

## FY22 Budget Performance Review

### Conservation Commission - 645

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

#### Agency Mission

To conserve, protect and restore Oklahoma's renewable natural resources working in collaboration with Conservation Districts and Partners on behalf of all Oklahomans.

#### Division and Program Descriptions

*Note: Please define any acronyms used in program descriptions.*

##### Division or Program Number and Name

**(20) Upstream Flood Control** - Through the Upstream Flood Control Program, OCC provides technical and financial assistance to conservation districts in support of the districts' responsibilities to operate and maintain 2107 flood control dams in the state, a \$2 billion public infrastructure that provides \$91 million in state benefits annually. Watershed Rehab - working in cooperation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service and conservation districts, OCC provides technical and financial assistance to modify high hazard dams to ensure they meet state dam safety criteria for reducing the risk of loss of life and improving public safety.

**(30) Field Services** - Provides funding and support to the state's 84 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 Statutes.

**(40) Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation (AML)** - To perform the reclamation of coal mined areas left without adequate reclamation prior to the enactment of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act (SMCRA) of 1977 and that continue, in their un-reclaimed condition, to substantially degrade the quality of the environment, prevent or damage the beneficial use of land or water resources or endanger the health or safety of the public.

**(50) Water Quality/Wetlands** - Division charged as technical lead for State's EPA Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Pollution Program responsible for assessing states waters for nonpoint source pollution (NPS) impacts, then cooperating with partners to educate and implement conservation practices to reduce those NPS impacts. Also leads the state's wetland working group to develop the state's Wetland Working Plan which describes the partnership among state, federal, tribes, and local groups and individuals to protect wetland resources in the state. Finally, implements the agency's soil health education program to encourage land owners and managers to adopt management strategies that will build and protect soil health, thereby protecting many other natural resources through voluntary programs.

#### FY'21 Budgeted Department Funding By Source

Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local <sup>1</sup>	Other <sup>2</sup>	Total
10	Administration (includes Office of Geographic Information, Public Information and General Counsel)	611,635	371,106	103,400			\$1,086,141
20	Upstream Flood Control	5,277,651	3,274,779	241,759			\$8,794,189
30	Field Services	5,957,239	1,694,725	799,310			\$8,451,274
40	Abandoned Mine Lands	-	3,091,195	500			\$3,091,695
50	Water Quality	1,000,000	3,701,368	4,351,575			\$9,052,943
88	ISD Data Processing	-	446,847	19,585			\$466,432
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$12,846,525</b>	<b>\$12,580,020</b>	<b>\$5,516,129</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$30,942,674</b>

1. Please describe source of Local funding not included in other categories:

2. Please describe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding if applicable for each department:

#### FY'20 Carryover by Funding Source

Carryover	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local <sup>1</sup>	Other <sup>2</sup>	Total
Neighborhood Conservation Program for Poultry Concerns	\$475,128	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$475,128

1. Please describe source of Local funding not included in other categories:

2. Please describe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding if applicable:

#### What changes did the agency make between FY'20 and FY'21?

1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?

No

2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?

No

3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?

No

4.) Did the agency provide any pay raises that were not legislatively/statutorily required?

Yes

#### FY'22 Requested Funding By Department and Source

Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other <sup>1</sup>	Total	% Change
10	Administration (includes Office of Geographic Information, Public Information and Attorney)	\$611,635	\$371,106	\$103,400	\$0	\$1,086,141	0.00%
20	Upstream Flood Control	\$5,277,651	\$3,274,779	\$241,759	\$0	\$8,794,189	0.00%
30	Field Services	\$5,957,239	\$1,694,725	\$799,310	\$0	\$8,451,274	0.00%
40	Abandoned Mine Lands	\$0	\$3,091,195	\$500	\$0	\$3,091,695	0.00%
50	Water Quality	\$1,000,000	\$3,701,368	\$4,351,575	\$0	\$9,052,943	0.00%
	ISD Data Processing	\$0	\$446,847	\$19,585	\$0	\$466,432	0.00%
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$12,846,525</b>	<b>\$12,580,020</b>	<b>\$5,516,129</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$30,942,674</b>	<b>0.00%</b>

1. Please describe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding for each department:

## FY22 Budget Performance Review

### Conservation Commission - 645

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

#### FY'22 Top Five Operational Appropriation Funding Requests

Request by Priority	Request Description	Appropriation Request Amount (\$)
Request 1:	Upstream Flood Control Infrastructure - Dam Safety	\$1,000,000
Request 2:	Support State Office of Geographic Information	\$536,000
<b>Top Five Request Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$1,536,000</b>
<b>Total Increase above FY-21 Budget (including all requests)</b>		<b>\$ 1,536,000</b>
Difference between Top Five requests and total requests:		\$0

#### Does the agency have any costs associated with the Pathfinder retirement system and federal employees?

Minimal costs associated with Pathfinder system for federally funded employees. The estimate is \$14,000 - \$18,000 annually for the next 3 fiscal years. The non-reimbursable costs can be paid with state funds.

#### How would the agency be affected by receiving the same appropriation for FY '22 as was received in FY '21? (Flat/ 0% change)

Dam repairs and maintenance would be deferred, creating a significant safety hazard and liability for the state. The agency would miss an opportunity to participate in a federal dam repair pilot project if unable to provide state match.

#### How would the agency handle a 2% appropriation reduction in FY '22?

This would reduce conservation district staff by approximately 5 people. Repairs to dams would need to be deferred. Would reduce the agency's ability to match federal agreements on programs and staff.

#### Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY '22?

	Fee Increase Request (\$)	Statutory change required? (Yes/No)
Increase 1	N/A	
Increase 2	N/A	
Increase 3	N/A	

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

Description of request in order of priority	Appropriated Amount (\$)	Submitted to LRCPC? (Yes/No)
Priority 1		
Priority 2		
Priority 3		

#### Federal Funds

CFDA	Federal Program Name	Agency Dept. #	FY 21 budgeted	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18	FY 17
10.902	USDA - Soil and Water Conservation	10, 20, 50	1,676,349	698,137	788,355	1,665,611	1,600,464
10.904	USDA-Watershed Protection Flood Prevention	20	786,753	92,386	354,661	213,000	
10.916	USDA - Watershed Protection Flood Prevention - Rehabilitation	20	3,767,607	2,102,109	2,876,301	2,800,715	973,473
10.923	USDA - Emergency Watershed Protection Program	20	213,312	43,134		627,051	
15.252	US Dept. of Interior - Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	40	3,000,000	1,695,496	704,061	4,023,335	2,792,394
15.631	US Fish & Wildlife Service - Monarch / Control Burning	30	50,000	100,000		262,108	139,039
66.46	Office of the Sec Of Environment - Water Quality 319 Program	50	2,209,394	2,967,112	2,156,691	3,247,105	3,407,358
66.461	Office of the Sec. of Env. - Wetlands Program	50			195,018	52,260	327,556
97.008	Non Profit Security Program - OK Emergency Mngt.	10			4,021	14,773	
97.008	Homeland Security - Dept. of Public Safety	10					162,373
97.036	FEMA - OK Emergency Management	10				133,774	1,934,538
10.934	USDA - Feral Swine Eradication Pilot Project	30	692,500	0	0	\$0	\$0
20.615	911 Grant Program	10	184,105				
10.901	Resource Conservation & Development	20,30			190,000		
10.912	Environmental Incentive Program	20,30		15,799			
97.073	State Homeland Security Program	10		39,615			

#### Federal Government Impact

- 1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government?  
Not applicable
- 2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate?  
Not applicable
- 3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency?
  - Abandoned Mine Land (AML) 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 at no cost to the state.
  - 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.
  - 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 State Dam Safety Act putting Oklahoma lives and property at risk.
  - Office of Geographic Information** - OGI manages Oklahoma's statewide web-based 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. The site is utilized daily by businesses, government agencies, academia and private individuals seeking geospatial infrastructure data to augment business and personal decisions. OKMaps: <https://okmaps.org/ogi/search.aspx>

## FY22 Budget Performance Review

### Conservation Commission - 645

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

**Field Services** - The funds 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 as well as hired shared staff. Elimination of these funds would result in a significant reduction in local conservation district personnel.

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

Every division of the agency is reliant on federal funding to some degree, ranging from 100% down to 30%. Any reduction in federal funding would result in a reduction of conservation programs and staff.

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

No

#### FY'21 Budgeted FTE

Division #	Division Name	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
10	Administration	2		5.25		2.25	3
20	Conservation Programs	1		8.8	1	5.8	2
30	Field Services			3		3	
40	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	3		7.7	1	5.7	1
50	Water Quality	5		33.25	6.1	23.15	4
<b>Total</b>		<b>11</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>58</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>39.9</b>	<b>10</b>

#### FTE History

Division #	Division Name	2021 Budgeted	2020	2019	2017	2012
10	Administration	5.25	4.93	4.0	6.0	8.0
20	Conservation Programs	8.8	6.90	6.0	6.50	8.5
30	Field Services	3.0			0.0	2.0
40	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	7.70	6.39	6.8	7.0	6.0
50	Water Quality	33.3	26.81	24.3	25.0	30.0
<b>Total</b>		<b>58.00</b>	<b>45.03</b>	<b>41.10</b>	<b>44.50</b>	<b>54.5</b>

#### Performance Measure Review

Program Name	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18	FY 17	FY 16
<b>(20) Watershed Operation &amp; Maintenance</b>					
# of Upstream Flood Control Dams	2107	2,107	2,107	2,107	2,107
# of Dams that have reached their design life	1497	1,444	1,370	1,322	1,220
# of Dams completing the planning, design, finance, and construction phases of rehabilitation	0	1	1	1	-
# of dams inspected annually	2107	2,107	1,910	1,854	2,107
<b>(30) Field Services</b>					
Locally Led Cost-Share Program					
# of Conservation Practices implemented as a result of the program	708	675	775	452	703
State Funds used for implementation	1,663,067	\$ 1,539,764	\$ 1,873,558	\$ 697,492	\$ 1,104,042
Participant matching funds used for implementation	1,290,476	\$ 1,282,834	\$ 1,692,848	\$ 799,966	\$ 1,258,818
Number of Districts implementing 75% of Long Range Plan Actions and Strategies	50%	new in FY20	0	0	0
Number of individuals who participated in at least one leadership development opportunity	400	525	525	525	525
Number of training opportunities provided to directors and district staff	30	25	24	24	24
<b>(40) Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation</b>					
Assessments - # of sites completed	11	20	3	0	14
Aerial Survey - # of sites completed	1	2	2	8	5
Bathymetric Survey - # of sites completed	1	2	2	5	0
Realty - acres completed	1280	719	195	500	900
Environmental Survey - # of surveys completed	4	4	1	4	8
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan - # of plans managed	9	4	5	7	6
Environmental Review - # of projects w/ completed reviews	3	2	5	2	2
Design - # of sites completed	5	6	5	5	2
Construction - # of reclamation projects initiated	3	2	1	4	2
Construction - # of reclamation projects w/ ongoing inspection	5	2	4	3	3
Construction - # of reclamation projects completed	2	0	4	3	1
Vegetation Mngt - # of sites vegetated and monitored	4	4	6	9	4
Maintenance - # of completed reclamation projects repaired	4	3	1	7	4
Complaints Investigated #	9				
Emergency Projects - # of completed projects	7	4	1	0	4
Public Safety AML Hazards - acres reclaimed	22.1	0	162	132	93
Public Safety Emergency Hazards - number eliminated	7	4	1	0	4
<b>(50) Water Quality</b>					
# of conservation districts or similar groups with active Blue Thumb volunteer monitoring / education programs	44	53	67	35	41
# of practices implemented in priority watershed programs	57	61	63	54	52
# of EPA accepted Non-Point Source Success Stories	4 + 2 updates	12 + 3 updates	12 + 3 updates	5	7
Annual Nitrogen (N) load reduction (lb.)	774939	775,186	672,702	665,316	411,471
Annual Phosphorus (P) load reduction (lb.)	453790	482,454	405,554	457,472	35,700
<b>Office of Geographic Information - OK Maps</b>					
Number Unique Visitors / Month	5,891	5,955	6,454	3,871	2,081
Number of Visits / Month	12,768	12,978	11,462	8,823	5,104
Number of Pages Viewed / Month	3,408,524	2,604,122	1,995,957	1,772,904	778,700

**FY22 Budget Performance Review**

**Conservation Commission - 645**

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)			
Please provide fund number, fund name, description, and revenue source	FY'18-20 Avg. Revenues	FY'18-20 Avg. Expenditures	June '20 Balance
<b>Fund number:</b> Fund name			
<b>Fund 200 - Small Watershed Flood Control Fund - Title 27A-3-3-405:409</b> - to enable districts to acquire real property or easements needed to install upstream flood control structures on rivers and streams and the tributaries thereof, including cooperative projects between such district and the United States government.	\$0	\$0	\$203,802
<b>Fund 205 - Geographic Information Fund - Title 82, Section 1501-205.2</b> - The initial purpose of the fund was to receive monies from several sources including private donations, grants or transfer by federal, state or local government agencies or appropriations by the Legislature to support the development and maintenance of Geographic Information System base map data layers. In 2004, when the Office of Geographic Information (OGI) was created by HB2457, the GIRF was amended to allow monies in the Fund to support the OGI.	\$9,595	\$441	\$33,975
<b>Fund 220 - Carbon Sequestration Assessment Cash Fund - Title 27A 3-4-104</b> - The purpose of the Fund is for the Oklahoma Conservation Commission to carry out the Oklahoma Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act. Funds to be credited to the account are any money appropriated to the fund by the Legislature, and any money received as gifts, grants, or other contributions from public or private sources obtained for the purposes of the Oklahoma Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act.	\$5,908	\$5,233	\$20,201
<b>Fund 245 - Donation</b> - Fund is used to receive and use funds that primarily encompass partnerships with other entities and agencies.	\$441,423	\$414,653	\$287,623
<b>Fund 250 - Conservation Infrastructure Fund - Title 271-3-2-110</b> - The funds purpose is to receive a portion of Gross Production Tax receipts. These funds are used for implementation of the locally led Conservation Cost Share Programs, the Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP), watershed dam maintenance, repair, and rehabilitation, and administration of conservation district functions.	\$2,978,043	\$2,184,531	\$6,559,697
<b>Fund 255 - TNC License Tag Fund</b> - The fund purpose serves as a pass thru of license tag proceeds from the Oklahoma Tax Commission to The Nature Conservancy.	\$74,460	\$74,460	\$0