



Growing Forward

Beneficial Management Practices

POLICIES AND CLARIFICATION - FEBRUARY 2010

Subject to updates

Category	Category statement #	Policies
General	1	Date: January 1, 2004 is to be the date for all BMPs where relevant. Farm operations must have been in existence on or before January 1 st 2004. Funding is not designed to incent a change in enterprise type. The On-Farm Action funding is designated to make necessary changes to existing operations or practices that are impacting water quality, quantity or climate change. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005) (MAL April 2009)</i>
	2	Funding of partial projects: Funding for partial projects are eligible only when the partial projects, on their own, achieve significant environmental risk reduction. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	3	New equipment: Provide funding for the environmental enhancing components of new equipment. This should be based on a technical review and cost estimates by appropriate experts. <i>(WG ratification December 14, 2004)</i>
	4	Stacking: Program policy is that the maximum amount of government funds for a project is not to exceed 75% of the total project costs. Where funding is provided by a government agency and the agency deems that the funding is not from government (e.g. DFO use of funds originating in the United States), a letter from the agency confirming the source of funds must accompany the request for payment. <i>(AAFC September 2005) (WG ratification October 2005)</i> Part of the reasoning behind this clause is that it has always been the case that producers should have some vested interest in the improvements made on their operations. We are certainly aware of the financial issues faced by some of your clients and that many improvements are not always seen as economically beneficial to an operation. The BMPs are meant to be economically, socially and environmentally beneficial to varying degrees. We did see situations under the APF where there were very creative solutions to funding the remaining 25% of a project. Community solutions that do not use government funding (Provincial, Federal or local) can be found – as was done in the Salmon River Watershed. In some cases rock, trees, live stacks and labour came to projects at little or no cost to the landowner- although these items are not normally seen as in-kind – unless they come from the land owner applying for the project – they can aid in reducing the overall cost. And, in the case of BMP category 10 – with a “community based action” –(practice code 1007) on a watershed – the cost share for an individual producer can go as high as 70%. <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i>
	5	In-kind: One of the purposes of allowing in-kind contributions to cover a portion of the project costs is to reduce the cash costs for the applicant and the cost to the program. Wherever possible, projects should comply with this principle. <i>(WG ratification October 2005)</i>
	6	In-kind or on-hand materials are not eligible. All materials must have a paid receipt dated within the timeframe of the approved project. <i>(ARC ratification May 2009)</i>

Category	Category statement #	Policies
	7	Access to the BMP Program: Access will be based on an EFP that is less than 5 years old and reflects the current farm or ranch operations. IF the EFP is more than 5 years old or there have been significant changes on the farm or ranch operation – the EFP must be renewed however this does not imply that the farm operation will be able to access On-Farm Action program dollars nor does it imply the farm cap will be reset. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
	8	Caps: Overall Farm cap for the BMP program is \$70K for any farm that has or is participating in the Canada-BC Environmental Farm Plan program. Those operations that participated in the BMP program under APF or the Continuity Year Agreements which have not reached the \$70K farm cap can continue to access the program until such time their cap has been met. Caps and cost shares for BMP Categories have been set as of May 12, 2009 and are valid for the 2009/10 BMP, however, are subject to revision. <i>(WG ratification June, 2009)</i>
	9	Project Initiation: Projects will be considered ineligible for funding if any portion has been initiated prior to approval. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
	10	Project completion: All projects must be complete prior to December 31 st of the year they are approved. Approval of projects will be based in the assumption that they will be complete by the end of the calendar year unless clearly specified in the BMP program category (i.e.; a pre-approved 3 year span for an approved riparian or shelterbelt planting). Work and invoices must be completed and dated December 31 st unless written consent by the program administration is given to carry on with project work beyond that date. Carrying will only be considered in extenuating circumstances (i.e.; delays such as result of regulatory approval). <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
	11	Evidence of payment: The program requires a paid invoice, cancelled cheque with invoice, or credit card transaction as evidence of payment. <i>(ARC ratification May 2009)</i>
	12	Cancelled Projects: Any projects cancelled by applicant or time deadline are considered cancelled. Any materials or services obtained for a cancelled project are not eligible for payment if a new application is received at a later date. By previously starting a project, it does not mean it is ineligible for further consideration under a new application. However, all costs incurred for materials or services under the previous application will be ineligible for funding under the new application. <i>(ARC ratification May 2009)</i>
	13	Number of BMP Applications: Individual farm operations are limited to two eligible BMP applications per year. Management plan BMP's required for other BMP applications are not included in this total. <i>(Clarification of previous programming policy June 2009)</i>
	14	Management Plans required: If the completion of the workbook triggers the need for a Management Plan BMP (for another BMP) then ARDCorp needs to be contacted and advised: type of plan, value, producer and date of plan OR submit the short application for the plan if it is intended to be funded by the program. The advisor bills the producer for the plan and the producer claims the cost through the program. Application for Management plans: A short BMP application from has been drafted (short form v.2) and is available on the member's portion of the ARDCorp website. If you cannot submit the application before completing the plan please advise ARDCorp so the funds can be allocated / approved for that BMP. Submit the application as soon as possible. <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i> The management plan will not be considered one of the two bmps for the producer in this calendar year, IF required for another BMP. A copy of the plan is required on file at ARDCorp. <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i> Consultant Requirements for Plans Biodiversity: Several of the advisors were trained to do Biodiversity Planning and had to submit plans to prove they were qualified. PAs who did the requisite number and quality of Biodiversity Plans would be approved for doing biodiversity plans under Growing Forward.

Category	Category statement #	Policies
		<p>Note there are no eligible BMPS in category 28 (Biodiversity Enhancement Planning) for 2009-2010. <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i></p> <p>Riparian Health Assessments: All advisors have the initial training required to develop a RHA plan. The plans will be submitted with producer claims and reviewed individually and marked on a performance level similar to the Biodiversity plans. The plans will be reviewed until the planning advisors show they are meeting an acceptable level. Technical assistance is available from Dave Trotter at MAL - David.Trotter@gov.bc.ca 604-556-3001 / 888-221-7141 <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i></p> <p>Further to the discussions with the funding partners, the following revision will be effective immediately for the EFP Riparian Health Assessments through the Growing Forward program: a maximum cost of \$1500 per report will be billed to ARDCorp by the PA (instead of the producer paying and claiming through the program) <i>(Policy Supplement September 2009)</i>.</p> <p>Nutrient Management Plans: The plan will need to address the manure stores and its handling in detail and should include the amount of manure produced, the use and cycle and period required to store. If the manure is removed from the farm, the plan is complete. Whereas if not, then the plan devised. Nutrient composition readings are to be submitted to ARDCorp with claim submissions. Only the technical information will be forwarded and no client info divulged. Technical assistance is available from Orlando Schmidt at MAL - Orlando.Schmidt@gov.bc.ca 604-556-3001 / 888-221-7141 <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i></p>
BMP Category	Category statement #	
1 IMPROVED MANURE STORAGE & HANDLING	1	Engineering: Manure storage structures are to be designed by a Professional Engineer. Exemptions for low risk projects are at the discretion of the approval process. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	2	Structures below barns: For structures built below barns; a portion of the cost of the roof is eligible if a roof is deemed necessary to meet the minimum storage requirement for the program. The maximum eligible cost for the roof will be the equivalent of the cost of a roof over a similar sized storage structure that is not below the barn. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	3	Nutrient Management Plan: A NMP is now a prerequisite under this category. <i>(WG ratification May 2009)</i>
	4	Divulge report findings: For those plans that cover the costs of manure, compost or soil testing, MAL requires the analytical values (N, P, K, etc.), the lab name and/or method, the farm operation type, the manure state (liquid or solid) and the regional district be provided. <i>(MAL June, 2009)</i>
2 MANURE TREATMENT	1	Anaerobic digestors: (Formerly practice code 203, now 201). Funding for this practice is to be focused on consultancy costs for feasibility studies, generation of construction and design plans, tendering processes, permitting and final economic calculations. If, after using funds for these purposes, the cap has not been reached, funds can be used to assist with construction costs. <i>(WG ratification February 15, 2006)</i>
	2	Nutrient Management Plan: A NMP is now a prerequisite under this category. See also 1, 4 <i>(Policy change May 2009)</i>
3 MANURE LAND APPLICATION	1	Solid manure spreaders: Up to \$10,000 (\$3,000 from the program) can be provided for the additional costs of cyclone spreading attachments. <i>(Cost share increase May 2009)</i> Other types of spreaders will be reviewed, on a case by case basis, to determine components that can be funded from the program. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	2	Nutrient Management Plan: A NMP is now a prerequisite under this category. See also 1, 4

Category	Category statement #	Policies
		<i>(Policy change May 2009)</i>
5 FARMYARD RUNOFF CONTROL	1	Gutters and downspouts: Gutters and downspouts for farm buildings are not eligible for funding. These are considered to be conventional building components that are the responsibility of producers. <i>(WG ratification October, 2005)</i>
6 RELOCATION OF LIVESTOCK & HORTICULTURE FACILITIES	1	Groundwater Protection: Proximity to sensitive groundwater is not a rationale for use of this BMP. Funding is to be used to move operations away from sensitive surface water, riparian areas, critical wildlife habitat and areas of severe erosion potential. <i>(WG ratification February 15, 2006)</i>
	2	Decommissions site: The site from which the relocation has occurred must remain under the control of the project applicant once the relocation has occurred. <i>(Policy clarification June 2009)</i>
	3	Category 6 will only be offered in up to 2010-11 program year
7 WINTERING SITE MANAGEMENT	1	Field access improvements: alleyway/access lane upgrades. All other practice codes deleted as they are available in other categories. <i>(WG ratification June, 2009)</i>
8 PRODUCT & WASTE MANAGEMENT	1	Worker sanitation facilities: These facilities are not eligible for funding assistance under the program. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	2	Poultry mortality incinerators: These are eligible as long as the incinerator uses Best Available Technology and meets appropriate air emission standards. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	3	Fertilizer storage: All types of structures are eligible for funding assistance with a limit being placed on the area of the structure based on the type(s) of crop and area being farmed. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i> The maximum area of the structure is the lesser of 1.86 m ² (20 ft ²) per pallet or 0.93 m ² (10ft ²) per hectare of land receiving the fertilizer. <i>(WG ratification October, 2005)</i>
	4	On-farm processing and marketing: These are considered farm operations where the majority of the material being processed or marketed is produced on the farm or the majority of the output of the processing operation is used on the farm. Waste management from these activities is eligible for funding. Where wastes are not agricultural wastes, the farm must ensure that appropriate authorizations for disposal have been obtained. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	5	Mulching mowers: Heavy duty mulching mowers for dealing with orchard prunings are eligible for incremental assistance. The maximum project cost is \$4,500 (\$1,350 from the program). This is based on the difference between a conventional mower and a mulching mower. <i>(Based on technical evaluation by MAL). (WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	6	Fuel storage: The program supports the cost of providing a roof and containment for a single walled tank or the cost of a double walled (enviro) tank. The program will not provide a roof and containment of a double walled tank. The cost of a concrete slab and bollards for enviro-tanks are eligible items. Spill kits and fire extinguishers are eligible items. <i>(WG ratification October, 2005)</i> Fuel storage structures should be designed with sufficient roof overhang and partial walls to minimize water collecting in the containment structure. <i>(WG ratification June, 2006)</i>
	7	Silage storage: Funding assistance can be provided to modify an existing facility or build a new facility where the existing facility (in place on or before January 1, 2004) is not adequate from an environmental protection perspective. Existing facilities include pit silos and free standing bunkers silos in addition to other types of constructed silos. <i>(WG ratification May, 2007)</i>
9 WATER WELL MANAGEMENT	1	
10 RIPARIAN AREA MANAGEMENT	1	Water Supply: Practice Code 1001 includes the construction of wells, dugouts and spring development as eligible costs. <i>(Policy clarification June 2009)</i>
	2	Cross fencing: Eligibility for funding must be based on a plan (Riparian Management Plan, Grazing Management Plan or Biodiversity Enhancement Plan) that identifies the importance and value of cross fencing in dealing with identified environmental risks and achieving environmental benefits.

Category	Category statement #	Policies
		<i>(WG ratification June, 2006)</i>
	3	Fencing costs: The maximum amount of eligible costs for materials, labour and equipment is \$20.00 (\$12.00 from the program) per metre or \$6.00 (\$3.60 from the program) per foot.
	4	Riparian Management Plan: A RMP is now a prerequisite for BMP categories: 1001, 1002, 1003, and 1006. See also 1,4 <i>(Policy change May 2009)</i>
	5	Grazing Management Plan: A GMP may also be required for bmp 1003, 1005 & 1007. See also 1,4 <i>(Policy change May 2009)</i>
	6	Category Cap: The cap for BMP Category 10 for an individual project is \$20K at 60% cost share. An individual project may be made up of any combination of 1 to 6 practices codes (1001 to 1006). For situations where multiple project sites (as determined by the riparian health assessment) exist on an individual stream or wetland or property, these should be considered as an individual project application. Where sites are not contiguous on the same stream, wetland or farm/ranch property or are extensive in scope, it may be more appropriate to split the projects into two separate applications. <i>(Policy clarification June 2009)</i>
	7	Category Cap additional: Once the operation receives \$20,000 the cap for Category 10 will have been reached and no more funding can be provided for Riparian Area Management projects. This includes Practice Code 1007. Although the cost-share is higher (70% compared to 60%) for landscape-based group riparian management projects, the Category Cap applies to each operation. For example, if an applicant has received funding from Practice Codes 1001 through 1006, the amount available for Practice Code 1007 projects is reduced accordingly. An individual operation can never receive more than \$20,000 in total for Category 10 projects. <i>(Clarification by R. Bertrand September 2009)</i>
11 EROSION CONTROL STRUCTURES	1	Constructed Works: Eligible expenses will include site assessment, engineering design and materials, labour, and equipment rental associated with earthwork, installation of structures, and re-vegetation work in addition to the constructed works.
	2	All Projects must be properly designed by an accredited engineering consultant or a qualified professional in accordance with federal provincial and local government regulations and specifications. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
14		<i>Category 14 dropped – Practice code 3305 replaces</i>
16 IMPROVED PEST MANAGEMENT	1	Common pest management practices: Pest management practices common to the industry and well understood will not be funded. <i>(WG ratification March 3, 2005)</i>
	2	IPM practices: Where the uses of IPM practices are new to the producer, one year of funding can be provided to assist producers to become familiar with these techniques in accordance with an IPM plan. An IPM Plan must be in place. <i>(WG ratification March 3, 2005)</i>
	3	Non-wildlife pests: Funding will not be provided to assist with the control of non-wildlife, pest species that are commonly found on farms and ranches in British Columbia. <i>(WG ratification March 3, 2005)</i>
	4	Tower sprayers: Up to \$5,000 (\$1,500 from the program) can be provided for the additional incremental costs of converting an existing sprayer into a tower sprayer or of purchasing a new tower sprayer (based on technical evaluation by MAL). <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i>
	5	Tillage equipment: The incremental costs to modify conventional tillage equipment for the purposes for reducing pesticide are eligible for funding. <i>(WG ratification February 15, 2006)</i>
	6	Orchard tillage equipment: 50% of the value of a "Weed Badger" or like piece of equipment will be eligible for funding to a maximum of \$1200 from the program. <i>(WG ratification June, 2006)</i>
	7	P. ramorum: Any projects related to control of P. ramorum must be based on a revised or new Integrated Pest Management Plan that deals with all pest issues on the farm. <i>(WG ratification June, 2006)</i>
	8	Implementing practices from a revised Integrated Pest Management plan: One year of funding can be provided to assist producers to become familiar with new IPM practices identified in a revised IPM plan. <i>(WG ratification August 31, 2006)</i>

Category	Category statement #	Policies
	9	<p>An Integrated Management Plan must have been developed and implemented by the producer before applications under Category 16 can be approved.</p> <p>Options for an Integrated Pest Management Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Plan has been prepared in consultation with an IPM firm or consultant and carried out by the producer and/or farm employees. evidence of the plan and the name of the firm or consultant must be supplied with the application. - An IPM program is carried out by an IPM firm or consultant under contract with the applicant. evidence of the contract and the name of the firm or consultant must be supplied with the application - The farm has been certified by the COABC evidence of organic certification must be supplied with the application. - The farm has a written and documented IPM plan and program that has been reviewed and accepted by the Planning Advisor. A copy of the plan and documentation showing implementation must be supplied with the application. <i>(Clarification by R. Bertrand July 2009)</i>
17 NUTRIENT RECOVERY FROM WASTE WATER	1	<p>Nutrient management plan: required for select sectors. <i>(WG Ratification June, 2009)</i></p>
18 IRRIGATION MANAGEMENT	1	<p>Irrigation efficiency: An efficiency increase of 15% must be identified in the certified plan. <i>(Policy change June, 2009)</i></p>
	2	<p>Labour and installation: In-kind services by applicant and installation costs of equipment are not eligible. <i>(Policy change June, 2009)</i></p>
	3	<p>Irrigation design: All eligible systems are to be based on a Certified Irrigation Plan. (1801 & 1803) (Based on a technical evaluation by MAL and Policy Committee approval) <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i></p>
	4	<p>Irrigation equipment: Mainline and sub main piping; wires and posts for hanging drip irrigation lines; are not eligible. Pumps, electrical panels and supplies are eligible under practice code 1803. <i>(WG ratification June, 2009)</i></p>
	5	<p>Farm use change: Changes in farm use are deemed to be normal farm evolution. Irrigation upgrades associated with these changes are therefore eligible for funding assistance under the program provided they meet all other relevant irrigation requirements of the program. New systems are not eligible. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i> <i>(MAL June 2009)</i></p>
	6	<p>Eligible technology: Conversions from one type of eligible irrigation technology to another type of eligible irrigation technology are eligible for assistance under the program provided they meet all other relevant irrigation requirements of the program. <i>(WG ratification June 16, 2005)</i></p>
	7	<p>Pre-existing irrigation systems:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The pre-existing irrigation system must have been in place on or before January 1, 2004. • The pre-existing irrigation system must have been: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ a sprinkler system – hand move, solid set or stationary gun, or ○ a traveling gun, or ○ a designed flood system, and ○ capable of meeting water demand based on climate, crop and soils. • Ineligible systems include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ garden hoses, or

Category	Category statement #	Policies
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ buckets, or ○ systems for areas not previously irrigated by the pre-existing system. ● Evidence of a pre-existing system that must be observed by the Planning Advisor include one or more of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ old system in place, or ○ irrigation infrastructure on farm, or ○ irrigation plan for previous system, or ○ photos of previous system, or ○ water bills from use of previous system, or ○ pump system in place, or ○ invoices for previous system. ● The BMP application description needs to include information about the pre-existing system. <p><i>(WG ratification August 31, 2006)</i></p>
	8	<p>Climate stations or improved irrigation management: Labour is not eligible expense.</p> <p><i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i></p>
	9	<p>BMP overall cap: The entire category is capped to \$500K - \$150K for Lower Mainland and Vancouver Island and \$350K for BC Interior.</p> <p>Project cap is decreased to \$5K (1801, 1803) and \$2K (1802).</p> <p><i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i></p> <p>Continue to use the flat conversion rate of \$3,000 per hectare (\$900 from the program) up to a maximum of \$5K for conversions from inefficient irrigation systems (sprinkler) to drip. Installation costs are not eligible so it is only the materials. And as before the certified plan must show the conversion is going to improve the efficiency. Also evidence of the existing system is required. <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i></p> <p>A reminder we should not be paying an incentive for systems where the cropping has changed. <i>(Policy Supplement July 2009)</i></p> <p>The Category Cap for an individual farm or ranch operation is \$12,000. The Growing Forward Beneficial Management Practices 2009/2010 document does not show a Category Cap, all of the caps are under the Practice Code column. In the case of Irrigation Management, the Practice Code caps apply. Therefore, a single project could have components that fall under Practice Codes 1801, 1802 and 1803 and the operation would be eligible for \$12,000 from the program; a maximum of \$5,000 for 1801 components, \$2,000 for 1802 components and \$5,000 for 1803 components.</p> <p><i>(Clarification by R. Bertrand September 2009)</i></p>
	10	<p>Practice Codes 1801, 1802 or 1803 could be combined in a single project application.</p> <p><i>(Policy clarification June 2009)</i></p>
19 BUFFER, HEDGEROW & SHELTERBELT ESTABLISHMENT	1	<p>Establishment of shelterbelts: The desired outcome of the shelterbelt must be identified in the plan and reflected in the proposed design and species mix. Shelterbelts must be multi rows – two row minimum. <i>(WG ratification June, 2009)</i></p>
	2	<p>In-kind for shelterbelts: In-kind valuation for establishing shelterbelts to be 100% of materials cost to a maximum of \$5.00 per metre (\$1.50 per foot) of shelterbelt. <i>(WG ratification May, 2007)</i></p>
	3	<p>Establishment of buffers and hedgerows:</p> <p>The desired outcome of the shelterbelt must be identified in the plan and reflected in the proposed design and species mix. Buffers and hedgerows can be single or multi row. <i>(WG ratification June, 2009)</i></p>
	4	<p>In-kind for buffers and hedgerows: In-kind valuation for establishing buffers and hedgerows to be 100% of materials costs to a maximum of \$5 per meter (\$1.50 per foot) of buffer or hedgerow. <i>(MAL based WG ratification June 2009)</i></p>

Category	Category statement #	Policies
	5	Materials for buffers, hedgerows and shelterbelts: Planting materials and design recommendations for these installations must meet the criteria provided by BC MAL. <i>(Policy clarification June 2009)</i>
	6	Category Caps: For an individual farm or ranch operation are \$15,000 for shelter belts and \$10,000 for buffers and hedgerows. The Growing Forward Beneficial Management Practices 2009/2010 document does not show a Category Cap, all of the caps are under the Practice Code column. As an example, a project that contains both establishment and materials costs for a shelterbelt, could receive up to \$15,000 from the program. <i>(Clarification by R. Bertrand September 2009)</i>
24 NUTRIENT MGMT. PLAN	1	Consultative services to develop nutrient management plans, planning and decisions support tools. Maximum of \$250 can be used for one time manure, soil or compost analysis as part of the eligible costs of the NMP (on the condition that the raw nutrient data – free of farm identification- will be collected for environmental health indicators reporting purposes). Producers may be eligible for a second NMP at 50% of the original BMP funding in a subsequent year subject to sign off of adequate record keeping on the original plan and availability of funds. <i>(WG ratification, June, 2009)</i>
	2	Funding: 100% for first \$1000, then 50% for the remainder up to a maximum of \$2000 to the program. <i>(WG ratification, June, 2009)</i>
	3	Planning for other BMP: When a Nutrient Management plan (or other plan that is funded bmp) is required in order for another BMP to be carried out, the planning BMP will not be considered as one of the two BMPs. The producer pays the consultant and submits a claim for the costs. <i>(WG ratification, June, 2009)</i>
	4	Divulge report findings: For those plans that cover the costs of manure, compost or soil testing, MAL requires the analytical values (N, P, K, etc.), the lab name and/or method, the farm operation, the manure state (liquid or solid) and the regional district. <i>(MAL June, 2009)</i>
	5	Consultant Qualifications: Producers and Planning Advisors to be provided with information on the desired qualifications of planning consultants. <i>(WG ratification March 3, 2005)</i> See document "Desired Qualifications for Consultants" for details. <i>(Updated June, 2009)</i>
	25 INTEGRATED PEST MGMT.	1
2		Consultant Qualifications: see 24, 5
26 GRAZING MGMT. PLAN	1	Consultant Qualifications: see 24, 5
	2	Funding: 100% for first \$1000, then 50% for the remainder up to a maximum of \$2000 to the program <i>(Policy Change May, 2009)</i>
29 IRRIGATION MGMT. PLAN	1	Consultative services for preparing certified irrigation plans. Site investigation, plan and quote preparation. Site inspection upon job completion. Certified designer must sign and seal each plan for project to be eligible. Certified designer must inspect project after completion and send a signed completion form to the program before payment for plan preparation and project costs are made. An invoice from the Certified Irrigation Designer must be submitted to produce outlining services.
	2	Consultant Qualifications: see 24, 5
	3	Funding: 100% for first \$500, then 50% for the remainder up to a maximum of \$1000 to the program <i>(Policy Change May 2009)</i>
30 RIPARIAN HEALTH ASSESSMENT	1	Consultant fees to complete a Riparian Health Assessment or a combination of the Riparian Health Assessment and the Riparian Area Management Plan. Riparian Area Management Plan consists of the RHA action plan, the design (layout, species and maintenance protocols) and implementation of the BMP project application. Funding: 100% for first \$1000, then 50% for the remainder up to a maximum of \$3000 to the program. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
	2	Consultant Qualifications: see 24, 5

Category	Category statement #	Policies
31 METHANE EMISSION REDUCTION	1	Practice codes 3101-2 and 3101-2 are not stackable: applicants may only apply for one or the other sub-category. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
	2	BMP overall cap: Projects in 3101-2 are capped to a total of \$280K. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
32 NITROUS OXIDE EMISSION REDUCTION	1	N₂O emission reduction: Projects must reduce nitrous oxide emissions from agricultural operations by prevention or suppression. <i>(MAL June 2009)</i>
	2	Water management plan is required. Refer to EFP Drainage management guide. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
33 CARBON DIOXIDE EMISSION REDUCTION	1	CO₂ Emission Reduction: Projects must either reduce agricultural carbon dioxide emissions or reduce the concentration of CO ₂ in the atmosphere or offset carbon dioxide emissions from other sectors. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i>
	2	A Project Justification letter is required for 3304 -replacement of fossil-fuel dependent space heating with renewable heating and 3307 – Thermal energy efficiency improvements that increase insulation. <i>(WG Ratification June 2009)</i>
	3	Equipment for no-tillage/ reduced tillage: 50% of the value of a zero-till drill is eligible for funding assistance. <i>(WG ratification May 2007)</i>
	4	Lighting efficiency improvements: A lighting worksheet (supplement) is required. <i>(WG ratification June 2009)</i> (new versions of the workbook will include this page)