

# **WILDLIFE HABITAT INCENTIVE PROGRAM OKLAHOMA IMPLEMENTATION PLAN 2007-2012**

## SUMMARY OF UPDATE

This is an update to the Oklahoma Wildlife Habitat Incentive Program (WHIP) Implementation Plan which was originally established in October, 2001. The updated plan remains very similar to the original plan. Oklahoma will continue with the current habitat based ranking criteria for 2007. However, each Administrative Zone will have its own fund code so that applications will compete within each Zone rather than statewide. Beginning in 2008, the ranking criteria will be based more on species of concern. In addition, the ranking criteria will be regionalized within the state to better address the habitat and species diversity that exist in Oklahoma. The general objectives and priorities remain the same; however our approach to addressing them will become more focused on species of concern.

## INTRODUCTION

In 1947, Aldo Leopold wrote, "*Everyone ought to be dissatisfied with the slow progress of conservation on the land. Our 'progress' still consists largely of letterhead pieties and convention oratory. The only progress that counts is that on the actual landscape of the back forty, and here we are still slipping two steps backward for each stride forward*". This statement has often been quoted over the last 50 years, usually followed by a remark about how much truth these words still hold today. Perhaps, because of recent farm bill conservation provisions and efforts on the part of other federal, state, and private agencies and groups, we are closer to making this an archaic statement than ever before. The opportunities for stepping forward are available and the wildlife partnership in Oklahoma will make the best possible use of WHIP and other available programs for the benefit of the state's fish and wildlife resources.

## GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF OKLAHOMA FISH AND WILDLIFE HABITATS

Fish and wildlife habitats in Oklahoma are determined by vegetative cover types and land uses. National Resources Inventory (NRI) data describes the following major cover types within the state: Cropland - 11,500,000 acres; Rangeland - 15,060,000 acres; Pastureland - 7,100,000 acres; and Forestland - 6,500,000 acres. Duck and Fletcher (1943) described 15 distinct vegetative cover types that strongly influence the wildlife populations of the state. Fishery habitat is provided by over 250,000 farm ponds providing approximately 500,000 acres of surface water. NRI data also describes 124,000 acres of aquatic habitat in small and intermediate streams throughout the state. These totals do not include the hundreds of thousands of acres of water in larger rivers and lakes across the state. Over 43 million acres (97 percent) of these lands are in private ownership and virtually all of it is used for some type of agricultural production (typically

production of livestock, timber, hay, and crops).

### OKLAHOMA FISH AND WILDLIFE RESOURCE ISSUES AND CONCERNS

Many of the current trends seen on private agricultural lands today tend to be more detrimental to wildlife than the agricultural operations found on the same lands three to four decades ago. A major shift from diversified farms with good interspersed cover types to a more simplified agricultural landscape dominated by crop and pasture monocultures has reduced the number and diversity of many wildlife species associated with agricultural lands (Farris and Cole, 1981). Remaining native habitats on rangeland and forestland have been negatively impacted by overgrazing and poor management practices that destroy required food and cover for wildlife. Riparian habitats along streams and rivers have also been negatively impacted by livestock use and encroachment by intensive crop and pasture production. The elimination or narrowing of riparian corridors has adversely impacted terrestrial habitat and associated stream aquatic systems. Collectively, the impacts have resulted in the loss of biodiversity at both the species and community levels.

### OKLAHOMA OBJECTIVES FOR WHIP

The detrimental impacts described above typically occur because fish and wildlife habitat on privately owned lands are considered to be a by-product of agricultural land use. The status of wildlife has been closely tied to agricultural economics and the intensity of land use. Agricultural landowners have production goals and the bottom line is profit with maintenance of the land resource base over time (Sebert 1985).

Because of landowners economic and production oriented goals, we believe that it is unreasonable to assume that large scale changes in existing agricultural land use toward intensive wildlife habitat development will occur through implementation of the WHIP program alone. This is especially true where cost-share practices, rather than incentive payments, will be emphasized. It should also be noted that other farm bill programs, including WRP, CRP, and EQIP, contain opportunities for fish and wildlife habitat development with incentives that may be at least as attractive to landowners as WHIP. While these programs should be complimentary rather than competitive, it is reasonable to assume that many potential WHIP applicants will utilize other available programs to accomplish their goals.

McConnell (1981) identified four key points in successful wildlife habitat development through private lands programs: (1) Programs must be acceptable to landowners. Therefore, their interests, benefits, and their role in making the program a success must be carefully considered; (2) The program must be compatible with the primary land use of the land in question; (3) Programs are most successful when habitat can be made suitable with little or no costs to the owner; (4) Habitat type is an influential factor and least successful when applied to intensively used agricultural lands. These key points will influence our efforts to meet the following objectives for implementing WHIP in Oklahoma.

- **Objective 1** - Provide statewide technical and financial assistance in developing fish and wildlife habitat as a viable secondary use of land that is currently devoted to agricultural production.
- **Objective 2** - Provide statewide technical and financial assistance in developing fish and wildlife habitat as a primary use of the land where landowners are willing to forego agricultural production in favor of more intensive fish and wildlife habitat management.

### OKLAHOMA FISH AND WILDLIFE PRIORITIES

We propose to implement the WHIP program statewide on all offered lands that would provide high quality benefits as determined by the WHIP ranking criteria. The goal is to emphasize restoration, enhancement, or protection efforts on areas of farms and ranches that will maximize fish and wildlife benefits while minimizing the loss of agricultural production. The priorities, rationale for selection, and associated practices for achieving fish and wildlife habitat benefits in Oklahoma are presented below. Each national WHIP priority is being addressed within one or more state priority.

#### **Priority 1 - Restore and protect native habitats with an emphasis on prairie ecosystems.**

This item will address the following national priorities:

- Promote the restoration of declining or important native wildlife habitats
- Protect, restore, develop or enhance wildlife habitat of at-risk species
- Reduce the impacts of invasive species on wildlife habitats

Rangeland still makes up over 40 percent of the land area of Oklahoma. Consequently, this cover type influences the overall health of wildlife resources more than any other vegetation. Virtually all rangeland is used for livestock production. Overgrazing and poor management on much of this land has diminished the quantity and quality of food and cover for wildlife.

Several cost-share practices are available that can improve habitat on these lands without sacrificing livestock production. The selected priority practices and benefits to wildlife are as follows: **Brush Management** - Species such as Eastern red cedar and mesquite have invaded over 3 million acres (20 percent) of native prairie in Oklahoma. These invaders have changed the kind, amount, condition, and interspersions of habitats. Native plants and animals have declined or been eliminated over much of this area. Invasion of these species shades out forage plants for wildlife and livestock and reduces stocking rates and carrying capacities. Cost-share for brush management would benefit wildlife and provide increased forage production for livestock. This is an excellent example of habitat restoration that is compatible with the landowners' objectives. **Prescribed Burning** - Burning is an effective, relatively inexpensive method of controlling excessive brush and improving forage for wildlife and livestock. Forbs and legumes in the plant community increase and stimulate seed and insect production. Most indigenous wildlife species such as deer, quail, turkey, rabbit,

prairie chicken, songbirds, raptors, and furbearers benefit from burning as long as a mosaic of nesting and protective cover is protected. Landowners are typically receptive to this practice, especially where cost-share and technical assistance are provided. **Fire Break** - This practice would be utilized as a necessary companion practice to prescribed burning. **Range Seeding** - Re-seeding of native grasses, forbs, and legumes on poor condition rangeland is often the most effective and timely method of restoring desirable habitat. This practice would have to be accompanied by fencing to restrict livestock and would most often be used on relatively small areas or where landowners were willing to defer grazing until the seeding was established. **Fencing** - This practice would be used to restrict grazing on re-seeded areas, protect nesting habitat, protect critically eroding areas having good habitat potential, or as part of a grazing management system that had special provisions for wildlife.

### **Priority 2 - Restore and protect buffers and corridors.**

This item will address the following national priorities:

- Protect, restore, develop or enhance declining or important aquatic wildlife species' habitats

Buffers and corridors, as defined in this proposal, include lands that are directly adjacent to water bodies such as streams, ponds, and wetlands. Buffers are important wildlife habitats because they provide reliable water supplies, increase wildlife diversity through interspersions of distinct plant communities, and provide important travel corridors. Associated vegetation can also improve fish habitat by moderating water temperatures. Overgrazing by livestock and encroachment for crop and pasture production are primarily responsible for the deteriorated condition of these habitats.

Priority practices that can improve or restore these productive buffer and corridor habitats include: **Riparian Buffer** - This practice provides general guidance and management recommendations on zone widths, types of vegetation, and environmental benefits. **Fencing and Use Exclusion** - Fencing of buffer areas requires relatively small areas of land with a tremendous potential for habitat improvement. These practices would be used to exclude livestock grazing or crop production immediately next to streams, ponds, and wetlands. The fencing practice would provide multiple benefits including nesting cover, improved fish habitat, travel corridors, and stream bank or shoreline erosion protection. However, alternative livestock water sources must be considered in order to make it attractive to landowners. **Tank or Trough** - Cost-share for freeze-proof tanks in combination with fenced buffers around farm ponds is one of the most attractive practices in terms of fish and wildlife benefits and landowner acceptance. **Tree/Shrub Establishment** - This practice would be used within the protected buffer areas to restore native tree and shrub species that have been lost to agricultural use or degraded by livestock and erosion damage. The benefits of re-establishing woody vegetation along riparian areas are documented above. **Range Seeding** - Re-establishment of native grasses, forbs, and legumes within the protected buffer would be accomplished with this

practice.

**Priority 3 - Increase habitat diversity within agricultural areas dominated by cropland and pastureland monocultures.**

This item will address the following national priorities:

- Promote the restoration of declining or important native wildlife habitats
- Protect, restore, develop or enhance wildlife habitat of at-risk species

As stated earlier, farming practices of 30 to 40 years ago that resulted in good interspersed and variations in vegetative cover types have been replaced by large-scale plantings of one or two species that do not meet the habitat requirements of most indigenous wildlife. Almost 40 percent of the native plant communities in Oklahoma have been converted to intensive pasture and crop production. These changes are particularly noticeable in the central and western part of the state where, as part of the "wheatbelt", entire landscapes are dominated by a monoculture of annually planted small grains.

Once again, it should be pointed out that large scale changes in land use are not anticipated through WHIP implementation. However, there are opportunities to improve habitat diversity within these monocultures by establishing trees, shrubs, and herbaceous vegetation using a multiple-use approach or in combination with programs such as WRP and CRP where there are greater incentives to restore natural vegetation on larger areas.

Practices that would be emphasized under this priority include: **Range Seeding-** This practice would be used to encourage planting of native warm season grasses, forbs, and legumes on existing or new Grass Waterways, Contour Field Strips, and odd areas such as corners in fields under center pivot irrigation systems. **Wind Breaks, Hedgerow Planting, and Tree Planting** - Multiple benefits to wildlife and soil resources would be gained from installation of these practices around field boundaries and on small, odd areas adjacent to fields.

**OKLAHOMA WILDLIFE PARTNERSHIPS**

Both long standing and new partnerships with resource agencies, private conservation groups, and landowner associations are in place to ensure the success of WHIP in Oklahoma. Partners who are presently committed to cooperative efforts for implementing fish and wildlife programs in the 2002 Farm Bill include: The Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation (ODWC), Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS), Farm Services Agency (FSA), Oklahoma Conservation Commission (OCC), Oklahoma Forestry Services (OFS), Cooperative Extension Service (CES), Oklahoma Association of Conservation Districts (OACD), Oklahoma Chapter of The Wildlife Society (OCTWS), Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality (ODEQ), Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), Quail Unlimited (QU), Ducks Unlimited (DU), Oklahoma Wild Turkey Federation (OWTF), Oklahoma Indian Tribes, Oklahoma Cattleman's Association (OCA), Oklahoma Farm Bureau, The Nature Conservancy (TNC), Oklahoma Riparian Workgroup, Lesser Prairie Chicken Interstate Working Group, The Noble Foundation, Playa Lakes Joint Venture (PLJV), Lower

Mississippi Valley Joint Venture (LMVJV), and the Sutton Avian Research Center.

All of the listed partners are expected to contribute to the successful implementation of WHIP and other important farm bill programs by informing landowners and respective members of their organizations about the benefits and opportunities available through these programs. Many of these groups are represented by membership on the State Technical Committee and will provide oversight on the expenditure of program funds and technical assistance.

Several state and federal agencies and conservation groups with responsibilities for management and protection of Oklahoma's natural resources will provide financial assistance, in-kind services, and/or technical assistance. These partners include ODWC, FWS, OCC, OFS, QU, DU, PLJV, LMVJV, and the Noble Foundation.

Memorandums of Understanding and Cooperative Agreements are in place with ODWC, FWS, OCC, QU, DU, NWTF, and Oklahoma's conservation districts. These agreements provide for the interagency transfer of funds and/or shared staff positions, equipment, and technical assistance. We believe these agreements have been mutually beneficial and fully expect the benefits to continue.

#### OKLAHOMA WHIP RANKING CRITERIA

ODWC technicians will rank WHIP applications, assess habitat, and develop WHIP plans. Their participation will continue to increase the level of technical expertise and improve consistency. This work will be done under the Cooperative Agreement with the Oklahoma Department of Wildlife Conservation (ODWC).

A copy of the ranking criteria that will be used to determine eligibility and to establish the order in which projects will be funded in 2007 is included as Attachment (A) of this proposal. The intent was to develop criteria that is easily interpreted by field staff, provides clear-cut distinctions between applications, and minimizes subjectivity. For 2008 and beyond, the ranking criteria will be modified to address species of conservation concern for various regions of the state. Bob-white quail will receive emphasis state wide where the habitat exists.

#### OKLAHOMA HABITAT ASSESSMENT PROCEDURES

Oklahoma has already developed several habitat appraisal guides for individual species and others are being developed. We will use these guides in situations where landowners are interested in managing for specific wildlife species. In situations where landowners are more interested in improving the habitat for overall wildlife benefits, we will use procedures that evaluate the overall health and condition of habitat provided by major vegetative cover types.

#### CRITERIA FOR MEASURING PROGRAM SUCCESS

High priority contracts will be written throughout the state dealing with species of concern. Practices will be applied that result in improvement in wildlife habitat.

The following information will be collected and analyzed to measure the success of the WHIP in Oklahoma.

- Number of applications received
- Acres under contract
- Number of contracts
- Dollar value of contracts
- Acres of upland wildlife habitat management
- Acres of wetland wildlife habitat management
- Acres of riparian wildlife habitat
- Acres of threatened and endangered species habitat benefited

WHIP reports that summarize this performance data will be posted to the Oklahoma public web site each year.

### SUMMARY

As emphasized throughout this proposal, we will continue to implement a WHIP program in Oklahoma that is acceptable to landowners, compatible with the primary use of the land, economically feasible, and beneficial to the wildlife resources of Oklahoma. Landowner interest will continue to make this a very successful program in Oklahoma.

### LITERATURE CITED

Duck, L. G. and J. B. Fletcher. 1943. Game Type Map of Oklahoma. State of Oklahoma, Game and Fish Department.

Farris, A. L. and S. H. Cole. 1981. Strategies and Goals for Wildlife Habitat Restoration on Agricultural Lands. Transactions, 46th North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. pp. 130-136.

Leopold, A. 1949. A Sand County Almanac. Ballantine Books, Inc., New York, New York.

McConnell, C. A. 1881. Common Threads in Successful Programs Benefiting Wildlife on Private Lands. Proceedings of Symposium: Wildlife Management on Private Lands. Milwaukee, Wisconsin.

Sebert, D. A. 1985, Wildlife Habitat on Private Lands: Oklahoma Conservation District Cooperator Attitudes, Perceptions, and Preferences. PhD. Thesis, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, Oklahoma. 188 pp.

## Natural Resources Conservation Service

## Application Ranking Summary

## WHIP Zone 1

<b>Program:</b>	<b>Ranking Date:</b>	<b>Application Number:</b>
<b>Ranking Tool:</b> WHIP Zone 1	<b>Applicant:</b>	
<b>Final Ranking Score:</b>	<b>Address:</b>	
<b>Planner:</b>	<b>Telephone:</b>	
<b>Farm Location:</b>		

## National Priorities Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
1. Will the treatment you intend to implement using WHIP result in the restoration of declining or important native wildlife habitats?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. Will the treatment you intend to implement using WHIP result in the protection, restoration, development or enhancement of wildlife habitat for at-risk species which can include candidate species and State listed threatened and endangered species?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. Will the treatment you intend to implement using WHIP result in the protection, restoration, development or enhancement of wildlife habitat for Federally listed threatened and endangered wildlife species?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. Will the treatment you intend to implement using WHIP result in the reduction of invasive species on wildlife habitats?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
5. Will the treatment you intend to implement using WHIP result in the protection, restoration, development or enhancement of declining or important aquatic wildlife species' habitats?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

## State Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
1. SIZE OF PROJECT (select only one) - Are there more than 100 acres of wildlife habitat that will be restored, enhanced, or created? (Must have Upland Wildlife Habitat Management and/or Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management planned and implemented during the contract period.)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
2. SIZE OF PROJECT (select only one) - Are there 71 - 100 acres of wildlife habitat that will be restored, enhanced, or created? (Must have Upland Wildlife Habitat Management and/or Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management planned and implemented during the contract period.)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
3. SIZE OF PROJECT (select only one) - Are there 41 - 70 acres of wildlife habitat that will be restored, enhanced, or created? (Must have Upland Wildlife Habitat Management and/or Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management planned and implemented during the contract period.)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
4. SIZE OF PROJECT (select only one) - Are there 10 - 40 acres of wildlife habitat that will be restored, enhanced, or created? (Must have Upland Wildlife Habitat Management and/or Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management planned and implemented during the contract period.)	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
5. NATIVE GRASS RESTORATION - Does the offer include restoration of native grass plant communities with future protection?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
6. BUFFER EXCLUSION WATER BODIES - Does the offer include protecting new or existing Filter Strips around ponds, lakes, or wetlands from livestock grazing by using Fence (382) or Use Exclusion (472)?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
7. BUFFER EXCLUSION STREAMS - Does the offer include protecting new or existing Filter Strip (393), Riparian Forest Buffer (391) or Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390) adjacent to streams from livestock grazing or encroachment from cropping? {Fence (382), Use Exclusion (472), or Prescribed Grazing (528) could be used}	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
8. HABITAT DIVERSITY (select only one) - Does a monoculture such as cropland, introduced pasture and/or closed-canopy woodlands comprise more than 70 percent of the area within a one-mile radius (2010 acres) of the center of the area being offered?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
9. HABITAT DIVERSITY (select only one) - Does a monoculture such as cropland, introduced pasture and/or closed-canopy woodlands comprise 51 to 70 percent of the area within a one-mile radius (2010 acres) of the center of the area being offered?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
10. HABITAT DIVERSITY (select only one) - Does a monoculture such as cropland, introduced pasture and/or closed-canopy woodlands comprise 20 to 50 percent of the area within a one-mile radius (2010 acres) of the	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>



center of the area being offered?	
11. HABITAT DIVERSITY (select only one) - Does a monoculture such as cropland, introduced pasture and/or closed-canopy woodlands comprise less than 20 percent of the area within a one-mile radius (2010 acres) of the center of the area being offered?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
12. LINKAGE OF HABITAT - Does the offer link existing native plant communities at least 10 acres in size and separated by a minimum of 300 feet?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
13. PROXIMITY TO PROTECTED HABITAT (select only one) - Is any part of the offer adjacent to a protected wildlife habitat area such as Refuges, Wildlife Management Areas, or WRP?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
14. PROXIMITY TO PROTECTED HABITAT (select only one) - Is the closest part of the offer within 1/4 mile but not adjacent to a protected wildlife habitat area such as Refuges, Wildlife Management Areas, or WRP?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
15. PROXIMITY TO PROTECTED HABITAT (select only one) - Is the closest part of the offer between 1/4 and 1/2 mile but not adjacent to a protected wildlife habitat area such as Refuges, Wildlife Management Areas, or WRP?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
16. PROXIMITY TO PROTECTED HABITAT (select only one) - Is the closest part of the offer between 1/2 and 1 mile but not adjacent to a protected wildlife habitat area such as Refuges, Wildlife Management Areas, or WRP?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
17. NEW STREAM BUFFERS - Does the offer include using native perennial vegetation in a new Filter Strip (393), Riparian Forest Buffer (391) or Riparian Herbaceous Cover (390) such that all locations next to all streams and natural drains in the offered area have a suitable buffer?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
18. OTHER NEW BUFFERS - Does the offer include a new Contour Buffer Strip (332), Cross Wind Trap Strip (589), Herbaceous Wind Barrier (422), Windbreak/Shelterbelt (380) or Field Border (386) established to native perennial vegetation that provides nesting/protective cover for wildlife?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
19. T&E SPECIES - Is the area offered in close proximity to known habitat of T&E species and will the practices to be installed meet the habitat needs of the identified species?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
20. SHRUB CANOPY (select only one) - Will the treatment provide for 20 to 40 percent canopy (by brush management &/or establishment) of native shrub species (skunkbush, sand plum, sand sagebrush, sumac, roughleaf dogwood, and/or sand shinnery in a native grass base) for wildlife habitat?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
21. SHRUB CANOPY (select only one) - Will the treatment provide for 10 to 20 percent or 40 to 60 percent canopy (by brush management &/or establishment) of native shrub species (skunkbush, sand plum, sand sagebrush, sumac, roughleaf dogwood, and/or sand shinnery in a native grass base) for wildlife habitat? Treatment will not reduce canopy of listed species below 20 percent.	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
22. SHRUB CANOPY (select only one) - Will the treatment provide for 5 to 10 percent or 60 to 70 percent canopy (by brush management &/or establishment) of native shrub species (skunkbush, sand plum, sand sagebrush, sumac, roughleaf dogwood, and/or sand shinnery in a native grass base) for wildlife habitat? Treatment will not reduce canopy of listed species below 20 percent.	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
23. COST FACTOR (select only one if it applies) - Will the cost for restoration practices be less than \$25 per acre?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
24. COST FACTOR (select only one if it applies) - Will the cost for restoration practices be \$26 to \$50 per acre?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
25. COST FACTOR (select only one if it applies) - Will the cost for restoration practices be \$51 to \$75 per acre?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
26. COST FACTOR (select only one if it applies) - Will the cost for restoration practices be \$76 to \$150 per acre?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
27. BENEFITS TO SOCIETY (all that apply) - Will the area provide education/research benefits?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
28. BENEFITS TO SOCIETY (all that apply) - Will the area provide public public recreation benefits?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
29. BENEFITS TO SOCIETY (all that apply) - Will the area provide water quality benefits?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
30. BENEFITS TO SOCIETY (all that apply) - Will the area provide economic benefits to the community?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>
31. BENEFITS TO SOCIETY (all that apply) - Will the area reduce soil erosion?	Yes <input type="radio"/> or No <input type="radio"/>

**Local Issues Addressed**

Issue Questions	Responses
-----------------	-----------

Land Use:

Resource Concerns	Practices
-------------------	-----------

**Ranking Score**

Efficiency:  Local Issues:  State Issues:  National Issues:  <b>Final Ranking Score:</b>
--

This ranking report is for your information. It does not in any way guarantee funding. When funding becomes available, you will be notified if your application is selected for funding. Some changes to the application may be required before a final contract is awarded.

<b>NRCS Designated Conservationist:</b>   <b>Signature Date:</b>	<b>Applicant Signature Required for Contract Development:</b>   <b>Signature Date:</b>
---	---