

Local Work Group development of local EQIP.

Area 4 (eleven county metro) FY04 EQIP

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

The resource concerns listed under item 3 below can be addressed through EQIP 2004.

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

All geographic areas within the eleven county metro will be scored without prioritization given to any individual area.

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	M	3
A2 Gully Control	M	3
B1 Water Resource	H	5
B2 Wastewater/CNMP	H	5
C Habitat Improvement	H	5
D Air Quality	L	1
E Impaired Water	M	3
F Distance	M	3
G Grazing System	H	5
H Forest Mgt.	L	1
Additional Local*	M	3

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

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: None

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

LWG Meeting Participants in 2004: LeAnn Buck, MASWCD; Wayne Edgerton, MNDNR; Marybeth Block, BWSR-Metro; Timothy Wilson, NRCS; John Crellin, NRCS