

MATCH TASK FORCE MEETING NOTES

The May 2014 Match Task Force meeting was held on Thursday, May 29th, 2014 at 9:30 a.m. at the ODNR campus on Morse Rd., Assembly Center conference room, E-1.

The following were in attendance:

Teresa Holter (ODNR-HR) meeting facilitator; Dorothy Farris (ODNR-SWR); Kevin Elder (OSWCC); Etta Reed (OSWCC); Ryan Garber (Office of Internal Audit); Cheryl Subler (OSWCD); Chris Schimpf (Seneca SWCD); Matt Peart (Wayne SWCD); David Anspach (Clermont SWCD); Irene Moore (Jefferson SWCD); Steve Hawkins (Pickaway SWCD); Lisa Syx (ODNR-DSWR); Ronda Tipton (ODNR-DSWR); Rob Hamilton (ODNR-DSWR); Jeff Ankney (ODNR-DSWR); Clark Hutson (ODNR-DSWR); Chad Amos (ODNR-DSWR); Liz Cline (ODNR-DSWR); Brian Meade (CCAO)

Teresa welcomed everyone to the May Match Task Force meeting, check in items followed. No reports from members.

Making sure all items have been covered and not fallen off the discussion board the morning session moved forward with Teresa and Dorothy addressing the short term and long term goals below to the Task Force members and audience. From the current list below (April's meeting), members narrowed down the most important and voted on the top 3 in each category. The top 3 are highlighted with the *number of votes also noted.

Ohio-DNR
Today, 10:56 AM
Added: Space

SHORT TERM

Distribution Equity

- Want to facilitate a statewide presence of soil and water districts/services - Do not want to put urban versus rural areas and need to recognize that soil and water issues are present in both areas, although varies. *8 votes
- Develop formula/policy that improves lower funded districts without significantly negatively impacting the higher funded districts. *8 votes
- Change what you can gradually/small increments in the direction you want to go.*8 votes
- County needs to be kept in the loop, tours and meetings.
- Be consistent on what is matchable.
- Never match dollars with a no strings attached at the same level as those with strings attached.

Overall SWCD Financial Status

- Have enough staff to have a viable program to meet local needs. 3* votes
- Report on Form 11 – list DF & SF – Balances in GASB54, Assigned committed and unassigned. *4 votes
- Need something to address “grand-fathered in” balances and how to go forward each year. *5 votes
- Be cautious of “pet projects” selected at the state level for just a particular region of the state, not to use up funding for all soil and water districts (statewide).
- Decide and record (black and white) what source are matchable for state funds.
- Need a plan to grow state and local dollars.

Accountability

- Use SWIMS or updated/improved program to justify progress. *5 votes
- Plan of work template. *6 votes
- Supervisors should be held accountable at the local level, not based on accomplishing state goals. *8 votes
- Pursue resources.
- Assessment/Needs.
- Plans for all 88 districts and overall state plan with goals.
- Have SWIMS run locally so there is not the loss of efficiency and slow recording while sending information to the main server.
- Will it be measured by project completed or dollars spent?
- Can SWIMS be used to accomplish this?
- How will Form 11 need to be altered?
- If they do not achieve state goal or spend all funds, what is/would there be a penalty?
- Better use of SWIMS – Assign SWIMS program types to SWCD goals and objectives in APO and LRP.

- Must use SWIMS and submit annual plan of operations in order to obtain state match

Matchability of Funds

- In order for funds to receive state match – must be deposited in the Districts Special Fund. *6 votes
- Work toward not matching other agency responsibilities funded through Soil and Water. *8 votes
- Decide and record in black and white what sources are matchable for state funds; be consistent on what is matchable – What is matchable?? Need to get this figured out/more clarity. *9 votes
- Match local funds from county general funds and townships that are not fee based.
- How will the source of funds be supported so DNR, Program Specialists, can validate matchability.
- What is matched? Need to get that established with clarity.
- Increase state funding for match, overall.
- Raise the base; 20 – 30 K.
- Flat rate should be available for all Districts. However, not too large, do not want county to back off on local appropriations – Not to exceed \$20,000.
- Keep same for now – (until legislation can be changed).

The same process (voting on the top 3) will be done at the June 26th meeting for long term items listed below.

LONG TERM

Distribution Equity

- Share responsibility between local and state based on local capability.
- Increase in sales tax income = Low Flat Rate.
- If Match changes – phase in over time, to avoid any short term funding issues for a district.
- If and when changes are made – gradual installments.
- Bring up all districts (especially lowest funded, highest needs).

Overall SWCD Financial Status

- Maintain 88.
- Need dedicated funding source – Move away from dependence on CD & D, MSW and tire fees.
- Base any increase on formula change based on growing state match dollars by bi-annual state budget.
- Actively seek dedicated state funding.
- Need to increase amount of state funds to be used for match.
- Create a list of matchable funds (CAUV, tree sales, NPES work, etc.)
- Limit amount of state match funds that can be carried over to 3 months expenses.

Accountability

- Replace SWIMS with a simpler/cheaper program using less time (We've spent more on SWIM's than we have gotten out of it).
- Continue current report.

- Continue concerted effort to keep local (particularly county commissioners) and state officials aware of districts purposes and efforts, particularly in light of term limits and turn over in elected official's hands.

Matchability of Funds

- The state benefits from all SWCD's and should pay a larger portion if funds are available locally.
- Broaden the defining sources of matchable funds.
- SWIMS – good for accountability.
- County "matchable" funds should not be restricted to only general fund moneys. No other jurisdiction/entity's dollars are limited in this fashion, particularly the state's support.
- Recognize the growing pressure on county general funds, particularly in light of cuts in state funding support and reductions in investment revenue. Soil and water is a discretionary program for county general fund dollars. Fear that pressure on county general funds could crowd out soil and water fund, particularly in some counties financially challenged.
- Change legislation to allow match of other funds from County Commissioner, County Auditor, Health Departments, Engineer, and RPC.

After much group discussion on short/long term items and district equality, Teresa turned the meeting over to Dorothy and Lisa. Handouts were distributed and the task force members and audience followed along with the projector presentation. Lisa presented additional match scenarios for the task force and asked for their input; adjustments, impacts on districts, what else would you like to see for the June meeting.

Dorothy revisited the History document that had been edited and framed at the April meeting – All documents can be found on the website.

Lisa left the meeting to create updated scenarios that the group would like to see, she will return to the meeting when those have been completed. Dorothy continued to edit and discuss the documents on the projector screen.

Dorothy suggested that in thinking ahead, as policies are implemented and/or revised, we should be mindful to create and test your documents and tools. In order to do that sometimes it is "Better to edit than create."

The group discussed the "definition of fees" - must be very careful and very clear on what a "fee" is actually for as the group is limited on what can be established as a fee;

Fee for service, Invoices, MOU's, who determines this?? SWCDs must be accountable and get out and look for all possible resources in the Counties, and promote SWCDs get "most bang for your buck". What can be matched? Should a Resolution from each local entity be included as supporting documentation in any guidance where funds are received? Shouldn't districts dictate use of their own money?

Discussion moved on to the importance of revisiting partnerships on the state, county and local levels. Must distinguish and present to the Commission what can be matched and on what levels. If there are local dollar % and code changes that expand matchability this may not leave much left to be matched. It was agreed that an Annual Plan of Work document needs to be presented and approved by the Commission.

The group discussed the SWIMS program. All feel templates need to guide SWCDs and further input is needed on how the template being made.

Due to the entire ODNR network being down Lisa was unable to rejoin the group to review the updated SWCD Fiscal handout, category by category. Lisa will supply those numbers and spreadsheets on Friday, 5/30 if the network is back up and running. Since this information was unavailable for the meeting Dorothy suggested a conference call to take place on Wednesday @ 7:30 p.m. All agreed.

June 26, 2014 Agenda Items

Next steps:

- Address what happens with long term items if not covered by short term
(Kevin and Etta)
- State funds needed for match
- Revisit Future to be matched -Property Tax Levy
- Future NOT to be matched + Future TO BE matched

Adjourned 4:15