



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83720

Telephone: 208-332-1790 • Fax: 208-332-1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

## IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION PUBLIC MEETING & TELECONFERENCE

### **Date and Time:**

Thursday, April 11, 2013

From 8:00 am – 1:00 pm MST

### **Location:**

Idaho State Capitol Building

700 W. Jefferson Street, East Wing 20

Boise, Idaho 83720

### DRAFT MINUTES

---

#### **COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Dick Bronson  
Norman Wright  
Dave Radford

Jerry Trebesch  
Roger Stutzman

#### **COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:**

Teri Murrison  
Delwyne Trefz  
Cheryl Wilson

Pam Johansen  
Terry Hoebelheinrich  
Jan Webster

#### **PARTNERS AND GUESTS PRESENT:**

Bret Rumbeck, IASCD  
Eugene Schock, NRCS  
Rich McAllister, Division of Financial Management

Keith Reynolds, Department of Administration  
Harriet Hensley, Office of the Attorney General  
Ray Houston, Legislative Services Office

#### **PARTNERS AND GUESTS PRESENT via teleconference:**

Robbie Taylor, IDEA

---

1 **ITEM #1: WELCOME AND ROLL CALL**

2 Chairman Bronson called the meeting to order at 8:15 am. Roll call: Chairman Dick Bronson,  
3 Commissioners Norman Wright, Dave Radford, Jerry Trebesch and Roger Stutzman were present.

4

5 **ITEM #3: PARTNER REPORTS**

6 Action: For information only

7

8 **ITEM #4: MINUTES**

9 Action: Commissioner Radford moved to approve the February minutes. Commissioner Stutzman  
10 seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

11

12

13

14 **ITEM #5: FINANCIAL REPORTS**

15 Action: Commissioner Trebesch moved to approve February financial report. Commissioner Wright  
16 seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

17

18 **ITEM #6: ADMINISTRATORS REPORT**

19 Action: Commissioner Radford moved to approve partial sponsorship of \$1,500 to IASCD for the FY 2013  
20 Envirothon and to provide two staff members' time and travel expenses to attend and assist IASCD.  
21 Commissioner Wright seconded the motion. Motion carried by unanimous vote.

22

23 **ITEM #7: DISTRICT SUPPORT SERVICES UPDATE**

24 Action: For information only

25

26 **ITEM #8: RCRDP PROGRAM UPDATE**

27 Action: For information only

28

29 **ITEM #9: PROPOSED RCRDP POLICY GUIDELINES FOR CONSIDERATION OF SECOND MORTGAGES**

30 Action: For information only

31

32 **ITEM #10: EXECUTIVE SESSION**

33 Action: Commissioner Radford moved to enter into executive session pursuant to Idaho Code § 67-  
34 2345(d) for the purpose of considering pending RCRDP loan business. Commissioner Wright seconded  
35 the motion. Roll call vote was taken with Chairman Bronson, Commissioner Stutzman, Commissioner  
36 Wright, Commissioner Trebesch and Commissioner Radford in attendance.

37

38 Executive Session commenced at 11:10 am. Ms. Murrison, Mr. Hoebelheinrich, Ms. Webster, Deputy  
39 AG Harriet Hensley, Deputy AG John Holman and Ms. Johansen were invited to stay.

40

41 Executive session ended at 12:30 pm.

42

43 The Regular Meeting reconvened at 12:30 pm.

44

45 No action was taken on Item #10 as a result of the Executive Session.

46

47 **ITEM #11: COMMISSIONER REPORTS**

48 Action: For information only

49

50 **ITEM #12: ADJOURN:**

51 The meeting was adjourned at 12:40 pm. The next Commission meeting will be held on Thursday,  
52 May 16, 2013 from 8:00 am – 1:00 pm at the Idaho State Capitol, Room EW20, in Boise.

53

54 Respectfully submitted,

55

56

57

58 Roger Stutzman, Secretary



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

**ITEM #4b**

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON AND COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**  
**FROM: TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 3, 2013**  
**RE: ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT**

## **Agreement for Engineering Services with Office of Species Conservation**

The Governor's Office of Species Conservation (OSC) has once again requested limited assistance on engineering tasks in the Lemhi Basin. Allan Johnson, our staff engineer, will assist OSC this year with a few projects entailing bridge design in the Salmon area.

## **Proposed Draft FY 2014 Meeting Schedule**

The following draft Regular Meeting Schedule is proposed for your review and input. As you know, Members asked that meetings be scheduled on the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday of every month (the proposed schedule reflects that). However, Deputy Attorney General Harriet Hensley has advised that the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursdays conflict with regularly scheduled Water Board meeting responsibilities. Ann Vonde is available to take her place should you decide to keep the 3<sup>rd</sup> Thursday meetings.

I have been in contact with the Executive Director of the Washington Conservation Commission as requested by Commissioner Wright re a two-state joint meeting. He recently told me that their Commission will meet in Spokane July 18 & 19 and asked if Commissioners would like to hold a joint meeting and tour then. In addition, the meeting schedule proposed anticipates a field meeting in Buhl to coincide with the Spring Division meeting of Division 4.

<b>DATE</b>	<b>LOCATION</b>
07/18/2013	Boise or Joint meeting w/Washington Commission in Spokane?
08/29/2013	Boise
09/12/2013	Boise or possible teleconference
10/10/2013	Boise
11/17-20/2013	Boise (during IASCD Annual Conf., tba)

12/19/2013	Teleconference (if necessary)
01/23/2014	Boise (subject to revision during Legislative Session)
02/17-21/2014	Boise (to coincide with Ag Summit, date tba)
03/20/2014	Buehl Field Meeting (subject to revision during Legislative Session)
04/17/2014	Boise
05/15/2014	Boise
06/19/2014	Boise

After your discussion at the meeting, staff will bring back the draft meeting schedule in June for final approval.

**District Request for Assistance with Payroll, Audit**

Attached is a copy of the letter from Rich McAllister, our DFM analyst in the Governor’s Office regarding the Conservation Commission’s ability to take on district audits and payroll. As was expressed by Harriet Hensley, Deputy Attorney General, according to DFM the Commission has neither the statutory authority nor the expertise to do so. We have forwarded a copy of the letter to the districts and the Board of the IASCD.

ACTION: For information only

Attachments: Copy of letter from Rich McAllister, DFM

May 9, 2013

Item 4b

To: Teri Murrison  
Administrator  
Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission

From: Rich McAllister  
Financial Management Analyst  
Division of Financial Management

CC: Jani Revier, DFM Administrator

Subject: District Payroll and Audit Duties

Thank you for sharing the request by Idaho conservation districts that the Commission assume district payroll and audit responsibilities.

I have thoroughly reviewed Idaho statutes (Title 22, Chapter 27) regarding the duties of the Soil and Water Conservation Commission, and the Commission does not have the authority to assume the responsibility of district payroll and/or audit functions.

The limited funds of the SWC are appropriated specifically towards supporting the Commission's responsibilities to promote and fund voluntary conservation projects within the state. This funding should not be used to provide day-to-day administrative support of districts. In addition to insufficient funds or authority, the SWC does not have within its ranks the necessary technical expertise to complete the requested tasks. For this purpose, the SWC contracts with the Department of Administration.

Finally, the Commission and local districts reached an agreement that districts would operate independently in regards to administrative functions. Assuming responsibilities for payroll functions would violate the spirit of the decisions reached by the 2009 legislative interim committee and the during the 2010 legislative session.

Please let me know if I can be of further assistance or if you have additional questions.

Sincerely,



Rich McAllister  
DFM Financial Management Analyst





# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

[www.swc.idaho.gov](http://www.swc.idaho.gov)

## ITEM #4c

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON AND COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**  
**FROM: TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 3, 2013**  
**RE: FY 2013 FINANCIAL REPORT, APRIL 30, 2013**

The Financial Report to be considered will be forwarded under separate cover or distributed at your meeting. The Department of Administration typically provides it around the 12<sup>th</sup> of each month.

**ACTION:** Approve

**Attachment:** Will follow under separate cover or be distributed at your meeting.



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

**ITEM #4d**

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON AND COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**  
**FROM: TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 3, 2013**  
**RE: FY 2014 BUDGET BLUEPRINT**

As you know, the Conservation Commission annually approves a Budget Blueprint for both general fund and dedicated funds. Attached are drafts for your consideration.

## **General Fund Blueprint**

There has been no change from last year's appropriated amounts with the exception of the removal of one time funds (NRCS CTA Grant, etc.) and the addition of \$50,000 in Trustee & Benefit funds appropriated for SWCC distribution to districts utilizing the match allocation formula.

While we do anticipate a slight decrease in SWCAP expenses from last year, those numbers are not yet available so the attached Blueprints use last year's number. The Blueprint assumes roughly 50/50 cost sharing with the RCRDP fund for overhead expenses including our MOU with the Department of Administration for HR, IT, and fiscal support. There is a very small amount of contingency budgeted (1%) which can be supplemented (if necessary) with personnel or operating cost savings from the general fund or from dedicated funds (not including the RCRDP fund) such as the SRF or Technical Assistance funds.

The General Fund Budget Blueprint assumes ISWCC is fully staffed at 14 FTPs with 2 part time temporary employees (general office support and TMDL program positions). It assumes that field staff will spend small amounts of time assisting with RCRDP conservation planning activities.

The Trustee and Benefit Fund assumes base funding of \$8,500 per district (\$17,000 for Jefferson District, in its third and final year of double allocations subsequent to consolidation with the Mud Lake District). Using FY 2012 match numbers (to be updated in Aug./Sept.), the state match with the additional \$50,000 allocation is a matching ratio of 1.48/1 (state/local). Delwyne has sent out several email reminders to the districts to take delivery of local matches before July 1<sup>st</sup>, and encouraging them to maximize local matches to increase their FY 2014 state match.

## **Dedicated Fund Blueprint**

There was no change in the FY 2014 appropriation for the RCRDP fund. The Blueprint assumes roughly 50/50 cost sharing between the RCRDP and general funds for overhead expenses (including the costs incurred under the MOU with the Department of Administration for HR, IT, and fiscal support). Again, while we anticipate a slight decrease in SWCAP expenses from last year, those numbers are not yet available so we have used last year's amount. There is a very small amount of contingency budgeted for (1%) which can be supplemented if necessary with any personnel or operating cost savings from the dedicated funds if necessary.

The Budget Blueprint for Dedicated Funds assumes maximum amounts will be received in Technical Assistance Cost Recovery, however that is typically not the case. In FY 2013, we billed approximately \$6,500 to OSC. As reported in the Administrator's Report, OSC has committed to continue our agreement in FY 2014.

The budgeted cost in the State Revolving Fund assumes that an amount equal to 10% of the loan officer's salary will be charged to this fund to recoup RCRDP administrative costs. The balance of funds generated through this loan will be held in contingency to build a reserve to protect the Commission should the borrower ever be late on payments.

The RCRDP Blueprint assumes 2 full time staff (loan officer and loan servicing assistant), as well as some WQRC/engineering, and administrator's time. It also assumes costs incurred for meetings where RCRDP program is discussed or business is conducted will be charged to that fund.

ACTION:            Approve

Attachment:      FY 2014 Budget Blueprint for General Fund  
                          FY 2014 Budget Blueprint for Dedicated Funds

SWC REPORT SUMMARY AS OF April 30, 2013, Item 4C

GENERAL FUND	PERSONNEL			OPERATING			CAPITAL OUTLAY			TRUSTEE & BENEFITS			CASH				
FY13	EXPENSE thru End of Current Month			EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month			EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month			EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month			BEG CASH AT 7/1/12	PLUS TOTAL		LESS TOTAL EXP TO DATE	CASH BALANCE End of Current
	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE	REC TO DATE	EXP TO DATE						
INDEX																	
7101 MANAGEMENT ADMINISTRATION	274,000	240,814	33,186	28,729	14,936	13,793			0			0	302,729	678	255,750	47,657	
7111 MANAGEMENT BOARD	2,000	3,552	(1,552)	6,600	7,302	(702)			0	0	0	0	8,600	0	10,854	(2,254)	
7201 ADMIN & FIELD STAFF	390,000	326,033	63,967	149,338	141,119	8,219	16,146	16,146	0	0	0	0	555,484	0	483,297	72,187	
7301 PROGRAMS	197,700	162,847	34,853	2,750	848	1,902			0	0	0	0	200,450	0	163,694	36,756	
7310 DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS			0			0			0	1,053,200	1,053,200	0	1,053,200	0	1,053,200	0	
7320 DISTRICT CAPACITY BUILDING	0		0			0			0	50,000	49,998	2	50,000	0	49,998	2	
7350 CREP	130,000	83,443	46,557	22,083	6,550	15,533			0			0	152,083	0	89,994	62,089	
TOTAL GENERAL FUND 0001	993,700	816,689	177,011	209,500	170,755	38,745	16,146	16,146	0	1,103,200	1,103,198	2	2,322,546	678	2,106,789	216,436	
			82.19%			81.51%						100.00%				90.71%	
7315 SWC TECH ASSISTANCE	0	0	0	80,000	18,733	61,267	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,000	18,733	61,267	
TOTAL FUND 0348	0	0	0	80,000	18,733	61,267	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80,000	18,733	61,267	
7325 SWC PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0	0	0	20,000	3,421	16,579	2,599	2,599	0	0	0	0	4,314	6,697	6,021	4,990	
TOTAL FUND 0450	0	0	0	20,000	3,421	16,579	2,599	2,599	0	0	0	0	4,314	6,697	6,021	4,990	
						17.11%											
DEDICATED FUND	PERSONNEL			OPERATING			CAPITAL OUTLAY			CASH							
FY13	EXPENSE thru End of Current Month			EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month			EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month			BEG CASH AT 7/1/12	PLUS TOTAL REC TO DATE	LESS TOTAL EXP TO DATE	CASH BALANCE End of Current				
	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE	BUDGET	BALANCE										
7351 RCRDP LOAN ADMINISTRATION	144,100	107,481	36,619	146,000	74,036	71,964	0	0	0	4,443,506	1,412,304	181,517	5,674,293				
TOTAL RCRDP ADMIN 0522-01	144,100	107,481	36,619	146,000	74,036	71,964	0	0	0	4,443,506	1,412,304	181,517	5,674,293				
			74.59%			50.71%											
7361 REVOLVING LOAN - DEQ	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000	0	0	0	16,228	147,364	134,693	28,898				
TOTAL DEQ LOAN 0529-16	0	0	0	30,000	0	30,000	0	0	0	16,228	147,364	134,693	28,898				
						0.00%											

**FY 2014 IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**ITEM #4d**

**AMENDED DRAFT Dedicated Funds Budget Blueprint**

<b>RWH009</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Operating</b>	<b>Capital</b>	<b>Trustee &amp; Benefit Funds</b>	<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>
RCRDP	\$146,000	\$146,000	\$0	\$0	\$ 292,000
TA Cost Recovery		\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
SRF Loan		\$30,000	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
Total	\$146,000	\$196,000	\$0	\$0	<b>TOTAL</b> \$342,000

<b>SWC Dedicated Funds Budget</b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Operating</b>	<b>Contingency</b>	<b>Capital</b>	<b>District Allocations</b>	<b>Capacity Building</b>	<b>TOTAL Budgeted</b>
RCRDP	\$146,000	\$146,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$292,000
TA Cost Recovery		\$20,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$20,000
SRF		\$5,400	\$24,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000
Total	146,000	\$171,400	\$24,600	\$0	\$0	<b>\$0</b>	<b>TOTAL</b> \$342,000

**Operating Highlights**

*Assumes SWCAP expenses including SCO, AG, STO estimated at \$47,600*

*Assumes appropriate amount of SWCAP, administrative (including postage, phone, rent expense, etc. ), and IT services charged to GF, RCRDP, & SRF*

*Ongoing expenses for MOU with Admin for HR, IT, fiscal support, includes slight decrease budgeted to FY 2013 actuals*

*Assumes maximum funds received under TA cost recovery*

*Assumes amount equivalent to 10% of loan officer salary charged to SRF to cover administrative costs. Remainder held in contingency to cover late borrower payments, if necessary.*

**Personnel Highlights**

*Assumes costs associated with meetings where RCRDP program or business conducted will be charged to RCRDP*

*Assumes 2 FTP RCRDP staff, some WQRC/Engineering, administrator time*

v:\budget\FY 2013\FY 2013 Budget Blueprint

**FY 2014 IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION**

**AMENDED DRAFT General Fund Budget Blueprint**

<b><u>RWH009</u></b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Operating</b>		<b>Capital</b>	<b>Trustee &amp; Benefit Funds (base, formula, &amp; capacity building)</b>	<b>TOTAL APPROPRIATION</b>
<b>General Fund</b>	\$1,005,400	\$198,400		\$0	\$1,153,200	\$ 2,357,000

<b><u>SWC Budget</u></b>	<b>Personnel</b>	<b>Operating</b>	<b>Contingency</b>	<b>Capital</b>	<b>District Allocations</b>		<b>Capacity Building</b>	<b>TOTAL</b>
					<b>Base Funding</b>	<b>Match Funding</b>		
	\$1,005,400	\$196,400	\$2,000	\$0	\$433,500	\$669,700	\$50,000	\$2,357,000

**Operating Highlights**

*Assumes SWCAP expenses including SCO, AG, STO estimated at \$47,600*

*Assumes appropriate amount of SWCAP, administrative (including postage, phone, rent expense, etc. ), and IT services charged to GF, RCRDP, & SRF*

*Ongoing expenses for MOU with Admin for HR, IT, fiscal support include slight decrease budgeted to FY 2013 actuals*

*Assumes general fund pays all of NRCS desk space and federal IT support*

*Small 1% operating contingency budgeted. Can be increased with personnel or operating cost savings or from dedicated funds (excluding RCRDP fund)*

**Personnel Highlights**

*Assumes fully staffed in general fund at 14 FTPs (2 FTPs in dedicated fund) 2 part time temporary, all projected personnel costs fall within budget with small contingency*

*Assumes some related field staff and administrative time in RCRDP fund*

**Trustee/Benefits Highlights (District Allocations, Capacity Building)**

*Match formula for FY 2014 is an estimated state match of 1.48:1 based on FY 2012 local match (inc. \$50k cap). Final TBD from actual FY 2013 local match*

	FY12 Local Match
	<u>\$ 484,698</u>
state/local match ratio	\$ 1.48



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

[www.swc.idaho.gov](http://www.swc.idaho.gov)

## ITEM #4e

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON AND COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**  
**FROM: TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 3, 2013**  
**RE: STRATEGIC PLAN UPDATE**

Staff has slightly revised the attached Strategic Plan to reflect the celebration of the Conservation Commission's 75 Anniversary Year and to include an update to the Ag Pollution Abatement Plan (due this year for updating on its regular 10 year cycle).

We will reconvene last year's Strategic Plan Advisory Group to review the draft and suggest revisions. We will also send the draft Plan out to all districts requesting their input in time to make revisions for your consideration at the June Commission meeting.

The approved Strategic Plan is due to DFM on July 1<sup>st</sup>, 2013.

**ACTION:** For review, discussion, and direction

**Attachment:** FY 2014 – 2017 DRAFT Strategic Plan

DRAFT

# FY 2014-2017 Strategic Plan

*Celebrating Our 75<sup>th</sup> Year of Stewardship*



## SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION

established

1939

*Conservation the Idaho Way:  
Sowing seeds of Stewardship*

650 W. State, Rm. 145  
Boise, Idaho 83702  
208-372-1790 ph.  
208-332-1799 fax  
[info@swc.idaho.gov](mailto:info@swc.idaho.gov)

*This page intentionally left blank.*

# DRAFT

## CONTENTS

MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR .....	0
INTRODUCTION: CONSERVATION THE IDAHO WAY .....	1
KEY EXTERNAL FACTORS .....	0
MISSION .....	0
VISION .....	0
PHILOSOPHY.....	0
PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES .....	1
GOAL #1: PROMOTE VOLUNTARY CONSERVATION BY PROVIDING TECHNICAL AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES TO IDAHO CONSERVATION DISTRICTS.....	1
Objective # 1.1: Technical Assistance to Districts.....	1
Objective # 1.2: State Funding Allocations to Districts.....	1
Objective # 1.3: Provide Comprehensive Services to Districts.....	1
GOAL #2: PROVIDE CONSERVATION PROGRAMS .....	2
Objective # 2.1: Incentive Programs .....	2
2.1.1 RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RANGELAND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RCRDP).	2
2.1.2 State Revolving Fund.....	3
2.1.3 Water Quality Program for Agriculture (WQPA).....	3
2.1.4 Conservation Improvement Grants.....	3
2.1.5 Working Landscapes Conservation Program .....	3
Objective # 2.2: Conservation Programs.....	4
2.2.1 Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP).....	4
2.2.2 Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Implementation Planning.....	4
2.2.3 Idaho Groundwater Quality Plan.....	5

# DRAFT

2.2.4 Idaho Agricultural Pollution Abatement Plan.....	5
2.2.5 Idaho OnePlan.....	5
2.2.6 Carbon Sequestration.....	6
2.2.7 Watershed Improvement Districts.....	6
GOAL #3: COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH.....	6
Objective 3.1 Partner Participation.....	6
Objective 3.2 Internal and External Communication.....	7
Objective 3.3 Intergovernmental Relations.....	7
Objective 3.4 Collaboration.....	8

|

# DRAFT

## MESSAGE FROM THE CHAIR

Lorem ipsum dolor sit amet, consectetur adipiscing elit. Proin a odio non urna semper facilisis ac at magna. Quisque sit amet lorem vel felis vehicular elementum eu ac enim. Aliquam quis mauris ut purus gravida faucibus.



Pellentesque vel neque dolor. Proin vitae nibh felis. Aliquam id nunc non lorem adipiscing aliquam. Nullam rutrum pellentesque orci, at tempor mauris sagittis nec. Duis at quam enim.

Sed auctor feugiat faucibus. Aliquam quis ante a dui vulputate porta. In ultricies varius mi, eget egestas massa malesuada vel. Aenean elementum luctus egestas. Vestibulum condimentum mollis venenatis.

Ut eget quam ipsum, ut fermentum nisl. Aenean nibh nisl, elementum quis tempor ut, tincidunt nec ante. Sed pharetra fermentum mauris vel ultricies.

Duis suscipit libero et diam facilisis sit amet eleifend erat tincidunt. Etiam nunc sapien, convallis vel luctus sed, semper vel risus. Aliquam et faucibus tortor. Aenean turpis nunc, imperdiet et aliquet ut, facilisis at arcu. Maecenas bibendum felis vitae nibh elementum condimentum.

Vestibulum ante ipsum primis in faucibus orci luctus et ultrices posuere cubilia Curae;

Quisque urna nibh, pharetra ut cursus id, tincidunt eget libero.

Nunc velit enim, adipiscing sed congue nec, accumsan eget velit. Donec enim eros, dignissim a molestie eget, iaculis sit amet elit. Donec lacus erat, tempor in auctor at, pretium et enim.

Vivamus sed volutpat libero. Nulla commodo imperdiet tincidunt. Suspendisse eleifend felis ut elit volutpat et laoreet malesuada. Morbi id ligula enim.

# DRAFT

Chairman Dick Bronson



## INTRODUCTION: CONSERVATION THE IDAHO WAY

Idaho is endowed with a magnificent blend of diverse natural landscapes – rivers, lakes, mountains, forests and desert canyons – combined with rich and fertile agricultural lands well-suited for growing a wide variety of crops and raising livestock.

People who work in Idaho agriculture have deep roots in the land. We know that caring for the land will reap benefits for future generations. We are convinced that the best way to care for and enhance our soil, water, air, plants and wildlife is through voluntary, locally led efforts. Our guiding philosophy is to use the state’s natural resources to benefit Idahoans while maintaining and improving those resources for future generations.

The Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission (Conservation Commission) focuses on Conservation the Idaho Way: voluntary stewardship, not regulatory mandates. No

Idahoan is required to do conservation projects. Instead, we incentivize responsible stewardship by providing cost sharing and technical expertise. Proactive, non-regulatory projects are beneficial because they address issues of concern and help avoid costly lawsuits and onerous regulations.

Conservation the Idaho way is locally led. In 1939 the Legislature established a bottom-up approach to voluntary conservation and today local people still lead local efforts. The Conservation Commission and our partners - local soil and water conservation districts (districts), the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), and others - combine efforts to assist farmers and ranchers engaged in voluntary stewardship activities. Together we are the heartbeat of voluntary conservation and partners in Idaho’s oldest conservation movement.

# DRAFT

The Conservation Commission was created as a state agency in 1939 during the Dust Bowl era to address significant soil erosion issues -- sheet erosion, wind erosion and severe gullyng. A 1934 soil erosion survey in Idaho revealed that more than 27 million acres of land, or roughly half the state, had serious soil erosion problems.

The state's first order of business was to help form soil conservation districts at the county level. Farmers and ranchers were elected directors of the districts, providing leadership on project priorities. As districts formed, NRCS and the Conservation Commission provided technical assistance to assist with stewardship projects.

Today there are 50 local soil and water conservation districts located from Bonners Ferry to Montpelier. Their efforts are guided by 5-year plans containing conservation goals and prioritized projects and activities. We provide funding and technical staff to empower districts - the boots on the ground - to get things done.

The Idaho Legislature has appropriated \$2.7 million to the Conservation Commission in FY 2014 (in general and dedicated funds) to support voluntary conservation in Idaho, \$1.1 million of which goes directly to districts for projects and operations. Because we're committed to

being good stewards of public funds, we all work to wring every last drop of conservation from every dollar invested.

In addition, we provide other incentive programs and technical assistance to promote and support Conservation the Idaho Way. With a small staff of 16 full time employees located around the state, we work with the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality to create voluntary Agricultural and Grazing Implementation Plans on Idaho's 303(d) listed waterways. Our plans integrate the use of a variety of best management practices to reduce pollutant loads and safeguard water quality.

While we began working 75 years ago to reduce soil erosion, our efforts now include soil, water, plants, air, and animal conservation activities, as well.

This FY2014-2017 Strategic Plan provides the Conservation Commission, our partners, the Legislature, Governor, and the public with a detailed roadmap for sowing seeds of stewardship across this great State of Idaho.

Teri Murrison, Administrator

*"Take care of the land and the land will take care of you."*

Hugh Bennett

# DRAFT

## KEY EXTERNAL FACTORS

There are key external factors that could affect the agency's ability to meet goals and objectives. They include:

- State and federal regulatory pressure and mandates that could shift priorities and resources away from current activities
- Changing economics of agriculture, which could result in significant increases or decreases in conservation program participation
- Changing economics of state and federal budgets, which could result in additional agency cuts or fewer conservation dollars being spent in the state

**Conservation the Idaho Way:  
sowing seeds of stewardship**

## MISSION

To facilitate coordinated non-regulatory, voluntary, and locally-led conservation by federal, state, and local governments including Idaho's conservation districts and other partners to conserve, sustain, improve, and enhance soil, water, air, plant, and animal resources.

## VISION

Conservation in Idaho reflects locally-led natural resource conservation leadership and priorities, is voluntary and incentive-based, non-regulatory, and demonstrates scientifically sound stewardship. The Conservation Commission and local conservation districts are the primary entities to lead coordinated conservation efforts to provide landowners and land-users with assistance and solutions for natural resource concerns and issues.

## PHILOSOPHY

The Conservation Commission is dedicated to guiding principles for each goal and related activity.

- Satisfy legislative intent and statute
  - Benefit the environment and Idaho's agricultural-based economy
  - Benefit conservation districts' locally led, voluntary, non-regulatory priorities and projects
  - Benefit the Commission's ability to serve
  - Promote fiscal responsibility
  - Strengthen existing and build new conservation partnerships
  - Incorporate valid scientific data and practices
-

# DRAFT

## PLAN GOALS & OBJECTIVES

### GOAL #1: PROMOTE VOLUNTARY CONSERVATION BY PROVIDING TECHNICAL AND OTHER SUPPORT SERVICES TO IDAHO CONSERVATION DISTRICTS

The Conservation Commission provides leadership and assistance to local conservation districts as established in Title 22 Chapter 27, Idaho Code.

#### OBJECTIVE # 1.1: ~~District~~ TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE TO DISTRICTS.

~~Develop and implement ongoing process for allocating~~ Allocate available technical staff time to provide specific and other technical assistance to districts as resources permit – technical services also include some current and future grant and project obligations consistent with Conservation Commission priorities and objectives. Support services may include:

Specialized Technical Assistance is defined as: That technical assistance used to support districts in the wise use and enhancement of natural resources which can only be provided by someone possessing a specialized, science-based skill set and an ability to integrate local knowledge of the site-specific interactions between environmental, economic, cultural and social concerns into the assistance provided.

Examples of Specialized Technical Assistance may include but are not limited to:

- Conservation planning
- Engineering services
- Project implementation and construction inspections
- BMP effectiveness monitoring
- Watershed planning and riparian assessments

#### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Provide technical assistance and engineering services as capacity and resources allow.
  - Benchmark: ~~Inventory~~ Annually inventory and award available field staff hours to provide technical and engineering assistance based on ranking criteria adopted by Conservation Commission to assist districts with new and existing projects and maximize number of landowners served.
  - Benchmark: Maintain field staff presence at district Board meetings as resources allow.
- ~~Initiate-Conduct~~ Conservation Commission, district, region, IASCD, and partner technical assistance needs assessment and capacity inventories.
  - Benchmark: Oversee planning for Conservation Commission staffing, preparation of annual agency work plan, maintain technical assistance capacity inventory.
- Convene ad hoc stakeholder workgroup(s) to rank and recommend provision of technical assistance to districts.
  - Benchmark: Utilize workgroup(s) to annually compile list of recommended ranked and prioritized district requests for technical assistance.

# DRAFT

- Benchmark: Document provision of district technical assistance in annual performance measures report.

## OBJECTIVE # 1.2: ~~DISTRICT STATE FUNDING~~ ALLOCATIONS TO DISTRICTS.

Distribute district allocations pursuant to Idaho Code 22-2727 and IDAPA 60.05.04 Rules for Allocation of Funds to Conservation Districts (annually).

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Distribute base allocations to districts in compliance with reporting requirements set forth in IDAPA 60.05.04.
  - Benchmark: Distribute base allocations by July 31<sup>st</sup> of each year.
- Convene workgroup annually to review Financial & Match Reports and make recommendation to Conservation Commission.
  - Benchmark: ~~Receive-Consider~~ recommendations for district allocations from workgroup by October ~~15<sup>th</sup>~~-1st annually.
- Distribute match allocations to districts in compliance with reporting requirements set forth in IDAPA 60.05.04.
  - Benchmark: Distribute 90% of match allocations no later than ~~October 31<sup>st</sup>~~November 30th annually. Distribute remaining 10% by April 1<sup>st</sup> annually.
- Provide assistance to districts to support the development and submission of materials required under IDAPA 60.05.04.
  - Benchmark: As needed, assist with or provide training to districts.

## OBJECTIVE # 1.3: PROVIDE COMPREHENSIVE SERVICES TO DISTRICTS ~~SERVICES~~.

Assist and provide services that encourage capacity development to independently and collectively strengthen districts.

Comprehensive District Assistance is defined as:

That assistance which supports the independent and collective strengthening of conservation districts by: a) providing services which expand resources or otherwise enhance district capacity to assist private landowners and land users in the conservation, sustainment, improvement and enhancement of Idaho's natural resources, or; b) providing assistance required to support routine district activities or projects.

Examples of comprehensive assistance may include but are not limited to:

- District secretarial and accounting tasks
- District information and outreach activities
- Administration of district-sponsored cost-share programs
- Development of a district needs assessment
- Grant writing assistance
- Development of 5-year and annual work plans

# DRAFT

## PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Identify and document unmet needs for funding water quality improvement projects related to listed waterbodies district project and program funding needs as identified and prioritized in 5-year and other district plans.
  - Benchmark: Conduct district budget hearing by June 15<sup>th</sup> annually.
- Provide capacity building services and/or funding to districts as resources allow.
  - Benchmark: If funds are available, by June 15<sup>th</sup> of each year solicit district requests for funding for capacity building activities.

## GOAL #2: PROVIDE CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

### OBJECTIVE # 2.1: INCENTIVE PROGRAMS

Support non-regulatory, science-based conservation incentive programs to accelerate the development of voluntary projects and practices throughout the state.

#### 2.1.1 RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RANGELAND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM (RCRDP).

Administer ~~and further develop the~~ low interest conservation loan program ~~to provide promoting~~ increased conservation benefits to agricultural, woodlands, and rangelands within the state and provide financial assistance to eligible applicants for the implementation of resource management projects.

#### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Administer and further develop the loan program to meet statewide conservation efforts.
  - Benchmark: Maintain or improve annual levels of funding.
- Monitor and evaluate loan policies on ongoing basis to ensure continued accountability and recommend improvements, if necessary.
  - Benchmark: ~~Annual evaluation~~ Evaluate of existing and new loan policies annually (by RCRDP Loan Committee) and make recommendations to Board.
- Monitor timeliness of loan review process as established by Conservation Commission.
  - Benchmark: Conduct bi-annual tracking of two loan applications and report results to Conservation Commission.
- Promote RCRDP program.
  - Benchmark: Develop and update marketing plan annually.
  - Benchmark: Provide regular training to all field staff and districts as identified in Marketing Plan.
- Implement district compensation process and payments for services provided to loan programs

# DRAFT

- Benchmark: Present recommendation ~~for to~~ Loan Committee and Board for district compensation ~~to for~~ participate ~~participating~~ in the loan program.

## 2.1.2 STATE REVOLVING FUND

Upon request, assist the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) with their water quality loan program addressing non-point source pollution.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Administer existing and/or future loans.
  - Benchmark: Service and track one loan.
- Determine potential to administer additional loans under SRF.
  - Benchmark: Report to Conservation Commission on potential for future program funding, and pursue if appropriate.
- ~~○ Provide information on SRF as an alternative for §319 grants.~~
- ~~○ Benchmark: Assist districts in identifying opportunities to partner with local SRF loan recipients to fund qualifying §319 grant applicants in accordance with protocols for funding nonpoint source projects as established by DEQ.~~

## 2.1.3 WATER QUALITY PROGRAM FOR AGRICULTURE (WQPA)

~~Evaluate feasibility of continuing program and a~~ actively pursue funding opportunities as identified.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Evaluate future funding and operation and actively pursue, if appropriate.
  - Benchmark: Report on potential for future program funding, and pursue if appropriate.

## 2.1.4 CONSERVATION IMPROVEMENT GRANTS.

This currently unfunded program has financed conservation projects in the past by providing cost sharing for the installation of conservation practices. Evaluate feasibility of continuing program.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Evaluate future funding and operation and actively pursue, if appropriate.
  - Benchmark: Report to Conservation Commission on potential for future funding and operation and actively pursue, if appropriate.

## 2.1.5 WORKING LANDSCAPES CONSERVATION PROGRAM

Evaluate feasibility of outcomes-based program as an alternative to regulations/permanent conservation easements and that provides incentives for landowners to improve water quality, and conserve working landscapes, viewsheds, and other beneficial uses of lands and natural resources.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Evaluate feasibility of establishing a Working Landscapes Conservation Program.

# DRAFT

- Benchmark: Report on status of similar projects and identify possible funding sources.

## OBJECTIVE # 2.2: CONSERVATION PROGRAMS

Provide policy and program mechanisms that enhance the environmental quality and economic productivity of the state.

### 2.2.1 CONSERVATION RESERVE ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM (CREP).

Provide technical leadership and oversight to improve water quantity and quality, enhance wildlife habitat, reduce groundwater use, and decrease agriculture-related chemical and sediment runoff to the waters of the Eastern Snake Plain Aquifer.

#### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Serve as lead agency for statewide CREP program.
  - Benchmark: ~~Achieve~~ Continue working to achieve goals and objectives for the CREP program as outlined in the 2006 agreement with the USDA Farm Service Agency.
  - Benchmark: Continue working to achieve ~~Meet~~ increased program goals as outlined in CREP 2011 annual report
  - Benchmark: Update agency's CREP goals and create implementation plan
  - Benchmark: Investigate feasibility of enhancing Idaho OnePlan for interagency CREP data sharing and reporting.
  - Benchmark: Submit annual report to Farm Service Agency and other partners.
  - Benchmark: Conduct annual leadership and regular interagency meetings.

### 2.2.2 TOTAL MAXIMUM DAILY LOAD (TMDL) IMPLEMENTATION PLANNING.

~~The Conservation Commission is the designated lead agency for~~ Lead efforts to address agricultural and grazing components of TMDL Implementation Plan development for water quality impaired surface waters in the state.

#### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- In coordination with the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), complete existing TMDL Agricultural Implementation Plans, initiate new plans or addendums, and assist with five-year reviews on existing DEQ Sub-basin Assessment (SBA) TMDLs.
  - Benchmark: Complete TMDL Agricultural Implementation Plans within 18 months of TMDL approval.
  - Benchmark: Provide technical assistance to districts with demonstrated need for implementation of BMPs outlined in TMDL agricultural implementation plans, as resources allow.
  - Benchmark: Support partner priorities and funding initiatives as resources allow.

# DRAFT

- Benchmark: Conduct annual meetings with six DEQ regional offices to coordinate TMDL activities.

## 2.2.3 IDAHO GROUNDWATER QUALITY PLAN.

Facilitate cooperative groundwater protection programs in conjunction with other state agencies pursuant to a 2008 Interagency Cooperative Agreement. Promote and support implementation of water quality projects across the state to reduce nitrate, phosphorus, and sediment loads.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Assist districts with demonstrated need in planning and implementation efforts in Nitrate Priority Areas to reduce nitrate contamination, as resources allow.
  - Benchmark: Conduct planning and implementation to meet responsibilities as outlined in the Cooperative Agreement and in coordination with the Idaho Agricultural Pollution Abatement Plan.
  - Benchmark: Deliver ~~quarterly~~ annual reports to ~~NRCS~~ Board on progress.

## 2.2.4 IDAHO AGRICULTURAL POLLUTION ABATEMENT PLAN.

Lead effort to update and maintain guidance document in support of control and abatement of agricultural non-point source pollution.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Update (every ten years) and m~~M~~aintain guidance documents in support of the control and abatement of agricultural non-point source pollution as resources allow.
  - Benchmark: ~~Research feasibility of~~ Secure funding and support to updating update the Agricultural Pollution Abatement Plan, and related Best Management Practices (BMP) Effectiveness Guide and report findings.
  - Benchmark: Provide training to staff on BMP Effectiveness Guide.
  - Benchmark: Convene BMP working group as needed.

## 2.2.5 IDAHO ONEPLAN.

Provide for the establishment and enhancement of Idaho OnePlan as a primary computer-based conservation planning process and repository for natural resource concerns.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Encourage and promote the use of OnePlan within Idaho.
  - Benchmark: Conduct annual Executive Committee meeting
- ~~Seek~~ Search for funding to create online enhancements.
  - Benchmark: Report to OnePlan Executive Committee and Conservation Commission Board on potential for enhancements, ongoing funding, and operation.

# DRAFT

- Benchmark: ~~Propose~~ Evaluate timing and consider update to statute for specific requirements for steering committee, etc. and ensure flexibility for continued participation and funding.

## 2.2.6 CARBON SEQUESTRATION.

Under Idaho statute, Conservation Commission is the lead agency for a currently inactive program related to carbon sequestration and greenhouse emission reductions associated with agricultural and forestry practices, management systems, and land uses occurring on cropland, forest land, and rangeland in Idaho.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Seek to identify potential funding sources.
  - Benchmark: Monitor ongoing carbon issues and determine feasibility of and funding for re-activating program.
  - Benchmark: Evaluate and consider proposing changes to Idaho Code to delete specific requirements for committee meetings and membership or reconvene planning group upon securing funding for program.

## 2.2.7 WATERSHED IMPROVEMENT DISTRICTS.

Oversee the creation and discontinuance of watershed improvement districts throughout the state.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Oversee creation and discontinuance of watershed improvement districts as provided for in statute.
  - Benchmark: As necessary, perform duties specified in statute for formation and dissolution of districts.

## GOAL #3: COMMUNICATION AND OUTREACH

Inform partners, local, state and federal agency officials and others about the Conservation Commission's mission. Develop beneficial intergovernmental and other relationships to maximize resources, funding, and streamline conservation delivery that is consistent with locally led, voluntary, and non-regulatory conservation plans and policies and harmonizes with regulatory efforts in an effort to meet statewide conservation goals. Educate local, state, and federal officials about Conservation Commission and partner efforts.

### OBJECTIVE 3.1 PARTNER PARTICIPATION

Engage districts and other partners in programs and activities. Seek to expand involvement in consideration and decision making. Disseminate information about services and activities of the Conservation Commission, encourage and increase district and public knowledge and participation in activities and processes.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Increase Conservation Commission transparency through greater ~~public~~ access.
  - Benchmark: Post online agendas, supporting documentation, and meeting minutes for Conservation Commission meetings

# DRAFT

- Benchmark: Where feasible, utilize live online video streaming and interactive stakeholder participation to increase district and public participation in meetings and processes.
- Disseminate information to encourage partner participation in planning processes.
  - Benchmark: Distribute meeting and activities announcements to our audience using Commission website, distribution lists, and social media accounts.

## OBJECTIVE 3.2 INTERNAL AND EXTERNAL COMMUNICATION

Inform and educate the public, partners, and others on Conservation Commission activities. Work with IASCD and the districts to publicize the successes of locally led voluntary, non-regulatory conservation efforts in Idaho.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Update Legislature and Executive Branch
  - Benchmark: Deliver annual reports to legislature germane committees, JFAC.
  - Benchmark: Deliver annual reports (performance measurements, etc.) to Governor
- Develop strategy for educating the public and other stakeholders about Conservation Commission activities.
  - Benchmark: ~~Prepare and implement communication plan.~~ Promote voluntary conservation during Conservation Commission's 75<sup>th</sup> Anniversary Year via monthly newsletters..
  - Benchmark: Conduct annual district and partner survey.
  - Benchmark: Maintain frequently ~~weekly~~ updated Facebook pages and posts on Twitter.
- Facilitate flow of information and communication with staff.
  - Benchmark: Distribute monthly activities summary/talking points to staff.
  - Benchmark: Hold annual All Staff meeting and trainings.

## OBJECTIVE 3.3 INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

Facilitate non-regulatory, voluntary, and locally-led conservation activities by and between local, state, and federal governments.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Work with partners
  - Benchmark: ~~Attend district meetings as resources allow~~ Identify potential new partnerships and resources.
  - Benchmark: Coordinate with NRCS State Engineer on approval authority issues; propose changes to Standards and Specifications.
  - Benchmark: Work with other state agencies regarding technical assistance and engineering on TMDLs, WQPA, RCRDP, Ground Water Priority Areas, etc.
- ~~Participate in natural resource groups and processes to focus attention on the roles, policies, and plans of the Conservation Commission and districts to attract partners and resources.~~
  - ~~Benchmark: Attend Environmental Forum and other similar meetings monthly.~~

# DRAFT

- Review federal, state, and local policies that are determined to impact the Conservation Commission and/or districts; review proposed and adopted plans, programs, environmental documents, activities and initiatives affecting conservation efforts.
  - Benchmark: Convene advisory group as needed.
  - Benchmark: Develop policies as needed.

## OBJECTIVE 3.4 COLLABORATION

Collaborate with stakeholders to conserve, sustain, improve, and enhance Idaho's private and public lands.

### PERFORMANCE MEASURES

- Collaborate with stakeholders including the Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts (IASCD), the Idaho District Employees Association (IDEA) to advance on the ground conservation in Idaho.
  - Benchmark: Attend IASCD meetings including: annual conference, spring and fall division meetings, and Board meetings, as requested.
  - Benchmark: Conduct annual district listening session to solicit input from partners.
- Collaborate with IDEA to advance and promote district employee training opportunities.
  - Benchmark: Assist IDEA with employee training opportunities, as requested.
- Collaborate with resource and agricultural production groups to disseminate information on Conservation Commission activities and conservation planning and implementation activities.
  - Benchmark: Attend other association meetings including Food Producers meetings weekly during legislative session.
  - Benchmark: Participate in natural resource groups and processes to focus attention on the roles, policies, and plans of the Conservation Commission and districts to attract partners and resources.
  - Benchmark: Attend Environmental Forum and other similar meetings monthly.
- Participate in, speak at, and attend field trips and tours, annual conferences, attend meetings, conferences, and other functions to represent the Conservation Commission and promote good stewardship of Idaho's natural resources.
  - Benchmark: Attend events as appropriate and present as requested.

DRAFT

---



SOIL & WATER  
CONSERVATION COMMISSION

established  
1939

*Conservation the Idaho Way:  
Sowing seeds of Stewardship*

C. L. "Butch" Otter, Governor

Richard "Dick" Bronson, Chair

David Radford, Vice Chair

Roger Stutzman, Secretary

Gerald Trebesch, Member

H. Norman Wright, Member

Teri Murrison, Administrator

IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
650 W. State Street, Rm. 145  
Boise, ID 83616 208-332-1790  
[www.swc.idaho.gov](http://www.swc.idaho.gov)



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

**ITEM #5**

**TO: Chairman Bronson and Commissioners Radford, Stutzman, Wright, and Trebesch**  
**FROM: Delwyne Trefz, District Support Services Specialist**  
**DATE: May 16, 2013**  
**RE: District Technical Assistance Requests**

As a result of constrained resources (human and financial) and the Conservation Commission’s statutory obligation to provide district support and conservation programs including TMDL Implementation Plans, your Board directed staff to undertake a collaborative process with district and IASCD representatives in order to balance our workload. Staff performed a comprehensive inventory of staff time available and came up with a Plan for equitable distribution of field staff time. A statewide Technical Assistance Work Group (TAWG) was appointed by Chairman Bronson and charged with:

1. Developing district request evaluation criteria, and
2. Developing a process to rank and recommend the allocation of our field staff efforts.

TAWG members included:

<u>Representing</u>	<u>Name</u>	<u>Position</u>
IASCD:.....	Bret Rumbeck.....	Executive Director
	Rick Rodgers.....	Division 4 Director
IDEA:.....	Karma Bragg.....	President
SWC Staff:.....	Teri Murrison.....	Administrator
	Chuck Pentzer.....	Technical Assistance Field Staff
Supervisor		
	Delwyne Trefz.....	District Support Services Specialist
SWC Commissioners:.....	Dick Bronson.....	Chair
	Roger Stutzman.....	Secretary
Panhandle Region:.....	Billie Brown.....	Benewah SWCD Chair
Clearwater Region:.....	Kyle Wilson.....	Nez Perce SWCD Treasurer
Southwest Region:.....	Julie Burkhardt.....	Adams SWCD Secretary
South Central Region:.....	Terry Halbert.....	North Side SWCD District Manager
Southeast Region:.....	Chris Wride.....	South Bingham SCD Chair
Northeast Region:.....	Matt Woodard.....	East Side SWCD Chair

The TAWG met 10 times in 2012 and developed criteria for district request evaluations and the process to help allocate available SWCC staff hours fairly among the 50 districts across the state. Their recommendation was presented to your Board last summer. Subsequent to district comments on the TAWG’s recommendation, several changes were proposed including replacing the statewide district request evaluation committee with regional review committees, 1 per Division. Your Board approved the TAWG recommendations including the change to regional review committees, the process, and the criteria for evaluation as recommended by the TAWG.



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

Each division selected representatives to serve on regional evaluation committees (see ranking sheets containing participants' names, attached). The committees received copies of district requests and criteria ranking sheets. Staff met with several of the committees to assist them.

## DISTRICT REQUESTS FOR FY2014 SWCC ASSISTANCE

Number of districts requesting SWCC assistance	39
Number of individual projects districts request help with	123
Requested SWCC staff hours, total statewide	13,035
Available SWCC staff hours, total statewide	11,520
Additional SWCC staff hours necessary to provide all requested assistance	1,515

This table illustrates why it is necessary for us to use careful planning in order to allocate our limited staff hours efficiently and effectively.

Staff had a productive and amicable meeting with IASCD Board members Kit Tillotson, Billie Brown, and Steve Becker last month to discuss the technical assistance process. They communicated concerns with the process and among their comments were: the process pits districts against each other, it's bureaucratic, the review should be done by a statewide ranking committee, the Commission should do the review and ranking, requests should be peer reviewed by partner agencies, our staff needs to be better educated on the process, and we need to do more outreach on the process. They requested a "compromise", however Administrator Murrison explained because the Board directed we use the existing process, staff would be happy to meet with them to review how things worked (or didn't) in July and to consider and document for the Board necessary changes at that time.

In addition to that review with IASCD, the statewide TAWG will reconvene in July to consider improvements to the process and evaluation criteria. The results of both reviews will be presented to your Board in August.

As you will see, most committees' rankings conform to the TAWG recommended and Board approved process (see committee recommendations attached), however Division 2 submitted a recommendation initially utilizing the adopted ranking process, but later requested we use an alternate process. Two committees did not utilize the adopted process (Divisions 2 and 5).

Attached is a copy of an email received from IASCD President Kit Tillotson (Division 5) which states:

*"In reviewing the amount of time that districts have requested of commission staff it appears that division 2 and 5 are the only areas that will be short of what they requested. If i am reading the reportt right it looks to me like there is 1668 hrs of available staff time around the state that wasnt requested by districts.*

*It would go a long ways with districts if the commission would restructure TMDL work loads away from div 2 and 5 in the amount of those hours and distribute the available hours that wasnt requested back to the districts that where not able to receive assistance for the total amount requested."*



## Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

[www.swc.idaho.gov](http://www.swc.idaho.gov)

This information is provided for your review and comment and to inform your direction to staff. The ranking recommendations have been distributed to conservation district supervisors and staff via email and their feedback has been solicited.

**ACTION:** For information only

**Attachments:** Copies of the evaluation committee's request rankings.

**REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE HANDLED ACCORDING TO THE TAWG-DEVELOPED PROCESS****REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE NOT REQUIRED TO BE RANKED****--MORE SWCC STAFF HOURS AVAILABLE THAN REQUESTED****DIVISION 1 REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE**

EVAL TEAM RANKING	DISTRICT	PROJECT	HOURS REQUESTED
N/A	BENEWAH SWCD	Comp Assistance	120
N/A	BONNER SWCD	District Meeting Attendance	20
N/A	BONNER SWCD	TMDL Issues	40
N/A	BONNER SWCD	Forestry Contest	10
N/A	KOOTENAI-SHOSHONE SWCD	Attend Mtngs, Grant Prop CA	350
N/A	KOOTENAI-SHOSHONE SWCD	Wolf Lodge Creek Engineering	100
N/A	KOOTENAI-SHOSHONE SWCD	Up Coeur d'Alene River Design Eng.	100
<b>TOTAL HOURS REQUESTED</b>			<b>740</b>
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Mark			700
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Bill			413
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SWCC STAFF HOURS</b>			<b>1113</b>

**REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE HANDLED ACCORDING TO THE TAWG-DEVELOPED PROCESS****REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE NOT REQUIRED TO BE RANKED  
--MORE SWCC STAFF HOURS AVAILABLE THAN REQUESTED****DIVISION 6 REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE**

EVAL TEAM RANKING	DISTRICT	PROJECT	HOURS REQUESTED
N/A	CLARK SCD	Comprehensive Assistance	28
N/A	EAST SIDE SWCD	Comprehensive Assistance	16
N/A	JEFFERSON SWCD	Comprehensive Assistance	24
N/A	MADISON SWCD	Comprehensive Assistance	24
N/A	TETON SCD	Brd Mtng Attendance CA	20
N/A	TETON SCD	RCRDP Loan Apps Cons Plans, TA	80
N/A	WEST SIDE SWCD	Brd Mtng Attendance CA	16
N/A	WEST SIDE SWCD	CIG Cover Crop Project TA	80
<b>TOTAL HOURS REQUESTED</b>			<b>288</b>
Avalable SWCC Staff Hours -- Brian			450
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Rob			86
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Allan			400
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SWCC STAFF HOURS</b>			<b>936</b>

**REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE HANDLED ACCORDING TO THE TAWG-DEVELOPED PROCESS****DIVISION 2 EVALUATION COMMITTEE RANKING OF REQUESTS (see RECOMMENDATION, below)**

EVAL TEAM	DISTRICT	PROJECT	HOURS
1	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP02 Stream Inventory TA	600
2	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP04 Construction Inspection TA	225
2	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP09 Watershed Plan Develop. TA	400
2	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP10 Cons Plan Writing TA	360
3	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP06 Tech Rpt Writing TA	160
4	IDAHO SWCD	Current Projects TA	600
5	LEWIS SCD	Current Project Conservation TA	960
6	CLEARWATER SWCD	Dip Pond Design	334
	CLEARWATER SWCD	4th Grade Earth Day	16
	IDAHO SWCD	New Grant Proposal Writing CA	40
	IDAHO SWCD	Training New District Staff CA	240
	LEWIS SCD	Grant Writing CA	40
	LEWIS SCD	8th Grade Field Day CA	16
	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP01 Engineering	1200
	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP03 Lapwai Cr Streambank Engineer	24
	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP05 Construcion Oversight Engineer	160
	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP07 Education Awareness Day CA	24
	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP08 Camp Wittman Instructor CA	16
	NEZ PERCE SWCD	NP11 Engineering Training, Engineer	24
<b>TOTAL HOURS REQUESTED</b>			<b>5439</b>
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Eileen			1050
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Bill			413
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SWCC STAFF HOURS</b>			<b>1463</b>

**DIVISION 2 EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

DISTRICT	PERCENTAGE OF AVAILABLE STAFF HOURS ALLOCATED TO DISTRICTS	
	EILEEN	BILL
CLEARWATER SWCD	10% (105 hrs)	6.7% (27.7 hrs)
IDAHO SWCD	45% (472.5 hrs)	6.7% (27.7 hrs)
LEWIS SCD	45% (472.5 hrs)	6.7% (27.7 hrs)
NEZ PERCE SWCD	0%	80% (330 hrs)
TOTAL	100% (1050 hrs)	100% (413 hrs)

**DIVISION 2 EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS MET**

Bruce Hanson --Clearwater SWCD  
Tom Gehring -- Idaho SWCD  
Eric Hasselstrom -- Lewis SCD  
Kyle Wilson -- Nez Perce SWCD

The committee met on April 29 in Craigmont.  
Delwyne participated via phone.

**REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE HANDLED ACCORDING TO THE TAWG-DEVELOPED PROCESS****DIVISION 4 EVALUATION COMMITTEE RANKING OF REQUESTS**

EVAL TEAM RANKING	DISTRICT	PROJECT	HOURS REQUESTED
1	MINIDOKA SWCD	Tech Assistance	100
2	BALANCED ROCK SCD	Ground Water Project	120
2	EAST CASSIA SWCD	Marsh Cr Riparian Restoratation TA	120
2	WOOD RIVER SWCD	Comprehensive Assistance	80
3	BALANCED ROCK SCD	CCPI Project	80
3	EAST CASSIA SWCD	Cassia Co. NPA CCPI TA	100
3	SNAKE RIVER SWCD	Tech Assistance	80
3	TWIN FALLS SWCD	Tech Assistance	80
4	WEST CASSIA SWCD	Tech Assistance	120
5	NORTH SIDE SWCD	Comprehensive Assistance	40
<b>TOTAL HOURS REQUESTED</b>			<b>920</b>
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Chuck			370
Avalable SWCC Staff Hours -- Carolyn			360
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Rob			344
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Allan			400
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SWCC STAFF HOURS</b>			<b>1474</b>

**DIVISION 4 EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Rick Rodgers -- Balanced Rock SCD

Kevin Dugan -- Camas SCD

The committee met on April 24 in Twin Falls.

Delwyne participated via video conference.

**REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE RANKED ACCORDING REGIONAL PRIORITIES AS DEFINED BY THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**DIVISION 3 EVALUATION COMMITTEE RANKING OF REQUESTS**

EVAL TEAM RANKING	DISTRICT	PROJECT	HOURS REQUESTED
1 CA	ADAMS SWCD	Proj 2--new Weiser River 319	56
1 CA	CANYON SCD	Grant Writing Training CA	84
1 CA	GEM SWCD	New 319 Grant Writing CA	80
1 CA	OWYHEE CD	Brd Mtng Attendance CA	12
1 CA	PAYETTE SWCD	Current & Future 319 Grant TA	60
1 CA	SQUAW CREEK SCD	Grant Writing CA	40
2 CA	ADAMS SWCD	Proj 3--New Meadows City	16
2 CA	CANYON SCD	Capacity Building CA	42
2 CA	CANYON SCD	Legal Issues Training CA	42
2 CA	WEISER RIVER SCD	Comprehensive Assistance	90
3 CA	ADA SWCD	Comprehensive Assistance	88
3 CA	ADAMS SWCD	Proj 4--Existing grant admin training	20
3 CA	CANYON SCD	Comp Dist Training CA	131
3 CA	ELMORE SWCD	Attend Board Mtngs CA	46
1 TA	ADAMS SWCD	Proj 1--existing 319	180
1 TA	CANYON SCD	Educate on Lake Lowell TMDL TA	26
1 TA	CANYON SCD	Lake Lowell 319 Grant Prep TA	84
1 TA	ELMORE SWCD	Cold Springs Creek 319 Project TA	137
1 TA	GEM SWCD	Current 319 Grant TA	100
1 TA	OWYHEE CD	Grant Proposal Development TA	80
1 TA	PAYETTE SWCD	Current 319 Grant TA	110
1 TA	SQUAW CREEK SCD	BMP Installation & Monitoring TA	40
1 TA	VALLEY SWCD	319 Project TA	200
2 TA	CANYON SCD	Wilder Irr. Dist Collaboration TA	42
2 TA	CANYON SCD	CO-OP Central Collaboration TA	42
3 TA	CANYON SCD	IWS Wetland Nutrient Trading TA	26
3 TA	CANYON SCD	Complex Irrigation TA	26
<b>TOTAL HOURS REQUESTED</b>			<b>1900</b>
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Loretta			830
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Jason			750
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Bill			413
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SWCC STAFF HOURS</b>			<b>1993</b>

**DIVISION 3 EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Julie Burkhardt -- Adams SWCD

Mike Sommerville -- Canyon SCD

Chuck Kiester -- OCD

Art Beal -- Squaw Creek SCD

The committee met on April 29 in Emmett.

Delwyne participated in person.

**REQUESTS FOR ASSISTANCE RANKED ACCORDING TO REGIONAL PRIORITIES AS DEFINED BY THE EVALUATION COMMITTEE**

**DIVISION 5 EVALUATION COMMITTEE RANKING OF REQUESTS (see RECOMMENDATION below)**

EVAL TEAM RANKING	DISTRICT	PROJECT	HOURS REQUESTED
1	CENTRAL BINGHAM CD	Comprehensive Assistance	40
1	POWER SCD	Comprehensive Assistance	35
1	SOUTH BINGHAM SCD	Technical Assistance	13
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	New ECC Grant	80
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	Ovid Stream Restoration	86
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	New BOR Grant	163
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	New 319 Grant	166
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	319 Grant--PBJ Diversion	66
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	319 Grant--PBJ Diversion	85
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	DEQ Grant Tour	6.5
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	District Project Tour	11.5
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	New 319 Grant Application	104.5
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	6th Grade School Days	8.5
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	ECC Grant	44.5
1	BEAR LAKE SWCD	New BOR Project Application	123
1	CARIBOU SCD	Bear/Whiskey 319 Grant TA	43
1	CARIBOU SCD	Upper Blackfoot 319 Grant TA	32.5
1	CARIBOU SCD	Bear/Whiskey 319 Grant Engineering	62
1	CARIBOU SCD	Cub Scout Day Camp CA	16
1	CARIBOU SCD	319 Project Apps CA	44
1	CARIBOU SCD	New BOR Project Application TA	128
1	CARIBOU SCD	New BOR Project Application CA	42
1	CARIBOU SCD	5th & 6th Grade School Days CA	36
1	CARIBOU SCD	SRF 319 Trout Creek Project TA	58
1	CARIBOU SCD	SRF 319 Trout Creek Project Engineer	153
1	CARIBOU SCD	Up Blackfoot River 319 Engineering	124
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	New Cub River Project Engineering	124
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	Cub River 319 Grant Application CA	81
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	Station Creek 319 Proj Engineering	176
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	Station Creek 319 Proj TA	123
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	BOR Consolidated Irr. Hydro TA	41
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	New BOR Weston Cr Project CA	41
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	BOR Planning - Cons. & Riverdale TA	41
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	Cub R. Water Dist Measuring TA	43
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	Franklin Cul. Water Coalition TA	44
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	ECC Project CA	46
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	5th Grade School Days CA	35
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	8th Grade School Days CA	21

1	FRANKLIN SWCD	Alternative HS Ecology Class CA	43
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	SRF Mound Valley Project Engineering	84
1	FRANKLIN SWCD	SRF Mound Valley TA	130
1	ONEIDA SWCD	Wide Hollow 319 Engineering	165
1	ONEIDA SWCD	Wide Hollow 319 TA	140
1	ONEIDA SWCD	FFA Workshop CA	24
1	ONEIDA SWCD	Educational Workshops CA	24
1	ONEIDA SWCD	RCRDP I&E CA	46
1	PORTNEUF SWCD	Pebble Cr. 319 Project	150
1	PORTNEUF SWCD	SRF Grant Topaz-Mid Portneuf Project	332
<b>TOTAL HOURS REQUESTED</b>			<b>3725</b>
Avialable SWCC Staff Hours -- Carolyn			240
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Steven			830
Available SWCC Staff Hours -- Allan			400
<b>TOTAL AVAILABLE SWCC STAFF HOURS</b>			<b>2083</b>

#### **DIVISION 5 EVALUATION COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION**

The evaluation team calculated that if each request for TA was awarded 65% of the hours requested, each request for CA received 10% of the request, and each request for engineering received 25%, SWCC staff time would be allocated equitably across Division 5.

#### **DIVISION 5 EVALUATION COMMITTEE MEMBERS**

Jennifer Jenson -- Bear Lake SWCD

Darwin Josephson -- Caribou SCD

Merlin Gleeds -- Franklin SWCD

Kevin Koester -- Portneuf SWCD

Chris Wride -- South Bingham SCD

The committee met on April 10 and April 22.

Delwyne did not participate in either meeting.



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332:1790 • Fax: 208-332:1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

**ITEM #7a**

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON AND COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**  
**FROM: TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR**  
**DATE: MAY 3, 2013**  
**RE: FINAL REPORT ON NRCS CTA AGREEMENT CONSERVATION ACTIVITIES**

The attached final report was submitted for NRCS Partnership Agreement No. 65-0211-09-015, an agreement for cooperation between NRCS and SWCC on activities in Idaho High Nitrate Priority Areas. It involved implementation of conservation practices on eligible lands through the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI).

## **Deliverables:**

During the duration of the Project, SWCC:

1. Provided conservation planning and engineering technical assistance to plan and implement conservation practices to improve ground and surface water quality in four of Idaho's highest priority water quality impaired watersheds: Jump Creek Succor Creek (TMDL Implementation Project), Twin Falls Nitrate Priority Area, and Cassia-Minidoka Nutrient and Water Management Project Area. Conservation planning technical assistance has also been provided to landowners on the Lower Payette and Squaw Creek rivers to address TMDL concerns of sediment, bacteria, temperature, nutrients, habitat, and flow alteration.
2. Provided water quality resource specialists and engineering expertise where necessary in 4 locations, provided technical assistance directly to landowners to develop conservation plans and survey, design, and certify conservation practices that provide treatment for water quality resource concerns.
3. Collaborated with participating Soil Conservation Districts on outreach strategies;
4. Provided the following partner contributions in terms of funds, office space, equipment, etc. in federal FY 2012 (Q1-4) and Q1 of FY 2013: a. Salaries for Water Quality Planners for project areas \$ 308,048

*(Includes Monitoring Conservation Practice Effectiveness, Follow-up)*

b. Vehicles, gas & maintenance	13,691
c. Office Space	7,769
d. Office Supplies	<u>127</u>
Total Partner Contributions for all Projects	\$ 337,259

The attached report contains specific project outcomes in the Jump and Succor Creek, Twin Falls and Cassia-Minidoka, and Lower Payette River/Squaw Creek TMDL Concerns Project areas.

SWCC has received payment in full of \$80,000 under this Agreement.

**ACTION:** For information only

**Attachment:** NRCS #68—02111-053 Final CTA Report

# FEDERAL FY 2011-12

NRCS #68-021111-053  
FINAL CTA Report



Prepared by:

Idaho Soil & Water

Conservation Commission

3/29/2013

This final report is submitted by the Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission (SWC) in conformity with NRCS Partnership Agreement No. 65-0211-09-015, an agreement to establish a framework for cooperation between NRCS and SWC on activities in Idaho High Nitrate Priority Areas that involve implementation of conservation practices on eligible lands through provisions of the Cooperative Conservation Partnership Initiative (CCPI).

This report documents SWC accomplishments and outlines goals pursuant to achieving project objectives as stipulated in Section IV-B (1-9) of the Agreement.

**Deliverables:**

During the duration of the Project, SWCC has:

1. Provided conservation planning and engineering technical assistance to plan and implement conservation practices to improve ground and surface water quality in four of Idaho’s highest priority water quality impaired watersheds: Jump Creek Succor Creek (TMDL Implementation Project), Twin Falls Nitrate Priority Area, and Cassia-Minidoka Nutrient and Water Management Project Area. Conservation planning technical assistance has also been provided to landowners on the Lower Payette and Squaw Creek rivers to address TMDL concerns of sediment, bacteria, temperature, nutrients, habitat, and flow alteration.
2. Provided water quality resource specialists and engineering expertise where necessary in 4 locations, provided technical assistance directly to landowners to develop conservation plans and survey, design, and certify conservation practices that provide treatment for water quality resource concerns.
3. Collaborated with participating Soil Conservation Districts on outreach strategies;
4. Provided the following partner contributions in terms of funds, office space, equipment, etc. in federal FY 2012 (Q1-4) and Q1 of FY 2013:

a. Salaries for Water Quality Planners for project areas <i>(Includes Monitoring Conservation Practice Effectiveness, Follow-up)</i>	\$ 308,048
b. Vehicles, gas & maintenance	13,691
c. Office Space	7,769
d. Office Supplies	<u>127</u>
Total Partner Contributions for all Projects	\$ 337,259

5. Submitted financial accrual reports.
6. Submitted written progress reports to Technical contact as well as Grants and Agreements Specialist showing activities performed supporting implementation of NRCS programs.
7. Submitted SF-270 Request for Reimbursement Form (10/3/2012).
8. Submitted SF 3881, ACH Vendor Sign-Up Form.
9. Submitted Federal Financial Report form SF-425 with final payment request and this serves as the final project report addressing items such as comparison of actual accomplishments with

established goals, reasons why goals may not have been met, cost overruns, and other pertinent information.

Accomplishments specific to the above deliverables are detailed below by Project Area.

## JUMP CREEK, SUCCOR CREEK TMDL CONCERN PROJECT OUTCOMES

**Deliverables:** Implement conservation planning and engineering technical assistance to plan and implement conservation practices to improve ground and surface water quality..

1. Outreach with 77 landowners on 7257 acres, and provide conservation planning and survey, design, and certify practices.
2. Practices will include Nutrient Management, Irrigation Water Management, Crop Rotation Systems, Surface and Sub-surface Irrigation Systems, Sediment Basins, and Channel Stabilization.
3. Participating Conservation Districts will assist with outreach by utilizing district newsletters, direct mailing to the 77 landowners, public meetings and press releases in the local newspaper.

### Final Overall Project Outcomes

Jump Creek, Succor Creek TMDL Concerns Project Deliverables	Completed	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Outreach with 77 landowners on 7,257 acres,</li> <li>• provide conservation planning, survey, design, and certify practices (including nutrient mgmt., irrigation water mgmt., crop rotation systems, surface &amp; sub-surface irrigation systems, sediment basins, and channel stabilization)</li> </ul>	See ATTACHMENT A	SWCC’s roles were reduced as a result of decreased federal funding for projects, demand, and intermittent NRCS and SWCC staffing issues. During 2009 and 2010 there were \$209,456 and \$204,783 in CCPI cost-share funds, and the field office was operating short-handed. Consequently, SWCC staff performed all conservation planning work. In 2011, the vacant D.C. position was filled and CCPI funding dropped to \$150,643. SWCC involvement was minimal that year because the vacant NRCS position was filled and CCPI projects were used to train new staff. Also in 2011, funding dropped to \$150,643 and to \$123,451 in 2012. NRCS’ budget reductions resulted in fewer projects and reduced related workload for SWCC staff. SWCC had an open position for a time in 2011/12 and a period of training to bring the new WQRC up to speed.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation District outreach (newsletters, press releases, public meetings, direct mailings to 77 landowners)</li> </ul>		

## TWIN FALLS TMDL CONCERNS PROJECT OUTCOMES

**Deliverables:** Implement conservation planning and engineering technical assistance to plan and implement conservation practices to improve ground and surface water quality..

1. SWCC employees will identify 3,000 priority acres in the Twin Falls Nitrate Area. Technical assistance will include conservation planning and conservation practice design/checkout/certification on irrigated cropland. Practices will include High Intensity Nutrient Management-590, High Intensity Irrigation Water Management-449, Crop Rotation Systems, Surface and Sub-surface Irrigation Systems.
2. Participating Conservation Districts will conduct outreach utilizing district newsletters, press releases in the local newspapers, public meetings, and direct mailing to producers within the targeted watersheds. Outreach and technical assistance will guide landowners to apply and participate in the EQIP, CCPI, and AWEP programs.
3. All conservation plans will be entered into ToolKit and progress will be reported in Performance Results System (PRS).

### Final Overall Project Outcomes

Twin Falls TMDL Concerns Project Deliverables	Completed	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Identify 3,000 priority acres</li> <li>provide conservation planning, practice design/checkout/cert. on irrigated cropland (incl. high intensity irrigation water mgmt.-449, crop rotation systems, surface &amp; subsurface irrigation systems)</li> </ul>	<p>X</p> <p>X</p>	<p>This project is still in progress. As of 4/8/2013, 1273 acres involving 4 producers are contracted for High Intensity Nutrient Management (590) and High Intensity Irrigation Water Management (449). An additional 800 acres will be contracted by 6/7/2013. One more signup will be offered during the next fiscal year, so it is anticipated the goal of treating 3000 acres will be attained. Personnel from SWCC and NRCS have worked together on conservation planning, practice design, and certification.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservation District outreach focusing on EQIP, AWEP, CCPI (newsletters, press releases, public meetings, direct mailings,</li> </ul>	<p>X</p>	<p>As mentioned above, this is an ongoing project. To date the Conservation Districts have conducted grower workshops and public meetings and have sent direct mailings to producers reporting on details and progress of the CCPI project.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Conservation Plans entered into ToolKit</li> </ul>	<p>X</p>	<p>Five plans have been entered into Toolkit as of 4/8/2013, and four more plans will be entered into Toolkit before 6/7/2013.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Progress reported in Performance Results System (PRS)</li> </ul>	<p>X</p>	<p>Progress has been reported as "Applied" for 3 contracts, with an additional 2 contracts being reported as "Planned." Once the additional four plans are entered into Toolkit, they will also be reported as "Planned."</p>

## CASSIA-MINIDOKA TMDL CONCERNS PROJECT OUTCOMES

**Deliverables:** Implement conservation planning and engineering technical assistance to plan and implement conservation practices to improve ground and surface water quality..

4. SWCC employees will identify 4,000 priority acres in the Cassia-Minidoka Nitrate Area. Technical assistance will include conservation planning and conservation practice design/checkout/certification on irrigated cropland.
5. Practices will include High Intensity Nutrient Management-590, High Intensity Irrigation Water Management-449, Crop Rotation Systems, Surface and Sub-surface Irrigation Systems.
6. Participating Conservation Districts will conduct outreach utilizing district newsletters, press releases in the local newspapers, public meetings, and direct mailing to producers within the targeted watersheds. Outreach and technical assistance will guide landowners to apply and participate in the EQIP, CCPI, and AWEP programs.
7. All conservation plans will be entered into ToolKit and progress will be reported in Performance Results System (PRS).

### Final Overall Project Outcomes

Cassia-Minidoka TMDL Concerns Project Deliverables	Completed	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify 4,000 priority acres</li> <li>• provide conservation planning, practice design/checkout/cert. on irrigated cropland (incl. high intensity irrigation water mgmt.-449, crop rotation systems, surface &amp; subsurface irrigation systems)</li> </ul>	X	This project is still in progress. As of 4/8/2013 1481 acres involving 7 producers are contracted for Nutrient Management-Precision Ag (590) and High Intensity Irrigation Water Management (449). An additional 106 acres will be contracted for the above practices by 6/7/2013, and 5581 acres will be contracted for Nutrient Management-Precision Ag (590) by 6/7/2013. One more signup will be offered during the next fiscal year, so the goal of treating 4000 acres will be surpassed. SWCC and NRCS personnel have completed conservation planning, practice design, and certification.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation District outreach focusing on EQIP, AWEP, CCPI (newsletters, press releases, public meetings, direct mailings,</li> </ul>	X	The Conservation Districts offered a grower workshop. They have also sent direct mailings to producers reporting on details and progress of the CCPI projects. Producers have been recognized in awards banquets (with coverage in the local newspapers). The project has been advertised at county fairs and NRCS field offices with a brochure published by the Conservation Districts.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation Plans entered into ToolKit</li> </ul>	X	Seven plans have been entered into Toolkit, and two more plans will be entered into Toolkit before 6/7/2013.
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Progress reported in Performance Results System (PRS)</li> </ul>	X	Progress has been reported as "Applied" for 4 contracts, with an additional 3 contracts reported as "Planned."

## LOWER PAYETTE RIVER/SQUAW CREEK TMDL CONCERNS PROJECT OUTCOMES

**Deliverables:** Implement conservation planning and engineering technical assistance to plan and implement conservation practices to improve ground and surface water quality in what are among Idaho’s highest priority water quality impaired watersheds.

1. SWC employees will provide technical assistance to the landowners on the Lower Payette and Squaw Creek rivers to address TMDL concerns of sediment, bacteria, temperature, nutrients, habitat, and flow alteration. 28 landowners will be targeted to install practices.
2. Practices include Irrigation Water Management (449), Irrigation Systems (442, 443), Irrigation Water Conveyance (430, 430), Pumping Plant (533), Structure for Water Control (587), Nutrient Management (590), Watering Facility (614), Pasture and Hayland Planting (512), Livestock Pipeline (614), and Fence (382).
3. Participating Conservation Districts will assist with outreach by utilizing district newsletters, direct mailing to landowners, public meetings, and press releases in the local newspaper.

### Final Overall Project Outcomes

Lower Payette River/ Squaw Creek TMDL Concerns Project Deliverables	Completed	Comments
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• provide technical assistance to landowners on the Lower Payette and Squaw Creek rivers to address TMDL concerns of sediment, bacteria, temperature, nutrients, habitat, and flow alteration</li> <li>• Target 28 landowners to install practices (including irrigation water management (449), irrigation systems (442, 443), irrigation water conveyance (430, 430), pumping plant (533), structure for water control (587), nutrient management (590), watering facility (614), pasture and hayland planting (512), and fence (382).</li> </ul>	X	Technical assistance was provided to 25 landowners within the Lower Payette River and Squaw Creek areas. Projects addressed TMDL concerns of sediment and bacteria and treated 423 acres.
	X	<p>28 Landowners were targeted and participated in the Lower Payette River/Squaw Creek CCPI program. Technical assistance was provided to 25 landowners, BMPs installed include: Irrigation Systems (442,443), Irrigation Water Conveyance (430), Pumping Plant (533), Structure for Water Control (587), Irrigation Water Management (449), Nutrient Management (590), Watering Facility (614), Livestock Pipeline (516), Fence (382) and Pasture Planting (512).</p> <p>Technical assistance was not provided on two projects due to a conflict in interest, a third project was planned by the Soil Conservationist in the Emmett Office.</p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conservation District outreach (newsletters, press releases, public meetings, direct mailings)</li> </ul>	<u>X</u>	CCPI information and accomplishments were provided to the Gem and Squaw Creek SWCD’s to include in their District newsletters.

**ATTACHMENT A: JUMP CREEK, SUCCOR CREEK CCPI**

**2009 - 2012 Overall Accomplishments**

Practice/BMP	2009			2010			2011			2012			TOTAL	
	Units	CCPI \$	Producer \$	Units	CCPI \$	Producer \$	Units	CCPI \$	Producer \$	Units	CCPI \$	Producer \$	Units	\$
Fence	1,961 ft	\$4,969	\$1,656	4,210 ft	\$6,837	\$2,279				5,815 ft	\$7,851	\$2,617	11,986 ft	\$26,209
Gated Pipe	920 ft	\$4,541	\$1,514										920 ft	\$6,055
Irrig. Land Leveling	5.6 ac	\$5,016	\$1,672										5.6 ac	\$6,688
Irrig. Water Management	15 ac	\$125	\$42	15 ac	\$110	\$37	149 ac	\$1,018	\$339	77 ac	\$576	\$192	256 ac	\$2,439
Livestock Pipeline	1,349 ft	\$3,525	\$1,175	250 ft	\$450	\$150				2,805 ft	\$4,909	\$1,636	4,404 ft	\$11,845
Livestock Watering Facility	4 each	\$2,607	\$869	1 each	\$820	\$273				2 each	\$2,420	\$807	7 each	\$7,796
Pasture/Hayland Planting	41.3 ac	\$5,917	\$1,972	8.4 ac	\$918	\$306				9 ac	\$444	\$148	58.7 ac	\$9,705
Irr. Water Conveyance	8,378 ft	\$130,812	\$43,604	15,628 ft	\$168,812	\$56,270	11,620 ft	\$40,679	\$13,560	4,020 ft	\$12,737	\$4,246	39,646 ft	\$470,720
Pumping Plant	2 each	\$3,693	\$1,231	2 each	\$3,280	\$1,093	4 each	\$24,975	\$8,325	2 each	\$6,875	\$2,292	10 each	\$51,764
Sediment Basin	1 each	\$2,107	\$702										1 each	\$2,809
Structure for Water Control	13 each	\$34,521	\$11,507	14 each	\$14,990	\$4,997	5 each	\$6,940	\$2,313	15 ft	\$5,820	\$1,940	47 ft	\$83,028
Irrigation System, Sprinkler	15 ac.	\$11,623	\$3,874	15 ac	\$6,509	\$2,170	149 ac	\$76,596	\$25,532	77 ac	\$81,462	\$27,154	256 ac	\$234,920
Nutrient Management				15 ac	\$86	\$29	88 ac	\$435	\$145	53 ac	\$258	\$86	156 ac	\$1,039
Prescribed Grazing				25 ac	\$1,602	\$534				15 ac	\$99	\$33	40 ac	\$2,268
Access Control				32 ac	\$369	\$123							32 ac	\$492
<b>TOTAL:</b>		<b>\$209,456</b>	<b>\$69,818</b>		<b>\$204,783</b>	<b>\$68,261</b>		<b>\$150,643</b>	<b>\$50,214</b>		<b>\$123,451</b>	<b>\$41,150</b>		<b>\$917,776</b>



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332-1790 • Fax: 208-332-1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

## Item 7b

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON, COMMISSIONERS STUTZMAN, RADFORD, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**

**FROM: TERRY HOEBELHEINRICH, LOAN OFFICER**

**DATE: MAY 6, 2013**

**RE: RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND RANGELAND DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM UPDATE**

Since your last meeting, the following activities have conducted by staff:

Marketing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Met with Teton SCD staff and engineer regarding BPA Variable Frequency Drive (VFD) projects</li></ul>
District Incentives Proposal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Researched other state commission options</li></ul>
RCRDP Financial Report	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• March 2013 report (attached)</li></ul>
New Loan Activity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Approved two applications</li><li>• \$8,100, 7 years, 2.5% for irrigation equipment, Twin Falls County</li><li>• \$45,000, 7 years, 2.5% for irrigation equipment, Gem County</li><li>• One \$30,000 application is in process</li><li>• 1 loan inquiry have been received since last update</li></ul>
Loan Servicing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• One request to assume a mortgage is being reviewed</li></ul>
Delinquencies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 2 delinquencies, with details to be provided in executive session</li></ul>

**ACTION:** For information only.

Attachment:

- RCRDP Financial Report March 2013



# Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

650 W. State St., Room 145 • Boise Idaho 83702

Telephone: 208-332-1790 • Fax: 208-332-1799

www.swc.idaho.gov

## Item 7c

**TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON, COMMISSIONERS STUTZMAN, RADFORD, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**

**FROM: TERRY HOEBELHEINRICH, LOAN OFFICER**

**DATE: MAY 6, 2013**

**RE: UPATED PROPOSED RCRDP POLICY GUIDELINES FOR SECOND MORTGAGES**

Based on Commission input at the April 11, 2013 meeting, the following guidelines have been drafted to provide guidance to staff in implementing existing SWCC policy.

Existing SWCC Policy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A second mortgage on real property may be utilized at the discretion of the Commission</li><li>• Total debt on pledged real property will not exceed seventy percent (70%) of the current market value of the collateral</li></ul>
DRAFT Guidelines	<p>The Commission <u>may</u> consider the following factors when reviewing a loan application with a second mortgage.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• First mortgage is no larger than twice the amount of our loan</li><li>• First mortgage balance does not exceed \$100,000</li><li>• Written verification of first mortgage balance and terms</li><li>• Real estate property with broad appeal and good marketability</li><li>• Additional collateral such as chattels with first lien position or purchase money security interest</li><li>• High credit scores, generally 750 or higher</li><li>• Strong cash flow, good margins after debt service, usually 20% or more.</li><li>• Low to moderate debt loads<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Strong working capital</li><li>• 2:1 or more current ratio</li><li>• 50% or less total debt to asset</li></ul></li></ul>

Though it is not required that the Board take action on guidelines, staff appreciates Board review and comments prior to their finalization.

**RECOMMENDED ACTION:** For review and comment