

Discussion Points

1. Staffing, ERI and Funded Vacancies

By division, how many employees are eligible for the early retirement initiative? By division, how many funded vacancies are expected to be eliminated and what are the expected savings? To the extent that new employees cannot be hired to fill 90 percent of lost positions, what services or programs are likely to be most effected? Will any of these reductions affect the department's monitoring and oversight of contracts, and its efforts to claim or maximize federal reimbursements?

Attachment I identifies the distribution of the 680 employees by division, which is based on the assumptions in the budget for the projected \$135.9 million net ERI savings. The savings assumes an overall 50% participation rate that varies by Department. The initial proposal is still under discussion and could be refined in the enabling legislation. Regardless, the Governor has stated that the backfills of participants will be limited to 10% on a Statewide basis.

The Department's Reduction in Force plan identified 26 funded vacancies that will be eliminated to meet (in part) \$1.2 million of the overall budget reduction. These positions are in the following divisions:

Parks & Forestry	9
Fish & Wildlife	6
Human Resources	5
General Services	3
Science & Research	1
Occupational Health	1
Legal Affairs	1

Given the lack of a legislative bill to address the offer of early retirements it is unknown at this time as to the specific impacts and where, with the 680 employees that could be potentially eligible, those employees choose to leave.

Relative to the Department's oversight of its contracts, procurement and federal grants there are no targeted budget reductions to these areas.

2. Penalties and Fine Collections

Please provide a listing of total fines and penalties actually collected by the department in FY 2007 and anticipated for FY 2008, including the disposition of these monies. If possible, please highlight the fines collected that are or will be affected by the provisions of P.L.2007, c.246. In light of the department's apparent understaffing in some of its compliance and enforcement units, how will P.L.2007, c.246 affect its ability to carry out enforcement responsibilities under the act?

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

Attachment II recaps the Department's penalty and fine collections for Fiscal Years 2007 (Actual) and 2008 (Projection and YTD) along with the scheduled disposition as reflected in current budget language.

The enactment of the Environmental Enforcement Enhancement Act (EEEA) (P.L. 2007, c.246), upgraded the enforcement provisions of the following statutes:

Waterfront Development Act N.J.S.A. 12:5-6;
Pesticide Control Act N.J.S.A. 13:1F;
Coastal Wetlands Act N.J.S.A. 13:9A;
Freshwater Wetlands Act N.J.S.A. 13:9B;
Coastal Area Facility Review Act N.J.S.A. 13:19;
Endangered & Non-Game Species Conservation Act N.J.S.A. 23:2A;
Water Supply Management Act N.J.S.A. 58:1A;
Safe Dam Act N.J.S.A. 58:4;
Flood Hazard Area Control Act N.J.S.A. 58:16A; and
Safe Drinking Water Act N.J.S.A. 58:12A.

More significantly, the EEEA created civil administrative penalty powers in the following statutes where this authority never existed:

Pesticide Control Act,
Coastal Wetlands Act,
Endangered & Non-Game Species Conservation Act, and
Flood Hazard Area Control Act.

The EEEA also provides for increased penalties, the ability to assess daily penalties and the ability to seek criminal sanctions. These enhancements to existing programs still need to be proposed and adopted through the administrative rule process prior to their implementation. Regulatory proposals to address these changes are expected to occur as regulations are modified or readopted.

There is no expectation that the changes to EEEA will result in significant changes to penalties collected in FY08.

3. Office of Permit Information and Assistance (OPIA)

Please describe the current functions of this office or its successor. Please explain the disposition of monies from this account, including the number and location of staff it supports. What impact will the loss of this appropriation have on the department's ability to help the public with permit information and assistance?

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

The Office of Permit Coordination and Environmental Review provides for a coordinated approach to the Department's permitting and compliance assistance to the regulated community. The Office which provides assistance to new major development and/or remediation projects works with the permit applicants to identify major site constraints and development plan flaws early in the planning phase. Later the Office establishes a permitting team that identifies and coordinates the review of all permits required to complete the project. Lastly, the office also coordinates environmental reviews for the Department for all projects receiving more than \$1 million in state or federal funding.

Currently there are six employees assigned to the account that supports this Office. As part of the Reduction in Force plan the Department will shift the staff to fee based programs to insure that the current functions will continue to be performed.

4. Parks Management Reductions

Please identify the operating units where staff reductions (representing filled positions) will likely be implemented. To the extent possible, please describe how these reductions will affect the operation of the State Park system. How will the funding reduction affect the department's ability to receive federal funds, as well as maintain State Parks once capital projects funded by constitutionally dedicated Corporation Business Tax revenues are completed?

Most of the impact from these reductions will affect the field operations of the state park system. Parks proposed for full or partial closure/elimination of services due to the staffing reductions include:

- **Ringwood State Park** (Partial Elimination of Services/ Closures) – Shepherd Lake Recreation Area (swimming), Ringwood Manor reduced hours, Steuben House is currently closed. The State Botanical Gardens and Skylands Manor will remain open.
- **D&R Canal State Park** (Partial Elimination of Services/Closures) – Camping/office at Bulls Island Recreation Area will be closed. Interpretive services will be suspended. Rockingham Historic Site will remain open. The tow path will remain accessible to the public.
- **Washington Crossing State Park** (Partial Elimination of Services) – There will be a 40 percent reduction in interpretive staff resulting in significantly reduced hours of operation at the Clark House at Princeton Battlefield State Park, the Johnson Ferry House and the museum.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

- **Monmouth Battlefield State Park** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Visitor center and restrooms will be closed.
- **Stephens State Park** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Camping area will be closed. *Stephens State Park is administered under Hopatcong State Park.*
- **High Point State Park** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Swimming, camping areas will be closed. Office and interpretive center will be closed. Access to some trails will be impacted.
- **Brendan T. Byrne State Forest** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Camping area/park office/group picnic area will be closed. Indian King Tavern, administered by Brendan Byrne State Forest, will be closed. Access to some trails will be impacted.
- **Round Valley Recreation Area** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Swimming, camping, Wallace House/Old Dutch Parsonage and park office closed.
- **Parvin State Park** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Swimming, camping, park office and interpretive center will be closed.
- **Jenny Jump State Forest** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Camping and park office closed. Access to some trails will be impacted.
- **Worthington State Forest** (Full Elimination of Services/Closure) – Camping and park offices closed. Access to some trails will be impacted.
- **Fort Mott State Park** (Full Elimination of Services/Closures) – Hancock House, park office and other historic sites closed. Access to ferry service will be provided.
- There would be several organizational consolidations that will impact the four regional offices, Kittatinny Valley State Park and Voorhees State Park.

Minimal patrolling of these areas impacted will be conducted by State Park Police, but vandalism will remain a viable concern. Additionally, minor maintenance will need to continue of some of the areas, such as Monmouth Battlefield with its geo-thermal operation in the visitor center. Maintenance plans will be developed by geographic regions. Additionally, state parks that offer similar services such as camping and/or swimming may experience increased visitors and increased wear on its facilities with no additional maintenance funding. Closure plans are being developed for each area, which will clearly define what impacts exist and how best we can address them along with any potential allowed access for trails, boating and/or fishing. Additionally, DEP is reaching out to park volunteer organizations and/or county park systems to partner with the department in maintaining and/or supporting programs at some of the areas.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

As for impacts to federal funding, the State Park Service does not apply nor receive any significant amount of federal funding for its operations and/or staffing. The Historic Preservation Office (HPO), a program supported by the Parks Management budget receives 30 percent of federal funding for its operations. However, the reduction in force will have no impact on HPO's funding received, as training and outreach (requirements to receive federal funding) will continue.

Capital projects being constructed utilizing Corporate Business Tax funds in Parks, Forest or Wildlife Managements area that remain open will continue to be maintained by current staffing levels. Projects being constructed in areas proposed for closing shall be completed and secured until such time the Park is re-opened. Projects in design phase for facilities in park areas slated for proposed closure will be evaluated on a case by case basis for completion. As an example, new underground utilities are being designed for Monmouth Battlefield State Park. These utilities will be constructed within existing roads and would normally affect visitors to the Park. It would be beneficial to construct this project during a proposed closure as it would cause the least amount of disturbance to the public.

5. Fish & Wildlife Reductions

Please describe the impact of the proposed salary account reduction on the Division and on its ability to maintain the State's wildlife management areas. In light of the recommended reduction, why does the position data indicate the loss of only three positions?

For the Division of Fish and Wildlife six (6) funded vacancies will be eliminated to address \$192,600 of the \$569,000 reduction. The balance will be achieved through reductions to operating accounts as well as taking other cost savings measures. The impacts of eliminating funded vacancies will be felt in the Bureau of Land Management, Office of Business Administration and the Bureau of Wildlife Management.

The Division's bear appropriation will be reduced by \$185,000. This operating reduction is expected not to impact the current non-lethal control initiative since major equipment purchases for this program were accomplished in Fiscal Year 2008.

6. Recycling Fund Reauthorization

Please explain how and when the existing recycling grant program will be replaced by the new grant program, including the disposition of available funds from both programs. What are the formula funding differences between the two grant programs? How will the changeover in programs affect staffing levels? How and when does the department plan to utilize the \$15 million in recycling tax revenues earmarked for non-grant activities? What

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

is the implementation status, budget, and staffing requirements of the new e-waste program? How will the Clean Communities program use its former recycling grant funds in FY 2009?

It is anticipated that approximately \$18 million will be available by June, 2008 to support the new program for Fiscal Year 2009. Specifically, no less than 60% of the anticipated \$18 million (or approximately \$ 10.8 million) will be announced by September 1, 2008, and approximately \$5.4 million will be available to the counties for those purposes identified in the Act before December 31, 2008. In both instances, the transition will be transparent to the municipalities and counties, as this is exactly how the predecessor grants to these entities have been implemented for the past two decades.

While the Recycling Enhancement Act's original estimate of \$34 million may have been overstated and is being revised downward due to the several exemptions that were included in the final bill, the following provides a summary of the funding that would be available between the first year and the second year based on the full level of taxes being collected.

		FY 2009	FY 2010
Direct Recycling Grants	60%	10,800,000	20,400,000
County Grants –SW Mgt	25%	4,500,000	8,500,000
County Grants – Public Ed	5%	900,000	1,700,000
Research – Higher Ed	5%	900,000	1,700,000
Administration	5%	900,000	1,700,000

Of the monies not specifically allocated to local governments approximately \$1 million (5% of annual revenues) will be used by the Department to implement and administer the Act, and no more than \$1 million annually will be used for "recycling research, demonstration and education, including professional training".

The following schedule reflects the change in the distribution of Clean Communities monies between Fiscal Year 2008 (with \$4 million being available for Recycling Tonnage Grants) and Fiscal Year 2009 based on approximately \$16.3 million in tax collections.

	FY 2008	FY 2009
Estimated Revenue = \$16,300,000		
Recycling	4,000,000	0
Clean Communities Council	300,000	375,000
Parks	1,200,000	1,592,500
Municipalities	9,600,000	12,740,000
Counties	<u>1,200,000</u>	<u>1,592,500</u>
	<u>16,300,000</u>	<u>16,300,000</u>

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

As noted above the largest impact of the reauthorization of the Recycling Fund can be seen in the additional monies that will be passed thru to the municipalities for their anti litter programs.

7. State Aid Funding – Lake Hopatcong Commission, and Highlands Council

How will the State Aid reductions and the elimination of the Lake Hopatcong Commission grant affect the operations of these agencies? What impacts, if any, will the impending adoption of the Highlands Master Plan have on the Highlands Council, the DEP, functions of the Department of Agriculture, and the Garden State Preservation Trust Fund?

The primary purpose of the Lake Hopatcong Commission is to harvest aquatic weeds that impact both the aesthetic quality and navigability of the Lake. This excessive weed growth is primarily caused by high nutrient loads (phosphorus) entering the lake. There are 2 primary inputs: septic systems and runoff from lawns. The Department and the federal EPA have provided over \$2 million in grants to the Commission (in addition to their Grants in Aid appropriation) to implement best management practices and stormwater controls to address the phosphorus load entering the lake.

The Department favors finding a stable source of funding for both the Lake Hopatcong Commission and the Greenwood Lake Commission, rather than rely on General State Fund support. The Department has recommended that specific user fees be authorized so that those whom benefit directly from the actions of the Commissions also support those activities. This is not unlike the imposition of beach fees that help coastal communities pay for life guards.

After finalizing the draft Regional Master Plan (RMP), during Fiscal Year 2008, the Highlands Council needs to ensure that adequate staff is available to effectively implement the RMP. The RMP sets forth a number of program areas necessary to successfully implement the Highlands Act and Regional Master Plan. For example, once the plan goes into effect, there is a need for staff to review applications to determine, as required by the Highlands Act, if the applications are consistent with the Regional Master Plan. Adequate staff is necessary in order to review and respond to applications in a timely manner. The Highlands Council is also required by the Highlands Act to implement a TDR program and to establish a TDR bank. Staff has met with the Governor's Office to discuss this issue and briefed them on the need to capitalize that bank if the program is to have a chance of success.

The Department expects that the adoption of the RMP will result in additional permit applications being submitted as landowners see the full suite of options available to them. The Department expects multiple programs to be impacted by these additional applications,

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

including, but not limited to the Division of Land Use Regulation, Division of Watershed Management, Division of Water Supply, Green Acres, Office of Natural Lands Management, Endangered Non-Game Species Program, Division of Water Quality, and the Office of Planning & Sustainable Communities.

Both the Department and the Highlands Council expect adoption of the RMP to result in an increase in properties submitted to Green Acres for preservation in the Highlands Region. As part of the RMP, the Highlands Council will be submitting to the Green Acres program (as well as the State Agricultural Development Committee) a confidential list of properties prioritized for acquisition. Implementation of the RMP will likely result in less opportunity for development as well as increased regulatory review, based on the resource protection mandates of the Highlands Act, thus resulting in landowners seeking preservation as an option for their land.

8. Shellfish and Aquaculture.

Please describe the intended impacts of these revisions in terms of economic benefits, staffing requirements and environmental effects. Please compare the anticipated revenues resulting from the revised laws with current revenue estimates; and describe how these funds will be used within the department.

The recent changes to the shellfish statutes regarding the change from a "clamming license" to a "shellfish license" are not expected to have a significant effect on revenue collected for deposition into the dedicated "Shellfisheries Law Enforcement Fund." While there is the potential for increased revenue since harvesters will now be required to obtain a license for the harvest of scallops, mussels and other shellfish, the "new" license will still be used predominantly for the harvest of clams. This change applies to both recreational and commercial shellfish licenses, the fees for which remain the same for resident recreational and commercial harvest. The statutory changes also established a new non-resident commercial shellfishing license of \$250. However, it is not anticipated that many of these licenses will be sold (or at least not enough to generate a significant increase in revenue to this account).

With respect to statutory revisions regarding aquaculture leasing in Delaware Bay, the statutory changes allow for the establishment of a new lease area in the lower bay. It is anticipated that with the total additional area approximately \$18,750 will be generated. This amount is dependent on all potential leases in the new "Aquaculture Development Zone" being executed.

9. Global Warming Response (P.L. 2007 c.112) and Global Warming Solutions Fund (P.L.2007, c.340)

What is the current status of the department's responsibilities under both acts? Notwithstanding the promulgation of rules expected to be issued this summer, what are

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

some of the options available to the department for expending its designated revenues from the sale of emissions credits? What is the current and projected administrative costs the department may incur under both acts, and will sufficient staff and resources be available to carry out its responsibilities?

The Department of Environmental Protection has been working closely with the Board of Public Utilities (BPU) and the Economic Development Authority (EDA) to implement the provisions of the Global Warming Response Act and the Global Warming Solutions Fund. The following efforts are underway:

The Department continues to work with the nine other states in the region participating in the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI) in making final design decisions pertaining to the RGGI auction.

The Department expects to propose its rule pertaining to the RGGI auction in early summer 2008. That proposal will undergo the normal rulemaking process with receiving comments.

The first RGGI auction is planned to take place in September 2008 and are likely to take place quarterly thereafter. New Jersey's participation in the initial auction will be dependent on the adoption of the DEP RGGI rulemaking. Extensive stakeholder input has already been sought on the RGGI model rule as part of the regional RGGI process.

Under the Global Warming Response Act, the Department is required to develop a statewide inventory of sources of greenhouse gas emissions. A draft of that inventory, based on existing sources of data, was posted on the Department website for public input in March 2008. That inventory will be finalized in the next couple of months. Additionally, the Act requires the Department to develop regulations establishing a greenhouse gas emissions reporting program. The Department has been internally developing that rule, with an emphasis on maximizing existing reporting programs so as to not create extensive new reporting programs, and expects to propose that rule in late summer.

A requirement of the Global Warming Solutions Fund is for the Department to promulgate regulations that set priorities for how the Department, EDA and BPU apply the proceeds of the RGGI auction. These regulations are to be developed in consultation with the two other agencies. The three agencies hosted a stakeholder meeting in March to solicit input on those "priority ranking" regulations. Attendance at the meeting was good and the three agencies received very productive comments from the public on what the agencies' priorities should be when applying the proceeds of the RGGI auction. The Department expects to propose these regulations, in consultation with BPU and EPA in mid-summer.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

The Global Warming Response Act requires the Department to prepare a report outlining recommendations on policies New Jersey can adopt to achieve the 2020 statewide greenhouse gas limits set in the Act. The Department has been examining policy options that can most efficiently and cost-effectively achieve the state's 2020 limit, including studying efforts in other states. The Department has been consulting with other state agencies as well since achieving the 2020 limit will involve policies related to transportation, building design, land use and other sections of state government. Additionally, the Department has held several stakeholder meetings to solicit input on policies for consideration. It expects to share a draft report with stakeholders in the early summer prior to providing those recommendations to the legislature.

Revenues under RGGI are expected to be between \$40 and \$70 million annually depending on the auction's price of carbon. The Global Warming Solutions Fund stipulates the following delineation in how the proceeds are to be expended:

60% to EDA for programs in the commercial and industrial section;

20% to BPU for programs in the residential sector and to reduce ratepayer impacts; and

20% to DEP for a program to incentivize municipal efforts to reduce greenhouse gases and a program to promote sequestration of greenhouse gases through forest stewardship and restoration of tidal salt marshes.

The Global Warming Solutions Fund authorizes the Department to utilize up to 4% of the total proceeds from the RGGI auction for administrative support. Administrative costs that may be covered by the Fund include costs associated with implementing the RGGI auction, costs associated with spending the 20% of the proceeds of the RGGI auction, and costs associated with implementing policies that will address achieving the statewide 2020 and 2050 greenhouse gas limits. The 4% is adequate for the immediate future as the RGGI program and other parts of the greenhouse gas program are currently being developed. However, as final recommendations on new policies are developed and as regulations currently under development reach implementation phase, the 4% is unlikely to be sufficient to cover all relevant administrative costs.

10. County Environmental Health Act (CEHA)

Please provide a table indicating the current CEHA allotment each county receives and the allotment they would receive in FY 2009 under the recommended appropriation. Discuss the possible impacts the lower allotments may have on a county's ability to carry out its responsibilities under the CEHA.

The following schedule compares the anticipated allocation of the State Aid CEHA monies to each County based on the Fiscal Year 2008 distribution.

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

GRANTEE	2008 GRANT	PROPOSED 2009 GRANT
Atlantic County Division of Public Health	\$156,500	\$122,070
Bergen County Department of Health Servc.	196,250	153,075
Burlington County Health Department	147,000	114,660
Camden County Division of Health	184,669	144,041
Cape May County Department of Health	124,000	96,720
Cumberland County Department of Health	162,750	126,945
Essex County Health Department	211,259	164,782
Gloucester County Department of Health	165,000	128,700
Hudson Regional Health Commission	168,179	131,179
Hunterdon County Department of Health	144,588	112,778
Mercer County Health Department	172,788	124,774
Middlesex County Public Health Department	189,335	147,681
Monmouth County Health Department	162,985	127,128
Morris County Office of Health Management	156,750	122,265
Ocean County Health Department	174,000	135,720
Passaic County Health Department	155,500	121,290
Salem County Health Department	125,000	97,500
Somerset County Health Department	159,700	124,566
Sussex County Health Department	130,500	101,790
Union County Health Department	171,179	133,519
Warren County Health Department	124,000	96,720
2008 NON-MATCHING GRANTS		
Rutgers Air Pollution Training Program	37,766	29,457
Rutgers Noise Technical Assistance Center	<u>28,432</u>	<u>22,176</u>
GRAND TOTAL:	\$3,448,130	\$ 2,679,536

For years, the CEHA funding mechanism has been strained as available funding has not kept pace with the addition of new county health agencies (14 to 21), new mandates, and the cost of living rate. The Department has a long standing agreement with the counties that no new work will be added unless there is a commensurate level of new funding. Conversely if funding is reduced, the amount of work will be reduced commensurately.

If funding were reduced by 22%, the Department would first eliminate its support for elective activities, which represents about 7% of the State Aid award to the counties. This would result in dropping the school lab chemical project, pesticides and Right to Know inspections, annual

Discussion Points (Cont'd)

surface water sampling, and county-specific projects. The additional 15% reduction would have to come from a reduction in core program activities, which are Air Pollution Control, Solid Waste, Safe Drinking Water, Water Pollution Control, and Hazmat Emergency Response. The counties perform over 12,000 inspections and investigations annually in these core programs, which means a reduction of 15% or 1,800 inspections and investigations in response to citizen complaints and incident notifications that the Department receives annually.

Implementation of this reduction will impact the Department's environmental field objectives; and may result in the loss of federal grant monies due to the inability to meet USEPA inspection commitments in the program areas of Air, Safe Drinking Water, and Pesticides. The Department's Air program would be especially hard hit since they rely heavily upon the CEHA agencies' inspection numbers to meet USEPA commitments.

**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
EARLY RETIREMENT ELIGIBILITY**

Program	50 Yrs Old/ 25 Yrs Service	60 Yrs Old/ 20-24 Yrs Service	60 Yrs Old/ <20 Yrs Service
<u>OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER</u>			
Communications	4	0	0
Legal Affairs	2	1	0
Office of the Commissioner	2	2	1
Press Office	1	0	0
Subtotal	9	3	1
<u>MANAGEMENT & BUDGET</u>			
Affirmative Action	2	0	0
Asst Comm M&B	1	0	1
Audit	2	0	0
Budget & Finance	28	1	0
General Services	8	2	2
Human Resources	10	1	0
Occupational Health & Safety	1	0	0
OIRM	12	2	3
Subtotal	64	6	6
<u>COMPLIANCE & ENFORCEMENT</u>			
Air Enforcement	15	0	1
Asst Comm C&E	2	0	1
Land Use Enforcement	4	1	0
Pesticide Control	5	1	1
Waste Enforcement	21	4	4
Water Enforcement	19	1	2
Subtotal	66	7	9
<u>ENVIRONMENTAL REGULATION</u>			
Air	26	4	2
Asst Comm ER	1	0	0
DESH	20	9	3
Solid and Hazardous Waste	14	3	3
Water Quality	44	2	4
Subtotal	105	18	12
<u>LAND USE MANAGEMENT</u>			
Geological Survey	11	0	0
Land Use Mgt	3	0	0
Land Use Reg	16	4	1
Water Monitoring	17	0	1
Water Supply	22	2	3
Watershed Mgt	8	0	0
Subtotal	77	6	5
<u>NATURAL & HISTORIC RESOURCES</u>			
Asst Comm NHR	4	1	0
Engineering & Construction	11	2	2

**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
EARLY RETIREMENT ELIGIBILITY**

Program	50 Yrs Old/ 25 Yrs Service	60 Yrs Old/ 20-24 Yrs Service	60 Yrs Old/ <20 Yrs Service
Fish and Wildlife	41	2	2
Green Acres	14	2	1
Mosquito Control	1	0	0
Parks and Forestry	62	9	15
Subtotal	133	16	20
<u>POLICY, PLANNING & SCIENCE</u>			
Policy and Planning	7	0	0
Science and Research	6	4	0
Subtotal	13	4	0
<u>SITE REMEDIATION PROGRAM</u>			
Asst Comm SRP	4	0	0
Remediation Mgt	36	9	5
Remediation Support	37	1	4
Subtotal	77	10	9
<u>IN BUT NOT OF</u>			
D&R Canal Commission	1	0	0
Environmental Infrastructure Trust	3	0	0
Subtotal	4	0	0
GRAND TOTAL	548	70	62

DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
 PENALTY AND FINE COLLECTIONS
 FY 2007 ACTUAL and FY 2008 PROJECTED AND YTD

Fines	FY2007 Actual		FY2008 Budget		FYTD Collections		Revised FY08		FY07 Disposition		FY08 Disposition	
	Estimate	Estimate	as of 4/7/08	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	General Fund	Excess Receipts	General Fund	Excess Receipts
Clean Water Enforcement	3,669,111	2,500,000	2,490,056	2,600,000	General Fund	\$2,893,471	General Fund	\$2,090,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 775,641	General Fund	\$ 510,000
Air Fines	4,324,359	4,550,000	5,551,524	5,700,000	General Fund	\$3,600,000	General Fund	\$3,300,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 724,359	General Fund	\$2,400,000
Land Use Fines	1,191,835	600,000	557,116	600,000	General Fund	\$1,191,835	General Fund	\$ 410,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 190,000
Solid Waste Fines	516,959	650,000	770,727	800,000	General Fund	\$ 516,959	General Fund	\$ 650,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 150,000
Hazardous Waste Fines	888,678	700,000	500,030	700,000	General Fund	\$ 888,678	General Fund	\$ 700,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 700,000
Pesticide Fines	131,143	130,000	64,896	130,000	General Fund	\$ 131,143	General Fund	\$ 130,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 0
Radiation Fines	87,694	90,000	122,645	125,000	General Fund	\$ 87,694	General Fund	\$ 125,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 0
RTK Fines	53,950	60,000	44,050	60,000	General Fund	\$ 53,950	General Fund	\$ 60,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 0
TCPA Fines	2,800	75,000	71,800	75,000	General Fund	\$ 2,800	General Fund	\$ 75,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 75,000
Lab Cert Fines	64,825	75,000	66,290	75,000	General Fund	\$ 64,825	General Fund	\$ 75,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 0
SDW Fines	637,728	320,000	207,166	320,000	General Fund	\$ 637,728	General Fund	\$ 320,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 320,000
Water Supply Fines	32,500	30,000	3,150	30,000	General Fund	\$ 32,500	General Fund	\$ 30,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 0
Parks Management Fines	123,904	135,000	107,051	135,000	General Fund	\$ 123,904	General Fund	\$ 135,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 0	General Fund	\$ 135,000
				TOTAL	General Fund	\$10,225,487	General Fund	\$ 8,100,000	Excess Receipts	\$ 1,500,000	General Fund	\$ 3,250,000