Oklahoma Conservation Commission

Mike Thralls, Executive Director

Steven Coffman, Comptroller

| FY'15 Budgeted FTE | | | | | | |
|----------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| | Supervisors | Classified | Unclassified | \$0 - \$35 K | \$35 K - \$70 K | \$70 K - \$\$\$ |
| Administration | 3 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 6 | 1 |
| Watershed Operations | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 6 | 0 |
| Field Services | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 |
| Abandoned Mine Land | 1 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 7 | 0 |
| Water Quality | 1 | 0 | 26 | 0 | 26 | 0 |
| OGIS & Tech Services | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| Total | 6 | 3 | 46 | 0 | 49 | 1 |

| FTE History | | | | | |
|----------------------|---------------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2014 Budgeted | 2013 | 2010 | 2009 | 2004 |
| Administration | 7 | 8 | 10 | 10 | 11 |
| Watershed Operations | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 5 |
| Field Services | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 | 3 |
| Abandoned Mine Land | 7 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 10 |
| Water Quality | 28 | 28 | 31 | 31 | 28 |
| OGIS & Tech Services | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 51 | 53 | 59 | 59 | 57 |

| FY'14 Projected Division/Program Funding By Source | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------|-----------|--------------|--|
| | Appropriations | Federal | Revolving | Local | Other* | Total | |
| Administration | \$2,887,037 | \$285,432 | \$68,568 | \$0 | \$0 | \$3,241,037 | |
| Watershed Operations | \$590,000 | \$6,888,971 | \$705,468 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,184,439 | |
| Field Services | \$6,454,647 | \$1,029,116 | \$840,743 | \$0 | \$0 | \$8,324,506 | |
| Abandoned Mine Land | \$0 | \$4,825,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,825,000 | |
| Water Quality | \$500,000 | \$6,201,896 | \$3,186,500 | \$0 | \$300,000 | \$10,188,396 | |
| OGIS & Tech Services | \$30,000 | \$339,000 | \$10,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$379,000 | |
| Total | \$10,461,684 | \$19,569,415 | \$4,811,279 | \$0 | \$300,000 | \$35,142,378 | |

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each. - Emergency Drought Relief fund

| FY'13 Carryover by Funding Source | | | | | | | |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|--|
| Appropriations Federal Revolving Local Other* Total | | | | | | Total | |
| FY'13 Carryover | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | |
| *Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each | | | | | | | |

What Changes did the Agency make between FY'13 and FY'14

- 1.) Are there any services no longer provided because of budget cuts? Eqipment Manager positions continued to be reduced and the services thay provide have been reduced.
- 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? Eliminted conservation district positions and reducedconservation district employee hours have resulted in slower service rates and customers having to travel longer distances.

| FY'15 Requested Division/Program Funding By Source | | | | | | | |
|--|----------------|--------------|-------------|-------|--------------|----------|--|
| | Appropriations | Federal | Revolving | Other | Total | % Change | |
| Administration | \$2,971,037 | \$150,000 | \$50,000 | \$0 | \$3,171,037 | 0.00% | |
| Watershed Operations | \$8,661,000 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$10,661,000 | 0.00% | |
| Field Services | \$7,965,647 | \$1,000,000 | \$800,000 | \$0 | \$9,765,647 | 0.00% | |
| Abandoned Mine Land | \$0 | \$4,500,000 | \$0 | \$0 | \$4,500,000 | 0.00% | |
| Water Quality | \$500,000 | \$2,152,090 | \$2,000,000 | \$0 | \$4,652,090 | 0.00% | |
| OGIS & Tech Services | \$263,000 | \$500,000 | \$5,000 | \$0 | \$768,000 | 0.00% | |
| Total | \$20,360,684 | \$10,302,090 | \$2,855,000 | \$0 | \$33,517,774 | 0.00% | |

*Source of "Other" and % of "Other" total for each.

| \$ Amount |
|-------------|
| φπιποαπι |
| \$906,000 |
| \$760,000 |
| \$8,000,000 |
| \$233,000 |
| |

How would the agency handle a 3% appropriation reduction in FY'15?

A 3% reduction would mean approximately a \$313,851 reduction in the Commission budget. The Commission would reduce personnel costs by eliminating 7 positions.

How would the agency handle a 5% appropriation reduction in FY'15?

A 5% reduction would mean approimately a \$523,084 reduction to the Commission budget. The Commission would reduce personnel costs by elimnating 12 positions.

| Is the agency seeking any fee increases for FY'15? | | | | | | |
|---|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | \$ Amount | | | | | |
| The agency is requesting no fee increase for FY-2015 No | \$0 | | | | | |
| | \$0 | | | | | |
| | \$0 | | | | | |

Federal Government Impact

- 1.) How much federal money received by the agency is tied to a mandate by the Federal Government? \$.00
- 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? The Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program would end immediately as it is 100% federally funded. The Water Quality Program would be reduced by well over 80%. The watershed rehabilitation program would be reduced by 65% meaning that the schedule for rehabilitating high hazard dams would be reduced accordingly. The \$400,000 from NRCS used to deliver the Farm Bill programs would be eliminated from the Commission's budget. These funds are used to support district personnel and operations. Should these funds be eliminated it would result in the reduction of conservation district personnel and the loss of the multiplier effect which would have a negative impact on the local and state economy. The Office of Geographic Information manages the the state's geospatial clearinghouse, OKMaps. The website and underlying application is maintained and upgraded strictly with federal Homeland Security funds. Loss of those funds would result in the site not being maintained and eventually not being available for use due to lack of maintenance and upgrades.
- 4.) How will your agency be affected by federal budget cuts in the coming fiscal year? Cuts to the federal budget mean EPA/State funded priority watershed projects that address specific water quality problems such as the Illinois River and North Canadian projects will end in December 2014. These cuts also mean the loss of a minimum of two and as many as seven staff as these programs close. There is a high liklihood that the The \$400,000 from NRCS used to deliver the Farm Bill programs would be eliminated from the Commission's budget. These funds are used to support district personnel and operations. Should these funds be eliminated it would result in the reduction of conservation district personnel and a loss of the multiplier effect which would have a negative impact on the local and state economy.
- 5.) Has the agency requested any additional federal earmarks or increases? No.

Division and Program Descriptions

Administration

Administration. Represents the commissioners by providing management, oversight and support for all agency operations, programs and divisions.

Financial Management & Human Resources. Provides support to all operations and programs of the agency and assistance to conservation districts regarding personnel, financial management, procurement, risk management and employee benefits coordination.

Public Information. Provides a wide range of information to agency clients, partners and the general public through publishing a monthly newsletter, preparation of press releases, maintenance of a website and the development of displays about agency programs and activities.

Watershed Operations

Operation and Maintenance. Provides technical and financial assistance to conservation districts in support of the districts' responsibilities to operate and maintain 2107 upstream flood control dams in the state, a \$2 billion public infrastructure that provides \$85 million in state benefits annually.

Watershed Rehabilitation. Working in cooperation with the Natural Resources Conservation Service and conservation districts provides technical and financial assistance to modify high hazard flood control dams to ensure they meet state dam safety criteria for reducing the risk of loss of life and improving public safety.

Field Services

Conservation Districts. Provides funding to the state's 87 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 State Statutes.

Conservation Education. Provides technical assistance to conservation districts to promote conservation education activities in the classroom and is responsible for chairing the Environmental Education Coordinating Council.

District Services. Provides tools, training and technical assistance to conservation district boards and employees on public official governance, personnel management and financial management in compliance with state law, rules, regulations and policy.

Abandoned Mine Land

Program Administration. Provides the administration and oversight for the federally funded abandoned mine land reclamation program.

Program Construction. Manages the design and construction of the reclamation projects on abandoned coal mined lands.

Program Emergencies. Manages the reclamation work on emergency mine projects where a public health or safety issue requires immediate action.

Water Quality

Water Quality. Responsible for identifying state waters impaired by nonpoint source pollution and then prioritizing and implementing projects to reduce pollutants by measureable amounts and improve water quality to remove streams from the state's List of Impaired Waters (Clean Water Act Section 303(d)List).

Wetlands. Responsible for preparing and updating the state's wetlands conservation plan and coordinating state state's Wetland's Working Group in order to conserve, enhance, and restore the quantity and biological diversity of wetlands in Oklahoma.

Locally Led Cost Share. Provides management of funds allocated to conservation districts to assist landowners installing conservation practices to address soil erosion and protect water quality.

Priority Watershed Cost Share. As federal and state funds are available, provides management of funds on a watershed basis to assist landowners with installing conservation practices to address water quality problems.

Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program. In cooperation with USDA provides technical and financial assistance to landowners in the Illinois River Watershed and the Spavinaw Lake Watershed to install riparian buffers along streams as a pollution prevention practice.

BlueThumb Water Quality Education Program. In cooperation with Conservation Districts and other partners, educate citizens across the atate about water quality and nonpoint source pollution and train citizen volunteers to collect data that can be used to supplement the state's data collection capabilities.

Office of Geographic Information and Technical Services

Office of Geographic Information and Technical Services. Responsible for housing the State Office of Geographic Information and the State GIS Coordinator, maintaining the agency's geographic information systems operations and database, and coordinating computer network, email and file system support with OMES for the agency. Also, privides information technology support to the conservation districts.

| Performance Measure Review | | | | | | |
|---|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|--|
| | FY13 | FY'12 | FY'11 | FY'10 | FY'09 | |
| Abandoned Mine Reclamation Program | | | | | | |
| Number of Reclaim Sites | 3 | 6 | 2 | 3 | 3 | |
| Hazardous Water Bodies Reclaimed | 5 | 3 | 2 | 3 | 5 | |
| Acres Reclaimed | 87 | 142 | 64 | 54 | 180 | |
| Emergency AML Program | | | | | | |
| Number of Projects | 6 | 1 | 4 | 5 | 4 | |
| Vertical Openings/Subsidences Recl | 7 | 2 | 11 | 6 | 4 | |
| Acres Reclaimed | 0.5 | 0.1 | 2.0 | 0.6 | 0.4 | |
| Field Services | | | | | | |
| Assistance to Conservation | \$7.9 | \$8.2 | \$8.3 | \$8.2 | \$8.2 | |
| Districts (Millions) | | | | | | |
| Water Quality Cost-Share Program | | | | | | |
| Number of Conservation Practices | | | | | | |
| Implemented as a Result of the | 699 | 750 | 928 | 1,203 | 1,010 | |
| Locally Led Cost-Share Prog. | | | | | | |
| State Appropriated Exp.(Millions) | \$0.9 | \$1.1 | \$1.4 | \$1.6 | \$1.2 | |
| Participant Matching Exp.(Millions) | \$1.1 | \$0.5 | \$1.4 | \$1.6 | \$1.5 | |
| Water Quality and Wetlands | | | | | | |
| Number of Conservation Districts | | | | | | |
| (or similar group) w/ Acitve Blue Thumb Volunteer | 42 | 37 | 57 | 57 | 57 | |
| Monitor/Education Programs | | | | | | |
| Number of New Cooperators | 99 | 88 | 120 | 102 | 224 | |
| in Priority Watershed Programs | | | | | | |
| Reduce Non-Point Source Pollution | 6% | 5% | 6% | 6% | 6% | |
| (% reduction) | | | | | | |
| Watershed Operation and Maintenance | | | | | | |
| Total Upstream Flood Control Sites | 2,107 | 2,107 | 2,107 | 2,105 | 2,105 | |
| # of Upstream Flood Control | | | | | | |
| Sites That Have Reached Their Design Life | 943 | 807 | 677 | 586 | 463 | |
| # of Upstream Flood Control Sites | | | | | | |
| Completing the Planning, Design, Finance, and | | | | | | |
| Construction Phases of Rehabilitation | 8 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 5 | |
| Structures Inspected Annually | 2,107 | 2,107 | 2,107 | 2,105 | 2,105 | |
| Office of Geographic Information | | | | | | |
| OK Maps Use Statistics | | | | | | |
| # Unique Visitors per Month | 1,520 | 963 | 603 | na | na | |
| # GB Bandwidth usage per Month | 7.5 | 4.4 | 2.2 | na | na | |

| # Visits per Month | 2,623 | 2,023 | 1,632 | na | na |
|--------------------------|---------|---------|---------|----|----|
| # Pages Viewed per Month | 442,317 | 340,694 | 182,329 | na | na |
| # Hits per Month | 508,756 | 382,340 | 235,776 | na | na |