

15-17 SCC Non-Shellfish & Shellfish Appropriation Assumptions

	Non-Shellfish 15-17 Appropriation	Shellfish 15-17 Appropriation
	4,000,000	4,000,000
SCC Indirect	(120,000)	(120,000) SCC Indirect
Cultural Resources/Emergency	(1,000,000)	(25,000) Cultural Resources/Emergency
Subtotal Available	2,880,000	3,855,000 Subtotal Available for Distribution
CD 25% Allowed Indirect	(720,000)	(963,750) CD 25% Allowed Indirect
Livestock TA	(318,109)	(512,075) Livestock TA
Estimated Non-Shellfish Priority 1 (31 Districts)	(816,165)	0
Estimated Non-Shellfish Priority 2 (31 Districts)	(769,629)	0
<i>Estimated Shellfish Priority 1 Non-Shellfish (14 Districts) *</i>	(343,492)	0
<i>Estimated Shellfish Priority 2 Non-Shellfish (14 Districts) *</i>	(383,438)	0
Total Funds Available	(470,833)	2,379,175 Total Funds Available

**Assumes this value for Shellfish district projects would be eligible under Non-Shellfish*

Capital Funds Policy Proposal & Analysis

Policy	Proposed Policy	Reason For Change
1	Funding Criteria & Process - Required	
2	All proposed projects must be input into the CPDS system.	No Change ---
3	Projects need to be ranked in the CPDS by priority at the practice level with the primary type chosen (see CPDS guide).	Partial Change Verification will occur to ensure any practice prioritized meets the programs funding definition and all elements required are contained within the CPDS.
4	Only input the cost share amount needed from the SCC for the project	No Change ---
5	Cost share contracts must be printed from the CPDS system	No Change ---
6	"Before" pictures are required for each practice	No Change ---
7	"Planned" implementation measures are required for each practice	No Change ---
8	For project input instructions, please refer to: The CPDS <i>Quick Reference Guide</i> .	No Change ---
9	The project must have a prioritization number at the practice level and a primary category type selected under the Details Tab.	Partial This was to be completed by all districts last fall, working with RM, included updating the list and ensuring all the elements were included.
10	Cost share awards are allocated based on amount requested in the CPDS system.	No Change ---
11	Based off of the cost share award per project, an additional 25% will be awarded to include the costs of technical assistance, engineering, travel and overhead.	Lump sum of 25% of the cost share award to each project. <i>Not allocated by</i> This allows for maximum flexibility regarding the implementation of the practice, reduces staff management time of the financial oversight, and recognizes adaptive changes in each project at the conservation district level.

		<i>Tech Asst., Eng., Travel, Overhead, etc.</i>	
12	Cultural resource costs are awarded on a case by case basis in addition to cost share funding.	Partial Change – Cultural Resources invoices required to be uploaded in CPDS and submitted for reimbursement.	All projects must comply with the WSCC cultural resources policy. A cultural resources review begins only after the final design is complete to expedite the process. Please plan ahead to ensure enough time is permitted prior to implementation, which could be 45 days or more. Cultural resources review is required by the Governor’s Executive Order 05-05 for all projects using both state operating and capital funding provided by WSCC. Please refer to the WSCC Cultural Resource Policy. Including the invoice in the CPDS system, allows a recording of the cost associated with the project and reporting capabilities for policy and funding decision-makers.
<i>Instead of separating the cultural resources review costs/invoicing, it may be much easier for districts to just have it as part of the overall project costs. Separate funding for this creates additional time and bureaucracy.</i>			
13	Ineligible costs: Goods and services Education and outreach	No Change	---
14	Significant movement on the project must begin within 120 days of the funding allocation.	No Change	---
<i>Districts can prioritize projects based on water quality or other criteria, but there is no good resolution/policy on how to change those priorities for projects. The WSCC needs to understand that priorities can change rapidly with projects/landowners that stop a project one reason or another. Districts need more flexibility on the projects that get funded through prioritization.</i>			
15	Maximum cost share per land owner per fiscal year is \$50,000.	No Change	---
16	All BMP practices must meet NRCS standards and specifications or alternative practice designs approved by a professional engineer licensed by the State of Washington. Emphasis will be placed on BMPs involving structures and facilities, including	No Change	---

	bioengineering practices. Practices must be in compliance with cost share policies and the management practice implementation guidance policy adopted by the Conservation Commission in 2013 (<i>13-05 Cost Share Assistance Policy, March 21, 2013</i>).		
17	All proposed projects must be in the CPDS.	No Change	---
18	Project must have a detailed project description unique to each project (see example descriptions below).	No Change, however...	An increase in review for compliance to ensure the description contains the elements necessary to report detail of the project.
19	Map of projects previously funded and projects needing funding. (Upload maps into the CPDS under the documents tab.)	This is a new requirement for Non-Shellfish funding.	Conservation districts need a map to identify the location of previously funded projects and those prioritized projects needed funded. The map is to be uploaded into the documents tab in CPDS.
<i>Mapping the project location should not be an issue. Recommend using latitude and longitude coordinates.</i>			
20	A report will be pulled from the CPDS of each conservation district's prioritized projects on July 1, 2015.	No Change, other than new pull date.	New identified report pull date.
<i>Extend to July 15th</i>			
21	Projects will be reviewed and selection will be based on priority and meeting requirements as listed in this guidance document and the guidance document provided to conservation districts on how to enter projects into CPDS.	No Overall Change, however...	Each record will be checked to confirm compliance with the requirements, reducing the wait time for compliance later when payment is requested.
22	Conservation Districts will be awarded funding based on projects prioritized in the CPDS up to \$150,000 maximum per district. If any funding is remaining after the initial allocation, funding for other projects	New – maximum funding awarded per district.	This allows districts with many smaller projects, the same opportunity and funding level as districts with larger projects. Ensures funding for each district at the onset, allowing for another review based upon unused funding.

	will be on a project by project basis.		<p>Minimum number of projects funded would be 3, no maximum, however they must be included in the prioritized list printed on July 1, 2015.</p> <p>If a districts list does not include prioritized projects valued at \$150,000, the difference is returned for another allocation process for districts with more projects available for funding.</p>
<p><i>As I understand this, districts with bigger and more projects will have a distinct advantage over smaller districts with less or smaller projects. Each district should be offered the \$150K. After an allotted time period, they either have proposals to utilize the funds or they must return the unused portion. No problem with a max of \$50K per landowner/project.</i></p>			
23	Districts will be informed whether funding has been approved or not.	No Change, however...	Does formalize the process.
24	Projects must go through the district's Regional Manager for possible approval of swapping of projects once funding has been awarded to a district for a project. Other districts may be able to use the funding resources, allowing more projects to be implemented.	New	Limited to projects not currently prioritized. If a district has an eligible project already included in the prioritized list, this requirement does not apply.
<p><i>It is helpful/beneficial to have the regional manager approve project swaps. Thank you.</i></p>			
25	Supervisors, Associate Supervisors and employees of a district who are applying for cost share will need to fill out a fillable form to supply more information regarding their cost share request. (form attached) link here: Supervisor, Associate Supervisor, District Employee Cost Share Survey	New	<p>In advance of any cost share funds being awarded to a supervisor, associate supervisor, or district employee, a request for additional information must be completed and submitted to SCC for review. This includes providing a total of all funds received during the term, and if any other entity funds are included in the implementation of the practice.</p> <p>Once form has been submitted, an SCC Commission Sub-committee would review the application prior to funding being awarded.</p> <p>The totals by district will be compiled into a regular report and provided at each SCC Commission meeting.</p>

This appears to be appropriate to avoid conflict of interest or favoritism.

26	Projects must be completed in the funding timeframe.	No Change	
----	--	-----------	--

Recommend being more clear, such as "What is specified in the project contract", or something similar.

27	The funding is granted on a biennium basis (July 1, 2015 - June 30, 2017) therefore, all projects must be completed by June 30, 2017.	Partial Change	Changed dates for biennium.
28	WSCC will hold back 25% of the total funding awarded to the Commission (\$1 million) for cultural resources, appeals to funding decisions, emergencies, and referrals.	New	The unknown costs of cultural resource investigation on practices, appeals of unfunded practices, emergencies, and regulatory referrals; all create a need for funding to be available for distribution to cover these costs.

Having a reserve fund is appropriate for unforeseen legal matters; however, \$1M may be excessive. What happens if/when it isn't used?

29	Program Recommendations		
30	Conservation Districts are encouraged to cluster projects.	This is a change for the non-shellfish funding, but not a change for shellfish funding.	This unique targeted approach of clustering projects with multiple landowners in one geographic area allows for more effective and efficient use of capital funding targeting focused geographic areas for measurable resource improvement.
31	Conservation Districts are encouraged to prioritize projects implemented in areas with identified pollution inputs with particular focus on areas with 303(d) listings, projects implementing an Ecology TMDL implementation plan, and project implementing a local resource plan.	Enhancement	
32	Conservation Districts are encouraged to prioritize projects connected to the conservation district's annual or long-range plan.	Enhancement	More emphasis will be placed on the content included in a district's annual and long-range plan and whether or not the district's prioritized list if following the plans.

33	Vouchering Process		
34	Monthly grant vouchers are required.	No Change	
35	Refer to the Grants and Contracts Procedures Manual for more detailed information about vouchering, eligible costs, timelines, etc.	No Change	
36	Secondary Review from SCC Commission Subcommittee		
37	A secondary review would come into play if a conservation district requests, or a determination by an SCC employee finds a situation where the project doesn't fall within guidelines.	Partial Change	Would formalize an appeals process authorized to review and make recommendations to SCC members.
38	The Secondary Review Subcommittee will be determined by the Conservation Commissioners. It would include Conservation Commissioners and SCC employee(s).		Comprised of SCC members and 1 SCC staff.
GENERAL COMMENTS			
<i>Is this feasible within the parameters of CPDS? Idea is good.</i>			

Unresolved Questions - Comments

Policy		Non-Shellfish Project Committee Recommendation
1	<p>Invasive Species:</p> <p>Is this covered under the Non-Shellfish Program? RCO allows spraying of Knotweed, but only if native plantings are then planted.</p>	<p>Knotweed usually takes two or more years to eradicate before native plantings could be planted. The recommendation is to allow this activity if it is in advance of another BMP practice being installed as part of a plan. However, this should not be allowed under Non-Shellfish funding, if SCC receives Toxics funding it should be funded under that funding source.</p>
<p><i>Spraying should be part of site prep for planting it is allowable expense for the year of the grant, future maintenance required by landowner. We do not have Knotweed, but reeds canary grass is our nemesis.</i></p>		
2	<p>Should Cover Crops be allowed under this funding?</p> <p>The NRCS Water Quality Enhancement Activity WQL120—Transition to Organic Cropping Systems states: Environmental benefits will be operation specific. Benefits may include, but are not limited to improving soil quality through reduced erosion, increased organic matter, and balancing plant nutrients; and reducing impact of the farming operation on water quality achieved by managing pests, weeds, and diseases using biological, mechanical, and/or physical practices that eliminate the need for synthetic pesticides.</p>	<p>This is a very beneficial BMP and is an important component to good management. However, it should be funded under IM or EQIP funding only, not Non-Shellfish. This activity is not considered capital.</p>
<p><i>I say no unless want to open up to all management practices prescribed grazing, pest nutrient management, this money should be geared toward the hard long term fixes 10 year life span</i></p>		
3	<p>Should districts be allowed to incur the costs for a landowner project, and then simply request reimbursement from the SCC?</p> <p>As compared to the current policy which requires the landowner to reimburse the district for the expenses, submit the invoices for reimbursement from the district, and the district submit reimbursement</p>	<p>SCC is in discussions with the Assistant Attorney General on options and considerations regarding a district investing in the materials, or paying vendors directly, before work is completed.</p>

Policy		Non-Shellfish Project Committee Recommendation
	requests of SCC.	
<i>I think districts should be allowed to incur costs, it allows for smaller landowner and more people able to do projects. Down side requires district to have higher management costs and input to the projects to protect interests. But it has to be legal our board worries about the gifting of public funds questions?</i>		
4	Should there be a maximum dollar of cost share per project? If so, what should this be?	Recommend the maximum per landowner/per fiscal year remain at \$50,000 per project as approved for the 13-15 biennium.
<i>I agree with the \$50,000 cap per project. Maybe allow for a process to request to go higher if important for landowner with greater impacts. The commission or a special committee to approve larger projects.</i>		
<i>It seems the WSCC needs to decide between spreading dollars across the state (and a variety of project) or emphasize the 'best' projects; i.e. whether it is important that many or few projects are funded and that one or two major projects do not use all the funds. The ranking process should reflect the WSCC approach and priorities.</i>		
5	Should there be a limit as to how much each district can receive under the Non-Shellfish Program? If so, what should that amount be? Some preliminary figures were evaluated based of current biennium expenditures. If a district had 20 practices prioritized for implementation, it would cost approximately \$550,000. At this level of funding, only 8 of the 45 districts would receive funding.	Recommend the maximum be at \$150,000 per district (may be less depending on Legislature's final budget). Allocation will be by prioritized projects in the CPDS until it reaches the \$150,000 cap. If needed a district may swap a prioritized project that isn't ready to move forward with another project (landowner) who is prioritized and ready to reach the \$150,000 cap. Once the \$150,000 cap has been reached per district, and funding is available more funding would be allocated at that time.
<i>no max limit per district the money needs to go where the need and willing landowners are, but it is important every district has the ability to get some money I would lower to \$100,000 per district (two projects). Because some districts have a need and good projects but do not have the staff to get projects prepared and entered into CPDS like some who have a staff that can enter every possible project. This is the hardest thing to make sure the best projects receive funding. Another issue if only 8 districts get the money the other districts will not support and fight for future funding.</i>		
6	Should programs be eligible for funding? Or should it be limited to landowner identified projects contained within the CPDS system? If programs are allowed would the district need to	Recommend programs without identified landowners would be ineligible. Only individual landowners identified in the CPDS should be eligible. Programs should be funded under the district's IM grant or other district funding. Rain gardens would be considered a capital project. However, rain barrels, aerial weed control spraying, bugs for natural weed prevention, and soil testing, are not activities considered to be capital projects.

Policy		Non-Shellfish Project Committee Recommendation
	<p>have a list of landowners already signed up and interested?</p> <p>What type of programs could be allowed under capital funding?</p>	
<p><i>I feel that programs, education and management BMPs should be from implementation grants or other sources. I think most legislators and common people consider Capital Funds structure and long term BMPs if we include other then we water down the money it appears that not much gets done. But that being said we in Stevens County have more success with the education, our landowners will do some of the right things and do not want the strings attached with funding. They just want to know what the right things to do are.</i></p>		
7	GENERAL COMMENTS	
<p><i>It is very important for us to have this money with minimal strings, minimal regulations, no mandatory buffers and the ability to use NRCS specifications and common sense the very reasons we give Ecology back some of their money.</i></p>		
<p><i>like funding and project tome 2 years.</i></p> <p><i>Thanks for the effort of SCC and a great policy and document.</i></p>		
<p><i>Have hotlinks in this document for things like the CPDS system</i></p>		

SCC Proposed Allocations for Operations, Grants, & Contracts

		Appropriation FY16		Appropriation FY15	
		General Fund	Other Funds	General Fund	Other Funds
1		6,775,000	500,000	6,819,000	500,000
2		7,275,000		7,319,000	

GF&OF Financial Distributions	PROPOSED FY16	% of Total Appropriation	Difference FY15 vs FY16	Actual FY15 Thru 6/25	% of Total Appropriation	
SCC Operations						
3	SCC Salaries & Benefits	1,580,289	22%	135,343	1,444,946	20%
4	Goods & Services	491,827	7%	71,497	420,330	6%
5	Travel	222,430	3%	7,430	215,000	3%
6	Equipment	25,500	0.4%	7,139	18,361	0.3%
7	<i>Subtotal SCC Operations</i>	<i>2,320,046</i>	<i>32%</i>	<i>239,770</i>	<i>2,080,276</i>	<i>28%</i>
SCC Grant Programs & Contracts						
8	Implementations Grants	3,858,754	53.0%	-	3,858,754	52.7%
9	Engineering Grants	675,000	9.3%	-	675,000	9.2%
10	TSP Grants	350,000	4.8%	75,000	275,000	3.8%
11	Technical Training Group	248,000	3.4%	168,000	80,000	1.1%
12	District Services	113,500	1.6%	113,500	0	0.0%
13	WACD	65,000	0.9%	2,500	62,500	0.9%
14	WADE Training	20,000	0.3%	-	20,000	0.3%
15	Envirothon	10,000	0.1%	6,835	3,165	0.0%
16	<i>Subtotal Grant Programs & Contracts</i>	<i>5,340,254</i>	<i>73.4%</i>	<i>365,835</i>	<i>4,974,419</i>	<i>68.0%</i>
17	TOTAL	7,660,300	5.3%	605,605	7,054,695	-3.6%
18	<i>Difference Between Appropriation & Proposed Budget</i>	<i>(385,300)</i>	<i>-5.3%</i>	<i>(365,835)</i>	<i>264,305</i>	<i>3.6%</i>
19	<i>Anticipated Reimbursements</i>	<i>497,450</i>	<i>6.8%</i>	<i>(365,835)</i>	<i>876,789</i>	<i>12.0%</i>
20	TOTAL AFTER PROPOSED REIMBURSEMENTS	112,150	1.5%	1,253,244	1,141,094	15.6%



Okanogan Conservation District

1251 S. Second Ave, Room 102

Okanogan, WA 98840

July 7, 2015

Clinton O'Keefe
Washington State Conservation Commission
PO Box 407221
Olympia, WA 98504-7721

Re: Funding assistance to continue work on Carlton Complex fire recovery

Dear Mr. O'Keefe,

The Okanogan Conservation District Board of Supervisors directed me to send this request to you and follow this up with my attendance, in person, at the July 2016 Conservation Commission meeting.

The Okanogan Conservation District worked with Governor Jay Inslee's office and members of the Washington State Senate and House of Representatives to secure much needed funding for agricultural and natural resource recovery work for the 2014 Carlton Complex Fire. Governor Inslee included \$3 million in his operating budget that was released in December 2014 in addition to \$1.165 million in his Supplemental Budget that was ultimately approved by the Legislature in late January 2015. Unfortunately, there was confusion by the two funding requests and most legislators assumed the Supplemental Budget request was adequate and the Operating Budget request was not necessary.

Despite much effort on our part and Ron Shultz of your office and WACD efforts, we were unsuccessful at getting the necessary funding for work to continue on landscape recovery work in the burn area. Work that still remains includes working with landowners to develop the necessary plans and permits to repair areas affected by flash floods and mud flows that caused significant erosion issues in addition to impacting area irrigation systems and destroying other agricultural infrastructure. We also continue to receive requests for technical assistance on fencing repairs and replacement and follow-up with the nearly 300 landowners we have already given direct technical assistance.

Unfortunately, we don't have the funds to cover this work. Our Implementation grant is largely spoken for as match for a wildlife project that has federal funds requiring a 1:1 match of non-federal dollars. This commitment was made before the fire even occurred, making it very difficult to change that course. Our assessment raises approximately \$120,000 per year. Between rent, insurance, and other operating costs of the district we have less than \$80,000 left and we need most of those funds to pay staff time to write grants, go to training, and send supervisors to the WACD Annual meeting. We have almost no other discretionary funds.

We need the financial assistance of the Conservation Commission to help us continue this much needed work. If we are funded we pledge to do all we can to work with the Legislature and others to get funding backfilled through the Supplemental budget in 2016 and beyond as necessary.

We ask for your consideration to fund one of the three options described below.

Option 1 – Minimal Continuance - \$130,000

This option funds 1.25 FTEs for the 2016 fiscal year including wages and benefits, overhead, travel expenses, printed material, public meeting expenses, and training expenses. Our staff will continue to provide follow-up assistance to as many landowners as possible on an as needed and priority based system, work with cooperators and partners to develop further grant funding for implementation of priority projects, develop information and planning guidance for other CDs on disaster (particularly fire) recovery, communicate to the public about fire recovery and sources of assistance.

Option 2 – Full Technical Assistance (no cost-share) - \$290,000

This option funds 3.25 FTEs for the 2016 fiscal year including wages and benefits, overhead, travel expenses, printed material, public meeting expenses, and training expenses. This will include all of the work of Option 1, but with full outreach and technical assistance to landowners affected by the fire and subsequent floods. Also gives the opportunity to better respond to subsequent flash floods and issues related to these secondary disasters.

Option 3 – Full Technical Assistance with cost-share - \$600,000

This option funds 3.4 FTEs for the 2016 fiscal year including wages and benefits, overhead, travel expenses, printed material, public meeting expenses, and training expenses, and cost-share to landowners. This option includes all of Options 1 and 2 with a slight increase in staff time to cover outreach activities related to landowner communication and oversight of cost-share contracting. This option also includes \$300,000 for cost-share to be distributed to landowners on a priority basis based upon public benefit and readiness to proceed and complete the project during the current fiscal year.

Thank you for your consideration and that of all the Commissioners. I will be happy to answer all questions to the best of my ability if called upon.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Craig T. Nelson". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first name "Craig" and last name "Nelson" clearly legible.

Craig T. Nelson
District Manager

SCC Implementation Grants to Conservation Districts for FY16

District	Current FY 15	Ellensburg Agreed-To Policy% increase	Ellensburg Result & Budget Request	SCC ACTION
N Yakima	\$ 84,726	15%	\$ 97,435	
Asotin	\$ 84,866	15%	\$ 97,596	
Wahkiakum	\$ 85,313	15%	\$ 98,110	
Whidbey	\$ 86,092	15%	\$ 99,006	
Cowlitz	\$ 86,326	15%	\$ 99,275	
Okanogan	\$ 88,923	15%	\$ 102,261	
Cascadia	\$ 90,274	15%	\$ 103,815	
Snohomish	\$ 94,026	15%	\$ 108,130	
Mason	\$ 95,484	15%	\$ 109,807	
Adams	\$ 97,229	15%	\$ 111,813	
Whatcom	\$ 114,060	15%	\$ 131,169	
Pierce	\$ 126,450	15%	\$ 145,418	
King	\$ 127,048	15%	\$ 146,105	
Clallam	\$ 127,156	15%	\$ 146,229	
Skagit	\$ 128,893	15%	\$ 148,227	
[Grant]	\$ 179,825	15%	\$ 206,799	
Pal Rock	\$ 60,875	25%	\$ 76,094	
Pine Creek	\$ 60,875	25%	\$ 76,094	
Whitman	\$ 60,875	25%	\$ 76,094	
E Klickitat	\$ 61,663	25%	\$ 77,079	
S Douglas	\$ 64,940	25%	\$ 81,175	
C Klickitat	\$ 66,033	25%	\$ 82,541	
Foster Creek	\$ 67,125	25%	\$ 83,906	
S Yakima	\$ 67,125	25%	\$ 83,906	
Palouse	\$ 68,820	25%	\$ 86,025	
Pomeroy	\$ 73,070	25%	\$ 91,338	
Pacific	\$ 77,440	25%	\$ 96,800	
San Juan	\$ 79,597	25%	\$ 99,496	
Benton	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Clark	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Columbia	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Ferry	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Franklin	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Grays Harbor	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Jefferson	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Kitsap	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Kittitas	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Lewis	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Lincoln	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Pend Oreille	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Spokane	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Stevens	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Thurston	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Underwood	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
Walla Walla	\$ 79,625	25%	\$ 99,531	
TOTALS	\$ 3,858,754		\$ 4,653,773	
<i>Averages</i>	\$ 85,750	21.44%	\$ 103,417	

Ellensburg