

August 2, 2006

State Technical EOIP Subcommittee
Minutes

The meeting began: 9:10 a. m.:

Attendees: Ted Hass-Farm Bureau Willcox, AZ
Alan Seitz-Farm Bureau Willcox, AZ
Marcia Colquitt-AZ Dept. of Agriculture
Lisa Pendrick-AZ Dept. of Agriculture
Dennis Becenti-Hopi Tribe
Sal Palazzolo-AZ Games & Fish
Eric Banks-USDA NRCS
Sherman X. Reed-USDA NRCS
Sabrina Adkisson-USDA NRCS (notetaker)

Environmental Quality Incentives Program National Priorities

1. Reductions of nonpoint source pollution, such as nutrients, sediment, pesticides, or excess salinity in impaired watersheds consistent with TMDLs, where available, as well as the reduction of groundwater contamination and reduction of point sources such as contamination from confined animal feeding operations;
2. Conservation of ground and surface water resources;
3. Reduction of emissions, such as particulate matter, nitrogen oxides (NO_x), volatile organic compounds, and ozone precursors and depleters that contribute to air quality impairment violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards;
4. Reduction in soil erosion and sedimentation from unacceptable levels on agricultural land; and
5. Promotion of at-risk species habitat conservation.

Recommendations

- National Headquarter added a national priority. It increased from 4 last year to 5 this year
- Hard to rate the areas as one, would have to separate areas and prioritize; *The committee felt all allocation areas should be given the same amount of points because all area allocation representatives were not present*
- Priorities should all be kept equal
- Keep the same point allotment, 1 to 1
- National- 60% towards animal waste practices: *60% of funds must go to livestock conservation practices*

State Priorities: *The committee recommended the state priorities remain the same, but prioritized in the following order:*

1. Water Quantity
2. Surface and Ground Water Quality
3. Grazing Lands Health
4. Air Quality
5. Quality Habitat for Animals (rephrase- Restoration for at risk Species Habitats)
6. Soil Quality

Local Issues

Recommendations:

- Local level will develop ranking tool similar to state
- Local issues weigh more considering the multiplier
- District Board and the local District Conservationist are responsible for scheduling the meetings
- People on our subcommittee should go out and encourage people to participate, get ideas, GET MORE LOCAL INPUT
- Locally, do we have influence nationally? Yes
- Local issues need to be addressed with higher priority
- Get input from locals on the questions
- The Hopi Nation in Allocation Area 4 should have its own allocation area or be attach to allocation area 2 with the Navajo Nation. Reason being the land uses, conservation practices, and resource concerns are very similar.
- Allocation Areas to consider At Risk Species Habitat as a local concern

Area 8 Prioritized resource concerns at the local level

1. Water Quantity (An irrigation efficiency concern)
2. Rangeland Health
3. Wildlife Health/Habitat Improvement

- **Area 4 Prioritized resource concerns at the local level**

1. Water Quantity
2. Water Quality
3. Rangeland Health
4. Soil Quality

- **Area 6 Prioritized resource concerns at the local level**

Suggestions will be forwarded to Sherman at a later date.

Administering Cost List & Allocation Areas

- Explain the purpose of Allocation Areas: Answer: **Created because resource concerns and use of practices were similar.**

Proposed options for EQIP Cost List for FY 2007

- Develop a state cost list
- Develop cost list by administrative area
- Develop cost list by allocation area
- Develop cost list by field office

Recommendations:

- '06 Average Cost for the whole state was not the way to go because of bias practice cost and availability to contractors
- The committee proposed to develop cost by allocation areas

Review of prices and practices from the cost lists:

- Proposed removal- 645 Raptor perch holes; removal suggestion has been retracted
- A more accurate price for (Code 382) Big Game Woven Wire should be between \$8-9
- Proposed suggestion for (Code 382) Big Game Woven Wire 3 barb wire fence; substitute 1 smooth wire for the top and bottom wire

Cost Share Percentages

Questions:

- What are the tribal rates in other states? Answer: **Plan to research**
- Is there an outreach problem with tribes? Answer: **Yes It is a combination of problems; lack of NRCS employees and tribal participants understanding of EQIP and high illiteracy rate on tribal lands**
- Why is there such an emphasis on tribal land? Answer: **Mandated by Congress that special emphasis be place on tribal lands.**
- Limited Resources/Beginning farmers- Can old people qualify, why? Is there an income cap? Answer: **Participants can not be discriminated because of age. They are to receive the established percentage, which is 90%.**

The subcommittee agreed on these percentages:

- Tribal lands: 75%
- General EQIP: 50%
- Limited Resource/Beginning Farmer: 90%

Other

- Bring back CSP, motivate people if possible. Is it worth it?

- Will talk with Tim Morrison to see if AACD would be interested in being involved
- Third week in August, meeting with Steve Barker regarding putting a packet together for the conservation districts, district conservationist, and subcommittee members

The meeting adjourned 2:35 p. m.