

Technical Review Guide for CNMP

Practice/Activity Code (102) (No.) approved by TSP and CTA planners (Pennsylvania)

Terms used in this guide: "Plan" and "Plans" a CNMP conservation plan; "CTA planner" a planner funded by CTA; "TSP planner" a planner funded by EQIP		
Technical Review begins date NRCS Administrative Review determines plan administratively adequate. The technical review period is 45 days.		
STEP 1 - enter Plan Information and Technical Reviewer data below.		
Plan Information		
Owner/Operator:	Program: EQIP/CBWI <input type="checkbox"/> CTA <input type="checkbox"/>	
Field Office:	Year CNMP scheduled due:	
Name of Planner:	Planner category: TSP (CAP 102) <input type="checkbox"/> CCP (CTA) <input type="checkbox"/>	
Technical Reviewer – (3 years experience as Certified Conservation Planner) completes within 45 days of administrative review		
Technical Reviewer (name):	Admin adequate date:	
Step 2 – Review plan for technical adequacy: <i>the technical review can include site visit and operator interview.</i>		
Criteria for all plans		
Plans must meet the following NRCS quality criteria requirements on all production and land treatment areas		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water quality (nutrients, organics, and sediments in surface and ground water) • Soil erosion (sheet and rill, ephemeral gully, classic gully, and irrigation induced) 		
<u>Plans also must</u>		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigate, if feasible, any excessive air emissions and/or negative impacts to air quality resource concerns that may result from practices identified in the plan or from existing on-farm areas/activities • Comply with federal, tribal, state, and local laws regulations, and permit requirements • Satisfy the owner/operators production objectives 		
The Technical Reviewer is responsible for the overall review process. As needed, the reviewer will consult with qualified staff.		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manure and Wastewater Handling and Storage – Engineering staff with JAA for planned practices • Land Treatment – Certified Conservation Planner • Nutrient Management – Nutrient Management Field Team Coordinator 		
Utilize appropriate directives, such as handbooks, manuals, and FOTG as needed. Appropriate references include:		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PA Conservation Planning and Regulatory Compliance Handbook • PA Nutrient Management Program (Act 38) Technical Manual version 5.0 • PA Field Office Technical Guide 		
Consult with state office staff as needed		
Instructions		
Document the technical adequacy of the plan by a checkmark in the column to the right of each component		
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use the first column "First Review" the first time a plan is reviewed • If a follow-up review is necessary, use the second column "Follow-up Review" for second review 		
Follow Review Outcome Guidance found at the end of this document to process the plan after review		
All required land in plan - determine that all production and land treatment areas are planned	Adequately planned	
	First review	Follow-up review
Production Area - Must include all production areas, including all animal confinement areas (barns, exercise yards, feedlots, loafing areas), feed and raw material storage areas, animal mortality facilities, and all manure handling containment or storage areas.		
Land Treatment Area - Must include all land treatment areas with all lands under control of the owner / operator (owned, rented or leased) manure or process wastewater is, or might be, applied for crop, hay, pasture or other uses. Areas degraded by animal traffic, concentration, feeding, etc. on this land use must be planned.		
Environmental Compliance: Finalized plan must include evaluation and documentation of compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, the Endangered Species Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, and other effects on the NRCS CPA 52 Environmental Evaluation Worksheet for Pennsylvania (CPA-52). Non-NRCS planners are encouraged, not required, to complete of CPA-52. At minimum, all plans submitted for review must include Documentation of natural resource objectives, need for action, benchmark conditions, and planned alternative effects.		
NRCS CPA-52 Environmental Evaluation Worksheet sections: D. Client's Objectives(s), E. Need for Action, F. Resource Concerns and Existing / Benchmark Conditions, and G./H. Effects of Alternatives (required in all submitted plans) . CNMP criteria for soil erosion and water quality resources planned to meet quality criteria. Need for each planned practice supported by documented resource concern.		

Place in customer file when after completing review (2/2012)

Technical Review Guide for CNMP

Practice/Activity Code (102) (No.) approved by TSP and CTA planners (Pennsylvania)

<i>Environmental Compliance (continued)</i>	Adequately planned	
	First review	Follow-up review
Planned practices reviewed for compliance with cultural resource requirements; <u>email verification from the NRCS cultural resources coordinator included</u> . (If not completed by non-NRCS planner, NRCS must complete before plan is finalized)		
Planned practices reviewed for compliance with the Pennsylvania Natural Heritage Diversity Program and <u>PNDI project review receipt is included</u> . (If not completed by non-NRCS planner, NRCS must complete before plan is finalized)		
<p>Technical Element Review – Reviewers will review each technical element and check consistency among the elements. The plan will describe an integrated conservation system that meets minimum CNMP quality criteria. While reviewing the plan, reviewers should evaluate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are the practices in the plan feasible and appropriate for the site? • Did the planner follow the planning process and review plan with the producer? • Does the producer understand and agree with the plan? 		
Manure and Wastewater Handling and Storage element review by individual with JAA for relevant engineering practices		
Verify proposed practices address resource concerns and meet standards. Overall concept is appropriate for site and is consistent with NMP and Land treatment. Quantities provided are adequate with minor adjustment to generate contract. If not acceptable, write specific comments on separate page. Review to be done by individual with JAA and sufficient experience in this element.		
Land Treatment element review by reviewer with 3 years experience as Certified Conservation Planner		
Verify proposed practices address resource concerns, meet criteria, and are consistent with the Nutrient Management <i>and</i> Manure and Wastewater Handling and Storage elements. Soil erosion and water quality concerns treated with planned practices to meet quality criteria. Maps and supporting documentation are consistent throughout the element and are easy to read. All cropland has supporting 328 documentation and RUSLE2 calculations, all pastureland supporting 528 documentation. Land identified as pasture is managed as pasture, not a feeding/exercise lot. Practice narratives have sufficient information to convey its extent, purpose, and how the practice fits into the overall conservation system.		
Nutrient Management element review by Nutrient Management Field Team Coordinator		
Verify plan meets current format and content requirements of current PA Nutrient Management Program (Act 38) plan. Management described should be consistent with Land Treatment including RUSLE2, crop rotation, and tillage. Assure field application plans protect water quality. Be especially attentive to management of fields requiring Part B of P-Index.		
Record Keeping element review		
Act 38 Record keeping packet required in plan for nutrient management element		
Feed Management element review		
Feed management elements are reviewed by state-office designated Feed Management Specialist		
Other Uses of Manure – all non application uses of manure are documented in plan; exported manure meets Act 38 and Act 49 regulatory and documentation requirements, other on-farm uses described adequately in plan		
STEP 3 – reviewer completes information below after completing the technical adequacy review		
Technical Review Determination		
Review Determination – check box indicating technical adequacy of plan		
<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate minor revisions required <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate major revisions required	Technical Reviewer (sign & date):	
Follow-up Review Determination (if needed) – check box indicating technical adequacy of plan		
<input type="checkbox"/> Adequate <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate minor revisions required <input type="checkbox"/> Inadequate major revisions required	Technical Reviewer (sign & date):	

Place in customer file when after completing review (2/2012)

Technical Review Guide for CNMP

Practice/Activity Code (102) (No.) approved by TSP and CTA planners (Pennsylvania)

STEP 4 – Review Outcome Guide

After making a determination of technically adequate or technically inadequate, refer to the guidance below to communicate the results to the planner, producer, and supervisor. All communications are to be written.

First review determined the plan is technically adequate, technically inadequate – minor revisions required, or technically inadequate – major revisions required. Guidance for each of these outcomes below:

Technically adequate

- Designated Conservationist signs the CNMP signature page designating complete and adequate review determination
- Notify planner that plan is technically adequate. Producer must receive two copies of the finalized plan signature; leave one signed copy with producer. Planner will deliver one producer-signed to NRCS field office.
- Upon receipt from planner of producer-signed plan, complete 1245 to process payment and enter 102 CNMP into toolkit as complete
- File CNMP, Technical Review Guide and CNMP Review Tracking document in customer file

Technically inadequate – minor revisions required The submitted plan indicates good conservation planning and addresses resource concerns adequately but has minor problems requiring correction. Minor problems could include correcting map legends, clearer application setback guidance for customer, minor jobsheet or narrative problems, etc.

- Notify planner that submitted plan was determined to be technically inadequate requiring minor revisions. Negotiate a date the planner agrees to resubmit the corrected plan (request 21 day turnaround)
- Notify producer that the named planner submitted plan was determined to be technically inadequate requiring minor revisions. Withhold details of the deficiencies as this can undermine the planner-producer relationship. Inform the producer that the planner agreed to submit the plan with corrections by the date agreed to.
- Notify (supervisors) - for information only
- File Technical Review Guide and Plan Review Tracking document in customer file

Technically inadequate – major revisions required The submitted plan indicates poor conservation planning. Indicators of poor planning can include unidentified nutrient/manure related resource concerns, untreated areas with manure that impact water quality, inconsistencies among the three technical elements significantly affecting conservation, producer dissatisfaction, identical rotation and nutrient application plan for all three years, etc.

- Notify (direct and area-level supervisors) that submitted plan is technically inadequate and requires major technical revisions. Review the plan with supervisors to establish concurrence of determination and agree to a three-way meeting with reviewer, planner, and area supervisor to review inadequacies and agree to revisions.
- Notify planner that major revisions are required for the plan to be technically adequate. Schedule three-way meeting with reviewer, planner and area-level supervisor to review inadequacies and agree to revisions.
- Notify producer that plan submitted by named planner has technical inadequacies and that a meeting between NRCS and TSP will take place to address the shortcomings and revisions required. Avoid alarming producer with details of plan deficiencies
- Advise State TSP Coordinator (for TSP planner) or State Resource Conservationist (for CTA planner) that the technical review determined plan to be technically inadequate and requires major revisions.
- At three-way meeting review plan and its technical inadequacies, establish a time period for TSP to resubmit the plan with revisions addressing the inadequacies (request 21 day turnaround). Document revisions agreed to at meeting. Notify producer of the agreement and date planner agreed to submit revised plan.
- File Technical Review Guide and Plan Review Tracking document in customer file

Follow-up review determined the plan is technically adequate, technically inadequate – minor revisions required, or technically inadequate – major revisions required. Guidance for each of these outcomes is provided below:

Technically adequate

- Same as first review guidance

Technically inadequate with minor revisions required Same as first review guidance

Technically inadequate with major revisions required

Plans determined to be technically inadequate requiring major revisions following second review - notify of your immediate supervisor, the Assistant State Conservationist for Field Operations, and the State TSP coordinator and State Resource conservationist within 5 days.