

*TEXAS STATE SOIL & WATER CONSERVATION BOARD*



**ANNUAL REPORT**

TO THE  
GOVERNOR,  
LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR  
&  
SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE

*JANUARY 1, 2019*

# Table of Contents

Historical Background	4
Status Report on Implementation of Sunset Legislation Provisions	6
Organization	7
Staff	8
Soil and Water Conservation Districts	9
Annual State Meeting of Soil and Water Conservation District Directors	11
Director Mileage and Per Diem	11
District Technical Assistance Funds	11
District Conservation Assistance Program	11
Programs and Activities of the TSSWCB	11
Flood Control Programs	12
• O&M Grant Program	12
• Structural Repair Grant Program	13
• Dam Rehabilitation	13
• Planning	13
• Design	14
• Construction	14
Texas Nonpoint Source Management Program	14
• Nonpoint Source Grant Program	15
• Clean Water Act §319(h) Grant Funding	16
• State Grant Funding	16
• Total Maximum Daily Load Program	17
• Recreational Use Attainability Analyses	19
• Watershed Protection Plan Program	19
Water Quality Management Plan Program	20
• Poultry Water Quality Management Plan Program	21
Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee	23
Texas Groundwater Protection Committee Function	24-25
Watershed Approach to Water Quality Planning and Implementation	25
SWCD Information Technology Assistance	25
• PC Hardware Replacement	26
Public Information /Education Report	26
• District Program Development Workshop	27
• 2018 Texas Conservation Awards Program	27
• Soil & Water Stewardship Public Speaking Contest	28
• Wildlife Alliance for Youth	28
• State Woodland Clinic and Contest	28-29
• Regional Woodland Contest	29
• Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Watershed Flow Model	29
• Texas Invasive Species Coordinating Committee	30
• Water Supply Enhancement Program	30
• Rio Grande Carrizo Cane Eradication Program	32

## Forward

In response to S.B. 1828 passed by the 78<sup>th</sup> Texas Legislature in Regular Session, 2003, and as amended by S.B. 59 passed by the 83<sup>rd</sup> Texas Legislature in Regular Session, 2013, the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) presents this review of its programs and activities. S.B. 59 amended §201.028 of the Texas Agriculture Code to provide that the TSSWCB shall prepare and deliver to the Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives an annual report, not later than January 1 of each year, relating to the status of the budget areas of responsibility assigned to the TSSWCB including outreach programs, grants made and received, federal funding applied for and received, special projects, and oversight of Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) activities.

The FY2018 Operating Budget is attached to this report. Information on grants available to local SWCDs and other entities is incorporated within the program section it involves.

The TSSWCB takes pride in the accomplishments and remarkable progress that have been made in soil and water conservation in this state. Often environmental successes are slow to be realized. We have realized and reported success stories that include reducing the level of Atrazine in several water bodies, particularly the Aquilla Reservoir, reducing the levels of bacteria in Buck Creek and the Leon River and improving the dissolved oxygen levels in Oso Bay and a tributary to Toledo Bend Reservoir

However, we recognize there remains a continuing challenge and an ongoing need to ensure our land has the capability to produce food and fiber for future Texans. Because of changes in land use, ownership, technology, and population growth, the need for soil and water conservation programs will remain critical. Texas has a finite number of acres to provide for the needs and desires of citizens and visitors, and this puts an ever-increasing demand on agricultural land. Farmers and ranchers face complex decisions concerning the best ways to manage and utilize the natural resources available to them.

We believe that soil and water conservation programs must remain dynamic as land uses change and technology improves to make some conservation practices more capable of meeting demands on soil and water resources. We also maintain the belief that the purpose of the soil and water conservation program is to promote the wise use of our renewable natural resources and provide for the conservation and enhancement of the soil and water resources of this state through and by the dynamic decisions of local SWCDs which promotes the use of each acre of land within its capabilities and treating it according to its needs.

From the beginning, the TSSWCB and local SWCDs have formed an organizational framework through which various complex governmental conservation programs are delivered to local landowners and operators. This relationship has successfully been utilized to disseminate sound management techniques and practices to maintain individual productive land uses to provide for the needs of present and future generations.

To the landowners of Texas, the individual SWCD directors, and the many agencies and organizations assisting and working with our programs, we offer our sincere gratitude.

## Historical Background

In the early history of the United States, those involved in agriculture often did not consider the conservation of soil and water resources. Land was cleared and put into farm production. When the land quit producing at a profitable level, the farmers merely moved on to new land farther west and started the process over again. There was no need to be concerned with soil conservation, as there was a seemingly unlimited supply of virgin land waiting to be tilled. This process continued through the 1800s and into the early 1900s. With the outbreak of World War I, farmers in the Great Plains states were encouraged to break out native grassland to grow wheat and other foodstuffs to feed the nation and the world. As a result of these and other unwise management practices and the fact that the farmlands were experiencing long periods of drought, the 1930s produced some of the worst dust storms the nation had ever seen. Clouds of dust rolled across the plains states sending dust storms through the south and into the nation's capital. At the same time, the nation was in the midst of a great economic depression. The federal government, seeking ways to put people back to work and encourage conservation, created the Civilian Conservation Corps and Soil Erosion Service. Through these mechanisms, demonstration projects were initiated to train technicians and to educate the public in ways to conserve soil resources. These programs were successful in putting people back to work, but lacked the local ties to establish lasting conservation programs.

One of the early day leaders in the national effort to control soil erosion was Hugh Hammond Bennett from North Carolina. After graduation from the University of North Carolina in 1903, Hugh Bennett took a job with the Bureau of Soils in the United States Department of Agriculture (USDA). Because of his experience, scientific knowledge and leadership ability, he was put in charge of the Soil Erosion Service when it was created in 1933. In 1935, P.L. (Public Law) 46 was passed creating the Soil Conservation Service within the USDA and Hugh Bennett became the first Chief of the agency. He soon became internationally known for his accomplishments in conservation work.

With the help of Congressman Buchanan from Columbus, Texas, Hugh Bennett was able to persuade President Franklin Roosevelt that the soil resources of this nation were being wasted. He convinced the President that a Model Soil Conservation Act should be developed and sent to the governors of each state for passage by their state legislatures. The purpose of this Model Act would be to develop programs at the state and local level to control soil erosion.

In 1936, a Model Act was sent to the governors with the endorsement of President Roosevelt. The Model Act, developed in Washington, was patterned after the Texas Wind Erosion Act, the Grass Conservation Acts in the Northern High Plains and certain water conservation district law.

In 1937, legislation was introduced in the Texas Legislature based on this Model Act. It is reported that as many as 25 different versions of this soil conservation law were considered before a final version was passed. There was much heated discussion of the proposed legislation. When the final version was adopted, the bill contained many undesirable features. The law would have set up Soil Conservation Districts automatically on a county basis and made County Commissioners Courts the governing body. A portion of the county tax was to be used to finance the program and county agricultural agents were to be the administrative officers.

A number of agricultural leaders from across the state had, by this time, become concerned about the newly passed legislation. It was their opinion that, if the responsibility for installing and maintaining conservation measures lay in the hands of the land owners, the control of such a program should also be in their hands.

As a result of these and other concerns, a group of landowners led by V.C. Marshall of Heidenheimer, Texas, convinced the Governor to veto the 1937 legislation.

Hard feelings among agricultural leaders resulted from the attempt to pass this soil conservation law. Under the leadership of Mr. Marshall, a concerted effort was made during the interim between legislative sessions to heal the old wounds and to put together a version of a law that would be generally accepted by the farmers and ranchers of Texas. Mr. Marshall organized a committee of leaders from across the state to promote the passage of a new Soil Conservation Law. He traveled many miles at his own expense seeking the views of agricultural leaders and promoting the idea of the Soil Conservation District Program.

The key points Mr. Marshall felt should be included in the new law were that (1) farmers and ranchers should determine whether or not a Soil Conservation District was needed and hold a local option election prior to the establishment of the district; (2) the program should be controlled by landowners; and (3) the Soil Conservation Districts should have no taxing authority or the power of eminent domain.

In 1939, the Texas Legislature passed H.B. (House Bill) 20 which incorporated those features and was the first Soil Conservation Law for the state. The law created the State Soil Conservation Board and allowed for the creation of the Soil Conservation Districts. Mr. Marshall was elected as the first Chairman of the Soil Conservation Board and later resigned to become the first Executive Director of the agency.

On April 30, 1940, the Secretary of the State issued Certificates of Organization for the first 16 Soil Conservation Districts paving the way for the program we now operate. Today, Texas has 216 local SWCDs that encompass 100% of the state.

As previously mentioned, the Model Act endorsed by President Roosevelt was in part patterned after the Texas Wind Erosion Act. Texas was already making attempts to address soil conservation as a result of the “Dust Bowl” days of the 1930s. The 44<sup>th</sup> Legislature in 1935 passed legislation authorizing the establishment of Wind Erosion Conservation Districts. This law provided for the creation of districts to “conserve the soil by prevention of unnecessary erosion caused by winds, and the reclamation of lands that have been depreciated or denuded of soil by reasons of winds.” Although a number of Wind Erosion Control Districts were created, the passage of the Soil Conservation District Law in 1939 resulted in those districts becoming dormant.

In 1975, Governor Dolph Briscoe, by Executive Order, designated the TSSWCB as lead agency to assume the planning and management responsibility for control of agricultural and silvicultural nonpoint source pollution as required by the Federal Water Pollution Control Act.

In 1981, the 67<sup>th</sup> Legislature passed H.B. 1436, which for the first time codified the agricultural laws of Texas. Title 7, Chapter 201 of this code contains the portion pertaining to Soil and Water Conservation.

In 1985, the 69<sup>th</sup> Legislature passed S.B. 1083 creating a Brush Control Program in Texas and granting new powers and responsibilities, without funding, to the TSSWCB and SWCDs under Chapter 203 of the Agriculture Code.

In 1999, the TSSWCB received its first appropriation in the FY00-01 biennium to control water-depleting brush and trees, such as cedar and mesquite. The program received \$9.1 million to establish a pilot project in the North Concho Watershed.



In 1993, the 73<sup>rd</sup> Legislature passed S.B. 503 which named the TSSWCB the lead agency to address water quality issues relating to runoff from diffused, or nonpoint sources resulting from agricultural and forestry operations. In 1999, the Legislature expanded the TSSWCB's environmental mission and appropriated money to address water pollution from nonpoint sources under a separate, federally mandated program.

The leaders who framed the Texas Soil and Water Conservation Law in 1939 recognized that landowners and operators of private land constitute the basic resource for the conservation of our renewable natural resources. Without the support and willing participation of private landowners and operators in the development and implementation of soil and water conservation programs there is little hope of success. Only local SWCDs led by farmers and ranchers who know the land and the local conditions and problems have the means to develop conservation plans that address each acre of land specific to its needs to solve or reduce the severity of its problems.

### **Status Report on Implementation of Sunset Legislation Provisions**

During Fiscal Year (FY) 2010, the mission and performance of the TSSWCB (State Board) was reviewed by the Legislature as required under the Texas Sunset Act. The Commission adopted recommendations for the TSSWCB in June 2010, and the Texas Legislature enacted House Bill 1808 (Cook, 82<sup>nd</sup> Legislature) in 2011 that continued the TSSWCB through 2023.

House Bill 1808 added standard Sunset language requiring impartial appointments to the State Board, modified standard Sunset language requiring members of the State Board to complete training before assuming their duties to apply the language to appointed, as well as elected, board members, and modified standard Sunset language specifying the grounds for removing a State Board member to apply the language to appointed, as well as elected, board members. None of these bill provisions required specific implementation action by the agency.

House Bill 1808 required the TSSWCB to establish specific program goals and statewide grant practices and to measure impacts for state-funded competitive grant programs.

House Bill 1808 also required the TSSWCB to ensure follow-up brush control treatment and assess the overall effectiveness of the water supply enhancement program. In response, the agency will continue to require follow-up brush control treatment, at no cost to the State, in its water supply enhancement plans. Status reviews will be conducted within three to five years after initial treatment of mesquite, mixed brush, juniper or saltcedar to determine if the canopy is above 5%. A second status review will be performed eight to nine years after initial treatment. If the producer is found out of compliance, he/she will not be eligible for another contract for a period of ten years.

The legislation also clarified the TSSWCB's ability to accept grants, loans, or other funds in its role as administrator of the Texas Invasive Species Coordinating Committee, although this ability has not been exercised by the agency.

Further updates on the status of the TSSWCB's implementation of House Bill 1808 will be reported on the agency website and can be accessed on each program's main website address:  
<https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/>.

## Organization

Since inception, the TSSWCB has been governed by five board members, elected by delegates from each of five regions of the state's 216 local SWCDs. Elections occur annually at regional conventions of the local SWCDs, with members serving two-year staggered terms. However, with the enactment of S.B. 1828 by the 78<sup>th</sup> Legislature, two Governor Appointees join the five elected board members to create a seven-member board. The two Governor appointed positions are listed below. The term of one member appointed by the Governor expires February 1 of each odd-numbered year, and the term of the other member appointed by the Governor expires on February 1 of each even-numbered year.

Elected State Board members must be 18 years of age or older; hold title to farmland or ranchland; and be actively engaged in farming or ranching. The Governor appointees must be actively engaged in the business of farming, animal husbandry, or other business related to agriculture and wholly or partly owns or leases land used in connection with that business; and may not be a member of the board of directors of a SWCD.

The State Board elects its own Chair and generally meets every odd month, unless specific programs or issues require more immediate action. The following list shows the current Board members and which State Board Region they represent.

The State Board elects its own Chair and generally meets every odd month, unless specific programs or issues require more immediate action. The following list shows the current Board members and which State Board Region they represent.

### Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board Member

Member Name	Region	Term	Residence
Scott Buckles	#1	May 5, 2015- May 7, 2019	Stratford
Marty H. Graham	#2	May 3, 2018- May 1, 2020	Rocksprings
José O. Dodier, Jr.	#3	May 5, 2015- May 7, 2019	Zapata
David Basinger	#4	May 1, 2018- May 4, 2020	Deport
Barry Mahler	#5	May 5, 2015- May 7, 2019	Iowa Park
Carl Ray Polk Jr.	Appointed	May 21, 2017- February 1, 2019	Lufkin
Tina Y. Buford	Appointed	May 21, 2017- February 1, 2020	Harlingen

## Staff

Mr. Rex Isom has been the Executive Director since January 2004 and continues to carry out the directives of the State Board and directing staff efforts. We emphasize our agency philosophy as stated in our Strategic Plan, “The State Soil and Water Conservation Board will act in accordance with the highest standards of ethics, accountability, efficiency, and openness. We affirm that the conservation of our natural resources is both a public and a private benefit, and we approach our activities with a deep sense of purpose and responsibility.” Mr. Isom, as Executive Director, is leading the agency in that direction and expects all employees to follow that lead.

As of December 1, 2018, the TSSWCB has 68 employees, 24 of which work in the Temple headquarters. The remaining 44 employees are field staff, either working out of their homes or located in eight satellite offices, located throughout the state. Due to difficulty in recruiting, engineers services are now being contracted with engineering firms. The following organization chart shows the agency’s current structure.

The current structure of the TSSWCB reflects efforts to maintain more personnel in the field and away from headquarters for a 65% to 35% ratio of Field personnel to Headquarters personnel. The regional office staff along with the program specific staff provides on-site technical assistance to farmers and ranchers. The field staff serves as a liaison between the TSSWCB and local districts. The field staff also provides assistance to local districts and district employees concerning operations, programs, and activities. The regional office staff and the program specific staff coordinate with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ), Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, and the USDA’s Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) to provide technical assistance to landowners to implement Water Quality Management Plans. The agency also works with the Texas Tech University and the United States Geological Survey (USGS) for technical expertise to the agency for implementing the Water Supply Enhancement Program.



**ORGANIZATIONAL CHART**




Figure 1. Diagram of Agency Organization

**Soil and Water Conservation Districts**

The TSSWCB performs many of its activities in coordination with the state’s 216 local SWCDs. These local SWCDs are political subdivisions of the state, established through local option elections of agricultural landowners. SWCDs generally reflect county boundaries, but may also follow river basin or watershed boundaries, depending on the desires of the local landowners.

The following SWCD map shows the current 216 local SWCDs that cover the entire state. The map also shows the grouping of the SWCDs into the five State Board Districts that respectively elect a State Board member and shows the field staff that is assigned to work with each SWCD within a specific area.




Figure 2. Map of State Board Zones and Soil and Water Conservation Districts

Landowners within these local SWCDs elect the five directors that comprise the SWCD’s governing body or board of directors. This board of directors administers the programs and activities of the SWCD. Representatives of the SWCDs within each region then elect the members of the State Board through a series of convention style-elections.

SWCDs do not have taxing authority and rely on locally generated funds from various activities and programs, federal assistance, county assistance, and state assistance from the TSSWCB. The USDA-NRCS provides most of the federal assistance available to SWCDs and through cooperative agreements provides technical assistance to farmers and ranchers requesting assistance from the SWCD.

## **Annual State Meeting of Soil and Water Conservation District Directors**

The Annual State Meeting of Soil and Water Conservation District Directors, required in §201.081, Texas Agriculture Code, was held October 29-31, 2018 in Fort Worth. The 2019 Annual State Meeting is scheduled for October 28-30 in San Antonio.

### **Director Mileage and Per Diem**

The 81<sup>st</sup> Legislature provided an additional \$134,510 per year to offset costs for the increase in the reimbursement rate for District Director Mileage claims from 18 cents to the current state rate of mileage. The FY2018 appropriation for this program is \$434,510.

### **District Technical Assistance Funds**

The TSSWCB disburses Technical Assistance payments to Districts on a reimbursing basis to supplement their efforts in providing assistance to agricultural producers in the state. Distributions are contingent upon Districts filing annual performance reports with the TSSWCB. The FY2018 appropriation for this program is \$2,193,394.

### **District Conservation Assistance Program**

The 85<sup>rd</sup> Legislature provided Conservation Assistance Grants to Districts for the 2018-19 Biennium. The grants are awarded on a matching basis requiring Districts to raise funds from sources other than the TSSWCB. Districts do not have taxing authority and use locally raised funds with this matching grant to support their operational expenses. The FY2018 appropriation for this program is \$1,134,000.

### **Programs and Activities of the TSSWCB**

The services and programs provided by the TSSWCB are focused on rural Texas farmers and ranchers, but the results of these services benefit all Texans. For example, many of the flood control structures maintained by SWCDs serve to protect heavily populated areas from flood damage, and also prevent sediment from building up in drinking water supplies. Another example is the use of best management practices (BMPs), implemented through TSSWCB-certified water quality management plans (WQMPs), to prevent pesticides, nutrients, bacteria and other pollutants from impairing the use of Texas streams, rivers, lakes, and estuaries.

The agency is responsible for numerous natural resource conservation efforts, the most prominent of which is serving as the lead state agency responsible for planning, implementing and managing programs and practices for preventing and abating agricultural and silvicultural (forestry-related) nonpoint source (NPS) water pollution. To fulfill this mandate, the agency jointly administers the *Texas Nonpoint Source Management Program* with the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). As a result, many of the agency's programs and services aim to improve and protect water quality, including the Water Quality Management Plan Program, the Nonpoint Source Grant Program, the Total Maximum Daily Load Program, and the Watershed Protection Plan Program. Additionally, the TSSWCB is a member of the Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee and the Texas Groundwater Protection Committee.

The TSSWCB is also responsible for programs affecting water quantity. The major existing program is the Water Supply Enhancement Program which seeks to increase water supply through the targeted

control of water-depleting brush. Additionally, many BMPs implemented by farmers and ranchers as prescribed in their WQMP have ancillary water conservation benefits – increasing irrigation efficiency and reducing water demand. The TSSWCB is also a member of the Water Conservation Advisory Council.

Other responsibilities include prevention of soil erosion, control of floods, maintaining the navigability of waterways, the preservation of wildlife, protection of public lands, and providing information to landowners regarding the jurisdictions of the TSSWCB and the TCEQ as related to NPS water pollution.

### **Flood Control Programs**

Approximately 2,000 floodwater retarding structures, or dams, have been built over the last 70 years within the State of Texas. The primary purpose of the structures is to protect lives and property by reducing the velocity of floodwaters, and thereby releasing flows at a safer rate. These are earthen dams that exist on private property, and were designed and constructed by the United States Department of Agriculture - Natural Resources Conservation Service (USDA-NRCS). They were built with the understanding that the private property owner would provide the land, the federal government would provide the technical design expertise and the funding to construct them, and then units of local government would be responsible for maintaining them into the future.

Due to the passage of time and difficulty in raising adequate funds locally, many sponsors approached the Texas Legislature with their concerns over the amount of needed operation and maintenance (O&M), and structural repairs. In recognition that these dams will continue to serve as a critical protection for our state's infrastructure, private property, and lives, the Legislature appropriated \$15 million dollars to the TSSWCB for grants to local SWCDs during the 2010-2011 biennium for O&M and structural repairs.

In response to this appropriation, the TSSWCB assembled a representative stakeholder group and began the process of developing programs to deliver the funds to the sponsors of flood control dams during the summer of 2009. It was determined that the most efficient and effective way to proceed was to develop two separate grant programs, one to address O&M, and the other to address structural repairs, due to their difference in complexity.

Currently, \$14 million is needed for O&M on 2,000 dams, \$67 million is needed to repair 188 flood control program dams in Texas, and \$1.5 Billion is needed to upgrade and rehabilitate about 500 high hazard dams where downstream urban development has resulted in public safety issues.

### **O&M Grant Program**

The O&M Grant Program is a reimbursable grant program for local SWCDs and certain co-sponsors of flood control dams. This program reimburses SWCDs 90% of the cost of an eligible O&M activity as defined by the program rules; the remaining 10% must be paid with non-state funding. Rules for the O&M Grant Program were developed by the TSSWCB staff and a representative stakeholder group during the summer of 2009. The rules were adopted by the State Board on September 17, 2009, and published in the Texas Register on October 9, 2009. The rules became effective October 14, 2009, and the program is fully operational.

For FY2018, \$3,000,000 was available for sponsors to submit proposals to complete O&M work. A total of 117 proposals were received, and 103 proposals were approved for funding to complete O&M activities.

For FY2019, \$1,000,000 was available for sponsors to submit proposals to complete O&M work. To date a total of 40 proposals have been received and approved to complete O&M activities in the amount of \$767,000. Proposals will continue to be received and approved until all funds are used.

### **Structural Repair Grant Program**

The Structural Repair Grant Program is a reimbursable grant program for local SWCDs and certain co-sponsors of flood control dams. This program reimburses SWCDs 95% of the cost of performance of structural repair activity as defined by the program rules; the remaining 5% must be paid with non-state funding. Rules for the Structural Repair Grant Program were adopted by the State Board on March 18, 2010, and became effective April 25, 2010.

Agreements are currently being signed with sponsors on three state funded dam repairs. Sponsors will contract for construction of these projects in the next three or four months. Approximately \$1,900,000 construction funding and \$470,000 for engineering services will be allocated to these projects in fiscal year 2019. Designs are underway on additional repair projects, which will be funded later in the fiscal year.

### **Dam Rehabilitation**

In September 2018, TSSWCB signed agreements with NRCS for \$19.1 million in federal rehabilitation funding for planning, design, and construction. TSSWCB is contracting for engineering services and construction on these dams. TSSWCB will be providing \$8.2 million in state matching funds to assist sponsors of these projects with the local share of rehabilitation project costs.

Since 2014, total federal dam rehabilitation funding provided by NRCS to TSSWCB is \$52.7 million on 71 dams. State matching funds for rehab construction obligated to date is \$16.9 million.

Following are the funded activities and current status of rehabilitation projects:

#### **Planning in Progress**

Lower East Fork Laterals 9 & 10 (Kaufman)

#### **Design in Progress**

Lower Brushy 20 (Williamson)  
Cedar Creek 87A (Kaufman)  
Lower Plum Creek 28 (Caldwell)  
Plum Creek 10 (Hays)  
Plum Creek 12 (Hays)  
Plum Creek 21 (Caldwell)  
Chambers Creek 10 (Ellis)  
Chambers Creek 11 (Ellis)

#### **Construction in Progress**

East Fork Above Lavon 4 (Collin)



### **Construction Completed in 2018**

Martinez Creek 2 (Bexar)  
Williams Creek 3 (Gillespie)  
Plum Creek 6 (Hays)  
Upper Brushy Creek 32 (Williamson)

### **Assessment of High Hazard Dams Completed**

FY 2016 – 18 dams  
FY 2017 – 16 dams

### **Emergency Watershed Protection Program (dam repair as of November 15, 2018)**

In FY 2016 and 2017, TSSWCB signed agreements with NRCS for \$8.5 million in federal EWP funding for repair of 23 dams damaged by heavy rainfall in 2015 through 2017. An additional \$13.6 million of federal EWP funds were contracted by NRCS directly with sponsors for the repair of an additional 49 dams. TSSWCB provided \$5.4 million of state funds for engineering services and grants to sponsors to help match the federal funds on these projects. All EWP dam repair projects have been completed, except for 5 dams in Fayette County (2017 Hurricane Harvey damage).

For more information on these programs, please visit the TSSWCB's website at:

<https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/flood-control-program>

### **Texas Nonpoint Source Management Program**

The federal Clean Water Act (CWA) requires States to develop a program to protect the quality of water resources from the adverse effects of NPS water pollution. The *Texas NPS Management Program* is the State's official roadmap for addressing NPS pollution and is jointly administered by the TSSWCB and the TCEQ. The program publication is updated every five years. The *2017 Texas NPS Management Program* was approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) March 2018.

The *Texas NPS Management Program* utilizes baseline water quality management programs and regulatory, voluntary, financial, and technical assistance approaches to achieve a balanced program. NPS pollution is managed through assessment, planning, implementation, and education. The TSSWCB and the TCEQ have established goals and objectives for guiding and tracking the progress of NPS management in Texas.

On March 1, 2018, TSSWCB distributed the *2017 Annual Report on Managing NPS Water Pollution in Texas* to all SWCDs; the report is jointly published by the TSSWCB and the TCEQ. In order to continue receiving CWA §319(h) funds, the State must annually report to EPA on success in achieving the goals and objectives of the *Texas NPS Management Program*. The report highlights the State's efforts during FY2017 to collect data, assess water quality, implement projects that reduce or prevent NPS pollution, and educate and involve the public to improve and maintain the quality of water resources. The report is available at <https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/about/agency-reports>.

Implementation of the *Texas NPS Management Program* involves partnerships among many organizations. With the extent and variety of NPS issues across Texas, cooperation across political boundaries is essential. Many local, regional, state, and federal agencies play an integral part in managing NPS pollution, especially at the watershed level. SWCDs are vital partners in working with landowners to implement BMPs that prevent and abate agricultural and silvicultural NPS water pollution.

Multiple water quality programs administered by and/or coordinated through TSSWCB collectively represent the agency's efforts in supporting the goals and objectives of the *Texas NPS Management Program* including:

- Nonpoint Source Grant Program
- Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) Program
- Watershed Protection Plan (WPP) Program
- Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) Program
- Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee Function
- Texas Groundwater Protection Committee Function

More information on the *Texas NPS Management Program* is available at

<https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/texas-nonpoint-source-management-program>

### **Nonpoint Source Grant Program**

The NPS Grant Program is administered by the TSSWCB for the purpose of providing funding as grants to cooperating entities for activities that address the goals and objectives stated in the *Texas NPS Management Program*. The Texas Legislature and the U.S. Congress (through the EPA) provide funding to the TSSWCB to administer the agricultural and silvicultural components of the *Texas NPS Management Program* through the TSSWCB NPS Grant Program.

Agricultural and silvicultural NPS pollution prevention and abatement activities that can be funded through the NPS Grant Program include the following: development and implementation of nine-element WPPs and the NPS portion of TMDL Implementation Plans (I-Plan), surface water quality monitoring, demonstration of innovative best management practices (BMPs), technical assistance and financial incentives for the development and implementation of WQMPs, public outreach/education, and monitoring activities to determine the effectiveness of specific pollution prevention methods.

More information on the TSSWCB NPS Grant Program is available at

<https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/texas-nonpoint-source-management-program>

### **Clean Water Act §319(h) Grant Funding**

Congress enacted §319(h) of the CWA in 1987, establishing a national program to control NPS water pollution. Through §319(h), federal funds are provided annually through the EPA to States for the implementation of each State's NPS Management Program. Texas' share of the §319(h) funding is divided equally between the TCEQ and the TSSWCB. Over the past two years, the State's allocation has been approximately \$7 million per year.

TSSWCB is currently administering approximately \$10 million in unliquidated federal funds from FY2014 - FY2018 CWA §319(h) allocations. There are currently 35 ongoing §319(h) grant-funded projects addressing a wide array of agricultural and silvicultural NPS issues. Specific project activities include implementing BMPs to abate NPS pollution from animal feeding operations, grazing livestock operations and row crop operations; providing technical assistance through SWCDs for the development of WQMPs; providing financial incentives for implementing certain BMPs prescribed in WQMPs;

supporting various targeted educational programs; developing and implementing WPPs and implementing the NPS portion of TMDL I-Plans.

Quarterly progress reports for ongoing projects were received by January 15, 2018, April 15, 2018, July 15, 2018 and October 15, 2018. To date, reports have been received for 100% of the projects. These reports are entered semi-annually into EPA's Grants Reporting and Tracking System.

On August 17, 2018, TSSWCB staff issued the FY2019 Request for Proposals (RFP) for the NPS Grant Program. The RFP was published in the Texas Register, posted on the TSSWCB website, and all SWCDs and cooperating entities were notified of this funding opportunity. TSSWCB staff identified priority areas and activities for this funding cycle based on the Texas NPS Management Program and the 2014 Integrated Report. The deadline for proposal submission was September 28, 2018. A total of 24 proposals were received.

### **State Grant Funding**

The Texas Legislature has appropriated funds to the TSSWCB for the purpose of planning, implementing, and managing programs and practices for preventing and abating agricultural and silvicultural NPS water pollution in impaired watersheds. On September 17, 2009, the TSSWCB approved a revised *TSSWCB Policy on TMDLs and Watershed Planning, Assessment, and Implementation Activities* which provides guidance to staff on directing state appropriations for the NPS Grant Program. The TSSWCB has approved operating budgets for FY2017, FY2018 and FY2019 that allocated a total of \$2.9 million in state funds to the NPS Grant Program.

There are currently 10 ongoing state funded projects addressing an array of agricultural and silvicultural NPS issues. These projects are primarily being used to implement agricultural NPS components of TMDL I-Plans; conduct recreational use attainability analyses (RUAs); support increased analytical infrastructure at public bacterial source tracking (BST) laboratories; demonstrate innovative BMPs on animal feeding operations and grazinglands; and collect and analyze water quality data for watersheds with impaired waterbodies.

Quarterly progress reports for ongoing projects were received by December 15, 2017, March 15, 2018, June 15, 2018 and September 15, 2018. To date, reports have been received for 100% of the projects.

### **Total Maximum Daily Load Program**

The CWA requires Texas to identify lakes, rivers, streams, and estuaries failing to meet or not expected to meet water quality standards and not supporting their designated uses (swimming, drinking, aquatic life, etc.). This list of impaired waterbodies is known as the *Texas 303(d) List* and must be submitted to the EPA for review and approval every two years. The *2014 Texas Integrated Report for CWA §§305(b) and 303(d)* was approved by EPA on November 19, 2015. The *2014 Integrated Report* identifies over 589 impairments on 410 waterbody segments.

The State must then establish a Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for certain waterbodies identified on the *303(d) List*. A TMDL defines the maximum amount of a pollutant that a waterbody can assimilate on a daily basis and still meet water quality standards. The pollution reduction goal set by the TMDL is necessary to restore attainment of the designated use of the impaired waterbody. The TMDL allocates pollutant loads between point sources and nonpoint sources. It also takes into account a margin of safety, which reflects uncertainty and future growth.

Based on the environmental target of the TMDL, an Implementation Plan (I-Plan) is then developed that prescribes the measures necessary to mitigate anthropogenic (human-caused) sources of that pollutant in that waterbody. The I-Plan specifies limits for point source dischargers and recommends BMPs for nonpoint sources. It also lays out a schedule for implementation. Together, the TMDL and the I-Plan serve as the mechanism to reduce the pollutant, restore the full use of the waterbody and remove it from the *303(d) List*. EPA must approve the TMDL, but the I-Plan only requires State approval.

TSSWCB shares responsibility with the TCEQ for the development and implementation of TMDLs. On September 27, 2006, at a joint meeting, the TSSWCB and the TCEQ renewed this partnership and approved a revised *Memorandum of Agreement on Total Maximum Daily Loads, Implementation Plans, and Watershed Protection Plans*. This framework for collaboration between the two agencies describes the programmatic mechanisms employed to develop and implement TMDLs and I-Plans.

TSSWCB is engaged in implementation activities that support approved I-Plans addressing agricultural or silvicultural NPS load reductions described in adopted TMDLs; collaborating with stakeholders on the development of I-Plans for adopted TMDLs that contain agricultural or silvicultural NPS load reductions; and, actively engaged in the development of TMDLs for waterbodies impaired due to known or suspected agricultural or silvicultural NPS pollution.

TSSWCB funded activities are mitigating bacteria, dissolved oxygen, phosphorus and salinity impairments through TMDLs and I-Plans.

In order to abate agricultural and silvicultural NPS pollution, TMDLs and I-Plans will implement components of other TSSWCB Programs, such as the Water Quality Management Plan Program. Additionally, the TSSWCB NPS Grant Program serves as a funding source to implement the agricultural and silvicultural NPS components of I-Plans. These programs are described in detail in other sections of this Report.

More information on the TSSWCB TMDL Program is available at:

<https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/texas-nonpoint-source-management-program/total-maximum-daily-load-program>

## **Watershed Approach to Water Quality Planning and Implementation**

Protecting the State's rivers, streams, lakes, bays, and aquifers from the impacts of NPS pollution is a complex process. Texas uses a Watershed Approach to focus efforts on the highest priority water quality issues of both surface and ground water. The Watershed Approach is based on the following principles:

- Geographic focus based on hydrology rather than political boundaries;
- Water quality objectives based on scientific data;
- Coordinated priorities and integrated solutions; and,
- Diverse, well-integrated partnerships.

The TSSWCB applies the Watershed Approach to managing NPS pollution by channeling its efforts to restore and protect water quality through the development and implementation of WPPs and TMDLs. Specific watersheds where agricultural and/or silvicultural NPS pollution is contributing to a water quality impairment or concern to an extent which TSSWCB believes is sufficient to justify expenditure of agency resources are shown in Figure 3. This list of "priority" watersheds is frequently updated by the TSSWCB.




Figure 3. TSSWCB Efforts to Restore Water Quality



## **Recreational Use Attainability Analyses**

According to the *2014 Texas Integrated Report for CWA §§305(b) and 303(d)*, 255 waterbodies are impaired because they do not meet surface water quality standards for bacteria established to protect contact recreation use (in freshwater or saltwater) and/or oyster water use. The magnitude of bacteria impairments in Texas is evident when compared to all other types of water quality impairments.

Critical to solving the breadth of bacteria impairments statewide is ensuring that the water quality standards designed to protect recreation use are appropriate and credible. The 2010 revisions to the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards establish a four tier approach to recreation use including primary contact recreation, secondary contact recreation 1, secondary contact recreation 2, and noncontact recreation. In order to change the presumed level of recreation use of a waterbody (i.e., primary contact recreation) to any of the other 3 tiers and the associated bacteria criterion, a recreational use attainability analysis (RUAA) must be completed for each waterbody and approved by TCEQ and subsequently EPA.

The purpose of an RUAA is to ascertain the actual recreation occurring on a waterbody, establish or verify a presumed use, and, if necessary, assign a more appropriate use. During an RUAA information is collected on water recreation activities, stream flow type, and stream depth; additionally, interviews from users who are present during surveys and those familiar with the waterbody may be conducted and a review of historical information may be completed. If the results of the RUAA indicate that a different, more appropriate use is warranted, the resulting change in the associated bacteria criterion may result in the waterbody no longer being identified on the *303(d) List* as impaired, thus negating the need to adopt a TMDL.

The TCEQ and TSSWCB are in the process of conducting RUAAs on waterbodies across the state. Prior to conducting the surveys, local stakeholders will be contacted to seek input on each project's monitoring plan. TCEQ is coordinating communication with SWCDs through the TSSWCB. After the RUAAs are conducted, TCEQ will evaluate the information and again consult with stakeholders regarding potential site-specific revisions to the surface water quality standards for each waterbody.

## **Watershed Protection Plan Program**

Watershed Protection Plans (WPPs) are locally-driven mechanisms for voluntarily addressing complex water quality problems that cross multiple jurisdictions. WPPs are coordinated frameworks for implementing prioritized water quality protection and restoration strategies driven by environmental objectives. Through the watershed planning process, TSSWCB encourages stakeholders to holistically address all the sources and causes of impairments and threats to both surface and ground water resources within a watershed.

WPPs serve as tools to better leverage the resources of local governments, state and federal agencies, and non-governmental organizations. WPPs integrate activities and prioritize implementation projects based upon technical merit and benefits to the community, promote a unified approach to seeking funding for implementation, and create a coordinated public education program. Developed and implemented through diverse, well integrated partnerships, a WPP assures the long-term health of the watershed with solutions that are socially acceptable and economically viable which achieve environmental goals for water resources. Adaptive management is used to modify the WPP based on an on-going science-based process that incorporates new knowledge into decision-making.

EPA requires certain expenditures through CWA §319(h) grants to be in accordance with a WPP. TSSWCB provides technical and financial assistance to local stakeholder groups to develop and implement WPPs to address significant agricultural or silvicultural NPS issues. Additionally, TSSWCB staff provides technical assistance in developing WPPs which are funded and facilitated by other entities, such as the TCEQ.

Partnerships with the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, the Texas Water Resources Institute and the TCEQ have resulted in the development of training programs for local stakeholder groups and watershed coordinators. The Texas Watershed Steward Program (<http://tws.tamu.edu/>) supports the development and implementation of WPPs by promoting a sustainable proactive approach to managing water quality at the local level by empowering individuals to take leadership roles in the management of water resources. The Texas Watershed Planning Short Course (<http://watershedplanning.tamu.edu/>) delivers training to watershed coordinators and water resource professionals to ensure WPPs are adequately planned, coordinated, implemented, and results properly assessed and reported. In order to build upon the fundamental knowledge conveyed through the Short Course, the State hosts Watershed Coordinator Roundtables (<http://watershedplanning.tamu.edu/developing/guidance/roundtable>) semi-annually to continue dialogue between watershed coordinators in order to facilitate interactive solutions to common issues being faced statewide.

WPPs currently sponsored by TSSWCB have significant agricultural or silvicultural NPS pollution components and are all funded through NPS Grants. While WPPs sponsored by TCEQ have significant water quality issues related to urban NPS pollution or wastewater treatment, most, to varying degrees, have agricultural or silvicultural NPS pollution components as well. There are several other watershed planning efforts across the state which are funded and sponsored by entities and agencies other than the TSSWCB or the TCEQ.

In order to abate agricultural and silvicultural NPS pollution, WPPs will implement components of other TSSWCB Programs, such as the Water Quality Management Plan Program.

More information on the TSSWCB WPP Program is available at <https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/texas-nonpoint-source-management-program/watershed-protection-plan-program>

### **Water Quality Management Plan Program**

The Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) Certification Program established by the enactment of Senate Bill 503 in 1993 offers landowners and operators of agricultural and silvicultural lands a voluntary mechanism for being protective of state water quality with respect to nonpoint source pollution. This program offers cost-share funding for the installation of soil and water land improvement measures to serve as an incentive for participating.

From January 1, 2018 through November 30, 2018 there have been 191 new WQMPs certified on 66,000 acres. There have also been 93 applications approved for financial incentives to assist producers with the implementation of agricultural nonpoint source pollution abatement practices. More information about the WQMP Program is available at: <https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/water-quality-management-plan>

## **Poultry Water Quality Management Plan (WQMP) Program**

### ***Background***

In 1994, the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB) began assisting poultry operations with the establishment of the Northeast Texas Regional Office in Mt. Pleasant.

In 1997, the Texas Legislature passed Senate Bill 1910, which required all poultry farms to have a TCEQ-approved method of dead bird disposal. It was during this time that requests for poultry WQMPs significantly increased due to pursuit of cost-share for mandated mortality management. This activity intensified the TSSWCB's poultry initiative.

In 2001, the 77<sup>th</sup> Legislature passed Senate Bill 1339, which requires all commercial poultry facilities in Texas to operate in accordance with a WQMP certified by the TSSWCB. The review and certification process assures the plan includes appropriate practices, management measures, and schedules of implementation.

In 2004, large dry-litter poultry farms were first defined as concentrated animal feeding operations (CAFOs) due to changes made by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to the federal regulations. In 2006 TCEQ adopted new rules to allow CAFO size dry-litter poultry farms an exemption to permitting if they obtain and follow a WQMP certified by TSSWCB.

In 2009 the 81<sup>st</sup> Texas Legislature passed Senate Bill 1693 which prohibits TSSWCB from certifying or re-certifying a WQMP for a farm that is likely to cause a nuisance odor for neighbors within ½ of one mile of the farm unless it obtains an odor control plan. It also requires owners of new farms to complete an odor control prevention course from Texas A&M poultry science department.

The TSSWCB Nacogdoches Poultry Program Office was established in 2003, while the Gonzales and Leon County offices were established in 2007. Each located in heavily poultry populated areas of the state and each also serves the poultry producers in surrounding counties. Those 3 offices serve 30 counties which account for about 70% of the currently over 1200 existing dry-litter poultry farms in Texas. Poultry Program staffing now consists of (1) Program Supervisor, (4) Natural Resource Specialists, and (1) Administrative Assistant to assist poultry producers primarily in those 30 counties, but are available for other counties as needed. In addition, TSSWCB Regional Office staffs also assist poultry producers in their areas across the state.

### ***Current Issues***

Currently, the TSSWCB is aware of 1214 total dry-litter poultry farms, of which 564 (46%) are defined as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO). However, there is an ongoing challenge of identifying new poultry farms continually being constructed and put into production, others going out of business, farms changing bird placement numbers which can affect their AFO/CAFO status, and locating other poultry farms not yet identified.

In FY 2019, staff in the Poultry WQMP Program continues to develop, update, and review Water Quality Management Plans for poultry producers and provide assistance with all issues related to the Poultry WQMP Program. Poultry program staff work with about 829 (68%) of the 1214 total farms. Regional office

staffs assist the other 385 farms. Approximately 482 (40%) of the estimated 1214 dry-litter poultry farms in Texas are located in an eleven-county area surrounding Nacogdoches that are worked by poultry program staff. About 181 (38%) of the 482 farms in the 11-county area are large enough to be defined as Concentrated Animal Feeding Operations (CAFO), which require inspections conducted by TSSWCB staff which could result in needed revisions to their WQMP. In addition, the other existing 301 WQMPs are reviewed regularly for needed updates and revisions.

The office also assists other SWCDs in the state with poultry WQMP development and revision and complaint investigations as needed.

Since 2009, there have been 234 odor control plans submitted to TCEQ for approval, and 2 are currently being reviewed by TCEQ.

In March 2017, Sanderson Farms, Inc. announced its plans to build an additional new poultry complex just north of Tyler, Texas including a processing plant, hatchery, feed mill, and waste water treatment plant. Approximately 80 new poultry farms will be built and operated by contract growers to supply birds to Sanderson. Some of the farms have already been built and others are under construction. The complex is expected to be fully operational by mid to late 2019. Staffs from the Mt. Pleasant Regional Office and the Nacogdoches and Leon County Poultry Offices have been and will continue to work with the new growers to develop water quality management plans for their poultry farms.

### **Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee**

The Texas Coastal Management Program (CMP) was created to coordinate state, local, and federal programs for the management of Texas' coastal resources. The federally approved program brings approximately \$1.7 million in federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) funds to Texas annually, most of which goes to state and local entities to implement projects and program activities. Texas is one of only a handful of coastal states that pass substantial amounts of CZMA funds through to coastal communities for projects in the coastal zone.

The Texas General Land Office (GLO) and the Land Commissioner are responsible for coordinating activities associated with the CMP. The Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee (CCAC), established by the Texas Legislature, advises the Land Commissioner on matters related to implementation of the CMP; the TSSWCB is a statutorily-authorized member of the CCAC.

The federal Coastal Zone Act Reauthorization Amendments (CZARA), §6217, requires each State with an approved CMP to develop a federally approvable program to control coastal NPS pollution. A Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program workgroup was created to develop this document. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the EPA jointly administer the program at the federal level. In Texas, the TSSWCB and the TCEQ hold primary responsibility for the program's development and implementation.

Section 6217 calls for implementation of management measures (§6217(g)) that will control significant nonpoint sources of pollution to coastal waters. Six source categories are addressed by these measures: agriculture, forestry, urban and developing areas, marinas, wetland/riparian areas, and hydromodification. States can use voluntary approaches combined with existing state authorities to achieve implementation of management measures. However, if the voluntary mechanisms are not effective, states must have backup enforcement authorities in place to ensure that management measures are implemented.

Texas submitted the Texas Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program to EPA and NOAA in December 1998. In July 2003, NOAA and EPA issued conditional approval of the Texas Coastal NPS Pollution Control Program. The agricultural and silvicultural portions of the program were approved without conditions. Texas has five years to meet the remaining conditions to gain full approval of the program. The NPS Work Group developed a list of potential options to address the remaining conditions and submitted it to NOAA and EPA in July, 2008 for approval. In May 2009 EPA and NOAA requested further information from Texas before lifting the conditions on its approval. On January 26, 2012, GLO submitted the State's approach to resolving one of the remaining conditions (associated with on-site sewage facilities) to NOAA and EPA for review and approval.

The TSSWCB is responsible for implementing the agricultural and silvicultural management measures of the program. Mechanisms the TSSWCB uses to abate agricultural and silvicultural NPS pollution in the coastal zone include: the agency's Water Quality Management Plan Program, the CWA §319(h) NPS Grant Program, the Total Maximum Daily Load Program, and the Watershed Protection Plan Program.

Many of the WPPs and TMDLs that the TSSWCB is engaged in are in the coastal zone. WPPs being developed or implemented in the Coastal Zone include Arroyo Colorado, Bastrop Bayou, Armand Bayou, Cedar Bayou, Double Bayou, Dickinson Bayou and San Bernard River, Highland Bayou, and Lower Nueces River. TMDLs being developed or implemented in the Coastal Zone include Adams and Cow Bayous, Clear Creek, Copano Bay, Aransas and Mission Rivers, Dickinson Bayou, and Oso Bay and Creek.

Fifteen SWCDs are located in the Coastal Management Zone and work with landowners to develop and implement WQMPs on agricultural land. Implementation of the silvicultural management measures in the coastal zone is through a CWA §319(h) NPS grant to the Texas A&M Forest Service.

CMP information can be found at <http://www.glo.texas.gov/coast/grant-projects/cmp/index.html>  
More information on the Texas Coastal Nonpoint Source Pollution Control Program is available at <https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/coastal-nonpoint-source-pollution-control-program>.

### **Texas Groundwater Protection Committee Function**

Established by the Texas Legislature in 1989, the Texas Groundwater Protection Committee (TGPC) bridges the gap between State groundwater programs, improves coordination between member agencies, and works to protect groundwater as a vital resource. The TSSWCB is a statutorily-authorized member of the TGPC.

The Texas Water Code sets nondegradation of the State's groundwater resources as the goal for all State programs and asserts that groundwater be kept reasonably free of contaminants that interfere with its present and potential uses. The TGPC implements the State's groundwater protection policy which:

- Requires that pollution discharges, waste disposal and other regulated activities not harm public health or impair current or potential groundwater use;
- Recognizes the variability between aquifers;
- Acknowledges the importance of water quality;
- Balances the protection of the environment and the long-term economic health of the state; and,
- Recognizes the use of the best professional judgment of the responsible state agencies to implement the policy.



The Texas Water Code requires that the TGPC biennially prepare a report that provides recommendations to improve groundwater protection for legislative consideration and describes the TGPC's activities for the preceding biennium. The report, *Activities and Recommendations of the Texas Groundwater Protection Committee – Report to the 84th Legislature*, was approved by the TGPC and published in January 2015 by TCEQ.

Mechanisms the TSSWCB implements in order to prevent and abate agricultural and silvicultural NPS pollution impacting groundwater include the agency's Water Quality Management Plan Program, CWA §319(h) NPS Grant Program, State NPS Grant Program, Total Maximum Daily Load Program, and Watershed Protection Plan Program. These programs are described in detail in other sections of this Report. High priority aquifers where TSSWCB has historically committed agency resources include the Seymour Aquifer and the Ogallala Aquifer.

More information on the TGPC is available at <http://www.tgpc.state.tx.us/>.

### **Watershed Approach to Water Quality Planning and Implementation**

Protecting the State's rivers, streams, lakes, bays, and aquifers from the impacts of NPS pollution is a complex process. Texas uses a Watershed Approach to focus efforts on the highest priority water quality issues of both surface and ground water. The Watershed Approach is based on the following principles:

- Geographic focus based on hydrology rather than political boundaries;
- Water quality objectives based on scientific data;
- Coordinated priorities and integrated solutions; and,
- Diverse, well-integrated partnerships.

The TSSWCB applies the Watershed Approach to managing NPS pollution by channeling its efforts to restore and protect water quality through the development and implementation of WPPs and TMDLs. Specific watersheds where agricultural and/or silvicultural NPS pollution is contributing to a water quality impairment or concern to an extent which TSSWCB believes is sufficient to justify expenditure of agency resources are shown in Figure 3. This list of "priority" watersheds is frequently updated by the TSSWCB.

### **Office 365 Migration**

In 2017, the TSSWCB migrated its on-premise email, groupware and office productivity applications to the Microsoft Office 365 cloud platform.

This migration marks the first and most significant adoption of public cloud services by the agency with additional migrations planned for web applications currently hosted in the agency's private cloud.

### **HQ Internet Migration to DIR**

Also in 2017, the agency migrated its headquarter's internet connectivity to a circuit routed through the network operations center of the Texas Department of Information Resources (DIR). The move from was made to better leverage DIR's security enhancements and technical support resources.

## **SWCD Information Technology Assistance**

In 2017, the TSSWCB continued providing assistance to Texas SWCDs who indicated a need for help in maintaining Internet connectivity.

This work was started in 2014 after the TSSWCB Long Range Planning Committee set several IT-related goals to enable the agency to better support the state conservation programs implemented by Texas' 216 SWCDs. These goals included increased efficiency and communication, and included projects to upgrade the SWCD email infrastructure, and help SWCD offices establish Internet connectivity and procure needed PCs and printers.

The TSSWCB worked with the Texas Department of Information Resources to reserve and configure the domain *swcd.texas.gov* for SWCD email accounts. TSSWCB provides primary DNS hosting for the domain. Google's G Suite cloud application platform was chosen for email hosting and offers SWCDs an array of other resources, including an online office suite, calendaring, and storage. TSSWCB staff administers the Google accounts and provides support for SWCD employees.

## **PC Hardware Refresh**

Work continued on the replacement of the oldest agency desktop PCs and servers with more capable and reliable units. This work was part of a continuous process that aims to lessen the risk of unacceptable levels of downtime that could occur following PC hardware failures.

Each of the machines replaced was at or, in some cases, significantly beyond the PC life cycle recommendations from DIR. All purchases were made in accordance with DIR guidelines through a DIR-approved vendor.

## **Public Information/Education Report**

The purpose of the public information/education program is to provide leadership and coordination of information/education programs relating to the agency and district programs, services, operations and resources. The TSSWCB prepares and disseminates public information relative to the agency and district functions, programs, events and accomplishments for the public and to farmers and ranchers. TSSWCB staff coordinates seminars, conferences, workshops, displays at trade shows and training for district directors and district bookkeepers, conservation professionals, youth groups and other entities. Staff provides guidance to districts with their own individual information/education programs as well as regional and state information/education programs initiated by districts. Staff prepares and disseminates press releases, news stories and printed promotional products. The TSSWCB monitors the use of the publications and use of information. Staff represents the agency as needed with various information/education groups and entities. The TSSWCB has a cooperative agreement with the Association of Texas Soil and Water Conservation Districts to provide assistance and help coordinate district involvement and participation with Association's Information/Education Committee and its programs.

## **District Leadership Development Workshop**

A district leadership development workshop will be held February 20-21, 2019 to provide training specifically for newly elected soil and water conservation district directors, although all district directors and district employees are encouraged to attend the training. In addition, a cooperative effort with the

USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service permits a limited number of new NRCS district conservationists to attend the training.

Key topics addressed in the training include:

- History, powers and duties of the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board (TSSWCB)
- Interaction but different authorities of the local soil and water conservation district (SWCD), Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, and the Natural Resources Conservation Service
- Qualifications, terms and duties of SWCD director
- General powers and duties of SWCDs
- Proper method of conducting a local SWCD meeting
- Overview of current TSSWCB program responsibilities
- Ethics training for SWCD directors
- Equal employment opportunity training for SWCD directors
- Fiscal operations and responsibilities of SWCDs
- Relationships between other state and national conservation organizations.
- Required training in Texas Open Government Laws through the Office of the Texas Attorney General

### **2018 Texas Conservation Awards Program**

Each year, the TSSWCB and the Association of Texas Soil and Water Conservation Districts co-sponsor the Texas Conservation Awards Program to recognize and honor those who dedicate themselves and their talents to the conservation and wise use of renewable natural resources. The 2018 Awards Program marks the 40<sup>th</sup> year of this joint program.

Local districts select their outstanding individuals as winners and submit them by mid-February each year for regional judging. Those selected as regional winners are honored each May at regional Awards Banquets. From these regional winners, a state winner is selected for the Outstanding Conservation Districts, Outstanding Conservation Teacher, Poster Contest, and the Essay Contest. These individuals are invited to the Annual State Meeting for recognition.

The conservation awards program provides competition and incentives to expand and improve conservation efforts, resource development, and increase the wise utilization of renewable natural resources. As a result, soil and water conservation districts, and both rural and urban citizens of Texas are benefited.

### **Soil & Water Stewardship Public Speaking Contest**

The Soil & Water Stewardship Public Speaking Contest is open to high school FFA students interested in soil, water and related renewable natural resource conservation. The contest is aimed at broadening students' interest and knowledge of conservation and how individuals must depend on and take care of the world around them for survival. The contest is coordinated through the Texas FFA, with contests at the local, area and state level. Local winners compete in the 12 state FFA areas and the first and second place winners at the area level compete for the state title. The theme of the 2018 contest was “Watersheds Our Water, Our Home.”

This project is a partnership between the Texas FFA, the Vocational Agriculture Teacher's Association of Texas, The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, and the Association of Texas Soil and Water

Conservation Districts. The State Winner of the Soil and Water Stewardship Public Speaking Contest is invited to attend the Annual State Meeting each year and asked to deliver their winning address.

### **Wildlife Alliance for Youth**

The Wildlife Alliance for Youth (WAY) contests offer opportunities at the local district level for 4-H and FFA students to demonstrate their knowledge of the outdoors on wildlife habitat and management, wildlife laws, sportsmanship and other factual information on wildlife. The program offers awards to the high scoring FFA chapter in each of the five state regions and awards to the first, second and third place high scoring teams at the state event. The benefit of the program enables students to become involved in conservation and obtain an appreciation for wildlife.

Agriculture Science students, who compete in the WAY Contest, first acquire the foundational knowledge and skills for this event through the Agscience 381 - Wildlife and Recreation Curriculum. The WAY contests address the following nine subject areas in Wildlife and Recreation Management: Wildlife Plant Identification; Wildlife Plant Preferences; Wildlife Biological Facts; Wildlife Habitat; Habitat Management; Game Laws; Hunter and Boater Safety; and Identification Techniques. FFA and 4-H youth should have an understanding of these subject areas before they compete.

The WAY contests are held in the five Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board areas. Area IV (East Texas) holds their contest in the fall. Area V (North Central), Area I (Panhandle), Area II (West Texas) and Area III (South Texas) all hold their contests in the spring. Each team is certified to the area level by their local SWCD. The WAY State Contest rotates each year to one of the five TSSWCB geographical areas of the state. Approximately 2,000 youth participate in the regional contests and statewide contest competition.

The Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board, Association of Texas Soil and Water Conservation Districts, USDA- Natural Resources Conservation Service, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Texas A&M University, Cooperative Extension service, and the Texas Education Agency, along with local soil and water conservation districts (SWCD), all partner in the success of the youth organization.

### **State Woodland Clinic and Contest**

The Texas State Woodland Clinic and Contest is held annually in the month of April. It is a joint effort between local soil and water conservation districts, Stephen F. Austin University School of Forestry and the NRCS-USDA.

The contest is an opportunity for 4-H and FFA youth to demonstrate their expertise in different aspects of forestry management and skills in identification of needed practices and management techniques. Competition is between teams composed of four members representing either a 4-H Club or a FFA Chapter. Prior to the state contest several local districts conduct contests for 4-H Clubs and FFA Chapters within their district and the surrounding area.

The contest began in the late 1950s and was initiated by local SWCDs and timber industry personnel to develop forestry and woodland curriculum in schools in the commercial timber area of the state (East Texas Piney Woods). The clinic and contest have experienced widespread popularity and now has participation from outside of the commercial timber area on a regular basis. The state participation level for teams averages around 55 teams per year, with the vast majority of teams being composed of FFA Chapters. Winners at the state level are eligible to participate in the four states regional woodland contest

held each May in one of four states. Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas and Oklahoma host the regional contest on a rotational basis.

### **Regional Woodland Contest**

The four states regional woodland contest is sponsored by soil and water conservation districts in each of the four states with program and technical support provided by USDA-NRCS and Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D), state organizations and industry personnel. The soil and water conservation districts in Texas hosted the first four states or southern regional woodland contest in 1984.

Each state is allowed to send a maximum of six teams to the regional contest. Each state has a competition that determines the six teams from that state that may enter in the regional contest. Those teams may be composed of individuals representing either a 4-H Club or an FFA Chapter.

### **Nonpoint Source (NPS) Pollution Watershed Flow Model**

The NPS model is a hands-on representation of a landscape that allows students to understand how water sources can become polluted from nonpoint sources. The plastic landscape structure has industrial, undeveloped, agricultural, and residential and roadway features complete with individual houses, trees, cars, tractors and cows. When "rain" falls on the model, the runoff flows into a city lake. Using various products to add color to the water, the model demonstrates how potential pollutants are picked up by runoff.

The model is a layout of a watershed that includes all the factors that may contribute to polluting our water. (Urban features such as: factories, parking lots, construction sites, lawn chemicals and golf courses and rural features such as: forested land, dairies, feedlots, cropland and pastureland). To demonstrate how each type of potential pollutant can enter a water body Kool-Aid and cocoa are used to color "runoff". Grape Kool-Aid is used to represent pollution from factories and oil from parking lots and roads. Orange Kool-aid represents pollution from lawn chemicals, golf courses, and cropland and pastureland chemicals. Cocoa is used to represent pollution from construction sites, forested land, dairies and feedlots. The Kool-aid and Cocoa are sprinkled on the model in the areas that represent each type of pollutant. Once all the pollutants are sprinkled on the model a spray bottle with water is use to represent rainfall. As the pollutants get wet and start to runoff the students can see how the water carries them to the streams and into the lake where we get our drinking water. Once all the pollutants have run into the lake the students can see how these factors have the potential to make surface waters unattractive and unsafe. This demonstration leads to a discussion about how to protect the water quality and prevent our water from looking like the model.

### **Texas Invasive Species Coordinating Committee**

The Texas Invasive Species Coordinating Committee (TISCC) was established by the 81<sup>st</sup> Texas Legislature in 2009 (Senate Bill 691) and administratively attached to the TSSWCB. The member agencies of the TISCC are the Texas Department of Agriculture, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, the TSSWCB, the Texas A&M AgriLife Extension Service, the Texas A&M Forest Service, and the Texas Water Development Board.

The TISCC provides a forum for developing interagency strategies and policies for invasive species control. Its member agencies cooperate through an orderly exchange of information, jointly held meetings, and the appointment of sub-committees and working groups in order to facilitate development



of effective and timely state responses to invasive species and to make recommendations to the leadership of state departments and agencies regarding research, technology transfer, and management actions related to invasive species control.

Many of TSSWCB's programs support the State's invasive species management goals and contribute to achieving the goals and objectives of the TISCC. For example, while the agency's new Rio Grande Carrizo Cane Eradication Program is directed towards improving border security, carrizo cane is also an invasive species; therefore, this program also supports the State's invasive species management goals.

More information regarding the TISCC is available at <http://www.tiscc.texas.gov/>.

## **Water Supply Enhancement Program**

### *Meeting Critical Water Conservation Needs and Enhancing Public Water Supplies Through Brush Control*

Over at least the last century, rangeland vegetation in the United States has undergone a large-scale conversion from grasslands to woodlands. Noxious brush, detrimental to water conservation, has invaded millions of acres of rangeland and riparian areas in Texas, reducing or eliminating stream flow and aquifer recharge through interception of rainfall and increased evapotranspiration. Brush control has the potential to enhance water yield by conserving water lost to evapotranspiration, recharge groundwater and aquifers, enhance spring and stream flows, restore native wildlife habitat by improving rangeland condition, improve livestock grazing distribution, and aid in wildfire suppression by reducing hazardous fuels. In order to help meet the State's critical water conservation needs and ensure availability of public water supplies, the Texas Legislature, in 2011, established the Water Supply Enhancement Program (WSEP) administered by the TSSWCB. The purpose of the WSEP is to increase available surface and ground water supplies through the targeted control of brush species that are detrimental to water conservation. More information on the WSEP is available at <https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/water-supply-enhancement-program>.

In March 2017, the TSSWCB requested proposals for water supply enhancement projects seeking funding in FY2018-2019 to conduct brush control under the Water Supply Enhancement Program (WSEP). Proposed projects focused on watersheds with a demonstrated water conservation need and where brush control has been shown, using a computer model, to be a feasible strategy to enhance surface and/or ground water supplies. Proposals were due Thursday, June 1, 2017, and the WSEP Office received 22 project proposals. Two of these projects were approved for funding in FY2018.

In FY2018, the TSSWCB approved \$1,008,288 in cost-share funds to the following on-going projects that were approved in FY2016 and in FY2017:

- Carrizo Wilcox (subbasin 23): Gonzales County SWCD 338 - \$14,950
- Edwards Aquifer-Frio River (subbasin 28): Upper Nueces-Frio SWCD 238-\$18,480
- Edwards Aquifer-Nueces River (subbasin 101-4): Upper Nueces-Frio SWCD 238-\$49,980
- Guadalupe River/Canyon Lake (subbasin 18): Kendall SWCD 216 - \$112,926
- Guadalupe River/Canyon Lake (subbasin 20): Kendall SWCD 216 - \$132,300
- Lake Fort Phantom Hill (subbasin 15): Middle Clear Fork SWCD 206-\$250,000
- Lake Ivie (subbasin CLD-62): Nolan County SWCD 245-\$250,000
- Lake Travis (subbasin 4): Pedernales SWCD 218-\$20,370

- Lake Travis (subbasin 5): Pedernales SWCD 218-\$66,726
- Medina Lake (subbasin 10): Bandera SWCD 229 - \$3,360
- Upper Llano River (subbasin 46): Upper Llano SWCD 225-\$66,726
- Upper Llano River (subbasin 48): Upper Llano SWCD 225-\$22,470

The State Board also approved FY2018 funding in the amount of \$400,000 to the following FY2018-2019 ranked projects:

- Lake Palo Pinto (subbasin 2210808): Palo Pinto SWCD 518-\$200,000
- Lake Brownwood (subbasin 32): Pecan Bayou SWCD 553-\$200,000

## **Rio Grande Carrizo Cane Eradication Program**

### *Improving Border Security and Restoring Ecosystem Function of the Rio Grande Through Invasive Species Control*

Large dense stands of non-native carrizo cane (*Arundo donax*) occupy the banks and floodplains of the Rio Grande, thwarting law enforcement efforts along the international border, impeding and concealing the detection of criminal activity, restricting law enforcement officers' access to riverbanks, and impairing the ecological function and biodiversity of the Rio Grande. As a result of this weed's high evapotranspiration capacity, infestations threaten water supplies for agricultural and municipal drinking water uses in south Texas. In order to help achieve the Governor's border security priorities, the Texas Legislature, in 2015, directed the TSSWCB to develop and implement a Rio Grande Carrizo Cane Eradication Program (RGCCEP). Comprehensively addressing the impacts of carrizo cane on border security is paramount to the program, while also accruing benefits to the ecosystem health of the Rio Grande and water user groups in south Texas. Due to the diversity of biological, legal, and cultural issues associated with control of carrizo cane along the 1,255-mile Rio Grande international border, the RGCCEP takes an ecosystem-based approach that integrates the use of biological, chemical, and mechanical controls, as appropriate, to manage carrizo cane along the river. This approach will promote restoration of treated areas with beneficial native plants, and necessitate a long-term maintenance and monitoring program to ensure control is successful. More information on the RGCCEP is available at <https://www.tsswcb.texas.gov/programs/rio-grande-carrizo-cane-eradication-program>

The 85th Legislature approved funding in the amount of \$3 million across the 2018-2019 biennium (\$1.5 million per fiscal year) to implement the RGCCEP. A need for dedicated funding to implement the RGCCEP is identified in the TSSWCB's Strategic Plan for Fiscal Years 2017 to 2021. Funding will allow the TSSWCB to reduce carrizo cane canopy and density which will improve border access for law enforcement officers and improve visibility to allow better detection of illegal activities.

The TSSWCB applied for a 2018 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) through The Governor's Criminal Justice Division. The request was for \$300,000 for Carrizo Cane control. The TSSWCB received notice that the grant was not approved.

The TSSWCB developed a Request for Proposals for aerial application of herbicide, herbicide application by watercraft, herbicide application by ATV (by hand) to utilize FY 18-19 RGCCEP funding. The RFP specifications allow for the TSSWCB to select contractors that have expertise in the various methods of treatment of cane: aerial application of herbicide, hand herbicide treatment, watercraft herbicide treatment, and biological

# Attachments

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance  
 OBJECTIVE: 1 Provide Prog Expertise, Finan Asst. & Tech Guide to All SWC Districts  
 STRATEGY: 1 Program Expertise, Financial & Conservation Implementation Assistance

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$1,028,802.72
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$29,920.00
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$1,993.08
2004	UTILITIES	\$22,594.65
2005	TRAVEL	\$191,611.73
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$32,871.04
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$2,511.18
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$90,787.84
4000	GRANTS	\$4,582,536.71
	<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$5,983,628.95</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$5,609,441.51
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$5,609,441.51</b>
555	Federal Funds	
	10.912.000 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INC	\$374,187.44
	CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555	\$374,187.44
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$374,187.44</b>
	<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$5,983,628.95</b>
	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>14.0</b>

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance  
 OBJECTIVE: 2 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair  
 STRATEGY: 1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$302,846.45
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$4,080.00
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	\$1,201,175.42
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	\$5,359.59
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$1,343.21
2004	UTILITIES	\$5,013.86
2005	TRAVEL	\$34,047.79
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$11,859.99
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$421.53
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$12,140.31
4000	GRANTS	\$3,893,407.02
	<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$5,471,695.17</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$5,073,202.16
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$5,073,202.16</b>
555	Federal Funds	
	00.000.000 Temp Place Holder	\$398,493.01
	CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555	\$398,493.01
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$398,493.01</b>
	<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$5,471,695.17</b>



86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 1 Soil and Water Conservation Assistance  
OBJECTIVE: 2 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair  
STRATEGY: 1 Flood Control Dam Maintenance & Structural Repair

<b>CODE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4</b>
-------------	--------------------	---------------------------------------

---

	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>5.0</b>
--	---------------------------------------	------------

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricul Nonpoint Source Pollution  
OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program  
STRATEGY: 1 Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$545,514.22
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$12,320.00
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	\$5,813.21
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$1,899.60
2004	UTILITIES	\$11,015.99
2005	TRAVEL	\$19,668.49
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$25,049.78
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$11,833.40
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$21,916.70
4000	GRANTS	\$5,522,412.66
<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>		<b>\$6,177,444.05</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$3,630,349.44
<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>		<b>\$3,630,349.44</b>
555	Federal Funds	
	66.460.000 Nonpoint Source Implement	\$2,547,094.61
CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555		\$2,547,094.61
<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>		<b>\$2,547,094.61</b>
<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>		<b>\$6,177,444.05</b>

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

- GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricul Nonpoint Source Pollution  
OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program  
STRATEGY: 1 Implement a Statewide Management Plan for Controlling NPS Pollution

<b>CODE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4</b>
	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>9.0</b>

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricul Nonpoint Source Pollution  
 OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program  
 STRATEGY: 2 Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$1,334,810.80
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$34,820.00
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	\$8,614.60
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	\$22,193.15
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$9,207.94
2004	UTILITIES	\$32,728.93
2005	TRAVEL	\$22,212.61
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$160,231.54
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$21,101.83
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$86,451.66
4000	GRANTS	\$1,572,469.39
	<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$3,304,842.45</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$3,221,402.89
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$3,221,402.89</b>
555	Federal Funds	
	10.912.000 ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY INC	\$83,439.56
	CFDA Subtotal, Fund 555	\$83,439.56
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$83,439.56</b>
	<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$3,304,842.45</b>

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

---

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

- GOAL: 2 Administer a Program for Abatement of Agricul Nonpoint Source Pollution  
OBJECTIVE: 1 Reduce Agricultural/Silvicultural NPS Pollution w/Prevention Program  
STRATEGY: 2 Pollution Abatement Plans for Problem Agricultural Areas

<b>CODE</b>	<b>DESCRIPTION</b>	<b>USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4</b>
	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>28.0</b>



86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies  
 OBJECTIVE: 1 Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas  
 STRATEGY: 1 Provide Financial/Technical Assistance for Water Quantity Enhancement

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$101,205.48
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$1,533.14
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	\$3,232.62
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$800.99
2004	UTILITIES	\$3,100.61
2005	TRAVEL	\$2,810.38
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$25,909.79
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$481.53
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$2,979.24
4000	GRANTS	\$1,167,058.89
	<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$1,309,112.67</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$1,309,112.67
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$1,309,112.67</b>
	<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$1,309,112.67</b>
	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>2.0</b>

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 3 Protect and Enhance Water Supplies  
 OBJECTIVE: 1 Conserve and Enhance Water Supplies for the State of Texas  
 STRATEGY: 2 Carrizo Cane Eradication

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$91,793.64
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$5,166.86
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	\$1,313.50
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$199.29
2004	UTILITIES	\$1,744.17
2005	TRAVEL	\$10,872.79
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$8,855.50
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$263.30
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$323,738.41
4000	GRANTS	\$298,852.82
	<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$742,800.28</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$439,585.28
444	Interagency Contracts - CJG	\$303,215.00
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$742,800.28</b>
	<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$742,800.28</b>
	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>1.0</b>

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
 Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

**592 Soil and Water Conservation Board**

GOAL: 4 Indirect Administration  
 OBJECTIVE: 1 Indirect Administration  
 STRATEGY: 1 Indirect Administration

CODE	DESCRIPTION	USAS ACTUAL 2018 Quarter 4
<b>Objects of Expense:</b>		
1001	SALARIES AND WAGES	\$603,027.90
1002	OTHER PERSONNEL COSTS	\$20,296.36
2001	PROFESSIONAL FEES AND SERVICES	\$613.42
2002	FUELS AND LUBRICANTS	\$219.31
2003	CONSUMABLE SUPPLIES	\$2,094.59
2004	UTILITIES	\$9,751.56
2005	TRAVEL	\$45,013.85
2006	RENT - BUILDING	\$20,138.01
2007	RENT - MACHINE AND OTHER	\$601.95
2009	OTHER OPERATING EXPENSE	\$22,605.70
	<b>TOTAL, OBJECT OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$724,362.65</b>
<b>Method of Financing:</b>		
1	General Revenue Fund	\$720,151.00
666	Appropriated Receipts	\$4,211.65
	<b>SUBTOTAL, MOF (EXCLUDING FEDERAL FUNDS)</b>	<b>\$724,362.65</b>
	<b>TOTAL, METHOD OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$724,362.65</b>
	<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>9.0</b>

**Distribution by Strategy**

12/18/2018 11:25:41AM

86th Regular Session, ABEST/USAS, Version 1  
Automated Budget and Evaluation System of Texas (ABEST)

**SUMMARY TOTALS:**

<b>OBJECTS OF EXPENSE</b>	<b>\$23,713,886.22</b>
<b>METHODS OF FINANCING</b>	<b>\$23,713,886.22</b>
<b>FULL-TIME-EQUIVALENT POSITIONS</b>	<b>68.0</b>