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 #6

TO: **Chairman Bronson and Commissioners Radford, Stutzman, Wright, and Trebesch**
FROM: **Delwyne Trefz, District Support Services Specialist**
DATE: **August 1, 2012**
RE: **TAWG Recommendations**

During their July 24, 2012 teleconference, members of the Technical Assistance Work Group (TAWG) agreed to forward to the commission their recommendations related to how district requests for assistance are evaluated, prioritized, and serviced by the commission. TAWG members developed the recommendations during 10 meetings held over the course of the last 4 months and staff very much appreciates the time and expertise that each TAWG member invested in the process.

During your meeting, staff will distribute the form to be used by districts to request technical assistance and present any staff proposed modifications to the attached TAWG recommendation.

After your review and discussion, there will follow a comment period to obtain general district input on the recommendation. On August 29th, your Board will consider those comments and adopt a Technical Assistance Review Process to guide staff in the award of scarce technical assistance resources in FY 2013.

ACTION: For information only

Attachments: TAWG Recommendations

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE WORK GROUP RECOMMENDATIONS

INTRODUCTION

As the technical assistance work group (TAWG) submits the following recommendations to the commission it wants to stress that the processes and tools it is recommending are a work in progress. As the commission moves towards adoption and implementation of this process the need to revise or modify specifics aspects of the process will most certainly become apparent. Thus, as important as any of the rest of these recommendations is the recommendation that both the overall strategy and the ranking tool be reviewed periodically and modified whenever doing so will improve the process.

Specific to the ongoing review and revision of this process, the TAWG recommends that, following the completion of the first cycle of this process during the Spring of 2013, the process be subjected to a thorough review by the current TAWG members in order to identify what is working well, and what needs revision. Thereafter, the process should be reviewed on an annually, and more frequently whenever the occurrence of procedural problems warrants.

BACKGROUND

In March of 2012 the Idaho Soil and Water Conservation Commission (SWC) convened the TAWG and tasked it with developing recommendations related to how district requests for technical assistance are evaluated, prioritized, and serviced by SWC.

Specifically, the TAWG was established to develop and recommend:

- An overall strategy to guide the equitable allocation of TA over time.
- A ranking tool which SWC can use to objectively prioritize annual district TA needs requests from across the state.

The TAWG is comprised of the following nine voting members. Each member was appointed by SWC Commission Chair Richard Bronson to represent the stakeholder group indicated.

Bret Rumbeck, IASCD Executive Director, representing.....IASCD
Rick Rodgers, IASCD Division IV Director, representing.....IASCD
Karma Bragg, IDEA Chair, representing.....IDEA
Billie Brown, Benewah SWCD District Chair, representing.....Panhandle Region Districts
Kyle Wilson, Nez Perce SWCD Supervisor, representing.....Clearwater Region Districts
Julie Burkhardt, Adams SWCD Supervisor, representing.....South West Region Districts
Terry Halbert, North Side SWCD District Manager, representing.....South Central Districts
Terry Lebrecht, South Bingham SCD Supervisor, representing.....South East Districts
Matt Woodard, East Side SWCD District Chair, representing.....North East Region Districts

Non-voting members of the TAWG include:

Richard Bronson, SWC Commission Chair
Roger Stutzman, SWC Commissioner
Teri Murrison, SWC Administrator

Chuck Pentzer, SWC Field Staff Supervisor
Delwyne Trefz, SWC District Support Services Specialist

Successful implementation of these recommendations will depend upon local conservation districts and the commission both investing significant time and thought into mid- to long-range planning. As district supervisors complete their annual work plans and update their 5-year plans they will need to consider upcoming assistance needs. The commission will also need to carefully review its strategic plan as well as its annual agency and staff work plans in order to efficiently address district needs.

TAWG members believe it is important that this process to be both transparent and objective. The TAWG recommends that opportunity be provided for all districts to review and comment on these recommendations.

THE OVERALL STRATEGY

The recommended process by which districts request assistance is designed to document the district's plans, objectives, and commitment to the particular project or activity for which they are requesting assistance. Individually, these requests and the process the Commission uses to evaluate them promote transparency and accountability; collectively, the requests demonstrate how districts across the state are addressing local resource concerns, and how much additional natural resources conservation work could be accomplished were commission resources not limiting.

The TAWG's recommended overall strategy for a process to guide the allocation of available commission assistance involves the following four steps:

- Conservation district develops a request for assistance.
- District submits a request for assistance to the commission.
- Evaluation team ranks requests based on a weighted criteria ranking tool.
- Commission allocates assistance based on the evaluation committee ranking and available resources.

Each of the above steps is expanded upon below.

Development of a request for assistance

A reference manual to assist districts to develop activity or project specific requests is attached to this report as Appendix A. Refer to Appendix A for details of the procedures the TAWG recommends districts follow to develop a request for assistance.

Note that before developing a request for assistance, a district will first need to determine which category of assistance they need. All assistance can be categorized as either specialized technical assistance or comprehensive district assistance, defined as follows.

Specialized technical assistance is defined as: That 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
- Development of a district needs assessment

Comprehensive district assistance is defined as: That assistance which supports the independent and collective strengthening of conservation districts by providing services which: a) 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) support routine district activities or projects.

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

- District information and outreach activities
- Administration of district-sponsored cost-share programs
- Grant writing assistance
- Development of 5-year and annual work plans

Submission of a request for assistance

Requests for assistance may be submitted at any time. However, to facilitate annual Commission budget and work plan development, the evaluation of requests and the allocation of assistance will be conducted one time per year. Requests must be formally approved and certified by the local conservation district board of supervisors and submitted to the commission no later than March 31st in order to be considered during the annual evaluation. Identifying needs and requesting assistance well in advance of when it is needed helps districts and the commission efficiently budget, schedule and utilize available resources.

The TAWG recognizes that urgent or emergency conservation opportunities and concerns do arise and recommends a mechanism for expediting the handling of urgent requests (see recommendation under **Evaluation of a request for assistance**, below.

Evaluation of a request for assistance

The TAWG recommends that a standing committee made up of 5 members be convened to evaluate district requests for assistance. It is recommended that the evaluation committee include: a current TAWG member; a person with experience allocating conservation resources across the state, e.g., someone with NRCS or SWC experience managing statewide staff and resources; 1-2 conservation district supervisors, selected to represent a broad range of districts, and; 1-2 commission staff.

The evaluation committee will meet annually in April to review requests. An annual review completed in early Spring is necessary in order for the commission to plan for the allocation of its resources during the upcoming field season and fiscal year. The committee will evaluate requests based on the criteria in the appropriate list, i.e., either the specialized technical assistance or the comprehensive district assistance criteria, depending on which type of assistance is being requested.

In order to expedite urgent or emergency requests for assistance, it is recommended that such requests be reviewed by a team comprised of Commission staff including the administrator, field staff supervisors, and the district support services specialist or alternates designated by them. This team will have discretionary authority to grant or deny assistance based upon their evaluation of the request and the availability of commission resources appropriate to addressing the need. The TAWG recommends that urgent or emergency requests for assistance be evaluated by the commission team and a decision made regarding the allocation of assistance to service the request within 3 business days of the commission having received the request. Please note that assistance which careful planning would have anticipated will not be considered by the commission to qualify as an urgent need.

The committee will prepare and provide to the commission a prioritized list of the requests, showing the total number of ranking points awarded to each request, by April 30th.

Allocation of Assistance

It is recommended that the commission allocate assistance to districts based on the recommendations of the evaluation committee and the availability of commission resources. The commission's assessment of available commission resources should include an inventory of available staff hours, consideration of logistical factors, and the existence of current and on-going commitments.

The commission will announce no later than May 31st its decision regarding whether or not assistance is being allocated to each request.

THE RANKING TOOL

The TAWG recommends that lists of weighted criteria be used to evaluate requests for assistance. The TAWG has developed two separate sets of criteria, one for evaluating requests for specialized technical assistance and the other for evaluating requests for comprehensive district assistance. Requests from districts around the state will be evaluated and ranked based upon the appropriate list of criteria. Each request will be awarded a number of ranking points per criterion depending upon how effectively the project or activity for which the district is requesting assistance with addresses each criterion. Requests will be ranked according to how many total points each project is awarded. The commission will use the results of the ranking of statewide requests as a tool to assist them with prioritizing projects and activities towards which they will allocate available assistance resources.

Following are the lists of weighted criteria which the TAWG recommends the evaluation committee use to evaluate requests for each category of assistance.

Criteria for Evaluating Requests for Specialized Technical Assistance:

1) Does the proposed activity address a natural resources conservation priority identified in the conservation district's 5-year or annual work plan?
   Weight: 12

2) Has the district provided documentation of support for the proposed activity, including: a) letters in support of the proposed activity from landowners and producers within the project area, and; b) letters in support of the proposed activity from entities which will be contributing resources towards project implementation?
   Weight: 12

3) Have the necessary steps been taken to ensure that the district will be able to utilize the assistance being requested within the time-frame indicated in the request for assistance?
   Weight: 11

4) Has the conservation district identified adequate resources to ensure that the objectives of the proposed project will be achieved?
   Weight: 11

5) Has the district requesting assistance received activity- or project-specific comprehensive or specialized technical assistance from SWC within the last three years?
   Weight: 11
   Note: a "No" response is awarded 11 ranking points; a "Yes" response is awarded 0 ranking points.

6) If the answer to question 5 is "yes", were the objectives of the activity or project which SWC provided assistance for achieved in a timely fashion?
   Weight: 1-10

7) Is the requested assistance necessary in order to address an urgent or emergency need?
   Weight: 10

8) Will the proposed project deliver quantifiable natural resources benefits?
   Weight: 8

9) Does the proposed project address the need for on-going operations and maintenance of the planned practices in order to ensure that conservation benefits are sustainable over time?
   Weight: 7

10) Is the assistance required for use as either in-kind or hard match in order to enable the district to qualify for a specific grant or cost-share program opportunity?
    Weight: 1-5

11) Will the requested specialized technical assistance help the district to develop a plan for a potential future project? Weight: 5

12) Does the proposed project include plans to publicize project outcomes?
Weight: 5

13) Have entities other than the conservation district indicated a willingness to commit resources towards implementation of the proposed project?
Weight: 5

14) Does the district have technical staff or other resources which will be committed to the project?
Weight: 2

Criteria for Evaluating Requests for Comprehensive District Assistance:

1) Does the proposed activity address a priority identified within the district's 5-year or annual work plan?
Weight: 18

2) Has the district provided documentation of support for the proposed activity, including: a) letters in support of the proposed activity from landowners and producers within the project area, and; b) letters in support of the proposed activity from entities which will be contributing resources towards achieving activity objectives?
Weight: 18

3) Have the necessary steps been taken to ensure that the district will be able to utilize the assistance being requested within the time-frame indicated in the request for assistance?
Weight: 15

4) Will the requested assistance be used to enhance district capacity by developing tools, strategies and successes which the district will be able to use to independently implement future projects?
Weight: 12

5) Is the assistance required for use as either in-kind or hard match in order to enable the district to qualify for a specific grant or cost-share program opportunity?
Weight: 1-12

6) Has the district provided evidence of having researched the availability of district, division, IASCD, IDEA or other resources which may be available to meet their need?
Weight: 9

7) Has the district requesting assistance received activity- or project-specific comprehensive or specialized technical assistance from SWC within the last three years?
Weight: 5
Note: a "No" response is awarded 5 ranking points; a "Yes" response is awarded 0 ranking points.

8) If the answer to question 7 is "yes", were the objectives of the activity or project which SWC provided assistance for achieved in a timely fashion?
   Weight: 1-4

Notes on the Weights Assigned to Each Criteria

The TAWG concluded that fair and equitable allocation of limited commission resources depends upon the process used to prioritize requests being as objective as possible. You can see that the criteria in the above two lists are, for the most part, very objective. This was purposeful on the part of the TAWG as they strove to develop a tool which minimized the chance that bias would affect the request's ranking scores.

Criteria with a Range of Weights

The following explanation of criteria numbers 5 and 6 on the specialized technical assistance list, and numbers 7 and 8 on the comprehensive district assistance list may be helpful.

The first of each of these pair of criteria—"Has the district requesting assistance received activity- or project-specific comprehensive or specialized technical assistance from SWC within the last three years?"—is intended to help make sure commission assistance is allocated fairly over time. If the district has received no specialized technical or comprehensive assistance from the commission over the course of the last 3 years, the request being evaluated is awarded the ranking points indicated. If the district has received such assistance during the last 3 years, the current request is awarded no points for that criterion. Knowing the commission's resources are not adequate to assist every needy district every year, the ranking tool awards extra points to districts who haven't received assistance recently in order to move those districts up the priority list relative to districts which have recently benefitted from commission assistance.

The criterion evaluators are next asked to consider is: "If the district has received assistance during the last 3 years, were the objectives of the activity or project which the commission provided assistance for achieved in a timely fashion?", and the number of ranking points awarded will vary depending upon how the district requesting assistance addresses this criterion. Basically, the TAWG's thinking is that this criterion provides opportunity for districts which "lost" ranking points on the basis of having received assistance recently to "make up" some, but not all, of the lost points by demonstrating that they make effective and efficient use of commission assistance when they do receive it. The bottom line is that, all else being equal, districts which haven't received assistance recently will rank higher than those who have. And, when requests from two districts which have both received assistance recently are evaluated, all else being equal, the district whose previous project wasn't completed in a timely fashion due to the field season being cut short by an unusually long, wet winter should rank higher than the district whose previous project wasn't efficiently run due to district supervisors being unable to agree on an implementation strategy.

Each list includes one additional criterion for which a range of ranking points may be awarded. Criteria number 10 on the specialized technical assistance criteria list and number 5 on the comprehensive assistance list relate to how critical the requested assistance is to enabling the

district to qualify for a grant or cost-share program. The TAWG feels that requests for assistance which it is absolutely essential that the commission provide in order for the district to qualify for third-party support of a district project should be awarded more ranking points than requests for assistance without which project implementation would still be possible.

Final Note

As stated in the Introduction, the TAWG recognizes that the processes introduced in this report will continue to evolve over time. We expect and encourage periodic reviews which will no doubt lead to these processes becoming increasingly effective as time goes on.

Appendix A:

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING AND SUBMITTING A REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PREPARING AND SUBMITTING A REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE

Purpose
The purpose of this section of the manual is to assist districts with developing, certifying, and submitting a Request for Assistance.

Authority
These instructions are issued to be consistent with chapter 27, title 22 Idaho Code ("Soil Conservation Districts") and with procedures adopted by the Soil & Water Conservation Commission.

The statute referenced above is available on the internet at:
http://www.legislature.idaho.gov/idstat/Title22/T22CH27.htm

Timing and Due Date
Requests for assistance may be submitted at any time. However, to facilitate annual Commission budget and work plan development, the evaluation of requests and the allocation of assistance will be conducted one time per year. Requests must be submitted to the Commission no later than **March 31** in order to be considered during the annual evaluation.

The commission recognizes that urgent or emergency conservation opportunities and concerns do arise. The commission is committed to remaining nimble enough to respond to these situations and so has instituted a mechanism for expediting the development and handling of urgent requests.

Certification
Once the request is finalized, complete the Certification attached as Appendix A and present the completed request to the district Board of Supervisors Chairperson for review and signature. Attach the Certification to the Request for Assistance and submit to the Commission by the due date.

Completing the Request for Assistance

Introduction

This section of the manual is designed to assist districts with the development of requests for assistance which will effectively document the district's plans, objectives, and commitment to the particular project or activity for which they are requesting assistance. Use of the standardized format presented here will enable the Commission to efficiently and objectively evaluate requests from districts across the state. Individually, the requests and the process the Commission uses to evaluate them are intended to promote transparency and accountability; collectively, the requests demonstrate how districts across the state are addressing local resource concerns, and how much additional work could be accomplished were resources not limiting.

It is expected that assistance will be requested for projects and activities intended to address local natural resources priorities identified in a district 5-year or annual work plan. It will be helpful to develop a district needs assessment, wherein you identify and quantify local characteristics, natural resource conditions, and available resources and strategies for improving conditions, as an aid to anticipating upcoming needs. Assistance which the Commission may be able to provide can then be requested well in advance of when it is needed. Requests for assistance can be submitted at any time during the year but in order to be considered for the upcoming field season requests need to be received by the Commission no later than March 31st.

The commission recognizes that there will be times when an urgent or emergency conservation opportunity or concern presents itself. In these instances the local district is encouraged to immediately submit an urgent request for assistance. Urgent requests will be evaluated by the Commission and a decision made regarding the allocation of assistance to service the request within 3 business days of the Commission having received the request. Please note that assistance which careful planning would have anticipated will not be considered by the Commission to qualify as an urgent need.

Categories of Assistance

The assistance districts require can be categorized as either "specialized technical" or "comprehensive district" assistance. A district request for assistance will be specific to either one or the other of these two categories. The categories are defined as:

Specialized Technical Assistance is 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
- Development of a district needs assessment

Comprehensive District Assistance is that assistance which supports the independent and collective strengthening of conservation districts by providing services which: a) 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) support routine district activities or projects.

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

- District information and outreach activities
- Administration of district-sponsored cost-share programs
- Grant writing assistance
- Development of 5-year and annual work plans

Development of a Request for Assistance

1. Schedule adequate time on district board meeting agendas to complete each of the following steps. Keep mindful that, as with other district business, preparing a request for assistance needs to be harmonized with local district priorities and objectives.

2. Determine which category of assistance you need. Refer to the definitions presented above to determine whether you are requesting "Specialized Technical" or "Comprehensive District" Assistance. If you are unsure which category of assistance your need falls under, contact the Commission for clarification.

3. Refer to the list of criteria which the project ranking committee will use to evaluate your request. Note that requests are evaluated based upon category-specific criteria. If you are requesting specialized technical assistance, refer to the list of criteria for evaluating requests for specialized technical assistance, and if you are requesting comprehensive district assistance, then refer to the list of criteria for evaluating comprehensive district requests for assistance. The two lists of criteria follow these instructions.

4. Develop your request by writing a narrative response to each of individual criterion on the relevant list. Because the listed criteria are all presented as questions this part of the process can be compared to completing an essay exam in school. The evaluating committee will award ranking points for each criterion based on the content of your response, not on grammar, spelling, or prose style!

   Write as little or as much as necessary to provide an evaluator who may be unfamiliar with your district enough information to get a clear picture of how the assistance you are requesting relates to each criterion. Take care to address each criterion on the list as no ranking points will be awarded for criteria lacking a response.

   Additional information which you would like evaluators to be aware of may be included in the form of an introduction. Make sure such information pertains to the request, and present it as succinctly as possible.

   Should a natural resources opportunity or emergency arise which you would like to request the commission help you with you may initiate a commission evaluation of your need by

telephoning a commission staff member or by emailing or faxing a written description of the situation to the commission office, depending upon the urgency of the need.

5. Estimate: a) the number of hours of Commission staff time which will be required to service your request, and; b) the calendar dates during which the assistance will be needed. Enter these estimates in the space provided at the top of the Request for Assistance Certification.

   It is important that you provide a realistic approximation of how much assistance you expect to need. If you need help estimating the hours of assistance your project will require, contact the commission field staff person who works with your district or the commission district support services staff.

6. Submit the request to your district Board of Supervisors for formal approval and certification. The request must be formally approved by the district board and the District Needs Request Certification (attached) must be signed by the Chair. Attach the signed and dated Certification to your request and submit to the Commission.

   Requests may be submitted to the Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission electronically, by fax, or by regular mail. If you submit your request electronically make certain that you also provide a signed copy of the Certification, which you may fax, scan, or mail to the Commission.

   - Email electronic versions to: info@swc.idaho.gov
   - Mail hard copies to: Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission, 650 West State Street, Room 145, Boise, Idaho 83702.
   - Fax documents to: (208)332-1799
   - Telephone: Boise Commission Office staff @ 208-332-1790
     Commission District Support Services staff @ 208-989-0707

Timing and Due Date

Standard requests for assistance are due on or before **March 31** of each year. Standard requests include requests for assistance needed during the upcoming fiscal year (July 1st – June 30th).

Urgent requests for assistance may be submitted at any time.

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING REQUESTS FOR SPECIALIZED TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE:

1) Does the proposed activity address a natural resources conservation priority identified in the conservation district's 5-year or annual work plan?
   Weight: 12

2) Has the district provided documentation of support for the proposed activity, including: a) letters in support of the proposed activity from landowners and producers within the project area, and; b) letters in support of the proposed activity from entities which will be contributing resources towards project implementation?
   Weight: 12

3) Have the necessary steps been taken to ensure that the district will be able to utilize the assistance being requested within the time-frame indicated in the request for assistance?
   Weight: 11

4) Has the conservation district identified adequate resources to ensure that the objectives of the proposed project will be achieved?
   Weight: 11

5) Has the district requesting assistance received activity- or project-specific comprehensive or specialized technical assistance from SWC within the last three years?
   Weight: 11
   Note: a "No" response is awarded 11 ranking points; a "Yes" response is awarded 0 ranking points.

6) If the answer to question 5 is "yes", were the objectives of the activity or project which SWC provided assistance for achieved in a timely fashion?
   Weight: 1-10

7) Is the requested assistance necessary in order to address an urgent or emergency need?
   Weight: 10

8) Will the proposed project deliver quantifiable natural resources benefits?
   Weight: 8

9) Does the proposed project address the need for on-going operations and maintenance of the planned practices in order to ensure that conservation benefits are sustainable over time?
   Weight: 7

10) Is the assistance required for use as either in-kind or hard match in order to enable the district to qualify for a specific grant or cost-share program opportunity?
    Weight: 1-5

11) Will the requested specialized technical assistance help the district to develop a plan for a potential future project?
    Weight: 5

12) Does the proposed project include plans to publicize project outcomes?
    Weight: 5

13) Have entities other than the conservation district indicated a willingness to commit resources towards implementation of the proposed project?
    Weight: 5

14) Does the district have technical staff or other resources which will be committed to the project?
    Weight: 2

CRITERIA FOR EVALUATING REQUESTS FOR COMPREHENSIVE DISTRICT ASSISTANCE:

1) Does the proposed activity address a priority identified within the district's 5-year or annual work plan?
   Weight: 18

2) Has the district provided documentation of support for the proposed activity, including: a) letters in support of the proposed activity from landowners and producers within the project area, and; b) letters in support of the proposed activity from entities which will be contributing resources towards achieving activity objectives?
   Weight: 18

3) Have the necessary steps been taken to ensure that the district will be able to utilize the assistance being requested within the time-frame indicated in the request for assistance?
   Weight: 15

4) Will the requested assistance be used to enhance district capacity by developing tools, strategies and successes which the district will be able to use to independently implement future projects?
   Weight: 12

5) Is the assistance required for use as either in-kind or hard match in order to enable the district to qualify for a specific grant or cost-share program opportunity?
   Weight: 1-12

6) Has the district provided evidence of having researched the availability of district, division, IASCD, IDEA or other resources which may be available to meet their need?
   Weight: 9

7) Has the district requesting assistance received activity- or project-specific comprehensive or specialized technical assistance from SWC within the last three years?
   Weight: 5
   Note: a "No" response is awarded 5 ranking points; a "Yes" response is awarded 0 ranking points.

8) If the answer to question 7 is "yes", were the objectives of the activity or project which SWC provided assistance for achieved in a timely fashion?
   Weight: 1-4

REQUEST FOR ASSISTANCE CERTIFICATION	**CONSERVATION DISTRICT:**
	PROJECT OR ACTIVITY NAME:
	FOR FISCAL YEAR:
IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION	**HOURS OF ASSISTANCE REQUESTED:**
	DATES ASSISTANCE IS NEEDED:
	REQUEST DUE DATE : MARCH 31, 2013

By the concurrence of a majority of the supervisors of the district board the above named conservation district certifies that the attached Request for Assistance is true and accurate, and further submits said Request for the above named conservation district and fiscal year.

A copy of this Request for Assistance and supporting documents shall be kept at the conservation district office and is available for public inspection.

Signature, Conservation District Board of Supervisors Chairperson

Printed Name

Date

District or Board Chairperson
Telephone

District Email Address

FOR SWC USE ONLY:

DATE OF CONFIRMATION:

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 #8

TO: **COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH**
FROM: **TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR**
DATE: **AUGUST 7, 2012**
RE: **APPOINTMENT OF ADMINISTRATOR FOR FY 2013**

A little over a year ago, this Commission appointed me as Administrator for FY 2012. Should you desire me to continue in that capacity, it is necessary to continue my Appointment and formally delegate powers and duties.

Attached is a copy of last year's Appointment/Delegation of Powers and Duties and a draft form for 2013 for your consideration.

ACTION: Consider Reappointment of Teri Murrison as Administrator for FY 2013

Attachments:

FY 2012 Delegation of Powers and Duties to Teri Murrison
DRAFT FY 2013 Delegation of Powers and Duties

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

DELEGATION OF POWER AND DUTIES

As Chairman of the Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission (SWC) and in accordance with Idaho Code 22-2718 (2) -

> "The state soil and water conservation commission shall appoint the administrator of the state soil and water conservation commission. The state soil and water conservation commission may employ such technical experts and such other agents and employees, permanent and temporary, as it may require, and shall determine their qualifications, duties and compensation. The commission may call upon the attorney general of the state for such legal services as it may require. It shall have authority to delegate to its chairman, to one (1) or more of its members, or to one (1) or more agents or employees, such powers and duties as it may deem proper. The commission may establish offices, incur expenses, enter into contracts and acquire services and personal property as may be reasonable for the proper administration and enforcement of this chapter..."

To the extent the SWC has appointed and employed such experts, agents, and/or empoloyees to perform or conduct its business, and therefore has become the "appointing authority", as defined in 67-5302(3), for the SWC, subject to law, and the state merit system where applicable, including, but not necessarily limited to the authority to supervise, transfer and remove persons to and/or from appointed positions, and change the duties, tittles and compensation of employees of SWC.

The appointed commissioners unanimously confirmed the appointment of Teri Murrison as Administrator during the SWC's June 8, 2011 public meeting. The delegation of appointing authority and other powers and duties referenced in Idaho Code 22-2718 (2) is effective retroactively to Ms. Murrison's employment date as Commission Administrator on June 1, 2011.

Bill Flory, Chairman
Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

6/15/11
Date Signed

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

DELEGATION OF POWER AND DUTIES

As Chairman of the Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission (SWC) and in accordance with Idaho Code 22-2718 (2) -

> "The state soil and water conservation commission shall appoint the administrator of the state soil and water conservation commission. The state soil and water conservation commission may employ such technical experts and such other agents and employees, permanent and temporary, as it may require, and shall determine their qualifications, duties and compensation. The commission may call upon the attorney general of the state for such legal services as it may require. It shall have authority to delegate to its chairman, to one (1) or more of its members, or to one (1) or more agents or employees, such powers and duties as it may deem proper. The commission may establish offices, incur expenses, enter into contracts and acquire services and personal property as may be reasonable for the proper administration and enforcement of this chapter..."

To the extent the SWC has appointed and employed such experts, agents, and/or employees to perform or conduct its business, and therefore has become the "appointing authority", as defined in 67-5302(3), for the SWC, subject to law, and the state merit system where applicable, including, but not necessarily limited to the authority to supervise, transfer and remove persons to and/or from appointed positions, and change the duties, titles and compensation of employees of SWC.

The Commissioners unanimously confirmed the continued appointment of Teri Murrison as Administrator during the SWC's August 7, 2012 public meeting. The delegation of appointing authority and other powers and duties referenced in Idaho Code 22-2718 (2) are retroactive to July 1, 2012.

_____ August 7, 2012
Dick Bronson, Chairman Date
Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

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

ITEM #9A

IDAHO SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION COMMISSION
PUBLIC MEETING & TELECONFERENCE

Date and Time:
Tuesday June 5 , 2012
From 8 am to 5 pm MDT

Location:
Soil & Water Conservation Commission
State Capitol, Rm EW20, Boise Idaho

DRAFT MINUTES

COMMISSION MEMBERS PRESENT:
Dick Bronson
Dave Radford
Roger Stutzman
Norman Wright

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE:
Jerry Trebesch

COMMISSION STAFF PRESENT:
Teri Murrison
Jan Webster
Delwyne Trefz
Terry Hoebelheinrich
Chuck Pentzer

PARTNERS AND GUESTS PRESENT:
Ann Vonde, Attorney General's Office
Brett Rumbeck, IASCD
Jeff Burwell, NRCS
Karma Bragg, IDEA
Terry Halbert, North Side SWCD
Dennis Tanikuni, Idaho Farm Bureau

ITEM #1: WELCOME AND ROLL CALL

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Bronson at 8:07 a.m. Roll call: Commissioners Dick Bronson, Dave Radford, Norman Wright, Roger Stutzman, and Jerry Trebesch (present via teleconference) responded in the affirmative. A quorum being reached, the meeting began.

ITEM #2: REVIEW AGENDA

No items were added

ITEM #3: PARTNER REPORTS

Reports were received from Karma Bragg, President, Idaho District Employees Association (IDEA), Bret Rumbeck, Idaho Association of Soil Conservation Districts (IASCD) and Jeff Burwell, NRCS. Discussion followed.
Action: No action taken, for information only.

ITEM #4: MINUTES
Action: Vice Chair Radford moved to approve April 4, 2012 and May 2, 2012 minutes and Commissioner Stutzman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #5: FY 2012 Financial Report
Action:

a. Vice Chair Radford moved to approve the April 2012 General Fund Financial Report. Commissioner Wright seconded. Motion carried unanimously.
b. Commissioner Trebesch moved to approve the April 2012 RCRDP Fund Financial Report. Commissioner Stutzman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #6: Administrator Report
Action: No action taken; for information only

ITEM #12: EXECUTIVE SESSION

Action: Vice Chair Radford moved to enter into executive session pursuant to Idaho Code § 67-2345(d) for the purpose of considering pending RCRDP loan business only. Commissioner Stutzman seconded. No discussion. Roll call vote was taken with all voting in the affirmative. Motion carried.

The Commission moved into executive session 10:30. Ms. Murrison, Mr. Hoebelheinrich, Ms. Vonde and Ms. Webster were invited to stay.

Executive session ended at 11:27 am.

In open session, Commissioners discussed the disposition of pending RCRDP loan business (Item #12c: A-669).

Loan 669

Amount:	$82,582
Term:	10 years
Rate:	3%

Reported conservation benefit: Directly addresses TMDL Watershed area 303(d) listed. Stream is impaired by sediment from in-stream bank erosion and in stream cattle watering. This project results in 100% containment of AFO waste. Resource concerns addressed by this construction are a reduction in excessive nutrients and organics and suspended sediment in turbidity. This project will also enhance ESA habitat for the species of Bull trout and White sturgeon.

Action: Vice Chair Radford moved to approve Loan A-669 pursuant to the loan officer recommendation as the application meets criteria for conservation benefit and meets the loan criteria established in IDAPA 60.05.01 and loan policy. Commissioner Stutzman seconded. No further discussion. Motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #7: STATEGIC PLAN DRAFT CONSIDERATION

ACTIONS: Vice Chair Radford moved to adopt the FY 2013-2016 Strategic Plan as presented by the Administrator. Commissioner Stutzman seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #8: DISTRICT BUDGET HEARING

Action: Vice Chair Radford moved to add the Camas District's unfunded program/project needs to the list of Unfunded District Needs, and to distribute remaining Capacity Building funds to the Bonner District. Commissioner Wright seconded.

Discussion: Chairman Bronson directed that the minutes reflect his statement that requests such as Franklin District's should be considered capacity building.

Motion carried unanimously.

ITEM #9: 2012 Conservation District Election Law Revisions

Action: For information only

ITEM #10: Technical Assistance Working Group Update

Action: For information only

ITEM #11: Other Business

No other business was discussed.

ITEM #13: Adjourn

At 1:04 pm, Chairman Bronson adjourned the meeting. The Conservation Commission is scheduled to reconvene July 11th at 8:00am.

Respectfully submitted,

Roger Stutzman
Commissioner and Secretary,
Idaho Soil & Water Conservation Commission

DRAFT

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 #10

TO: **Chairman Bronson, Commissioners Stutzman, Wright, Trebesch, and Radford**
FROM: **Teri Murrison, Administrator**
DATE: **August 1, 2012**
RE: **Proposed Commission Meeting Schedule for FY 2013**

There is a benefit to the Commission, the public, and our conservation partners in establishing a regular meeting schedule. As has been the general practice, staff proposes the following regular meeting schedule.

FY 2013 Regular & Special Commission Meetings

Date	Location
Aug. 29	Boise
Sep. 21	Teleconference/Videoconference
Oct. 19	Boise
Nov. 14-17	Meet in conjunction w/IASCD Annual Conference, Idaho Falls
Dec. 19	Boise
Jan. 16	Teleconference/Videoconference or Boise *
Feb. 20	Boise or Teleconference/Videoconference*
Mar. 20	Boise or Teleconference/Videoconference*
Apr. 17	Teleconference/Videoconference
May 15	Possible Field Meeting, Buhl area
Jun. 12	Boise

DRAFT

**Meetings during Legislative Session are subject to change.*

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve annual meeting schedule

6/1/2012

Item 11a

SWC REPORT SUMMARY AS OF June 1, 2012

GENERAL FUND	PERSONNEL			OPERATING			CAPITAL OUTLAY			TRUSTEE & BENEFITS		
FY12	BUDGET	EXPENSE thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE
INDEX												
7101					(215)							
7111 MANAGEMENT BOARD	1,692	2,820	(1,128)	3,957	6,837	(2,880)	0	0	0	0	0	0
7201 ADMIN & FIELD STAFF	802,599	743,835	58,764	230,056	151,966	78,090	0	0	0	0	0	0
7202 TEMPS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7310 DISTRICT ALLOCATIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,053,200	1,053,200	(0)
7320 WQPA WATER QUALITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	45,387	4,613
7350 CREP	89,308	72,416	16,892	18,987	9,307	9,680	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL GENERAL FUND 0001	**893,599**	**819,071**	**74,528**	**253,000**	**167,894**	**84,891**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**1,103,200**	**1,098,587**	**4,613**
			91.66%			**66.36%**						**99.58%**
7315 SWC TECH ASSISTANCE	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUND 0348	**0**	**0**	**0**	**20,000**	**0**	**20,000**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**0**
7325 SWC PROFESSIONAL SERVICES	0	0	0	37,385	0	37,385	2,615	0	2,615	0	0	0
TOTAL FUND 0450	**0**	**0**	**0**	**37,385**	**0**	**37,385**	**2,615**	**0**	**2,615**	**0**	**0**	**0**

DEDICATED FUND	PERSONNEL			OPERATING			CAPITAL OUTLAY			CASH		
FY12	BUDGET	EXPENSE thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BEG CASH AT 7/1/11	PLUS TOTAL REC TO DATE	LESS TOTAL EXP TO DATE
7351 RCRDP LOAN ADMINISTRATION	83,600	52,754	30,846	101,600	91,849	9,751	0	0	0	2,984,699	1,569,062	144,603
TOTAL RCRDP ADMIN 0522-01	**83,600**	**52,754**	**30,846**	**101,600**	**91,849**	**9,751**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**2,984,699**	**1,569,062**	**144,603**
			63.10%			**90.40%**						
7361 REVOLVING LOAN - DEQ	0	0	0	30,000	7,567	22,433	0	0	0	13,208	12,794	7,567
TOTAL DEQ LOAN 0529-16	**0**	**0**	**0**	**30,000**	**7,567**	**22,433**	**0**	**0**	**0**	**13,208**	**12,794**	**7,567**
						25.22%						

6/1/2012

CASH			
BEG CASH AT 7/1/11	PLUS TOTAL REC TO DATE	LESS TOTAL EXP TO DATE	CASH BALANCE End of Current
0	0	(215)	215
5,649	0	9,656	(4,007)
1,032,655	17,283	895,801	154,137
0	0	0	0
1,053,200	0	1,053,200	(0)
50,000	0	117,284	(67,284)
108,295	0	81,723	26,572
2,249,799	**17,283**	**2,157,449**	**109,633**
			95.90%
0	0	0	0
0	**0**	**0**	**0**
1,450	2,859	0	4,310
1,450	**2,859**	**0**	**4,310**

ACTUAL CASH BALANCE End of Current
4,409,157
4,409,157
18,435
18,435

7/23/2012

Item 11b

SWC REPORT SUMMARY AS OF June 30, 2012

GENERAL FUND	PERSONNEL			OPERATING			CAPITAL OUTLAY			TRUSTEE & BENEFITS			CASH			
FY12	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BEG CASH AT 7/1/11	PLUS TOTAL REC TO DATE	LESS TOTAL EXP TO DATE	ACTUAL CASH BALANCE End of Current
INDEX 7101					(215)								0	0	(215)	215
7111 MANAGEMENT BOARD	1,692	2,820	(1,127)	3,957	6,837	(2,880)	0	0	0	0	0	0	5,649	0	9,656	(4,007)
7201 ADMIN & FIELD STAFF	802,600	811,051	(8,451)	177,181	181,972	(4,791)	69,006	52,860	16,146	0	0	0	1,048,787		1,045,882	2,905
7202 TEMPS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
DISTRICT 7310 ALLOCATIONS	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1,053,200	1,053,200	(0)	1,053,200	0	1,053,200	(0)
WQPA WATER 7320 QUALITY	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50,000	50,000	0	50,000	0	50,000	0
7350 CREP	89,309	79,730	9,579	18,987	11,499	7,488	0	0	0	0	0	0	108,296	0	91,229	17,067
TOTAL GENERAL FUND 0001	893,601	893,600	1	200,125	200,093	(183)	69,006	52,860	16,146	1,103,200	########	(0)	2,265,932	0	2,249,753	16,179
			100.00%			99.98%						100.00%				99.29%
SWC TECH 7315 ASSISTANCE	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL FUND 0348	0	0	0	20,000	0	20,000	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SWC PROFESSIONAL 7325 SERVICES	0	0	0	37,385	0	37,385	2,615	0	2,615	0	0	0	1,450	2,864	0	4,314
TOTAL FUND 0450	0	0	0	37,385	0	37,385	2,615	0	2,615	0	0	0	1,450	2,864	0	4,314

DEDICATED FUND	PERSONNEL			OPERATING			CAPITAL OUTLAY			CASH			
FY12	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BUDGET	ACTUAL EXPENSE Thru End of Current Month	BALANCE	BEG CASH AT 7/1/11	PLUS TOTAL REC TO DATE	LESS TOTAL EXP TO DATE	ACTUAL CASH BALANCE End of Current
7351 RCRDP LOAN ADMINIST	59,800	59,706	94	125,400	102,695	22,705	0	0	0	2,984,699	1,621,209	162,401	4,443,506
TOTAL RCRDP ADMIN 0522-01	59,800	59,706	94	125,400	102,695	22,705	0	0	0	2,984,699	########	162,401	4,443,506
			99.84%			81.89%							
7361 REVOLVING LOAN - DEQ	0	0	0	30,000	9,795	20,205	0	0	0	13,208	12,815	9,795	16,228
TOTAL DEQ LOAN 0529-16	0	0	0	30,000	9,795	20,205	0	0	0	13,208	12,815	9,795	16,228
						32.65%							

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 #12

TO: CHAIRMAN BRONSON AND COMMISSIONERS RADFORD, STUTZMAN, WRIGHT, AND TREBESCH
FROM: TERI MURRISON, ADMINISTRATOR
DATE: AUGUST 1, 2012
RE: ADMINISTRATOR'S REPORT

Activities

Initial base District Allocations ($8,500 per district) were received prior to July 31st along with the Capacity Building awards. We will be refining the process based on a number of comments we received, but overall the Districts appear to be pleased with the outcome. Attached is a copy of the May 2012 Bonner District's Forestry Contest Newsletter, for your information.

Since your last meeting in June, we attended an IASCD Board meeting, staff successfully closed out the FY 2012 budget (see Item # 11), our FY 2013 Overall Work Program is in the final stages of editing, we implemented a new time and expense coding system to better track staff time and services/program expenses, and during the week of July 17th, held a two-day All Staff Training Meeting (see attached agenda). We've also been focusing on the FY 2014 line item enhancement requests (see below), and putting together statistics for the FY 2012 Performance Measures Report (which you will be asked to approve at your August 29th meeting).

District Support Services Specialist Delwyne Trefz has concluded work with the Technical Assistance Work Group (TAWG) for now and will be educating districts on the process and products in August prior to your consideration of our recommendation on a process to award scarce Conservation Commission technical resources.

RCRDP Program Manager Terry Hoebelheinrich has been talking with staff, some districts, and our conservation partners to spark interest in the Loan Program. He's also met with the Loan Committee to seek direction on Program priorities, the upcoming interest rate setting, and the Incentive Committee process. You'll hear about his progress in Item #13.

Last month your Board requested we investigate setting a field meeting in September or October in the Buhl area. I spoke with Bret Rumbeck who reminded me that there will be a national or regional conservation district meeting in Boise in September and 6 division meetings in October and consequently the timing is not optimal for districts to attend our meeting. Staff recommends we delay holding a field meeting until after the next legislative session.

Revised FY 2013 District Unmet Needs

On May 2 and June 5, 2012, the Commission conducted a hearing to consider the needs of the soil conservation districts based on district budgets, budget requests, district programs and work plans. The goals were to document unmet natural resource needs (projects and/or programs) based on districts' 5-year and annual work plans, and to continue last year's capacity building grants to districts.

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

The deadline to submit both unmet needs and capacity building requests was April 24, 2012 for purposes of conducting the hearing and districts were also given the option to present their unmet needs at the hearing.

After the hearing, the Camas District submitted Project/Program Priorities (see attached) and requested theirs be included in the previously considered prioritized unmet needs list. Commissioners considered the Camas District's unmet needs on June 5th, however the wrong totals were presented to Commissioners at that time. Consequently, an updated summary of Prioritized Unmet Project/Program Needs is as follows:

Updated Unmet District Needs Documented	**$ 3,437,335**
Priority 1 Total:	$ 804,825
Priority 2 Total:	$ 2,183,610
Priority 3 Total:	$ 448,900

Columbia River Treaty Listening Session

Last month, Delwyne Trefz attended the Boise Listening Session on the Columbia River Treaty Listening Session and prepared the attached Memo. Also attached is a copy of the Draft Listening Session Analytical Status Fact Sheet obtained from an official at the Northwest Power and Conservation Council. Delwyne will be at your meeting to respond to questions you may have.

Idaho Dept. of Fish and Game Wildlife Summit

Attached is a copy of a flyer about the upcoming Wildlife Summit and a copy of a recent Idaho Statesman newspaper article giving background on a possible motivator for holding the Summit. It is advisable that anyone concerned with the future of wildlife, recreation, and agriculture attends the Summit to learn more and weigh in on their interests. Chairman Bronson and I are registered to attend. Should you desire to join us, please let us know so we can make a reservation for you.

FY 2014 Budget

At your August 29th meeting, you will be presented with a draft FY 2014 Budget Request for approval. The Request is due to the Division of Financial Management on September 1st.

Due to zero based budgeting (which this agency underwent several years ago), DFM establishes a base funding level, adds and subtracts for expenses like employee benefit cost adjustments and indirect costs, and we request "line item enhancements" to their adjusted budget which are then considered by the Governor and Legislature.

I met with our analyst Keith Reynolds last week and he confirmed what I have been hearing which is that line item enhancement requests should reflect our needs, but be "modest" considering the slow recovery of the economy and possible future downturns which were detailed in the latest State of Idaho Economic Forecast (http://dfm.idaho.gov/Publications/EAB/Forecast/2012/July/ieffulldocument_July2012.pdf) which was distributed to you yesterday by email.

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

We discussed the following non-prioritized line item enhancement requests and he advised that they appear to be reasonable to request (although past history might suggest the 2 to 1 match is not likely to be funding and in fact, the Governor's Recommended Budget may or may not include any or all of them due to economic concerns).

Draft Non-prioritized Line Item Enhancement/Adjustment Request

- Request an additional FTP for District Technical Assistance, TMDL, CREP, etc. tasks. As you know, our staff size has been significantly reduced in recent years and our work output has correspondingly decreased although our statutory responsibilities have not. While we are undergoing a new process to allocate scarce staff technical assistance resources, we are assembling statistical information on workload to quantitatively document the need for more staff in FY 2015. At present however, we know that we lack a technical field staff person (currently in the Twin Falls area) to assist with programs and district support.
  Proposed Line Item Enhancement: $58,188

- Given the Districts' strong support, the 2 to 1 District Match should be an ongoing Line Item Enhancement Request. We will determine the amount necessary to bring Districts to a full 2 to 1 match in the upcoming months, but last year the additional appropriation request amounted to $ 174,257.

- **NRCS Space and IT Support** Request adjustment in appropriations due to Office and IT charges for field offices in NRCS offices around the state and also for increased Dept. of Admin office space in Boise:
  - Increase NRCS IT and Office space rent from $48,900k to $53,753k. Remember, we were paying $11000 a year and NRCS advised us those costs would increase to $48900 in FY 2012. The Legislature approved an additional $37900 to our General Fund appropriation to accommodate that increase. However, during negotiation with NRCS, they told us the increase will actually be for up to $ 53,753 a year.

  Proposed Line Item Enhancement/adjustment: $4,853.

- **Administrative Office Space Line Item Enhancement/Adjustment Request** In addition, our office space rent in the LBJ building also went up for FY 2012. We were paying approximately $8,000 a year before we added extra square footage in January, Facilities advised me it was going up to $11,300 a year in FY 2013.

  Although we are quite pleased with our current space and would prefer not to move, when we had one more person in the office last year and were bursting at the seams, we talked to Admin about finding office space with more square footage. They suggested we move to the 4th floor above the Post Office in the Borah Building (located at the corner of 8th and Bannock across from the Capitol Building) which would need little modification to meet our needs.

  Admin moved one of its departments out of our current space to accommodate us when we expanded to make more room for two staff sharing an office in the RCRDP program, but it hasn't been an optimal situation for Admin. They are very interested in exchanging our office space in LBJ for the Borah Building space so they can recentralize their operations.

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

If we end up moving in FY 2013 or 2014, we will benefit from more office space and a larger conference room to accommodate public Commission and committee meetings, however our rent will increase to approximately $21,000 a year. In light of a possible move, staff recommends requesting a line item enhancement for this purpose.
Proposed Line Item Enhancement/adjustment: LBJ Building $ 3,300 or Borah Building $ 9,700

- Request to continue spending authority for Technical Assistance Cost Recovery of $20,000 for services we provide to the Office of Species Conservation and other state agencies.
  Proposed Line Item Enhancement request: Spending authority for $20,000 Technical Assistance Cost Recovery

- Purchase 1 pickup truck (driven by field staff) to begin a program to replace aging vehicles (over 150,000 miles)
  Proposed Line Item Enhancement Request: $18,800

- Purchase 1 ATV for CREP and CCPI field checks
  Proposed Line Item Enhancement: $5500

We do not anticipate requesting any line item enhancements for the RCRDP Program for FY 2014. Less the request for 2 to 1 match ($ 174,257), the General Fund line item enhancement requests above total $ 97,041. The continued spending authority would not require funds from the General Fund, but raises the total to:

Proposed Line Item Enhancements requested w/o 2 to 1 match:	**$ 117,041**
Proposed Line Item Enhancements requested including 2 to 1 match:	**$ 291,298**

This information is provided to generate discussion in advance of preparing the actual Line Item Enhancement Requests for your approval on August 29th (and submission to DFM on September 1st).

ACTION: Approve Revised District Unmet Needs Totals:

Updated Unmet District Needs Documented	**$ 3,437,335**
Priority 1 Total:	$ 804,825
Priority 2 Total:	$ 2,183,610
Priority 3 Total:	$ 448,900

Attachments:

- May 2012 Bonner District Forestry Contest Newsletter
- Agenda, All Staff Meeting 7/19/12 and 7/20/12
- CRT Memo
- Invitation and Flyer on IDFG Wildlife Summit
- Clipping on Wolf Feud, Wildlife Summit