Legislative Appropriations Request

2014-2015

Submitted to the
Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy
And the Legislative Budget Board

By

Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board

Revised August 29, 2012

Contents

Administrator's Statement
Organizational Chart
Certification of Dual Submissions
2.A. Summary of Base Request by Strategy
2.B. Summary of Base Request by Method of Financing (MOF)
2.C. Summary of Base Request by Object of Expense (OOE)
2.D. Summary of Base Request Objective Outcomes
2.E. Summary of Exceptional Items Request
2.F. Summary of Total Request by Strategy
2.G. Summary of Total Request Objective Outcomes
3.A. Strategy Request
3.B. Rider Revisions and Additions
4.A. Exceptional Item Request Schedule
4.B. Exceptional Item Strategy Allocation Schedule
4.C. Exceptional Item Strategy Request
6.A. Historically Underutilized Business (HUB) Supporting Schedule
6.C. Federal Funds Supporting Schedule
6.I. Ten Percent Biennial Base Reduction Options Schedule
7.A. Indirect Administrative and Support Costs
7.B. Direct Administrative and Support Costs

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

ADMINISTRATOR'S STATEMENT

MISSION

It is the mission of the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB), working in conjunction with local Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs), to encourage the wise use and productive use of natural resources for future generations so that all Texans' present and future needs can be met in a manner that promotes a clean, healthy environment and strong economic growth.

BACKGROUND

The TSSWCB was created in 1939 to assist agricultural landowners in the formation of local SWCDs and the coordination of a statewide soil and water conservation program. In addition, the TSSWCB is designated by the Legislature as the planning and management agency for the state with regard to agricultureal and silviculturale nonpoint source pollution including a cost-share assistance program through SWCDs for implementing soil and water conservation land improvement measures. The TSSWCB is also authorized by the Legislature to conduct a Water Supply Enhancement Program through local conservation districts that includes cost-share assistance for the "selective control, removal, or reduction of noxious brush such as mesquite, salt cedar, and other brush species that consume water to a degree that is detrimental to water conservation."

The TSSWCB is governed by a seven-member State Board, which is composed of two members appointed by the Governor and five members elected from across Texas by more than 1,000 local SWCD directors through state district conventions; SWCD directors are elected to their positions by agricultural producers and rural landowners within the geographic boundaries of each SWCD.

The TSSWCB also works cooperatively with the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) as the statewide planning agency when implementing NRCS federal responsibilities under the Soil and Water Resources Conservation Act.

The TSSWCB operates as a liaison between the districts and the state, its legislature, the Governor, other state agencies, and the federal government.

AGENCY OVERVIEW

SWCDs are political subdivisions of state government, responsible for carrying out soil and water conservation programs within their boundaries. SWCDs work directly with owners and operators of agricultural land to develop and implement soil and water conservation plans which involve land treatment measures for erosion control, water conservation, and water quality purposes.

In 1969, the 61st Texas Legislative Session resulted in a program through which funds are appropriated to the TSSWCB for allocation to SWCDs on a matching basis. To receive money under this Conservation Assistance Program, a SWCD must raise funds from sources other than the State or earnings from State funds. Also, Since 1984, the Legislature has appropriated funds annually to the TSSWCB for conservation implementation assistance. The funding is appropriated to employ soil conservation technicians at local offices throughout the State. These technicians work with owners and operators of agricultural or other lands to install and maintain various conservation practices. This work includes gathering supplementary planning data and information on the physical features of farms, performing survey and layout work, explaining and/or demonstrating methods of applying conservation practices such as contour cultivation, terracing, tree planting, woodland improvement, seasonal or

other irrigation practices, range practices, fertilizing, seeding, and land preparation operations. These technicians are also responsible for follow-up on the application and maintenance of planned conservation practices associated with programs funded through the TSSWCB.

Beginning in 2006 the TSSWCB has received annual grants from the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) to deliver conservation technical assistance and help implement conservation cost-share programs of mutual interest. Through this program the TSSWCB and NRCS jointly provide funding to local SWCDs to assist with the design, installation, and checkout of conservation practices across the State. The TSSWCB was successful in leveraging existing appropriations for conservation implementation assistance as the State's contribution to this agreement.

The 81st Legislature appropriated funding to the TSSWCB to administer grant programs to SWCDs for conducting operation, maintenance, and repair activities on the State's approximately 2,000 flood control dams. Local SWCDs, county governments, municipalities, water control and improvement districts, and other special districts are all party to sponsorship agreements across the state whereby they have agreed to perform needed maintenance and repairs on federally designed and constructed flood control dams on private property.

The TSSWCB is also responsible for numerous natural resource conservation efforts, serving as the lead state agency for the prevention, management, and abatement of nonpoint source pollution resulting from agricultural and silvicultural, or forestry related activities. The TSSWCB is also responsible for water conservation and supply enhancement, or water quantity. Other responsibilities include prevention of soil erosion, control of floods, maintaining the navigability of waterways, the preservation of wildlife, protection of public lands, and providing information to landowners regarding the jurisdictions of the TSSWCB and the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) related to nonpoint source pollution. The TSSWCB has no regulatory functions; all of the agency's programs and services are voluntary in nature.

A conservation planning program the TSSWCB administers, which results from the nonpoint source mandate, is the Water Quality Management Plan Program. This program, and the mandate in general, comes from Senate Bill 503 of the 73rd Legislative Session in 1993. This program is administered through a partnership between the 216 soil and water conservation districts in Texas and the TSSWCB. It is a voluntary program that emphasizes implementation of the management practices contained within the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS) Field Office Technical Guide. Landowners may apply for cost-share assistance through this program which is available through annual appropriations from the Texas Legislature. By voluntarily participating in this program, landowners demonstrate their concern for natural resource conservation and intent to be protective of water quality standards.

Another program the TSSWCB administers is the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Program. The TMDL effort in Texas is primarily administered by the TCEQ because it usually results in regulatory limits being placed on the amount of a particular pollutant that can safely be assimilated into a waterbody. We work very closely with the TCEQ, and actually take a lead role in cases where the primary pollutant of concern results from an agricultural nonpoint source. Many of the TMDLs being developed and implemented involve nonpoint sources from agricultural and forestry related activities, therefore the TSSWCB works to make sure those interests are represented and are given a voice during this process. The TSSWCB's goal is to ensure TMDLs are fair and equitable and that implementation plans are reasonable and achievable.

The TSSWCB receives half of the dollars annually provided to Texas through the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Water Act, Section 319(h) grant program. These funds are used for a variety of projects and programs to educate, implement, demonstrate, and assess technologies and practices that protect Texas water quality from nonpoint sources of pollution. The TCEQ receives the other half of the funding and uses it to address urban nonpoint sources. We currently manage special projects across the State, and through this program we have established partnerships with entities such as state and federal agencies, departments and institutes within Texas Universities, river authorities, municipalities, water districts, private entities such as the Texas Farm Bureau, and many soil and water conservation districts.

The Watershed Protection Plan Program provides guidance and technical assistance to local stakeholder groups in developing and implementing Watershed Protection Plans. These projects are designed to protect unimpaired surface waters from nonpoint source water pollution threats and restore impaired surface waters polluted by nonpoint source water pollution. These locally-driven projects serve as a mechanism for addressing complex water quality problems that cross multiple jurisdictions. Watershed Protection Planning serves as a tool to better leverage the resources of local governments, state and federal agencies, and non-governmental organizations. The planning process integrates activities and prioritizes implementation projects based upon technical merit and benefits to the community, promotes a unified approach to seeking funding for implementation, and creates a coordinated public communication and education program.

A goal of the TSSWCB is to protect and enhance water supplies in Texas by ensuring that a quantity conservation program is available and that funds are being used effectively to increase water conservation and enhance water yields in targeted areas. It is the objective of this goal to conserve and enhance water supplies for the State by managing and directing water conservation and water yield programs in targeted areas. Under our water supply enhancement responsibilities, we administer a program designed to enhance water availability and water conservation through effective land stewardship by removing water-depleting brush and trees, such as juniper, mesquite, and salt cedar, which have invaded many areas of the state and created critical water shortages.

GOVERNING BOARD

Barry Mahler, Chairman	May 3, 2011-May 7, 2013	Iowa Park
Marty H. Graham, Vice-Chairman	May 1, 2012-May 6, 2014	Rocksprings
Scott Buckles, Member	May 3, 2011-May 7, 2013	Stratford
José Dodier, Jr., Member	May 3, 2011-May 7, 2013	Zapata
Jerry D. Nichols, Member	May 1, 2012-May 6, 2014	Nacogdoches
Larry D. Jacobs, Member	February 1, 2012-February 1, 2014	Montgomery
Joe L. Ward, Member	February 1, 2011-February 1, 2013	Telephone

2014-15 LEGISLATIVE APPROPRIATION REQUEST

The agency's legislative appropriation request includes three exceptional item requests: 1) increased funding for flood control dam operation, maintenance, and structural repair; 2)increased funding for conservation implementation assistance grants for soil and water conservation districts located in total maximum daily load and watershed protection plan priority areas; 3) total conservation implementation assistance needs identified by soil and water conservation districts for the 2014-15 biennium. The highest priority exceptional item is increased funding for the operation, maintenance, and structural repair of flood control dams. Many dams have aged to an extent that repairs are needed to ensure their continued functionality and in some cases the original design of the dams has become inadequate due to increased residential and commercial development. Another complication is that many roads and bridges were engineered to specifications that did not take the presence of the structures into account. As of February 2012, it is estimated that there are $9.6 million in operation and maintenance needs on $1,666 dams statewide and $48 million in repair needs on 157 dames statewide. The exceptional item request is for $10.8 million intended to address 25% of the identified operation and maintenance needs and 10% of the identified structural repair needs.

Because the TSSWCB currently operates with minimal indirect administration (3%), an across the board reduction to all programs will be proposed as a ten percent biennial base reduction option.

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

The governing board would also like to respectfully request an increase in compensation cap for the agency's exempt position of Executive Director from $92,600 to $125,000. The compensation cap increase for the Executive Director is being requested to allow the board the ability to be competitive in maintaining and selecting Executive Directors. The agency administers numerous conservation, nonpoint source, and water quality programs under the direction of the Executive Director. These programs average a cumuulative biennial total of approximately $66.5 million in pass-through and grant obligations. The increase would make the salary range competitive with other entities hiring positions of similar responsibility. This request is for authorization only and would not require new funding.

State Soil and Water Conservation Board

Vice-Chairman
Scott Buckles
Marty H. Graham
José Dodier, Jr.

Chairman
Barry Mahler
Jerry D. Nichols
Joe L. Ward
Larry D. Jacobs

Executive Director
Rex Isom

Administrative Coordinator - Vicki Davis
Executive Assistant - Edna Etheredge

Headquarters Office
Statewide Program Support

Field Services
Local/Statewide Program Support/Services

Statewide Resource Management
Statewide Programs Officer - John Foster

Flood Control Programs
Programs Engineer - Richard Egg
FC Programs Coordinator -Lee Munz
FC Specialist - Ben Bowers
FC Specialist - Jared Bowen

Nonpoint Source Management Programs
NPS Program Coordinator - T.J. Helton
NPS Grants Coordinator - Pam Casebolt
NPS Project Management Coordinator - Mitchell Conine
NPS Project Manager - Vacant
NPS Project Manager - Ashley Alexander
NPS Project Manager - Jana Lloyd
DB Administrator - David Reeves
Watershed Planning Coordinator - Aaron Wendt
Regional Watershed Coordinator -
Brian Koch (Wharton)

Conservation Outreach
Spec. Proj. Coordinator - Mel Davis
Public Affairs Specialist - Loren Warrick
Public Affairs Specialist - Rusty Ray
Information Specialist - Clyde Gottschalk

Human Resources
HR Coordinator - Dawn Heitman

Budget & Accounting
Fiscal Officer - Kenny Zajicek
Information Officer - Clay Wright
Accountant - Anita Mungia
Accountant - Karen Preece
Accountant - Pam Manuel
Fiscal Services - Amy Devereaux
Contract Specialist - Yolanda Brown

Water Supply Enhancement Office
Invasive Species Coordinator -
Johnny Oswald
Program Spec. -
Tuffy Wood
Program Spec.-
Melissa Grote
Contract Specialist-
Kimberly York

SWCD Field Representatives
Area I
Field Representative - Bob Gruner
Field Representative - Jack Foote

Area II
Field Representative - Kendria Ray
Field Representative - Ben Wilde

Area III
Field Representative - Adrian Perez
Field Representative - Tony Franklin

Area IV
Field Representative - Trey Watson
Field Representative - Joel Clark

Area V
Field Representative Coordinator -
Don Brandenberger
Field Representative - Charlie Upchurch

Regional Office Coordinator
Steve Jones
Dublin

Poultry Water Quality Management Plan Office
Program Supervisor -
Mark Cochran
Natural Resources Spec -
Jeremy Welch
Natural Resources Spec -
April Sease
Natural Resources Spec -
Jackie Risner
Admin. Assist. - Marilyn King
Centerville Office- Teresa Reese
Gonzales Office- Dawna Winkler

Wharton Regional Office
Program Supervisor -
Lawrence Brown, Jr.
Engineer - Contracted Service
Natural Resources Specialist -
Jeff Cerny
Watershed Coordinator -
Brian Koch
Engineering Tech -
Kirk House
Admin. Assist. - Carrie Sanford

Mt Pleasant Regional Office
Program Supervisor -
Carl Steffey
Engineer - Contracted Service
Natural Resources Specialist -
Andy Kuklish
Engineering Tech -
Cindy Ramirez
Admin. Assist. - Beverly Krause

Hale Center Regional Office
Program Supervisor -
Judy Albus
Engineer - Contracted Service
Natural Resources Specialist -
Glenn Baker
Engineering Tech -
Reese Myatt
Engineering Tech -
Ryan Robertson
Admin. Assist. -
Melinda Summers

Harlingen Regional Office
Program Supervisor -
Luis Peña
Engineer - Contracted Service
Natural Resources Specialist -
Ricardo Chapa
Planner - Ronnie Ramirez
Engineering Tech -
Fidencio Mesa
Admin. Assist. - Ruby Garcia

Dublin Regional Office
Engineer - Contracted Service
Natural Resources Specialist -
Todd Oneth
Natural Resources Specialist -
Chris Couch
Engineering Tech -
Mark Cuba
Admin. Assist. - Trecia Perales

15 Jun 12

CERTIFICATE

Agency Name Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board

This is to certify that the information contained in the agency Legislative Appropriations Request filed with the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) and the Governor's Office of Budget, Planning and Policy (GOBPP) is accurate to the best of my knowledge and that the electronic submission to the LBB via the Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST) and the PDF file submitted via the LBB Document Submission application are identical.

Additionally, should it become likely at any time that unexpended balances will accrue for any account, the LBB and the GOBPP will be notified in writing in accordance with Article IX, Section 7.01 (2012–13 GAA).

Chief Executive Office or Presiding Judge

Signature

Rex Isom
Printed Name

Executive Director
Title

August 16, 2012
Date

Board or Commission Chair

Signature

Barry Mahler
Printed Name

Chairman
Title

August 16, 2012
Date

Chief Financial Officer

Signature

Kenny Zajicek
Printed Name

Chief Financial Officer
Title

August 16, 2012
Date

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

Goal / *Objective* / STRATEGY	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance					
1 *Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts*					
1 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & ASSISTANCE	4,912,179	4,741,481	4,695,601	3,922,662	3,922,662
2 *Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair*					
1 FLOOD CONTROL DAMS	5,543,070	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000	2,000,000
TOTAL, GOAL 1	**$10,455,249**	**$6,741,481**	**$6,695,601**	**$5,922,662**	**$5,922,662**
2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution					
1 *Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program*					
1 STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN	4,782,451	7,297,346	7,297,346	7,297,346	7,297,346
2 POLLUTION ABATEMENT PLAN	4,194,070	4,134,349	4,212,193	4,067,971	4,067,971
TOTAL, GOAL 2	**$8,976,521**	**$11,431,695**	**$11,509,539**	**$11,365,317**	**$11,365,317**
3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies					
1 *Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas*					

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

Goal / *Objective* / STRATEGY	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
1 WATER CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT	4,898,011	2,135,413	2,135,413	2,135,413	2,135,413
TOTAL, GOAL 3	**$4,898,011**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**
4 Indirect Administration					
1 *Indirect Administration*					
1 INDIRECT ADMINISTRATION	644,456	620,114	619,454	619,735	619,735
TOTAL, GOAL 4	**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
TOTAL, AGENCY STRATEGY REQUEST	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**
TOTAL, AGENCY RIDER APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST*				**$0**	**$0**
GRAND TOTAL, AGENCY REQUEST	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

Goal / *Objective* / STRATEGY	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
METHOD OF FINANCING:					
General Revenue Funds:					
1 General Revenue Fund	20,515,258	14,043,408	14,042,846	14,043,127	14,043,127
SUBTOTAL	**$20,515,258**	**$14,043,408**	**$14,042,846**	**$14,043,127**	**$14,043,127**
Federal Funds:					
555 Federal Funds	4,458,954	6,885,196	6,917,161	6,000,000	6,000,000
SUBTOTAL	**$4,458,954**	**$6,885,196**	**$6,917,161**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
Other Funds:					
666 Appropriated Receipts	25	99	0	0	0
SUBTOTAL	**$25**	**$99**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**

*Rider appropriations for the historical years are included in the strategy amounts.

2.B. SUMMARY OF BASE REQUEST BY METHOD OF FINANCE

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1

Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

METHOD OF FINANCING	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
GENERAL REVENUE					
1 General Revenue Fund					
REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS					
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2010-11 GAA)	$22,543,335	$0	$0	$0	$0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2012-13 GAA)	$0	$14,042,847	$14,042,846	$0	$0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table	$0	$0	$0	$14,043,127	$14,043,127
RIDER APPROPRIATION					
Art IX, Sec 14.03(j), Capital Budget UB (2010-11 GAA)	$10,635	$0	$0	$0	$0
Rider 6, Brush Control (2010-11 GAA)	$766,420	$0	$0	$0	$0
Rider 5, Water Quality Management Plans (2010-11 GAA)	$1,530	$0	$0	$0	$0

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

METHOD OF FINANCING	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
GENERAL REVENUE					
Art IX, Sec 18.15, Reimbursements from DIR (2012-13 GAA)	$0	$561	$0	$0	$0
SUPPLEMENTAL, SPECIAL OR EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS					
HB 4, 82nd Leg, Regular Session, Sec 1(a) General Revenue Reductions.	$(2,790,749)	$0	$0	$0	$0
LAPSED APPROPRIATIONS					
Lapsed Appropriations	$(15,913)	$0	$0	$0	$0
Comments: $537.98 to be lapsed from Capital Budget - Vehicle Replacement					
TOTAL, General Revenue Fund	**$20,515,258**	**$14,043,408**	**$14,042,846**	**$14,043,127**	**$14,043,127**
TOTAL, ALL GENERAL REVENUE	**$20,515,258**	**$14,043,408**	**$14,042,846**	**$14,043,127**	**$14,043,127**
FEDERAL FUNDS					
555 Federal Funds					
REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS					

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

METHOD OF FINANCING	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
FEDERAL FUNDS					
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2010-11 GAA)	$6,059,750	$0	$0	$0	$0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2012-13 GAA)	$0	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$0	$0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table	$0	$0	$0	$6,000,000	$6,000,000
RIDER APPROPRIATION					
Art IX, Sec 8.02, Federal Funds/Block Grants (2010-11 GAA)	$893,734	$0	$0	$0	$0
Comments: Federal Grant Award from USDA, NRCS for assistance with the Environmental Quaility Incentive Program - 10.912					
Art IX, Sec 8.02, Federal Funds/Block Grants (2012-13 GAA)	$0	$885,177	$917,161	$0	$0
Comments: Federal Grant Award from USDA, NRCS for assistance with the Environmental Quaility Incentive Program - 10.912					
Art IX, Sec 18.15, Reimbursements from DIR (2012-13 GAA)					

2.B. SUMMARY OF BASE REQUEST BY METHOD OF FINANCE

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1

Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

METHOD OF FINANCING	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
FEDERAL FUNDS					
	$0	$19	$0	$0	$0
LAPSED APPROPRIATIONS					
Lapsed Appropriations	$(2,494,530)	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL, Federal Funds	**$4,458,954**	**$6,885,196**	**$6,917,161**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
TOTAL, ALL FEDERAL FUNDS	**$4,458,954**	**$6,885,196**	**$6,917,161**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
OTHER FUNDS					
666 Appropriated Receipts					
REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS					
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2010-11 GAA)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2012-13 GAA)	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
RIDER APPROPRIATION					

2.B. SUMMARY OF BASE REQUEST BY METHOD OF FINANCE

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1

Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

METHOD OF FINANCING	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
OTHER FUNDS					
Art IX, Sec 12.02, Publications or Sales of Records (2010-11 GAA)	$25	$0	$0	$0	$0
Comments: Fees for Defensive Driving					
Art IX, Sec 12.02, Publications or Sales of Records (2012-13 GAA)	$0	$99	$0	$0	$0
Comments: Fees for Defensive Driving					
TOTAL, Appropriated Receipts	**$25**	**$99**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
TOTAL, ALL OTHER FUNDS	**$25**	**$99**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
GRAND TOTAL	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**

2.B. SUMMARY OF BASE REQUEST BY METHOD OF FINANCE

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1

Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

METHOD OF FINANCING	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	Req 2014	Req 2015
FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS					
REGULAR APPROPRIATIONS					
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2010-11 GAA)	72.5	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table (2012-13 GAA)	0.0	72.1	72.1	0.0	0.0
Regular Appropriations from MOF Table	0.0	0.0	0.0	72.1	72.1
RIDER APPROPRIATION					
Rider 9, Contingency for House Bill 865 (2010-11 GAA)	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
UNAUTHORIZED NUMBER OVER (BELOW) CAP					
Unauthorized Number Over (Below) cap	(2.4)	(1.0)	0.0	0.0	0.0
TOTAL, ADJUSTED FTES	**71.1**	**71.1**	**72.1**	**72.1**	**72.1**
NUMBER OF 100% FEDERALLY FUNDED FTEs	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**0.0**

2.C. SUMMARY OF BASE REQUEST BY OBJECT OF EXPENSE

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1

Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

OBJECT OF EXPENSE	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
1001 SALARIES AND WAGES	$3,487,581	$3,577,958	$3,578,000	$3,578,000	$3,578,000
1002 OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$118,861	$151,594	$153,000	$153,000	$153,000
2001 PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	$35,860	$16,129	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000
2002 FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$63,459	$69,250	$67,500	$67,500	$67,500
2003 CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$46,215	$38,000	$38,000	$38,000	$38,000
2004 UTILITIES	$70,195	$71,500	$71,500	$71,500	$71,500
2005 TRAVEL	$371,094	$396,000	$389,000	$389,000	$389,000
2006 RENT - BUILDING	$188,531	$208,203	$211,500	$211,500	$211,500
2007 RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$37,503	$39,199	$39,500	$39,500	$39,500
2009 OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$2,239,793	$2,294,632	$1,647,574	$1,503,633	$1,503,633
4000 GRANTS	$18,211,455	$14,066,238	$14,740,433	$13,967,494	$13,967,494
5000 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$103,690	$0	$0	$0	$0
OOE Total (Excluding Riders)	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**
OOE Total (Riders)					
Grand Total	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**

2.D. SUMMARY OF BASE REQUEST OBJECTIVE OUTCOMES

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation system of Texas (ABEST)

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

Goal/ *Objective* / **Outcome**	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance					
1 Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts					
KEY 1 % of District Financial Needs Met by Conservation Board Grants	57.60%	50.00%	50.00%	61.20%	59.20 %
2 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair					
1 % of Flood Control Dams Identified as in Need of Repair	0.00%	7.68%	7.63%	7.59%	7.54 %
2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution					
1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program					
1 Percent of Projects Addressing 303(D) List Impaired Water Bodies	80.00	65.00	65.00	80.00	80.00
KEY 2 % Problem Areas with Certified Plans	76.60%	50.00%	50.00%	70.00%	70.00 %
3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies					
1 Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas					
1 Percent Eligible Acres in Brush Control Areas Treated and Cleared	2.27	1.50	50.00	90.00	50.00
KEY 2 Predicted Number of Gallons of Water Yielded	0.00	2,500,000,000.00	882,000,000.00	1,500,000,000.00	838,000,000.00

2.E. SUMMARY OF EXCEPTIONAL ITEMS REQUEST

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1

Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

DATE: **8/30/2012**
TIME : **8:23:40AM**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

		2014			2015			Biennium	
Priority	**Item**	**GR and GR/GR Dedicated**	**All Funds**	**FTEs**	**GR and GR Dedicated**	**All Funds**	**FTEs**	**GR and GR Dedicated**	**All Funds**
1	Flood Control Dam O&M and Repair	$5,400,000	$5,400,000		$5,400,000	$5,400,000		$10,800,000	$10,800,000
2	Conservation Implementation Assist.	$229,800	$229,800		$237,000	$237,000		$466,800	$466,800
3	Conservation Implementation, Match	$2,700,648	$2,700,648		$2,700,648	$2,700,648		$5,401,296	$5,401,296
Total, Exceptional Items Request		**$8,330,448**	**$8,330,448**		**$8,337,648**	**$8,337,648**		**$16,668,096**	**$16,668,096**
Method of Financing									
General Revenue		$8,330,448	$8,330,448		$8,337,648	$8,337,648		$16,668,096	$16,668,096
General Revenue - Dedicated									
Federal Funds									
Other Funds									
		$8,330,448	**$8,330,448**		**$8,337,648**	**$8,337,648**		**$16,668,096**	**$16,668,096**
Full Time Equivalent Positions									
Number of 100% Federally Funded FTEs				**0.0**			**0.0**		

2.F. SUMMARY OF TOTAL REQUEST BY STRATEGY
83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

DATE : **8/30/2012**
TIME : **8:24:45AM**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Goal/*Objective*/**STRATEGY**	**Base 2014**	**Base 2015**	**Exceptional 2014**	**Exceptional 2015**	**Total Request 2014**	**Total Request 2015**
1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance						
1 *Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Distri*						
1 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & ASSISTANCE	$3,922,662	$3,922,662	$2,930,448	$2,937,648	$6,853,110	$6,860,310
2 *Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair*						
1 FLOOD CONTROL DAMS	2,000,000	2,000,000	5,400,000	5,400,000	7,400,000	7,400,000
TOTAL, GOAL 1	**$5,922,662**	**$5,922,662**	**$8,330,448**	**$8,337,648**	**$14,253,110**	**$14,260,310**
2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution						
1 *Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Prog*						
1 STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN	7,297,346	7,297,346	0	0	7,297,346	7,297,346
2 POLLUTION ABATEMENT PLAN	4,067,971	4,067,971	0	0	4,067,971	4,067,971
TOTAL, GOAL 2	**$11,365,317**	**$11,365,317**	**$0**	**$0**	**$11,365,317**	**$11,365,317**
3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies						
1 *Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas*						
1 WATER CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT	2,135,413	2,135,413	0	0	2,135,413	2,135,413
TOTAL, GOAL 3	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$0**	**$0**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Goal/*Objective*/**STRATEGY**	**Base 2014**	**Base 2015**	**Exceptional 2014**	**Exceptional 2015**	**Total Request 2014**	**Total Request 2015**
4 Indirect Administration						
1 *Indirect Administration*						
1 INDIRECT ADMINISTRATION	$619,735	$619,735	$0	$0	$619,735	$619,735
TOTAL, GOAL 4	**$619,735**	**$619,735**	**$0**	**$0**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
TOTAL, AGENCY STRATEGY REQUEST	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**	**$8,330,448**	**$8,337,648**	**$28,373,575**	**$28,380,775**
TOTAL, AGENCY RIDER APPROPRIATIONS REQUEST						
GRAND TOTAL, AGENCY REQUEST	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**	**$8,330,448**	**$8,337,648**	**$28,373,575**	**$28,380,775**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Goal/*Objective*/**STRATEGY**	**Base 2014**	**Base 2015**	**Exceptional 2014**	**Exceptional 2015**	**Total Request 2014**	**Total Request 2015**
General Revenue Funds:						
1 General Revenue Fund	$14,043,127	$14,043,127	$8,330,448	$8,337,648	$22,373,575	$22,380,775
	$14,043,127	**$14,043,127**	**$8,330,448**	**$8,337,648**	**$22,373,575**	**$22,380,775**
Federal Funds:						
555 Federal Funds	6,000,000	6,000,000	0	0	6,000,000	6,000,000
	$6,000,000	**$6,000,000**	**$0**	**$0**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
Other Funds:						
666 Appropriated Receipts	0	0	0	0	0	0
	$0	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**	**$8,330,448**	**$8,337,648**	**$28,373,575**	**$28,380,775**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS	**72.1**	**72.1**	**0.0**	**0.0**	**72.1**	**72.1**

2.G. SUMMARY OF TOTAL REQUEST OBJECTIVE OUTCOMES

83rd Regular Session, Agency Submission, Version 1
Automated Budget and Evaluation system of Texas (ABEST)

Date : **8/30/2012**
Time: **8:25:06AM**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Goal/ *Objective* / **Outcome**	BL 2014	BL 2015	Excp 2014	Excp 2015	Total Request 2014	Total Request 2015
1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance						
1 *Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts*						
KEY 1 % of District Financial Needs Met by Conservation Board Grants						
	61.20%	59.20%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00 %
2 *Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair*						
1 % of Flood Control Dams Identified as in Need of Repair						
	7.59%	7.54%	7.44%	7.29%	7.44%	7.29 %
2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution						
1 *Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program*						
1 Percent of Projects Addressing 303(D) List Impaired Water Bodies						
	80.00	80.00			80.00	80.00
KEY 2 % Problem Areas with Certified Plans						
	70.00%	70.00%			70.00%	70.00 %
3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies						
1 *Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas*						
1 Percent Eligible Acres in Brush Control Areas Treated and Cleared						
	90.00	50.00			90.00	50.00
KEY 2 Predicted Number of Gallons of Water Yielded						
	1,500,000,000.00	838,000,000.00			1,500,000,000.00	838,000,000.00

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance — Service: 37 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Output Measures:						
1	Number of Grants-related Claims Processed	2,656.00	2,700.00	1,850.00	1,850.00	1,850.00
KEY 2	# of Contacts w/Districts to provide Conservation Education Assistance	17,230.00	17,000.00	15,396.00	15,396.00	15,396.00
Efficiency Measures:						
1	Average Number of Days to Process a Grants-Related Claim	2.09	2.00	5.80	5.80	5.80
Explanatory/Input Measures:						
1	Percent of Districts Receiving Technical Assistance Funds	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Objects of Expense:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$724,977	$739,000	$739,000	$739,000	$739,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$19,640	$47,600	$47,600	$47,600	$47,600
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$2,651	$2,700	$2,700	$2,700	$2,700
2004	UTILITIES	$15,434	$16,500	$16,500	$16,500	$16,500
2005	TRAVEL	$210,016	$208,000	$208,000	$208,000	$208,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	$16,998	$17,800	$17,800	$17,800	$17,800
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$3,070	$3,900	$3,900	$3,900	$3,900
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$19,264	$36,709	$36,634	$36,634	$36,634
4000	GRANTS	$3,891,033	$3,669,272	$3,623,467	$2,850,528	$2,850,528

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance — Service: 37 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
5000	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$9,096	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$4,912,179**	**$4,741,481**	**$4,695,601**	**$3,922,662**	**$3,922,662**
Method of Financing:						
1	General Revenue Fund	$4,443,943	$3,922,663	$3,922,662	$3,922,662	$3,922,662
SUBTOTAL, MOF (GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS)		**$4,443,943**	**$3,922,663**	**$3,922,662**	**$3,922,662**	**$3,922,662**
Method of Financing:						
555	Federal Funds					
	10.912.000 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INC	$468,236	$818,818	$772,939	$0	$0
CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555		$468,236	$818,818	$772,939	$0	$0
SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)		**$468,236**	**$818,818**	**$772,939**	**$0**	**$0**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)					**$3,922,662**	**$3,922,662**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)		**$4,912,179**	**$4,741,481**	**$4,695,601**	**$3,922,662**	**$3,922,662**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:		**12.0**	**12.0**	**12.6**	**12.6**	**12.6**

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	1	Soil and Water Conservation Assistance	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6	4	
OBJECTIVE:	1	Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts	Service Categories:			
STRATEGY:	1	Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance	Service: 37	Income: A.2	Age: B.3	

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) is charged with overall responsibility for administering and coordinating the state's soil and water conservatior the state's Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs). (Title 7, Chapters 201 and 203 of the Agriculture Code of Texas) The objective of this goal is to provide a level of assistance, technical guidance, and administrative support to all districts allowing them to identify 100% of their soil and water resource needs through the development and ma conservation plans and programs.

Since 1984, the Texas Legislature has appropriated funds annually to the TSSWCB for the purpose of assisting districts in their efforts to provide conservation implementation agricultural producers. This funding may be used to pay technical employees to work with owners and operators of agricultural or other lands on the installation and maintenar conservation practices.

In 1969, the 61st Texas Legislative Session implemented a program through which funds are appropriated to the TSSWCB for allocation to SWCDs on a matching dollar for d receive money under this program, a district must raise funds from sources other than the State or earnings from State funds.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	1	Soil and Water Conservation Assistance	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6 4
OBJECTIVE:	1	Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts	Service Categories:	
STRATEGY:	2	Rural and Urban Conservation Outreach	Service: 37 Income: A.2	Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Output Measures:						
1	Number of District Meetings Attended	2,066.00	2,028.00	1,600.00	1,600.00	1,600.00
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)						
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)						
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:						

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board has an unfunded strategy under the goal of Soil and Water Conservation Assistance. This strategy will design and impleme programs to effectively communicate and promote the proper stewardship of the state's natural resources. Through this program, the TSSWCB seeks to maintain an open and r relationship between districts, agricultural interest groups, and the general public by sponsoring and assisting with soil and water stewardship contests, conservation awards pro maintaining a conservation video library, supporting teacher workshops, and providing conservation education models for school children.

Because more and more of the issues that we address through our programs are beginning to focus on the rural and urban interface, we intend to focus more of our efforts on th so that we can better educate them on the critical nature of the work SWCDs perform.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	1	Soil and Water Conservation Assistance	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6 4
OBJECTIVE:	1	Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts	Service Categories:	
STRATEGY:	2	Rural and Urban Conservation Outreach	Service: 37 Income: A.2	Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015

The services and programs provided by the TSSWCB target rural Texas farmers and ranchers, but the results of these services benefit all Texans. For example, many of the flo structures maintained by SWCDs serve to protect heavily populated areas from flood damage, and also prevent sediment from building up in suburban drinking water supplies. example is the use of best management practices, implemented through TSSWCB certified water quality management plans, to prevent pesticides, nutrients, and other contamir impairing Texas waters.

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 0

OBJECTIVE: 2 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair — Service: NA Income: NA Age: NA

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Output Measures:						
KEY 1	Number of Flood Control Dam Repair Grants Awarded	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
2	Number of Flood Control Dam Repairs Completed	0.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00
Objects of Expense:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$139,632	$140,000	$140,000	$140,000	$140,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$2,120	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400	$2,400
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$10,234	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$502	$2,800	$2,800	$2,800	$2,800
2004	UTILITIES	$3,101	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500	$3,500
2005	TRAVEL	$13,146	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	$3,715	$4,200	$4,200	$4,200	$4,200
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$1,025	$2,100	$2,100	$2,100	$2,100
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$504,420	$840,000	$120,000	$120,000	$120,000
4000	GRANTS	$4,865,175	$980,000	$1,700,000	$1,700,000	$1,700,000
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$5,543,070**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**
Method of Financing:						
1	General Revenue Fund	$5,543,070	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000	$2,000,000

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	1	Soil and Water Conservation Assistance	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6 0
OBJECTIVE:	2	Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair	Service Categories:	
STRATEGY:	1	Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair	Service: NA Income: NA	Age: NA

CODE DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
SUBTOTAL, MOF (GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS)	**$5,543,070**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)				**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)	**$5,543,070**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**	**$2,000,000**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:	**3.0**	**3.0**	**3.0**	**3.0**	**3.0**

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The Texas Legislature appropriates funds to the TSSWCB for the operation, maintenance, repair and rehabilitation of approximately 2,000 federally designed and constructed f dams in Texas. In order to deliver these dollars, the TSSWCB has developed one grant program to address operation and maintenance (O&M) needs, and another to address str needs. The separation of the two activities is being done to increase efficiency and flexibility due to the difference in complexity of both the nature of O&M and repair activitie differences in the complexity in the administrative needs. O&M activities are relatively routine and uncomplicated in nature, where structural repair activities are more complic they involve extensive engineering design
specifications and more elaborate concurrence requirements from regulatory agencies such as the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) Dam Safety Program. water conservation districts (SWCDs), in partnership with other local governments, are sponsors for all sponsors of the flood control dams, therefore the TSSWCB is developir programs to provide pass through grants to SWCDs.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution — Service: 36 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Output Measures:						
KEY 1	# of Proposals for Federal Grant Funding Evaluated	27.00	28.00	20.00	20.00	20.00
Objects of Expense:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$509,237	$510,000	$510,000	$510,000	$510,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$14,177	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$9,049	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000	$5,000
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$22,924	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000
2004	UTILITIES	$9,995	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
2005	TRAVEL	$38,138	$35,000	$35,000	$35,000	$35,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	$18,358	$19,000	$19,000	$19,000	$19,000
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$12,406	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000	$10,000
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$1,205,934	$1,065,074	$1,065,074	$1,065,074	$1,065,074
4000	GRANTS	$2,932,883	$5,620,272	$5,620,272	$5,620,272	$5,620,272
5000	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$9,350	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$4,782,451**	**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**
Method of Financing:						
1	General Revenue Fund	$1,262,311	$1,297,346	$1,297,346	$1,297,346	$1,297,346

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution — Service: 36 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
SUBTOTAL, MOF (GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS)		**$1,262,311**	**$1,297,346**	**$1,297,346**	**$1,297,346**	**$1,297,346**
Method of Financing:						
555	Federal Funds					
66.460.000	Nonpoint Source Implement	$3,520,140	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000
CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555		$3,520,140	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000	$6,000,000
SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)		**$3,520,140**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)					**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)		**$4,782,451**	**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**	**$7,297,346**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:		**9.8**	**11.6**	**11.0**	**11.0**	**11.0**

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	2	Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6 4
OBJECTIVE:	1	Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program	Service Categories:	
STRATEGY:	1	Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution	Service: 36 Income: A.2	Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015

Section 201.026 of the Agriculture Code of Texas gives the TSSWCB responsibility for planning, implementing and managing programs and practices for abating agricultural a nonpoint source pollution. The TSSWCB is the lead agency in Texas for agricultural and silvicultural nonpoint source pollution abatement programs. The Federal Clean Wate the development and implementation of nonpoint source pollution management programs by states. The TSSWCB is currently meeting requirements of the Clean Water Act th ongoing, voluntary programs to identify and abate agricultural and silvicultural nonpoint source pollution.

The TSSWCB receives half of the approximately 10 million dollars annually provided to Texas through the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Clean Wa 319(h) grant program. These funds are used for a variety of projects and programs to implement, demonstrate, and assess technologies and practices that protect Texas water qu nonpoint sources of pollution. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality receives the other half of the funding and uses it to address urban nonpoint sources.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

Federal statutes impact soil and water conservation programs in Texas. In the forefront of these is the Clean Water Act, which requires the development and implementation of source pollution management programs, of which agriculture and silviculture are the responsibility of the TSSWCB. Currently, the TSSWCB receives federal funds through the Act. The greatest impediment to securing federal funds is the requirement in most programs that they be matched by varying percentages of non-federal funds. The Clean Wate 319(h)federal grant has a 40% non-federal match requirement. the TSSWCB utilizes general revenue appropriations in the Statewide Management Plan Strategy and the Polluti Plan Strategy toward satisfying the match requirement.

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 2 Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas — Service: 36 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Output Measures:						
KEY 1	Number of Pollution Abatement Plans Certified	620.00	582.00	589.00	589.00	589.00
2	Number of Water Quality Treatment Grants Made	370.00	313.00	250.00	250.00	250.00
Efficiency Measures:						
1	Average Number of Days to Certify Pollution Abatement Plans	1.29	2.30	20.00	20.00	20.00
Objects of Expense:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$1,397,010	$1,491,000	$1,491,000	$1,491,000	$1,491,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$62,946	$65,000	$65,000	$65,000	$65,000
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	$0	$14,818	$0	$0	$0
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$37,790	$46,000	$46,000	$46,000	$46,000
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$15,919	$20,000	$20,000	$20,000	$20,000
2004	UTILITIES	$27,580	$28,500	$28,500	$28,500	$28,500
2005	TRAVEL	$45,090	$60,000	$60,000	$60,000	$60,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	$118,689	$132,278	$135,000	$135,000	$135,000
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$18,320	$20,000	$20,000	$20,000	$20,000
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$361,555	$277,472	$367,412	$223,190	$223,190
4000	GRANTS	$2,030,377	$1,979,281	$1,979,281	$1,979,281	$1,979,281
5000	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$78,794	$0	$0	$0	$0

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 2 Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas — Service: 36 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$4,194,070**	**$4,134,349**	**$4,212,193**	**$4,067,971**	**$4,067,971**
Method of Financing:						
1	General Revenue Fund	$3,723,492	$4,067,971	$4,067,971	$4,067,971	$4,067,971
SUBTOTAL, MOF (GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS)		**$3,723,492**	**$4,067,971**	**$4,067,971**	**$4,067,971**	**$4,067,971**
Method of Financing:						
555	Federal Funds					
10.912.000	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INC	$470,578	$66,378	$144,222	$0	$0
CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555		$470,578	$66,378	$144,222	$0	$0
SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)		**$470,578**	**$66,378**	**$144,222**	**$0**	**$0**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)					**$4,067,971**	**$4,067,971**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)		**$4,194,070**	**$4,134,349**	**$4,212,193**	**$4,067,971**	**$4,067,971**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:		**32.8**	**31.7**	**33.0**	**33.0**	**33.0**

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	2	Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricl Nonpoint Source Pollution	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6	4	
OBJECTIVE:	1	Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program	Service Categories:			
STRATEGY:	2	Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas	Service: 36	Income: A.2	Age: B.3	

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

This strategy includes a conservation planning program called the Water Quality Management Plan Program. This program, in addition to a nonpoint source mandate, comes fr 503 of the 73rd Legislative Session in 1993. This program is administered through a partnership between the 216 SWCDs in Texas and the TSSWCB. It is a voluntary program emphasizes implementation of the management practices contained within the United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service's (NRCS)Fiel Technical Guide. Landowners may apply for cost-share assistance through this program.

This strategy also includes a poultry initiative that involves assisting.Texas poultry producers with meeting the requirements of the77th Legislative Session's Senate Bill 1339. requires all poultry producers in Texas to obtain a TSSWCB certified water quality management plan in accordance with a schedule provided in the legislation.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

Due to changes made by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to the federal regulations for concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs), the Texas Commissi Environmental Quality (TCEQ) has adopted a change to their agency rules that requires dry-litter poultry operations larger than 125,000 birds to operate under a water quality p change was necessary to make the CAFO rules in Texas consistent with the federal regulations. Prior to this change in the federal regulations, dry-litter poultry operations were have a permit. However, due to Senate Bill 1339 (77th Legislative Session, 2001), all poultry operations in Texas are required to operate in accordance with a TSSWCB certifi Quality Management Plan. The TSSWCB is working cooperatively with the TCEQ to ensure that the technical work is carried out as a result of Senate Bill 1339.

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 3

OBJECTIVE: 1 Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Provide Financial/Technical Assistance for Water Quantity Enhancement — Service: 37 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Output Measures:						
KEY 1	Number of Acres of Brush Treated	48,666.00	9,682.00	23,138.00	23,138.00	23,138.00
2	Number of Acres of Brush Under Resource Management Plan	169,007.00	55,990.00	145,000.00	145,000.00	145,000.00
Efficiency Measures:						
1	Average Cost Per Acre of Mechanical Brush Clearing	138.97	135.20	100.00	100.00	100.00
2	Average Cost Per Acre of Chemical Brush Clearing	22.25	22.83	50.00	50.00	50.00
Objects of Expense:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$218,457	$220,000	$220,000	$220,000	$220,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$5,060	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000	$8,000
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$6,221	$6,500	$6,500	$6,500	$6,500
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$1,382	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500	$1,500
2004	UTILITIES	$5,355	$5,500	$5,500	$5,500	$5,500
2005	TRAVEL	$20,237	$21,000	$21,000	$21,000	$21,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	$18,258	$18,500	$18,500	$18,500	$18,500
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$895	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000	$1,000
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$126,209	$36,000	$36,000	$36,000	$36,000
4000	GRANTS	$4,491,987	$1,817,413	$1,817,413	$1,817,413	$1,817,413

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 3

OBJECTIVE: 1 Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Provide Financial/Technical Assistance for Water Quantity Enhancement — Service: 37 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
5000	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$3,950	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$4,898,011**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**
Method of Financing:						
1	General Revenue Fund	$4,898,011	$2,135,413	$2,135,413	$2,135,413	$2,135,413
SUBTOTAL, MOF (GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS)		**$4,898,011**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)					**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)		**$4,898,011**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**	**$2,135,413**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:		**4.0**	**3.9**	**4.0**	**4.0**	**4.0**

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

A goal of the TSSWCB is to protect and enhance water supplies in Texas by ensuring that a quantity conservation program is available and that funds are being used effectivel water conservation and enhance water yields in targeted areas. It is the objective of this goal to conserve and enhance water supplies for the State by managing and directing wa and water yield programs in targeted areas. Under our water supply enhancement responsibilities, we administer a program designed to enhance water availability and water co through effective land stewardship by removing water-depleting brush and trees, such as juniper, mesquite, and salt cedar, which have invaded many areas of the state and crea water shortages.

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL:	3	Protect and Enhance Water Supplies	Statewide Goal/Benchmark:	6	3
OBJECTIVE:	1	Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas	Service Categories:		
STRATEGY:	1	Provide Financial/Technical Assistance for Water Quantity Enhancement	Service: 37	Income: A.2	Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

Water Supply Enhancement responsibilities include programs designed to enhance water availability by removing water-depleting brush and trees, such as juniper, mesquite, ar which have invaded many areas of the state and created critical water shortages.

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 4 Indirect Administration — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 0

OBJECTIVE: 1 Indirect Administration — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Indirect Administration — Service: 09 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Objects of Expense:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$498,268	$477,958	$478,000	$478,000	$478,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$14,918	$13,594	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	$35,860	$1,311	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$165	$1,750	$0	$0	$0
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$2,837	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
2004	UTILITIES	$8,730	$7,500	$7,500	$7,500	$7,500
2005	TRAVEL	$44,467	$57,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	$12,513	$16,425	$17,000	$17,000	$17,000
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$1,787	$2,199	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$22,411	$39,377	$22,454	$22,735	$22,735
5000	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$2,500	$0	$0	$0	$0
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
Method of Financing:						
1	General Revenue Fund	$644,431	$620,015	$619,454	$619,735	$619,735
SUBTOTAL, MOF (GENERAL REVENUE FUNDS)		**$644,431**	**$620,015**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**

592 Soil and Water Conservation Board

GOAL: 4 Indirect Administration — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 0
OBJECTIVE: 1 Indirect Administration — Service Categories:
STRATEGY: 1 Indirect Administration — Service: 09 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Method of Financing:						
666	Appropriated Receipts	$25	$99	$0	$0	$0
SUBTOTAL, MOF (OTHER FUNDS)		**$25**	**$99**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS)					**$619,735**	**$619,735**
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS)		**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:		**9.5**	**8.9**	**8.5**	**8.5**	**8.5**

STRATEGY DESCRIPTION AND JUSTIFICATION:

The TSSWCB focuses on maintaining a low administrative overhead compared to program delivery. The agency's indirect administration for the 2014-15 biennium is anticipat approximately 3%. The Indirect Administration Strategy funds State Board Member travel, Executive Director, Budget and Accounting, Information Technology, and Human I

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS IMPACTING STRATEGY:

The TSSWCB budget is grant and pass-through driven with approximately 75% of annual expenditures comprised of grants and pass-through to end users of agency programs. general administration, this strategy also funds staff for administering grant and pass-through payments to end users of agency programs including soil and water conservation landowners, farm and ranch operators, and local/state/federal partner entities.

SUMMARY TOTALS:

OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**
METHODS OF FINANCE (INCLUDING RIDERS):				**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**
METHODS OF FINANCE (EXCLUDING RIDERS):	**$24,974,237**	**$20,928,703**	**$20,960,007**	**$20,043,127**	**$20,043,127**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS:	**71.1**	**71.1**	**72.1**	**72.1**	**72.1**

3.B. Rider Revisions and Additions Request

Agency Code:	Agency Name:	Prepared By:	Date:	Request Level:
592	Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board	Kenny Zajicek	8/16/12	

Current Rider Number	Page Number in 2012-13 GAA	Proposed Rider Language
1	VI-61	**1. Performance Measure Targets.** The following is a listing of the key performance target levels for the Soil and Water Conservation Board

	~~2012~~ 2014	~~2013~~ 2015
A. Goal: SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION ASSIST Outcome (Results/Impact): Percent of District Financial Needs Met by Soil and Water Conservation Board Grants	~~50%~~ 61.2%	~~50%~~59.2%
A.1.1. Strategy: PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & ASSISTANCE Output (Volume): Number of Contacts with Districts to Provide Conservation Education Assistance	15,396	15,396
B. Goal: NONPOINT SOURCE POLLUTION ABATEMENT Outcome (Results/Impact): Percent of Agricultural and Silvicultural Operations with a Potential to Cause Nonpoint Pollution in Problem Areas As Identified and Designated by the TSSWCB	50%	50%
B.1.1. Strategy: STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN Output (Volume): Number of Proposals for Federal Grant Funding Evaluated by TSSWCB Staff	20	20
B.1.2. Strategy: POLLUTION ABATEMENT PLAN Output (Volume): Number of Pollution Abatement Plans Certified	589	589
C. Goal: WATER SUPPLY ENHANCEMENT C.1.1. Strategy: WATER CONSERVATION AND ENHANCEMENT Output (Volume): Number of Acres of Brush Treated	23,138	23,138

3.B. Rider Revisions and Additions Request (continued)

2	VI-62	**Matching Requirements.** Funds appropriated above for conservation assistance grants for soil and water conservation districts may be expended only when matched by equal amounts from sources other than state funds or earnings from state funds, not to exceed $7,500 in any district per fiscal year.
3	VI-62	**Allocation of Grant Funds.** Out of the amounts appropriated above to the Soil and Water Conservation Board, any Conservation Implementation Assistance or Technical Assistance grant funds to the soil and water conservation districts shall be used for expenses occurring in the fiscal year in which the grant funds are allocated. Grant distributions are made contingent upon districts filing annual Conservation Implementation Assistance or Technical Assistance expenditure summary reports with the Soil and Water Conservation Board and are subject to a year-end reconciliation.
4	VI-62	**Water Quality Management Plans.** Included in amounts appropriated above in Strategy B.1.2, Pollution Abatement Plan, is $406,818 out of the General Revenue Fund in fiscal years 2012~~2~~4 and 2013~~3~~5 for administrative costs associated with the preparation of water quality management plans for poultry operators and $3,661,153 out of the General Revenue fund in fiscal years 2012~~2~~4 and 2013~~3~~5 for the planning and implementation of water quality management plans. Any unexpended balances from this appropriation as of August 31, 2012~~2~~4are hereby appropriated for the same purpose for the fiscal year beginning September 1, 2012~~2~~4.~~-~~**4. Allocation of Grant Funds.** Out of the amounts appropriated above to the Soil and Water Conservation Board, any Conservation Implementation Technical Assistance grant funds to the soil and water conservation districts shall be used for expenses occurring in the fiscal year in which the grant funds are allocated. Grant distributions are made contingent upon districts filing annual Conservation Implementation Technical Assistance expenditure summary reports with the Soil and Water Conservation Board and are subject to a year-end reconciliation.
5	VI-62	**Conservation Assistance to the Soil and Water Conservation Districts.** Out of the amounts appropriated above to the Soil and Water Conservation Board, any conservation assistance grants awarded to soil and water conservation districts on a matching basis and requiring districts to raise funds from sources other than the Soil and Water Conservation Board prior to receiving such grants shall remain permanently with the soil and water conservation district granted the funds. The Soil and Water Conservation Board shall not require the soil and water conservation districts to return conservation assistance grant funds at the end of a fiscal year or at the end of a biennium.
6	VI-62	~~**Brush Control**~~**Water Supply Enhancement.** Included in amounts appropriated above in Strategy C.1.1, Water Conservation and Enhancement, is $2,135,413 in fiscal year 2012~~2~~4 and $2,135,413 in fiscal year 2013~~3~~5 out of the General Revenue Fund for the ~~brush control~~ Water Supply Enhancement program. These funds shall be used for supporting existing and implementing new ~~brush control~~ water enhancement projects designated by the Soil and Water Conservation Board. Any unexpended balances from this appropriation as of August 31, 2012~~2~~4are hereby appropriated for the same purpose for the fiscal year beginning September 1, 2012~~2~~4.
7	VI-62	~~**Sunset Contingency.1** Funds appropriated above for fiscal year 2013 for the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board are made contingent on the continuation of the Texas Soil and Water Conservation Board by the Eighty-second Legislature. In the event that the agency is not continued, the funds appropriated for fiscal year 2012, or as much thereof as may be necessary areto be used to provide for the phase out of agency operations.~~
8	VI-62	**Appropriation: Flood Control Dam Operation, Maintenance, and Structural Repair.** Included in the amounts appropriated above in Strategy A.1.~~1~~2, Flood Control Dam O&M and Repair ~~Program Management and Assistance~~, is $2,000,000 in each fiscal year out of the General Revenue Fund to provide for operations and maintenance, structural repair, and rehabilitation needs to flood control dams. Any unexpended balances from this appropriation as of August 31, 2012~~2~~4are hereby appropriated for the same purpose for the fiscal year beginning September 1, 2012~~2~~4.

3.B. Rider Revisions and Additions Request
(continued)

9	N/A	**Appropriation: Statewide Management Plan.** Included in the amounts appropriated above in Strategy B.1.1., Statewide Management Plan is $1,257,346 in each fiscal year out of the General Revenue Fund for nonpoint source water quality grants. Any unexpended balances from this appropriation as of August 31, 2014 are hereby appropriated for the same purpose for the fiscal year beginning September 1, 2014.

Agency code: **592** Agency name:

Soil and Water Conservation Board

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
	Item Name: Flood Control Dam Operation, Maintenance, and Structural Repair		
	Item Priority: 1		
	Includes Funding for the Following Strategy or Strategies: 01-02-01 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair		
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	5,400,000	5,400,000
	TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE	**$5,400,000**	**$5,400,000**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	5,400,000	5,400,000
	TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING	**$5,400,000**	**$5,400,000**

DESCRIPTION / JUSTIFICATION:

Starting in 1944, the federal government passed a number of laws that ultimately resulted in the creation of approximately 11,000 flood control structures across the nation. Thr authorizations passed between 1944 and 1981, approximately 2,000 of these dams were constructed in Texas on private property through the cooperation of the landowner, the l Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and an association of local sponsors to carry out the needed operation and maintenance (O&M) as well as perform various repairs and In Texas, Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) were included as a local sponsor. O&M responsibilities for sponsors includes activities such as brush control on the s repair, mowing, and pipe replacement. Many dams have aged to an extent that repairs are needed to ensure their continued functionality and in some cases the original design of become inadequate due to increased residential and commercial development. Another complication is that many roads and bridges were engineered to specifications that did n presence of the structures into account.

As of February 2012, it is estimated that there are $9.6 million in operation and maintenance needs on $1,666 dams statewide and $48 million in repair needs on 157 dames state estimate is based on the 2008 statewide survey (which has been adjusted for underestimated operation, maintenance, and repair costs, work performed since then, and adjustmer compensate for construction-related inflation since 2008 (16.5% increase). This exceptional item request is intended to address 25% of the identified operation and maintenance of the identified structural repair needs.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS:

Agency code: **592** Agency name:

Soil and Water Conservation Board

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
	Item Name: Conservation Implementation Assistance		
	Item Priority: 2		
	Includes Funding for the Following Strategy or Strategies: 01-01-01 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance		
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	229,800	237,000
	TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE	**$229,800**	**$237,000**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	229,800	237,000
	TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING	**$229,800**	**$237,000**

DESCRIPTION / JUSTIFICATION:

Section §303(d) of the 1972 Federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires all states to compile a list of water bodies that are impaired because they are not meeting their designated non-attainment of Texas surface water quality standards. The CWA also requires states to develop Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) for the particular pollutant(s) that is(impairment. A TMDL is the maximum amount of specific pollutant that a lake, river, stream or estuary can receive on a daily basis without seriously harming its beneficial uses drinking, aquatic life, etc.). Following the development of a TMDL, a state approved implementation plan is developed prescribing measures needed to restore water bodies. T the lead agency for agricultural and silvicultural nonpoint source pollution abatement and works cooperatively with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) t federal requirement.

The EPA also requires states to utilize federal CWA §319(h) grant funds in accordance with a watershed-based plan. In Texas, these watershed-based plans are called Watershe Plans (WPPs). The 216 local SWCDs are the delivery system through which the TSSWCB implements best management practices on agricultural lands within the scope of an i watershed with a TMDL and/or WPP. SWCDs in these watersheds are often required to perform conservation implementation assistance to much greater extents, therefore this is intended to alleviate their increased costs. This request includes $57,800 increase for targeted grants to SWCDs with impaired waterbodies listed on the Texas §303(d)and $4 for targeted grants to SWCDs in watersheds with an ongoing WPP.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS:

Agency code: **592** Agency name:

Soil and Water Conservation Board

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
	Item Name: Conservation Implementation Assistance and State Matching Fund Program		
	Item Priority: 3		
	Includes Funding for the Following Strategy or Strategies: 01-01-01 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance		
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	2,700,648	2,700,648
	TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE	**$2,700,648**	**$2,700,648**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	2,700,648	2,700,648
	TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING	**$2,700,648**	**$2,700,648**

DESCRIPTION / JUSTIFICATION:

SWCDs are political subdivisions of state government, responsible for carrying out soil and water conservation programs within their boundaries. Conservation districts work d owners and operators of agricultural land to develop and implement soil and water conservation plans which involve land treatment measures for erosion control, water conserva quality purposes. The funding is appropriated to employ soil conservation technicians at local conservation district offices throughout the state. The technicians work with owne operators of agricultural or other lands on installing and maintaining various conservation practices. This work includes gathering supplementary planning data and information features of farms, performing survey and layout work, explaining and/or demonstrating methods of applying conservation practices such as contour cultivation, terracing, tree pl improvement, seasonal or other irrigation practices, range practices, fertilizing, seeding, and land preparation operations. The technicians are responsible for follow-up on the ap maintenance of planned conservation practices. The Matching Funds Program provides funds on a dollar-for-dollar matching basis to local Conservation Districts. These funds operating expenses. Conservation Districts must raise sufficient additional local funds to match the state allocation prior to the receipt of state funds. The average Conservation receives $4,400 per fiscal year based on current TSSWCB appropriations. The fact that an equal amount of funds must be raised locally before state funds are granted verifies th and that there is an interest in a soil and water conservation program at the local level. This request meets all identified needs as reported by the 216 soil and water conservation Conservation Implementation and Matching Funds for the 2014-15 biennium.

EXTERNAL/INTERNAL FACTORS:

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Code	Description	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
Item Name:	Flood Control Dam Operation, Maintenance, and Structural Repair		
Allocation to Strategy:	1-2-1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair		
STRATEGY IMPACT ON OUTCOME MEASURES:			
1	% of Flood Control Dams Identified as in Need of Repair	7.44%	7.29%
OUTPUT MEASURES:			
1	Number of Flood Control Dam Repair Grants Awarded	3.00	3.00
2	Number of Flood Control Dam Repairs Completed	3.00	3.00
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	5,400,000	5,400,000
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$5,400,000**	**$5,400,000**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	5,400,000	5,400,000
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING		**$5,400,000**	**$5,400,000**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Code	Description	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
Item Name:	Conservation Implementation Assistance		
Allocation to Strategy:	1-1-1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance		
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	229,800	237,000
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$229,800**	**$237,000**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	229,800	237,000
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING		**$229,800**	**$237,000**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Code	Description	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
Item Name:	Conservation Implementation Assistance and State Matching Fund Program		
Allocation to Strategy:	1-1-1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance		
STRATEGY IMPACT ON OUTCOME MEASURES:			
1	% of District Financial Needs Met by Conservation Board Grants	100.00%	100.00%
OUTPUT MEASURES:			
1	Number of Grants-related Claims Processed	4,000.00	4,000.00
EFFICIENCY MEASURES:			
1	Average Number of Days to Process a Grants-Related Claim	7.00	7.00
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	2,700,648	2,700,648
TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE		**$2,700,648**	**$2,700,648**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	2,700,648	2,700,648
TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING		**$2,700,648**	**$2,700,648**

Agency Code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 - 4

OBJECTIVE: 1 Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance — Service: 37 Income: A.2 Age: B.3

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
STRATEGY IMPACT ON OUTCOME MEASURES:			
1	% of District Financial Needs Met by Conservation Board Grants	100.00 %	100.00 %
OUTPUT MEASURES:			
1	Number of Grants-related Claims Processed	4,000.00	4,000.00
EFFICIENCY MEASURES:			
1	Average Number of Days to Process a Grants-Related Claim	7.00	7.00
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	2,930,448	2,937,648
	Total, Objects of Expense	**$2,930,448**	**$2,937,648**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	2,930,448	2,937,648
	Total, Method of Finance	**$2,930,448**	**$2,937,648**

EXCEPTIONAL ITEM(S) INCLUDED IN STRATEGY:

Conservation Implementation Assistance

Conservation Implementation Assistance and State Matching Fund Program

Agency Code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance — Statewide Goal/Benchmark: 6 - 0

OBJECTIVE: 2 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair — Service Categories:

STRATEGY: 1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair — Service: NA Income: NA Age: NA

CODE	DESCRIPTION	Excp 2014	Excp 2015
STRATEGY IMPACT ON OUTCOME MEASURES:			
1	% of Flood Control Dams Identified as in Need of Repair	7.44 %	7.29 %
OUTPUT MEASURES:			
1	Number of Flood Control Dam Repair Grants Awarded	3.00	3.00
2	Number of Flood Control Dam Repairs Completed	3.00	3.00
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:			
4000	GRANTS	5,400,000	5,400,000
	Total, Objects of Expense	**$5,400,000**	**$5,400,000**
METHOD OF FINANCING:			
1	General Revenue Fund	5,400,000	5,400,000
	Total, Method of Finance	**$5,400,000**	**$5,400,000**

EXCEPTIONAL ITEM(S) INCLUDED IN STRATEGY:

Flood Control Dam Operation, Maintenance, and Structural Repair

Agency Code: **592** Agency: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

COMPARISON TO STATEWIDE HUB PROCUREMENT GOALS

A. Fiscal Year 2010 - 2011 HUB Expenditure Information

Statewide HUB Goals	Procurement Category	HUB Expenditures FY 2010 % Goal	% Actual	Diff	Actual $	Total Expenditures FY 2010	HUB Expenditures FY 2011 % Goal	% Actual	Diff	Actual $	Total Expenditures FY 2011
11.9%	Heavy Construction	11.9 %	0.0%	-11.9%	$0	$0	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	$0	$1
26.1%	Building Construction	26.1 %	0.0%	-26.1%	$0	$64,018	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	$0	$1
57.2%	Special Trade Construction	57.2 %	0.0%	-57.2%	$0	$1,671	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	$0	$1
20.0%	Professional Services	20.0 %	43.6%	23.6%	$18,505	$42,472	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	$0	$1
33.0%	Other Services	33.0 %	0.0%	-33.0%	$1,260	$3,151,104	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	$0	$1
12.6%	Commodities	12.6 %	26.4%	13.8%	$48,605	$184,322	0.0 %	0.0%	0.0%	$0	$1
	Total Expenditures		**2.0%**		**$68,370**	**$3,443,587**		**0.0%**		**$0**	**$6**

B. Assessment of Fiscal Year 2010 - 2011 Efforts to Meet HUB Procurement Goals

Attainment:

The TSSWCB generates expenditures in three procurement categories and they are Professional Service, Other Services, and Commodities. The agency did not attain or exceed the Heavy Construction, Building Construction, Special Trade, categories of the applicable statewide HUB procurement goals for fiscal year 2010-11.

Applicability:

The following procurement categories were not applicable to our agency for fiscal year 2010-11: Heavy Construction, and Building Construction

Factors Affecting Attainment:

The TSSWCB is a small agency with seven regional offices and two-thirds of the staff strategically officed in predominantly rural areas of the state where less vendors are available for selection.

"Good-Faith" Efforts:

The agency assists local vendors with obtaining a state HUB listing. The agency also works closely with oversight agency to maintain compliance with procurement requirements and criteria. The agency reviews available HUB's for all procurements and utilizes them whenever possible within financial constraints. The agency continues to periodically meet with HUB vendors and attend conferences where HUB vendors are represented to make every effort to publicize the available procurement opportunities at the agency.

Agency code: **592** Agency name: Soil and Water Conservation Board

CFDA NUMBER/ STRATEGY	**Exp 2011**	**Est 2012**	**Bud 2013**	**BL 2014**	**BL 2015**
10.912.000 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INC					
1 - 1 - 1 PROGRAM MANAGEMENT & ASSISTANCE	468,236	818,818	772,939	0	0
2 - 1 - 2 POLLUTION ABATEMENT PLAN	470,578	66,378	144,222	0	0
TOTAL, ALL STRATEGIES	**$938,814**	**$885,196**	**$917,161**	**$0**	**$0**
ADDL FED FNDS FOR EMPL BENEFITS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL, FEDERAL FUNDS	**$938,814**	**$885,196**	**$917,161**	**$0**	**$0**
ADDL GR FOR EMPL BENEFITS	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**
66.460.000 Nonpoint Source Implement					
2 - 1 - 1 STATEWIDE MANAGEMENT PLAN	3,520,140	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
TOTAL, ALL STRATEGIES	**$3,520,140**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
ADDL FED FNDS FOR EMPL BENEFITS	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL, FEDERAL FUNDS	**$3,520,140**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
ADDL GR FOR EMPL BENEFITS	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: Soil and Water Conservation Board

CFDA NUMBER/ STRATEGY		**Exp 2011**	**Est 2012**	**Bud 2013**	**BL 2014**	**BL 2015**
SUMMARY LISTING OF FEDERAL PROGRAM AMOUNTS						
10.912.000	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INC	938,814	885,196	917,161	0	0
66.460.000	Nonpoint Source Implement	3,520,140	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000
TOTAL, ALL STRATEGIES		$4,458,954	$6,885,196	$6,917,161	$6,000,000	$6,000,000
TOTAL , ADDL FED FUNDS FOR EMPL BENEFITS		0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL, FEDERAL FUNDS		**$4,458,954**	**$6,885,196**	**$6,917,161**	**$6,000,000**	**$6,000,000**
TOTAL, ADDL GR FOR EMPL BENEFITS		**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**

SUMMARY OF SPECIAL CONCERNS/ISSUES

Assumptions and Methodology:

The majority of federal funds received by the TSSWCB are Clean Water Act Section 319(h) grant funds. The majority of projects funded with CWA 319 funds are Technical Assistance Incentive Projects with projected payments over a three to five year period. This type of project success or failure is tied to the climatic and economic conditions of the State. Due to extreme climatic conditions several projects have been extended to the full 5 year timeframe available under the CWA 319(h) grant. These funds are drawn into the agency on a reimbursement basis. The match requirements for the grant is 60% federal and 40% non-federal funds. Scope of projects are increasing in size and dollar amount as they are coordinated with the state's TMDL program and 303(d) list.

Agency code: **592** Agency name: Soil and Water Conservation Board

CFDA NUMBER/ STRATEGY	**Exp 2011**	**Est 2012**	**Bud 2013**	**BL 2014**	**BL 2015**

Potential Loss:

All federal funding is dependant upon federal appropriations.

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	REVENUE LOSS			REDUCTION AMOUNT			TARGET
Item Priority and Name/ Method of Financing	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	
1 Five Percent Reduction							
Category: Across the Board Reductions							
Item Comment: A five percent across the board reduction to all program pass-through and grants for $968,592. This amount includes $45,890 for the soil and water conservation district state matching fund program, $71,978 for conservation implementation assistance grants, $21,726 for soil and water conservation district director mileage and per diem reimbursements, $90,000 for flood control dam structural repair grants, $64,867 for state funded water quality grants, $98,964 for water quality management plan incentives, and $90,871 for water supply enhancement grants. Additionally there is a five percent program service reduction of $435,720, including a reduction of three full time employees, contingent upon expected workload decreases from implementing a $968,592 reduction in program pass-through and grants.							
Strategy: 1-1-1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$142,523	$142,523	$285,046	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$142,523**	**$142,523**	**$285,046**	
Strategy: 1-2-1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$90,000	$90,000	$180,000	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$90,000**	**$90,000**	**$180,000**	
Strategy: 2-1-1 Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$64,867	$64,867	$129,734	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$64,867**	**$64,867**	**$129,734**	
Strategy: 2-1-2 Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$239,305	$239,305	$478,610	

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	REVENUE LOSS			REDUCTION AMOUNT			TARGET
Item Priority and Name/ Method of Financing	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$239,305**	**$239,305**	**$478,610**	
Strategy: 3-1-1 Provide Financial/Technical Assistance for Water Quantity Enhancement							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$150,461	$150,461	$300,922	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$150,461**	**$150,461**	**$300,922**	
Strategy: 4-1-1 Indirect Administration							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$15,000	$15,000	$30,000	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$15,000**	**$15,000**	**$30,000**	
Item Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$702,156**	**$702,156**	**$1,404,312**	
FTE Reductions (From FY 2014 and FY 2015 Base Request)				**3.0**	**3.0**		

2 Five Percent Reduction

Category: Programs - Grant/Loan/Pass-through Reductions

Item Comment: A ten percent reduction for program pass-through and grants for $1,378,808. This amount includes $180,000 for flood control dam structural repair grants, $129,735 for state funded water quality grants, $197,928 for water quality management plan incentives, and $181,741 for water supply enhancement grants. Additionally there is a program service reduction of $25,505 contingent upon expected workload decreases from implementing a $1,378,808 reduction in pogram pass-through and grants.

Strategy: 1-1-1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$12,751	$12,752	$25,503	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$12,751**	**$12,752**	**$25,503**	
Strategy: 1-2-1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair							

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	REVENUE LOSS			REDUCTION AMOUNT			TARGET
Item Priority and Name/ Method of Financing	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$180,000	$180,000	$360,000	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$180,000**	**$180,000**	**$360,000**	
Strategy: 2-1-1 Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$129,735	$129,735	$259,470	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$129,735**	**$129,735**	**$259,470**	
Strategy: 2-1-2 Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$197,928	$197,928	$395,856	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$197,928**	**$197,928**	**$395,856**	
Strategy: 3-1-1 Provide Financial/Technical Assistance for Water Quantity Enhancement							
General Revenue Funds							
1 General Revenue Fund	$0	$0	$0	$181,742	$181,742	$363,484	
General Revenue Funds Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$181,742**	**$181,742**	**$363,484**	
Item Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$702,156**	**$702,157**	**$1,404,313**	
FTE Reductions (From FY 2014 and FY 2015 Base Request)							
AGENCY TOTALS							
General Revenue Total				**$1,404,312**	**$1,404,313**	**$2,808,625**	**$2,808,625**
Agency Grand Total	**$0**	**$0**	**$0**	**$1,404,312**	**$1,404,313**	**$2,808,625**	
Difference, Options Total Less Target							

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	REVENUE LOSS			REDUCTION AMOUNT			TARGET
Item Priority and Name/ Method of Financing	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	**2014**	**2015**	**Biennial Total**	
Agency FTE Reductions (From FY 2014 and FY 2015 Base Request)				**3.0**	**3.0**		

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Strategy		Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
4-1-1	**Indirect Administration**					
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$498,268	$ 477,958	$ 478,000	$ 478,000	$ 478,000
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	14,918	13,594	15,000	15,000	15,000
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	35,860	1,311	24,000	24,000	24,000
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	165	1,750	0	0	0
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	2,837	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
2004	UTILITIES	8,730	7,500	7,500	7,500	7,500
2005	TRAVEL	44,467	57,000	50,000	50,000	50,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	12,513	16,425	17,000	17,000	17,000
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	1,787	2,199	2,500	2,500	2,500
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	22,411	39,377	22,454	22,735	22,735
5000	CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	2,500	0	0	0	0
	Total, Objects of Expense	**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
METHOD OF FINANCING:						
1	General Revenue Fund	644,431	620,015	619,454	619,735	619,735
666	Appropriated Receipts	25	99	0	0	0
	Total, Method of Financing	**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
FULL TIME EQUIVALENT POSITIONS		**9.5**	**8.9**	**8.5**	**8.5**	**8.5**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
GRAND TOTALS					
Objects of Expense					
1001 SALARIES AND WAGES	$498,268	$477,958	$478,000	$478,000	$478,000
1002 OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$14,918	$13,594	$15,000	$15,000	$15,000
2001 PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	$35,860	$1,311	$24,000	$24,000	$24,000
2002 FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	$165	$1,750	$0	$0	$0
2003 CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$2,837	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000	$3,000
2004 UTILITIES	$8,730	$7,500	$7,500	$7,500	$7,500
2005 TRAVEL	$44,467	$57,000	$50,000	$50,000	$50,000
2006 RENT - BUILDING	$12,513	$16,425	$17,000	$17,000	$17,000
2007 RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$1,787	$2,199	$2,500	$2,500	$2,500
2009 OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	$22,411	$39,377	$22,454	$22,735	$22,735
5000 CAPITAL EXPENDITURES	$2,500	$0	$0	$0	$0
Total, Objects of Expense	**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**
Method of Financing					
1 General Revenue Fund	$644,431	$620,015	$619,454	$619,735	$619,735
666 Appropriated Receipts	$25	$99	$0	$0	$0
Total, Method of Financing	**$644,456**	**$620,114**	**$619,454**	**$619,735**	**$619,735**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
Full-Time-Equivalent Positions (FTE)	**9.5**	**8.9**	**8.5**	**8.5**	**8.5**

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Strategy		Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
1-1-1	**Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance**					
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$20,580	$20,580	$20,580	$20,580	$20,580
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	150	150	150	150	150
2004	UTILITIES	250	250	250	250	250
2006	RENT - BUILDING	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	100	100	100	100	100
	Total, Objects of Expense	**$22,880**	**$22,880**	**$22,880**	**$22,880**	**$22,880**
METHOD OF FINANCING:						
1	General Revenue Fund	22,880	22,880	22,880	22,880	22,880
	Total, Method of Financing	**$22,880**	**$22,880**	**$22,880**	**$22,880**	**$22,880**
FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS (FTE):		**0.5**	**0.5**	**0.5**	**0.5**	**0.5**

DESCRIPTION

The administrative and support costs for Strategy A.1.1. support one part-time FTE to maintain legal files for 216 soil and water conservation districts.

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Strategy		Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
2-1-1	**Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution**					
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$48,763	$48,763	$48,763	$48,763	$48,763
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	2,000
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350	1,350
2004	UTILITIES	545	545	545	545	545
2006	RENT - BUILDING	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800	1,800
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	420	420	420	420	420
	Total, Objects of Expense	**$54,878**	**$54,878**	**$54,878**	**$54,878**	**$54,878**
METHOD OF FINANCING:						
555	Federal Funds					
	66.460.000 Nonpoint Source Implement	54,878	54,878	54,878	54,878	54,878
	Total, Method of Financing	**$54,878**	**$54,878**	**$54,878**	**$54,878**	**$54,878**
FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS (FTE):		**1.0**	**1.0**	**1.0**	**1.0**	**1.0**

DESCRIPTION

The administrative and support costs in strategy B.1.1. are for one contract specialist to manage Clean Water Act Section 319(h) grant awards.

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

Strategy		Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
2-1-2	**Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas**					
OBJECTS OF EXPENSE:						
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	$186,655	$186,655	$186,655	$186,655	$186,655
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600	2,600
2004	UTILITIES	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000
2006	RENT - BUILDING	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600	9,600
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400	2,400
	Total, Objects of Expense	**$210,755**	**$210,755**	**$210,755**	**$210,755**	**$210,755**
METHOD OF FINANCING:						
1	General Revenue Fund	210,755	210,755	210,755	210,755	210,755
	Total, Method of Financing	**$210,755**	**$210,755**	**$210,755**	**$210,755**	**$210,755**
FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS (FTE):		**6.0**	**6.0**	**6.0**	**6.0**	**6.0**

DESCRIPTION

The administrative and support costs for strategy B.1.2. are for six administrative technicians. One technician is located in each water quality management plan regional office: Nacogdoches, Dublin, Wharton, Mt. Pleasant, and Hale Center.

Agency code: **592** Agency name: **Soil and Water Conservation Board**

	Exp 2011	Est 2012	Bud 2013	BL 2014	BL 2015
GRAND TOTALS					
Objects of Expense					
1001 SALARIES AND WAGES	$255,998	$255,998	$255,998	$255,998	$255,998
1002 OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	$8,500	$8,500	$8,500	$8,500	$8,500
2003 CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	$4,100	$4,100	$4,100	$4,100	$4,100
2004 UTILITIES	$3,795	$3,795	$3,795	$3,795	$3,795
2006 RENT - BUILDING	$13,200	$13,200	$13,200	$13,200	$13,200
2007 RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	$2,920	$2,920	$2,920	$2,920	$2,920
Total, Objects of Expense	**$288,513**	**$288,513**	**$288,513**	**$288,513**	**$288,513**
Method of Financing					
1 General Revenue Fund	$233,635	$233,635	$233,635	$233,635	$233,635
555 Federal Funds	$54,878	$54,878	$54,878	$54,878	$54,878
Total, Method of Financing	**$288,513**	**$288,513**	**$288,513**	**$288,513**	**$288,513**
Full-Time-Equivalent Positions (FTE)	**7.5**	**7.5**	**7.5**	**7.5**	**7.5**