

LWG Minutes

11/15/2017

Oxford County Service Center South Paris Me

10 in attendance including FSA, NRCS, District staff

5 producers

1 dairy (female)

1 dairy/ forestry

2 forestry

1 mixed vegetable/ livestock (female)

The meeting began with member signup and a recap of the previous year's meeting. A handout of commonly used NRCS acronyms (handout 1) was distributed. A summary of the 2017 contract amounts and installed projects was distributed (handout #2).

We then discussed our current requests for 2018 applications and compared those estimates in each funding category to the funding target ratios set at the previous year's meeting. Extensive discussion ensued, mostly around the high target amount of funding aimed at forestry compared to the low number of applications. After input from the producers attending it was decided to change our 2018 ratios to as follows:

2018

35% Forestry

45% Ag waste

14% Crop

5% pasture

1% wildlife

%0 high tunnel

2019

45% forestry

35% Ag waste

10% crop

5% pasture

5% wildlife

This was followed by a discussion of the payment schedule, which was brief as the payment schedule was not yet available.

Handout # 3, local ranking questions was distributed. Discussion continued to Local Questions on the ranking tools for 2019. Extensive discussion of the current questions as well as how our ranking process works ensued.

The group recommended adding a question to give 15 points to veteran's applications and rebalance the remaining questions. We will use the same definition of Veteran currently listed in the appendix. The information will come directly from the applications. Please see the following "2019 Oxford County Local

Ranking Questions.” Invasive pests are still a top priority for the LWG, so this will still be reflected in the ranking.

The meeting closed around 12 noon following distribution and explanation of the 2017 program delivery schedule. Some discussion occurred on the AOP pools through RCCP. Participants had ideas for various AOP sites. We also discussed public land vs. private land, since many people identified problem stream crossings that are town-owned. Anna and Alex explained that this is not eligible under EQIP.