

Environmental Quality Incentive Program (EQIP): Lower Arkansas Watershed-Water
Quality/Animal Waste Mgt Screening and Resource Analysis Worksheet (C5)

Part I. Producer/Land Unit Information										
Producer/ Group Name:				Tract Number(s):						
				Farm Number(s):						
Kind of Entity or Joint Operation:	Joint Venture			Total Number of Animals (expressed as CAFO/AFO Equivalence, COE):			450	Kind:	Beef Cattle	
Location:	Rocky Ford, CO Field Office			Contract Financial Assistance Request:		\$15,000.00	Total Points:	81.58		
Planner:	G. Langer	Date:	06-Apr-09							
Priority:	LOW PRIORITY			Minimum Number of Points Required:			> 45	QUALIFIED		
Part II. Screening Tool										
1.	Is this EQIP application requesting Financial Assistance for an expanding feedlot/dairy ? NOTE: An existing feedlot/dairy that is being moved is not considered an expanding or new feedlot. In the case of an expanding feedlot/dairy, only that part considered existing is eligible for cost-share.								NO	
2.	Has the applicant within the past 3 years (a) had a previous cost-share contract that was cancelled or terminated due to lack of progress OR , (b) where the installed practices failed due to lack of maintenance, OR (c) has the applicant previously declined an approved funded application for reasons other than technical, or drought related reasons? (If any of a, b, or c is "yes", answer YES to question)								YES	
If either #1 and #2 above are "yes", application is LOW priority. NOTE: (a) Feedlots/animal feeding operations that are under a judicial (state or federal) court order (i.e. order signed by a judge) are not eligible.										
3.	Does the applicant (a) have a current conservation plan in place for the requested practices that complies with current NRCS conservation planning policy with completion and documentation of the 7 deliverables in the Colorado Conservation Planning <i>STATEMENT of WORK</i> ; (b) is there sufficient indication that applicant is ready, willing, and able to complete a contract; and, (c) has the conservation plan been reviewed and site visit made to confirm that the proposed practices are still needed and feasible to address the stated resource concerns? (If any of a, b, or c is "no" answer NO to the question)								YES	