



2023 Local Work Group Recommendations

Submit one worksheet per LWG

-----PLEASE RESPOND BY 11/14/22 -----

Local Work Group (LWG) Information

Team: 9 - Peaks to Craters

Districts: Blaine, Butte, ~~Custer~~

LWG Chairperson: Randy Purser (Butte/~~Custer~~) and Chris Johnson (Blaine)

Meeting Date: 11/14/22

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:

Recommendation for Distribution of LWG funds

2020-2022 Average initial Team allocation \$ 715,174

Review the proposed list of FY 2023 ranking pools and last year’s team categories. Similar to FY 2022, each LWG will receive an FY 2023 EQIP allocation. Identify how you would like LWG funds to be divided into categories. For example, you may identify categories by land use, geographic priority area, or other strategic funding need. Funds will be distributed among the selected categories within the LWG ranking pool according to your recommendations. Identify **up to five** categories below.

Based on the average allocation above and expected average contract cost per category, it may be advisable for some teams to only identify 2-3 Ranking Pool Categories with funds allocated initially. You may designate one or more of the five team categories with an initial allocation of 0% and only recommend allocating funds to those categories during the reallocation process or through an additional funds request. For example special projects or smaller contracts could be funded with excess funds. These 0% categories should be used with caution as they do require ranking questions and must improve identified priority resource concerns.



LWG Ranking Pool Category	Percentage of LWG Funding (0-100%)
<i>Example: Irrigated Cropland</i>	40%
Focused Conservation	65% ~\$465,214.00
Wildlife	15% ~\$107,276.00
Range/Pastureland	10% ~\$71,517.00
Seasonal High Tunnels	5% ~35,758.00
Irrigated Cropland	5% ~35,758.00
Total	100%

Priority Resource Concerns (PRC)

Review the Priority Resource Concerns established in last year’s Team Ranking Pool. Your priority resource concerns will be used in the EQIP screening and ranking process to determine the highest priority applications that will be ranked and funded first. Select **up to 8 Priority Resource Concerns** for your LWG Ranking Pool Categories. Please select your top 8 priority resource concerns for CSP as well.

Priority	EQIP (<u>Up to 8 PRC's</u>)	CSP (<u>Top 8 PRC's</u>)
1	Source Water Depletion	Degraded Plant Condition
2	Terrestrial Habitat for Wildlife & Invertebrates	Fire Management
3	Inefficient Irrigation Water Use	Livestock Production Limitation
4	Bank Erosion from Streams, Shorelines, or Conveyance Channels	Concentrated Erosion
5	Plant Productivity and Health	Soil Quality Limitation
6	Inadequate Livestock Water Quantity, Quality, an Distribution	Source Water Depletion
7	Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities	Terrestrial Habitat
8	Soil: Aggregate Instability	Wind and Water Erosion



EQIP Local Ranking Concepts

For categories retained from FY 2022, review the ranking questions used to evaluate applications and identify any recommended changes. For new categories, develop approximately 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):

See attached

Follow up action recommended by Team Lead: Develop approximately 5 Ranking questions per category that fit within NRCS policy and submit those back to the LWG participants to review prior to submitting recommendations.

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	Wildlife
2	Rangeland/ Pastureland
3	Seasonal High Tunnels
4	Irrigated Cropland
5	Focused Conservation



Special Projects/Long Term goals for LWG:

There are many projects that may not fit within the team fund pool, due to cost, complexity, resource concerns, or lack of appropriate payment rate scenarios. Please list and describe potential projects, ideas you have, potential funding sources outside NRCS and we can help try to find a program that fits.

Does the Local Work Group have a long term plan they would like to implement to streamline the LWG process i.e focus on a particular area/resource concern this year and then move to another priority next year?

CSP comments or ideas to improve CSP:

- Remove overbearing enhancement requirement from ID State Addendum(s).
- Extended FV timeline (takes time to do it right).
- Cost scenarios need to increase.

Signatures

Chairperson of the LWG: Ray P Date: 11/14/22

NRCS Team Lead: _____ Date: _____

Area Conservationist: _____ Date: _____