

**State Technical Committee  
Minutes  
May 21, 2009**

**Attendees:** David Steele, Bill Angstadt, Chris Sigmund, Jack von Almelo, Bruce Wilkins, Karen Sykes, Jim Baird, Craig Derickson, Susan McDowell, Brenda Shambaugh, Joel Rotz, Bill Wehry, Jeff Dlott, Doug Goodlander, Barry Frantz, Dave Day, Suzy Friedman, Karl Brown, Johan Berger, Pat Buckley, Jeff Moyer, Allan Bair, Keisha Brown, Ken Martin, Kirsten Saacke-Blunk, Leslie Zuck, Chrystal Fetzer, Marel Raub, David Biddinger, Gene O'Dato, Mike Lester, Kelly O'Neill, Don Fiesta

**Welcome and Introductions**

Craig Derickson, PA NRCS State Conservationist, welcomed all to the meeting. Craig mentioned that NRCS wants to try to improve the operation of the STC and beef up the local work group process. And we have been improving the website and will produce minutes and note decisions and actions made for this meeting in the meeting minutes.

**Role of Local Work Group and State Technical Committee Process:**

Barry Frantz discussed the local workgroup input, national policy or state policy for NRCS to work together. State structure local workgroup structure get both technical input and local input and make the two work together. Need resource and technical needs. May need to set up a sub committee or outreach committee. We are looking for effective committees that will make change happen (example: break up the large group into smaller effective groups /committees as needed to handle issues).

Past subcommittees: Operating Procedures for State Technical Committee and Local Working Group  
Potential Subcommittee Structure:

Q: Do we need a Forestry subcommittee? Do we need to recreate if there is a state forestry stewardship committee existing?

A: We may need one for wildlife, wildlife habitat, WRP, etc. Have smaller state committees come up with priorities, such as CNMP/nutrient management, or air quality. We have had some small air quality meetings or groups with interest in air quality.

Grazing - have not had grazing subcommittee – may need one.

Pest Management - no committee, may need one.

Organic – had one a long time ago to develop ranking sheet through ag marketing program, now we have EQIP, not much has been done for technical options. Shorter group was very effective (comment). 2010 may be a good year to roll out committee.

TSP - may be a need for TSPs to help farmers with conservation plans, larger in new farm bill.

Craig responded: we have worked to make TSPs work in PA, budget cycles make it difficult for us to plan TA money for TSPs. There are some subcommittees possibly for 2010 and there is an opportunity for anyone here to provide input about a need that might exist.

David Steele said he would be happy to work with state forestry committee.

Q: Would it be appropriate to have subcommittee on market based incentives?

A: Environmental markets, credits for nutrient and water and air trading.

## **Identification of Funding Pools for 2010 (such as cropland, grazing, organic farming, forestry, etc.)**

Barry Frantz asked: Where are we this year? There are two sheets/handouts summarizing applications for funding/conservation FRPP FAPD, easement programs, EQIP, WHIP special initiatives. A lot of interest in programs has occurred this year. NRCS has had a lot of applications. This is encouraging for conservation funding and interest in using funding.

Farm Bill has increased interest. What are we funding? We need input from you all. Are these the right categories for us to make funding offerings in?? There are many choices and it can be confusing. Can we consolidate? New things being promoted add to the list. Hard to keep it simple and work for interests and customers.

Craig said we currently have about four times the applications we can fund.

Leslie said funding seems specific for specific types of funding projects.

Barry responded: some EQIP is mandated or earmarked and we don't have an option to use it for anything else. For example, we can fund new irrigation only with AMA. We have more applications than we have funds. Funding changes a lot from year to year. AMA may be more stable with the new Farm Bill.

CBWI – new money for conservation practices, nutrient management, stream fencing, waterways, diversions, etc. NRCS is targeting the lower area of the bay first, and then using extra money for other parts of the bay. Funding has already spilled over to other parts of the bay. NRCS is funding every request for core management practices in the bay, all of them -- 145 requests. CORE - outside of the bay, we will fund all of those. GENERAL – full list of practices – with extra money.

Next year, anticipating NRCS will get double the money than this year. This is good if we can get farmers ready, willing and able to start new practices. That may be difficult.

EQIP air quality is a mandated earmark. 21 counties we are allowed to spend it or money goes to another state. Beginning farmers/socially disadvantaged – outreach for new participants, \$1M out of EQIP or lost to another state.

CNMP plan development - \$500,000 state goal set by PA Forestry \$500,000 set by PA is state amount.

Applications do not always have an estimated cost.

\$6M based on local offices and their requests for practices - i.e. grazing vs. manure management.

New money \$880,000 ORGANIC certified or for people in transition. May lose money if we don't spend it on organic farming. Extended from May 19<sup>th</sup> date to June 12<sup>th</sup>. Signup by 29<sup>th</sup>.

Q: Is June 12<sup>th</sup> a cutoff date?

A: Not sure if that is a cutoff. August 15<sup>th</sup> national due date.

Craig responded: all programs operate under continuous signup, but all have ranking periods. National announcement -- organic is part of \$50M initiative. Will go through ranking periods until the money is spent.

Cannot extend past Sept 30<sup>th</sup>, because that is the end of funds

Dave indicated this would be hard to get word out to everyone in time

Q: Is future years funding affected by how we utilize funds today?

A: If we don't use what we get, we could lose. There is a big interest in PA in specialty and organic – I am optimistic we can use those funds.

Craig asked: How do we get guidance & development to get it to work well? We are open to your help and ideas.

Barry said CCPI national funds are set aside, out of EQIP...could use for other EQIP if not used for CCPI.

CIG - can shift money to other uses.

Q: Are these unique applications or are they duplicates?

A: Duplicates – CCPI, CBWI are back and forth with duplicate applications, some double apply – organic and manure storage. The number of applications may count producers multiple times if they signed up for more than one program. Estimated cost typically is in 60% of applications.

WHIP– good allocation, more than in previous years.

Q: CBWI stuff – a group at the lower Susquehanna is the priority area – anyone who applied here got approved?

A: Yes, if they do core practice.

Q: Regular EQIP, would they get moved to CBWI? Anyone in lower are who wanted core practices can get it done. Expanded to anywhere in the bay watershed??

A: Yes, knew funding would be tighter. (Ed S.) – Process outside core area.

Q: Does “core” mean core practices or core area??

A: Core practices, Chesapeake Bay main issues are excess nutrients, excess sediments – these practices are most effective and cost efficient methods of addressing issues

Q: Anyone who applied in bay area under bay program will get it?

A: Yes

Q: Regular EQIP has too many applications to fund? It is good that you help people in those core activities in the bay.

A: CORE 4 – extend to BAY Core “12” - Nutrient management, cover crop – why not fence animals out of the stream? Priority = priority area. General practices, May also include cover crops, etc.

Q: Outside bay area, core six, three of six to rank high on system?

A: Just for organic.

Comment: Three out of six do not apply

Craig welcomed ideas and said recommendations are good for us to forward up the line.

Dan said all are management practices on a particular type of operation by land use, core of conservation system.

Barry added that duplication, overlap on practices we may fund, livestock vs. cropland – i.e. livestock or stream fencing or stream fencing with grazing. These are different ways to fund the same practice.

Really have \$6M dollars of un-earmarked EQIP for many different things. Make some calls on where to spend in earmarked money. Hope CBWI doubles to \$10M next year.

Q: Do you feel the bay program and SAC are working to invest additional monitoring areas to overlap NRCS priority areas/watersheds, is NRCS comfortable with that activity?

A: I have contacts with them and work with other states in the bay on those issues. Are comfortable with what each entity is doing. Politically and annually appropriated system is difficult to work with. Make note of watersheds that have most nut and sed. That will be the landscape we will operate in.

Comment: Help get money, form organic subcommittee. DEP sec of Ag in PA announced that program based on EQIP throughout us. Because did not have time to collect organic info. Really should be able to get more funds into organic program which will allow other funds for specialties.

Response: organic is extra, and does not cut into other funds.

Q: For CSP – what is changed?? Not sure if it will be available?

A: Not sure if will be open for applications this year not.

Craig added: we believe it will be, according to changes to Farm Bill will be open to all watersheds in the nation it will be an acre constrained versus a dollar amount.

Goals for 2009: Ranking will select high rate of stewardship. Many more contracts awarded than in prior years.

Barry said the Farm Bill states it is for new practices only. Will be a screening threshold for doing well with requirement to add something new

Q: Flexibility for people new in the program – field or state office?

A: Field level – the State Office sets up ranking, etc., local work group will get feedback from local – what do they need from rankings, etc, single ranking for each category

Q: \$50M came out – could help organic producers, but also farm bill money to use to transition to organic?

A: Transition could be people who are in transition or who want to be in transition.

Q: Use of money? Transition is not the same as organic operation?

A: NRCS will not pay to get certified.

Q: There are only six core practices?

A: Not complete list of practices.

Q: Organic/specialty money under regular EQIP could apply?

A: At the beginning of the year, did not have organic, so we combined specialty crops with organic. NRCS then got the mandate for organics, so we kept both. NRCS will shift the organic producers into the organic category.

Q: PDA has pool of money for organics - can you describe?

A: Initiative on May 4<sup>th</sup>. Worked with Kristen Saacke-Blunk at Penn state – developed a webinar for organics – available soon on Kristen’s site and will help describe what the initiative is. Gwen is the point of contact. There are two new web pages up on our site with information for org. initiative. There will be more news to come and opportunities to ask questions. In a few weeks will offer a Q&A session.

Q: Does organic money come out of EQIP?

A: It does this year.

Barry added: other money in Farm Bill is subsidies for Farm Bill organic certification requirements, etc.

Separate from EQIP money. Some of AMA money comes from same source as ag marketing service.

Gwendolyn said the money she is talking about is through EQIP. How PDA works – path to organic basically helps producers through transition process. Certified organics do not have a lot of input for farmers. Work with farmers to help them go in right direction; Money to help a team help producer transition to organic, etc. operations specific. Ag marketing service has funding Pa IS one of 16 nation-wide guaranteed funding for certification fees. Money comes through state. Jerry Grisinger with PDA is who to talk to.

Q: Cost listed \$66M – is that total project costs or total eligible costs?

A: Total estimated cost – eligible cost.

Q: Is that the total to producer, or what NRCS will pay?

A: That is just what NRCS will pay.

Q: Actual cost will be higher? \$20M of costs to represent a higher number of additional costs.

A: 2009 was delayed in funds, signups, obligation, etc. Obligation is the next important step for the field.

NRCS can start obligating WHIP and AMA and EQIP in the next few weeks. Funds will decrease as all is obligated. Award July 1 most of contract dollars, hopefully. Declining accounts as contracts are awarded.

Normally, we like to do this in Jan/Feb so we can concentrate on obligation, and the field does not have to do implementation.

Q: TSPs to help?

A: We are interested in making tsp process work in PA. In the last three years we began FY with budget deficit, would not be appropriate to send TSP \$ out the door. We get money later in the year and then the time frame is so short that we don’t have time to use TSPs.

Q: Can we streamline the TSP process? Looks like you will need to rely on TSPs as the workload increases.

A: We will take suggestions on how to improve, if you have them. We can talk about this in detail at a later time.

## **Resource Priorities for 2010...Including the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Initiative**

Q: Dollars tied to Chesapeake Bay watershed?

A: Special under CBWI – watersheds are priority? But had given rankings to other watersheds that had nutrients? We don't intend to do that in 2010. Will separate what EQIP can do since CBWI is so strong. Barry added: 60-65% into bay watershed. Could have spend all money in lower part of watershed if we wanted to, but decided to go watershed wide

Craig said this was not preconceived – trying to separate out from EQIP.

Q: Lots of work to get applications. How many from traditional vs. new to NRCS programs??

A: We don't have numbers on that, don't track that.

Keisha said we don't track – but are probably traditional clients, because of short notice for new initiatives, organics, forestry, etc.

Craig mentioned that we need a lot of help getting the word out to new participants. News release – respondents are those that already participate. Help from all on that would be appreciated.

Barry reminded all that the easements application period is still open. June 1 was the application due date, extended till June 15<sup>th</sup>. GRP due date is May 29 – may extend. FRPP is for farmland, GRP is for easements or rental. GRP easements are not restricted – can graze, hay, etc. Have not had funding for GRP since 2005. HFRP – only three states have this funding. Easements – PA may get in future. WRP – a lot of applications, but we fund easement first, then the restoration. Might take 9 months to get easement. Flat rates for WRP instead of appraising property. Same for GRP, AWEP, and ag water enhancement – 1 application. CCPI – More funds requested than available. CIG same

Q: Do you have any input on HFRP proposal?? What kind of deadline for that?

A: No deadline yet. We should talk about this soon for proposals.

Q: HFRP? How will it be run? Would like to be involved in discussion in stewardship committee

A: Committee may be too big. We may need a separate committee meeting.

Craig asked all to let us know you are interested and we can make it happen.

Barry mentioned the calendar for timelines – payment rates for incentive programs. There are many practices. This is what farmer looks at when we work with them. Time and statistics used for this. Cannot change these for 2009, but can discuss for 2010.

Q: Can cost share natural re-generation??

A: Payment rate list – point out terms – cost share is old – now we use payment rates (flat rate) a price tag for a practice, participant will receive. Don't use cost share any more.

Q: Still submit costs to you?

A: Yes, it helps set up lists, but this is clearer to participants when deciding on contracts.

Barry added: we offer higher rates to beginning, socially disadvantaged, limited resource farmers, as well.

Q: New practice – 122, ag energy management plan criteria – is this not on list??

A: We will get to that later. Dan will cover it. AGI and payment limits, new farm bill lowered AGI for farmers. And has max payment limits on annual and farm bill lifespan, Ex-EQIP no more than \$300,000, income limit is \$1M. Input into system. Programming is not completed yet. Waiting to sign contracts until this is fixed.

Craig said our system interfaces with FSA's system to program checks and balances

Q: Growers separate entities with individuals – how is AGI calculated? For each grower in a business?

A: Yes, AGI is for you as a person. Each calculated separately. Whatever percent calculated is made up by the ineligible member. One out of four in entity has over 1million, reduce by 25%.

Public land entity eligibility – new farm bill ruled out entities from applying for programs, with the exception of FRPP and now GRP. NRCS cannot work with the Game Commission or the Fish and Boat for projects.

Craig added that the land needs to be privately owned.

Barry brought up inputs on 2009 program issues. CSP, FRPP, GRP, CStP for Pa Geographic areas and primary resource concerns. There will be a short notice if a sign up is announced. Give consideration to farmers who are growing conservation crops, etc. Three eligible land uses under CSP. Minimum of three, maximum of five applicants are asked to treat. Resource conserving crop rotations. Input on resource conserving crops- are farmers really using these rotations?

Q: Animal concerns declining populations, expand to include animals in state action plan? There are Immediate and high level concern species, beyond threatened and endangered species. These are listed in wildlife action plan. Keep from declining.

A: Declining species may be what you are saying “at risk”.

Dan added that species of concern in state plan are target species “at risk”.

Comment: Odd combo to put domestic livestock in the same category as livestock and not with water quality or something else.

Barry agreed, but that’s how it is set up. These are decisions we have to make. These are hoops for farmers to jump through to sign up. Domestic livestock under animals is meaning food and shelter, etc.

Dan said planning divides natural res into five categories. SWAPA. Animals have domestic and wildlife concerns, which is why they are listed. The grazing category mostly addresses domestic and wildlife concerns.

Q: Pollinator strips fall under animals?

A: May fall under plants, habitat vs. insects. Doesn’t mean we can’t fund things in different categories. Just what a farmer is mandated to do.

Craig said this is simpler, less complex is better.

Q: What kind of input are you looking for?

A: Today, or think about and provide later. If you have a thought for minimum resource concerns, as mandates, etc. Or if need others for a minimum, please add. Geographic area – could use whole state or separate into areas. Might have different concerns for different areas. Should we split??

Same comments on crops, etc.

FRPP GRP interim rule published. FRPP new angle is that we can fund parcels that are up to 2/3 woodland. Calls for forest management plan if more than 10 acres, does not define management plan. Ask landowner what they want to do on woodland? Could write up something simple, or harder, would work with forestry for forest stewardship plan. Need input

Q: What our focus is for – stewardship plan goes into depth. Probably don’t need that kind of detail. Land owners state what they want/need to accomplish for land. How to manage forest land? Look at plan and include those things. Want it to be something people will use, instead of complicated that they will put away and not look at. Forest service and district staff may help.

A: Easements first concern is soil erosion, taking care of properly. Need to educate agency and landowners.

Q: Maybe not addressing forest could create a problem with invasives.

Comment: Could use to determine if these forests are eligible for HFRP down the road, maybe with a t&e species selection?

Comment: Look at species at risk, endangered species, will occur on limited terrain – this is a different specific approach. Habitat may be there, but species may not ... two animals.

Barry said if they are in FRPP, will not be eligible for HFRP.

Q: Is forestland in easement? Or just excluded?

A: Up to the participant

Q: Part of or excluded? Forest management plans approved by state conservationist, should be approved by state forester.

A: The Secretary of Ag delegates authority to run program. No Farm Bill delegation goes beyond USDA.

Comment: Won't be an increased workload – whatever Craig is comfortable with.

Barry said this is verbatim from the interim rules.

Comment: We would want to make sure we know what is going on in these plans.

Barry said GRP is focused on grazing, but hay is also allowed. Concerns are for wildlife habitat. Have to do in accordance with state law. The Preference is to leave it flexible for the landowner. PNDI check is a minimum. There might be something in the ranking for T&E or habitat.

Comment: PNDI is limited in accuracy. PNDI hits are clustered in university areas.

Barry responded with: bog turtle do not rely on PNDI, Much more out there in PA

### **Colleen Delong– Presentation on Ring Necked Pheasant in PA**

**Significant increase in grassland birds in CREP fields – Pheasants, Short eared Owl, and Meadowlark.**

**Want to work with USDA to partner to help pheasant 2008-2017 pheasant management plan for PA.**

**Need row crop habitat close to grassland/secure nesting cover. Travel limited amt due to predation.**

Comment: CCPI – Pheasants Forever/Game commission are looking for this type of partnership. Let's focus on areas that are out there on the ground now and work to improve it. We are working with outreach to disadvantaged farmers.

Barry said we will do contracts with landowner like always, but would let the entity target areas for participation.

Craig added this may be opportunities for 2010 and beyond.

Dan mentioned we should invite Scott Singer to work with -- meeting to discuss criteria to establish bio-mass/bio-fuels plants would like input on how to establish without harming habitat.

### **Utilization of Conservation Activity Plans in 2010**

Dan said all should ask his staff to address specific questions on activity plans. An activity plan is a specific authorized program practice for EQIP, Each of the type of activities is specific purpose chosen by the Secretary of Ag. Eleven other types of activities have been chosen, as well. Authority in EQIP legislation gives financial assistance to these types of plans. Can use some money to actually develop conservation plans. Activity plans must be developed by TSPs. A TSP is any individual, private or public certified by NRCS certified to provide services on behalf of NRCS ([techreg.usda.gov](http://techreg.usda.gov)).

Activity plan – one plan on the same acreage at one time. 12 activities: CNMP, Forest, Grazing, IPM, Irrigation Water Management, Ag energy management plan, air quality plan, drainage water management plans, organic transition plans, pollinator plan. Criteria in Section III of Tech Guide was posted last week on PA website.

Q: Were criteria set at national level?

A: Criteria set at the national level.

Q: Are there enough TSPs in the state to handle all of these plans?

A: No there are not. We need outreach, find people who are willing interested in providing these services.

Q: How do these fit in with traditional conservation plans??

A: A traditional plan can address any of the natural res concerns. (70+) erosion, sediment, nutrient runoff... Traditionally encourage customer to address w conservation practices voluntarily. Talk about other concerns, and their criteria, etc... to be eligible for programs, sometimes, or for other reasons. Now these are packaged in 12 activities in a way that we can solicit specific help from an outside source.

Q: Comprehensive air quality – if a producer asks for air quality mgmt plan, what elements need already implemented where to start? Is this an empty slate, or an addition to existing cons, work?

A: Example: forest management. Certified by state conservationist – How do we do that? Certified Planners have training in whatever area they concentrate in.

Q: First place to start is to work with Penn state to train TSPs to deliver this.

A: We have criteria established and will work with other entities to train and provide training if we can on some of these issues. Not sure if we actually are allowed to train TSPs at NRCS for new activity plans.

Q: On-line air education for some services, but only allowed for NRCS, not TSPs.

A: That's not true. The Tech Reg site has AgLearn accts and other tech training access that NRCS employees have access to.

Craig said that's a good idea to involve Penn State. We need input from all of you on how to provide complete training for this.

Q: TSPs need certified in each area?

A: Each category has different proficiency criteria for that type of plan. Example: air quality 1<sup>st</sup> prove you have one year of experience in designing air quality practices, draft an air quality plan to present for review, then get approved for that plan.

Q: That is bad policy. Right now only ones with one year with experience in air quality plans are in California. We need to keep it local, can review and update plans locally, that makes sense.

A: Feed Mgmt, for example, is an air quality plan.

Comment: Feed Management, working with national land grants on a practice by practice air manual that will be a good resource for us.

Q: This is a pilot year for these practices. These are not eligible now, right?

A: Right, we offer CNMPs, now, with air quality initiative, we offer that too... organic initiative, we need momentum, we have interest in piloting more of these next year and we need help from all of you for ideas. Pollinator habitat, forest management plans with many levels, etc. Eco-trading markets, etc., wildlife habitat management. Lots of interest.

Q: Will all of these be eligible practices in 2010?

A: We are interested in your advice on which we should enter, if not all of them.

Craig said to pick out activity plans that are challenges, and need to put out info in activity plans that are applicable to PA to be successful. Forestry issues, we have a few months for this. Need to be more developed for consideration in 2010. Rally around ones that have a strong interest to provide a useful product. Communicate with Barry, Dan and other staff.

Comment: Good to keep it local, don't want to bring in from outside – except for big IPM plans. Streamline process for TSPs would be good. Using university people to develop plans could also be an option. Need to train people this year.

Comment: Have Game Commission staff trained for wildlife plans already, but others do not.

Response: have others, like Trout Unlimited, etc., need to find them and start to work with them.

Q: EQIP funds are for public, or private?

A: They go directly to farmer/operator, not to TSP. A TSP, by definition, could be a private or public organization.

That really covers the entire big points see me for more information if you want. For each of the activity plans, we have contacts, don't hesitate to contact them for practice info – Hosea, Barry I, Gwendolyn, Mark Goodson, Jana Malot.

Q: Recommendations we haven't already talked about -- for 2009/2010??

Q: How will the subcommittees work?

A: As needed to review issues – to get together

Comment: Put air quality and water quality together, instead of dividing with animals.

Response: Resource concerns, fund allocation, subcommittees, plans, make a suggestion, speak up.

Comment: Easements meeting. Form a subcommittee on easements to discuss all of the easements.

Response: Easements are specialized – i.e. FRPP is different from WRP may need different committees

Q: If anyone is interested on being on a committee – should talk to Barry?

A: Yes, and let him know what issue you are interested in. 2010 is right around the corner.

Q: What geography will local work groups cover???

A: Some at county level or some may be regional – i.e. as in the west, where multi-county may work better.

Whatever fits for that specific work group. Open to your thoughts on that if you have a specific idea.

Comment: Needs to be a forestry work group, habitat workgroup, if you want to sell programs, need to package as individual things, like forestry habitat, easements, etc. Not completely fragmented.

Q: Logistics of subcommittees – how would schedule? Will they be held on the same day as STC, or other dates? How would this work?

A: We have been using net and teleconferences and will probably use those for these meetings, as well, to make it easier than having to travel.

Q: CCPI funding – some way to use that for universities to train TSPs?

A: No, no money for the third party. But third party could direct money to landowners in program.

Craig said this is not through CCPI, but through TSPs, if funding is available. Will we have CBWI in same watersheds next year? Depending on how much effect it has had, and how much interest is in existing vs. new watersheds, and what resource concerns have been met.

Barry mentioned that the CBWI is very important to us.

Comment: Ranking worksheet, targeting, put on subcommittee agenda

Response: have technical need, which is separate from funding need, hard to see what funding we need before we have technical figured out.

Craig said these are topics subcommittees would be interested in.

Barry said GRP flat rates are being used for WRP easements. Hired appraisers for market value worth. Same for regular land, pasture, cropland, etc. GRP 65% of estimated value for what we would pay for an easement. Get back to us with you comments on this. FRPP, bill, law says we need to use an appraisal.

Ed White added that watershed assessments/resource issues. 8-digit hydrologic units' studies. Looked at data and determination on how much data existed and how many people would participate over next 5 years and complete practices for addressing resource concerns. Analysis. 6 watersheds, profile on all watersheds in PA.

Q: Practices listed are just what NRCS has paid for?

A: Looked at practices to see what was installed, what was needed and how many landowners would be needed to convert.

Q: Is it already installed?

A: No it is a needs assessment, a mix of what has been installed and what has not.

Q: Is this NRCS criteria or other criteria?

Q: Location of practices??

A: We have locations internally.

Q: How will this be used?

A: Will be used to target programs on water shed basis programs/practices.

Q: How are you verifying this data?

A: estimating what is out there.

A: This is just a profile of what watersheds really are (a character profile of those watersheds).

Q: How do the practices go from needed to actually completed?

A: Landowners answered questions and their responses were calculated.

Craig said there is a PA water atlas from DEP which covers resource maps from major watershed basins in PA. Resource structure that we need to work within -- originally by county, but now we want to try to work in watersheds more than counties as a system.

It is difficult to agree to add to package, we need to keep it simple. We are busy, but have opportunities and this is a great situation. Thanks for participation. Encourage your input, please send to us.

Thank you all.