3;2	David Beebe	850-245-8340
66.458	EPA	Capitalization Grants for Clean Water State Revolving Fund	Y	allotments determined by table of decimal fraction (s. 205(c)(3) of the CWA)	formula based on 1970 population data		form coalition with other growth states to change formula and hold states harmless	State match c/b changed to come from wastewater fees rather than GR	20% cash match (comes from Gen. Rev)	44,550,642	44,261,022			8,910,128	8,852,204	Form coalition to amend Clean Water Act formula or withhold support for appropriations until amendment is effected	10;7;2	David Beebe	850-245-8340

DEP Survey Responses Formula Only

CFDA#	Agency	Name	Formula			Remedy			State Match	Federal Funds (M)		Other Funds		State Funds		Federal Analyst Comments	FL Ranking (Total Obligation) (of 50;7;16)	Contact	Phone
			Y/N	Data	Constraint	Fed	State	Other		2002	2003	2002	2003	2002	2003				
66.460	EPA	Nonpoint Source Implementation Grants	Y		based on 1980 Census Data	encourage EPA to sue more recent data		Maintenance of Effort required	40%, comes from local sub grant sponsor s, no state funds used	9,079,000	9,116,800			3,631,600	3,646,720	FL should continue to encourage EPA to use recent data.	3;3;2	Karl Kurka	850-245-8682
66.461	EPA	Wetlands Program Grants	Y?					25% in kind match (salaries)	49,560				16,520	*respondent believed that DEP district offices would provide this info.		2;2;1	David Beebe	850-245-8342	

APPENDIX 6
DEP Federal Grant Summaries

DEP FEDERAL GRANT SUMMARIES

The following DEP Federal Grant Summary offers a synopsis of information regarding each federal grant in which DEP participates. The information provided includes:

- (1) the Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance (CFDA) number for the grant;
- (2) a short description of the grant and its purpose provided by the CFDA and DEP staff; and
- (3) proposed considerations regarding the grant made by DEP staff and the LCIR's Federal Consultant, Mr. Vic Miller.

11.419 Coastal Zone Management Administration Awards

Program Description: This program is designed to enhance the State's approved Coastal Zone Management programs by providing federal funds for salaries and other related expenses required under the programs. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) awards an annual grant to the Florida Coastal Management Program (FCMP) part of which is subgranted to other state agencies. Federal funds under this program are available under three distinct federal funding streams available under sections 306, 309, and 6217 of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA). This program allows each participating state to designate its own coastal zone. Due to Florida's unique geographical characteristics, its coastal zone comprises the entire state. Awards are given on a yearly basis and typically are spent within 15 months. However, DEP may request an extension due to unexpected delays, i.e., hurricanes. Section 306 and 6217 funds require a 1:1 match, which Florida satisfies with in-kind project matches. Section 309 funds, typically amounting to \$540,000, do not require any type of match.

Florida participates in this program based on the conditional approval of Coastal Non-Point Source Pollution Control Program. In April 2006, DEP submitted all remaining required documentation to NOAA and expects to gain full approval this year.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors: Funds under this program are awarded by formula based on the state's population, length of the coastline and other factors. These factors would benefit Florida were they not limited by an existing legislative cap on Section 306 funds. This mitigation results in Connecticut and Florida receiving the same amount of CZMA funds despite the vast difference in the states' coastlines and populations. DEP suggests that lifting the cap on Section 306 funds would benefit Florida.¹ Furthermore, DEP suggests that adjusting the formula's allocation criteria to consider other factors, such as the geographic area of the designated coastal zone would also serve states with unique geographical characteristics, such as Florida.²

State Factors: DEP cited the necessity to obtain state budget authority to spend federal grant funds should be reconsidered. Specifically, DEP suggested that the necessity for double budget authority for pass-through grants should be eliminated. Currently DEP must obtain budget authority to pass FCMP grant funds through to subgrantees. When the recipient is a state agency, that agency must also obtain budget authority to expend the passed through funds. DEP states that "this requirement is unnecessarily burdensome and results in double budget authority for the same funds in the state budget."

¹ See, Federal Grant Questionnaire, CFDA No. 11.419, Coastal Zone Management Administrative Awards, pp. 1 and 2.

² Id.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:³

FFY 2002: \$2,910,000/\$2,188,918/\$237,000

The \$721,082 in unused funds were a result of: (1) overestimation of anticipated administrative costs associated with the transfers of the FCMP from the Department of Community Affairs to DEP; and (2) unused subgrant funds. The funds were returned to National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA).

FFY 2003: \$2,945,000/\$28,897/\$2,405,000

No funds have been returned to NOAA, since FFY 2003.

³ The amounts reflected under the Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match sections are as of December 2004, when the surveys were completed.

15.611 Wildlife Restoration (Pittman-Robertson Program)

Program Description: This program supports activities to restore or manage wildlife populations and public use of these resources and to provide facilities and services that conduct hunter-safety programs. Funds for wildlife management and restoration are apportioned based on the state's land area (50 percent) and the number of paid hunting-license holders (50 percent). Funds for hunter-safety activities are apportioned based on the state's 2000 Census population. The program specifies that no state receive more than 5 percent or less than 0.5 percent of the total program funds. Participating states are required to provide a 25 percent in-kind match. Florida's match consists of land acquisitions funded through the Florida Forever Program.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. This grant program prescribes a 0.50 percent small state minimum which disadvantages Florida. Furthermore, the hunter-safety awards under this grant are calculated using Census data from the year 2000. Use of outdated population counts substantially disadvantages rapidly growing states like Florida. The Act should be amended to eliminate the small state minimum and also to incorporate more recent population counts.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

**FFY 2002: \$1,000,000/
FFY 2003: \$**

15.616 Clean Vessel Act

Program Description: This program funds grants to coastal states to survey and plan for pumpout and dump stations for recreational boats and to all states to construct pumpout and dump stations and implement education programs to prevent recreational boat sewage from entering U.S. waters. Federal assistance consists of competitive project grants that meet the goals of the program. Funding for any individual state may not exceed 10 percent of the total federal funds available for that year. States that participate are required to provide a nonfederal funding commitment of 25 percent. In Florida, 80 percent of that commitment is met by private entities involved in the placement of pumpout installations. The remainder of the match is from funds from the Coastal Protection Trust Fund. Florida has consistently ranked in the top three states nationally and funding during 1998-2003 has been at the 10 percent maximum allowed.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Although no state may receive more than 10 percent of total funding, Florida's longer boating season, number of marinas, and number of boats over 26 feet, may be able to justify a larger share.

State Factors. Florida received four awards in FYs 2002-2003. These awards are for three years. Florida has not yet been able to fully utilize the funds available for inland waters.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$1,553,048/\$49,213/

FFY 2003: \$1,747,805/\$507,160/

15.623 North American Wetland Restoration

Program Description: This program provides grant funds to any public or private organization or individual for wetland conservation projects in the United States, Canada, and Mexico. Funds may be used to acquire real property interest in land or waters, to restore, manage and/or enhance wetland ecosystems and other habitats for migratory birds and other wildlife. Proposals must have 1:1 match of nonfederal dollars.

Proposed Considerations:

State Factors. DEP staff states that more state financial resources would enable it to obtain more federal resources.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$40,000/\$39,790

FFY 2003: \$169,670/\$97,670

15.632 Conservation Grants Private Stewardship for Imperiled Species

Program Description: This program provides federal financial and other assistance to individuals and local, private and voluntary conservation efforts which are carried out on private lands that benefit species on the U.S. Endangered Species Act list and other at-risk species. The assistance is available as project grants. Some state match is required and varies by project grant.

Proposed Considerations:

State Factors. DEP staff believes that the availability of more state financial resources would enable it to pursue more federal grant projects under this program.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2003: \$49,296/fully expended

15.808 U.S. Geological Survey Research and Data Collection (FO-876 Florida Geological Survey (FGS)/Minerals Management Service (MMS) Cooperative Agreement).

Program Description: This program is designed to support research complementary to U.S. Geological Survey Research programs in classification of public lands and examination of geological structure, water, mineral and biological resources and products of the national domain. Application must be for scientific research projects. Funds can be used for attendance at national conferences to disseminate project results.

Proposed considerations:

Federal Factors. In Florida, this program helps find beach quality replenishment sands offshore to repair beach erosion; this is important because there is little such sand in Florida's waters. The current 50-50 match does not appear to be mandated by federal law, but encouraged, though the in-kind match is seen as a definite advantage.

State Factors. Agency states that tight budget constraints limit FGS contributions to in-kind match, and that additional FGS budgetary funds would increase participation in Cooperative Investigations. Alabama is listed as a state that might be willing to work with Florida.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$207,202/\$200,923/\$103,601 (at least)

Unused funds (\$6,279), due to inclement offshore weather, rolled over to 2003.

**15.810 National Cooperative Geological Mapping Program
(STATEMAP and EDMAP)**

Program Description: The objective of this program is to produce maps of areas in which knowledge of geology is important to the economic, social, or scientific welfare of individual states. Funds from STATEMAP are used to support projects which: (1) produce new geological maps with explanatory information; and (2) compile existing geological data in a digital form. EDMAP provides funding for graduate students in academic research programs through cooperative agreements that involve geographic mapping and scientific data analysis, expand the research and educational capacity of programs that teach earth sciences students geological mapping techniques and data analysis, and facilitate the publication of maps generated by such programs.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. The Florida Geological Survey considers this program a high priority. Consequently, it has been funded for 11 years. Florida does not appear to participate in EDMAP, which provides funding for graduate students in academic research programs that involve geologic mapping and scientific data analysis. Perhaps identifying state university resources could provide a match for an EDMAP program.

State Factors. The agency has “maxed-out” its administrative costs for use as an in-kind match. Possible sources of additional match for cost allocation purposes include: (1) being permitted to fully utilize indirect costs as a match; (2) finding ways to access OPS matching funds from other state funding sources (*i.e.*, Hydrogeology/Florida Springs Initiative); and (3) finding ways to get credit for the time that state university professors and other university personnel spend on projects. In addition, any way of freeing up resources now devoted to tracking cost allocations would also free up personnel to be used for the match.

Funds Allocated/Expended/ State Match:

FFY 2002: \$134,606

FFY 2003: \$125,761

15.916 Outdoor Recreation: Acquisition, Development and Planning (Land and Water Conservation Fund)

Program Description: This program provides financial assistance to states and their political subdivisions for the preparation of Statewide Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plans (SCORPs) and acquisition and development of outdoor recreation areas for the general public. The grants may be used for outdoor recreation projects such as picnic areas, inner city parks, bike trails, outdoor swimming pools, and support facilities such as roads and water supply among others.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Forty percent of the first \$225 million appropriated; thirty percent of the next \$275 million; and twenty percent of all additional appropriations are apportioned equally among the states. The remaining appropriation is apportioned based on need. (?Does this work well for Fl or not?)

State Factors. The state expends \$300 million per year for land acquisition (through the Florida Forever program*) that could be used as a match if the federal program were expanded. The current match consists of funding for an ongoing contract with the Florida Natural Areas Inventory. A revision to the federal formula to allow such a match would better match allocations to the land area of the state.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$30,000/*/\$60,000**

FFY 2003: \$30,000 /*/\$60,000**

17.600 Mine Health and Safety Grants

Program Description: These project grants: (1) assist states in developing and enforcing effective coal or other mine health and safety laws and regulations consistent with s. 506 of the Federal Mine Safety and Health Act of 1977; (2) improve state workers compensation and occupational disease laws and programs related to coal and other mine employment; and (3) provide federal-state coordination and cooperation in improving the health and safety conditions in mines.

Proposed Considerations:

State Factors. Florida's 20 percent match is provided from the state's Non-Mandatory Lands Reclamation Trust Fund and in-kind training from the mining industry. The average award under this program is \$162,000. Given the low level of mining in Florida, the state appears to be receiving an appropriate share of this grant. In order to receive more funds under this program, Florida would need to have more mines. Any policy or law change that would provide a greater incentive for mining in Florida, and consequently, more federal funds, would be offset by the environmental costs associated with increased mining activities.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$153,214/fully expended/\$38,303

FFY 2003: \$155,134/fully expended/\$38,784

20.205 Federal-Aid Highway Program: Florida Keys Overseas Heritage Trail and other trail grants.

Program Description: This program assists state transportation agencies in the planning and development of integrated, interconnected transportation systems important to interstate commerce and travel. The specific project grant administered by the Florida DEP is the Florida Keys Overseas Heritage Trail (FKOHT), a 106 mile trail which connects the Florida Keys.

Proposed Considerations:

State Factors. The survey showed that only a percentage of the funding had been expended within a year. For example, \$3 million of the \$ 7 million received under this program in FY 2002, was expended. Furthermore, only \$1 million of the \$4.8 million received in FY 2003, had been expended. The survey stated that the balance of these funds had not been contracted. During an interview, DEP staff explained that these projects are multi-phased projects which can take four or more years, from the design phase to the construction phase, to complete.⁴ For this reason, unexpended funds do not adversely affect Florida's future receipt of federal aid. Projects on the FKOHT expected to be undertaken during the next 12 years will total \$300 million.

Federal Factors. DEP staff mentioned that because these projects take several years, sometimes the funds allocated for the construction phase are insufficient as a result of rising construction costs. DEP staff suggested that it would be helpful if the state could take the rate of inflation into account when projecting construction costs.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$7,000,000/\$3,000,000/No match required
FFY 2003: \$4,847,697/\$1,000,000/No match required

⁴ Interview with Stan Mobley, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Office of Greenways and Trails.

20.219 Recreational Trails Program (RTP)

Program Description: This program provides funds to states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trail-related facilities for both motorized and non-motorized recreational use. The types of assistance available are both formula grants and project grants. Funds for this program are divided among the states as follows, 50 percent of the funds are equally apportioned among the states and the remaining 50 percent are distributed to the states based on a formula. The formula takes into account the participating states': (1) use of non-highway recreational fuel; (2) number of light trucks registered through the Florida Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles; and (3) estimates of ATVs and dirt bikes in the state as determined by the Motorcycle Industry Council.

Use of RTP funds are constrained in the following manner: (1) 40 percent of the funds must benefit diverse use recreational trails; (2) 30 percent must benefit motorized recreational trails; and (3) the remaining 30 percent must benefit non-motorized recreational trails. Once a state receives RTP funding, it has four years in which to obligate those funds.

The existence of the RTP is contingent on the Federal Surface Transportation Act, which was recently reauthorized in August 2005. One of the most significant changes resulting from the 2005 reauthorization is that states are no longer allowed to access funds categorized as non-motorized funds for a motorized project. Prior to 2005, this type of flexibility was allowed between these two categories only if the state's funding would lapse due to non use. However, as of 2005, any unused funds are lost. Because Florida has always been one of two states nationally to ensure that RTP funds were used on the type of projects for which they were originally intended, this change has not affected Florida. Florida has consistently ranked among the top five states in receipt of RTP funding.

Proposed Considerations:

State Factors. Of funding in 2002 (\$1.6 million) and 2003 (\$1.7 million), only \$839,063 of the 2002 funding has been obligated. This was due to rule writing and Florida being one of two states nationally that ensures that these funds are used on motorized trails, as originally intended. Florida has until 2006 in which to obligate these funds.

As of 2005, all states must ensure that funds are used for the category for which they were granted. There is a 20 percent match requirement for administrative and education costs, met by a soft match consisting of "toll credits" provided through the Florida Department of Transportation. No other in-kind or cash match is required to fund this aspect of this program.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$1,636,742/\$839,063 obligated/\$327,348
FFY 2003: \$1,656,895/none obligated/\$331,378

66.001 Section 105 Air Pollution Control Grants

Program Description: This program assists states and their political subdivisions in planning, developing, establishing, improving, and maintaining adequate programs for the prevention and control of air pollution or implementation of national primary and secondary air quality standards. The types of assistance available are project grants.

Under this program, DEP receives a share of EPA Region 4's funding each federal fiscal year. EPA Region 4 consists of Florida, Georgia, Mississippi, Alabama, Tennessee, South Carolina, and North Carolina. Florida's allocation is determined by multiplying the EPA Region 4 funding level by 0.0791816. Since 2000, the federal funding level for Region 4 has declined. As a result, Florida's share of funds under this program has decreased as well. Additionally, in order to participate in this program Florida must commit to an Air Planning Agreement with EPA Region 4. Florida is also required to match at least 40 percent of the previous year's funding level and implement a Maintenance of Effort (MOE) requirement, which is to match the prior year's funding level by at least \$1.00, as required by EPA. Florida currently matches at 58 percent. As a result, Florida's match exceeds the amount allocated and is funded by Motor Vehicle Registration Fees from the Department of Highway Safety and Motor Vehicles. In FFY 2002, Florida's match for this grant was \$2,141,300 and in FY 2003 it was \$2,141,600.

Additionally, Florida has eight approved local programs that receive funds from this grant. They are located in Miami-Dade, Broward, Palm Beach, Sarasota, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Orange, and Duval counties. In FY 2003, Broward, Duval, Hillsborough, Miami-Dade, Palm Beach, and Pinellas counties received \$2,112,358 in additional funds from this grant.⁵

Florida collects approximately \$20 million per year from the Motor Vehicle Registration Tag Fee for these programs as well. Years ago, Florida forfeited some federal funds under this program as a result of the funds collected by the tag fee.

Proposed Considerations:

Comments. Inquiry regarding why the share of a growing state like Florida is declining revealed that funding for the entire program has been reduced dramatically in recent years. The President's proposed budget for FY 2007 recommends cutting funding for air quality grants by \$35 million (from \$220 million to \$185 million). DEP is currently engaged in lobbying efforts to maintain funding for this program at FY 2006 levels.

Additionally, Florida may want to look for relief from the MOE requirement that effectively requires it to expend more than the statutory match.

⁵ FY 2003 Air Grant Allocation for Region 4 State and Local Agencies.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$1,488,034/fully expended/\$2,141,300

FFY 2003: \$1,406,339/fully expended/\$2,142,600

66.419 Water Pollution Control – State and Interstate Program Support

Program Description: This program assists states in establishing and maintaining adequate measures for the prevention and control of surface and ground water pollution from both point and non-point sources. The types of assistance available are formula grants and competitive awards. Funds are appropriated based on the extent of the pollution problem in the respective state. This is measured by taking into account the following components: (1) surface water area; (2) ground water use; (3) water quality impairment; (4) point sources; (5) non-point sources; and (6) population of urbanized areas. The set-aside for Interstate Water Pollution Control Agencies is 2.6 percent of the total state funds appropriated under Section 106 of the Clean Water Act. The interstate allotment formula consists of: (1) a base portion, and (2) a variable portion. The base portion ensures that each interstate agency will receive a base level of \$125,000. The variable portion seems only to affect tribal lands

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Two parts of the formula seem to work against Florida: (1) the base level of funding, \$125,000, for all states regardless of need; and (2) the formula's focus on surface water rather than groundwater pollution problems, directs funds away from Florida and benefits states in the Northeast.

State Factors. The state match is provided in-kind, with salaries of staff working in the Water Resources Regulatory programs funded primarily from DEP's Permit Fee and Water Quality Assurance Trust Funds.

Comments. While there could be some improvement, DEP staff believes that the current formula works fairly well. Florida's grant is the largest in the South and ranks third among the seven most populous states.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$5,863,400/fully expended/\$22,500,000 (for FY 2002 AND FY 2003).

FFY 2003: \$5,821,000/fully expended/ (“)

66.432 State Public Water System Supervision

Program Description: These grants provide financial assistance to eligible states and tribes for their Public Water Systems Supervision Program in order to ensure that they comply with the National Primary Drinking Water Regulations, contained in 40 CFR 141. The funds are to be used to develop and implement a public water system supervision program that complies with the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Two aspects of the allocation formula work against Florida: (1) a base level funding award of \$334,500 for all states, regardless of need; and (2) a focus on serving permanent populations in a state with millions of tourists each year.

State Factors. The state match is provided in-kind, with salaries of staff working in the Water Resources Regulatory programs funded primarily from DEP's Permit Fee and Water Quality Assurance Trust Funds.

Comments. Florida's grant is the largest in the South and ranks fourth among the seven most populous states. There may be value in raising the issue of the burden on water supplies as a result of tourism and incorporation of that impact into the formula.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$3,482,650/fully expended/\$3,500,000 (for FY 2002 AND FY 2003)
FFY 2003: \$3,493,000/fully expended/ (“)

66.433 State Underground Water Source Protection

Program Description: Funds from this formula grant are to be used to develop and implement an underground injection control program to enforce the requirements of the Safe Drinking Water Act. The goal of the program is to ensure that underground drinking water sources are protected from injection activities that can jeopardize water quality. The factors used to determine a state's allocation are: (1) the state's population, based on estimates or resident population taken from the 1996 Census Bureau Data; (2) state land area, based on data from the 1992 Statistical Abstracts and updates; and (3) injection practices by the State, based on data reported by the State and maintained by EPA as of the most recent fiscal year. Federal assistance is limited to 75 percent of the program's eligible costs and is required not to exceed the state's allotment.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Under the current formula, Florida's grant is ranked number four among the seven most populous states. However, federal program funding has been stagnant. The number of regulated underground injection wells continues to grow, and will probably require increased state expenditures unless the federal appropriation is increased.

State Factors. The state match is provided in-kind, with salaries of staff working in the Water Resources Regulatory programs funded primarily from DEP's Permit Fee and Water Quality Assurance Trust Funds.

Comments. The State may want to consider contacting its Congressional Delegation about the need for additional funding.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match: (#'s appear the same as the previous grant, CFDA # 66.454)

FFY 2002: \$247,700/fully expended/\$1,400,000

FFY 2003: \$246,450/fully expended/\$1,400,000

66.454 Water Quality Management Planning

Program Description: This program is designed to assist States, Regional Public Comprehensive Planning Organizations (RPCPO's), and Interstate Organizations (IO's) with water management planning. Each fiscal year the grant administrator reserves under Section 604(b) of the Clean Water Act an amount not to exceed one percent of the amount allotted or \$100,000, whichever is greater, for each state. At least 40 percent of a state's annual award must be allocated to eligible RPCPO's and IO's, unless the EPA approves a lesser amount.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. The current formula works fairly well. Florida's grant ranks third among the seven most populous states.

State Factors. No state match is required.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match: (#'s appear the same as the previous grant, CFDA # 66.433)

FFY 2002: \$247,700/fully expended/\$1,400,000

FFY 2003: \$246,450/fully expended/\$1,400,000

66.458 Capitalization Grants for Clean Water State Revolving Fund

Program Description: This formula grant is used to create a state revolving fund for construction of wastewater treatment facilities and implementation of other water quality management measures. The grant is deposited in the state’s revolving fund and used to provide loans and other financial assistance (except grants) to communities and interstate agencies. Four percent of grant amounts may be used for the cost of administering the State Revolving Fund. States determine the priority of the funding within their state. State allotments are determined by a table of decimal fractions in Section 205 of the Clean Water Act. States are required to match 20 percent of the amount of each federal grant payment.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. The allocation of funds is based on a percentage initially calculated administratively in the 1970s, and then enacted into Section 205(c)(3) the Clean Water Act. This formula negatively impacts Florida based on the “needs surveys” that Florida conducts for the EPA to measure unmet needs for wastewater, storm water, and non-point source facilities and activities. Florida, with almost six percent of the national population and a substantial tourist industry, receives only 3.4 percent of funds, which is less than Massachusetts’s share and less than one-third that of New York.

State Factors. The State must provide an amount equal to 20 percent of the federal grant. This amount currently comes from general revenue funds; it could be restructured to be collected from wastewater fees.

Comments. This is a very large program, and one whose formula significantly disadvantages Florida. The state’s Congressional Delegation may want to consider an effort to join with other growing states to amend the Clean Water Act formula, or to withhold support for appropriations until such amendment is effected.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$44,550,642/fully expended/\$8,910,128

FFY 2003: \$44,261,022/fully expended/\$8,852,204

66.460 Non-Point Source Implementation Grants

Program Description: This formula-grant program assists states with implementing EPA-approved Section 319 (of the Clean Water Act) non-point source management programs.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Florida's grant is ranked third among the seven most populous states. However, EPA uses 1980s census data for the calculation, which negatively impacts Florida and other growth states. Federal program funding has been stagnant. Further, the number of regulated underground injection wells continues to grow, and will probably require increased state expenditures unless the federal appropriation is increased.

State Factors. The program requires a state match of 40 percent of program costs and a maintenance of effort requirement. The state match is provided by local program sponsors, and there are therefore no state general revenue funds required.

Comments. According to DEP, EPA is considering using more current Census data. This effort should be encouraged.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$9,079,000/fully expended/\$3,631,600

FFY 2003: \$9,116,800/fully expended/\$3,646,720

66.461 Wetland Program Grants

Program Description: This program assist state, tribal and local government agencies with protecting, managing, and restoring wetlands through specific project grants that encourage comprehensive wetlands program development. The recipient must provide a 25 percent minimum towards total projects costs which can be met with contributions from other entities, except the federal government.

Proposed Considerations:

Federal Factors. Florida's grant is ranked second among the seven most populous states.

State Factors. The 25 percent state match is provided through in-kind matches, with salaries of staff funded primarily from DEP's Permit Fee and Water Quality Assurance Trust Funds.

Funds Allocated/Expended/State Match:

FFY 2002: \$49,560/fully expended/\$16,520