**1. Determining eligibility**

* **Is the practice to be implemented on the 2019 Maple RCPP practice list?**
If NO, ineligible. Recommend regular EQIP.
* **Is the practice to be implemented on a field that is at least 50% in the Maple Watershed?**
If NO, ineligible. Recommend regular EQIP.

**2. Modeling impacts for applications**

Technicians will run the models within the Great Lakes Watershed Management System (GLWMS) on a field-by-field basis and generate a report that provides individual field scores and a cumulative score for all fields included in the application. The information in the table below is integrated into the GLWMS analysis and reporting features. The GLWMS has map layers for stream types and available water remaining in the State’s Accounting Database for reference; the system will make these determinations automatically and include them in the score.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Question** |  | **Points** |
| Is over 50% of the application located in a stressed WWAT water management unit according to the State’s Water Accounting Table? | 0 gallons/minute remaining | 40 |
| Less than 111 gallons/minute but greater than 0 gallons/minute remaining | 20 |
| Is over 50% of the application located within a WWAT water management unit with cold, cold-transitional or cool stream? | 10 |
| Will implementing selected practices within this application result in a significant increase of groundwater recharge? Select the appropriate average rate.  | 0 - 1,000 gal/acre | 0 |
| 1,001 - 1,500 gal/acre | 50 |
| 1,501 - 2,000 gal/acre | 110 |
| 2,001 - 4,000 gal/acre | 160 |
| 4,001 - 6,000 gal/acre | 210 |
| > 6,000 gal/acre | 250 |
| Will implementing selected practices within this application result in a significant decrease in sediment? Select the appropriate average rate. | 0 - 0.1 tons/ acre | 0 |
| 0.11 - 0.2 tons/acre | 20 |
| 0.21 - 0.3 tons/acre | 40 |
| 0.31 - 0.4 tons/acre | 60 |
| 0.41 - 0.5 tons/acre | 80 |
| > 0.5 tons/per acre | 100 |
| **Total points possible** | **400** |

**3. Identify final fields to be included in the application**

Review the cumulative application score with the producer. If the cumulative score in the GLWMS report is relatively low, review the individual field scores to see if some fields are affecting the overall competitiveness of the application. Talk with the producer and determine if any fields will be removed from the application. If any changes are made, generate another report reflecting those changes and submit that with the application.

**4. Application screening and scoring**

Conservation Activity Plan (CAP) applications cannot be evaluated in GLWMS and will automatically be assigned high priority.

All other applications will be screened based on their ability to increase groundwater recharge. Applications that increase groundwater recharge will be considered high priority, while applications that are modeled to have no increase in groundwater recharge will be considered low priority.

Low priority applications will not be ranked at this time.

**Local scoring questions used in EQIP ranking**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Issue Questions** | **Points** |
| Is the program application to support the development of a CAP? If answer is “Yes,” do not answer the following question. If answer is “No,” proceed with evaluation to address the following question. | Yes | 250 |
| No | 0 |
| How many points did this project score using the Maple River RCPP Scoring Rubric? Choose one of the following based on the score included in the GLWMS Report. | 250 or more | 250 |
| 175-249 | 150 |
| 100-174 | 75 |
| 50-99 | 50 |
| 0-49 | 0 |