



2021 Local Work Group Recommendations

Submit one worksheet per LWG

-----PLEASE RESPOND BY DECEMBER 09, 2020-----

Local Work Group (LWG) Information

Team: 9

Districts: Butte SWCD

LWG Chairperson: Randy Purser, Butte SWCD

Meeting Date: 11/20/20

Minutes from the meeting(s) – please attach a copy of the minutes and an attendance sheet when submitting recommendations

Provide the following recommendations for your local working group:

EQIP Priority Resource Concerns

Your priority resource concerns will be used in the EQIP screening and ranking process to determine the highest priority applications and which high priority applications will be ranked and funded first. If funds remain after high priority applications have been selected for funding, medium priority applications may be considered.

Priority	NRCS Resource Concern
<i>Example</i>	<i>Degraded Plant Condition</i>
1	Source Water Depletion
2	Degraded Plant Condition
3	Soil Quality Limitation
4	Inefficient Energy Use
5	Livestock production Limitation
6	Terrestrial habitat
7	Aquatic habitat



Recommendation for Distribution of LWG funds

Review the proposed list of FY 2021 ranking pools and last year’s team categories. Similar to FY 2020, each LWG will receive an FY 2021 EQIP allocation. Identify how you would like LWG funds to be divided into categories. An EQIP application will be ranked against other applications in the same category for funding. Funds will be distributed among the selected categories within the LWG ranking pool according to your recommendations. For example, you may identify categories by land use, geographic priority area, or other strategic funding need. Identify up to five categories below.

LWG Ranking Pool Category	Percentage of LWG Funding (0-100%)
<i>Example: Irrigated Cropland</i>	40%
Cropland	20%
Rangeland	15%
Wildlife habitat	5%
Irrigated Pasture	5%
High Tunnels	10%
Special/Group Projects – Inskeep Project	45%
Total	100%

Priority for Reallocation of Funds

If high priority applications within a ranking pool category do not utilize all the funds allocated, indicate the recommended order in which excess funds should be reallocated. The recommendations below will be considered in reallocating funds, but cannot be guaranteed.

Priority	LWG ranking pool category
1	Special/Group Projects – Inskeep Project
2	Cropland
3	Rangeland
4	High Tunnels
5	Wildlife habitat
6	Irrigated Pasture



EQIP Local Ranking

For categories retained from FY 2020, review the ranking questions used to evaluate applications and identify any recommended changes. For new categories, develop up to five qualities of a project that should cause it to rank higher (e.g. certain practices will be applied, certain resource concerns will be addressed, or conditions or qualities of the field make it a higher priority).

	LWG Ranking Pool Category	List desired qualities of a priority project
1	Cropland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Improve irrigation delivery efficiency • Improve energy efficiency of water delivery • Improve soil health • Reduce water use • Utilizes a nutrient management plan • Utilizes cover crops
2	Rangeland	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Progresses towards the ecological site description • Protects stream banks or streams • Promotes livestock distribution • Improves forage • Fire/weed (biomass) management
3	Wildlife Habitat	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wetland/riparian improvement • Improves habitat connectivity/passage routes • Streambank enhancements • Benefits habitat for species of greatest conservation need
4	Irrigated Pasture	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promotes water recharge • Improves forage quality and quantity • Utilizes rotational grazing • Protects streambanks and canals • Utilizes a nutrient management program
5	Special/Group Projects – Inskeep Project	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is the engineering completed? • Is there high participation (compare across projects)? • Is the project located in the Inskeep project area?
6	High Tunnels	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Is this a first-time application? • Is this for commercial production?



Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) Local Ranking Questions

The ranking pools for CSP are Ag-North, Ag-South, and Non-Industrial Private Forestland (NIPF). Review the FY 2020 ranking questions for the applicable CSP pool(s). If you would like to retain the local questions from the approved FY 2020 Classic ranking pools, leave this section blank. Alternatively, suggest changes to the questions below or identify qualities of a project that should cause it to rank higher. Recommended changes from all LWGs within the ranking pool boundary will be considered, but final questions will be based on recommendations from the majority.

	Ranking pool	Local Ranking Question
1		
2		
3		
4		
5		
6		
7		



United States Department of Agriculture

Signatures

Chairperson of the LWG: Ray P. P. Date: _____

_____ Date: _____

NRCS Team Lead: _____ Date: _____

Area Conservationist: _____ Date: _____



Signatures

Chairperson of the LWG: Paul Purn Date: _____

[Signature] Date: 12/16/2020

NRCS Team Lead: _____ Date: _____

Area Conservationist: _____ Date: _____

