

2012 Land Use Categories and descriptions

Confined animal 20%

Total confinement or emergency farm pads for confinement during flooding events.
Little or no grazing, cropland, or forest.

Cropland 10%

Crop only, little or no livestock or forest.

Multi-land use 40%

Farm descriptions not fitting any of the above.

Forestry 30%

Forest only, little or no livestock or cropland.

1. Excess funding from any of the pools will first go to fund any remaining unfunded applications in the Confined Animal pool.
2. Any remaining monies following #1 above will then be used to fund additional applications under the Cropland pool.
3. Any remaining monies following # 1 and 2 above will be used to fund additional applications under the Multi Land-use pool.
4. Any remaining monies following # 1, 2 & 3 above will be used to fund additional applications under the Forestry pool.

**PUGET SOUND LOCAL WORK GROUP
2012 EQIP IMPLEMENTATION PACKAGE**

PUGET SOUND TEAM

Goals and Objectives

The Puget Sound Local Work Group's (LWG) objective is to assist landowners and operators with the conservation treatment of identified natural resource concerns. Our goal is to treat all applicants in a fair and equitable manner, placing highest priorities for planning and program funding on those resource concerns identified by the group as most important. Additional goals of the LWG are providing an opportunity for landowners to comply with increasing state and federal environmental legislation, and gaining the highest degree of conservation benefit for the lowest cost while not penalizing applicants who have worked successfully with us in the past on effective conservation practices. We are also concerned about addressing the existing EQIP practice backlog by reducing practices which require a lot of administrative design time or by bringing additional technical resources to bear from outside sources. We are also increasing efforts to identify and utilize TSP's and Task Orders to assist in implementation and application of practices to reduce the backlog. For 2012, the LWG made no changes in the local ranking sheet other than editorial. The recent efforts of a group from King County proposed a plan to target construction of Farm Pads in floodplain and floodway areas of the Snoqualmie River. The LWG agreed and ranking criteria were formally approved addressing this concern. Monies for this will come out of the King County Confined Animal pool and any excess would come out of possible slippage from other pools. No changes were made to Funding Pool allocations. The only proposed change to the Eligible Cost list is a suggestion to include Seasonal High Tunnels which may become eligible under the Regular EQIP signup this year.

Primary Resource Concerns:

1. Water Resources Quality and Management Issues:
 - Surface and ground water quality concerns brought about by non-point and point source pollutants such as nutrients, pesticides, sediments, temperature, turbidity, pathogens, protection of sole source aquifer designations, and degradation of shellfish harvest areas.
2. Fish and Wildlife related concerns:
 - Impacts to riparian areas by urbanization pressures, uncontrolled livestock access to stream-banks and other factors degrading critical fish and wildlife habitat due to reductions of vegetation along fish bearing streams resulting in fragmentation of wildlife corridors in riparian zones .
 - Conversion of agricultural and forest lands to other uses, near-shore and terrestrial habitat losses, increases in impervious surfaces due to urbanization with resultant increases in peak flow conditions during flooding, and reduction of shellfish harvests.
 - Fish passage obstructions such as road culverts, improperly maintained roads on forest, pasture and other agricultural lands degrading water quality, and fish passage obstacles on non-forest lands.
3. Forest Health Issues:
 - Erosion and sedimentation from logging and forest roads, improper management practices resulting in poor forest health and vigor, presence of fish passage obstacles in streams, near-stream habitat losses, protection of endangered species, improvement of priority species habitat, and absence of complexity in existing stream channels
4. Plant community and resource concerns:
 - Invasion of noxious weeds and plant species due to inadequate grazing plans and urban pressures requiring additional protection of endangered species and other native plant communities.

**PUGET SOUND LOCAL WORK GROUP
2012 EQIP IMPLEMENTATION PACKAGE**

5. Resource impacts of urbanizing pressures:

- Cumulative impacts of numerous small livestock farms on the resource base, and the comparatively high cost of addressing the concerns. Conversion of farmland to residential or commercial uses.
- Inadequate servicing of small urban/suburban truck farms, many of which market locally and the minority producers who generally work these lands

List of Local Work Group Members

(See LWG Members Attachment)

Ranking Criteria

(See Instructions Attachment)

Planned Funding Distribution for Funding Pools

The Puget Sound Local Work Group (LWG) Approved the establishment of 4 land use funding pools listed below with initial allocation percentages, with additional 5% allocations for both Beginning and Socially Disadvantaged Producers under each of the 4 major categories: **Confined animal 20%** , **Cropland 10%**, **Multi-land use 40%**, and **Forestry 30%**.

An application which would be eligible in more than one pool will be placed in the funding pool that has the higher estimated cost on the application. The LWG has established a 200 point minimum for non-forestry pools, but no lower limit for the forestry applicants.

Funding Pool Management

1. How were the funding pools identified?: Within the Puget Sound Local Work Group there are four distinct land uses that require separate allocations. In addition, private non-industrial forestland in the LWG area has not historically competed well in the EQIP ranking processes. Therefore, the LWG felt that forest landowners and other land-uses within the 5 county area needed to have separate funds to encourage additional EQIP applications and to improve the equitable distribution of EQIP funds.
2. How was the targeted allocation decision made? The LWG evaluated the historical number of applications received, recent trends in applications received, resource needs, and acres of underserved private non-industrial forestland for each of the five counties. The LWG then established the approximate funding percentage needed to implement a successful EQIP program.
3. Why are there changes to how EQIP is being administered at the local level? The LWG wanted to assure a more representative distribution of EQIP funding throughout the Puget Sound Local Work Group area.
4. Why are certain special interest groups or producers not in a funding pool? The existing funding pool allocation allows equal participation by all groups.
5. How will excess funds from each funding pool be used? Non-obligated or slippage funds from the four funding pools will be used to fund additional applications in the Confined Animal pool first, followed in order by the Cropland pool, the Multi Land-use pool and the Forest pool.

**PUGET SOUND LOCAL WORK GROUP
2012 EQIP IMPLEMENTATION PACKAGE**

6. What process will be used to ensure that low priority or poor projects in a funding pool are not funded when there are better projects in other funding pools? The LWG earlier revised the ranking process to limit easily scored modifiers in applications. Additionally the LWG has established 200 as the minimum acceptable ranking for non-forestry pools. Remaining funds will be transferred successively to remaining pools where all remaining applications will be considered.

Eligible Practice List

For the 2012 signup period, the "Payment schedule" is used for Washington State as a result of national directives. The LWG recommended including Seasonal High Tunnels (PS-798) be added to the eligible cost list for 2012.

(See Payment Schedule Attachment)

Potential Partnership Contributions

The area that encompasses Puget Sound LWG area has a broad but limited pool of funding sources for on-the-ground projects. Typical sources include Local agencies such as Conservation Districts, counties, and South Puget Sound Salmon Enhancement Group; State agencies such as the Washington State Department of Natural Resources and SRF Board funding; Federal funding from the US Fish and Wildlife Service, and Tribal sources to name a few.

Tie-Breaker Method

The Puget Sound Local Working Group will use Protracts for deciding "Tie-breakers.

2012 Eligible Practice List - Puget Sound Team

Practice Code	Practice Name	Practice Hold-Down NTE \$ 1/
472*	Access Control (472)	\$ 50,000
560	Access Road (560)	\$ 50,000
316	Animal Mortality Facility (316)	\$ 50,000
575	Animal Trails and Walkways (575)	\$ 50,000
314	Brush Management (314)	\$ 50,000
584	Channel Bed Stabilization (584)	\$ 50,000
360	Closure of Waste Impoundment (360)	\$ 50,000
317	Composting Facility (317)	N/A
340	Cover Crop (340)	\$ 50,000
342	Critical Area Planting (342)	\$ 50,000
362	Diversion (362)	\$ 50,000
647	Early Successional Habitat Development/M (647)	\$ 50,000
382	Fence (382)	\$ 50,000
386	Field Border (386)	\$ 50,000
393	Filter Strip (393)	\$ 50,000
396	Fish Passage (396)	\$ 100,000
512	Forage and Biomass Planting (512)	\$ 50,000
384	Forest Slash Treatment (384)	\$ 50,000
666	Forest Stand Improvement (666)	\$ 50,000
655	Forest Trails and Landings (655)	\$ 50,000
412	Grassed Waterway (412)	\$ 50,000
561	Heavy Use Area Protection (561)	\$ 50,000
422	Hedgerow Planting (422)	\$ 50,000
595*	Integrated Pest Management (595)	\$ 50,000
430	Irrigation Pipeline (430)	\$ 50,000
441	Irrigation System, Microirrigation (441)	\$ 50,000
442	Irrigation System, Sprinkler (442)	\$ 50,000
449*	Irrigation Water Management (449)	\$ 50,000
484	Mulching (484)	\$ 50,000
379	Multi-Story Cropping (379)	\$ 50,000
590*	Nutrient Management (590)	\$ 5,000
500	Obstruction Removal (500)	\$ 50,000
582	Open Channel (582)	\$ 50,000
516	Pipeline (516)	\$ 50,000
378	Pond (378)	\$ 50,000
521A	Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C)	\$ 50,000
521C	Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membrane (521A)	\$ 50,000
528*	Prescribed Grazing (528)	--
533	Pumping Plant (533)	\$ 50,000
643	Restoration and Management of Declining Habitats (643)	\$ 50,000
391	Riparian Forest Buffer (391)	\$ 50,000
390	Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390)	\$ 50,000
654	Road/Trail/Landing Closure and Treatment (654)	\$ 50,000
558	Roof Runoff Structure (558)	\$ 50,000
367	Roofs and Covers (367)	\$ 50,000
798	Seasonal High Tunnel System for Crops (798) Non HU	\$ 5,337
798	Seasonal High Tunnel System for Crops (798) HU	\$ 6,404
350	Sediment Basin (350)	\$ 50,000

646	Shallow Water Development and Management (646)	\$ 50,000
381	Silvopasture Establishment (381)	\$ 50,000
574	Spring Development (574)	\$ 50,000
578	Stream Crossing (578)	\$ 50,000
395	Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395)	\$ 50,000
580	Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580)	\$ 50,000
587	Structure for Water Control (587)	\$ 50,000
606	Subsurface Drain (606)	\$ 50,000
612	Tree/Shrub Establishment (612)	\$ 50,000
660	Tree/Shrub Pruning (660)	\$ 50,000
490	Tree/Shrub Site Preparation (490)	\$ 50,000
620	Underground Outlet (620)	\$ 50,000
645	Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645)	---
635	Vegetated Treatment Area (635)	\$ 50,000
313	Waste Storage Facility (313)	N/A
634	Waste Transfer (634)	\$ 50,000
633*	Waste Utilization (633)	\$ 5,000
614	Watering Facility (614)	\$ 50,000
659	Wetland Enhancement (659)	\$ 50,000
657	Wetland Restoration (657)	\$ 50,000
644	Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644)	--
380	Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380)	\$ 50,000

*** Management Practices 2/**

1/ The listed practice hold-downs are per contract, and apply to all applicants. Applicants qualifying as Historically Underserved (Beginning, Limited Resource, and Socially Disadvantaged Farmers or Ranchers) will receive an increase in payment rates; the listed hold-down per contract is not increased.

2/ Payments for a Management practice will be allowed for one to three years in the contract. Exception: Residue Management practices (329 and 345) must be scheduled for 3 consecutive years. Nutrient Mgt (590) and Pest Mgt (595) must also be scheduled in all contracts that have 329 or 345, for the same 3 years.

3/ A \$2500 hold-down per animal unit (AU) on all structural practices will be in effect for all participants where livestock is a concern. The maximum cost share that can be earned in a contract for these practices is posted in the "Practice Hold Down NTE" column.

4/ Seasonal High Tunnel for Crops cost-share is limited to 5% of one acre or 2178 square feet.