

# Local Work Group development of local EQIP

Pope County NRCS & Pope Soil & Water Conservation District FY08 EQIP

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

The local resource concerns that EQIP can address in order of priority are as follows:

- |                                 |                         |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------|
| 1) Water Resource Protection    | 2) Erosion Control      |
| 3) Wildlife Habitat Improvement | 4) Forrest Management   |
| 5) Grazing                      | 6) Air Quality          |
| 7) Invasive Species Control     | 8) Farmstead Renovation |

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

The following geographic regions will serve as priority areas because they are all TMDL's, they are:

Ashley Creek	Ditch #6	Little Chippewa River	Mud Creek
W. Branch of the Chippewa River			

The following lakes are priority areas and TMDL's for phosphorus. Lakes that were TMDL's for Mercury were not included.

Reno	Leven	Ann	Pelican
Malmedal	Gilchrist	Emily	Strandness
Trappers Run			

## 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.

- 1) Water Resource Protection
- 2) Erosion Control
- 3) Wildlife Habitat Improvement

## 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.

- 1) Is the proposed contract within a priority area, the areas are Ashley Creek, Ditch # 6, Little Chippewa River, Mud Creek, W. Branch of the Chippewa River, and the following lakes are priority areas, Reno, Leven, Ann, Pelican, Malmedal, Gilchrist, Emily, and Strandness?
- 2) Is the proposed contract within 1000' of protected water?
- 3) Will sheet and rill erosion be reduced by 2 ton per acre per year or more?
- 4) Will the practice reduce or eliminate observed gully erosion or ephemeral erosion?
- 5) Is the proposed contract using native species which will improve wildlife habitat?
- 6) Will the wildlife practice increase a limiting factor for an existing wildlife species that needs management?

**5. Assign points to the questions in Item #4 as desired to reflect local priorities. The total points assigned to the questions should be between 35 to 60 points.**

- 1) 15 points                      2) 15 points                      3) 10 points                      4) 10 Points
- 5) 5 points                        6) 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**

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

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Chair, Local Work Group**

\_\_\_\_\_  
**Date**