



## Agriculture and Markets

### Agricultural Nonpoint Source Abatement and Control Program Round 26 Questions and Answers May 13, 2020

*(Please also review the Round 26 RFP, Highlights and Proposal Rating Sheet for more information. If you do not find the answer to your question in any of these documents, please contact Bethany Bzduch, [Bethany.bzduch@agriculture.ny.gov](mailto:Bethany.bzduch@agriculture.ny.gov))*

#### **\*NOTICE\***

**The deadline for questions to be submitted was extended to May 11, 2020.  
The deadline for the submission of applications has been extended to June 15, 2020.**

#### **Round 26 Questions**

**Application Requirement Clarification:** As a result of the restrictions put in place due to the COVID-19 virus, Soil and Water Conservation Districts will **NOT** be required to obtain landowner commitment signatures (last page of the application form). If an application is received without these signatures no penalty will be assessed. If the project is awarded funding, the Soil and Water Conservation District will be required to obtain the signatures as part of the plan of work.

#### **Previously asked question clarification:**

**Q. The farm currently uses treated pond water for their water source for drinking water and all other farm uses. According to the farm the treated water tests well, but the treatment is costly and quantity has been an issue at times. There is a village public water line approximately 900 feet from the farm that they would like to connect to if possible. Can the water line from a village to a farm be included as a practice within the Agrichemical Handling & Storage System? Livestock Pipeline is a practice within that system, but I'm not sure that it is applicable. The second part of this question is can the farm use the water line as part of their in-kind percentage if it is not an eligible bmp but they want to connect to village water anyway?**

**A.** Establishing a new water supply for the **ENTIRE** farm is not eligible for cost share assistance. According to the NRCS NY Standard Agrichemical Handling Facility (309), it is necessary to provide an adequate water supply for mixing agrichemicals, rinsing tanks and containers, and for emergency health and safety needs as appropriate for the facility. The costs associated with providing a water supply to the **agrchemical handling** facility from an existing water supply for the farm can be cost shared. **Additionally, if the proposed Agrichemical Handling & Storage System requires a new water supply (i.e., a well) this would be an eligible cost.** Only costs that are directly associated with the proposed Best Management Practice System are eligible for match.

**Q. A CAFO farm wants to apply for a satellite waste storage. A waste transfer would move the waste from the main pit to the satellite pit using a PTO pump that could be**

**moved. Is the mobile pump eligible for cost share or landowner match? A second waste transfer would move waste from the satellite pit, 4000 feet south to a large block of land where the manure would be land applied. Would the underground piping and pump be eligible for cost share or only for landowner match? There would be a frac tank and pump to unload the tank and fill the spreaders at the end of the second waste transfer. Could this equipment be either cost shared or landowner match?**

A. A portable manure pump shall be considered as landowner match only. The underground piping and pump for the waste transfer would be eligible for cost share or landowner match. Items that are integral to the function of the BMP system may be considered for cost share or landowner match, however, portable pumps shall be considered as landowner match only.

**Q. While siting a location for manure storage a private planner shows it adjacent to a wet area with wetland vegetation that IS NOT mapped as a state or federal wetland. What is the proper action to continue with a grant application? Should the Army Corps of Engineers be contacted prior to the application?**

A. Given the proximity of the proposed storage location to an area displaying characteristics of a wetland, the landowner, private planner, and SWCD may want to consider alternative locations. If this is not possible, NRCS should be contacted to begin the process of a conducting a wetland determination. The District may still submit the application, with the understanding that it is the responsibility of the District/LO to determine the need for and obtain all permits necessary. Note, permits do not need to be obtained prior to submitting the application. While not required, as much of this as possible should be worked out prior to application to evaluate feasibility of the project. Additionally, when constructing a 313 Waste Storage close to a seasonal water table extra design criterion must be considered. Geological assessments/permits/extra design criteria can result in project delays and/or increased project costs.

**Q. Under the Ag Nonpoint Source Program, is it a requirement for earthen waste storages to be lined (regardless of suitable soils) as in the CAFO Program?**

A. No, this is not currently a requirement through the AGNPS program. However, synthetic liners are eligible for cost share as components of a Waste Storage and Transfer system.

**Q. A farm is interested in applying for funding for a standalone waste transfer. The transfer system they are wanting to implement would connect the existing waste storage at their main farmstead to a satellite storage (approximately 2 miles away) that has not been built yet. This satellite storage is a NRCS funded project that is intended to be built this year, but currently does not exist. The proposed waste transfer would need to cross multiple landowners, several roads, several streams, as well as crossing between two HUC 12's to connect the two storages. Is this proposed waste transfer eligible for funding through Ag NPS Round 26?**

A. The standalone waste transfer practice would be eligible as a part of an Agricultural Waste Storage and Transfer System. NRCS funding counts as landowner match so the funding devoted to the storage would be reported under the landowner column as a part of the entire system. The state share for the transfer would be reported as a part of the entire system and listed under state contribution. The District and landowner would be responsible for obtaining all permits to cross landowner boundaries, streams, roads, etc. for this transfer. As much of this as possible should be worked out prior to application to evaluate feasibility of this approach. Tentative landowner permissions and a list of required permits should be obtained prior to application to evaluate the feasibility of this approach. If the

project is selected for funding the landowner will be required to have a lease or easement in place on all non-owned property that the transfer line would cross over prior to the development of a contract with the District.

**Q. A farm is interested in doing a combination of no-till and cover crop. The three year plan, as they want it written, has no-till in all three years, but cover crop in only one due to crop rotation limitations. According to the new Soil Conservation - Cultural System policy, the BMP system needs to have a three year commitment. In our scenario, the no-till and cover crop are technically the same system, but we do not have a three year commitment from this farm on cover crop alone. Is this something that would be eligible? Or do we need to have a three year commitment on the cover crop and no-till separately?**

A. The Soil Conservation - Cultural System Implementation Guidance Policy states, "...component practices of the Soil Conservation Cultural System will be cost shared for a three-year term to allow sufficient time to demonstrate the value of the practice to the farmer over multiple growing seasons." If cover crop is included in the system as a component practice, the farm must be committed to implementing it for three years. However, there is not currently a rule against changing fields for cover crops based on rotation as long as the total acres proposed to be cover cropped is implemented.

**Q. We have a farm that wants to install cover crops again. He just finished planting his full acreage under the round 22 grant but we have not closed the contract yet due to other farmers in the grant utilizing the last year to finish planting their required acreage. In the first contract he planted single species and now he wants to plant multi species cover crops. I know in the webinar it was mentioned that the 3 year waiting period is over for applying for cover crop implementation, but you cannot have two open cover crop contracts with a farm at the same time. Is his contract still technically open since we have not closed the whole grant yet, even though this specific farm has fulfilled their contract and implemented everything?**

A. If the Soil and Water Conservation District has certified completion and issued reimbursement to the farm for the cover crop implemented through Round 22, the farm may reapply to Round 26.

**Q. Under Rd. 26 Ag. Non-Point, under the cover crop vegetative practice specification, lime can be added as a soil amendment using requirements of NYS Ag. & Markets by soil test. Can a District recommend a much higher rate of lime application while utilizing cover crops and reduced tillage management to further reduce sediment and nutrient removal via surface runoff or leaching?**

A. Recommending a higher rate of lime application would not make the cover crop project ineligible. When planning for implementation, this recommendation should be detailed and explained in the AEM Tier 3A Cover Crop Planning, Implementation, and Evaluation Tool (or similar planning document). It should also be noted that recommending a higher application rate of lime can increase the overall project cost which should be taken into consideration if utilizing a flat rate per acre.

**Q. We are writing an application for the implementation of cover crops. The farms that are going to be installing the cover crops have many fields covering the whole county, multiple watersheds and HUC areas. When we fill out the application should we just be putting the watershed and HUC that the farmstead is located on, even though some of their tracts that the cover crops will be put on will be on different ones?**

A. Question 7 of the Application Form states, "Please list the 12 Digit Hydrologic Unit Code(s) being addressed by the proposed project". Please list all HUCs that will be addressed by the proposed project. The HUC that the farmstead is located in should be listed on the SW 1 – Participating Landowner form.

### **Frequently Asked Questions**

**Q. If a landowner has a documented need for waste storage and is planning to upgrade facilities altogether, is a concrete waste storage, built under a barn as a new barn is constructed, eligible for cost-share assistance through the state grant program?**

A. An under barn manure storage is a combined livestock housing and agricultural waste management system. Housing livestock directly above manure storage presents management concerns, including herd health. According to the policy adopted by the NYS SWCC on April 21, 2015, under barn waste storage and transfer systems are not eligible for cost share or landowner match. (Updated 2015, Round XXI)

**Q. I have been asked by an agricultural research institute to apply on their behalf for Round 23 Ag NPS grant funding for a waste storage facility. They operate a Medium CAFO Dairy Farm milking 391 cows and owning/operating 997 acres of cropland. In order to comply with new CAFO regulations, they need to increase waste storage capacity. Is the institute eligible for state funds from the Ag NPS program?**

A. Program funds are available for nonpoint source abatement and control projects that plan or implement Ag BMPs on New York State farms. The definition of farm in the Agriculture and Markets Law (which is the definition that is used for the AgNPS program) is: "Farm operation" means the land and on-farm buildings, equipment, manure processing and handling facilities, and practices which contribute to the production, preparation and marketing of crops, livestock and livestock products as a commercial enterprise (AGM Article 25-AA § 301). Because this facility identifies itself as a not-for-profit educational institution rather than a commercial enterprise it is not eligible to apply for funding through the AgNPS program. (2017, Round 23)

**Q. Can you confirm yes or no, if a farm operation (50 acres of vineyard) which also presses grapes would be eligible for cost share assistance? Specifically addressing the wastewater and sludge produced at the press operation.**

A. If it is a facility that requires a SPDES permit to handle process waste, then it is considered a point source and therefore not eligible for funding under this program. (2005, Round XII)

**Q. If a farm is under a consent order from DEC, are they eligible for funding through the Ag NPS program?**

A. A farm would not be ineligible because of the consent order. It should be noted, however, that due to the time frame of the grant program, applicants should not expect to use grant funds for a problem that requires an urgent, immediate remedy. (2002, Round IX)

**Q. [UPDATED – 11/4/10] Q. Referring to Question 5. "Are all regulated CAFO farms compliant with appropriate requirements? (CAFO = Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation.)" Can a CAFO that has not yet met CAFO requirements be included on an application?**

A. No, a CAFO that has not met CAFO requirements is not eligible to be included on an application and cannot be considered for funding. (2004, Round XI).

The Department of Environmental Conservation recommends and the Ag NPS contract requires that funding not be provided to a CAFO that has been issued a Notice of Violation under the terms of the CAFO General SPDES Permit by which the farm is permitted at time of application (CWA Permit – GP-04-02 or ECL Permit – GP-0-09-001). If a CAFO that is part of a funded project receives a Notice of Violation for either type of permit, it must agree to a consent order with a compliance schedule or otherwise resolve the Notice of Violation with DEC, in order to release Ag NPS funding [UPDATED – 11/4/10].

Letter from Division Director to Undisclosed District (January, 2006) “The [AgNPS Program] requires that participating farms be in compliance with all federal, state, and local laws, rules, and regulations. The DEC-Division of Water has informed us that the Blank Farm is not in compliance with their CAFO General Permit and has not addressed the terms of the Consent Order issued on... When the Blank Farm is in compliance with the terms of the Permit, we can release funds for the projects identified on the plan of work. Until such time, however, no state funded expenses can be allocated to the Blank Farm’s portion of the contract. Consequently, all entitled advances cannot include state funds for the Blank Farm portion as identified on the plan of work.”

#### **Equipment Eligibility**

The purchase of specialized equipment may be considered an eligible expense under the program if deemed a reasonable percentage of the total project cost as determined by the State Committee and is considered an integral component of the project. *If considering the purchase of specialized equipment (cost share or landowner match), approval must be obtained by the State Committee prior to equipment purchase.* Manure spreaders will no longer be considered for funding but can be used as part of the farmer’s match if the waste storage system being implemented requires the farmer to purchase a different type of spreader, i.e. liquid vs. solid. (2002, Round IX, updated 2018)

#### **Q. In an implementation project, though most equipment is not eligible for state funding, would a pump for a waste storage facility be considered equipment?**

A. Items that are an integral part of the BMP may be considered for state funding. Other related equipment may be eligible as a match. In either case, equipment should be listed in the Other Direct Expenses category. (2002, Round IX)

#### **Q. Can the AgNPS Program provide cost share for BMP Systems that utilize NRCS Standards from other states for the purpose of design, implementation, and certification?**

A. BMP Systems cost-sharable under the AgNPS Grants Program must be identified in the Agricultural Best Management Practice Systems Catalogue and the individual Conservation Practices must meet NRCS-NY Practice Standards. If NRCS-NY has approved the use of a particular standard or suite of standards to address a NPS pollution concern, standards from other states cannot be used in place of the NRCS-NY standard(s). If no NRCS-NY Practice Standard exists for a particular NPS pollution concern, then the Practice must be designed to meet nationally recognized standards (e.g. American Concrete Institute Standards). All practices implemented must be approved by an individual with appropriate approval authority. (Round 19, 2012, updated Round 22, 2016)

**Q. Can grant funds be used to pay for roof structures where a consultant engineer will not allow/approve a wastewater treatment strip?**

A. Grant funds may be used to cost-share a roof structure if the project engineer documents that the roof is needed to meet the water quality objectives of the planned best management practice. This alternative may be costly. If proposing this alternative, the Screening Tool for Covered Heavy Use Areas must be completed, signed and submitted with each copy of the proposal. Please refer to the Roofs and Covers for Livestock Heavy Use Area Runoff Management Systems: Cost Share Eligible Components to determine what components are eligible for cost share. (Updated for Round 20).

**Q. Would excluding livestock and establishing a marginal pastureland wetland buffer (CREP CP 30) that meets the appropriate NRCS-NY Standard(s) qualify for preference points pursuant to the Proposal Rating Sheet?**

A. Yes, the purpose of the preference points is to encourage the adoption of livestock access control and buffers for all hydrologically sensitive areas, including wetlands. In order to qualify for the points, all livestock on the farm must be excluded from all wetlands where they currently have access. (Round 19, 2012)

**Q. If a BMP being applied for is on rented property; should the lease between farmer and landowner be for the life of the practice (10Yrs) or the life of the practice plus the years in the contract (13-14yrs) (the BMP doesn't get implemented until the last year of the contract)? Also, should the lease be on file and submitted with the application or do we not need it until the Plan of Work?**

A. According to the RFP, "BMPs to be implemented on rented property should not be submitted for funding unless there is a written lease for the use of the property for the life span of the BMP (see attached BMP Operation & Maintenance Guidelines, Page 17)." In order to qualify for funding under the AG NPS program, the farmer must have an existing lease with the landowner. The lease would need to cover application, award, construction, and the lifespan of the BMP. In your scenario, if the BMP system is not implemented until the last year of a 4 year contract and there is a 10 year lifespan, the lease would be 14 years plus the application time period. According to previous Q and A, "The District should ensure that the lease exists, but it need not be included in the application. If funding is awarded, a copy of the lease may be required." (2002, Round IX, 2017, Round 23)

**Q. Is there a list of BMP's that require a CNMP?**

A. The AGNPS program only requires a CNMP be developed when implementing a Waste Storage Facility (NRCS – NY Standard 313) which would fall under the Waste Storage and Transfer System as described in the Agricultural Best Management System Practice Catalogue. (2019, Round 25)

**Q. I have a question in regards to cost-sharing mulch installation on vineyard lands. I understand that once we have cost-shared mulch installation for three years with one farm, they are not eligible in the near future for additional mulching cost-share payments. Is that only for those vineyard blocks or is that for any vineyard lands the farm has under their control. If a vineyard owner picks up a new piece of property that has never had mulch installed before, if they could be eligible for AgNPS grant funds for mulch installation at the new property.**

A. With cover crops and mulching, the AgNPS Program is piloting an approach that supports the learning phase with a new practice for three years so a farmer can efficiently adopt it within their own farm budget post-contract.

After project completion, farms may reapply based on new technologies being available, local priorities of the AEM Strategy, and/or the Soil Conservation-Cultural System practice is

needed to address additional concerns than what were dealt with in the original contract. (Round 21, 2015, updated 2019)

**Q. The Soil Conservation Cultural – System implementation guidance identifies two categories for cover crop payment: Cover Crop – Basic and Organic/Non-Organic and Cover Crop Multiple Species Organic and Non-Organic. Can we assume that if we sign someone up based on the Multiple Species program and they can't pull it off one year (due to weather constraints, etc.), but can plant a Basic Species that we could count it and just have to pay them at the lower rate?**

A. Yes. If the farmer cannot complete the Multiple Species due to weather constraints, etc., a Basic Species may be planted and would be eligible to be reimbursed at the lower rate if it can be certified (2016, Round 22, updated 2019).

**Q. Is a Center Pivot Irrigation System eligible for cost share? This is a system that is fixed in a field and pivots around the well water source to irrigate a large tract of land. It will be computer controlled, with drop water nozzles that regulate the water flow to match field conditions and crop needs.**

A. Implementing conservation systems on acreage that is rotated between specialty crops and field crops is acceptable. Implementing an irrigation system that would provide a water quality benefit would be acceptable as part of an Irrigation Water Management System. (2017, Round 23)

**Q. A CAFO dairy farm currently buries their dead animals. They are interested in purchasing an incinerator in order to manage animal mortalities. Is it possible to fund an incinerator through the ag nonpoint source program?**

A. This would be an eligible practice through the Ag Non-Point Source Program. It will need to be implemented in accordance with the NRCS-NY 316 -Animal Mortality Facility Standard and Specifications. The District will need to verify the requirement for special permits prior to implementation. (2019, Round 25)

**Q. We have 2 barnyards on the same farm that we are applying for Roofs and Covers (367) for in Round 24. The barnyards run parallel to one another and are only separated by 20 feet. Do we need to submit separate barnyard screening tools for each barnyard or can we define each barnyard on the same screening tool.**

A. If these projects are considered two separate Livestock Heavy Use Area Runoff Management systems then a Covered Heavy Use Area Screening Tool would need to be completed for each system. If they are part of the same system, one screening tool may be submitted.

**Q. Does the "Screening Tool For Roofs and Covers for Heavy Use Areas" need to be filled out for an Agrichemical Handling and Storage System?**

A. The Screening Tool for Roofs and Covers for Heavy Use Areas does not need to be filled out for an Agrichemical Handling and Storage System.

**Q. A farm has a silage bunk located on a Trout stream and the only solution is to relocate the bunk and provide treatment at the new site. Can the new bunk pad, exterior wall, and, the treatment system be cost shared? The farm will also require an access road which will be used to maintain the VTA, pump out the tank, etc. Can the access road be included as part of the Silage Leachate System?**

A. Pursuant to the Bunk Silo Relocation Policy/New Bunk Silo Construction Policy which was approved in November 2016, the new bunk floor can be cost shared if it is the same size as the original bunk floor or smaller. Any amount over the size of the original floor must be considered Landowner Match Only. The treatment system may also be cost shared. Exterior walls will be considered Landowner Match Only. The access road is an allowable practice and can be cost shared as it will be used to maintain the VTA, pump out the tank, etc. (2016, Round 22, updated 2018 Round 24).

**Q. I am working with a farm that would like to address issues from a bunk silo area. The current silo does not have a concrete floor, only crushed stone and millings. Can a concrete floor be cost shared or only landowner match?**

A. The bunk silo floor can be cost shared or used as landowner match as part of a Silage Leachate Control and Treatment System. (2018, Round 24)

**Q. Could a project be allowed for funding if the silage leachate (i.e., total collection) goes to an existing six-month storage that was not designed by an engineer?**

A. The waste storage facility that will collect the silage leachate must meet the NRCS 313 Waste Storage Facility standard and be certified by a professional engineer in order to be eligible. (2018, Round 24)

**Q. Can the AgNPS Program cost share the construction of a ramp into an existing waste storage to facilitate the clean out of manure? The existing storage does meet NRCS Standards but clean out is difficult.**

A. Construction of the clean out ramp would not be eligible in an existing certified storage as it is not a standalone water quality BMP. (2014, Round 20)

**Q. A farm is interested in installing a satellite storage away from the farmstead. The farm indicates that there is a used storage (slurry store) that they can purchase for a reduced cost. If they were to purchase the used slurry store, can they apply for Ag Non Point to help offset the costs of installing the slurry onto their property?**

A. A used Slurrystore can be used and cost shared provided a representative of Slurrystore oversees the construction of the storage. The storage as set up in its new location will need to be certified that it is structurally sound and meets the NRCS standard 313 – Waste Storage Structure. All other program requirements such as the use of the Waste Storage Screening Tool, and a CNMP eventually being developed or revised to reflect the presence and proper use of the Slurrystore must be met (Round 22, 2016).

**Q. If applying to CAFO Waste Storage and Transfer System Program for a Waste Storage, can the farm apply to Ag Non- Point for the supporting components only? I.E. Transfer lines, pump, reception pit (if needed), HUA, Access Road, Fencing, etc. By doing so, they would not be asking for State funding for the same practices.**

A. A standalone waste transfer would be eligible for funding through the AgNPS program provided a Waste Storage Facility is already in place and a licensed engineer can sign off on the waste transfer as a complete system. However, funding from the AgNPS program cannot be used to match other state funds and vice versa. (2018, Round 24)

**Q. Are Bedded Packs [or Composted Bedded Packs] eligible practice system[s] for manure storage and feeding? If so what components would be cost shareable?**

**A.** Yes, both Bedded Packs and Composted Bedded Pack Systems for manure storage or composting are eligible practice systems through the Ag NPS Grant Program. Components that are an integral part of the practice standard being applied may be considered for state funding. Other related or indirect components may be eligible as a match. The SWCC approved a policy on February 18, 2014 outlining the requirements for Waste Storage and Transfer System - Bedded Pack / Composted Bedded Pack Cost Share Eligible Practices. Please contact the SWCC office for a copy of this policy. (Updated for Round 21).

**Q. We have a farm that has previously received funding to install a waste storage facility that only receives silage leachate. They are now applying for funding for a waste storage facility that will only receive manure. Is this considered an expansion related practice and does that mean that they should provide “significantly more cost share” as it says in the guidance manual? The farm does already have manure storage and they have expanded, but we never cost shared their existing manure storage just their leachate collection storage.**

**A.** If the manure storage is being proposed to address a water quality concern that originated from intentional farm growth that occurred within the past 5 years then it is considered an expansion related practice. Landowners implementing expansion related practice systems must provide a contribution significantly greater than that required by the program (refer to the Match Requirements section of the RFP for more information). Previous guidance indicates that the amount of contribution may be determined by the applicant and the landowners involved. (2017, Round 23)

**Q. The District is working with a farmer whose primary facilities are located in our county. The farm has a heifer facility in a neighboring county where they would like to construct a waste storage structure. Can our District write an AgNPS grant for the farm if the project location would be outside of the county?**

**A.** Since the main facility is located in your county and the AEM records for the heifer facility are maintained by your SWCD, you may submit an application for a project located in a neighboring county. The two Districts may want to approve the application by way of a motion or joint resolution. (2017, Round 23)

**Q. For BMPs on rented property, does a copy of the lease have to be included with the application?**

**A.** No. The District should ensure that the lease exists, but it need not be included in the application. If funding is awarded, a copy of the lease may be required. (2002, Round IX)

**Q. Can an applicant mix recommended and actual salary rates for District staff?**

**A.** Typically, applicants assign either recommended or actual rates for District staff and cannot mix the two rates (2002, Round IX). The exception to this would be if a District employs a Professional Engineer and wishes to charge their actual hourly rate. If using an actual hourly rate for a District Engineer overhead expenses cannot be charged. \*See *current RFP for further details*. (Updated 2019)

**Q. Is there a specified hourly rate for landowner match? May the \$5/hour overhead be used?**

A. No hourly rate has been specified for landowners. Districts may name a reasonable rate, based on the work the landowner will be performing. The \$5/hour overhead may not be used for landowners; it is to be used for agency personnel only, and only when the recommended hourly rates are used. Applicants should ensure that the \$5/hour is not automatically calculated on Form SW-4 for personnel for whom it is not applicable. (2002, Round IX)

**Q. Can a grass mower with a bagging system for the clippings be used as landowner match for a Silage Leachate Control and Treatment System in order to collect and remove the clippings/nutrients from the Vegetated Treatment Area (VTA)?**

A. In this case, the grass mower would be used to maintain the VTA. Costs associated with operation and maintenance are not eligible expenses through the AgNPS program. Therefore, the mower would not be eligible to cost share or as landowner match.

**Q. Are contingency funds referenced in section 3.6 – Proposed Scope and Budget of the RFP to be used only for BMP (as opposed to planning or services) cost overruns?**

A. Yes. However, when implementing a Soil Conservation – Cultural System utilizing flat rates, contingency funds are not applicable and should not be included in the proposed budget. (1996, Round IV, Updated 2016, 2019)

**Q. Multiple proposals from a county must be clearly prioritized. How is this done? What section must this information be present?**

A. Priorities are assigned by the local SWCD which submits multiple proposals. The application form includes a section for Project ID#. Instructions pertaining to the assignment of a Project ID are included in the RFP highlights document. (1995, Round III, updated 2019)

**Q. For a broad agronomic or nutrient management project like cover cropping, that covers many areas of the watershed, are we able to include a farm scale "project area map" for each farm in place of a "project site map".**

A. Yes, a farm scale map showing all fields and indicating which are to be cover cropped would satisfy the farmstead/field AEM plan map requirement. A farm scale map can be submitted in lieu of a project site map for the following Best Management Practice Systems: Feed Management System, Irrigation Water Management System, Integrated Pest Management System, Nutrient Management System-Cultural, Soil Conservation System – Cultural (this includes cover crop), and Waste Storage & Transfer System.

In addition, projects proposed to protect public drinking water over a sole source aquifer can supply one project map with the farms identified and the sole source aquifer overlaid.

The intent of asking for the farmstead or field map from the AEM Plan as described in the RFP is to show the project evaluators a visual of the existing condition and resource concern including the flow-path and distance to a receiving waterbody or groundwater recharge area.

A farmstead/field AEM plan map for **project site locations** as described in the RFP shall be included for the following BMP Systems: Access Control System, Agrichemical Handling and Storage Systems, Composting System - Animal, Livestock Heavy Use Area Runoff Management System, Pathogen Management System, Petroleum and Oil Storage System, Process Wash Water Management System, Silage Leachate Control and Treatment System, and Stream Corridor and Shoreline Management System, Prescribed Rotational Grazing System, and Riparian Buffer System (2015 – Round 21, updated Round 22).

**Q. Can letters of support be included in the grant application?**

A. No. Applicants should substantiate an organization's support and are free to obtain support letters for their own files, but these letters should not be included in the application. Any letters that accompany an application will be removed prior to distribution to reviewers. Applicants may list agencies and groups who support the proposal in the project narrative of the application form. (2002, Round IX, updated 2019)

**Q. For supporting documentation, is it possible for videos to be used/uploaded and reviewed, showing site issues/opportunities with ground, drone footage, etc.? If so, can narration of the video be included?**

A. The AgNPS application does not have the capacity to incorporate videos as supporting documentation. Videos and video narration may not be used as supporting documentation. (2019, Round 25)

**Q. Can before and after photographs of past projects be included in a proposal to demonstrate the effectiveness of a practice?**

A. Yes, photographs may be included as supporting documentation.

**Past Performance**

In the project ranking process, the review committee will consider the project sponsor's ability to complete previous projects in a timely manner. (memo from John Wildeman, 6/16/99)

**Q. The District has a farm that was awarded a Rd. 19 Barnyard Runoff Management System. Unfortunately, the farm was not able to implement the project at that time. The District is looking to apply to Rd. 25 to install the same BMP System. Does this qualify as a Repeat BMP System?**

A. Since the Round 19 project was never implemented it would not be considered a Repeat BMP System. (2019, Round 25)