FY23 Budget Performance Review

12500 Department of Mines

Lead Administrator: Mary Ann Pritchard Lead Financial Officer: Suzen M. Rodesney

Agency Mission

The mission of the Oklahoma Department of Mines (ODM) is to protect the environment of the state, to protect the life, health and safety of the miners and to protect affected citizens and their property through enforcement of state mining and reclamation laws.

Division and Program Descriptions

Note: Please define any acronyms used in program descriptions.

Administration

This program includes the Director, executive assistant and support staff, comprised of the financial staff. Their responsibility is to provide agency leadership and support services for the operation of the Department.

Coal Division

The coal program includes the administration and enforcement of the coal regulatory program for the State of Oklahoma. It includes all permitting activities, inspection, CCB, reclamation and legal actions associated with the program enforcement. Coal Combustion Byproduct (CCB) placement is an environmental necessity. The placement assists in the reclamation of old abandoned mine sites left by previous operations. All fly ash, bottom ash, or any other material produced by coal combustion, power generating facilities and kiln dust generated by cement producing entities shall be exempt from all solid waste permitting requirements pursuant to Title 27A of the Oklahoma Statutes, provided such ash or dust is constructively reutilized, or disposed of in any active or inactive coal or noncoal mining operations subject to the provisions contained in Title 45 of the Oklahoma Statutes.

Minerals

This program includes all activities of the Minerals Division. It includes all permitting activities, reclamation inspections and all health and safety inspections on mine sites and the enforcement of non-mining blasting. There are over 700 permitted sites in all 77 counties of the state. The non-mining blasting program is responsible for the regulation of blasting, and the use, transfer, or sale of explosives for non-mining purposes. Responsibilities include the issuance of blasting permits, the issuance of blasting exemptions, the inspection of blasting sites and the seller's records, the investigation of blasting complaints, the issuance of violations and the assessment of penalties for non-compliance.

Oklahoma Miner Training Institute

The Oklahoma Miner Training Institute (OMTI) is responsible for the statutorily mandated training of all miners on the mine sites in the state, as outlined under Title 45. The OMTI trains and certifies miners from other states and independent contractors.

Data Processing/IT

This is now a mandated separate activity of the agency. In previous fiscal years, these costs were recorded as part of the administration costs.

	FY'22 Budgeted Department Funding By Source								
Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local ¹	Other ²	Total		
1 Ac	lministration	266,256	204,891	217,228			\$688,375		
2 Co	oal Division	20,955	652,328	358,038			\$1,031,321		
3 M	inerals Division	482,722		540,383			\$1,023,105		
10 Ol	da. Miner Training Inst.		200,000	207,500			\$407,500		
88 Da	ata Processing		63,600	74,600			\$138,200		
							\$0		
Total		\$769,933	\$1,120,819	\$1,397,749	\$0	\$0	\$3,288,501		

- 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 departme

	FY'21 Carryover by Funding Source								
Class Fund #	Carryover Class Fund Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local ¹	Other ²	Total		
19X	ODM Operations- Appropriated	\$75,581					\$75,581		
40000	ODM Operations		\$17,281				\$17,281		
20000	ODM Operations			\$214,634			\$214,634		
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'21 and FY'22?

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?

N/A

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

None

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

No

	FY'23 Requested Funding By Department and Source							
Dept.#	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other ¹	Total	% Change	
1 Ad	lministration	\$266,256	\$204,891	\$217,228	\$0	\$688,375	0.00%	
2 Co	al Division	\$20,955	\$652,328	\$358,038	\$0	\$1,031,321	0.00%	
3 Mi	nerals Division	\$482,722	\$0	\$540,383	\$0	\$1,023,105	0.00%	
10 Ok	la. Miner Training Inst.	\$0	\$200,000	\$207,500	\$0	\$407,500	0.00%	
88 Da	ta Processing	\$0	\$63,600	\$74,600	\$0	\$138,200	0.00%	
Total		\$769,933	\$1,120,819	\$1,397,749	\$0	\$3,288,501	0.00%	

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

FY23 Budget Performance Review

12500 Department of Mines

Lead Administrator: Mary Ann Pritchard Lead Financial Officer: Suzen M. Rodesney

	FY'23 Top Five Operational Appropriation Funding Requests							
Request by Priority	Request Description			Appropriation Request Amount (\$)				
Request 1:	Coal Program : McGirt action	(Supplemental)		\$680,000				
Request 2:	Coal Program : VOBO action	(Supplemental)		\$251,068				
			Top Five Request Subtotal:	\$931,068				
Total Increas	se above FY-22 Budget (including all requests)	Not applicable since these amounts are for FY '22.		N/A				
Difference be	etween Top Five requests and total requests:			N/A				

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

Currently, the agency has nineteen (19) employees who are in the Pathfinder retirement system and their payroll allocations are assigned to a federal grant. At this time, it is approximately \$20,000 per year that the agency cannot allocate to the federal program. The agency must use non grant funds to cost out and pay for these contributions.

How would the agency be affected by receiving the same appropriation for FY '23 as was received in FY '22? (Flat/0% change)

The agency would be able to meet the statutory requirements and continue to serve the needs of the permittees and clients who require the services of the Department of Mines.

How would the agency handle a 2% appropriation reduction in FY '23?

An approximate \$15,387 would be 2%. The agency would probably not purchase a vehicle for replacement in FY22. Other cost savings methods would be underfilling replacements as retirements occur. A reduction in operating budgets will lead to reduced services to citizens of the state. All legislative pass trough's will be reduced by 2%.

Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY '23?		
	Fee Increase Request (\$)	Statutory change required? (Yes/No)
Increase 1		

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	Digitizing of paper records Interagency contract with Dept. of Corrections	\$0	No

	Federal Funds							
CFDA	Federal Program Name	Agency Dept. #	FY 22 budgeted	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18	
15.25	Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement (U.S. Dept. of Interior) - Administration and Enforcement Grant		920,819	1,031,315	1,131,337	1,070,199	\$ 1,026,971	
17.6	Mine Safety and Health Administration (U.S. Dept. of Labor) - Oklahoma Miner Training Institute Grant		200,000	157,000	150,533	139,002	\$145,754	

Federal Government Impact

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

The federal funds are 100% as a result of the SMRCA (Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act).

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

No, the grant application covers all required costs.

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

Approximately 1/3 of the staff would be let go, and we would close the Tulsa field office. Operations regarding the implementation of the SMCRA would cease. Primacy would revert back to the U.S. Dept. of Interior.

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

Since the agency is currently in litigation, and federal funds have been cut off, the Department would seek supplemental funds. A bridge loan would be required until supplemental funding could be awarded

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

No

	FY'22 Budgeted FTE								
Division #	Division Name	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$		
1 Admini	stration	2	2	7		5	2		
2 Coal Pr	ogram	2	2	13.7		11.7	2		
3 Mineral	ls Program	1	L	9.8		8.8	1		
Total		5	5 0	30.5	0	25.5	5		

FTE History								
Division #	Division Name	2022 Budgeted	2021	2020	2018	2013		
1 Adminis	tration	7	7.0	6.0	6.0	6.0		
2 Coal Pro	gram	13.7	11.6	12.4	15.0	15.4		
3 Minerals	s Program	9.8	10.4	10.6	11.0	10.6		
Total		30.5	29.0	29.0	32.0	32.0		

FY23 Budget Performance Review

12500 Department of Mines

Lead Administrator: Mary Ann Pritchard Lead Financial Officer: Suzen M. Rodesney

Performance Measure Review					
	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18	FY 17
Coal Inspection Frequency					
Perform regular inspections of coal mine sites to meet required inspection frequency (per	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%
federal grant) and to verify/enforce compliance with the approved mining permit. Determine					
the percentage of coal permit where inspection frequency for the fiscal year was met. The					
number of inspections performed in accordance with the statutory compliance schedule.					
Off-site impact	0/40000	0/4/0000	0.40.660	10/00/405	0/2007
Reduce the number of off-site impacts from mining and blasting operations by tracking the number of off-site impacts observed per permitted acre per year. Count the number of off-	8/18000	8/18000	9/19,660	12/20465	9/20697
site impacts compared to the number of permitted acres per year. Count the number of off-					
number of off-site impacts to the permitted acreages.					
Minerals Permit Timeframes					
Review and issue/deny non-coal mining and blasting permits within ODM required	100%	100%	71%	100%	100%
timeframes, decreasing process time 30% over four(4) years. The percentage of non-coal issued permits where the timeframe was met-considered an approval rate.					
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
Minerals Inspection Frequency	000/ . 537	000/ . 537	000/ . 537		
Perform safety inspections of mine sites at the required frequency in order to verify/enforce compliance with safety regulations. The percentage of compliance is based upon the	98% at 5X	90% at 5X	87% at 5X		
frequency (X) and the number of inspections.	3850 inspections	3500 inspections	3500 inspections		
Miner Training					
To provide miner training and refresher training to the mining industry, resulting in a safer	23	37	48	62	49
workforce, thus resulting in fewer accidents. Measured by the number of accidents that					
occur each fiscal year.					

Revolving Funds (200 Series Funds)								
Please provide fund number, fund name, description, and revenue source	FY'19-21 Avg. Revenues	FY'19-21 Avg. Expenditures	June '21 Balance					
Fund number: Fund name								
ODM Revolving Funds 20000: Production fees, permit fees and revisions, reimbursements	\$1,117,277	\$1,131,616	\$165,071					
OMTI Revolving Fund: 20500 : Production fees, training registration fees, reimbursement of travel costs	\$174,358	\$196,774	\$49,564					