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Identify and rank the top 8 resource priorities for Agricultural Lands

Response options

- Soil Quality Limitations
- Aquatic Habitat
- Field Sediment, Nutrient, and Pathogen Loss
- Wind and Water Erosion
- Terrestrial Habitat
- Weather Resilience
- Degraded Plant Condition
- Storage and Handling of Pollutants
- Source Water Depletion
- Field Pesticide Loss
- Fire Management
- Concentrated Erosion
- Air Quality Emissions
- Salt Losses to Water
- Pest Pressure
- Livestock Production Limitation
- Inefficient Energy Use

Rank
1st
2nd
3rd
4th
5th
6th
7th
8th
9th
10th
11th
12th
13th
14th
15th
16th
17th

Average responses: 89%
Average engagement: 78%

Activities: 3
Participants: 9
Average responses: 35
Average engagement: 78%

Engagement: 78%
Responses: 7
Identify and rank the top 8 resource priorities for Forest Lands

Response options

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority</th>
<th>Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fire Management</td>
<td>1st</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrestrial Habitat</td>
<td>2nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aquatic Habitat</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concentrated Erosion</td>
<td>4th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degraded Plant Condition</td>
<td>5th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weather Resilience</td>
<td>6th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Quality Limitations</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wind and Water Erosion</td>
<td>7th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest Pressure</td>
<td>9th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Sediment, Nutrient, and Pathogen Loss</td>
<td>10th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source Water Depletion</td>
<td>11th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality Emissions</td>
<td>12th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inefficient Energy Use</td>
<td>13th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage and Handling of Pollutants</td>
<td>14th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salt Losses to Water</td>
<td>15th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Production Limitation</td>
<td>16th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field Pesticide Loss</td>
<td>17th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EQIP Fund Pool Prioritization - Your 10 votes can be placed in any number of fund pools. For example, you could place all 10 votes in 1 fund pool, spread them out over 4 fund pools, or place 1 vote in each fund pool.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response options</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beginning Farmer</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAP</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Tunnel</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On-Farm Energy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organic</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socially Disadvantaged</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Health</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wildlife</strong></td>
<td><strong>22</strong></td>
<td><strong>24%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Open Ended Questions

Are there any concerns associated with the EQIP ranking questions? If yes, please describe.

Responses

- I'd like to see Wildlife, Beginning, and Socially-disadvantaged farmers ranked higher

- I think that what is important to a village would be different than it would be to say a farmer in the Valley. Some of the categories in the way they are ranked would only benefit one or the other. I see this as a national problem but don't have a good way to address it.

Go to our local response, please.
Is there any conservation practices not offered by NRCS that should be? If yes, please describe the need.

Responses

No. We have vast areas for wildlife. In this state you can afford to not address everything on every acre at the same time. This in reply to question 3 sorry.

no response to this question

i can't think of any at this time

Reseeding fertilized Salmon eggs into Alaska rivers and streams. Help Alaskan leaders become more aware of how important NRCS has been to food security in other states.

Go to our local response, please. No no comment

Is there a need for WLFW? If Yes - include the following: 1) Species identified 2) Partners who are interested 3) geographical area of interest

Responses

See above Yes, moose and salmon

YES!! multiple species. Interested parties would be state, federal, tribal partners as well as private individuals and organizations.

Yes. Reindeer and moose have been species that communities around the state say they would like to increase access to healthy plant food.

Yes Please. 1) Salmon all species. Making certain there is salmon relieves pressure on other wildlife species. 2) Alaska Landowners (ANCSA, those who lease ANCSA lands, Mental Health, University lands.) 3) Southcentral and Southeast Alaska.

Yes. Salmon, songbirds, and bats. USFWS. Tanana Valley

N/A no comment yes
Is there a need for State CIG in Alaska? If yes, please describe the need.

**Responses**

Yes. need to allow program emphasis on small agriculture. Ak is actually in the infancy of ag with a history of large ag not having done so well. Market wise. "Gladwell" the world is flat except for Alaska. Large corporate farm do not do well so small farms are the growth potential. USDA in Ak needs to think small support of composting, bio-char, increasing berry, fish and wildlife production/ habitat improvement

Yes, because we are unique in Alaska,

Yes. Some communities have stated that an interest in increasing soil nutrient availability through increasing fish populations, and therefor increasing the fish in spawning areas to provide that natural source of nutrients.

Yes. BioChar and Salmon Reseeding as is done in Pacific and Great Lake States.

Yes.  Not aware  no comment  unknown
**Have you identified any special projects? If yes, please describe.**

Responses

- Restoration of excess chemical nutrients on abandoned farm land. Kenai Peninsula. When fertilizer was dirt cheap.

  no response

- Wildlife crossings for roadways throughout the state

**Is there any concerns associated with the ACEP ranking questions? If yes, please describe.**

Responses

- No they were great.

  no response

- None

  no

- Yes. More education to landowners. Appraisal methods and instructions need to be evaluated to maximize benefits of the program to all users.

  Go to our local response, please. Not aware

  no comment
  no
Are there any concerns with the point values associated with the questions? If yes, please describe.

Responses

Right number of choices and a good population to comment on them.

- no response
- none

Is the current GARC acceptable? If not, please describe the concern and proposed solution.

Responses

yes.

Concerned with the wide variance in land values in different areas of the state. Propose to have different rates for different regions/zones.

I think there should be different rates for different areas of the state. An acre of land close to anchorage or the valley costs way more than one away from the higher populated areas of the state. I think there should be a way to reflect that.

Go to our local response, please. We have been investigating.

- No input
- no comment
- No experience to judge