

MARSHALL COUNTY EQIP PROPOSAL 2/12/03

High Priorities for EQIP in Marshall County will be Water Quality and Forestry

Medium Priority will be Erosion

Low Priority will be Livestock

WATER QUALITY - HIGH PRIORITY

1. Is the area being offered within  $\frac{1}{4}$  mile of one of the "IMPAIRED WATERBODIES" listed on the 1998 303(d) list?

Yes = 2 pts

No = 0 pts.

2. Does the area being offered contain abandon wells?

Yes = 1pt.

No = 0 pts.

3. Does the area offered have 51% or greater HEL designated field?

Yes = 1 pt.

No = 0 pts.

4. For the area being offered do you have soil tests indicating phosphorous levels over 100 lbs. per acre or 50 parts per million? (from the tri-state fertilizer recommendation guide)

Yes = 2 pts

No = 0 pts.

5. Is the area being offered located within the Lake Of The Woods or Tippecanoe watershed?

Yes = 2 pts.

No = 0 pts.

WATER QUALITY SCORE:

8 - 6 = HIGH, 5 - 4 = MEDIUM, 3 - 0 = LOW

FOREST MANAGEMENT - HIGH PRIORITY

1. Will the area being offered connect existing forested areas?

YES = 1 pt.  
NO = 0 pts.

2. Will the existing woods be joined or expanded with the new tree planting? (existing woods may be off the offered tract).

YES = 1 pt.  
NO = 0 pts.

2. Is the area offered in the 100 year flood plain?

YES = 1 pt.  
NO = 0 pts.

3. Will the area offered, when reforested, have multi uses? (example: windbreak, wildlife corridor)

YES = 1 pt.  
NO = 0 pts.

4. Will the offered acres be planted to predominately

HARDWOODS 2 pts  
CONIFERS 1 pt.

5. Is the area offered in an area where GYPSY MOTH have been detected?

\* See IDNR division of forestry map \*

YES = 1 pt.  
NO = 0 pts.

6. Do the soils in the offered area have a "potential productivity site index" of 3 or greater?

\* SEE - FOTG SECTION II - iii - c (1)

YES = 1 pt.  
NO = 0 pts.

FOREST MANAGEMENT SCORE

8 - 6 HIGH, 5 - 3 MEDIUM, 2 - 0 LOW

EROSION - MEDIUM PRIORITY

1. Does the offered area contain 51% or greater HEL soils?

Yes = 1 pt.  
No = 0 pts.

2. What type of tillage is used on the offered acres?

Conventional = 5 pt.  
Alternating No-till = 3 pts.  
Reduced Tillage = 2 pts. (30% or greater residue after planting)  
Continuous No-till = 1 pts.

3. If not currently using No – till would you be willing to adapt a no-till or reduced tillage system?

Willing to adapt no-till = 3 pts  
Willing to adapt reduced tillage = 1 pt.  
No change in tillage method = 0 pts.

#### EROSION SCORE

9 – 6 HIGH, 5 – 4 MEDIUM, 3 – 0 LOW

#### LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT – LOW PRIORITY

\* In this instance OPEN BODY OF WATER is defined ANY GROUND WATER WHERE THE LIVESTOCK or the WASTE THERE OF could have direct contact with each other. Examples: lakes, ponds, streams, rivers, creeks, drainage ditches, surface inlets to tiles, wetlands. NOT INCLUDED subsurface drainage tile.\*

1. What is the distance to open water that livestock waste is spread?

500 – 1000 ft. = 3 pts.  
1001 – 2500 ft. = 2 pts.  
> than 2500 ft. = 1 pt.

2. What is the distance to an open body of water from an area where livestock are present?

< than 20 ft. = 4 pts.  
21ft. – 120 ft. = 3 pts.  
121 ft. – 500 ft. = 2 pts.  
> than 500 ft. = 1 pt.

3. How many days manure storage do you currently have?

< than 60 days = 4 pts.  
61 – 120 days = 3 pts  
121 – 180 days = 2 pts.

> than 180 days = 1 pt.

3. Do livestock currently have access to an open body of water?

Yes = 1 pt.

No = 0 pts.

4. Will the land on the offered tract be converted to prescribed grazing and have a plan developed?

YES = 3 pts.

No = 0 pts.

5. Is the proposed area located in either the Lake Of The Woods or Tippecanoe Watershed?

Yes - 2 pts

No - 1 pt.

#### LIVESTOCK MANAGEMENT SCORE

19 - 14 HIGH, 13 - 7 MEDIUM, 6 - 0 LOW