

Local Work Group development of local EQIP.

_____ NRCS Area 5 (SW Minnesota) _____ FY03 EQIP

1. List the local resource concerns that EQIP can address:

The group discussed medium to high resource concerns in the area which include ag waste systems, water quality (lakes and streams), sediment reduction, erosion control, small dam repair and installation, conservation tillage systems, nutrient management and total maximum daily loads (TMDL).

2. If applicable, list any geographic regions (i.e. watersheds, townships, etc.) and their respective resource concerns within the District to receive priority:

3. Prioritize and weight each local resource concern for the district. Weight must be between 1 and 10:

Factor	Resource Priority	Weight
A1. Erosion Control	High	9
A2 Gully Control	Medium	7
B1 Water Resource	High	8
B2 Wastewater/CNMP	High	8
C Habitat Improvement	Medium	4
D Air Quality	Low	2
E Impaired Water	High	9
F Distance	Medium	6
G Grazing System	Low	3
H Forest Mgt.	Low	1
Additional Local*	High	10

* If the additional local concern is scored, describe the concern here and how points will be scored. Include any geographic priorities.

Six points with a multiplier of 10 will be scored for projects in MPCA 319 project areas and Clean Water Partnerships: Redwood, Cottonwood, Yellow Medicine, Upper Des Moines, Hawk Creek, Chippewa River, Lac qui Parle, Watonwan, Little Cottonwood, Mountain Lake, Pomme de Terre, Heron Lake, Holland Wellhead Area and Verdi Well Field.

4. Attach the scoring worksheet as recommended for the district.
5. List any recommended practices to be deleted from the state Conservation Practice Payment Document

The local EQIP program description, cost-share docket changes, and ranking worksheet must be reviewed and approved by the State Conservationist before any EQIP contract is approved and signed.

This document serves as the Local Work Group recommendation for FY 03 EQIP. Attached is a roster of participation in the Local Work Group.

Chair, Local Work Group

Date