

**Conservation Commission - 645**

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

FY'17 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
Administration	\$2,788,655	\$163,670	\$26,600			\$2,978,925
Watershed	\$568,000	\$9,621,200	\$740,000		\$3,204,830	\$14,134,030
Field Services	\$5,428,083	\$594,737	\$788,310			\$6,811,130
Abandoned Mine		\$8,367,650				\$8,367,650
Water Quality / Wet	\$482,000	\$2,847,501	\$3,442,399			\$6,771,900
ISD Data Processing	\$30,000	\$332,744	\$7,075			\$369,819
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$9,296,738</b>	<b>\$21,927,502</b>	<b>\$5,004,384</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$3,204,830</b>	<b>\$39,433,454</b>

\*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

FY'16 Carryover and Refund by Funding Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local	Other*	Total
FY'16 Carryover					\$3,204,830	\$3,204,830
FY'16 GR Refund**	\$256,914					\$256,914

\* Fund - 19312 - \$1,580,800 - remainder of funds provided in FY-15 supplemental appropriation to be used for watershed rehabilitation.  
 \* Fund - 40500 - \$1,624,030 - remainder of funds provided in FY-16 supplemental appropriation to be used for watershed flood damage  
 \*\* FY-16 GR Refund was budgeted as follows - Administration - \$61,914, Watershed - \$68,000, Field Services - \$85,000, Water Quality / Wet - \$42,000

**What Changes did the Agency Make between FY'16 and FY'17?**

**1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?**  
 Conservation district staff have been reduced or transitioned to part-time positions. This is reducing the district's ability to assist local landowners with natural resource concerns as well as diminishes their ability to implement a local cost-share program. Each district is also being forced to prioritize and evaluate each service and program it provides based on available staff. In many instances, outreach and education activities are being eliminated.

**2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?**  
 None

**3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?**  
 Commission staff numbers were reduced in the areas of human resources, conservation programs, district services and water quality. Fewer staff means slower response times for every task including training district employees, providing assistance to conservation districts, assistance to landowners, education, data and report requests, complaint investigation and response, and sharing information with the public through webpage updates and news articles.

Staff has also been reduced within local conservation districts. As a result, conservation district capacity to perform required maintenance and repairs to upstream flood control sites has been reduced, placing Oklahoman's lives and property at risk. A reduced district workforce will result in slower and limited response to emergencies and routine operation and maintenance needs on the 2,107 flood control dams that 67 conservation districts serve as the primary watershed project sponsor.

**4.) Did the agency provide any pay raises that were not legislatively/statutorily required? If so, please provide a detailed description in a separate document.**  
 Yes. See attached.

FY'18 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source						
	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other	Total	% Change
Administration	\$2,790,837	\$165,000	\$25,000	\$0	\$2,980,837	0.06%
Watershed	\$3,654,095	\$9,500,000	\$0	\$0	\$13,154,095	-6.93%
Field Services	\$6,391,633	\$600,000	\$788,310	\$0	\$7,779,943	14.22%
Abandoned Mine	\$0	\$8,000,000	\$0	\$0	\$8,000,000	-4.39%
Water Quality / Wet	\$505,000	\$3,000,000	\$2,311,690	\$0	\$5,816,690	-14.11%
ISD Data Processing	\$30,000	\$330,000	\$10,000	\$0	\$370,000	0.05%
Office of Geo Info	\$241,247	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$241,247	
<b>Total</b>	<b>\$13,612,812</b>	<b>\$21,595,000</b>	<b>\$3,135,000</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$38,342,812</b>	<b>-2.77%</b>

\*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

**FY'18 Top Five Appropriation Funding Requests**

	\$ Amount
Request 1: Upstream Flood Control Infrastructure Dam Safety - Restoration of O&M and Rehabilitation funds	\$3,090,000
Request 2: Restoration of Stream Monitoring funds	\$65,000
Request 3: Restoration of Conservation District and agency mission critical position funds	\$1,176,741
Request 4: Office of Geographic Information funds	\$241,247
<b>Total Increase above FY-18 Request</b>	<b>4,572,988</b>

**How would the agency handle a 5% appropriation reduction in FY'18?**

A 5% reduction would represent a \$451,991 reduction to the commission budget. The Commission would reduce personnel costs by eliminating 9 positions.

**How would the agency handle a 7.5% appropriation reduction in FY'18?**

A 7.5 % reduction would represent a \$677,987 reduction to the commission budget. The Commission would reduce personnel costs by eliminating 14 positions.

**How would the agency handle a 10% appropriation reduction in FY'18?**

A 10 % reduction would represent a \$903,982 reduction to the commission budget. The Commission would reduce personnel costs by eliminating 19 positions.

**Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'18?**

	\$ Amount
Increase 1 N/A	\$0
Increase 2 N/A	\$0
Increase 3 N/A	\$0

**What are the agency's top 2-3 capital or technology (one-time) requests, if applicable?**

N/A

**Federal Government Impact**

**1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government?** N/A

**2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate?** N/A

**3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency?**

Water Quality – The state would lose the Non-Point Source Water Quality monitoring program which is a national leader and demonstrates the success of addressing many sources of pollution through voluntary, rather than federal regulatory programs. The state would also lose all water quality focused volunteer monitoring and education programs. Loss of federal funding would eliminate USDA programs, such as RCPP, which address water quality problems through voluntary cooperation with landowners in the Elk City Lake and Neosho River watersheds through the installation of conservation practices.

Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation – The program would end immediately as it is 100% federally funded. This elimination would increase the threat to the public's health, safety, and general welfare as well as reduce the level of federal funds injected into the state's economy at \$3 million per year.

Watershed Rehabilitation Program – The Watershed Rehabilitation Program would be eliminated resulting in an economic loss of over \$30 million to Oklahoma. In addition, conservation districts serving as watershed project sponsors would be in violation of the Oklahoma Dam Safety Act putting Oklahoma lives and property at risk.

District Services – The \$300,000 received from NRCS to deliver Farm Bill programs would be eliminated from the Commission's budget. These funds are used to support conservation district personnel and operations. Elimination of these funds would result in the reduction of conservation district personnel.

Office of Geographic Information – OGI manages the state's geospatial clearinghouse, OKMaps. The website and underlying application is maintained and upgraded strictly with federal Homeland Security funds. Elimination of these funds would result in the site not being maintained and unavailable for use due to lack of maintenance and upgrades.

**4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year?**

The federal government is currently operating under a continuing resolution so effects of a federal budget cut are unknown at this time. The agency anticipates that the federal sequestration will be applied to federally awarded funds which will result in reductions in AML and WQ funds. With the change in federal administration it is unknown how grants administration will be affected. Potential reductions in the area of WQ and flood control could occur.

**5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases?**

No

**Division and Program Descriptions**

**Administration**

Administration. Represents the commissioners by providing management, oversight and support for all agency operations, programs and divisions.

Human Resources. Provides support to all operations and programs of the agency and assistance to conservation districts regarding personnel and employee benefits coordination.

Financial Management. Provides support to all operations and programs of the agency and assistance to conservation districts regarding financial management, procurement and risk management.

Public Information. Provides a wide range of information to agency clients, partners and the general public through publishing a monthly newsletter, preparation of press releases, maintenance of a website and the development of displays about agency programs and activities.

**Watershed**

Operation and Maintenance. Provides technical and financial assistance to conservation districts in support of the districts' responsibilities to operate and maintain 2107 upstream flood control dams in the state, a \$2 billion public infrastructure that provides \$91 million in state benefits annually.

Watershed Rehabilitation. Working in cooperation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service and conservation districts provides technical and financial assistance to modify high hazard flood control dams to ensure they meet state dam safety criteria for reducing the risk of loss of life and improving public safety.

**Field Services**

Conservation Districts. Provides funding to the state's 86 conservation districts for personnel and operations to support the administration of their duties per the Conservation District Act, Title 27A, Chapter 3, of the Oklahoma State Statutes.

Conservation Education. Provides technical assistance to conservation districts to promote conservation education activities in the classroom and is responsible for chairing the Environmental Education Coordinating Council.

District Services. Provides tools, training and technical assistance to conservation district boards and employees on public official governance, personnel management and financial management in compliance with state law, rules, regulations and policy.

**Abandoned Mine**

The mission of the Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Program is to protect the public from hazards left as a result of past coal mining practices. The primary objective is to reclaim surface and underground coal mine sites that pose the highest threat to the public's health, safety, and general welfare.

To accomplish the objective of the AML Program, abandoned mine sites must be identified, inventoried, assessed, prioritized, right-of-entry acquired, plan developed, surveys performed, design completed, construction contracted, construction performed with AML inspection, vegetation established and maintenance monitored for at least two years.

Additionally, the AML Program responds to emergencies created by sudden occurrences involving abandoned coal mines when a public health or safety issue requires immediate action.

**Water Quality / Wet**

Water Quality. Responsible for identifying state waters impaired by nonpoint source pollution and then prioritizing and implementing projects to reduce pollutants by measureable amounts and improve water quality to remove streams from the state's List of Impaired Waters (Clean Water Act Section 303(d)List).

Wetlands. Responsible for preparing and updating the state's wetlands conservation plan and coordinating state's Wetland's Working Group in order to conserve, enhance, and restore the quantity and biological diversity of wetlands in Oklahoma.

Priority Watershed Cost Share. As federal and state funds are available, provides management of funds on a watershed basis to assist landowners with installing conservation practices to address water quality problems.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. In cooperation with USDA provides technical and financial assistance to landowners in the Illinois River Watershed and the Spavinaw Lake Watershed to install riparian buffers along streams as a pollution prevention practice.

BlueThumb Water Quality Education Program. In cooperation with Conservation Districts and other partners, educate citizens across the state about water quality and nonpoint source pollution and train citizen volunteers to collect data that can be used to supplement the state's data collection capabilities.

**ISD Data Processing**

The agency's data processing management has been consolidated with the Office of Management and Enterprise Services.

FY'17 Budgeted FTE						
	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
Administration	3	3	4		4	3
Watershed	1		5		4	1
Field Services	0					
Abandoned Mine	3		8		6	2
Water Quality / Wet	6		26		25	1
ISD Data Processing						
<b>Total</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>7</b>

FTE History					
	2017 Budgeted	2016	2013	2010	2006
Administration	7	8	9	13	10
Watershed	5	5	7	7	4
Field Services	0	1	3	3	3
Abandoned Mine	8	6	6	9	8
Water Quality / Wet	26	28	34	32	30
ISD Data Processing					
<b>Total</b>	<b>46</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>59</b>	<b>64</b>	<b>55</b>

Performance Measure Review					
	FY'16	FY'15	FY'14	FY'13	FY'12
Field Services	\$6,811,130	\$7,800,000	\$7,800,000	\$7,900,000	\$8,200,000
Watershed Operation & Maintenance					

Number of upstream flood control sites	2,107	2,107	2,107	2,107	2,107
Number of sites that have reached their design life	1,318	1,220	1,100	943	807
Number of sites completing the planning, design, finance, and construction phases of rehabilitation	0	1	2	8	2
Structures inspected annually	2,107	2,107	2,107	2,107	2,107
<b>Water Quality</b>					
Cost-Share Program					
Number of Conservation Practices Implemented as a Result of the Locally Led Cost-Share Prog.		514	606	699	750
State Appropriated Expenditures		\$822,236	\$800,000	\$900,000	\$1,100,000
Participant Matching Expenditures		\$904,343	\$1,100,000	\$1,100,000	\$500,000
Number of Conservation Districts (or similar group) w/ active Blue Thumb volunteer monitored program	41	43	45	42	37
Number of practices implemented in priority watershed programs	52	153	176	237	284
Number of EPA accepted NPS stories	7	3	6	13	1
Annual Nitrogen (N) load reduction	411,471	856,906	1,420,749	956,735	2,880,104
Annual Phosphorus (P) load reduction	35,700	358,469	1,036,393	750,741	2,873,344

Abandoned Mine					
Assessments - number of sites completed	14				
Aerial Survey - number of sites completed	5				
Bathymetric Survey - number of sites completed	0				
Realty - acres completed	900				
Environmental Survey - number of surveys completed	8				
Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan - number of permits managed	6				
Environmental Review - number of projects with completed reviews	2				
Design - number of sites completed	2				
Construction - number of reclamation projects initiated	2				
Construction - number of reclamation projects with ongoing inspection	3				
Construction - number of reclamation projects completed	1	1	3	3	6
Vegetation Management - number of sites vegetated and monitored	4				
Maintenance - number of completed reclamation projects repaired	4				
Emergency Projects - number of completed projects	4				
Public Safety AML Hazards - acres reclaimed	93	108	32	100	147
Pubic Safety Emergency Hazards - number eliminated	4	3	3	6	1

Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)			
	FY'14-16 Avg. Revenues	FY'14-16 Avg. Expenditures	June '16 Balance
<b>Revolving Fund I - 20000</b> Small Watershed	\$66,213	\$0	\$203,802
<b>Revolving Fund II - 20500</b> GIS	\$0	\$622	\$7,277
<b>Revolving Fund III - 220</b> Carbon Sequestration	\$8,702	\$4,190	\$15,727
<b>Revolving Fund IV - 245</b> Donation	\$141,737	\$118,092	\$953,615
<b>Revolving Fund V - 25000</b> Infrastructure	\$2,328,458	\$1,966,876	\$4,220,290