

---

December 15, 1997

**NATIONAL FOOD SECURITY ACT MANUAL, Third Edition, 1996**  
**180-V NFSAM**  
**Idaho Notice. No. 2**

Purpose: Distribution of Forms

Effective Date: Upon receipt.

The attached CPA forms for FSA replace existing forms.

**Filing Instructions:**

1. Replace existing forms in Part 526 Exhibits of the NFSAM with the one copy of the new attached forms.
2. Place one set of forms in the master copy forms file.
3. File the remaining forms where they can be accessed for use in as needed.

  
LUANA E. KIGER  
State Conservationist

Attachments

ATTACHMENT OF FORMS

FORM  
NUMBER

NAME

NRCS-CPA-1	NRCS Employee Data on Farm Interest
NRCS-CPA-20	HELC/WC Conservation Compliance Quality Review Questions
NRCS-CPA-21	Administrative Record Document Index Wetland Appeals
NRCS-CPA-22	FSA Appeals - Wetland Administrative Record
NRCS-CPA-31	Wetland Documentation Record General Site Information
NRCS-CPA-32	Wetland Documentation Record Remotely Sensed Data Summary
NRCS-CPA-33	Wetland Documentation Record Vegetation Data Routine Method
NRCS-CPA-34	Wetland Documentation Record Vegetation Data Comprehensive Method
NRCS-CPA-36	Wetland Documentation Record Hydrology Data Routine Method



## HELC/WC CONSERVATION COMPLIANCE QUALITY REVIEW QUESTIONS

State _____ Field Office _____			
INDICATE ANSWER BY PLACING "X" IN PROPER COLUMN	YES	NO	N/A
<b>I. State:</b>			
A. Has the State Conservationist delegated the Food Security Act of 1985's, as amended, responsibilities in writing?			
B. Have the state supplements to the NFSAM been approved by the Director of the Conservation Operations Division?			
C. Number of compliance and wetland appeals received at the state level. _____ Number Upheld _____ Number Overturned _____			
D. Does the quality control plan provide procedures to correct deficiencies found in prior year reviews?			
<b>II. Field Office Information:</b>			
A. Are requirements for conservation systems and conservation treatments used in the compliance plan documented in Section III, FOTG?			
B. Is the Highly Erodible Soil Map Unit List (HESMUL) on file in Section II, FOTG?			
C. Were additional soil map units which meet HEL and PHEL found in the county added to the HESMUL list in Section II, FOTG?			
D. Are HEL and PHEL lists in the FOTG date January 1, 1990?			
E. Are requests for HEL determinations (AD-1026's) logged in a tracking register and assigned a priority category when received?			
F. Number of compliance and wetland reconsiderations received at the field office. _____ Number Upheld _____ Number Overturned _____			
G. Was the hydric soils list in Section II FOTG developed from the hydric soil module in SSSD?			
H. Are there any soils on the national hydric soils list but not on the county hydric soils list?			
I. Were CWNA requests properly planned and documented?			
J. Was the CWNA plan signed by the person?			
K. Is the National List of Plant Species that occur in wetlands part of the FOTG in Section I or other field office references?			
L. Are approved mapping conventions available in the field office?			
M. Were all available tools used to make wetland determinations?			
N. Are USFWS National Wetland Inventory Maps maintained in the field office?			
O. Are FSA slides on file or available for use? List available years. _____			

**HELC/WC**  
**CONSERVATION COMPLIANCE**  
**QUALITY REVIEW QUESTIONS**

INDICATE ANSWER BY PLACING "X" IN PROPER COLUMN	YES	NO	N/A
P. Have determinations been made for all AD-1026's which indicate a " YES" to questions involving wetland use or alterations?			
Q. Has a new HEL or wetland determination resulting from a violation investigation been documented in the tract case files?			
R. Is an administrative record maintained and does it include complete documentation for each appeal?			
<b>III. Appeals:</b>			
A. Are written decisions to appellants on file in the administrative record?			
B. Are appellants provided information (formal written) on appeal rights and procedures?			
C. Are administrative records maintained for each appeal and does the record contain complete documentation?			
<b>IV. Case File Requirements: for all tracts reviewed.</b>			
A. Are delineations used on FSA aerial photos?			
B. Do HEL fields identified on form NRCS-CPA-026E match the HEL fields identified?			
C. Does documentation of the approved system or practice identify fields where approved systems and/ or practices are applied?			
D. If a plan exists, do the plan narratives define:			
1. What practice(s) will be installed?			
2. When practices(s) will be installed?			
3. Were the practice(s) is/are to be installed?			
E. Does the system documentation or plan describe the criteria used to determine when a practice is satisfactorily implemented?			
F. Is there documentation on the predicted erosion rates? Before _____ After _____			
G. Were wetland determinations properly executed for all areas within tracts when they are requested?			
1. Are the areas excluded from wetland determinations outlined on FSA photos and identified as not having determinations? (Labeled NI)			
2. Are persons informed that a wetland determinations should be requested for any area on which a determination has not been made and which is being converted to cropland or is to be manipulated?			
H. For areas called PC, does crop history support that determination?			

**HELIC/WC**  
**CONSERVATION COMPLIANCE**  
**QUALITY REVIEW QUESTIONS**

INDICATE ANSWER BY PLACING "X" IN PROPER COLUMN	YES	NO	N/A
I. Has NRCS provided technical assistance with drainage-related measures on any tracts since December 23, 1985?			
1. If YES, were FSA wetland determinations made prior to such assistance?			
J. Are properly completed forms, AD-1026 and NRCS-CPA-026E, and one copy of the FSA aerial photo containing wetland determinations in the case files?			
K. Do farmed wetlands and farmed wetland pasture have scope and effect of existing drainage properly documented where manipulations have taken place or are proposed?			
<b>V. Status Review Requirements:</b>			
A. Are plans or approved systems that received a variance the previous year scheduled for a status review the following year?			
B. Are the practices that are scheduled to be applied as of the date of the field office status review actually applied?			
1. Are applied practices documented?			
2. If scheduled practices were not applied, were any substitute practices applied?			
a. If YES: Go to Question "3" below. If NO: Go to "(1)" below			
(1) Are variances granted for one of the conditions given in NFSAM?			
(a) If NO: Do field office status review results show a determination of not actively applying the approved conservation plan?			
(b) If YES:			
(1) Have persons been notified of determinations?			
(2) Did FSA receive copies of these determinations?			
3. If YES to Question "2"			
(a) Do substitute practices provide erosion reduction benefits during the current crop year equivalent to these originally scheduled practices?			
C. Are status reviews requested by FSA, on the form FSA-569, being accomplished in addition to the required sample?			
D. With regard to status reviews, are all fields documented on the NRCS-CPA-18?			
E. Was FSA notified on a FSA-569?			
F. Do HEL cropland fields converted from native vegetation (rangeland or woodland) have erosion control planned that does not permit a substantial increase in erosion?			
G. Do those FSA tracts or fields have the level of treatment required by the LTA, EQIP, or WS project?			
H. In any contract were cost-share practices delayed or removed to avoid loss of benefits?			

**ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD  
DOCUMENT INDEX  
WETLAND APPEALS**

<b>NAME (APPELLANT):</b>	<b>TRACT NO.:</b>
<b>COUNTY:</b>	<b>STATE:</b>

**SECTION I. Forms**

- A. Index/Check List-Form NRCS-CPA-21
- B. Chronology of Events
- C. Site Identification Tracking Form, NRCS-CPA-31, and FSA Appeals Wetland Administrative Record, NRCS-CPA-22
- D. AD-1026(a) - All years pertinent to the appeal, most recent on top
- E. NRCS-CPA-026(s) w/ attached dated FSA photo w/wetland designations and revisions
- F. FSA-569

**SECTION II. Letters of Appellant and Appeal Determinations (most recent on top)(Include data supplied by appellant in chronological order and letters from FWS and other agencies, any letters of acknowledgment or other correspondence.)**

**SECTION III. Soils Data**

- A. Soils map, legend, series description (with area(s) in question highlighted in color)
- B. County hydric soils list
- C. Soils field notes
- D. Soils Forms NRCS-CPA-35 or similar COE form, all levels

**SECTION IV. Vegetation Data**

- A. Map of sample transects or plots
- B. Vegetation field notes
- C. Vegetation Forms NRCS-CPA-33, NRCS-CPA-34, or similar COE Form

**SECTION V. Hydrology Data**

- A. Hydrology field notes
- B. Hydrology Forms NRCS-CPA-36, NRCS-CPA-37, or similar COE Form
- C. Scope and effect documentation
- D. Hydrology data and calculations
- E. Climate

**SECTION VI. Other Supporting Data**

- A. USFWS-NWI (with area in question highlighted in color)
- B. USGS topo map (with area in question highlighted in color)
- C. NRCS compliance slides
- D. Remotely sensed data summary Form NRCS-CPA-32 or similar state form
- E. Meeting records
- F. NRCS-CPA-6 Conservation Assistance Notes
- G. Minimal effect data and information
- H. SWCD Comments

U. S. Department of Agriculture Natural Resource Conservation Service	NRCS-CPA-22 10/96	1. Name of Appellant:	2. Date:
<b>FSA APPEALS - WETLAND ADMINISTRATIVE RECORD</b>		3. Subject of Appeal:	4. Date Forwarded:

Reviewer (s)

<b>INDICATE ANSWER BY PLACING "X" IN PROPER COLUMN</b>	YES	NO
1. Is completed form AD-1026 and NRCS-CPA-38 contained?		
2. Is completed form NRCS-CPA-026 contained with attached FSA photo and appropriate wetland/converted wetland designation?		

INFORMATION USED IN OFFICE DETERMINATION (IF APPLICABLE)			
Information Sources	FO	RO	SO
FSA Slides			
FWS NWI			
Color IR			
Soil Survey			
Weather Data			
Other (specify)			

1. INFORMATION GATHERED IN FIELD DETERMINATION (IF APPLICABLE)		YES	NO
2. Is there documentation that hydric soil criteria are met?			
3. Is there documentation that the area supports prevalence of hydrophytic vegetation under normal circumstances?			
4. Is soil map with site in question identified?			
5. Name of the hydric soil or inclusion and the hydric soil criterion met?			
6. Was visual determination made regarding prevalence of hydrophytic vegetation? If so, list prevalent plant species, their appropriate indicator status, and relative percent coverage.			

Species	Indicator Status	% Coverage

		YES	NO
7. Was comparison site used in determination of prevalence?			
8. Was transect technique used to determine prevalence?			
Were the following documented?			
- location of transects within subject area			
- completed copy of prevalence index worksheet			
- completed calculations documenting adequate number of transects and identified plants			
9. Is abandonment an issue raised in the appeal?			
10. Is conversion prior to the Act an issue raised in the appeal?			
Is information present to document abandonment?			
11. Was minimal effect appealed?			
If so was determination of minimal effect considered?			
12. If artificial wetland is an issue, is information contained to document that artificial or irrigation induced wetland was either non wetland or prior converted wetland previous to artificial modifications?			

Remarks:

**WETLAND  
DOCUMENTATION RECORD  
GENERAL SITE INFORMATION**

1. Owner/Landowner

2. County/State

3. Field Investigator

Title

4. Site Identification No.

Date

5. (Tract No., Farm No., Site No.)

ATTACH GENERAL SITE MAP SHOWING TRANSECT AND PLOT LOCATIONS,  
IMPORTANT PHYSICAL FEATURES, ETC.

**GEOMORPHIC DATA**

**1. Depressional**

1. Pocosin	2. Playa	3. Flats	4. Pothole
5. Size (ac)	6. Watershed Size (ac)	7. Depth (ft)	

**2. Riverine**

1. Stream Name	2. Watershed Size (ac)	3. Streamflow (cfs)
4. Avg. Land Slope (%)		5. Area

**3. Fringe**

1. Estuarine	2. Lacustrine	3. Avg. Width
--------------	---------------	---------------

**SITE MODIFICATION**

1. Is wetland artificially created?

YES  NO

2. Describe significant alteration to wetland that may affect determination process.



**WETLAND DOCUMENTATION RECORD  
VEGETATION DATA  
ROUTINE METHOD**

1. Owner/Landowner

2. County/State

3. Field Investigator Title

4. Site Identification No. Date

5. (Tract No., Farm No., Site No.)

CHECK APPROPRIATE  
INVESTIGATION TYPE

CHECK

SITE SIZE (Check Size)

CHECK

1. On-Site Evaluation

2. < 5 acres

3. Reference Site(Comparison Site)

4. > 5 acres

5. Method of determination visual estimate

6. Transect

7. Comparison site: soil map unit \_\_\_\_\_

hydrologic condition \_\_\_\_\_

8. Transect No. (One form per transect)

List the 3 dominant species in each vegetation layer; list 5 species if only 1 or 2 layers are present

**1. TREES**

**2. HERBS**

Dominant Species	% Cover	Indicator	Dominant Species	% Cover	Indicator

**3. SAPLING/SHRUBS**

**4. WOODY VINES**

Dominant Species	% Cover	Indicator	Dominant Species	% Cover	Indicator

1. % of observed dominant species that are OBL, FACW, or FAC

2. Hydrophytic vegetation criteria met YES NO

Remarks:



**WETLAND DOCUMENTATION RECORD  
HYDROLOGY DATA  
ROUTINE METHOD**

1. Owner/Landowner

2. County/State

3. Field Investigator

Title

4. Site Identification No.

Date

5. (Tract No., Farm No., Site No.)

Do Normal Circumstances exist on the site?

Yes

No

Is the site significantly disturbed (atypical situation)?

Is the area a potential problem area?  
(If needed, explain on reverse.)

1. On-Site Evaluation

2. Reference Site  
Soil Map Unit

3. Surface drainage features evident  
(circle) Yes No

4. Subsurface drainage features evident  
(circle) Yes No

**Attach description, location map, gradelines, x-sections, outlet conditions and date of installation.**

**Antecedent Moisture Conditions**

1. Prior month rainfall (in)

2. Normal (in)

3. Station name and number

4. Prior week rainfall (in)

5. Normal (in)

6. Current weather (rainy, sunny, etc.)

Recorded Data (Describe in Remarks):

\_\_\_\_ Stream, Lake, or Tide Gauge  
\_\_\_\_ Aerial Photographs  
\_\_\_\_ Other  
\_\_\_\_ No Recorded Data Available  
\_\_\_\_ Mapping Conventions

Wetland Hydrology Indicators:

Primary Indicators

\_\_\_\_ Inundated  
\_\_\_\_ Saturated in Upper 12 Inches  
\_\_\_\_ Water Marks  
\_\_\_\_ Drift Lines  
\_\_\_\_ Sediment Deposits  
\_\_\_\_ Drainage Patterns in Wetlands

Field Observations:

Secondary Indicators (2 or more required)

Depth of Surface Water: \_\_\_\_\_(in.)  
Depth of Free Water in Pit: \_\_\_\_\_(in.)  
Depth to Saturated Soil: \_\_\_\_\_(in.)  
Seeps or Springs Yes No  
(circle)

\_\_\_\_ Oxidized Root Channels in Upper 12 Inches  
\_\_\_\_ Water-Stained Leaves  
\_\_\_\_ Local Soil Survey Data  
\_\_\_\_ FAC-Neutral Test  
\_\_\_\_ Other (Explain in Remarks)

Other Observations:

Wetland Hydrology Criteria Met Yes No  
(circle)

Remarks: