

“FIELD OFFICE OF THE FUTURE” INITIATIVE

Work Notes from the 2012 KACD Convention

**Ray Ledgerwood,
Facilitator**

Kansas Conservation Future Scenario Options (11.19.12)

Meet Customer Needs (technical assistance, cost share, field services, conservation planning)

Component	Group			
	1	2	3	4
Local representation from CD/NRCS or both – office or vehicle				
Ability to do work at local level				
Technical assistance is needed that is responsive in timely manner (technician)				
Office staff needs expertise in programs (very important)				
Need an office presence – some place for producer to make contact with person (actual building needed)				
Conservation plan – staff covering plans thoroughly with producers (staff that do not have all field practice knowledge need more training)				
Conservation planning – properly trained conservation partnership employees to address current resource conservation needs				
Cost share - short on cost share, but producers willing to pay out own pocket – these should be moved up priority chain (at County Discretion)				
Have an office presence in each county (to meet needs)				
Address natural resource concerns of all local constituents.				
Additional technical assistance is needed that is responsive in a timely manner to priority jobs whether cost-shared or non-cost shared. (Local or shared Area Technicians).				
What <u>are</u> the producer needs				
Board would give directions & be respectful to employees				
Different resources for different regions				

Field Office Structure (district & NRCS)

Component	Group			
	1	2	3	4
Point of contact in county office with presence of CD's and NRCS				
Cultivate/expand partnerships				
Voluntary sharing within management units				
Shared specialized staff available in each county				
Specialize technical staff				
Move CD to courthouse or other location and have NRCS there too...NRCS can help out with costs ...stay in same offices...flexible (CD and NRCS stay together in the same building, would prefer to stay with FSA)				
Rethink our partnership				
Look at extension model				
Working together at multi-county level may be same as MU				
We may need to do some education to meet the partnership needs.				

Focus Resources

(people & money toward conservation)

Component	Group			
	1	2	3	4
Manpower - sharing employees over counties...based on strength of staff and customer needs (NRCS, board members, employees, etc.) (not combining)				
County boards meet together...common resource needs watersheds, local work groups meet quarterly or semi-annually (or as needed)				
Trade technology shared (Video Teleconference etc.)				
Support present, but potential funding issues at local & state level				
Put more emphasis on district board members generating more enthusiasm towards getting the word out regarding the conservation movement				
Coordinate and trade shared technology				
CD Network with Area Working Groups				
Based off producers need				
Local work groups work together and share information.				
One stop shop to a greater extent.				

Efficiencies

(sharing staff and resources)

Component	Group			
	1	2	3	4
Streamline programs				
Reduce paperwork...not just with NRCS and district (eg permitting process)				
Resource groups developing common goals				
Technology/telework				
Cross training				
Video conferencing capacity / all office – share with all agencies/compatible				
IT resources need to work for all partnering agencies				

Funding

(preparing for budget cuts)

Component	Group			
	1	2	3	4
Enhance lobbying for revenue				
Fees for services				
Enhance partnership group - including non-agriculture				
Enhance CD enterprise activities and marketing				
Local and state revenue; county funding				
Grants				
Local tax or other dedicated funding sources				
Support a mixture of state and local funding and or taxes				
Dedicated sales tax				
Look at the Missouri model for sale taxes				

Kansas Conservation Future Scenario Option Built by Group #1

Element	Notes
<p>Meet Customer Needs (technical assistance, cost share, field services, conservation planning)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local representation from CD/NRCS or both – office or vehicle ▪ Ability to do work at local level ▪ Technical assistance is needed that is responsive in timely manner (technician) ▪ Need an office presence – some place for producer to make contact with person ▪ Office staff needs expertise in programs ▪ Cost share- short on cost share but producers willing to pay out own pocket – these should be moved up priority chain (at County Discretion) ▪ Conservation plan – staff covering plans thoroughly with producers and staff doesn't have all field practice knowledge CD Staff need more training. ▪ Address natural resource concerns of all local constituents. ▪ Additional Technical assistance is needed that is responsive in a timely manner to priority jobs whether cost-shared or non-cost shared. (Local or shared Area Technicians). ▪ Have an office presence in each county (to meet needs) ▪ Conservation planning – properly trained conservation partnership employees to address current resource conservation needs
<p>Field Office Structure (district & NRCS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Point of contact in office. Co-presence in every County. ▪ Voluntary sharing within management units
<p>Focus Resources (people & money toward conservation)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support is there, but funding issues at local & state level ▪ Manpower - sharing employees over counties...based on strength of people already have (NRCS, board members, employees, etc.) ▪ Coordinate and Trade shared technology ▪ County boards meet together...common resource needs watersheds, local work groups (RC&D model) meet quarterly or semi-annually ▪ CD Network with Area Working Groups ▪ Put more emphasis on district board members generating more enthusiasm towards getting the word out regarding the conservation movement Put more emphasis on district board members generating more enthusiasm towards getting the word out regarding the conservation movement
<p>Efficiencies (sharing staff and resources)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streamline programs ▪ Reduce paperwork...not just with NRCS and district (eg permitting process) ▪ Resource groups developing common goals <p>Technology/telework</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meet by specializing staff resources
<p>Funding (preparing for budget cuts)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Enhance Lobbying for Revenue ▪ Fees for services ▪ Enhance partnership group - including non-agriculture ▪ Enhance CD enterprise activities and marketing

Kansas Conservation Future Scenario Option Built by Group #2

Element	Notes
Meet Customer Needs (technical assistance, cost share, field services, conservation planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local representation from CD/NRCS or both – office or vehicle ▪ Ability to do work at local level; have an office presence in each county ▪ Office and technical staff expertise to meet customer needs in a consistent timely manner ▪ Conservation plan – staff covering plans thoroughly with customers
Field Office Structure (district & NRCS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Point of contact in county office with presence of CD's and NRCS ▪ Shared specialized staff available in each county ▪ Cultivate partnerships
Focus Resources (people & money toward conservation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support present, but potential funding issues at local & state level ▪ Manpower - sharing employees over counties...based on strength of staff and customer needs (NRCS, board members, employees, etc.) ▪ Technology shared ▪ County boards meet together...common resource needs watersheds, local work groups meet as needed
Efficiencies (sharing staff and resources)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streamline programs ▪ Reduce paperwork...not just with NRCS and district (eg permitting process) ▪ Resource groups developing common goals ▪ Technology/telework
Funding (preparing for budget cuts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local and state revenue; county funding ▪ Grants ▪ Fees for services

Kansas Conservation Future Scenario Option Built by Group #3

Element	Notes
<p>Meet Customer Needs (technical assistance, cost share, field services, conservation planning)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local representation from CD/NRCS or both – office or vehicle ▪ Ability to do work at local level ▪ Technical assistance is needed that is responsive in timely manner (technician) ▪ Need an office presence – some place for producer to make contact with person (actual building needed) ▪ Office staff needs expertise in programs(Very Important)
<p>Field Office Structure (district & NRCS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Point of contact in office - presence ▪ Move CD to courthouse or other location and have NRCS there too...NRCS can help out with costs ...stay in same offices...flexible(CD and NRCS stay together in the same building, would prefer to stay with FSA) Expand our partnership ▪ Specialize technical staff
<p>Focus Resources (people & money toward conservation)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Manpower (Not Combining) - sharing employees over counties...based on strength of people already have (NRCS, district employees, etc.) ▪ Trade technology shared (Video Teleconference etc.) ▪ County boards meet together...common resource needs watersheds, local work groups meet quarterly or semi-annually Put more emphasis on district board members generating more enthusiasm towards getting the word out regarding the conservation movement
<p>Efficiencies (sharing staff and resources)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streamline programs ▪ Reduce paperwork...not just with NRCS and district (eg permitting process) ▪ Resource groups developing common goals ▪ Technology/telework
<p>Funding (preparing for budget cuts)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local tax or other dedicated funding sources.

Kansas Conservation Future Scenario Option Built by Group #4

Element	Notes
<p>Meet Customer Needs (technical assistance, cost share, field services, conservation planning)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Local representation from CD/NRCS or both – office or vehicle ▪ Ability to do work at local level ▪ Technical assistance is needed that is responsive in timely manner (technician) ▪ Need an office presence – some place for producer to make contact with person ▪ Office staff needs expertise in programs ▪ Cost share- short on cost share but producers willing to pay out own pocket – these should be moved up priority chain ▪ Conservation plan – staff covering plans thoroughly with producers and staff doesn't have all field practice knowledge ▪ What <u>are</u> the producer needs ▪ Board would give directions to employees ▪ Different resources for different regions ▪ Board has to be respectful of employees
<p>Field Office Structure (district & NRCS)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Point of contact in office - presence ▪ Rethink our partnership ▪ Look at extension model ▪ Working together at multi-county level may be same as MU ▪ We may need to do some educations to meet the partnership needs.
<p>Focus Resources (people & money toward conservation)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Based off producers need ▪ Manpower - sharing employees over counties...based on strength of people already have (NRCS, board members, employees, etc.) ▪ Trade technology shared ▪ Local work groups work together and share information. ▪ One stop shop to a greater extent.
<p>Efficiencies (sharing staff and resources)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Streamline programs ▪ Reduce paperwork...not just with NRCS and district (eg permitting process) ▪ Resource groups developing common goals ▪ Technology/telework ▪ Cross training ▪ Video conferencing capacity / all office – share with all agencies/compatible ▪ IT resources need to work for all partnering agencies
<p>Funding (preparing for budget cuts)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Support a mixture of state and local funding and or taxes ▪ Dedicated sales tax ▪ Look at the Missouri model for sale taxes

Follow-up Ideas – Kansas Conservation Future (11.20.12)

Element	Notes
Overall	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Moved from stage of denial to serious considerations and debate about Kansas Conservation Future ▪ Needing to move from defense of the status quo to proactive strategies and actions. ▪ Leaders form “Blue Ribbon” Committee to develop these concepts, contingency planning, and tools for districts use.
Meet Customer Needs (technical assistance, cost share, field services, conservation planning)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collect information on producer needs at district level, but also analyze at multidistrict, area, state levels...then compare to current and needed programs and services ▪ Conservation planning & programs training for all district employees...level 1 awareness for all...level 3 for technical employees ▪ Workload needs discussed at district level, collect and analyze at area and state level to effect hiring decisions, shared staff ▪ Producer evaluation pilot project (graduate student?)
Field Office Structure (district & NRCS)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collect information on current and potential voluntary sharing within management units ▪ Best options for districts identified and shared (tools) in contingency if office space changes occur to assure an office presence (CD & NRCS) in each county to meet needs
Focus Resources (people & money toward conservation)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Utilize resource planning in multidistrict and state level for building budget requests ▪ Build state budget request...district-by-district budget with accomplishments that would be done...accumulate on the state level ▪ Meet with partner agencies and organizations regarding staff needs and budget related to work to be done and explore joint staffing & funding ▪ Move to Local Work Groups that are multi-districts for County boards meet together with partner agencies and organizations to discuss and plan for common resource needs watersheds, quarterly or semi-annually ▪ Tools for supervisor to producer outreach
Efficiencies (sharing staff and resources)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Collect recommendations from districts on reducing paperwork...not just with NRCS and district (eg permitting process)...develop action strategies for influencing the policy and procedures ▪ Concept paper on specializing staff resources built from recommendations
Funding (preparing for budget cuts)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Meet with districts that currently have mill level to determine impact and discuss approaches ▪ Build tools for working with county commissioners on funding strategies including mill levy ▪ Develop potential legislation for state or local sales tax for discussion by districts ▪ Develop a districts self help guide to funding alternatives (grants, fees for services, donations, other) ▪ Build tools for enhancing CD enterprise activities and marketing