

Conservation Practice Standard Updates

Comments & Responses



CPS 635 Vegetated Treatment Area

Comment: Practice standard should consider sizing of dosing tanks/settling basins to ensure we meet soil saturation limitations.

Response: We agree that VTA standard has limitations for use in Ohio as written. Recommend development of updated technical release on use of VTAs, which can be used for a reference and update the standard.

Comment: The practice will be limited due to temperature restrictions. How will this be handled for Ohio producers?

Response: We agree that VTA standard has limitations for use in Ohio as written. Recommend development of updated technical release on use of VTAs, which can be used for a reference and update the standard.

Comment: What storm event should be used to “provide additional storage in basin collection”?

Response: The criteria states: design the VTA based on the need to treat the runoff volume from the 25-year, 24-hour storm event from the agricultural animal management facility.

Comment: Practice limitations will discourage use of it in Ohio.

Response: We agree that VTA standard has limitations for use in Ohio as written. Recommend development of updated technical release on use of VTAs, which can be used for a reference and update the standard.

CPS 566 Recreation Land Improvement & Protection

Comment: Engineering plans should include at a minimum - seeding, fertilizing, mulching, erosion control, blanket details. Also need to include estimated excavation and fill quantities.

Response: This language has been added.

CPS 606 Subsurface Drain

Comment: An installation method should be included for situations where tile must be installed with low cover.

Response: This method has been added to the updated practice specification

CPS 378 Pond

Comment: NRCS should remove the option to use anti-seep collars.

Response: Agree that filter diaphragm is better option, however we are not ready to prevent its use entirely, in case there is a site specific need for one. We will review practice specification to list diaphragms as preferred method.

Comment: NRCS should prohibit the use of corrugated steel, aluminum, or corrugated plastic pipe.

Response: Added statement “ Design and install all joints and couplings using materials manufactured for the designed pipe material, conforming with applicable ASTM designations, that results in a joint that meets the hydrostatic pressure rating of the designed pipe material” Intended to limit corrugated materials usage. Also added statement that installation must meet the manufacturer’s specification for the pipe. PS modified accordingly.

Revised Conservation Practice Standards

These standards revise Ohio Field Office Technical Guide (FOTG) and provide the criteria and considerations required for all USDA Farm Bill financial and technical assistance related to the resource concerns being addressed.

The revisions come after a 30-day public comment period.

“Reviewing our standards ensures that we are placing cutting-edge, scientifically backed conservation practices on farms,” said John Wilson, state conservationist for Ohio. “We want to ensure that the public has time to review and provide input so that we can look to the future of agriculture together.”

Comment: Add back in the criteria for Upground Reservoirs that is in the current CPS.

Response: Added criteria for Upground Reservoirs & Fire protection ponds that is in the current OH CPS.

CPS 353 Monitoring Well

Comment: Spacing and punctuation needs reviewed and corrected.

Response: Corrected.

Comment: Add “or quality” to planning portion of the document to address the need to identify additional sources of contamination.

Response: Added.

CPS 591 Amendments for Treatment of Agricultural Waste

Comment: Consider reducing the bullet points under the “Purpose” section to: “Improve/protect air quality, water quality, or animal health.”

Response: Ohio can delete a CPS purpose with justification. We will need further discussion on why the other purposes should be removed.

Comment: In the “Labeling and Instructions for Use” section, consider rewording “as a minimum” to “at a minimum.”

Response: Change made.

Comment: Consider separating the large paragraph in the “Expected amendment performance” section. Begin new paragraph starting at “At a minimum, the technology provider will...”

Response: Change made.

Comment: In the “Expected Amendment Performance” section, consider adding the commentary on potential climate effects from the current version back in.

Response: New CPS address this by documentation of “decreases or increases of emissions of particulate matter, ammonia,

volatile organic compounds, oxides of nitrogen (NOx), hydrogen sulfide, methane, nitrous oxide, and carbon dioxide.”

CPS 672 Energy Efficient Building Envelope

Comment: Spacing and punctuation needs reviewed and corrected.

Response: Corrected.

CPS 543 Land Reclamation, Abandoned Mine Land

Comment: Spacing and punctuation needs reviewed and corrected.

Response: Corrected.

Comment: In the “Purpose” section, include a bullet for “Support desirable vegetation.”

Response: A new purpose can only be added if we have quantifiable criteria and justification, and requires a variance. Additional discussion is needed.

Comment: In the “Storage of Soil Materials” section, include “Use NRCS CPS Pest Management (Code 595).”

Response: Change made.

Comment: In the “Placement of Surface Material” section, consider rewording to “spreading of stockpiled topsoil material [, to the planned depth,] as the final layer.”

Response: Change made.

Comment: In the “Establishment of Vegetation” section, consider including a paragraph discussing the soil nutrients necessary to ensure growth and survival of the vegetation.

Response: Added vegetative management plan ... including soil nutrients necessary to ensure growth and survival of the vegetation.

Comment: In the “Control of toxic discharge” section, consider rewording the 4th sentence in the second paragraph to say, “Select a [suitable] method that can adequately treat the water based on the quantity and chemistry of the mine water and that is suitable for the



of the mine water and that is suitable for the planned level of operation and maintenance.”

Response: Change made.

Comment: In the “Considerations” section, consider removing “and those” from the 3rd sentence of the 1st paragraph.

Response: Change made.

Comment: In the “Considerations” section, consider re-adding the paragraph on carbon sequestration potential from current version.

Response: This comment will need further discussion, since deep rooted plants can be problematic when capping acid forming materials.

CPS 632 Waste Separation Facility

Comment: The current standard indicates under “Conditions Where Practices Applies” includes “separate sand for further uses”. This was removed from the draft standard. Sand separation could still fall under the application of “Reduce solids content in a waste stream so liquids and solids can be recycled for other uses” but you might consider keeping “Separate sand for further uses or reuse” in the standard.

Response: “Separate sand for further uses” added to Conditions Where Practices Applies.

CPS 360 Waste Facility Closure

Comment: Page 1 under “Conditions Where Practice Applies” is a little confusing. First paragraph indicates this applies to confined animal housing while 6th paragraph indicates it does not apply to demolition of confined animal housing. Is the difference being demolition vs closure?

Response: Wording clarified.

Comment: Page 3 – Third paragraph prescribes burying demolished material onsite. Consultation with Ohio EPA should be made on if this is generally acceptable.

Response: Language added to reference



USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender. [OH-2024] • [January 2024]

designation by State or Local officials.

Comment: Page 4, paragraph 6, I would recommend beginning the sentence with “If” – “If a breached embankment may detract from the overall aesthetics...”

Response: Change made.

CPS 642 Water Well

Comment: Page 6 indicates not storing agrichemical within 100’ radius of the wellhead. This is in conflict with the 309 standard which allows a producer to build agrichemical storage within 50’ of their own well.

Response: Modified CPS 642 O&M section to match CPS 309 when agrichemical facility conforms with CPS 309.

CPS 319 On-Farm Secondary Containment

Comment: Consider guidance on fuel loading pads similar to what is found in the 309 CPS.

Response: This will require additional discussion since National CPS does not address, and Fire Marshall Rules are complex.

Comment: Page 4 – Line 10, an “@” symbol is used in the rule citation that was probably intended to be “2”.

Response: Corrected

CPS 309 Agrichemical Handling Facility

Comment: Page 1 – ODA storage requirements is handled by the “Division of Plant Health” rather than the “Division of Plant Industry.”

Response: Change made

Comment: Page 2 states “Do not construct posts, pipes, hoses, discharge valves, or other features that pass through the floor...” I would recommend considering these types of pass throughs if the design of such can be show to be watertight.

Response: Language from National CPS,

[Ohio]

Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

nrcs.usda.gov/

and would likely require a variance to modify. Additional discussion on need before proceeding with variance request.

Comment: Page 2, the intention/definition for the seasonal high water table has been discussed at great length over the last year. I would recommend additional clarification in the standard or provided outside of the standard in a guidance document.

Response: The State Office will work on guidance for obtaining a variance from the State Conservation Engineer per the CPS language.

Comment: Page 4, 2nd line, starts with "Agrichemical Handling Facility. (SCF)..." I believe the abbreviation intended here was (AHF).

Response: Corrected.

Comment: Fix several spelling and grammar errors.

Response: Corrected.

Comment: Page 5, Table 1, HDPE thickness under the previous standard was 40 instead of 60. I assume this change was intentional but thought I would note it in case it was not.

Response: Yes, change in national CPS to match liner thickness to same as CPS 521 Pond lining.

CPS 374 Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

Comment: Typos and Table/Figure references need corrected.

Response: No change, "onfarm" vs "on-farm" in definition locked for state revision.

CPS 670 Energy Efficient Lighting System

Comment: Typos and Table/Figure references need corrected

Response: Corrected. CRI range note at bottom of table in XML does not print to pdf, copied note to end of paragraph above table for clarity.



E384A Biochar

Comment: It looks like there could be a funding program under the Code E384A for biochar production in Ohio, but I don't think there is for someone to purchase biochar and have funding offset the cost of application. At least not yet in Ohio.

Response: CPS 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment has been adopted in Ohio. This conservation practice addresses the land application of carbon amendments including biochar.

General

Comment: Need indication of the proposed changes (redlines).

Response: Comment received. We will consider ways to better convey changes to the practice standards in the future. Currently National Practice Standard updates do not come with redlines, only summary language in the NHCP Notice. For now, the Tech Guide Notice will include summary language of changes in a similar format.

[Ohio]

Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service