

Preliminary Performance Review

**Commission on Potomac
River Basin**

**The Benefits of West Virginia's Membership in
the Interstate Commission on the Potomac
River Basin Have Decreased During Recent
Years, But the Benefits Still Outweigh the Costs**



JOINT COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

Senate

Edwin J. Bowman
Chair

Billy Wayne Bailey, Jr.
Vice Chair

Walt Helmick

Joseph M. Minard

Sarah M. Minear

House Of Delegates

J.D. Beane
Chair

Earnest H. Kuhn
Vice Chair

Joe Talbott

Craig P. Blair

Otis Leggett

**Scott G. Varner, Ex
Officio Non-Voting
Member**

Citizen Members

Dwight Calhoun

John Canfield

James Willison

W. Joseph McCoy

(Vacancy)



OFFICE OF THE LEGISLATIVE AUDITOR

Aaron Allred
Legislative Auditor

John Sylvia
Director

David Mullins
Research Manager

Russell Kitchen
Research Analyst

Performance Evaluation and Research Division
Building 1, Room W-314
State Capitol Complex
Charleston, West Virginia 25305
(304) 347-4890

WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE
Performance Evaluation and Research Division

Building 1, Room W-314
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0610
(304) 347-4890
(304) 347-4939 FAX



John Sylvia
Director

September 7, 2003

The Honorable Edwin J. Bowman
State Senate
129 West Circle Drive
Weirton, West Virginia 26062

The Honorable J.D. Beane
House of Delegates
Building 1, Room E-213
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0470

Dear Chairs:

Pursuant to the West Virginia Sunset Law, we are transmitting a Preliminary Performance Review of the Commission on the Potomac River Basin, which will be presented to the Joint Committee on Government Operations on Sunday, September 7, 2003. The issue covered herein is "The Benefits of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin Have Decreased During Recent Years, But the Benefits Still Outweigh the Costs."

We transmitted a draft copy of the report to the Department of Environmental Protection on August 22, 2003. The DEP opted not to have an exit conference. We received the agency response on August 28, 2003.

Let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of John Sylvia in cursive script.
John Sylvia

JS/wsc

Joint Committee on Government and Finance

Contents

Executive Summary	5
Review Objective, Scope and Methodology	7
Background	9
Issue 1: The Benefits of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin Have Decreased During Recent Years, But the Benefits Still Outweigh the Costs.....	11

List Of Tables

Table 1: Composition of the Potomac River Basin.....	9
Table 2: Funding Sources for the Commission: FY 1996-FY 2003.....	13
Table 3: Commission Funded Projects Benefitting West Virginia: FY 1997 - FY 2003	15
Table 4: Commission Grant and Project Funding Provided By Signatory Governments: FY 1993-FY 2002.....	17

List Of Appendices

Appendix A: Transmittal Letter to Agency.....	19
Appendix B: DEP Remarks.....	21
Appendix C: Agency Response.....	23

Executive Summary

Issue 1: The Benefits of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin Have Decreased During Recent Years, But the Benefits Still Outweigh the Costs.

The Legislative Auditor, therefore, recommends that West Virginia maintains its membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.

The Preliminary Performance Evaluation on West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin concludes that the benefits still outweigh the costs of the State's membership, however, the benefits have decreased during recent years. A primary cause for the reduction in benefits is the discontinuation of a \$511,000 federal appropriation to the Commission. This occurred during FY 1997 and there has not been a direct federal appropriation to the Commission since then. The loss of the federal appropriation to the Commission has resulted in reduced funding for projects benefitting West Virginia. The Commission has had to find other funding sources to replace the loss of the direct federal appropriation in order to protect the environmental quality of the Potomac River Basin. The Commission has achieved this through grant and project funding primarily provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and by the environmental agencies of Commission signatories. West Virginia's environmental agency, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), has not obtained federal grants for Potomac River projects through the Commission, whereas, the other signatory governments have. The Commission has also increased the contribution levels of each signatory government. West Virginia's contribution increased by \$10,602 from FY 1996 to its current FY 2003 level of \$49,500. While West Virginia's signatory contribution only accounts for 3% of the Commission's revenues, West Virginia contains nearly 24% of the Potomac River Basin.

Signatory governments benefit from membership in the Commission by:

1. Seeking the Commission's assistance and expertise in obtaining federal grants and possibly grants from non-profit institutions as they pertain to Potomac River Basin projects.
2. Receiving technical, administrative and funding assistance from the Commission for projects that relate to the signatory governments' specific environmental needs along the Potomac River Basin.
3. Benefiting directly or indirectly from projects initiated or supported by the Commission.

4. Benefiting from ready access to a forum for coordinating with other basin states on any issue relating to Potomac River water quantity or water quality.

The direct and indirect benefits of Commission membership exceed West Virginia's signatory contribution. As the DEP identifies additional Potomac River projects in the future, it may be able to take greater advantage of the administrative and staff expertise available from the Commission, in order to obtain additional federal funding for Potomac River projects. **The Legislative Auditor, therefore, recommends that West Virginia maintains its membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.**

Recommendations

1. *The Legislative Auditor's Office recommends that West Virginia continue its membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.*
2. *The Legislative Auditor's Office recommends that the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection work in cooperation with the Commission to identify and apply for additional federal grant and project funding.*

Review Objective, Scope and Methodology

Congress authorized the creation of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin in 1940 for *the purpose of regulating, controlling, preventing, or otherwise rendering unobjectionable and harmless the pollution of the waters of said Potomac drainage area by sewage and industrial and other wastes* [Public Law 91-407]. The objective of the Preliminary Performance Evaluation of the Commission is to determine if the benefits of West Virginia's membership in the Commission still outweigh the State's financial contribution. This requires determining the Commission's level of grant and project funding, as well as the growth of West Virginia's signatory contribution since the end of the direct federal appropriation in FY 1997. This report will update the findings of the 1997 Preliminary Performance Evaluation of the Commission. The 1997 report contained the following issues:

- i ***The Benefits of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin Outweigh Its Financial Contribution.***
- ii ***Congressional Appropriation to the Commission Was Cut for FY 1997.***

The scope of the present evaluation extends from FY 1996, the last year the Commission received a direct federal appropriation, to FY 2003. The Legislative Auditor's Office utilized financial data provided by the Commission for fiscal years 1996-2003. Data for FY 2003 represent budgeted figures, while actual revenues are provided for the other years.

Background

The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin is a conservancy district consisting of the drainage basin of the Potomac River and the main tributary streams therein. Congress authorized the creation of the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (referred to as the Commission) in 1940 to coordinate water quality programs for the Potomac River Basin. The Interstate Compact includes the states bordering on or draining into the Potomac River as well as the District of Columbia and the Federal Government.

The Commission consists of three commissioners and three alternate commissioners from each signatory government and the Federal Government. Signatories to the compact include West Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Virginia, the District of Columbia and the Federal Government. The Commission has a staff of 26 positions with four vacancies.

The Potomac drainage area, also known as the Potomac Watershed, encompasses approximately 14,670 miles. Table 1 lists the number of miles found in each bordering state and the District of Columbia.

Member	Area (square miles)	Percentage of Basin
West Virginia	3,490	23.8%
Maryland	3,818	26.0
Pennsylvania	1,570	10.7
Virginia	5,723	39.0
Washington, D.C.	69	0.5
Total	14,670	100%

Source: The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

Issue 1

The Benefits of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin Have Decreased During Recent Years, But the Benefits Still Outweigh the Costs.

Issue Summary

The 1997 Preliminary Performance Evaluation on the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin found that the benefits of West Virginia's membership outweighed its financial contribution. **The 2003 report concludes that the benefits still outweigh the cost of the State's membership, however, the benefits have decreased during recent years.** A primary cause for the reduction in benefits is the discontinuation of a \$511,000 federal appropriation to the Commission. This occurred during FY 1997 and there has not been a direct federal appropriation to the Commission since then. The 1997 report expressed the concern that the loss of the federal appropriation to the Commission could result in reduced funding for projects benefitting West Virginia. This has occurred. The Commission has had to find other funding sources to replace the loss of the direct federal appropriation in order to protect the environmental quality of the Potomac River Basin. The Commission has achieved this through grant and project funding primarily provided by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and by the environmental agencies of Commission signatories. Private organizations are a much less significant source of grant funding. In addition, the Commission has increased the contribution levels of each signatory government. West Virginia's contribution increased by \$10,602 from FY 1996 to its current FY 2003 level of \$49,500 (see Table 2). While West Virginia's signatory contribution only accounts for 3% of the Commission's revenues, West Virginia contains nearly 24% of the Potomac River Basin.

West Virginia's signatory contribution accounts for 3% of the Commission's revenues, whereas West Virginia contains nearly 24% of the Potomac River Basin.

Signatory governments benefit from membership in the Commission by:

1. Seeking the Commission's assistance and expertise in obtaining federal grants and possibly grants from non-profit institutions as they pertain to Potomac River Basin projects.
2. Receiving technical, administrative and funding assistance from the Commission for projects that relate to the signatory governments' specific environmental needs along the Potomac River Basin.

-
3. Benefitting directly or indirectly from projects initiated or supported by the Commission.
 4. Benefitting from ready access to a forum for coordinating with other basin states on any issue relating to Potomac River water quantity or water quality.

West Virginia's environmental agency, the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), has not obtained federal grants for Potomac River projects through the Commission, whereas, the other signatory governments have (see Table 4). Also, the DEP has not utilized the administrative assistance of the Commission by providing state funds to the Commission for Potomac River projects that would benefit West Virginia. Funding from the Commission for projects benefitting West Virginia fell considerably after FY 1996. The State continues to benefit directly from Commission projects in West Virginia and indirectly from the projects of other signatory governments. Table 3 shows expenditures on Commission projects in West Virginia. The benefits from these projects are relatively small. The DEP has indicated in a written response (see Appendix 1) that state funds that could be directed to the Commission for Potomac River projects have been scarce. The DEP also indicated that it obtains federal grants for various projects around the State and that its grants staff are encouraged to use Commission staff when contemplating projects that could benefit from Commission expertise. The DEP has indicated that Commission assistance could become necessary in the future, when certain Potomac River projects arise, such as the Potomac River Total Maximum Daily Load Program.

The benefits of Commission membership exceed West Virginia's signatory contribution.

The direct and indirect benefits of Commission membership exceed West Virginia's signatory contribution. As the DEP identifies additional Potomac River projects in the future, it may be able to take greater advantage of the administrative and staff expertise available from the Commission. West Virginia's position at the headwaters of the Potomac River makes the State's participation in the Commission of critical importance. **The Legislative Auditor, therefore, recommends that West Virginia maintains its membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.**

Table 2
Funding Sources for the Commission: FY 1996-FY 2003

Funding Source*	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003*
WV	\$38,898	\$39,675	\$41,064	\$42,727	\$44,299	\$45,300	\$48,750	\$49,500
MD	\$106,948	\$107,869	\$108,082	\$123,620	\$128,169	\$131,000	\$137,250	\$142,000
PA	\$34,410	\$35,461	\$36,383	\$37,857	\$39,250	\$40,100	\$42,500	\$44,500
VA	\$108,554	\$111,868	\$114,779	\$119,428	\$123,823	\$126,500	\$132,250	\$137,000
Washington, D.C.	\$49,498	\$50,933	\$52,716	\$54,851	\$56,870	\$58,100	\$60,000	\$62,500
Grants and Projects	\$1,148,439	\$1,139,575	\$995,637	\$1,416,821	\$1,255,544	\$1,522,119	\$1,768,608	\$2,115,200
Miscellaneous Revenue	\$12,885	\$6,582	\$4,775	\$6,092	\$6,550	\$5,975	\$7,442	\$14,000
Federal Appropriation	\$511,000	--	--	--	--	--	--	--
Total	\$2,010,632	\$1,491,963	\$1,353,436	\$1,801,396	\$1,654,505	\$1,929,094	\$2,196,800	\$2,564,700

Source: The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin
*Figures for signatories represent their annual signatory contributions.
**FY 2003 data represents budgeted amounts, data for other years represents actual revenues. The Commission is requesting \$51,000 from West Virginia for FY 2004.

Commission Expenditures on Projects Directly Benefitting West Virginia.

Table 3 lists Commission expenditures on projects that directly benefit the State of West Virginia. The list is not exhaustive since some projects that are not primarily focused on West Virginia may benefit the State in an indirect manner. The value of such projects to West Virginia cannot always be clearly identified. The following example illustrates this point. At the time of the 1997 Preliminary Performance Audit, the Commission attached a value of \$123,082 for planning and agency support provided by the Commission for calendar years 1993 to 1997. The Commission was unable to determine the value of similar services provided since then. The 1997 report identified total expenditures of \$1,900,015 for Commission projects that benefitted West Virginia from calendar years 1985 to 1997. Annual project expenditures during this period averaged \$146,155. This contrasts with average annual project expenditures of only \$42,400 for the period from FY 1998 to FY 2003. Five different projects from calendar years 1985 to 1997 accounted for a disproportionate share of Commission expenditures in West Virginia (\$1,566,277). The largest of these projects, the South Branch Flood Study, had expenditures totaling \$773,851. This project was concluded by 1995, prior to the end of the federal appropriation. Clearly, expenditures on the most costly projects in West Virginia declined following the loss of the federal appropriation after FY 1996.

Table 3 Commission Funded Projects Benefitting West Virginia: FY 1997-FY 2003						
Project	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003
Spill Model Enhancements	--	--	--	--	\$10,000	\$1,000
Potomac Safe Water Alliance	--	--	--	--	--	\$20,000
Technical Support to the Chesapeake Bay Program and West Virginia Tributary Teams	--	--	--	\$5,000	\$5,000	\$10,000
North Branch Potomac River Task Force	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	--
Assess pathogen risk to Washington, D.C. water supply from West Virginia poultry industry in South Branch	\$20,000	--	--	--	--	--
Elk Lick Mine Drainage Projects	\$47,500	\$4,000	\$57,000	\$20,900	--	--
Basin-wide consumption use assessment	--	\$6,000	\$6,000	--	--	--
Participation in the Watershed Management Framework	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000	\$2,000
Evaluation of Stony River Reservoir	--	--	\$10,000	\$10,000	--	--
Total	\$71,500	\$14,000	\$77,000	\$39,900	\$19,000	\$33,000

Source: *The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin*

West Virginia is the only signatory government which has not provided grant and project funding in addition to its annual signatory contribution.

Other Signatory Governments Have Obtained Substantial Federal Grant Funding for Projects During Recent Years

The loss of the federal appropriation eliminated a source of funding for some water quality projects. With the exception of West Virginia, the other signatory governments have chosen to provide grant and project funding in addition to their annual signatory contributions. Most of this funding is federal in origin, primarily provided by the EPA. This increases the level of funding available for projects directly benefitting signatory governments. Table 4 provides data on grant and project funding provided by signatory governments. The amount of additional funding provided through other signatories has more than doubled since FY 1996. Signatory grant and project funding

budgeted for FY 2003 accounts for 27.8% of the Commission's total budget. Additional project funding provided by signatory governments increases the level of benefit received from Commission membership.

The West Virginia DEP has indicated in a written response (see Appendix 1) that it may need the Commission's assistance for future projects involving the Potomac River Basin. A representative of the West Virginia DEP further stated:

The elimination of ICPRB federal appropriation in 1997 did not result in an obligation by the states to replace that lost funding.

The DEP indicated that it has worked in cooperation with the Commission on past issues and projects, and that the State has benefitted, regardless of the State's inability to provide additional project funding:

While it is unfortunate that West Virginia has been unable to provide financial support beyond annual dues to support ICPRB staff, we do benefit from the forum provided by the Commission.

Table 4 also lists project funding provided directly by the Commission. West Virginia is the only signatory absent from the table because the State's DEP has not obtained additional federal grant funding for Potomac River projects in West Virginia. Total grant and project funding increased dramatically in FY 2002, but generally ranged from \$200,000-\$400,000 in previous years. The data indicate that considerable grant funding is available but West Virginia needs to utilize the services of the Commission's staff in order to maximize the financial benefits of the State's membership in the Commission. It is important to remember that many federal grants have requirements for matching state funds. This means that substantial state funding may be required in order to qualify for some federal funding. The DEP should weigh the potential costs of matching requirements with the benefits of new grant funding opportunities, on a case-by-case basis.

The West Virginia DEP has indicated that increased federal grant funding for projects benefitting West Virginia may be available in the future.

The DEP indicated that increased federal grant funding for projects benefitting West Virginia, may be available in the future. A representative of the DEP stated:

There is funding available from both federal and state sources that could be utilized for ICPRB project support. West Virginia's recent

involvement in the Chesapeake Bay Program, accompanied by a federal grant, may provide another opportunity to support ICPRB project involvement.

Table 4
Commission Grant and Project Funding Provided By Signatory Governments: FY 1993-2002

Signatory	1993	1994	1995	1996	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002
Maryland Department of the Environment	\$232,473	\$112,013	\$97,263	\$202,558	\$67,809	\$110,547	\$86,078	\$80,954	\$102,526	\$168,287
ICPRB Share	\$53,260	\$0	\$2,607	\$112	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection	\$50,150	\$102,256	\$137,643	\$51,100	\$80,890	\$93,030	\$98,861	\$63,652	\$84,380	\$117,174
ICPRB Share	\$17,183	\$24,669	\$32,925	\$10,890	\$0	\$9,197	\$23,809	\$11,693	\$10,693	\$21,059
Virginia Department of Environmental Quality	\$12,530	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$44,257	\$9,363	\$0	\$0	\$16,948	\$79,973
ICPRB Share	\$4,177	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$5,649	\$29,952
District of Columbia Department of Health	\$180,484	\$80,112	\$83,659	\$126,306	\$12,420	\$30,561	\$153,037	\$65,937	\$194,350	\$295,722
ICPRB Share	\$46,206	\$35,710	\$416	\$9,286	\$0	\$20,546	\$7,464	\$14,668	\$791	\$6,238
Total	\$596,463	\$354,760	\$354,513	\$400,252	\$205,376	\$273,244	\$369,249	\$236,904	\$415,337	\$718,405

Source: The Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin

Conclusion

The end of the direct federal appropriation to the Commission in FY 1997 reduced the Commission's total revenues until FY 2002. By FY 2002, grant and project funding, mostly federal in origin, brought total revenues above the FY 1996 level. While West Virginia's signatory contribution has gradually increased each year, it has constituted no more than 3% of the Commission's revenues and annual increases have averaged only \$1,515. Although West Virginia's signatory contribution has not dramatically increased, the changing composition of the Commission's budget has resulted in reduced funding levels for projects that directly benefit the State. **The Legislative Auditor's Office concludes that membership in the Commission has not been as beneficial for West Virginia since the end of the federal appropriation in FY 1997, but the current benefits still outweigh the State's signatory contribution.**

Membership in an interstate compact dedicated to the improvement of water quality in the Potomac River Basin is potentially beneficial for all governments bordering the Basin. West Virginia's DEP should consider obtaining more federal funding to increase its benefit from the State's membership. In conclusion, West Virginia does benefit directly and indirectly from Commission projects located in the State and other signatory governments.

Recommendations

1. *The Legislative Auditor's Office recommends that West Virginia continue its membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin.*
2. *The Legislative Auditor's Office recommends that the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection work in cooperation with the Commission to identify and apply for additional federal grant and project funding.*

Appendix A: Transmittal Letter

WEST VIRGINIA LEGISLATURE *Performance Evaluation and Research Division*

Building 1, Room W-314
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0610
(304) 347-4890
(304) 347-4939 FAX



John Sylvia
Director

August 22, 2003

Stephanie R. Timmermeyer, Cabinet Secretary
West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection
1356 Hansford Street
Charleston, WV 25301

Dear Ms. Timmermeyer:

This is to transmit a draft copy of the report on the Preliminary Performance Evaluation of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin. This report is scheduled to be presented during the September 7-9, 2003 interim meeting of the Joint Committee on Government Operations to be held in Lewisburg, West Virginia. It is expected that a representative from your agency be present at the meeting to orally respond to the report and answer any questions the Committee may have. We will inform you of the exact time and location once the information is available.

We need to schedule an exit conference to discuss any concerns you may have with the report. We would like to have the meeting with you sometime between August 25- 27, 2003. Please notify us to schedule an exact time. In addition, we need your written response by noon on Friday, August 29, 2003 in order to included it in the final report. If your agency intends to distribute additional material to committee members at the meeting, please contact the House Government Organization staff at 340-3192 by Thursday, September 4, 2003 to make arrangements. Thank you for your cooperation.

We request that your personnel treat the draft report as confidential and that it not be disclosed to anyone not affiliated with your agency.

Sincerely,

Handwritten signature of John Sylvia in cursive script.
John Sylvia

Enclosure

JS/rk

Joint Committee on Government and Finance

Appendix B: DEP Remarks



Division of Water and Waste Management
414 Summers Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Telephone Number: (304) 558-2107
Fax Number: (304) 558-5905

West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

Bob Wise
Governor

Stephanie R. Timmermeyer
Cabinet Secretary

July 21, 2003

Mr. David Mullins
Research Manager
West Virginia Legislature
Performance evaluation and Research Division
Building 1, Room W-314
1900 Kanawha Boulevard East
Charleston, West Virginia 25305-0610

Dear Mr. Mullins:

I received your request for information regarding West Virginia's funding support for the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin (ICPRB). As an alternate Commissioner for Ms. Stephanie Timmermeyer, I attend ICPRB Commission meetings and in fact serve as chair of the Co-op section of the Commission that deals with water supply and quantity issues. I also serve on the Executive Committee of the Commission. West Virginia has three official Commissioners, Delegate Harold Michael, David Levine and Stephanie Timmermeyer.

In answer to your question regarding project and grant funding for ICPRB support from West Virginia, I must first explain that the Division of Water and Waste Management relies heavily of federal grants for a variety of statewide water pollution control activities. Most of the funding received supports personnel needed to implement specific programmatic responsibilities. Rarely does the Division have access to funding from existing grant sources that could be directed to ICPRB. Over the course of the last six years, after ICPRB lost its federal appropriation, the Division's federal grants have remained static and even decreased. State general revenue funding has decreased yearly since then as well.

Other ICPRB states may not rely as much on federal grants for program and staff support and therefore may have more flexibility in directing federal grant and project funds to the ICPRB for specific activities. In previous years ICPRB did conduct projects on West Virginia's behalf in several eastern panhandle communities related to flood planning. Those funds, provided by the US Army Corps of Engineers, require match that the Division cannot provide.

As alternate Commissioner and grants manager for the Division's federal grants, I have encouraged program personnel to consider ICPRB staff when contemplating projects that could benefit from the expertise available there. As West Virginia assumes complete responsibility for the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) program this year, opportunities to assist in modeling and data collection may arise depending on when Potomac River TMDLs are due. There is funding available from both federal and state sources that could be utilized for ICPRB project



West Virginia Department
of Environmental Protection

"Promoting a healthy environment."

Mr. David Mullins

Page 2

support. West Virginia's recent involvement in the Chesapeake Bay Program, accompanied by a federal grant, may provide another opportunity to support ICPRB project involvement.

With due respect to Mr. Hoffman, I hope your discussion didn't lead to a conclusion that there has been a lack of inter-agency cooperation with ICPRB. The elimination of the ICPRB federal appropriation in 1997 did not result in an obligation by the states to replace that lost funding. ICPRB solicits project funding from a variety of sources, including foundations, water utilities, local and state governments, etc. and a federal grant to supplement member state dues. Those funds are for the most part directed to the purpose and needs of the entities providing the funding.

Obviously, given the availability and the need for funding to support and maintain West Virginia state water quality programs, our priority will be focused on the Division's needs. West Virginia annually renews its membership in ICPRB. The leadership of the Department of Environmental Protection has defended our membership and dues through years of general revenue reductions and legislative inquiry. I personally have worked with ICPRB staff on several issues in the past several years: potential use of a West Virginia lake to supplement water supply for D.C. utilities, ICPRB participation in the state's Watershed Management Framework process, and support for a grant proposal to locate ICPRB offices in eastern panhandle.

Finally, West Virginia's membership and participation in the ICPRB provides representation for the state in matters relating to water quality and quantity in the Potomac River drainage. While it is unfortunate that West Virginia has been unable to provide financial support beyond annual dues to support ICPRB staff, we do benefit from the forum provided by the Commission. I appreciate the opportunity to comment on your review. If you have additional questions, please do not hesitate to contact me at 304 558-2107. Thank you.

Sincerely,



William D. Brannon
Acting Director

cc: Stephanie Timmermeyer, Cabinet Secretary

Agency Response



Division of Water and Waste Management
414 Summers Street
Charleston, WV 25301
Telephone Number: (304) 558-2107
Fax Number: (304) 558-5905

West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection

Bob Wise
Governor

Stephanie R. Timmermeyer
Cabinet Secretary

August 28, 2003

John Sylvia
WV Legislature Performance Evaluation
and Research Division
1900 Kanawha Boulevard, East
Charleston, WV 25305-0610

R E C E I V E D
AUG 28 2003

**PERFORMANCE EVALUATION AND
RESEARCH DIVISION**

Dear Mr. Sylvia:

On behalf of Secretary Timmermeyer, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to review the draft copy of the "Preliminary Performance Evaluation of West Virginia's Membership in the Interstate Commission on the Potomac River Basin"

After discussion of the draft findings with you and members of your staff, we are pleased to report we concur with the report's recommendation to continue membership in the organization. Indeed, the tangible and intangible benefits of membership in the organization clearly outweigh the cost.

As requested, we will have representation at the September interims to orally answer any questions the Joint Committee on Government Operations may have. If you have any questions please contact me at 558-2837 or by emailing me at pcampbell@wvdep.org.

Sincerely,

Patrick V. Campbell
Assistant Director

cc: Stephanie Timmermeyer, Cabinet Secretary
Allyn Turner, Director



West Virginia Department
of Environmental Protection

"Promoting a healthy environment."
