

**FY23 Budget Performance Review**

**Conservation Commission**

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.*

**(20) Upstream Flood Control**

(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**

(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)**

(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**

(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.

**(60) Office of Geographic Information and IT Services**

(60) Office of Geographic Information and IT Services - division responsibilities include housing the State Office of Geographic Information and the State Geographic Information Coordinator as well as providing a variety of technical and IT services to the Oklahoma Conservation Commission and conservation districts.

**FY'22 Budgeted Department Funding By Source**

Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local <sup>1</sup>	Other <sup>2</sup>	Total
10	Administration (includes Public Information and General Counsel)	\$729,078	\$147,190	\$140,000			\$1,016,268
20	Upstream Flood Control	\$5,786,320	\$5,656,782	\$176,220			\$11,619,322
30	Field Services	\$6,188,979	\$2,160,702	\$1,301,000			\$9,650,681
40	Abandoned Mine Lands	\$0	\$4,164,867	\$500			\$4,165,367
50	Water Quality	\$1,021,624	\$2,919,107	\$4,141,359			\$8,082,090
60	Office of Geographic Information and IT Services	\$0	\$213,587	\$9,370			\$222,957
88	ISD Data Processing	\$0	\$420,895	\$48,000			\$468,895
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$13,726,001</b>	<b>\$15,683,130</b>	<b>\$5,816,449</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$35,225,580</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'21 Carryover by Funding Source**

Class Fund #	Carryover Class Fund Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Local <sup>1</sup>	Other <sup>2</sup>	Total
19101	Administration	\$7,600					\$7,600
19101	Conservation Programs	\$956,654					\$956,654

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? 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'23 Requested Funding By Department and Source**

Dept. #	Department Name	Appropriations	Federal	Revolving	Other <sup>1</sup>	Total	% Change
10	Administration (includes Public Information and General Counsel)	\$729,078	\$147,190	\$140,000	\$0	\$1,016,268	0.00%
20	Upstream Flood Control	\$7,786,320	\$5,656,782	\$176,220	\$0	\$13,619,322	17.21%
30	Field Services	\$6,918,979	\$2,160,702	\$1,301,000	\$0	\$10,380,681	7.56%
40	Abandoned Mine Lands	\$0	\$4,164,867	\$500	\$0	\$4,165,367	0.00%
50	Water Quality	\$1,421,624	\$2,919,107	\$4,141,359	\$0	\$8,482,090	4.95%
60	Office of Geographic Information and IT Services	\$301,348	\$213,587	\$9,370	\$0	\$524,305	135.16%
88	ISD Data Processing	\$143,640	\$420,895	\$48,000	\$0	\$612,535	30.63%
<b>Total</b>		<b>\$17,300,989</b>	<b>\$15,683,130</b>	<b>\$5,816,449</b>	<b>\$0</b>	<b>\$38,800,568</b>	<b>10.15%</b>

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

## FY23 Budget Performance Review

### Conservation Commission

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

#### FY'23 Top Five Operational Appropriation Funding Requests

Request by Priority	Request Description	Appropriation Request Amount (\$)
Request 1:	Upstream Flood Control Infrastructure - Dam Safety	\$2,000,000
Request 2:	Critical Needs for Conservation District Services	\$730,000
Request 3:	Roadside Erosion / Unpaved Roads Initiative	\$400,000
Request 4:	Operational Support for Office of Geographic Information	\$444,988
Request 5:	Operational Funding for the State AML reclamation program (Not included in total since it was not in full budget request)	\$4,165,000
<b>Top Five Request Subtotal:</b>		<b>\$3,574,988</b>
<b>Total Increase above FY-22 Budget (including all requests)</b>		<b>\$ 3,574,988</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 matching funds.

#### How would the agency be affected by receiving the same appropriation for FY '23 as was received in FY '22? (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 '23?

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. A reduction in operating budgets will lead to reduced services to citizens of the state. All legislative pass through'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 LRCP? (Yes/No)
Priority 1		

#### Federal Funds

CFDA	Federal Program Name	Agency Dept. #	FY 22 budgeted	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18
10.902	USDA - Soil and Water Conservation	10, 20 , 50	\$1,430,431	\$337,633	\$179,974	\$690,753	\$2,393,908
10.904	USDA-Watershed Protection Flood Prevention	20	\$9,037	\$3,738		\$70,000	
10.916	USDA - Watershed Protection Flood Prevention - Rehabilitation	20	\$5,525,100		\$3,818,178	\$2,734,360	\$835,000
15.252	US Dept. of Interior - Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	40	\$4,178,312	\$1,642,964	\$2,061,997	\$1,507,062	\$2,532,049
15.631	US Fish & Wildlife Service - Monarch / Control Burning	30	\$75,000	\$45,500	\$47,742	\$78,480	\$91,153
66.419	Wetlands 106 - National Wetlands Condition Assessment Program	50	\$203,533	\$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 Program	50	\$2,533,580	\$3,373,984	\$2,585,252	\$2,474,644	\$2,167,681
66.461	Office of the Sec. of Env. - Wetlands Program 104(b)(3)	50	\$103,800	\$123,825	\$112,866	\$150,740	\$188,441
97.008	Non-Profit Security Program	60			\$14,567	\$28,005	\$32,422
10.934	USDA - Feral Swine Eradication Pilot Project	30	\$1,028,611	\$61,128			
20.615	911 Grant Program	60	\$156,935	\$144,753			
97.073	State Homeland Security Program	60	\$52,500	\$58,010	\$45,293	\$8,944	

#### Federal Government Impact

<b>1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government?</b>	
Not applicable	
<b>2.) Are any of those funds inadequate to pay for the federal mandate?</b>	
Not Applicable	
<b>3.) What would the consequences be of ending all of the federal funded programs for your agency?</b>	
<p><b>Abandoned Mine Land (AML) Reclamation</b> - 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.</p> <p><b>Water Quality</b> – 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><b>Watershed Rehabilitation Program</b> - 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><b>Office of Geographic Information</b> – 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: <a href="https://okmaps.org/ogi/search.aspx">https://okmaps.org/ogi/search.aspx</a></p> <p><b>Field Services</b> - 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>	
<b>4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year?</b>	
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 staffing.	
<b>5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases?</b>	
No	

**FY23 Budget Performance Review**

**Conservation Commission**

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

FY'22 Budgeted FTE							
Division #	Division Name	Supervisors	Classified	Unclassified	\$0 - \$35 K	\$35 K - \$70 K	\$70 K - \$\$\$
10	Administration	2		5		2	3
20	Conservation Programs	1		7		4	3
30	Field Services	0		4	2	2	0
40	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	2.5		6.5		3	3.5
50	Water Quality	7		28		21	7
60	Office of Geographic Information and Technical Services	0.5		1.5		1	0.5
<b>Total</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>52</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>17</b>

FTE History							
Division #	Division Name	2022 Budgeted	2021	2020	2018	2013	
10	Administration	5.0	4.0	4.93	7.00	9.00	
20	Conservation Programs	7.0	6.0	6.90	4.00	6.00	
30	Field Services	4.0	0.0	0.00	0.00	2.00	
40	Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation	6.5	7.5	6.39	9.50	3.00	
50	Water Quality	28.0	25.0	26.81	17.00	28.00	
60	Office of Geographic Information and Technical Services	1.5	1.5	1.50	1.50	1.50	
<b>Total</b>		<b>52.0</b>	<b>44.0</b>	<b>46.5</b>	<b>39.0</b>	<b>49.5</b>	

Performance Measure Review					
Program Name	FY 21	FY 20	FY 19	FY 18	FY 17
<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	1549	1,497	1,444	1,370	1,322
# of Dams completing the planning, design, finance, and construction phases of rehabilitation	0	0	1	1	1
# of dams inspected annually	2107	2107	2107	1910	1854
<b>(30) Field Services</b>					
Locally Led Cost-Share Program					
# of Conservation Practices implemented as a result of the program	747	708	675	775	452
State Funds used for implementation	\$3,331,595	\$1,663,067	\$1,539,764	\$1,873,558	\$697,492
Participant matching funds used for implementation	\$2,999,876	\$1,290,476	\$1,282,834	\$1,692,848	\$799,966
Number of Districts implementing 75% of Long Range Plan Actions and Strategies	50%	50%	New in FY20	0	0
Number of individuals who participated in at least one leadership development opportunity	300	400	525	525	525
Number of training opportunities provided to directors and district staff	30	30	24	24	24
<b>(40) Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation</b>					
Assessments - # of sites completed	17	1	2	2	8
Aerial Survey - # of sites completed	2	1	2	2	5
Bathymetric Survey - # of sites completed	2	1280	719	195	500
Realty - acres completed	0	4	4	1	4
Environmental Survey - # of surveys completed	5	9	4	5	7
Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan - # of plans managed	12	3	2	5	2
Environmental Review - # of projects w/ completed reviews	6	5	6	5	5
Design - # of sites completed	9	3	2	1	4
Construction - # of reclamation projects initiated	4	5	2	4	3
Construction - # of reclamation projects w/ ongoing inspection	7	2	0	4	3
Construction - # of reclamation projects completed	3	4	4	6	9
Vegetation Mngt - # of sites vegetated and monitored	5	4	3	1	7
Maintenance - # of completed reclamation projects repaired	5	9			
Complaints Investigated #	2	7	4	1	0
Emergency Projects - # of completed projects	0	22.1	0	162	132
Public Safety AML Hazards - acres reclaimed	163.5	7	4	1	0
Public Safety Emergency Hazards - number eliminated	0				
<b>(50) Water Quality</b>					
# of conservation districts or similar groups with active Blue Thumb volunteer monitoring / education programs	119	44	53	67	35
# of practices implemented in priority watershed programs	49	57	61	63	54
# of EPA accepted Non-Point Source Success Stories	6	4 + 2 updates	12 + 3 updates	12 + 3 updates	5
Annual Nitrogen (N) load reduction (lb.)	851,041	774,939	775,186	672,702	665,316
Annual Phosphorus (P) load reduction (lb.)	531,539	453,790	482,454	405,554	457,472
<b>(60) Office of Geographic Information - OKMaps</b>					
Number Unique Visitors / Month	5,358	5,891	5,955	6,454	3,871
Number of Visits / Month	11,742	12,768	12,978	11,462	8,823
Number of Pages Viewed / Month	4,005,137	3,408,524	2,604,122	1,995,957	1,772,904
Gigabytes of Data Downloaded / month	102	87	72	55	62

**FY23 Budget Performance Review**

**Conservation Commission**

Lead Administrator: Trey Lam, Executive Director

Lead Financial Officer: Bob Richardson, Comptroller (040)

**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
<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.	\$7,091	\$573	\$30,785
<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.	\$0	\$0	\$20,201
<b>Fund 245 - Donation</b> - Fund is used to receive and use funds that primarily encompass partnerships with other entities and agencies.	\$180,969	\$272,009	\$440,506
<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.	\$3,030,996	\$2,727,682	\$5,910,215
<b>Fund 255 - TNC License Tag Fund</b> - Fund established to provide a mechanism for the Agency to pass through funds to The Nature Conservancy (TNC) for the sale of TNC specialty license tags.	\$141,190	\$108,460	\$17,960