U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service

Save As

ME-CPA-52
October, 2010

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Instructions

A. Client Name:

B. Conservation Plan ID # (as applicable):

Program Authority (optional):

D. Client's Objective(s): (purpose) Maintain and improve the economic return from the dairy operation, apply dairy manure to obtain maximum nutrient benefit while minimizing runoff

C. Identification #: (farm, tract, field #, etc, as required)

E. Need for Action:	**G. Alternatives** *No Action* √ if RMS ☐	*Alternative 1* √ if RMS ☐
Maintain sensitive area setbacks on lands where manure is applied	Farm is an operating dairy farm with 40 holstein milkers and another 44 young stock and dry cows. Milk production	Nutrient Mgmt, 590, Waste Storage Facility, 313, Heavy Use Area, 561, Waste Utilization, 633

Resource Concerns & Special Environmental Concerns
In Section "F" below, analyze, record and address concerns identified through the Resource Inventory process.
(See FOTG Section III - Resource Quality Criteria for guidance).
Click on the following links for a Resource Concerns/Considerations Checklist or Conservation Practice Physical Effects (CPPE).

F. Resource Concerns and Existing/Benchmark Conditions (Analyze and record the existing/benchmark conditions for each identified condition)	**H. Effects of Alternatives** *No Action* Amount, Status, Description (short and long term)	√ if does NOT meet QC	*Alternative 1* Amount, Status, Description (short and long term)	√ if does NOT meet QC
SOIL				
Condition: Animal Wastes/Other Organics - N	Soil nitrogen excessive at multiple manure stacking sites	☒	Removal/reduction in stacking sites	☐
Condition: Compaction	Compaction around buildings and where livestock are fed	☒	Heavy use area practice addresses compaction issue	☐
		☐		☐
WATER				
Surface Water Quality: Excessive Nutrients and Organics	Contamination due to improper waste storage and handling	☒	Proper ag waste storage design prevents contamination of water	☐
Surface Water Quality: Harmful Levels of Pathogens	Contamination due to improper waste storage and handling	☒	Proper ag waste storage design prevents contamination of water	☐
Quantity: Excessive Runoff, Flooding or Ponding	Building runoff increases volume of waste	☒	Clean runoff diverted out of waste storage	☐
AIR				
Quality: Objectionable Odors	Odors from liquid manure present and improperly stored	☒	Properly stored waste reduces odors, timing of spreading reduces odor complaints	☐
		☐		☐
		☐		☐
PLANTS				
Condition: Productivity, Health & Vigor	Animal waste spread over fields nearest to manure pit, low level of manure/ nutrient management	☒	Animal waste spread as per soil test improves plant nutrition and productivity	☐
		☐		☐
		☐		☐

F. Concerns and Existing/Benchmark Conditions (Analyze and record the existing/benchmark conditions for each identified condition)	H. Effects of Alternatives, (continued) No Action: Amount, Status, Description (short and long term)	√ if does NOT meet QC	Alternative 1: Amount, Status, Description (short and long term)	√ if does NOT meet QC
ANIMALS WHEP				
Domestic: Stress and Mortality	Improper disposal of waste and carcasses spreads diseases	☒	Proper storage of waste, disposal of waste and carcasses reduces risk from disease	☐
		☐		☐
		☐		☐
HUMAN, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS				
Land Use	Adequate land available for forage production		No change	
Capital	Adequate machinery		Initial capital outlay for new structures	
Labor	Adequate labor		No change	
Management Level	Timing constraint due to dairy/beef operations limit time for adequate mgmt of forage fields		Increased management level requirements for waste storage and handling	
Profitability	Narrow margin of profitability exists due to poor milk market		Improved forage and livestock environment; better milk/meat production	
Risk	Risk from not meeting State Ag rules		Reduced liability risk by properly managing livestock waste	
Social Well-Being	Rural ag area - dairies/beef farms have existed in community		Maintain local agribusiness	

Special Environmental Concerns: Environmental Laws, Executive Orders, policies, etc.

In Section "I" complete and attach applicable Environmental Procedures Guide Sheets for documentation. Items with a "•" may require a federal permit or consultation/coordination between the lead agency and another government agency. In these cases, effects may need to be determined in consultation with another agency. Planning and practice implementation may not proceed for practices not involved in consultation.

I. Special Environmental Concerns (Document compliance with Environmental Laws, Executive Orders, policies, etc.)	J. Impacts to Special Environmental Concerns No Action: Status and progress of compliance. (Complete and attach Guide Sheets as applicable)	√ if needs further action	Alternative 1: Status and progress of compliance. (Complete and attach Guide Sheets as applicable)	√ if needs further action
•Clean Air Act	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
•Clean Water Act/Waters of the U.S.	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
•Coastal Zone Management Coral Reefs	Not applicable	☐	Not applicable	☐
•Cultural Resources	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
• Endangered and Threatened Species (Use one ME-ECS-1 Guidesheet for both plants and animals)	No effect	☐	No effect	☐

I. Special Environmental Concerns (Document compliance with Environmental Laws, Executive Orders, policies, etc.)	J. Impacts to Special Environmental Concerns, (continued)			
	No Action		*Alternative 1*	
	Status and progress of compliance. (Complete and attach Guide Sheets as applicable)	√ if needs further action	Status and progress of compliance. (Complete and attach Guide Sheets as applicable)	√ if needs further action
Environmental Justice	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
•Essential Fish Habitat	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
Floodplain Management	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
Invasive Species	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
•Migratory Birds/Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
Prime and Important Farmlands	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
Riparian Area	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
•Wetlands	No effect	☐	No effect	☐
•Wild and Scenic Rivers	Not applicable	☐	Not applicable	☐

K. Other Agencies and Broad Public Concerns	*No Action*	*Alternative 1*
Easements, Permissions, or Permits Required and Agencies Consulted	None	None
Cumulative Effects Narrative (Describe the cumulative impacts considered, including past, present and known future actions regardless of who performed the actions)	None	Long term improvements in air shed, income and income stability, biodiversity, habitat suitability; health for humans, domestic & wild animals and quality of surface waters and aquatic habitats. (Source: , Section IV, Conservation Practices, network diagrams for Nutrient
L. Mitigation	None	None
M. Preferred Alternative — √ preferred alternative	☐	☒
M. Preferred Alternative — Supporting Reason		Typical practices exist, no extraordinary circumstances exist

N. Context (record context of alternatives analysis): The significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality.	Site specific action, localized impacts are the extent of the affected region

O. Determination of Significance or Extraordinary Circumstances
Intensity: Refers to the severity of impact. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant affect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance, the effect will be beneficial. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.
If you answer ANY of the below questions "yes" then contact the State Environmental Liaison as there may be extraordinary circumstances and significance issues to consider and a site specific NEPA analysis may be required.

YES	NO	
☐	☒	Is the preferred alternative expected to cause significant effects on public health or safety?
☐	☒	Is the preferred alternative expected to significantly effect unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical areas?
☐	☒	Are the effects of the preferred alternative on the quality of the human environment likely to be highly controversial?
☐	☒	Does the preferred alterative establish a precedent for future actions with significant impacts or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration?
☐	☒	Is the preferred alternative known or reasonably expected to to have potentially significant environment impacts to the quality of the human environment either individually or cumulatively over time?
☐	☒	Will the preferred alternative likely have a significant adverse effect on ANY of the special environmental concerns? Use the Environmental Procedure Guide Sheets to assist in this determination. This includes, but is not limited to concerns such as cultural historical resources, endangered and threatened species, environmental justice, wetlands, floodplains, coastal zones, essential fish habitat, riparian areas, natural areas, scenic beauty, and invasive species.
☐	☒	Will the preferred alterative threaten a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements for the protection of the environment?

P. The information recorded above is based on the best available information:
In the case where a non-NRCS person (i.e. a TSP) assists with the planning they are to sign the first signature block and then NRCS is to sign the second block as the responsible federal agency for the planning action.

Signature (TSP if applicable)	Title	Date

Signature (NRCS - Certified Conservation Planner)	Title	Date

Q. NEPA Compliance Finding (check one)
The preferred alternative:

		Action Required
☐	1. is **not** a federal action where the agency has control or responsibility. (7 CFR Part 650)	Document in "R.1" below. No additional analysis is required.
☐	2. is a federal action that is **categorically excluded** from further environmental analysis **and** there are **no extraordinary circumstances**.	Document in "R.2" below. No additional analysis is required.
☒	3. is a federal action that has been **sufficiently analyzed** in an existing Agency state, regional or national NEPA document and there are **no predicted significant adverse environmental effects or extraordinary circumstances**.	Document in "R.1" below. No additional analysis is required.
☐	4. is a federal action that has been **sufficiently analyzed** in another Federal agency's NEPA document EA or EIS) that addresses the proposed NRCS action and its' effects **and has been formally adopted by NRCS.** NRCS is required to prepare and publish the agency's own Finding of No Significant Impact for an EA or Record of Decision for an EIS when adopting another agency's EA or EIS document. **Note: this box is not applicable to FSA.**	Contact the State Environmental Liaison for a list of NEPA documents formally adopted and available for tiering. Document in "R.1" below. No additional analysis is required.
☐	5. is a federal action that has **NOT** been sufficiently analyzed or may involve predicted significant adverse impacts or extraordinary circumstances and may require an EA or EIS.	Contact the State Environmental Liaison. Further NEPA analysis is required.

R. Rationale Supporting the Finding

R1. Findings Documentation	Use of NRCS Conservation Practices to Address Natural Resource Concerns on Non-Federal Lands in the New England States and New York, Environmental Assessment, April, 2007
R.2 Applicable Categorical Exclusion(s) (more than one may apply)	

I have considered the effects of the alternatives on the Resource Concerns, Human, Economic and Social Considerations, Special Environmental Concerns, and Extraordinary Circumstances as defined by Agency regulation and policy.
S. Signature of Responsible Federal Official:

Signature	Title	Date
	District Conservationist	

Additional notes