

FY 2024 Budget Performance Review

645 - Conservation Commission

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam

Lead Financial Officer: Jeannie Parsley

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.

Division and Program Descriptions

Note: Please define any acronyms used in 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 Geographical Information Technology Services - 60

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

ISD Data Processing - 88

It costs and support for all agency divisions.

FY'23 Budgeted Department Funding By 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 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'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
							\$0
							\$0

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'22 and FY'23?

- Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts?
N/A
- What services are provided at a higher cost to the user?
N/A
- What services are still provided but with a slower response rate?
N/A
- Did the agency provide any pay raises that were not legislatively/statutorily required?
Yes

FY'24 Requested Funding By Department and Source

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%

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

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 Increase above FY-23 Budget (including all requests)		\$ 6,627,660
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 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?		
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 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 Reclamation	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 Pt	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?
<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p> <p>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.</p>
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

FY'23 Budgeted FTE							
Division #	Division Name	Supervisors	Non-Supervisors	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$100K	\$100K+
10	Administration	3	6.5	1.5	4	2	2
20	Conservation Programs	1	6.8		4.5	1	1
30	Field Services	1	3		3	1	
40	Mine Land Reclamation	3	3		1	2	
50	Water Quality	7	25	11	19	5	1
60	Office of Geographic Information & Technical Services	1	1			1	1
Total		16	45.3	12.5	31.5	12	5

FTE History						
Division #	Division Name	2023 Budgeted	2022	2021	2019	2014
10	Administration	9.5	4.0	4.0	4.0	9
20	Conservation Programs	7.8	6.0	6.0	7.2	6
30	Field Services	4.0	3.0	0.0	0.0	3
40	Mine Land 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 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 Measure 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			
(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				

