

**Soil and Water Conservation Commission Cost Share Committee**  
**February 12, 2014: 8:30am**  
**Meeting Minutes**

Teleconference: [\(919\)250-4221](tel:(919)250-4221)

Webinar: <https://agr.ncgovconnect.com/csc/>

Attendees: Brian Lannon, Jason Walker, Gavin Thompson, Julie Henshaw, Tom Hill, Davis Ferguson, Vicky Porter, Kelly Ibrahim, Ken Parks, Charlie Bass, Keith Larick, Jennie Hauser, David Williams

1. Consideration of December 2013 meeting minutes  
December 2013 meeting minutes approved by consensus
2. Commission actions  
The commission approved all recommended policy revisions at their January 2014 meeting: approval of cost share applications, contracts and requests for payment; repairs; spot checks; and non-compliance.
3. Conservation Planning Workgroup update
  - a. This committee convened for the first time on January 30, 2014. Attendees included Jason Walker, Kelly Ibrahim, Natalie Woolard, Charles Bass, Matt Flint, Dana Ashford-Kornburger, and Julie Henshaw.
  - b. Division staff is drafting a policy for the workgroup's review based on the feedback from the meeting. The goal is to develop consensus on a draft policy and bring to the April Cost Share Committee meeting, then present a final draft to the Commission in May of July.
  - c. The workgroup is recommending a two part approach:
    1. Conservation planning (definition and scope)
    2. Specific items required for commission cost share program contracts.
4. Signature lines on forms  
The committee discussed different signature lines for design approval and job approval authority on cost share contract forms. Division staff will draft version(s) for review and feedback; but not for a formal vote.
5. Technical assistance  
The committee discussed different scenarios that should be run to help evaluate different options for technical assistance allocations. Refer to Attachment A to review these scenarios. The following scenarios were discussed:
  1. Current salary & benefits support (every district **requesting**)
  2. 50% up to the cap \$25,500
  3. 50% up to the cap of \$20,000
  4. 50% up to the cap \$25,500 with **all** districts receiving 1 employee
  5. 50% up to the cap \$20,000 with **all** districts receiving 1 employee
  6. Consider performance – rating for encumbrances and expenditures; compare at 1 employee ratio
    - a. Using SWCC programs only
    - b. Using SWCC and NRCS programs combined

- i. Run this scenario with existing supported 2<sup>nd</sup> positions as an additional scenario

After discussion, the committee chose to only pursue further revisions on scenario 6a and 6b; specifically the following options:

- \$15,000 min + \$ value per point (points determined by performance)
- \$15,000 min, + \$ value per point up to cap of \$30,000 (points determined by performance)

Scenarios 1-5 are no longer under consideration.

Additional discussion surrounded the idea of encouraging district employees to obtain job approval authority (JAA). The consensus of the committee was that there is a relationship between the amounts of BMPs installed in a district and the district employees' JAA. Evaluating districts on dollars spent will encourage BMP implementation which will lead to district employees' pursuit of JAA.

Next steps:

- Contact FSA to obtain their BMP implementation (dollars spent) data by county by year.
- Contact NRCS to make sure that all BMP implementation (dollars spent) data from all programs was collected.
- Develop a draft survey to collect data from districts regarding the amount of money they spent per year for BMP implementation (not including conservation easements) in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011 and 2012.
- All county level data will be evaluated based on dollars spent per closed fiscal year.
- The committee supports using a longer-term window as these funds provide support for positions: consider data for the best three out of the four last fiscal years. For example, a FY2015 allocation would include BMP implementation data from FY2010, 2011, 2012 and 2013.
- Request NRCS speak regarding future directions for allocating funds for EQIP and other programs at our next meeting. Is there targeting at a level that will allow some districts to obtain funds at the expense of others? Data on applications written and applications funded by year at county level would be helpful for discussion.

6. Set next meeting date

Distribute a doodle poll for dates in early April

7. Future meeting agenda topics:

- a. Program Development & Eligibility Policies – last section of the manual to review
  - i. Introducing new or revised BMPs to cost share programs
  - ii. New and expanded operations
  - iii. Policy on program outreach
  - iv. Use of cost share program funds on new site (not new operation)
  - v. Commission guidance for .0200 certified operations
  - vi. Supplemental allocation of cost share financial assistance
  - vii. Strategy plan
- b. Cost Share allocation rule revisions
  - c. District assessment – score cards