FY 2024 Budget Performance Review

645 - Conservation Commission

Lead Financial Officer: Jeannie Parsley

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam

Agency Mission

To conserve, protect and restore Oklahoma's natural resources, working in collaboration with the conservation districts and other partners, on behalf of the citizens of Oklahoma.

Note: Please define any acronyms used in program descriptions.

Division and Program Descriptions

Administration - 10

General agency administration which includes office management, mail, communications, legislative liaison, general counsel/legal, human resources, and finance and accounting.

Conservation Projects - 20

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.

Field Services - 30

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.

Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation (AML) - 40

To perform the reclamation of mined areas left without adequate reclamation prior to 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.

Water Quality/Wetlands - 50

Division charged as technical lead for State's EPA Clean Water Act Section 319 Nonpoint Source Pollution Program responsible for assessing state's 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.

Office of Geological Information Technology Services - 60

The OGI provides an open source data base used by public and grivate groups forr emergency services, economic development and basic governmental services.

ISD Data Processing - 88

It costs and support for all agency divisions.

	FY'23	Budgeted Departm	ent Funding By S	Source					
Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local ¹	Other ²	Total		
10	Administration	\$1,062,549	\$150,015	\$15,660			\$1,228,224		
20	Conservation Projects	\$7,064,160	\$21,607,092	\$40,983			\$28,712,235		
30	Field Services	\$7,154,588	\$2,339,664	\$788,310			\$10,282,562		
40	Abandoned Mine Reclamation	\$2,991,104	\$30,240	\$100			\$3,021,444		
50	Water Quality	\$1,417,899	\$3,055,349	\$5,456,611			\$9,929,859		
60	Office of Geographical Information Technology Services	\$325,288		\$154,622			\$479,910		
88	ISD Data Processing	\$147,400	\$355,194	\$38,000			\$540,594		
Total		\$20,162,988	\$27,537,554	\$6,494,286	\$0	\$0	\$54,194,828		
1. Please des	Please describe source of Local funding not included in other categories:								
2. Please des	cribe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding if applica	ble for each departm							

	FY'22 Carryover by Funding Source									
Class Fund #	Carryover Class Fund Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local ¹	Other ²	Total			
19211	General Revenue	\$2,130,486					\$2,130,486			
							\$C			
							\$C			
1. Please desc	cribe source of Local funding not included in other catego	ories:								
2. Please desc	cribe source(s) and % of total of "Other" funding if application	able:								
	What changes did the agency make between FY'22 and FY'23?									

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

2.) What services are provided at a higher cost to the user? $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N/A}}$

3.) What services are still provided but with a slower response rate? $\ensuremath{\mathsf{N/A}}$

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

Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other ¹	Total	% Change
10	Administration	\$1,062,549.00	\$150,015.00	\$15,660.00	\$0.00	\$1,228,224.00	0.00%
20	Conservation Projects	\$7,064,160.00	\$21,607,092.00	\$40,983.00	\$0.00	\$28,712,235.00	0.00%
30	Field Services	\$7,154,588.00	\$2,339,664.00	\$788,310.00	\$0.00	\$10,282,562.00	0.00%
40	Abandoned Mine Reclamation	\$2,991,104.00	\$30,240.00	\$100.00	\$0.00	\$3,021,444.00	0.00%
50	Water Quality	\$3,002,899.00	\$3,055,349.00	\$5,456,611.00	\$0.00	\$11,514,859.00	15.96%
60	Office of Geographical Information Technology Services	\$325,288.00	\$0.00	\$154,622.00	\$0.00	\$479,910.00	0.00%
88	ISD Data Processing	\$190,060.00	\$355,194.00	\$38,000.00	\$0.00	\$583,254.00	7.89%
Total		\$21,790,648.00	\$27,537,554.00	\$6,494,286.00	\$0.00	\$55,822,488.00	3.00%

	FY'24 Top Five Operational Appropriation Funding Requests	
Request by Priority	Request Description	Appropriation Request Amount (\$)
Request 1:	Continuation of funds for dam repair and maintenance*	\$2,000,000
Request 2:	Unpaved roads/roadside erosion education and training	\$600,000
Request 3:	Funding for implementation of soil health program	\$985,000
Request 4:	Continuation of funds for Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation*	\$3,000,000
Request 5:	Funding for Oklahoma Geographical Information Technology*	\$42,660
	Top Five Request Subtotal:	\$6,627,660
Total Increas	e above FY-23 Budget (including all requests)	\$ 6,627,660
Difference be	tween 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 matching funds.

How would the agency be affected by receiving the same appropriation for FY '24 as was received in FY '23? (Flat/ 0% change)

Dam repairs and maintenance would be deferred, creating a significant safety hazard and liability for the state.

How would the agency handle a 2% appropriation reduction in FY '24?

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 '24?							
	Fee Increase Request (\$)	Statutory change required? (Yes/No)					
Increase 1 N/A							
Increase 2							
Increase 3							
What are the agency's top 2-3 capital or technology (one-time) requests, if applicable?							

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

		Federa	l Funds				
CFDA	Federal Program Name	Agency Dept. #	FY 23 budgeted	FY 22	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19
10.902	USDA - Soil and Water Conservation	10, 20, 50	1,919,453	387,345	\$337,633	\$179,974	\$690,753
10.904	USDA-Watershed Protection Flood Prevention	20	8,643,750	104,370	\$3,738		\$70,000
10.916	USDA - Watershed Protection Flood Prevention - Rehab	20	12,893,565			\$3,818,178	\$2,734,360
15.252	US Dept. of Interior - Abandoned Mine Land Reclamatio	40		822,826	\$1,642,964	\$2,061,997	\$1,507,062
15.631	US Fish & Wildlife Service - Monarch / Control Burning	30	100,000	46,650	\$45,500	\$47,742	\$78,480
66.419	Wetlands 106 - National Wetlands Condition Assessment	50	28,717	320,423	\$39,947	\$12,578	\$1,471
66.458	EPA Clean Water Act - OWRB State Revolving Fund	50				\$6,240	\$7,249
66.460	Office of the Sec Of Environment - Water Quality 319 Pi	50	2,609,625	1,166,057	\$3,373,984	\$2,585,252	\$2,474,644
66.461	Office of the Sec. of Env Wetlands Program 104(b)(3)	50	309,911	2,724	\$123,825	\$112,866	\$150,740
97.008	Non-Profit Security Program	60				\$14,567	\$28,005
10.934	USDA - Feral Swine Eradication Pilot Project	30	558,674	325,603	\$61,128		
20.615	911 Grant Program	60		120,591	\$144,753		
97.073	State Homeland Security Program	60	80,000	14,380	\$58,010	\$45,293	\$8,944

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.

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

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?

The majority of agency divisions are reliant on federal funding to some degree, ranging from 100% to 30%. Any reduction in federal funding would result in a reduction in delivery of c

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

No

Division # Division Name Supervisors Non-Supervisors \$35 K - \$70 K \$70 K - \$100K \$100K+ 10 Administration 3 6.5 1.5 4 2 1 2 2 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 1 1 2 2 2 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1			FY'23 Bud	geted FTE					
20 Conservation Programs16.84.5130 Field Services133140 Mine Land Reclamation331250 Water Quality7251119560 Office of Geographic Information & Technical Services111	Division #	Division Name	Supervisors	Non-Supervisors	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$100K	\$100K+	
30 Field Services13140 Mine Land Reclamation33150 Water Quality725111960 Office of Geographic Information & Technical Services111	10 Admin	istration	3	6.5	1.5	4	2	2	
40 Mine Land Reclamation331250 Water Quality7251119560 Office of Geographic Information & Technical Services1111	20 Conser	rvation Programs	1	6.8		4.5	1	1	
50 Water Quality 7 25 11 19 5 60 Office of Geographic Information & Technical Services 1 1 1 1	30 Field S	ervices	1	3		3	1		
60 Office of Geographic Information & Technical Services	40 Mine L	Land Reclamation	3	3		1	2		
	50 Water	Quality	7	25	11	19	5	1	
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12 12	60 Office	of Geographic Information & Technical Services	1	1			1	1	
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12 12									
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12 9									
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12 12									
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12 12									
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12 12									
Total 16 45.3 12.5 31.5 12									
	Total		16	45.3	12.5	31.5	12	5	

	FTE History						
Division #	Division Name	2023 Budgeted	2022	2021	2019	2014	
10 Admini	istration	9.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	9	
20 Conser	vation Programs	7.8	6.0	6.0	7.2	6	
30 Field Se	ervices	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3	
40 Mine L	and Reclamation	6.0	5.0	7.5	6.5	9	
50 Water	Quality	32.0	20.5	25.0	27.3	29	
60 Office of	of Geographic Information & Technical Services	2.0	1.5	1.5	0.0	0	
Total		61.3	40.0	44.0	45.0	56.0	

Performance M	easure Review				
Program Name	FY 22	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18
(20) Watershed Operation & Maintenance					
# of Upstream Flood Control Dams	2107	2107	2,107	2,107	2,107
# of Dams that have reached their design life	1600	1549	1,497	1,444	1,370
# of Dams completing the planning, design, finance, and construction phases of rehabilitation	2	0	0	1	1
# of dams inspected annually	2107	2107	2107	2107	1910
(30) Field Services					
Locally Led Cost-Share Program					
# of Conservation Practices implemented as a result of the program	817	747	708	675	775
State Funds used for implementation	\$2,341,577	\$3,331,595	\$1,663,067	\$1,539,764	\$1,873,558
Participant matching funds used for implementation	\$2,073,422	\$2,999,876	\$1,290,476	\$1,282,834	\$1,692,848
# of Districts implementing 75% of Long Range Plan Actions and Strategies	50	50	50	New in FY20	0
# of Districts completing 50% of Joint Plan Objectives	42	New in FY22			
# of directors who participated in at least one leadership development/continuing education op	210	300	400	525	525
# of training opportunities provided to directors and district staff	36	30	30	24	24
# of districts meeting all performance criteria for operating expense allocation	30	New in FY22			
Program Name	FY 22	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18
(40) Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation					
Assessments - # of sites completed	2	17	11	20	3
Aerial Survey - # of sites completed	0	2	1	2	2
Bathymetric Survey - # of sites completed	0	2	1	2	2
Realty - acres completed	157.5	0	1280	719	195
Environmental Survey - # of surveys completed	0	5	9	4	5
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan - # of plans managed	9	12	3	2	5
Environmental Review - # of projects w/ completed reviews	3	6	5	6	5
Design - # of sites completed	4	9	3	2	1
Construction - # of reclamation projects initiated	4	4	5	2	4
Construction - # of reclamation projects w/ ongoing inspection	0	7	2	0	4
Construction - # of reclamation projects completed	3	3	4	4	6
Vegetation Mngt - # of sites vegetated and monitored	9	5	4	3	1
Maintenance - # of completed reclamation projects repaired	4	5	9		
Public Safety AML Hazards - acres reclaimed	115.1	163.5	7	4	1
Hard Rock Inventory - # of conservation districts completed	42				

(50) Water Quality					
# of conservation districts or similar groups with active Blue Thumb volunteer monitoring /					
education programs	38	119	44	53	67
# of practices implemented in priority watershed programs	89	49	57	61	63
# of EPA accepted Non-Point Source Success Stories	3	6	4+2 updates	12 + 3 updates	12 + 3 updates
Annual Nitrogen (N) load reduction (lb.)	788,941	851,041	774939	775,186	672,702
Annual Phosphorus (P) load reduction (lb.)	360,174	531,539	453790	482,454	405,554
(60) Office of Geographic Information - OKMaps					
Number Unique Visitors / Month	5,899	5,358	5,891	5,955	6,454
Number of Visits / Month	17,558	11,742	12,768	12,978	11,462
Number of Pages Viewed / Month	4,961,527	4,005,137	3,408,524	2,604,122	1,995,957
Gigabytes of Data Downloaded / month	211	102	87	72	55

Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)						
Please provide fund number, fund name, description, and revenue source	FY'20-22 Avg. Revenues	FY'20-22 Avg. Expenditures	June '22 Balance			
Fund number: Fund name						
Fund 200 - Small Watershed Flood Control Fund - Title 27A-3-3-405:409 - to enable districts						
to acquire real property or easements needed to install upstream flood control structures	\$0	\$0	\$203,802			
on rivers and streams and the tributaries thereof, including cooperative projects between						
such district and the United States government.						
Fund 205 - Geographic Information Fund - Title 82, Section 1501-205.2 - The initial purpose						
of the fund was to receive monies from several sources including private donations, grants	\$10,783	\$1,242	\$35,747			
or transfer by federal, state or local government agencies or appropriations by the						
runu 220 - Carbon Sequestration Assessment Cash runu - Title 27A S-4-104 - The purpose						
of the Fund is for the Oklahoma Conservation Commission to carry out the Oklahoma	\$0	\$0	\$20,201			
Carbon Sequestration Enhancement Act. Funds to be credited to the account are any						
monov appropriated to the fund by the Legislature and any monov received as gifts						
Fund 245 - Donation - Fund is used to receive and use funds that primarily encompass	\$94.964	\$231.842	\$458,914			
partnerships with other entities and agencies.	. ,		. ,			
runu 200 - conservation initiastructure runu - nite 271-3-2-110 - nie runus purpose is to						
receive a portion of Gross Production Tax receipts. These funds are used for	\$2,971,708	\$3,300,641	\$5,303,713			
implementation of the locally led Conservation Cost Share Programs, the Conservation						
Posonio Enhancoment Drogram (CRED) watershed dam maintenance, repair, and						
Fund 255 - TNC License Tag Fund - Fund established to provide a mechanism for the						
Agency to pass through funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) for the sale of TNC	\$138,027	\$80,081	\$11,660			
specialty license tags.						

FY 2023 Current Employee Telework Summary

List each agency location, then report the number of employees associated with that location in the teleworking categories indicated. Use "No specified location" to account for remote employees not associated with a site. Use actual current employees, not budgeted or actual FTE.			Full-time and Part-time Employees (#)			
Agency Location / Address	City	County	Onsite (5 days onsite, rarely remote)	Hybrid (2-4 days onsite weekly)	Remote (1 day or less weekly onsite)	Total Employees
2800 N Lincoln, Ste 200	Oklahoma City	Oklahoma	9.5	15	2	26.5
No Specificed Location			19			19
128 E 3rd Street	Bristow	Creek	4			4
				Total Agency	Employees	49.5