

Chapter 8: Evaluation / Overview of Financing Mechanisms

8.1 Introduction

8.1.1 Background

The Stage II RAP outlines a comprehensive set of actions designed to address water quality problems in the Rochester Embayment watershed. In recognition of the limited resources available for water quality programming, both new and existing funding options must be explored. The objective of Chapter 8 is to outline these funding options so that a strategy for funding RAP implementation can be developed for Chapter 11 "Management of RAP Implementation". The following criteria may be useful in assessing the appropriateness of various financing mechanisms for funding RAP implementation.

- *Equity* - Is the funding burden fairly distributed? Ideally, environmental programs are designed so that the funding burden is distributed according to the contribution to environmental degradation ("polluter pays"), or according to the level of benefit derived from an enhanced environment ("beneficiary pays").
- *Impacts* - Does this funding mechanism create incentives for desirable behavior?
- *Political Acceptability* - Will the stakeholders support this type of funding mechanism or does it place an undue burden on taxpayers or stakeholders?
- *Revenue Potential* - Will this mechanism produce adequate and long-term (if necessary) revenue?
- *Flexibility* - Can the revenue generated by this mechanism be used for a wide range of purposes or is it restricted to a single use?
- *Administrative Requirements* - What are the administrative costs associated with a particular funding mechanism?

8.1.2 Special District Task Group

In 1995, the Special District Task Group of the Monroe County Water Quality Coordinating Committee (WQCC) analyzed the issue of creating special districts as a means of funding remedial actions required to address non-point source pollution associated with stormwater runoff. The primary tools used in this analysis were an Evaluation/Overview of Funding Mechanisms (prepared by Kevin Wheeler, an intern in the Water Quality Section of the Monroe County Health Department) and Protecting the Lake Ontario Drainage Basin in New York State: A Proposal to Develop a Finger Lakes - Lake Ontario Watershed Protection Alliance (prepared by the Water Resources Board of the Finger Lakes Association, Inc. - an update is found in Appendix C). The Evaluation/Overview document presents the following range of options.

1. Establish a county-wide stormwater district
2. Establish a county-wide lake protection district
3. Establish multiple stormwater districts based upon watersheds
4. Establish an inter-county lake protection district
5. Establish a county stormwater management authority
6. Expand the role of Monroe County Pure Waters Districts¹ to include stormwater management
7. Continue to establish intergovernmental agreements (IGAs)

The Water Resources Board document describes a proposal similar to option #4.

The Task Group concluded that the most effective strategy to implement stormwater management in Monroe County consists of two parallel components. The first component of this strategy is a two-step process. The first step is the continued establishment of water quality IGAs between Monroe County and the municipalities within the County. The IGAs contain a consistent set of basic principles, including the need to explore the potential of establishing special districts on a watershed basis as funding mechanisms for stormwater remedial actions. The process of establishing and implementing IGAs will help to educate public officials and citizens on the benefits of stormwater management and involve them in remedial action. As the IGAs evolve, the municipalities and their citizens may decide to take the second step which would consist of establishing special districts based upon watersheds.

The second component of the Task Group's recommended strategy is the advancement of the proposed Finger Lakes - Lake Ontario Watershed Protection Alliance. The alliance would represent the institutionalization of the Finger Lakes Aquatic Vegetation Control Program and ultimately consist of the 25 New York State counties in the Lake Ontario watershed. The Alliance would be funded by both the New York State Environmental Protection Fund and as a line item in the budget of the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. The primary role of the Alliance would be to develop and implement coordinated watershed protection strategies at the county level throughout New York State's Lake Ontario basin. The implementation of the RAPs would be a major part of this effort.

Upon recommendation from the full membership of the WQCC, the Monroe County Water Quality Management Agency adopted the two component stormwater management strategy, as described above, at its March 24, 1995 meeting.

¹ "The Monroe County Department of Environmental Services (DES) is divided into divisions including Pure Waters, Solid Waste Management, and the Environmental Management Council. The 5 Pure Waters Districts are funding mechanisms that are used to fund the Pure Waters Division."

8.2 Establishing New Financing Options

8.2.1 Special districts

8.2.1.1 Definition

A special district is an independent unit of local government organized to perform a single function (such as stormwater management or lake protection/rehabilitation) or a limited number of related functions. Special districts usually have the power to incur debt and levy taxes or special assessments. New York state laws grant counties and municipalities the authority to establish special districts for selected purposes, and dictates how special assessments must be calculated under certain circumstances. If the improvement or service to be provided in a proposed district is to be financed by the issuance of bonds (or other evidences of indebtedness), approval from the state Comptroller is required.

8.2.1.2 Options

Options relating to the creation of a special district:

- The county legislatures or boards of supervisors could establish one or more special districts in accordance with section 5-A of County Law (precedent - current Pure Waters Districts).
- The New York State Legislature could create a special district in accordance with state enabling legislation (precedent - Saratoga Lake Protection District).
- The Monroe County Legislature could direct the existing Pure Waters Districts to assume stormwater management responsibilities. This option could be the easiest to implement from a political and administrative perspective. However, the Pure Waters Districts do not correspond exactly with the basins in Monroe County and there are parts of Monroe County that are not included in a Pure Waters district.
- The New York State Legislature could direct the Monroe County Water Authority² to assume stormwater management responsibilities.
- The New York State Legislature could create a new authority to assume stormwater management responsibilities.

Options relating to the tax/fee structure of a special district:

- The tax or fee charged to property owners could be based on the quantity of impervious surfaces located on the parcel. Such a fee adheres to the polluter pays axiom, because property owners would be assessed fees based upon the amount of runoff which flows from their property.
- The tax or fee charged to property owners could be based on a property classification system. The amount of the tax/fee would be related to the average pollutant runoff load associated

² The Monroe County Water Authority is a public benefit corporation established by the New York State Legislature under the Public Authorities Law. The Authority was created to finance, construct, operate, and maintain a water supply for the residents of the County of Monroe. The Authority is governed by a Board of Directors that are appointed by the Monroe County Legislature and operates under guidelines established in its charter.

with the particular land use. Such a system adheres to the polluter pays principle.

- The tax or fee could be added to the existing water bill.

Options relating to the geographic/political scope of the special district:

- A county-wide special district could be established. An advantage of a county-wide district would be that priority watersheds could be identified and resources allocated accordingly. However, the redistribution of resources from one watershed to another could create resentment. There also could be political opposition to a county-wide district as authority would be shifting from the municipalities to the county.
- Special districts based on watersheds could be established. The advantages associated with this strategy are that it utilizes the watershed approach and that it might be more equitable than a county-based system because revenue generated within a particular watershed would be used in that watershed. A potential problem associated with this option is that major watersheds cross county lines. Therefore, approval from multiple counties would be required.
- An inter-county Lake Ontario protection special district could be established. There are approximately twenty counties which drain into Lake Ontario. The advantage of this option is that it is very comprehensive. However, in all likelihood, such a district would have to serve in an advisory capacity because it is very unlikely that so many counties would agree to grant taxing authority to a district.

8.2.1.3 Advantages of special districts as a funding mechanism

- A special district creates a direct link between the revenue stream and the service provided.
- A special district provides a stable revenue source and liberates stormwater management from dependence upon the financial situation/limitations of the municipality.

8.2.1.4 Disadvantages of special districts as a funding mechanism

- The creation of any new level of government, especially one with taxing authority, may not be well received by the taxpayers. Traditionally, special districts have been established after a crisis.
- Several stormwater special districts already exist at the municipal level. The municipalities may not be willing to cede local control.

8.2.1.5 Local example

- The Town of Greece (Lake Ontario West Basin) has a town-wide drainage district which levies a fee based on land use. A survey was done in that town to determine the average amount of impervious surfaces for residential properties and a flat yearly rate was set at \$14. Commercial properties are assessed a flat rate of \$70 a year and vacant lands are charged \$0.30 a year per acre.

8.2.2 General tax revenues

8.2.2.1 Definition

An enforced proportional contribution from persons and property levied by the state by virtue of its sovereignty for the support of government and for all public needs. Each level of government possesses a unique set of taxes which it may impose. For instance, in New York State, cities are granted the authority to collect property taxes, sales taxes, and income taxes, whereas counties may collect property taxes and sales taxes but not income taxes.

8.2.2.2 Options

- Revenue from sales or commodities taxes on items which contribute to environmental degradation (such as motor oil, pesticides, and fertilizers) could be used to fund restoration projects.
- A tax surcharge (an added levy, on an existing tax, that is earmarked for a specific project) on a sewer bill could be used to finance stormwater retention basins.
- Existing tax revenue could be used for water quality programs.

8.2.2.3 Advantages

- If the tax base is relatively large, even a modest tax can produce significant and relatively stable levels of revenue.
- Tax revenue can be used for a wide range of purposes.
- The administrative structure for managing taxes already exists.

8.2.2.4 Disadvantages

- Generally, taxes do not precisely target polluters or beneficiaries. However, in a situation where the polluters or beneficiaries cannot be identified a tax may be appropriate.
- Public opposition to any increase in taxes.
- Water quality programs will have to compete with other programs for funding.

8.2.2.5 Local example

- Monroe County's support for water quality staff is funded through general tax revenues.
- The Town of Pittsford funds stormwater management programs through general tax revenues.
- In some municipalities garbage collection is funded through general tax revenues.

8.2.3 Bonds

8.2.3.1 Definition

A bond is a written promise to repay a debt at a specific date or maturity with periodic payments of interest (customarily every six months). In New York State, municipalities, school districts, district corporations, and authorities have all been granted the authority to issue bonds within guidelines and restrictions established by the state. Debt size, length, and structure of repayment are all regulated by the state.

8.2.3.2 Options

- General obligation bonds which are repaid using general revenues.
- Revenue bonds which are repaid using revenue from a specific project.

8.2.3.3 Advantages

- Bonds can generate relatively large amounts of revenue very quickly.
- The issuance of bonds is a relatively common government practice therefore the administrative structure is already in place.
- If the bonds are structured so as to allow their payment to coincide with the life of the proposed projects, then those individuals who benefit from the projects would be responsible for paying for the benefits which they are receiving.

8.2.3.4 Disadvantages

- The interest associated with bonds increases the cost of a project.
- Revenue raised through the use of bonds is generally restricted to a single project or program.
- There may be political and citizen opposition to increasing the public debt.
- Water quality projects would have to compete with other programs for funds.
- The use of bonds might not result in an equitable distribution of the funding burden depending upon what source(s) of revenue are used to make payments on the bonds.

8.2.3.5 Local example

- In Monroe County, the Planning Board develops a prioritized list of capital projects. This list of recommendations is provided to the County Executive who submits his/her proposed Capital Improvement Program to the County Legislature for approval.

8.2.4 Fees

8.2.4.1 Definition

Fees are payments made for particular services rendered or rights granted. The size of the fee must correlate to the service provided. Many levels of government, including state and local, possess the authority to impose fees.

8.2.4.2 Options

- Establish a user fee which seeks to target the beneficiaries of a program.
- Establish an impact fee which seeks to target polluters.
- SPDES or wetlands permit fees could be modified or increased in order to fund water quality programs or restoration. Such an action may require legislative approval.

8.2.4.3 Advantages

- Fees tend to be more equitable because they seek to precisely target the polluter or beneficiary.
- No state imposed limit (as with taxes).
- The size of the fee is designed to adequately cover program costs.

- There may be an administrative structure already in place which can manage a new fee.

8.2.4.4 Disadvantages

- The imposition of new fees will be unpopular with the regulated community.
- There may be significant collection costs associated with the imposition of new fees.

8.2.4.5 Examples

- Water and sewer bills have a user fee component based upon the amount of water used.
- The Irondequoit Watershed Collaborative (IWC) is researching the idea of using impact fees to fund stormwater management activities. The IWC is a coalition of municipalities within the Irondequoit Watershed whose goal is to initiate cooperative efforts to manage stormwater quantity and quality.

8.2.5 Not-for-profit organization

8.2.5.1 Definition

A not-for-profit organization is an organization that is maintained for purposes other than making a profit. In New York State, the establishment of a not-for-profit organization involves filing with the New York State Secretary of State, the New York State Department of Taxation and Finance, and the United States Internal Revenue Service.

8.2.5.2 Options

- Monroe County could establish a not-for-profit organization.
- An existing not-for-profit organization could adopt water quality programming or education as its mission.

8.2.5.3 Advantages

- Contributions to a not-for-profit organization are tax deductible.
- A not-for-profit organization may be in a better position to solicit donations from corporations and the general public.
- The administrative structure may already be in place.
- The use of a voluntary contribution mechanism is likely to be popular with the public because it does not place any additional burdens on taxpayers.
- There may be a high degree of flexibility associated with the use of donated funds.

8.2.5.4 Disadvantages

- A not-for-profit does not place the funding burden on polluters or the beneficiaries.
- The quantity of revenue that may be obtained through a not-for-profit organization may be limited or unpredictable.
- An extended period of time may be required for the not-for-profit organization to establish a solid reputation in the community. A solid reputation is essential in order to obtain substantial donations from corporations, foundations, and individuals.
- Not-for-profit organizations do not possess any regulatory authority.

8.2.5.5 Examples

- Not-for-profit organizations have been established in many areas of concern across the Great Lakes basin. For example, in Hamilton Harbour, Ontario, the public advisory committee (PAC) has been incorporated as a not-for-profit organization known as the Bay Area Restoration Council (BARC). BARC was formed to monitor the implementation of the RAP and conduct implementation programs with an emphasis on educational projects. BARC is funded through citizen, corporate, and public interest group memberships.
- The Toronto Waterfront Regeneration Trust is another excellent example of a not-for-profit in the Great Lakes Basin. The Trust was established in 1992 with the objective of revitalizing the Toronto waterfront. Although the Trust receives some funds from the provincial government, it has been quite successful in marketing its cause to corporations. In order to facilitate its marketing efforts, the Trust encourages corporate participation on its committee and developed a logo which it makes available to its corporate sponsors.
- The Friends of the Buffalo River is a third example of a not-for-profit organization that has been established in a Great Lakes Basin area of concern. The objective of this volunteer organization is to preserve and protect the Buffalo River. The Friends of the Buffalo River has initiated a number of activities including litter clean-ups, greenway planning, and educational programs in schools. The organization is supported through memberships. The Greenway Planning project is being funded by grants from the New York State Council on the Arts and the Great Lakes Research Consortium.

8.2.6 Partnerships

8.2.6.1 Definition

A partnership is a voluntary, consensus-based coalition of diverse organizations and agencies convened in order to implement a specific project. The management of the partnership may be assigned to a coordinating committee comprised of representatives from each of the partners. The purpose, philosophy, bylaws, organizational structure etc. of the partnership may be outlined in a charter or memorandum of understanding (MOU).

8.2.6.2. Options

- The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (NYSDEC) could facilitate the creation of partnerships to implement selected remedial measures”.
- The Monroe County Water Quality Coordinating Committee (WQCC) could facilitate the creation of partnerships to implement selected remedial measures.
- A not-for-profit organization could facilitate the creation of partnerships to implement selected remedial measures.
- The Genesee/Finger Lakes Regional Planning Council (G/FLRPC) or the Water Resources Board (WRB) could facilitate the creation of partnerships to implement selected remedial measures in the rural counties.

8.2.6.3 Advantages

- The voluntary nature of a partnership may facilitate the participation of a broad cross-section of stakeholders in remedial programs.
- The participation of a broad cross-section of stakeholders in the process may facilitate the contribution of financial and in-kind resources to remedial programs.
- May place the funding burden on polluters or beneficiaries (if they participate in the partnership).
- The partnership concept is very popular with funding agencies.

8.2.6.4 Disadvantages

- Some stakeholders may be unwilling to participate in a partnership unless there is a “carrot or stick”.
- Achieving consensus can be very time consuming.
- A possible disadvantage of partnerships is that the partners can change and organizations can expand or collapse.

8.2.6.5 Examples

- The Indiana Grand Kankakee Marsh Restoration Project (Grand Calumet River/Indiana Harbor Canal Area of Concern) is an example of an innovative partnership that has been quite successful in leveraging funding. The 14 project partners include federal agencies, conservation organizations, and local businesses. The partnership’s mission is to protect, restore, and enhance 26,500 acres of wetlands and associated uplands in the Kankakee River Basin. Thus far, the partners have committed approximately \$2.3 million in land, cash, and in-kind services. The North American Wetlands Conservation Council awarded the partnership a grant of \$1.5 million in matching funds.
- The Ashtabula River Partnership (Ashtabula River Area of Concern) is another example of the benefits associated with a partnership approach. The Partnership was established in 1994 in order to address sediment contamination as identified in the Ashtabula River RAP. The Partnership is comprised of the diverse community interested in sediment remediation including private corporations, government agencies, politicians, and shipping and recreational boating interests. The possibility that the lower Ashtabula River and Harbour could be listed as a Superfund site and the threat to shipping and recreational boating were major factors in encouraging stakeholder participation in the Partnership. The partners believe that a cooperative project to address a shared sediment remediation problem could provide a more comprehensive and efficient solution.

As initial steps in the process, the Partnership established a charter that outlines the by-laws, a mission, goals, and a workplan. In addition, a full-time coordinator position was established. A respected and well-known retired dean from a local university was hired for this position. Activities that have or will be undertaken by the partnership include defining the contaminated sediments to be addressed, developing a detailed plan for remediation,

identifying resources needed for remediation, and generating a timeline for remediation activities. Thus far, the Partnership has received funding from the partners themselves, the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency, the United States Army Corps of Engineers, and Congressional add-ons.

- The Wildlife Habitat Council's Waterways for Wildlife program is an example of another type of partnership. The objective of this program is to protect and enhance habitat for wildlife by means of developing and implementing corporate-led, community-based regional wildlife habitat management plans. For example, the Tri-State Waterways Partnership (West Virginia, Ohio, and Kentucky) was established to work cooperatively with local corporations, state and federal natural resource agencies, conservation organizations, and private landowners to (1) increase the quality, quantity, and diversity of wildlife habitat and (2) provide a mechanism for developing and achieving a collective vision for the future of the region's waterways. As of August 1996, the Partnership is funded by three local corporations. Thus far, habitat enhancement activities have been initiated at three corporate sites.
- Although the situation in the Rochester Embayment Area of Concern (AOC) differs from that in the Grand Calumet River/Indiana Harbor Canal and the Ashtabula River (Superfund related issues are not driving the process in the Rochester Embayment AOC), some of the success factors may be applicable. For example, the success of both partnerships in obtaining funding was the result of the large number of stakeholders that were involved in the process. In addition, in the case of the Ashtabula River Partnership, the participation of a well-respected local leader in the role of coordinator and the participation of politicians were key in obtaining financial commitments.

8.2.7 Dedication of revenues

8.2.7.1 Definition

The term "dedication of revenues" refers to the establishment of accounts or funds in order to set aside revenue for a specific purpose. For example, the New York state Legislature establishes "special revenue funds" which ensure that monies collected through a particular revenue stream are used only for the purposes designated in the fund. Revenue can also be dedicated through "earmarked revenue accounts" within New York's general revenue fund. However, because earmarked revenue accounts are administratively established, there is no guarantee that their revenue will be used only for the stated purpose.

8.2.7.2 Options NA

8.2.7.3 Advantages

- The dedication of revenues may help environmental programs compete with other government programs for funding.
- The administrative costs associated with the dedication of revenue are minimal.

- The dedication of revenue may appeal to the public because it often involves using revenue resulting from environmental degradation for environmental remediation.

8.2.7.4 Disadvantages

- The creation of special revenue funds may be unpopular with some legislators as they may not want to lose control over the allocation of revenue.

8.2.7.5 Examples

- The New York Great Lakes Protection Fund was created by the Legislature in 1990 as a depository for revenue from environmental litigation, corporate donations, and government transfers. The revenue in this fund is restricted to designated purposes.
- New York State has established an Environmental Protection and Oil Compensation Fund and a Hazardous Waste Remediation Fund.

8.2.8 Fines

8.2.8.1 Definition

A fine is a sum imposed as punishment for a criminal or civil offense. The funds that are collected through the imposition of fines can be dedicated to special funds for wetlands protection, etc.

8.2.8.2 Options NA

8.2.8.3 Advantages

- Fines target the polluter.

8.2.8.4 Disadvantages

- The revenue stream associated with fines fluctuates significantly.
- If enforcement efforts are weak, fines may rarely be imposed therefore little revenue will be generated.
- Fines are subject to litigation.

8.2.8.5 Examples

- The New Hampshire Wetlands Board is authorized to impose an administrative fine of up to \$2,000 per offense on any person violating provisions of the state's wetlands statutes or rules. Proceeds of the fines and penalties are placed in a nonlapsing fund in the state's treasury and may be spent by the Wetland's Board for restoration, research, and enforcement relative to wetlands.

8.2.9 Lotteries

8.2.9.1 Definition

A drawing of lots in which prizes are distributed to the winners among persons buying a chance.

8.2.9.2 Options NA

8.2.9.3 Advantages

- State lotteries are more acceptable to voters and state legislatures than less "voluntary" revenue sources.

8.2.9.4 Disadvantages

- As a funding mechanism, lotteries do not target polluters or beneficiaries. Instead, lottery revenues are considered by some to be a regressive source of income, that is lower-income groups bear a greater financial burden than higher-income groups.
- Some constituencies may be opposed to the concept of government promoting gambling.
- Water quality programs would have to compete with education, economic development, etc. programs for funding.
- The funding level may be variable

8.2.9.5 Examples NA

8.3 Accessing Funds from Existing Sources

8.3.1 Federal grant and loan programs

Table 8-1. Federal Grant and Loan Programs

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Water Resource Development Act (WRDA)					
WRDA Section 401: Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans	United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE)	To provide technical, planning and engineering assistance in the development and implementation of RAPs.	States, local governments	\$500,000 (FY 1996) 50% Federal, 50% Non-Federal match	
WRDA Section 312: Environmental Dredging	USACOE	To provide for the removal of contaminated sediments outside the boundaries of Federal navigation channels as part of the operation and maintenance on a navigation project.	States, local governments	No specific appropriation (FY 1996), 50% Federal, 50% Non-Federal match, disposal costs are non-Federal	
WRDA Section 22: Planning Assistance to the States	USACOE	Support States in their comprehensive planning for the development, utilization, and conservation of water and related land resources.	States, local governments	\$2,000,000 (FY 1996) 50% Federal, 50% State match	
WRDA Section 1135: Project Modifications for Improvement of Environment	USACOE	Modify existing USACOE projects project structures and/or their operation to restore environmental quality, consistent with project's authorized purpose.	States, local governments, non-profits	\$10,800,000 (FY 1996) 75% Federal, 25% Non-Federal match	
WRDA Section 204: Beneficial Use of Dredged Material	USACOE	Protect, restore and create aquatic habitat, including wetlands, in connection with dredging at authorized Federal navigation projects.	States, local governments	\$500,000 (FY 1996) 75% Federal, 25% Non-Federal match, O/M costs are non-Federal	

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Clean Water Act (CWA)					
CWA Section 104(b)(3) - Water Quality Grants	United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)	Support implementation of the NPDES program through unique investigations, special one-time studies, and demonstrations. Activities might include the development and implementation of best management practices for stormwater or the development of a stormwater permit program.	States, municipalities, not-for-profits, and individuals.	For federal fiscal year 1996, the NYSDEC was awarded \$155,000 for Great Lakes program activities	The Monroe County Health Department has received Section 104 funds to support both the Rochester Embayment Watershed Mercury Pollution Prevention project and the Distribution and Presentation of Wetlands Information to Public Officials and the General Public project.
CWA Section 118 - Great Lakes Contaminated Sediment Remediation	Great Lakes National Program Office of the USEPA	To assist in bringing about remediation of contaminated sediments at priority geographic areas in the Great Lakes.	States, interstate agencies, other public or private agencies, and individuals.	A minimum of a 5% nonfederal match is required. For federal fiscal year 1996, no funds were appropriated.	
CWA Section 118 - Great Lakes Habitat Protection / Restoration	Great Lakes National Program Office of the USEPA	To assist in protecting/restoring Great Lakes habitats, including near-shore and other high-priority areas identified in 1994 by the Nature Conservancy.	States, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit agencies, and individuals.	A minimum of 5% in nonfederal matching funds is required. For federal fiscal year 1996, no funds were appropriated.	
CWA Section 118 - Great Lakes Monitoring	Great Lakes National Program Office of the USEPA	To provide trend analysis and baseline data on toxic and nutrient concentrations through open lake and atmospheric monitoring, to support and target remedial efforts and measure environmental progress.	States, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit private agencies, and individuals.	A minimum of 5% in nonfederal matching funds is required. For federal fiscal year 1996, \$314,000 was awarded to the NYSDEC for lake monitoring.	NYSDEC monitoring funds were applied to the Drainage Basin Sediment Study for Eastern Lake Ontario.

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
CWA Section 118 - Great Lakes Pollution Prevention	Great Lakes National Program Office of the USEPA	To support activities and projects that help reduce and/or eliminate the use, generation, or release of persistent, toxic substances, especially those that bioaccumulate.	States, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit private agencies, and individuals.	A minimum of 5% in nonfederal matching funds is required. For federal fiscal years 1995 and 1996, no funds were appropriated.	
CWA Section 118 - Implementation of Great Lakes Remedial Action Plans and Lakewide Management Plans	Great Lakes National Program Office of the USEPA	To provide assistance to states and others in implementing remedial action plans for the 31 U.S./binational areas of concern in the Great Lakes, developing lakewide management plans, and reducing critical pollutants pursuant to those plans for each of the Great Lakes.	States, interstate agencies, other public or nonprofit private agencies, and individuals.	A minimum of 5% in nonfederal matching funds is required.	
CWA Section 319	USEPA	To provide federal funds for the implementation of approved nonpoint source management programs. Maintenance of effort and 40% match required. Administration costs are limited to 10% of the amount of the grant.	State designated lead nonpoint source agencies.	In New York State fiscal year 1995-1996, \$990,000 has been provided in federal grants to address nonpoint source pollution.	The NYSDEC has used Section 319 funds to implement nonpoint source pollution control programs, as well as information and education programs designed to control stormwater runoff from new development. Locally, Section 319 funds have been used for the Irondequoit Bay Wetlands project, the Detention Basin Conversion project, the Pesticide Amnesty Day project and Pittsford's Allen's Creek Stormwater Management Facility.

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
CWA Section 603(d)	USEPA	The New York State Revolving Fund (SRF) for water pollution control projects provides interest-free short term, and low interest rate long term loans to municipalities to finance planning, design, and construction of water pollution control facilities. In the past, only publicly owned treatment plant projects were funded. However, a range of non-point source projects are now eligible for SRF funding including landfill closure or capping and deicing materials storage facilities.	The New York State Environmental Facilities Corporation awards loans to municipalities.	As of 8-30-1996, the Environmental Facilities Corporation (EFC) has made 350 SRF loans totaling \$3.32 billion. Through the use of existing resources, EFC can provide long term loans of approximately \$858 million for municipal pollution control projects during federal fiscal year 1997.	Collector sewers and a pump station in the Town of Pittsford were funded through the SRF. The Village of Honeoye Falls and the Towns of Penfield and Irondequoit have also received loans to fund storm and wastewater system improvements.
CWA 604 (b)	USEPA	Implement water quality management planning, including determining the nature, extent, and causes of water quality problems.	States	60% of the funds awarded to New York State are used to fund personnel at NYSDEC and 40% is passed through to local water quality planning agencies. In fiscal year 1996, these pass through funds amounted to \$579,000.	The erosion control projects in Linear and Powder Mills Parks, as well as the dry basin conversion program were funded through Section 604(b) funds. For New York State fiscal year 1995-1996, pass through funds were used to support Regional Planning Boards to establish baseline water quality programs and implementation projects.
Near Coastal Waters Program of the CWA	USEPA	Improve environmental condition of near coastal waters. Activities might include identification of problems and/or strategy implementation.	States, municipalities, not-for-profits, and individuals	5% nonfederal match required.	

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Regional Initiatives of the CWA	USEPA Region 2	Allow regions to develop individual initiatives within the framework of the annual budget process. All phases of a watershed protection project can be supported.	No limitations	For federal fiscal year 1996, \$424,000 was used for the contaminated sediment program.	In 1996, the contaminated sediments program at NYSDEC was funded. Past projects include pollution prevention, clean sweep, and contaminants trackdown.
Wetlands Protection Program of the CWA	USEPA	Fund wetlands protection activities including planning, monitoring, enforcement, or education.	States, municipalities	Recipient must provide at least 25% matching funding.	
Farm Bill					
Environmental Quality Incentives Program (EQIP)	United States Department of Agriculture (USDA)	EQIP combines the functions of a number of existing programs including the Agricultural Conservation Program. Encourage voluntary compliance with federal requirements to solve point and nonpoint sources of pollution through the provision of cost share and technical assistance.	Agricultural producers who bear a part of the cost of an approved conservation practice.	EQIP is funded at \$130 million in fiscal year 1996 and \$200 million annually thereafter.	A farm in the Town of Parma (Lake Ontario West Basin) received \$14,000 in cost share assistance to exclude clean water from entering the barnyard.
Wetlands Reserve Program	USDA	The goal of the Wetlands Reserve Program is to restore wetland function and values to eligible lands. Eligible land is defined as land that is (1) farmed or has been farmed in the past and is (2) characterized by soils that are predominately hydric. Restoration costs may be shared or paid in full by the Natural Resources Conservation Service in exchange for an easment or restoration agreement.	Landowners	The 1996 Farm Bill allows for restoration cost-share agreements, where up to 75% of the restoration will be paid by the USDA. The new Farm Bill calls 1/3 permanent easements, 1/3 in 30 year easments, and 1/3 in cost share restoration agreements only.	

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Resource Conservation and Development Program	USDA	Assist state and local governments, as well as not-for-profit organizations plan and implement programs for Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) through the provision of project grants and advisory services.	States, municipalities, and not-for-profit organizations		The Ontario Lake Plains RC&D Council has been active since 1991 and received not-for-profit status in 1994. The Council includes representatives from Monroe, Niagara, Orleans, Genesee, and Wayne counties. The Council has three members from each county representing the soil & water conservation district, county government, and a citizen member. Although the Council is active, it has not received authorization from the Secretary of Agriculture and therefore is funded through a \$300 annual contribution from each county.
Coastal Wetlands Planning, Protection, and Restoration Act					
	The United States Department of the Interior (USF&WS)	The long-term restoration, enhancement, management, or purchase of coastal wetland ecosystems.	States		
Land and Water Conservation Fund					
	The United States Department of the Interior (National Park Service)	To create and maintain a nationwide legacy of high-quality recreation areas and facilities. Monies are used for federal, state, and local acquisition, development, and improvement of outdoor recreation areas.	States, municipalities		

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Coastal Zone Management Act					
National Coastal Zone Management Program	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration	Assist the states in effectively managing the nation's coastal zone by balancing the competing demands of resource protection, provision for public access, and economic development. Grants are provided to the states in order to facilitate the development, administration, and implementation of coastal programs, including nonpoint source pollution control.	States	New York's award is used to fund personnel in the New York State Department of State.	Local Waterfront Revitalization Plans have been developed for a number of municipalities in the Rochester Embayment watershed including Irondequoit, Penfield, and Rochester.
North American Wetlands Conservation Act					
		Grants may be used to acquire wetlands that further the North American Waterfowl Management Plan and international treaties on migratory birds.			

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Nonindigenous Aquatic Nuisance Prevention and Control Act of 1990					
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Lower Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Resources Office - Aquatic Nuisance Species Task Force)	Prevent the introduction and spread of aquatic nuisance species; monitor distribution of nuisance species and impacts to native species	states with approved management plans	Vary according to Congressional appropriations	In 1995, New York State was granted \$60,000 to initiate its management plan
Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act of 1990					
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service (Lower Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Resources Office)	Rehabilitate and protect Lake Erie and Lake Ontario ecosystems	Partnerships with 50/50 matching funds - no limits on potential partners	Generally \$25,000 per project	Lake Ontario assessment (Cape Vincent); Atlantic salmon rehabilitation and evaluation

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Fish and Wildlife Foundation					
	United States Fish and Wildlife Service	Ecological restoration activities and/or ecological education		Generally under \$180,000 per year; 50% funding match required (can be in-kind services)	Wilson, New York (Lake Ontario West Basin) lake trout reef assessment

8.3.2 State grant and loan programs

Table 8-2. State Grant and Loan Programs

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
New York State Environmental Protection Fund (EPF)					
	NYSDEC	The EPF was established by New York State as a permanently dedicated fund to meet many of the state's pressing environmental needs. More than a dozen local assistance and state environmental programs are authorized for funding by the EPF. These include non-point source water pollution abatement and control projects, open space conservation, and local coastal rehabilitation projects. NYSDEC and the New York State Department of Agriculture and Markets have proceeded to implement grant funded projects based on receiving requests for proposals.	Municipalities	Created in 1993, the EPF received 31.5 million in 1994-1995. In New York State fiscal year 1994-1995 \$1 million was made available to fund environmental projects. In fiscal year 1995-1996, \$1.2 million was made available. In 1996-1997 \$4 million was appropriated.	<p>Town of Irondequoit (Lake Ontario Central Basin) - \$100,000 for development of a public park on a 25 acre parcel along Irondequoit Bay. The site was formerly used by the Town as a landfill and this project will provide much needed public access to the Town's waterfront.</p> <p>Town of Penfield (Lake Ontario Central Basin) - \$20,000 for the design of stormwater run-off and drainage improvements within the LaSalle Landing area along Irondequoit Bay.</p> <p>Town of Greece (Lake Ontario West Basin) - \$29,500 (to be shared with 2 other municipalities) for preparation of a regional dredging management plan.</p>

Program	Admin. Office	General Program Objective	Eligible Parties	Funding Level	Local Example
Great Lakes Protection Fund					
	Great Lakes Protection Fund, Chicago, Ill.	The Great Lakes States created the Fund in 1989 as the nation's first multi-state environmental endowment. The Fund's mission is to identify, demonstrate, and promote regional action to enhance the health of the Great Lakes ecosystem. The Fund supports projects in three areas: pollution prevention, natural resources, and health effects.	Not-for-profit agencies, individuals, and proprietary entities	Seven of the Great Lakes States have contributed \$76.8 million to create the permanent endowment.	The State University of New York - Oswego was awarded \$203,000 to continue a study assessing the neurobehavioral impacts on infants and young children whose mothers consumed Lake Ontario fish.

8.3.3 Foundations/Private Sources

Private foundations are another possible source of funds that may be pursued in order to implement the Rochester Embayment RAP. The Rochester Public Library possesses a number of directories that provide basic information (mission, nature of assistance, eligibility, funding availability, application process, information contact, etc.) on private foundations in the United States. The following are a few of the foundation directories that are available.

- The Foundation Center (published annually). The Foundation Directory. Lists over 6,500 of the largest foundations in the United States with a brief description including address, officers, size of grants, and application procedures. Arranged geographically, with alphabetical, types of support, and field of interest indices.
- The Foundation Center (1993, 3rd edition). New York State Foundations. Comprehensive directory of over 4,600 independent, company-sponsored, and community foundations active in New York State. Indexed by subject, type of support, and geography.
- The Foundation Center (1993, 3rd edition). National Directory of Corporate Giving. Guide to corporate giving programs and foundations of more than 1,700 corporations.
- The Foundation Center (revised regularly). Corporate Foundations Profiles. Analyzes the funding patterns of over 200 of the largest company-sponsored foundations. Also provides brief financial data on over 700 additional, smaller company-sponsored foundations.
- The Foundation Center (1994, 5th edition). Foundation Fundamentals. Designed to help novice and more experienced grantmakers understand the world of foundations and learn techniques for identifying funding sources.
- Rochester Grantmakers Forum (1995). Guide to Grantmakers in the Rochester Area: 1995-1997. Directory of foundations in the Rochester area. Indexed by field of interest and type of support. Also includes a guide to creating a grant proposal and common application and reporting forms.

Additional information pertaining to foundations may be found in the New York Guide to Financing RAP Implementation. In preparing this document, the Apogee Research Corporation conducted a search of two directories and identified a number of foundations that support environmental causes in New York State.

Author: Todd Stevenson

