

Local Working Group Recommendations

Please complete and return by **September 30, 2022**

to Kenneth.branch@usda.gov, Aaron.reynolds@usda.gov and Martin.meairs@usda.gov

Introduction: Provide a short introduction, key features of the geographic area, and the general agricultural setting.

Local Working Group: Provide a short description of the local working group, including the area represented, membership, meetings held, and any other significant information.

Conservation Needs Assessment: Describe progress made by the conservation district to prepare a conservation needs assessment. Has one been finalized? When was the assessment last reviewed?

GIS data prepared by the district to use for program funding: Describe any GIS data the district would like to be used in CART for program ranking pools or ranking. Please list the program the GIS data would be used for (EQIP, CSP, ACEP).

Program Outreach: Recommendations from LWG on improving participation from underserved populations, addressing barriers to participation and ways that NRCS and partners can collaborate on outreach activities.

Payment Schedules: Recommendations for FY2024 changes to practices scenarios and CSP enhancements and bundles.

CSP: Does the LWG recommend funding local CSP pools for a specific watershed or geographic area?

Does the LWG has recommendations on CSP ranking questions and points? What enhancements or management activities should be prioritized?

What are the top priority resource concerns for rangeland?

CIG: Are there any on-farm research, pilot projects or demonstrations that would benefit producers in the LWG area that should be prioritized for funding with CIG?

ACEP: Are there local areas that under threat of development that need to be prioritized for conservation easements? Are there areas where protecting private land would expand benefits from land that is already protected (FS land, existing easements, state land, etc.)?

EQIP Funding Recommendations

Priority Resource Concerns: Provide a list of priority resource concerns for each land use that the local working group has recommended to be addressed in the EQIP team ranking pools. Please do not confuse resource concerns with conservation practices. For CART each ranking pool must have resource concerns assign a percent weight. The total for all resource concerns in the ranking pool must add up to 100%. Please refer to the CART ranking pool details report to identify changes in the

percentages. This can be documented in Attachment #4 "EQIP Resource Concerns Ranking Template

Ranking Criteria: The LWG can provide input regarding the percent weight for each of the five ranking criteria. The percent must stay between the max and minimum allowed and need to equal 100 percent. This can be documented in Attachment #4 "EQIP Resource Concerns Ranking Template

Team Sub Accounts and Funding Allocations: Sub accounts can be based on land use or operation types. Land use designations will generally include crop, forest, range, hay, and pasture. Operation types can include Animal Feeding Operation/Confined Animal Feeding Operation. Describe what approximate percent of the funds to be allocated to the ranking pool will be applied to each land use where priority resource concerns will be addressed

Payment Percentage Rates: The payment percentage rate used in New Mexico is at the maximum level. If the LWG recommends a lower rate and the D.C. concurs this recommendation needs to be included in your proposal and provided to the A.C.:

Screening Criteria: Please attach screening questions if wanted for a ranking pool. Refer to 530 Working Lands Conservation Programs Manual Subpart D.

Ranking Questions: When using ranking questions based on resource concerns addressed, the CART results summary should be used to confirm that the resource concern is met. Please attach ranking questions for each ranking pool requested if there are changes from last year, if no changes please indicate. The maximum points possible should add up to 200 for program priorities and 200 for resource priorities. This can be documented in Attachment #4 "EQIP Resource Concerns Ranking Template

CART Assessments: Resource concerns specified by national must be evaluated for CSP. Does the LWG recommend additional resource concern categories be required for CSP? Does LWG recommend that the same RC categories that must be evaluated for CSP be evaluated for EQIP ranking pools to maintain consistency in ranking? A producer evaluated for CSP may rank higher in EQIP than another producer not evaluated in CSP when everything else is the same due to the fact that CART is a program neutral tool.