U.S. Department of Agriculture
Natural Resources Conservation Service

Save As

ME-CPA-52
October, 2009

ENVIRONMENTAL EVALUATION WORKSHEET

Instructions

A. Client Name:

B. Conservation Plan ID # (as applicable):

Program Authority (optional):

C. 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

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

E. Need for Action:

Improve quantity and quality of forages, reduce potassium levels in soils.

F. Alternatives

No Action	*Alternative 1*
√ if RMS ☐	√ if RMS ☒
Farm is an operating dairy farm with 40 holstein milkers and another 44 young stock and dry cows. Milk production averages about 20,000 lbs. per animal	Nutrient Mgmt, 590, Prescribed Grazing, 528, Waste Utilization 633

Resource Concerns & Special Environmental Concerns

In Section "G" below, analyze, record and address concerns identified through the Resource Inventory process. (For *Resource Concerns* see FOTG Section III - Resource Quality Criteria for guidance. For *Special Environmental Concerns* 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 proceed for practices not involved in consultation.)
Click on the following links for a Resource Concerns/Considerations Checklist or Conservation Practice Physical Effects (CPPE).

G. Concerns and Existing/Benchmark Conditions
(Analyze and record the existing/benchmark conditions for each identified condition)

H. Effects of Alternatives

G. Concerns and Existing/Benchmark Conditions	*No Action* Trend short	*No Action* Trend long	*No Action* Amount, Status, Description	*No Action* √ if meets QC	*Alternative 1* Trend short	*Alternative 1* Trend long	*Alternative 1* Amount, Status, Description	*Alternative 1* √ if meets QC
SOIL								
Condition: Animal Wastes/Other Organics – K	-	-	High K in soil tests which can lead to high K forages, increased potential for grass	☒	0	+	Reduced potassium in soils relates to reduced potassium in forages	☒
				☐				☐
				☐				☐
Prime and Important Farmlands	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
WATER								
No water resource concerns exist on this planning unit	0	0	No effect	☒	0	0	No effect	☒
				☐				☐
				☐				☐
Clean Water Act/ Waters of the U.S.	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Coastal Zone Management Areas	N/A	N/A	Not applicable		N/A	N/A	Not applicable	
Floodplain Management	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Riparian Area	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Wetlands	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	

G. Concerns and Existing/Benchmark Conditions (Analyze and record the existing/benchmark conditions for each identified condition)	H. Effects of Alternatives							
	No Action				*Alternative 1*			
	Trend		Amount, Status, Description	√ if meets QC	Trend		Amount, Status, Description	√ if meets QC
	short	long			short	long		
AIR								
No air resource concerns exist on this planning unit	0	0	No effect	☒	0	0	No effect	☒
				☐				☐
				☐				☐
Clean Air Act	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
PLANTS								
Condition: Productivity, Health & Vigor	0	0	Legumes 5% for 2 pastures (10 acres) PCI score is 36, all other pastures (118 ac PCI	☐	0	+	Improved productivity of pastures	☒
Condition: Forage Quality and Palatability	-	-	High potassium levels in forage can lead to grass tetany	☐	0	+	proper soil mgmt reduces potassium levels in forage and reduced	☒
				☐				☐
Endangered and Threatened Species (Use one ME-ECS-1 Guidesheet for both plants and animals)	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Invasive Species	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Natural Areas	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Riparian Area	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
ANIMALS **WHEP**								
Domestic: Inadequate Quantities & Quality of Feed & Forage:	-	-	Livestock getting poor quality forage from pastures, plants have potential for K toxicity	☐	0	+	Livestock getting higher quality forage from pastures	☒
Wild: Inadequate Cover/Shelter	-	-	Large distances to cover in pastures, WHEP benchmark is a 0.4	☐	0	+	Wildlife is secondary resource concern; the planned condition	☒
				☐				☐
Endangered and Threatened Species (Use one ME-ECS-1 Guidesheet for both plants and animals)	0	0	Atlantic salmon identified as ESA species - habitat impaired due to nutrients/organics in surface waters		0	0	See attached recommendations	
Essential Fish Habitat	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Invasive Species	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	
Riparian Area	0	0	No effect		0	0	No effect	

G. Concerns and Existing/Benchmark Conditions (Analyze and record the existing/benchmark conditions for each identified condition)	H. Effects of Alternatives					
	No Action			*Alternative 1*		
	Trend		Amount, Status, Description	Trend		Amount, Status, Description
	short	long		short	long	
HUMAN, ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CONSIDERATIONS						
Cultural Resources	0	0	See attached recommendations	0	0	See attached recommendations
Environmental Justice	0	0	No effect	0	0	No effect
Scenic Beauty	0	0	No effect	0	0	No effect
Land Use	0	0	Adequate land available for forage production	0	0	No change
Capital	0	0	Adequate machinery	-	0	Initial capital outlay for new structures
Labor	0	0	Adequate labor	0	0	Increased labor demand for pasture management and milk production
Management Level	0	-	Low level pasture management	-	-	Increased mgmt level due to pasture management and milk production
Profitability	-	-	Narrow margin of profitability exists due to transportation and current market prices	0	+	Improved forage and livestock environment; better production, greater profits
Risk	-	-	Pastures have potential for K toxicity, low milk prices	+	+	Reduced risk due to increased milk production, improved livestock health
Social Well-Being	0	0	Rural ag area - dairies have existed in community	0	0	Maintain local agribusiness

I. Other Agencies and Broad Public Concerns	*No Action*	*Alternative 1*
Easements, Permissions, or Permits Required and Agencies Consulted	None	None
Identify any additional environmental, resource-protection, or land use laws or regulations or concerns to address:	None	None
J. Mitigation	None	None
K. Preferred Alternative — √ preferred alternative	☐	☒
K. Preferred Alternative — Supporting Reason		Typical practices exist, no extraordinary circumstances exist

L. The information recorded above is based on the best available information:

Signature	Title	Date

TSPs STOP HERE. THE FOLLOWING SECTIONS ARE TO BE COMPLETED BY THE RESPONSIBLE FEDERAL OFFICIAL (RFO). Sections "M" & "N" do not need to be completed when only Technical Assistance is provided (e.g. development of conservation plans without federally guided implementation.

The RFO is to use the ME-CPA-52 to determine whether there are significant adverse environmental effects or "extraordinary circumstances" that would preclude the applicability of a categorical exclusion or the tiering process. Review definitions below of significance and extraordinary circumstances as defined by context and intensity (40 CFR Part 1508.27)

M. Context (record context of alternatives analysis):

Site specific action, localized impacts are the extent of the affected region

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:

N. 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 Resource Conservationist 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?

O. NEPA Compliance Finding (check one)
The preferred alternative

		Action Required
☐	1. is **not** a federal action subject to NRCS regulations implementing NEPA (7 CFR Part 650)	Document in "P" 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 "P" below. No additional analysis is required.
☒	3. is a federal action that has been **sufficiently analyzed** in an existing published NRCS state, regional or national NEPA document and there are **no predicted significant adverse environmental effects** or extraordinary circumstances.	Document in "P" below. No additional analysis is required.
☐	4. is a federal action that has been **sufficiently analyzed** in another Federal agency's NEPA document 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.	Contact the State Resource Conservationist for a list of NEPA documents formally adopted and available for tiering. Document in "P" 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 Resource Conservationist. Further NEPA analysis is required.

P. Rationale Supporting the Finding:

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

Q. I have considered the effects of the alternatives on the Resource Concerns, Human, Economic and Social Considerations, Special Environmental Concerns, and Extraordinary Circumstances (as outlined in the NECH 610.22)

	District Conservationist	
Signature	**Title**	**Date**