

# Local Work Group development of local EQIP.

\_Nobles\_\_\_\_\_ District FY06 EQIP

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

Endangered Species – Topeka Shiners, Feedlot Runoff, High Nutrient Loading (TMDL)

Well Head Protection, Gully Erosion, Water Quality – Lakes and Streams

Wetland Restorations, well sealing

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

Adrian, Ellsworth and Worthington well head protection areas.

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

Factor	Resource Priority	Geographic Priority	Weight
A1. Erosion Control			10
A2 Gully Control			9
B1 Water Resource			8
B2 Wastewater/CNMP			6
C Wildlife Habitat			4
D Air Quality			2
E Impaired Water			7
F Distance			5
G Grazing System			3
H Forest Mgt.			1
Additional Local*			

\* If the additional local concern is scored, describe the concern here and how points will be scored.

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 06 EQIP. Attached is a roster of participation in the Local Work Group.

Vern Suedkamp

September 14, 2005

---

Chair, Local Work Group

Date