

Local Work Group development of local EQIP.

Goodhue County Soil and Water Conservation District FY08 EQIP

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

Priority Concerns Identified included:

- Excess surface water / flooding
- Gully erosion
- Sheet & Rill Erosion
- Deposition in Streams & Ditches
- Forest Mgmt, esp. Invasive species
- Water Quality / Feedlots
/ Manure Applications
- Riparian Corridors
- Streambank Erosion
- Education – Identified but noted - not through regular EQIP funding
- Pasture Management
- Energy conservation

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

The group felt that high priority concerns were scattered throughout the county; that all watersheds had significant problems which need to be addressed.

Applying practices in the drainage areas of existing projects which could help extend their useful life and functionality was considered a priority to address.

3. From items 1 & 2 above prioritize the local resource concerns to be addressed with EQIP funding for the district. Describe a minimum of 3 categories of the highest priority applications which you would want to receive funding.

- Flooding – apply conservation practices that will help reduce peak runoff events
- Erosion control both sheet and rill and the resulting deposition – apply practices to cropland which will control excess erosion problems
- Surface water quality concerns as related to concentrations of animal manures and field application of same – apply practices which reduce the pollution potential associated with these.
- Forest land management as related to invasive species – measures to encourage the vigor of desirable plants and the control of non-native invasive species
- Practices associated with systems to increase the amount of and vitality of perennial covers either through pasture management or increased use of cover crops or hay in crop rotations.

4. **Develop a minimum of 3 and maximum of 12 yes/no questions to determine if an application is addressing the high priority concerns described in item 3.**
5. **Assign points to the questions in Item #4 as desired to reflect local priorities. The total points assigned to the questions must equal 35 - 60 points.**

Does the practice(s) to be applied with EQIP assistance address upland treatment concerns that will extend the useful life of an existing structural work of improvement? 10 points

Will the practice(s) to be installed with EQIP assistance increase infiltration and reduce runoff from the property? 15 points

Will the practice(s) which are planned to be applied with EQIP assistance reduce soil erosion on actively cropped land? 5 points

Will the practice(s) which are planned to be applied with EQIP assistance benefit native vegetation and reduce the incidence of invasive, non-native plants? 5 points

Will the application of the planned practice(s) reduce the pollution potential from animal manures and benefit surface or ground water in a recognizable manner? 10 points

Will the practice(s) result in an increase in hay in rotation or implement a cover crop in systems with corn silage, canning crops, or after fragile, low residues crops? 5 points

6. **Submit this worksheet to your respective ASTC(FO). After approval from the state office, the questions will be entered into the Local Issues section of the ranking tool.**

7. **List any recommended practices to be deleted from the state Conservation Practice Payment Document**

(345) Mulch tillage is commonly utilized and financial incentives to encourage it's use would not be recommended.

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

Chair, Local Work Group

Date