

#### Conserving Natural Resources for Our Future

March 2, 2011

RE: Chesapeake Bay Accountability – Soil Conservation and Water Quality Plans

#### TO ALL INTERESTED IN ADDRESSING WHAT IS POLLUTING OUR WATERWAYS

My name is Doug Valentine and I just retired as the Agricultural Specialist for the Fulton County Conservation District located in south-central Pennsylvania. I'd been employed with the District for 5 years and before that, I worked for the U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) for 40 years as a Soil Conservationist and District Conservationist. I spent my last 22 years with Maryland NRCS working in Carroll County. I was a charter member of the Upper Potomac Tributary Strategy Team and served on the Trib Teams for the Upper Western Shore and Patapsco/Back River. Carroll County drained into three different watersheds. I took my appointment on the Trib Teams very seriously, but in the end, was quite disappointed with what we had accomplished.

Working for the NRCS, I utilized the 9-step conservation planning process. Steps 3 and 4 are to "inventory the resources" and "analyze the condition of the resources." Ever since I was a young soil conservationist back in the late 1960's, it has always concerned me that we never had a systematic method to document what was on the ground and what its condition was. I always thought that there should have been a "checklist" to ensure that we looked at, and evaluated, all pertinent aspects of the farm operation.

Finally in the early 1990's, I developed my own inventory, assessment and planning procedure. At that time, it was just a hardcopy "checklist" to be filled out and included in the landowner's case file; nonetheless, at least the planners had a tool that directed them to consider and document all of the environmental concerns on the farm. In addition, a numeric value was assigned to each resource concern that had been identified; the value given was based on the level of environmental impact. My hope was that I could find someone who would develop this method into a computer program.

When I began my employment with the Fulton County Conservation District (FCCD) in January of 2006, the Commonwealth's Departments of Environmental Protection (DEP) and Agriculture (PDA) were in the process of updating the Nutrient Management Regulations under Act 38 – the Agriculture, Communities, and Rural Environment (ACRE) Initiative. The Initiative included funds for DEP to provide grants to Districts directed at the development of a framework and pilot tools to guide the districts' role in agriculture erosion and sedimentation compliance and compliance with Nutrient Management Plans. This was a golden opportunity for me to get my inventory, assessment and planning procedure developed into a working model through a grant obtained by the FCCD. We completed our pilot project on 20 farms for 2,980 acres. We were able to demonstrate the level resource concerns on those properties (See {6} Resource Concern Values).



# TO ALL INTERESTED IN ADDRESSING WHAT IS POLLUTING OUR WATERWAYS March 2, 2011 Page 2

According to a recent newspaper article ("Chesapeake Bay gets 'D' grade from foundation" <u>The Herald-Mail</u>, Hagerstown, MD) on the condition of the Chesapeake Bay, the Chesapeake Bay Foundation (CBF) gave it a "D". The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is looking for a way to improve the accountability and performance of the Chesapeake Bay Program. Living in Maryland and paying my annual "flush" tax, I am very concerned about the massive amounts of money being pumped into projects to protect and improve the Bay and the piece meal manner in which it is done with little or no improvements in the overall quality of the Bay.

I am proposing that a more systematic, detailed approach be utilized to comprehensively document the conditions on the agricultural lands draining into the Chesapeake Bay. The key to this proposed approach is that 21 environmental concerns will be evaluated and given a numeric rating of 1 - 4 (1 =slight water quality issues, to 4 =critical water quality issues) for each tax parcel, farm or tract within a watershed. I have enclosed a booklet containing hardcopies of the computer program and what the final product looks like which outlines how the inventory, assessment and planning procedure works. My hope is, that someone within your organization would take the time to review this information (at least review the document entitled "#6 Resource Concern Values"), with the further hope that if the reviewer thinks it may have merit, that I could meet with them to explain it in more detail and answer any questions.

The final products generated by this proposed approach are high-quality, "soil conservation and water quality plans" that contain the necessary information to demonstrate what level of conservation and water quality is actually on the ground and what additional conservation practices are needed to address any unanswered water quality concerns. These soil conservation and water quality plans would demonstrate which sub-watersheds and on which agricultural operations we should be concentrating our funds in order to get the biggest bang for our buck. The Fulton County Conservation District Board of Directors supports these efforts. I hope that you will take the time to study this proposal and share it with others in your organization or others in the environmental community.

Sincerely,

Douglas A. Valentine Ag Specialist (Retired) dvalentine@myactv.net

Enclosures - 1

cc: J. Charles Fox, EPA Advisor, CBP; William Baker, CBF; Carin Bisland, EPA-CBP; Jeff Lape, CBP; Kim Coble, CBF; Lou Etgen, Alliance for the Chesapeake Bay; Amanda Tipton-Bassow, NFWF; Hilary Harp Falk, Choose Clean Water; David Kindig, Chair, CBP Agricultural Nutrient & Sediment Reduction Workgroup; Ben Cardin, U.S. Senator, Ken Cook, EWG; Maria Payan, Peach Bottom CCG; Chris Aadland, MdDNR; Gerald W. Winegrad, American Bird Conservancy; Robert McAfee, NRCS Bay Coordinator, Mike Helfrich, Lower Susquehanna Riverkeeper; John Tippett, Friends of the Rappahannock; Eldon James, Rappahannock River Basin Commission, Chris Miller, Piedmont Environmental Council, Warrenton, VA, Don McNutt, District Manager, Lancaster CCD, Kimberly Snell-Zarcone, PennFuture, Chief David White, NRCS; Mark Hollberg, Anthony Moore, Russ Perkinson,



### **ACRE Evaluation System**

#### **0** = Not Applicable or Not Inventoried or Assessed

1 = good management according to current guidelines; (Recommended management practices for the operator's consider)

# **SLIGHT** water quality issues

2 = fair management providing reasonable water quality protection; (Recommended management practices for the operator's consider)

# **MODERATE** water quality issues

3 = inadequate management providing poor protection in many situations; (Recommended conservation practices that should be installed within the next three [3] years.

# **SERIOUS** water quality issues

4 = critical management conditions posing a high risk of causing water pollution, needing immediate corrective action;

(Recommended conservation practices that should be addressed ASAP)

# **CRITICAL** water quality issues

#### **ACRE Evaluation System**

The attached is the evaluation system developed to assess a value to the environmental conditions of the inventoried resource.

This system may be subjective but a conservation planner will some experience should be able to assess value with some accuracy.

Some additional guidelines may need to be developed to better define the levels of impact.

There needs to a uniform evaluation system so all farms are evaluated against the same criteria.

#### THIS IS THE WORKING DOCUMENT FOR FIELD USE

| L/O-Operator Name: | Tract: | Planner's Initials: | Date: | {4 | C |  |
|--------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|----|---|--|
|--------------------|--------|---------------------|-------|----|---|--|

|                                  |  |   |  | PLAN WORKSHEET  |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--|---|
|                                  |  | HEADQUARTER   | S - FARM   | STEAD AREAS   |
| Type o                           | of farm operation & number   | rs of different size/age of   | of livestock:  |   |
| a)                               | Type of farming operation  | n:  |  |   |
| b)                               | Livestock #'s & size (wt)  | presently:  |  |   |
|                                  | Type:  |   |  | Weight:   |
| D.                               | Type:  | ; Numbers:  |  | Weight:   |
| C.                               | Type:  | ; Numbers:  |  | Weight:   |
| a.                               | Type:  | ; Numbers:  | <b></b> ;  | Weight:   |
| Aerial                           | photograph of buildings - f  | eedlot etc. Locate the f  | ollowing:  |   |
|                                  |  |   | ences, and e   | xisting ag-waste management structures  |
|                                  | Vell, spring and septic syste  |   |  |   |
|                                  | esticide storage building an   |   |  |   |
|                                  | utrient (fertilizer) storage b   | •   | •  |   |
|                                  | airyhouse/parlor wastewate   | er discharge.   |  |   |
| f. Si                            | ilos and Type.   |   |  |   |
| Type o                           | of milking facilities - Stancl   | nion Barn, Tie Stall, and   | d/or Milking   | g Parlor or N/A - Notes:  |
| Descri                           | be current animal waste ma   | nagement system:  |  |   |
| a.                               | Hauls/spreads on a: daily  | v weekly monthl   | ly basis or  |   |
|                                  |  |   |  | monthly basis or  |
| 1).                              |  |   |  |   |
|                                  | Type of bedding materia  | l used:   |  |   |
| c.                               |  | 1 used:<br>YES – NO   |  |   |
| c.<br>d.                         | Has a storage structure:   | YES – NO  |  |   |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.                   | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system:   | YES – NO<br>bedded pack; dry s  | tack; sl   | urry; liquid?   |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.                   | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr  | YES – NO<br>bedded pack; dry s<br>ete; concrete block   | stack; sl  |   |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.       | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system:   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block   | stack; sl  | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular?  |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.       | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr Days of storage:   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block   | stack; sl  | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular?  |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to o   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage struct                                  | tack; sl<br>; woode<br>ure or uses of<br>stem:         | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:                                       |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to a  Assessment of existing ag-   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage structe ewaste management sys           | tack; sl<br>; woode<br>ure or uses of<br>tem:<br>Value | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:                                       |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to a  Assessment of existing ag-   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage structe ewaste management sys           | tack; sl<br>; woode<br>ure or uses of<br>tem:<br>Value | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:                                       |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to a  Assessment of existing ag-   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage structe waste management sys ings:      | tack; sl<br>; woode<br>ure or uses of<br>tem:<br>Value | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:                                       |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concrudate concrudat | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage struct waste management sys             | tack; sl; woode ure or uses of tem: Value              | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:                                       |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concrudate concrudat | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage struct waste management sys             | tack; sl; woode ure or uses of tem: Value              | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:  Storage structure conditions:  Value |
| c.<br>d.<br>e.<br>f.<br>g.<br>h. | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to a  Assessment of existing aga List any existing shortcom  Recommendations/Alterna   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage struct waste management sys ings: tive: | tack; sl; woode ure or uses of tem: Value              | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:  Storage structure conditions:  Value |
| c. d. e. f. g. h.                | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to a  Assessment of existing aga List any existing shortcom  Recommendations/Alterna   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage struct waste management sys ings: tive: | tack; sl; woode ure or uses of tem: Value              | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:  Storage structure conditions:  Value |
| c. d. e. f. g. h.                | Has a storage structure: Type of storage system: Storage Structure: concr. Days of storage: Available equipment to a  Assessment of existing aga List any existing shortcom  Recommendations/Alterna   | YES – NO bedded pack; dry s ete; concrete block clean-out storage struct waste management sys ings: tive: | tack; sl; woode ure or uses of tem: Value              | urry; liquid? en; circular; rectangular? custom hauler:  Storage structure conditions:  Value |

| L/O-Operator Name:  | Tract:                       | Planner's Initials:               | Date:           |
|---|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------|
| INVENTORY & ASSESSMENT &  | PLAN WORKSHI                 | EET - HEADQUARTERS -              | FARMSTEAD AREAS |
| 5. Physical conditions around the outbuilding   | gs & barns:                  |                                   |                 |
| a. Dairy house/parlor wastewater dischard     1) Assessment of any problem:   | _                            | t - locate on aerial or diagram – | N/A             |
| Valu List any existing shortcomings:  |                              |                                   |                 |
| Recommendations/Alternatives:   |                              |                                   |                 |
|   |                              |                                   |                 |
| b. Are barns and other outbuildings roof  |                              | d with proper downspout outlets   |                 |
| 1) Assessment of problem:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| List any existing shortcomings:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| Recommendations/Alternatives:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| Landowner/Operator's Decision::   |                              |                                   |                 |
| c. Animal Concentration Areas (ACA) –  1) Dimensions or approximate sqft. of  2) Assessment of problem:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| Value List any existing shortcomings:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| Recommendations/Alternatives:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| Landowner/Operator's Decision::   |                              |                                   |                 |
| 6. Drylot/Exercise Lot/Walkways - locate on a) Dimension or approximate sqft/a b) Assessment of pollution hazard: List any existing shortcomings: | cres of sacrifice/dry  Value |                                   |                 |
| Recommendations/Alternatives:   |                              |                                   |                 |
| Landowner/Operator's Decision::   |                              |                                   |                 |

| L/O-Ope  | erator Name: I ract: Pianner's initials: L   | Date:           |
|----------|--|-----------------|
| INV      | VENTORY & ASSESSMENT & PLAN WORKSHEET - HEADQUARTERS - FARMST  | EAD AREA        |
| Pesticid | e/Fertilizer Storage Facilities-locate on aerial photo   |                 |
|          | Chemical/Pesticide/Fertilizer storage facilities:  |                 |
|          | 1) Are any quantities of chemicals stored on farm? YES - NO  |                 |
|          | 2) If YES, list chemicals:   |                 |
|          | 2) And the manner of controls about daths for illetty foil 19 VEC. NO. N/A   |                 |
|          | 3) Are there any controls should the facility fail? YES NO N/A Assessment of pollution hazard/potential:                                       |                 |
| 0)       | Value  |                 |
|          | List any existing shortcomings:  | _               |
| -<br>]   | Recommendations/Alternatives:  |                 |
| -        |  | -               |
| ]        | Landowner/Operator's Decision:   | -               |
| Nutrient | Management Plans (NMP)   | •               |
| a.       | Does operator soil tests on a regular basis (at least once ever three years)?: YES NO  |                 |
|          | Is any organic fertilizer (manure) utilized on this tract: YES - NO  |                 |
| c.       | Number of AEU's on the farm:   |                 |
|          | Annual Waste Produced:tons/gallons/cuft (Estimate @ PA Agronomy Guide)   |                 |
| e.<br>f. | Acres available to receive manure: cropland: hayland: pasture:<br>Number of AEU's/Ac of available land:  | _               |
| g.       | Is this a Concentrated Animal Operation (CAO)? YES NO  |                 |
| g.<br>h. | Is this a Concentrated Animal Speration (CAS)? TES NO  Is this a Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO)? YES NO                          |                 |
| i.       | Is there a current certified Nutrient Management Plan (NMP)? YES NO N/A  |                 |
| j.       | Do we have a copy of the NMP? YES NO N/A   |                 |
|          | Does it require manure/fertilizer incorporation? YES NO N/A  |                 |
| 1.       | Are there any fields with Phosphorus levels => 200 PPM? YES – NO   |                 |
|          | List fields w/ratings => 200 PPM of "P":   |                 |
|          | Is any sludge used on this tract? YES NO   |                 |
| 0.       | Do we have a copy of the State Sludge Application: YES NO N/A  |                 |
| p.       | Is manure/sludge incorporated? YES - NO If yes, with what and how long after application:  |                 |
| -        | Is manure applied in the winter (12/15 <sup>th</sup> through 2/28 <sup>th</sup> ): YES – NO  | <del></del><br> |
| q.<br>r. | Does the operator keep any type of records of how much and when manure is applied & incorporate in the winter (12/13) through 2/28 ): YES – NO | orated          |
| 1.       | to the different fields: YES - NO Is he willing to share that information with us? YES   |                 |
| s.       | Assessment of current nutrient management planning/implementation on the farm:   | 110 11/         |
|          | Value  |                 |
| ]        | List any existing shortcomings:  | -<br>-          |
| -        |  | -               |
| ]        | Recommendations/Alternatives:  | -               |
| -        |  | -               |
| -        | Landowner/Operator's Decision:   | -               |
|          | Landowner/Operator 5 Decision.   | _               |
|          |  | _               |

| and any nearby houses.   | ousing developments: locate on aerial photo all intermittent and perer |
|--|--|
| a. Assessment of any potential                                     | to surface water pollution from farmstead runoff:  Value               |
| Notes:   |  |
| b. Assessment of any potential                                     | I farmstead situations to create problems with neighbors:              |
| Notes:   | Value  |
| 10. How is on-farm animal mortal                                   | lity handled?  |
| Assessment animal mortality h                                      | nandling:  |
|  | ngs:   |
|  | ives:  |
| Landowner/Operator's Deci  | ision:   |
| Silos - locate on diagram or aerial a) Type & number of silos:     | ;;;;;;;;;;   |
| List any existing shortcomir                                       | ngs:   |
| Recommendations/Alternations/                                      | ives:  |
| Landowner/Operator's Deci  | ision:   |
| Surface runoff problems around fa<br>a) Assessment of any runoff p |  |
| List any existing shortcomir                                       | ngs:   |
| Recommendations/Alternations                                       | ives:  |
|  | ision:   |

L/O-Operator Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Tract: \_\_\_\_ Planner's Initials: \_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_

| L/O-Operator Name:   | Tract:   | Planner's Initials:   | Date:             |
|--|--|---|-------------------|
| INVENTORY & ASSES  | SMENT & PLA  | AN WORKSHEET CROI   | PLAND             |
| <ol> <li>Aerial photo w/tract outlined &amp; fields identifie</li> <li>Copy of soil survey sheet with tract outlined; v</li> <li>Distance to any streams - locate streams on aer</li> <li>Any ephemeral or gully erosion present? YES</li> <li>Any evidence of sheet/rill erosion visible (sedi</li> </ol>   | with soil descript<br>rial photo<br>NO - I                                     | ions  f present locate area(s) on aerial                    | photo.            |
| <ul> <li>6. Show existing water courses and/or access land</li> <li>a) Appears to be adequately stabilized (black)</li> <li>b) Any water courses and/or lanes needing to</li> <li>1) Critical Area Plantings (342); draws or</li> <li>2) Waterway (412); drawers needing to be</li> <li>3) Grade Stabilization Structure (Waterbar</li> <li>4) Heavy Area Use Protection – laneways</li> </ul> | be corrected: (re<br>area just needing<br>constructed gra<br>rs) (410); divert | d) g seeding ss waterways water from the lane in order to c |                   |
| 7. Current crop rotation & tillage regime (include AB  |  |   |                   |
| 8. See RUSLE worksheet for soil loss by fields.  |  |   |                   |
| 9. Are cover crops planted following low residue   | crops in the fall  | : YES – NO - Should they be                                 | planted: YES – NO |
| 10. Is any crop residue removed by stacking/balin Is any of the corn(g) ground grazed after harve  |  |   |                   |
| <ul> <li>11. End-Rows/Turn-rows/Head-rows:</li> <li>a) Number of end-rows or width of end-</li> <li>b) Length of slope of the end-rows:</li> <li>c) Do they appear to be an erosion problem.</li> </ul>  |  |   |                   |
| 12. Field borders, filter strips/areas - present: YES Could they fit into the crop rotation or farm of Could or should they be used in place of end-   | perations as hayl  | and? YES - NO   |                   |
| <ul> <li>13. Pesticide Management:</li> <li>a Does the operator apply any pesticides</li> <li>b. Herbicides used? or farmer</li> <li>c. Pesticides are custom or farmer</li> <li>d. Method of disposal for empty pesticides</li> </ul>   | r applied?   |   |                   |
| 14. Assessment of cropland management:  Value  List any existing shortcomings:   |  |   |                   |
| Recommendations/Alternatives:  |  |   |                   |
| Landowner/Operator's Decision:   |  |   |                   |

| L/O-Operator Name:  | Tract:   | Planner's Initials:                  | Date:                             |
|---|--|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| INVENTORY & ASSESSM   | MENT & PLAN WOR  | KSHEET - HAYLAND - 1                 | PASTURELAND                       |
| <ol> <li>Locate pastures &amp; long-term haylands</li> <li>Locate any streams flowing through fie</li> <li>Locate access/laneways to and through         <ul> <li>Assessment of any access/walkway g</li> </ul> </li> </ol> | elds on photo<br>pastures (especially cro  | ossing any streams)                  | ge bare areas, and cattle trails) |
| List any existing shortcomings:   |  | alue                                 |                                   |
| Recommendations/Alternatives  |  |                                      |                                   |
|   | n:   |                                      |                                   |
| 4. Pasturing livestock:   |  |                                      |                                   |
| a. Type:; e. Type:; f. Type:;   | Numbers:   | _; Weight:<br>_; Weight:             |                                   |
| g. Type:;  5. Stream Quality  a) Length of stream(s):   |  |                                      |                                   |
| b) Assessment of streambank damage - List any existing shortcomings:  | From erosion ar<br>Value   | nd/or livestock                      |                                   |
|   |  |                                      |                                   |
| *   | n:   |                                      |                                   |
| c) Is stream the only or main source of Would farmer be interested in CRP/Potential or need for watering troug Notes:   | CREP along the stream (h(s) – pressurized, grav  | ? YES NO ity or solar powered? YES N |                                   |
| 6. Hayland/Pasture Management a) Present grass/legume mixture in the  |  |                                      |                                   |
| b) Present fertilizer management of past c) Are pasture fields soil tested on any d) Are hayland fields used for aftermat e) Are pastures over-grazed: YES f) Potential or desire for an intensive ro                       | stures/haylands:<br>regular schedule (every<br>h grazing? YES I<br>NO<br>otational or extended gra | 3-5 years)? YES NO NO nzing system:  |                                   |
| g) Assessment of current pasture/haylar   |  |                                      | <del></del>                       |
| List any existing shortcomings:   |  |                                      |                                   |
| Recommendations/Alternatives  | :  |                                      |                                   |
| Landowner/Operator's Decision   |  |                                      |                                   |

|  | Tract:   |                                    |                 |
|--|--|------------------------------------|-----------------|
| INVENTORY & ASSESSMENT   | Γ & PLAN WORKSHEET   | WOODLAND/WE                        | ETLAND & W/L LA |
| Locate on aerial photo - woodlands, we Proximity to streams/watercourses - lo Locate any "dump" sites on aerial phota) List some of the larger or more haza  | cate stream on aerial.<br>co – YES – NO – N/A  | ?                                  |                 |
| b) Assessment of potential pollution h   | azard from this "dump" site:   |                                    |                 |
| List any existing shortcomings:  |  | Value<br>                          |                 |
| Recommendations/Alternatives   | y:   |                                    |                 |
| Landowner/Operator's Decisio   | n:   |                                    | <u>.</u>        |
| Any noticeable gully erosion: YES Woodland Management a. Are woodlands grazed? YES I b. Would the landowner be willing t c. Are the woodland used as shade? Type of woodland (mixed hardwood Est. acres or % of total: Hardwood  | NO Over-grazed? YES o fence out livestock to protect YES NO conifers - shrubs/brush/trash) Est. acres or % of total Conifer                    | NO N/A et the resource: YES -      | NO N/A          |
|  | Value  |                                    |                 |
| List any existing shortcomings:  | Value  |                                    |                 |
|  | Value  |                                    |                 |
|  | Value  S:  |                                    |                 |
| List any existing shortcomings:  Recommendations/Alternatives  Landowner/Operator's Decisio  Pond Management:  a) Does the tract contain a pond: b) Do the livestock have access to Are the livestock damaging the d) Would the farmer be interested d) Does pond appear that it need 1) Renovated: YES  2) Management (brush, a g) Assessment of pond condition:  List any existing shortcomings: | ryes NO Note:  to the pond: Yes NO the banks/sides of the pond: Yed in discussing CRP/CREP at ls:  NO algae, rodent control, etc.): Yes  Value | ES NO Notes:<br>ound the pond: YES | NO              |
| List any existing shortcomings:  Recommendations/Alternatives  Landowner/Operator's Decisio  Landowner/Operator's Decisio  Does the tract contain a pond: b) Do the livestock have access to Are the livestock damaging the d) Would the farmer be interested Does pond appear that it need  1) Renovated: YES  2) Management (brush, as g) Assessment of pond condition:                          | ryes NO Note:  to the pond: Yes NO the banks/sides of the pond: Yed in discussing CRP/CREP at ls:  NO algae, rodent control, etc.): Yes  Value | ES NO Notes:<br>ound the pond: YES | NO              |

| L/O-Operator Name:  | Tract:                   | Planner's Initials:              | Date:             |
|---|--------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------|
| INVE  | NTORY & ASSESSMEN        | NT & PLAN WORKSHEET              |                   |
| Overall assessment value for the total fa                                   |                          |                                  |                   |
| Notes:  | Value                    |                                  |                   |
|   |                          |                                  |                   |
|   |                          |                                  |                   |
|   |                          |                                  |                   |
| Does NRCS' Case Files contain a signed                                      | d "Cooperator's Agreemer | nt Form"? YES – NO; Date For     | m was signed:     |
| s there a Conservation Plan on file w/N                                     | RCS? YES – NO; App       | proval Date of Conservation Plan | ı:                |
| s it a RMS Plan, Progressive Plan _   | , CRP/CREP Plan          | or Food & Security Act Complia   | nce Plan?         |
| Does this Plan meet the requirement for                                     |                          | -                                |                   |
| Joes this Flan meet the requirement for                                     | a FA Chapter-102 Ag E&   | S Fian and/or son & water        | Conservation Fran |
| Notes on the quality of the Conservation                                    | Plan on file with NRCS:  |                                  |                   |
|   |                          |                                  |                   |
|   |                          |                                  |                   |
|   |                          |                                  |                   |
| We have received a copy of the comple                                       | eted Inventory/Assessmen | t & Plan Worksheet.              |                   |
|   | •                        |                                  |                   |
| Landowner - Signature   |                          | Date                             |                   |
| · <del></del>   |                          |                                  |                   |
| Operator - Signature  |                          | Date                             |                   |
| Conservation District Superviso   | or - Signature           | Date                             |                   |
| District Conservationist - Signat   | ture                     | Date                             |                   |
| Planner or Reviewer - Signature   | ;                        | Date                             |                   |
| As part of assessment: a sliding scale of                                   | 0-4                      |                                  |                   |
| = Not Applicable or Neither Inventorion                                     | ed nor Assessed          |                                  |                   |
| = good management according to curr<br>= fair management providing reasonal |                          |                                  |                   |
| s = inadequate management providing p                                       | 1 7 1                    | 1 1                              | issues            |

L/O-Operator Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Tract: \_\_\_\_ Planner's Initials: \_\_\_\_\_

Each category contains questions that need to be obtained while interviewing the owner and/or operator. If you elect not to answer any questions section; inventory any resource or make an assessment, enter a "0" under value to indicate that you at least considered the item.

4 = critical management conditions posing a high potential of causing water pollution, needing immediate corrective action;

major water quality issues