

**Practice:** 101 - CNMP Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #9 - CNMP Revision

**Scenario Description:**

A Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CNMP) will be revised to address changes in manure management, volume or analysis, plants and crops, or plant and crop management or to adjust the nutrient balance on an Animal Feeding Operation (AFO). No modifications are required to engineered practices in the farmstead/production area. This scenario is where the services of a professional engineer are typically not required. The producer may export a portion of manure or organic products from the farm. The producer has an animal production area and land applies nutrients.

**Before Situation:**

The owner/operator of an AFO has an existing written Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CNMP) that addresses the current required resource concerns and client objectives present on the facility production area and land application areas. The CNMP is

**After Situation:**

Utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to update the nutrient management plan and design planned agronomic conservation practices that address the handling, storage, and application of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. Design and implementation will meet the general and additional applicable criteria found in each conservation practice. Design all agronomic conservation practices found in Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CPA 102) or Conservation Plan that addresses the planned practices for land application of manure and nutrients, and the handling, transfer, storage and treatment of animal wastes. Management and conservation practices in the CNMP document delivered to the client ensure that, if implemented, the AFO will properly, within applicable NRCS standards and specifications, store, handle, and contain manure and wastewater materials generated by the AFO; dispose of AFO mortality; implement conservation practices to reduce soil erosion on land application areas to sustainable levels; land apply waste material nutrients in a manner than meets NRCS 590 Nutrient Management standard technical criteria. Use CEMA 226 and CEMA 227 if site feasibility and evaluation of existing storages are needed.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,861.74 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,861.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 101 - CNMP Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #25 - All Livestock Operations, No Land Application

**Scenario Description:**

Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) without land application. Use only if CEMA 226 is needed. The producer exports (material transferred to another owner with written documentation of the transfer) manure or organic products from the farm. The operation has an animal production area. Select applicable CPA 102 component for a complete CNMP

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area does not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Manure not frequently tested. Various levels of management and conservation implementation have occurred on the farm. Little documentation of the systems

**After Situation:**

Utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to design planned conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. Design and implementation will meet the general and additional applicable criteria found in each conservation practice. Use only if CEMA 226 is needed. Management and conservation practices in the CNMP document delivered to the client ensure that, if implemented, the AFO will properly, within applicable NRCS standards and specifications, store, handle, and contain manure and wastewater materials generated by the AFO.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,115.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,115.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 101 - CNMP Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #41 - All Livestock Operations, Less Than or Equal to 300 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

All Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently less than 300 animal units (AU). The producer may export (material transferred to another owner with written documentation of the transfer) a portion of the manure or organic products from the farm. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Select applicable CPA 102 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current. Manure not frequently tested.

**After Situation:**

Utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to complete a nutrient management plan and implementation specifications for conservation practices treating resource concerns and the application of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner on the production and land treatment areas. Design and implementation will meet the general and additional applicable criteria found in each conservation practice. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's eFOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used. Complete Implementation Requirements or Job Sheets for all agronomic conservation practices found in Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CPA 102) or Conservation Plan that address the planned practices for land application of manure and nutrients and treat identified resource concerns. Use CEMA 226 and CEMA 227 if site feasibility and evaluation of existing storages are needed.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,635.39 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,635.39

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 101 - CNMP Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #73 - All Livestock Operations, 301 to 700 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

All Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently greater than 300 animal units (AU) and less than 700 AU with land application. The producer may export (material transferred to another owner with written documentation of the transfer) a portion of the manure or organic products from the farm. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Select applicable CPA 102 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current. Manure not frequently tested.

**After Situation:**

Utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to complete nutrient management plan and implementation specifications for conservation practices treating resource concerns and the application of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner on the production and land treatment areas. Design and implementation will meet the general and additional applicable criteria found in each conservation practice. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's eFOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used. Complete Implementation Requirements or Job Sheets for all agronomic conservation practices found in Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CPA 102) or Conservation Plan that address the planned practices for land application of manure and nutrients and treat identified resource concerns. Use CEMA 226 and CEMA 227 if site feasibility and evaluation of existing storages are needed.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,929.72 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,929.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 101 - CNMP Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #105 - All Livestock Operations, Greater Than 700 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

All Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently greater than 700 animal units (AU) with land application. The producer may export (material transferred to another owner with written documentation of the transfer) a portion of the manure or organic products from the farm. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Select applicable CPA 102 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current. Manure not frequently tested.

**After Situation:**

Utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to complete a nutrient management plan and implementation specifications for conservation practices treating resource concerns and the application of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner on the production of land treatment areas. Design and implementation will meet the general and additional applicable criteria found in each conservation practice. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's eFOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used. Complete Implementation Requirements or Job Sheets for all agronomic conservation practices found in Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan (CPA 102) or Conservation Plan that address the planned practices for land application of manure and nutrients and treat identified resource concerns. Use CEMA 226 and CEMA 227 if site feasibility and evaluation of existing storages are needed.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,295.86 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,295.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #355 - Dairy Operations, 301 to 700 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

Dairy Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) greater than 300 but less than 700 animal units (AU). The producer utilizes manure or organic products from the farm and may export a portion. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Select applicable DIA 101 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current or do not exist. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area and land a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP Certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 - CNMP identifies the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area and land application areas. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,864.25 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,864.25

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #371 - Dairy Operations, Less Than or Equal to 300 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

Dairy Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently is less than 300 animal units (AU). The producer utilizes manure or organic products from the farm and may export a portion. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Select applicable DIA 101 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current or do not exist. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area and land a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP Certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 - CNMP identifies the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area and land application areas. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,579.15 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,579.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #387 - Dairy Operations, No Land Application

**Scenario Description:**

Dairy Feeding Operation (AFO). The producer exports (material transferred to another owner with written documentation of the transfer) all manure or organic products from the farm. The operation has an animal production area only. There is no land treatment section, this plan would cover production only. Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Export only Plan, DIA 101 should not be used unless a CEMA 226 is needed.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area does not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area does not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. The owner/operator of a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling, storage, and transfer of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 -CNMP describes the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,837.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,837.06

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #403 - Non-Dairy Livestock Operations, No Land Application

**Scenario Description:**

Animal Feeding Operation (AFO). The producer exports (material transferred to another owner with written documentation of the transfer) all manure or organic products from the farm. The operation has an animal production area only. There is no land treatment section, this plan would cover production only. Use CEMA 227 for evaluation of existing components, if needed. Export only Plan, DIA 101 should not be used unless CEMA 226 is needed.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area does not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area does not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. The owner/operator of a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling, storage, and transfer of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 -CNMP describes the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,606.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,606.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #419 - Non-Dairy Operations, Greater Than 700 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently is greater than 700 animal units (AU). The producer utilizes manure or organic products from the farm and may export a portion. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Select applicable DIA 101 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current or do not exist. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area and land a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP Certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 - CNMP identifies the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area and land application areas. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,726.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,726.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #435 - Non-Dairy Livestock Operations, 301 to 700 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently is greater than 300 but less than 700 animal units (AU). The producer utilizes manure or organic products from the farm and may export a portion. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Select applicable DIA 101 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current or do not exist. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area and land a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP Certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 - CNMP identifies the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area and land application areas. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,011.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,011.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #451 - Non-Dairy Livestock Operations, Less Than or Equal to 300 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) currently is less than 300 animal units (AU). The producer utilizes manure or organic products from the farm and may export a portion. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Select applicable DIA 101 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current or do not exist. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area and land a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP Certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 - CNMP identifies the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area and land application areas. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,551.97 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,551.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 102 - Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan

**Scenario:** #467 - Dairy Operations, Greater Than 700 Animal Units

**Scenario Description:**

Dairy Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) greater than 700 animal units (AU). The producer utilizes manure or organic products from the farm and may export a portion. The operation has an animal production area, cropland, and applies most nutrients (manure and commercial fertilizers). Use CEMA 226/227 if site evaluation and evaluation of existing components are needed. Select applicable DIA 101 component for a complete CNMP.

**Before Situation:**

Currently the production area and land application areas do not meet NRCS quality criteria for water quality and soil erosion. Soil tests are not current or do not exist. Manure or Organic products are not frequently tested. The production area and land a

**After Situation:**

Utilize a CNMP Certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to plan conservation practices that address the handling and storage of animal waste in an environmentally safe manner. CPA 102 - CNMP identifies the conservation practice solutions to all identified resource concerns on the AFO production area and land application areas. Production, collection, transfer, treatment, and storage of manure and wastewater systems, mortality management facilities, as well as any rainfall or runoff diversion systems will be inventoried-evaluated and planned for adequacy according to applicable NRCS conservation practice standard technical criteria. Decisions presented within the CNMP have been made to mitigate, if feasible, negative air quality impacts and improve farmland safety and security.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,579.20 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,579.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 106 - Forest Management Plan

**Scenario:** #74 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, Less Than or Equal to 20 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land typically unmanaged or limited management activities. Typical site is approximately 1 to 20 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands without an existing forest management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Forest Management Plan or Conservation Plan Activities (CPA), as de

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Conservation Plan Activities (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Forest Management CPA is not considered a Forest Harvest Plan, but should complement the needs for harvest if desired by the land user. Additional CPA plan criteria is detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,610.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,610.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 106 - Forest Management Plan

**Scenario:** #75 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 21 to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land typically unmanaged or limited management activities. Typical site is approximately 21 to 100 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands without an existing forest management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Forest Management Plan or Conservation Plan Activities (CPA), as de

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Conservation Plan Activities (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Forest Management CPA is not considered a Forest Harvest Plan, but should complement the needs for harvest if desired by the land user. Additional CPA plan criteria is detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,372.71

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,372.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 106 - Forest Management Plan

**Scenario:** #76 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 101 to 250 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land typically unmanaged or limited management activities. Typical site is approximately 101 to 250 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands without an existing forest management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Forest Management Plan or Conservation Plan Activities (CPA), as de

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Conservation Plan Activities (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Forest Management CPA is not considered a Forest Harvest Plan, but should complement the needs for harvest if desired by the land user. Additional CPA plan criteria is detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,898.02

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,898.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 106 - Forest Management Plan

**Scenario:** #77 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land typically unmanaged or limited management activities. Typical site is approximately 1001 acres or greater in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands without an existing forest management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Forest Management Plan or Conservation Plan Activities (CPA), as de

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Conservation Plan Activities (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Forest Management CPA is not considered a Forest Harvest Plan, but should complement the needs for harvest if desired by the land user. Additional CPA plan criteria is detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,151.86

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,151.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 106 - Forest Management Plan

**Scenario:** #78 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 501 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land typically unmanaged or limited management activities. Typical site is approximately 501 to 1000 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands without an existing forest management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Forest Management Plan or Conservation Plan Activities (CPA), as de

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Conservation Plan Activities (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Forest Management CPA is not considered a Forest Harvest Plan, but should complement the needs for harvest if desired by the land user. Additional CPA plan criteria is detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,033.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,033.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 106 - Forest Management Plan

**Scenario:** #79 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 251 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land typically unmanaged or limited management activities. Typical site is approximately 251 to 500 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands without an existing forest management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Forest Management Plan or Conservation Plan Activities (CPA), as de

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Conservation Activity Plan (CPA). The CPA requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Forest Management CPA is not considered a Forest Harvest Plan, but should complement the needs for harvest if desired by the land user. Additional CPA plan requirements are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,762.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,762.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 110 - Grazing Management Plan

**Scenario:** #75 - Grazed Lands, 101 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Site specific conservation plan for grazed lands for an agricultural operation with 101 to 500 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of management of livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan to address identified natural resource concerns. Producer is interested in management of

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) plan for grazing lands. The CPA requires the plan to meet the General Requirements (steps 1-7) of the planning process. Step 1- Identify Problems and Opportunities, Step 2- Determine Objectives, Step 3-Inventory Resources, Step 4-Analyze Resource Data, Step 5-Formulate Alternatives, Step 6-Evaluate Alternatives, and Step 7-Make Decisions (Select Preferred Alternative).

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,141.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,141.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 110 - Grazing Management Plan

**Scenario:** #91 - Grazed Lands, Less Than or Equal to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Site specific conservation plan for agricultural operation with less than 100 acres grazed land. The plan will address the following natural resource concerns: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of management of livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan to address identified natural resource concerns. Producer is interested in management of

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) plan for grazing lands. The CPA requires the plan to meet the General Requirements (steps 1-7) of the planning process. Step 1- Identify Problems and Opportunities, Step 2- Determine Objectives, Step 3-Inventory Resources, Step 4-Analyze Resource Data, Step 5-Formulate Alternatives, Step 6-Evaluate Alternatives, and Step 7-Make Decisions (Select Preferred Alternative). The plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CPA meets the basic quality criteria for the CPA 110 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,513.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,513.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 110 - Grazing Management Plan

**Scenario:** #107 - Grazed Lands, 501 to 1,500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Site specific conservation plan for grazed lands for an agricultural operation with 501 to 1,500 acres of grazed land. The plan will address the following natural resource concerns: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of management of livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan to address identified natural resource concerns. Producer is interested in management of

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) plan for grazing lands. The CPA requires the plan to meet the General Requirements (steps 1-7) of the planning process. Step 1- Identify Problems and Opportunities, Step 2- Determine Objectives, Step 3-Inventory Resources, Step 4-Analyze Resource Data, Step 5-Formulate Alternatives, Step 6-Evaluate Alternatives, and Step 7-Make Decisions (Select Preferred Alternative). The plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CPA meets the basic quality criteria for the CPA 110 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,770.14

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,770.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 110 - Grazing Management Plan

**Scenario:** #123 - Grazed Lands, 1,501 to 5,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Site specific conservation plan for grazed lands for an agricultural operation with 1,501 to 5,000 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of management of livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan to address identified natural resource concerns. Producer is interested in management of

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) plan for grazing lands. The CPA requires the plan to meet the General Requirements (steps 1-7) of the planning process. Step 1- Identify Problems and Opportunities, Step 2- Determine Objectives, Step 3-Inventory Resources, Step 4-Analyze Resource Data, Step 5-Formulate Alternatives, Step 6-Evaluate Alternatives, and Step 7-Make Decisions (Select Preferred Alternative). The plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CPA meets the basic quality criteria for the CPA 110 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,398.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,398.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 110 - Grazing Management Plan

**Scenario:** #139 - Grazed Lands, 5,001 to 10,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Site specific conservation plan for grazed lands for an agricultural operation with 5,001 to 10,000 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of management of livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan to address identified natural resource concerns. Producer is interested in management of

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) plan for grazing lands. The CPA requires the plan to meet the General Requirements (steps 1-7) of the planning process. Step 1- Identify Problems and Opportunities, Step 2- Determine Objectives, Step 3-Inventory Resources, Step 4-Analyze Resource Data, Step 5-Formulate Alternatives, Step 6-Evaluate Alternatives, and Step 7-Make Decisions (Select Preferred Alternative). The plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CPA meets the basic quality criteria for the CPA 110 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,026.86 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,026.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 110 - Grazing Management Plan

**Scenario:** #155 - Grazed Lands, Greater Than 10,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Site specific conservation plan for grazed lands for an agricultural operation with greater than 10,000 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of management of livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan to address identified natural resource concerns. Producer is interested in management of

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) plan for grazing lands. The CPA requires the plan to meet the General Requirements (steps 1-7) of the planning process. Step 1- Identify Problems and Opportunities, Step 2- Determine Objectives, Step 3-Inventory Resources, Step 4-Analyze Resource Data, Step 5-Formulate Alternatives, Step 6-Evaluate Alternatives, and Step 7-Make Decisions (Select Preferred Alternative). The plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CPA meets the basic quality criteria for the CPA 110 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,655.22

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,655.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #89 - Organic Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,922.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,922.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #105 - Organic Crops Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,751.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,751.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #121 - Small Farm, Less Than or Equal to 10 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for a small farm (<10 acres).

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,719.41

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,719.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #137 - Organic Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,094.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,094.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #153 - Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,579.11

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,579.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #169 - Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,063.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,063.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #185 - Organic Crops Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,235.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,235.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #201 - Crops Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,407.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,407.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 116 - Soil Health Management Plan

**Scenario:** #217 - Crops Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages without an existing soil health management plan, or with an outdated plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan.

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of a Soil Health Conservation Plan Activity (CPA). The CPA criteria requires the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,891.35

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,891.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #9 - High Complexity, Greater Than or Equal to Six Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose several variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that cannot be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a “High Complexity” system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 30% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to two or more of the electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Complex analysis to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a detailed simulation is required to determine systems sizing and layout.) “High Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: comprehensive lighting system redesign; radiant heating systems; convert to tunnel ventilation; or convert to bench heating. Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than five practices are contracted, then, at a minimum, “6+ Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. Use this scenario if at least one design is deemed high complexity. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,068.11 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,068.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Medium Complexity, Greater Than or Equal to Six Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose some variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that can be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a "Medium Complexity" system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 10% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to either electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Analysis beyond the scope of NRCS methodology to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a simplified heat transfer model to determine heating, ventilation, and cooling loads may be required if existing device capacity cannot be estimated.) "Medium Complexity" practice scenarios include but are not limited to: change of lighting fixture counts or layout; wall insulation; grain dryers; add reverse osmosis to syrup production; or add evaporative cooling systems (cooling cells). Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than five practices are contracted, then, at a minimum, "6+ Designs" shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. If at least 1 scenario is more complex than indicated herein, use an alternate scenario for contracting. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,553.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,553.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Low Complexity, Greater Than or Equal to Six Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for one-to-one device retrofits. The scenario(s) may provide for a new component to modify the operation of an existing device (e.g., timer to reduce run-time). Three factors typically indicate a “Low Complexity” system, as follows. 1) New devices maintain output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) of the old devices within a roughly 10% range. 2) New devices are installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit does not require substantive changes to electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. “Low Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: lamp or fixture upgrades; attic insulation; fans; or washer-extractors. Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than five practices are contracted, then, at a minimum, “6+ Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. If at least 1 scenario is more complex than indicated herein, use an alternate scenario for contracting. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,038.92 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,038.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #57 - High Complexity, Four to Five Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose several variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that cannot be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a “High Complexity” system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 30% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to two or more of the electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Complex analysis to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a detailed simulation is required to determine systems sizing and layout.) “High Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: comprehensive lighting system redesign; radiant heating systems; convert to tunnel ventilation; or convert to bench heating. Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than three practices are contracted, then, at a minimum, “4-5 Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. Use this scenario if at least one design is deemed high complexity. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,407.48 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,407.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #73 - Medium Complexity, Four to Five Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose some variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that can be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a “Medium Complexity” system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 10% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to either electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Analysis beyond the scope of NRCS methodology to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a simplified heat transfer model to determine heating, ventilation, and cooling loads may be required if existing device capacity cannot be estimated.) “Medium Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: change of lighting fixture counts or layout; wall insulation; grain dryers; add reverse osmosis to syrup production; or add evaporative cooling systems (cooling cells). Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than three practices are contracted, then, at a minimum, “4-5 Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. If at least 1 scenario is more complex than indicated herein, use an alternate scenario for contracting. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,892.89 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,892.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #89 - Low Complexity, Four to Five Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for one-to-one device retrofits. The scenario(s) may provide for a new component to modify the operation of an existing device (e.g., timer to reduce run-time). Three factors typically indicate a “Low Complexity” system, as follows. 1) New devices maintain output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) of the old devices within a roughly 10% range. 2) New devices are installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit does not require substantive changes to electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. “Low Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: lamp or fixture upgrades; attic insulation; fans; or washer-extractors. Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than three practices are contracted, then, at a minimum, “4-5 Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. If at least 1 scenario is more complex than indicated herein, use an alternate scenario for contracting. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,378.29 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,378.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #105 - High Complexity, Two to Three Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose several variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that cannot be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a “High Complexity” system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 30% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to two or more of the electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Complex analysis to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a detailed simulation is required to determine systems sizing and layout.) “High Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: comprehensive lighting system redesign; radiant heating systems; convert to tunnel ventilation; or convert to bench heating. Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than one practice is contracted, then, at a minimum, “2-3 Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. Use this scenario if at least one design is deemed high complexity. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,746.86 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,746.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #121 - Medium Complexity, Two to Three Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose some variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that can be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a "Medium Complexity" system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 10% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to either electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Analysis beyond the scope of NRCS methodology to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a simplified heat transfer model to determine heating, ventilation, and cooling loads may be required if existing device capacity cannot be estimated.) "Medium Complexity" practice scenarios include but are not limited to: change of lighting fixture counts or layout; wall insulation; grain dryers; add reverse osmosis to syrup production; or add evaporative cooling systems (cooling cells). Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than one practice is contracted, then, at a minimum, "2-3 Designs" shall be contracted for Energy DIA. If at least 1 scenario is more complex than indicated herein, use an alternate scenario for contracting. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,232.26 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,232.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #137 - Low Complexity, Two to Three Designs

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with multiple energy practice scenarios. Associated scenario(s) provide for one-to-one device retrofits. The scenario(s) may provide for a new component to modify the operation of an existing device (e.g., timer to reduce run-time). Three factors typically indicate a “Low Complexity” system, as follows. 1) New devices maintain output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) of the old devices within a roughly 10% range. 2) New devices are installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit does not require substantive changes to electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. “Low Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: lamp or fixture upgrades; attic insulation; fans; or washer-extractors. Each “Design” indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. If more than one practice is contracted, then, at a minimum, “2-3 Designs” shall be contracted for the Ag Energy DIA. If at least 1 scenario is more complex than indicated herein, use an alternate scenario for contracting. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,717.66 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,717.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #153 - High Complexity, One Design

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) energy practice scenario. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose several variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that cannot be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a “High Complexity” system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 30% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to two or more of the electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Complex analysis to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a detailed simulation is required to determine systems sizing and layout.) “High Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: comprehensive lighting system redesign; radiant heating systems; convert to tunnel ventilation; or convert to bench heating. “One Design” indicates that each new device or component is closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,086.23 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,086.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #169 - Medium Complexity, One Design

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) energy practice scenario. Associated scenario(s) provide for retrofits that impose some variables in the design process. The scenarios may involve a change in service levels that can be evaluated or designed through use of simple tools or manual calculations. Four factors typically indicate a "Medium Complexity" system, as follows. 1) Client objectives require a change of output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) that varies more than about 10% from old devices. 2) System constraints prevent new devices from being installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit requires substantive changes to either electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. 4) Analysis beyond the scope of NRCS methodology to evaluate alternatives is required to confirm level of service and appropriate device output, placement, etc. (For example, a simplified heat transfer model to determine heating, ventilation, and cooling loads may be required if existing device capacity cannot be estimated.) "Medium Complexity" practice scenarios include but are not limited to: change of lighting fixture counts or layout; wall insulation; grain dryers; add reverse osmosis to syrup production; or add evaporative cooling systems (cooling cells). "One Design" indicates that each new device or component is closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,571.63 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,571.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 120 - Agricultural Energy Design

**Scenario:** #185 - Low Complexity, One Design

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to conserve energy through an EQUIP contract with at least one (1) energy practice scenario. Associated scenario(s) provide for one-to-one device retrofits. The scenario(s) may provide for a new component to modify the operation of an existing device (e.g., timer to reduce run-time). Three factors typically indicate a “Low Complexity” system, as follows. 1) New devices maintain output (hp, Btu/hr., lux, etc.) of the old devices within a roughly 10% range. 2) New devices are installed in the same location as the old devices. 3) The retrofit does not require substantive changes to electrical, mechanical, plumbing, or structural systems. “Low Complexity” practice scenarios include but are not limited to: lamp or fixture upgrades; attic insulation; fans; or washer-extractors. “One Design” indicates that each new device or component is closely related to other devices or components even if numerous scenarios are contracted. The Ag Energy DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address energy concerns. The Ag Energy DIA documents: a) the client’s final decisions related to the associated energy practice scenarios, b) estimated energy and greenhouse gas benefits; and c) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to transition their agricultural operation to become more energy efficient. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scenarios to address Energy Efficiency resource concerns using th

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Ag Energy DIA. The DIA 120 criteria include tasks needed to document the client’s decision, energy savings and design of conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 120 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,057.04 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,057.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #24 - Supporting Organic Transition for Crops and Livestock

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will transition from conventional to organic to meet USDA National Organic Program (NOP) requirements. Natural Resource Concern: Soil Erosion, Water Quality, Plant Condition, and other identified natural resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using traditional and conventional methods for farming and/or ranching mixed operation of crops and livestock. The producer currently manages the operation based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Th

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop the Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition Conservation Activity Plan (CAP) The CAP criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to implement a system of conservation practices which assist the producer to transition from conventional farming or ranching to an organic production system with crops and livestock. The CAP plan will include conservation practices which address related resource concerns. The CAP meets the basic quality criteria for the 138 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,447.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,447.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #41 - Transition to Organic for Crop, Low Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

A site specific conservation plan that contains planned conservation treatment activities for resource concerns resulting from the transition of conventional to organic production systems. At a minimum two alternatives will be developed. The first will be a no-action alternative in which current management activities are assumed to continue. The second will be an action alternative identifying a conservation practice or a system of conservation practices and management activities to address CPA identified resource concern(s). Additional action alternatives may be developed to identify different ways of achieving client objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current crops and rotation, farming practices (tillage, nutrient application methods, timing, source, and rate), soils, and equipment and technology utilized are not considered as Organic. The producer objectives are to become organic. The effect of chang

**After Situation:**

When evaluating conservation practice effects, the short term and long term effect on natural resources and the applicability and effect on special environmental concerns identified in Step-3 (Resource Inventory) must be documented. Include recommendations that will avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on soil, water, air, plants, animals (including livestock, fish, and wildlife), energy, or human concerns; as well as on special environmental concerns. The Organic System Plan Template supplements are completed as part of NRCS Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) 138 that helps farmers who are interested in transitioning from conventional farming practices to organic production by addressing the natural resource concerns on their operation.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,588.07 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,588.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #57 - Transition to Organic for Crop, High Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

A site specific conservation plan that contains planned conservation treatment activities for resource concerns resulting from the transition of conventional to organic production systems. Crop production system is more complex based on site features, large acreage, specialty crops, irrigation, orchard and vineyards. At a minimum two alternatives will be developed. The first will be a no-action alternative in which current management activities are assumed to continue. The second will be an action alternative identifying a conservation practice or a system of conservation practices and management activities to address CPA identified resource concern(s). Additional action alternatives may be developed to identify different ways of achieving client objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current crops and rotation, farming practices (tillage, nutrient application methods, timing, source, and rate), soils, and equipment and technology utilized are not considered as Organic. The producer objectives are to become organic. The effect of chang

**After Situation:**

When evaluating conservation practice effects, the short term and long term effect on natural resources and the applicability and effect on special environmental concerns identified in Step-3 (Resource Inventory) must be documented. Include recommendations that will avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on soil, water, air, plants, animals (including livestock, fish, and wildlife), energy, or human concerns; as well as on special environmental concerns. The Organic System Plan Template supplements are completed as part of NRCS Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) 138 that helps farmers who are interested in transitioning from conventional farming practices to organic production by addressing the natural resource concerns on their operation.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,447.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,447.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #73 - Transition to Organic for Livestock, Low Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

A site specific conservation plan that contains planned conservation treatment activities for resource concerns resulting from the transition of conventional to organic livestock systems. At a minimum two alternatives will be developed. The first will be a no-action alternative in which current management activities are assumed to continue. The second will be an action alternative identifying a conservation practice or a system of conservation practices and management activities to address CPA identified resource concern(s). Additional action alternatives may be developed to identify different ways of achieving client objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current livestock production, housing, feed, equipment and technology utilized are not considered as Organic. The producer objectives are to become organic. The effect of changes to the current system are not known and new resource concerns may emerge.

**After Situation:**

When evaluating conservation practice effects, the short term and long term effect on natural resources and the applicability and effect on special environmental concerns identified in Step-3 (Resource Inventory) must be documented. Include recommendations that will avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on soil, water, air, plants, animals (including livestock, fish, and wildlife), energy, or human concerns; as well as on special environmental concerns. The Organic System Plan Template supplements are completed as part of NRCS Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) 138 that helps farmers who are interested in transitioning from conventional farming practices to organic production by addressing the natural resource concerns on their operation.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,017.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,017.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #89 - Transition to Organic for Livestock, High Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

A site specific conservation plan that contains planned conservation treatment activities for resource concerns resulting from the transition of conventional to organic livestock systems. System is high complexity based on conditions such as large Animal Units, multiple production locations, age segregation and similar management. At a minimum two alternatives will be developed. The first will be a no-action alternative in which current management activities are assumed to continue. The second will be an action alternative identifying a conservation practice or a system of conservation practices and management activities to address CPA identified resource concern(s). Additional action alternatives may be developed to identify different ways of achieving client objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current livestock production, housing, feed, equipment and technology utilized are not considered as Organic. The producer objectives are to become organic. The effect of changes to the current system are not known and new resource concerns may emerge.

**After Situation:**

When evaluating conservation practice effects, the short term and long term effect on natural resources and the applicability and effect on special environmental concerns identified in Step-3 (Resource Inventory) must be documented. Include recommendations that will avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on soil, water, air, plants, animals (including livestock, fish, and wildlife), energy, or human concerns; as well as on special environmental concerns. The Organic System Plan Template supplements are completed as part of NRCS Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) 138 that helps farmers who are interested in transitioning from conventional farming practices to organic production by addressing the natural resource concerns on their operation.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,015.74 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,015.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #105 - Transition to Organic for Crop and Livestock, Low Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

A site specific conservation plan that contains planned conservation treatment activities for resource concerns resulting from the transition of conventional to organic crop and livestock production systems. At a minimum two alternatives will be developed. The first will be a no-action alternative in which current management activities are assumed to continue. The second will be an action alternative identifying a conservation practice or a system of conservation practices and management activities to address CPA identified resource concern(s). Additional action alternatives may be developed to identify different ways of achieving client objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current crops and rotation, livestock management and feeding, farming practices (tillage, nutrient application methods, timing, source, and rate), soils, and equipment and technology utilized are not considered as Organic. The producer objectives are to b

**After Situation:**

When evaluating conservation practice effects, the short term and long term effect on natural resources and the applicability and effect on special environmental concerns identified in Step-3 (Resource Inventory) must be documented. Include recommendations that will avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on soil, water, air, plants, animals (including livestock, fish, and wildlife), energy, or human concerns; as well as on special environmental concerns. The Organic System Plan Template supplements are completed as part of NRCS Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) 138 that helps farmers who are interested in transitioning from conventional farming practices to organic production by addressing the natural resource concerns on their operation.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,447.78 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,447.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 138 - Conservation Plan Supporting Organic Transition

**Scenario:** #121 - Transition to Organic for Crop and Livestock, High Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

A site specific conservation plan that contains planned conservation treatment activities for resource concerns resulting from the transition of conventional to organic crop and livestock production systems. Increased crop acreage, irrigation, specialty crops, orchards and vineyards, large AUs, age segregation management add complexity to the system. At a minimum two alternatives will be developed. The first will be a no-action alternative in which current management activities are assumed to continue. The second will be an action alternative identifying a conservation practice or a system of conservation practices and management activities to address CPA identified resource concern(s). Additional action alternatives may be developed to identify different ways of achieving client objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current crops and rotation, livestock management and feeding, farming practices (tillage, nutrient application methods, timing, source, and rate), soils, and equipment and technology utilized are not considered as Organic. The producer objectives are to b

**After Situation:**

When evaluating conservation practice effects, the short term and long term effect on natural resources and the applicability and effect on special environmental concerns identified in Step-3 (Resource Inventory) must be documented. Include recommendations that will avoid or mitigate any adverse effects on soil, water, air, plants, animals (including livestock, fish, and wildlife), energy, or human concerns; as well as on special environmental concerns. The Organic System Plan Template supplements are completed as part of NRCS Conservation Planning Activity (CPA) 138 that helps farmers who are interested in transitioning from conventional farming practices to organic production by addressing the natural resource concerns on their operation.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,445.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,445.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 140 - Transition to Organic Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Low Complexity Conservation Practices, One to Four

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will transition from conventional production to organic production. They will meet the USDA National Organic Program (NOP) requirements. All Natural resources will be addressed: Soil, Water, Air, Plants and Animals. Will address resource concerns with 1 - 4, low complexity conservation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using conventional agricultural production methods. Producer will transition all or part of the farm operation to meet national USDA NOP requirements for organic certification. The producer will collaborate with a

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to meet organic certification requirements. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,962.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,962.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 140 - Transition to Organic Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Low Complexity Conservation Practices, Greater Than or Equal to Five

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will transition from conventional production to organic production. They will meet the USDA National Organic Program (NOP) requirements. All Natural resources will be addressed: Soil, Water, Air, Plants and Animals. Will address resources concerns with 5 or more conservation practices with low complexity.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using conventional agricultural production methods. Producer will transition all or part of the farm operation to meet national USDA NOP requirements for organic certification. The producer will collaborate with a

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to meet organic certification requirements. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,856.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,856.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 140 - Transition to Organic Design

**Scenario:** #41 - High Complexity Conservation Practices, One to Four

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will transition from conventional production to organic production. They will meet the USDA National Organic Program (NOP) requirements. All Natural resources will be addressed: Soil, Water, Air, Plants, and Animals. Will address resource concerns with 1 - 4, high complexity conservation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using conventional agricultural production methods. Producer will transition all or part of the farm operation to meet national USDA NOP requirements for organic certification. The producer will collaborate with a

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to meet organic certification requirements. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,752.61

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12,752.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 140 - Transition to Organic Design

**Scenario:** #57 - High Complexity Conservation Practices, Greater Than or Equal to Five

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will transition from conventional production to organic production. They will meet the USDA National Organic Program (NOP) requirements. All Natural resources will be addressed: Soil, Water, Air, Plants and Animals. Will address resource concerns with 5 or more, high complexity conservation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using conventional agricultural production methods. Producer will transition all or part of the farm operation to meet national USDA NOP requirements for organic certification. The producer will collaborate with a

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to meet organic certification requirements. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,436.72

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16,436.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 144 - Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Habitat Design, One Land Use

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses. Natural Resource Concerns: Terrestrial Habitat and/or Aquatic Habitat on an agricultural operation. The Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design and Implementation Activity (DIA) addresses fish and wildlife habitat management relative to only one land use on the agricultural operation.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or knowledge of development or management of fish and/or wildlife habitat. The producer does not currently manage or enhance habitat to promote opportunities for fish and/or wildlife habitat. Within existing land uses, the producer is

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, the participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to meet quality criteria for the primary fish/wildlife habitat resource concern and provides for opportunities to improve, restore, or enhance habitat that supports native and/or managed species. The DIA may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 144 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Design & Implementation PI

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,277.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,277.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 144 - Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Habitat Design, Two Land Uses

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses. Natural Resource Concerns: Terrestrial Habitat and/or Aquatic Habitat on an agricultural operation. The Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design and Implementation Activity (DIA) addresses fish and wildlife habitat management relative to two land uses on the agricultural operation of which each land use is at least 20 acres in size.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or knowledge of development or management of fish and/or wildlife habitat. The producer does not currently manage or enhance habitat to promote opportunities for fish and/or wildlife habitat. Within existing land uses, the producer is

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, the participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to meet quality criteria for the primary fish/wildlife habitat resource concern and provides for opportunities to improve, restore, or enhance habitat that supports native and/or managed species. The DIA may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 144 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Fish and Wildlife Habitat DI

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,006.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,006.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 144 - Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Habitat Design, Three or More Land Uses

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses. Natural Resource Concerns: Terrestrial Habitat and/or Aquatic Habitat on an agricultural operation. The Fish and Wildlife Habitat Design and Implementation Activity (DIA) addresses fish and wildlife habitat management relative to three or more land uses on the agricultural operation of which at least three of the land uses are at least 20 acres in size.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or knowledge of development or management of fish and/or wildlife habitat. The producer does not currently manage or enhance habitat to promote opportunities for fish and/or wildlife habitat. Within existing land uses, the producer is

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, the participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Fish and Wildlife Habitat DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to meet quality criteria for the primary fish/wildlife habitat resource concern and provides for opportunities to improve, restore, or enhance habitat that supports native and/or managed species. The DIA may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 144 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Fish and Wildlife Habitat DI

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,734.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,734.88

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 148 - Pollinator Habitat Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Pollinator Habitat, No Local TSP

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses, No qualified TSP within 300 miles. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife, Plant Condition, Soil Erosion, Water Quality on an agricultural operation.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer currently has no plan or knowledge of development or management of pollinator habitat. The producer does not currently manage or enhance habitat to promote opportunities for pollinator habitat. Within existing land uses, the producer

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Pollinator Habitat Enhancement Conservation Activity Plan (CAP). The CAP criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to improve, restore, or enhance flower-rich habitat that supports native and/or managed pollinator species. The CAP plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CAP meets the basic quality criteria for the 146 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,554.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,554.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 148 - Pollinator Habitat Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Pollinator Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife, Plant Condition, Soil Erosion, Water Quality on an agricultural operation.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer currently has no plan or knowledge of development or management of pollinator habitat. The producer does not currently manage or enhance habitat to promote opportunities for pollinator habitat. Within existing land uses, the producer

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Pollinator Habitat Enhancement Conservation Activity Plan (CAP). The CAP criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to improve, restore, or enhance flower-rich habitat that supports native and/or managed pollinator species. The CAP plan may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The CAP meets the basic quality criteria for the 146 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,824.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,824.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 157 - Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #9 - Nutrient Management, 101 to 300 Acres Fertilizer and Manure

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses where natural or artificial amendments are applied. Natural Resource Concern: Water Quality, Soil Erosion, Water Quantity, and other associated resource concerns. Manure may be imported.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has no plan or minimal knowledge for the application and management of nutrients. The producer currently manages nutrient application based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Producer is interested in management of nut

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Nutrient Management conservation activity plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 157 and 590 Nutrient Management. The DIA criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for Soils, Water Quality and Air Quality resource concerns and other applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to manage nutrients for plant production and address offsite movement of nutrients. The design may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. Meets the basic quality criteria for the DIA 157 as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide and CPS 590 Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,759.71

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,759.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 157 - Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #25 - Nutrient Management, 101 to 300 Acres and No Manure

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses where natural or artificial amendments are applied. Natural Resource Concern: Water Quality, Soil Erosion, Water Quantity, and other associated resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has no plan or minimal knowledge for the application and management of nutrients. The producer currently manages nutrient application based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Producer is interested in management of nut

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Nutrient Management conservation activity plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 157 and 590 Nutrient Management. The DIA criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for Soils, Water Quality and Air Quality resource concerns and other applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to manage nutrients for plant production and address offsite movement of nutrients. The design may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. Meets the basic quality criteria for the DIA 157 as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide and CPS 590 Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,434.12 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,434.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 157 - Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #41 - Nutrient Management, Greater Than 300 Acres and No Manure

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses where natural or artificial amendments are applied. Natural Resource Concern: Water Quality, Soil Erosion, Water Quantity, and other associated resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has no plan or minimal knowledge for the application and management of nutrients. The producer currently manages nutrient application based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Producer is interested in management of nut

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Nutrient Management conservation activity plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 157 and 590 Nutrient Management. The DIA criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for Soils, Water Quality and Air Quality resource concerns and other applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to manage nutrients for plant production and address offsite movement of nutrients. The design may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. Meets the basic quality criteria for the DIA 157 as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide and CPS 590 Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,542.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,542.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 157 - Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #57 - Nutrient Management, Less Than or Equal to 100 Acres Fertilizer and Manure

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses where natural or artificial amendments are applied. Natural Resource Concern: Water Quality, Soil Erosion, Water Quantity, and other associated resource concerns. Manure may be imported.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has no plan or minimal knowledge for the application and management of nutrients. The producer currently manages nutrient application based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Producer is interested in management of nut

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Nutrient Management conservation activity plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 157 and 590 Nutrient Management. The DIA criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for Soils, Water Quality and Air Quality resource concerns and other applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to manage nutrients for plant production and address offsite movement of nutrients. The design may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. Meets the basic quality criteria for the DIA 157 as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide and CPS 590 Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,542.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,542.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 157 - Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #73 - Nutrient Management, Less Than or Equal to 100 Acres and No Manure

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses where natural or artificial amendments are applied. Natural Resource Concern: Water Quality, Soil Erosion, Water Quantity, and other associated resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has no plan or minimal knowledge for the application and management of nutrients. The producer currently manages nutrient application based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Producer is interested in management of nut

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Nutrient Management conservation activity plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 157 and 590 Nutrient Management. The DIA criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for Soils, Water Quality and Air Quality resource concerns and other applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to manage nutrients for plant production and address offsite movement of nutrients. The design may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. Meets the basic quality criteria for the DIA 157 as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide and CPS 590 Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,325.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,325.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 157 - Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity

**Scenario:** #89 - Nutrient Management, Greater Than 300 Acres Fertilizer and Manure

**Scenario Description:**

Various on-farm land uses where natural or artificial amendments are applied. Natural Resource Concern: Water Quality, Soil Erosion, Water Quantity, and other associated resource concerns. Manure may be imported.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has no plan or minimal knowledge for the application and management of nutrients. The producer currently manages nutrient application based upon personal knowledge, or other local criteria. Producer is interested in management of nut

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Nutrient Management conservation activity plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 157 and 590 Nutrient Management. The DIA criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for Soils, Water Quality and Air Quality resource concerns and other applicable resource concerns and provides for opportunities to manage nutrients for plant production and address offsite movement of nutrients. The design may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. Meets the basic quality criteria for the DIA 157 as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide and CPS 590 Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,422.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,422.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 158 - Feed Management Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Feed Management Plan

**Scenario Description:**

The owner/operator of an Animal Feeding Operation (AFO) has not received a written Feed Management Plan that addresses all resource concerns present on the facility. Various levels of management and conservation implementation has occurred in the operation. Little documentation of the methods of feed management used and practices installed exists, and the producer is not likely to developed a complete forage inventory or nutrient analysis. The producer may or may not have a conservation plan or a nutrient management plan. Nutrient management related resource concerns on the operation remain to be addressed through the development of a complete activity plan including management and conservation practices for proper quantity and quality of available nutrients, feedstuffs, and/or additives fed to livestock or poultry that may be present on the operation. Present operation and feed methodology poses risk of feeding excessive amounts of nutrients in animal manure which result in negative impacts to water quality and odor resource concerns. Negative water and air quality impacts as well as farmstead safety and security issues may remain on the AFO, and inadequate record-keeping nutrient, inspection and monitoring of the existing operation may need further improvement.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have a plan or has limited knowledge of management of feed, nutrients, feedstuffs, or nutritional additives provided to domestic livestock and poultry. The producer currently manages feed without a plan which would address livestock prod

**After Situation:**

Participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Feed Management plan (CAP). The criteria requires the plan to meet quality criteria for applicable natural resource concerns and provides for opportunities to identify and implement conservation practices related to management of feed, forages, or delivery of supplements to maximize efficient feeding operations and livestock growth. The plan may serve as the basis for implementation of the primary conservation practice 592 - Feed Management. If applicable, the plan may also be developed to complement Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plans (CNMP) or to help meet requirements of NRCS practice standard 590 - Nutrient Management. The plan may include recommendations for addressing associated natural resource concerns with other conservation practices.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,434.12 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,434.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 159 - Grazing Management Design

**Scenario:** #105 - Grazed Lands, Less Than or Equal to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation activities for agricultural operation with less than 100 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of conservation practices to effectively manage livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan or implemented conservation practices to address identify

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Grazing Management DIA. The DIA criteria requires the design and implementation of grazing activities as a component of the CPA to address resource concerns and to meet criteria for applicable conservation practices including practices such as: Prescribed Grazing Management (528), Brush Management (314), Fencing (382), Forage Harvest Management (511), Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548), Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315), Pasture and Hay Planting (512), Range Planting (550), and any additional conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 159 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,675.62 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,675.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 159 - Grazing Management Design

**Scenario:** #121 - Grazed Lands, 101 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation activities for an agricultural operation with 101 to 500 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of conservation practices to effectively manage livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan or implemented conservation practices to address identify

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Grazing Management DIA. The DIA criteria requires the design and implementation of grazing activities as a component of the CPA to address resource concerns and to meet criteria for applicable conservation practices including practices such as: Prescribed Grazing Management (528), Brush Management (314), Fencing (382), Forage Harvest Management (511), Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548), Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315), Pasture and Hay Planting (512), Range Planting (550), and any additional conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 159 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,094.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,094.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 159 - Grazing Management Design

**Scenario:** #137 - Grazed Lands, 501 to 1,500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation activities for agricultural operation with 501 to 1,500 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of conservation practices to effectively manage livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan or implemented conservation practices to address identify

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Grazing Management DIA. The DIA criteria requires the design and implementation of grazing activities as a component of the CPA to address resource concerns and to meet criteria for applicable conservation practices including practices such as: Prescribed Grazing Management (528), Brush Management (314), Fencing (382), Forage Harvest Management (511), Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548), Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315), Pasture and Hay Planting (512), Range Planting (550), and any additional conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 159 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,513.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,513.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 159 - Grazing Management Design

**Scenario:** #153 - Grazed Lands, 1,501 to 5,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation activity for an agricultural operation with 1,501 to 5,000 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of conservation practices to effectively manage livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan or implemented conservation practices to address identify

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Grazing Management DIA. The DIA criteria requires the design and implementation of grazing activities as a component of the CPA to address resource concerns and to meet criteria for applicable conservation practices including practices such as: Prescribed Grazing Management (528), Brush Management (314), Fencing (382), Forage Harvest Management (511), Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548), Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315), Pasture and Hay Planting (512), Range Planting (550), and any additional conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 159 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,932.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,932.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 159 - Grazing Management Design

**Scenario:** #169 - Grazed Lands, 5,001 to 10,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation activities for an agricultural operation with 5,001 to 10,000 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of conservation practices to effectively manage livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan or implemented conservation practices to address identify

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Grazing Management DIA. The DIA criteria requires the design and implementation of grazing activities as a component of the CPA to address resource concerns and to meet criteria for applicable conservation practices including practices such as: Prescribed Grazing Management (528), Brush Management (314), Fencing (382), Forage Harvest Management (511), Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548), Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315), Pasture and Hay Planting (512), Range Planting (550), and any additional conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 159 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,351.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,351.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 159 - Grazing Management Design

**Scenario:** #185 - Grazed Lands, Greater Than 10,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation activities for an agricultural operation with greater than 10,000 acres grazed land. The following natural resource concerns will be addressed: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, and all other appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no plan or limited knowledge of conservation practices to effectively manage livestock or other animals on grazed land resources. The producer currently manages animals without a plan or implemented conservation practices to address identify

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Grazing Management DIA. The DIA criteria requires the design and implementation of grazing activities as a component of the CPA to address resource concerns and to meet criteria for applicable conservation practices including practices such as: Prescribed Grazing Management (528), Brush Management (314), Fencing (382), Forage Harvest Management (511), Grazing Land Mechanical Treatment (548), Herbaceous Weed Treatment (315), Pasture and Hay Planting (512), Range Planting (550), and any additional conservation practices which address other related resource concerns. The DIA meets the basic quality criteria for the 159 plan as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,770.14 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,770.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 160 - Prescribed Burning Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Burn Implementation, Less Than or Equal to 20 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Non Industrial Private Forest Land, Pasture or Range Land typically less than or equal to 20 acres in size and is dominated by fire tolerant species that are competing with undesirable vegetation and accumulating fuel load. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no existing plan or an obsolete plan that is insufficient for current stand condition. A Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA is needed to enable the producer to apply for financial assistance through EQIP or other financial assistance programs in

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) for development of the Prescribed Burning DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Prescribed Burning Plan DIA is not considered a Forest Management Plan, a Reforestation Plan, a Forest Harvest Plan, or a Prescribed Grazing Plan, but should complement the needs of those plans if they exist and if desired by the decision maker. The DIA plan will fully describe all aspects of the prescribed burn including, but not limited to objectives of the burn (i.e., site preparation, wildlife habitat, etc.), site conditions (i.e., fuel load, fuel type, etc.), implementation strategies (i.e., method of ignition, number of persons required, equipment needs, etc.), tolerable weather parameters (i.e., wind direction, relative humidity, mixing height, etc.) and identification of Smoke Sensitive Areas. Additional DIA plan criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide and potentially state developed technical criteria.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,271.09 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,271.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 160 - Prescribed Burning Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Burn Implementation, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Non Industrial Private Forest Land, Pasture or Range Land typically greater than 1,000 acres in size and is dominated by fire tolerant species that are competing with undesirable vegetation and accumulating fuel load. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no existing plan or an obsolete plan that is insufficient for current stand condition. A Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA is needed to enable the producer to apply for financial assistance through EQIP or other financial assistance programs in

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) for development of the Prescribed Burning Plan (DIA). The DIA criteria require the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Prescribed Burning Plan DIA is not considered a Forest Management Plan, a Reforestation Plan, a Forest Harvest Plan, or a Prescribed Grazing Plan, but should complement the needs of those plans if they exist and if desired by the decision maker. The DIA plan will fully describe all aspects of the prescribed burn including, but not limited to objectives of the burn (i.e., site preparation, wildlife habitat, etc.), site conditions (i.e., fuel load, fuel type, etc.), implementation strategies (i.e., method of ignition, number of persons required, equipment needs, etc.), tolerable weather parameters (i.e., wind direction, relative humidity, mixing height, etc.) and identification of Smoke Sensitive Areas. Additional DIA plan criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide and potentially state developed technical criteria.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,084.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,084.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 160 - Prescribed Burning Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Burn Implementation, 501 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Non Industrial Private Forest Land, Pasture or Range Land typically greater than 501 acres and less than 1,000 acres in size and is dominated by fire tolerant species that are competing with undesirable vegetation and accumulating fuel load. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no existing plan or an obsolete plan that is insufficient for current stand condition. A Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA is needed to enable the producer to apply for financial assistance through EQIP or other financial assistance programs in

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) for development of the Prescribed Burning Plan DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Prescribed Burning Plan DIA is not considered a Forest Management Plan, a Reforestation Plan, a Forest Harvest Plan, or a Prescribed Grazing Plan, but should complement the needs of those plans if they exist and if desired by the decision maker. The DIA plan will fully describe all aspects of the prescribed burn including, but not limited to objectives of the burn (i.e., site preparation, wildlife habitat, etc.), site conditions (i.e., fuel load, fuel type, etc.), implementation strategies (i.e., method of ignition, number of persons required, equipment needs, etc.), tolerable weather parameters (i.e., wind direction, relative humidity, mixing height, etc.) and identification of Smoke Sensitive Areas. Additional DIA plan criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide and potentially state developed technical criteria.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,389.58 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,389.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 160 - Prescribed Burning Design

**Scenario:** #57 - Burn Implementation, 251 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Non Industrial Private Forest Land, Pasture or Range Land typically greater than 251 acres and less than 500 acres in size and is dominated by fire tolerant species that are competing with undesirable vegetation and accumulating fuel load. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no existing plan or an obsolete plan that is insufficient for current stand condition. A Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA is needed to enable the producer to apply for financial assistance through EQIP or other financial assistance programs in

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) for development of the Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Prescribed Burning Plan DIA is not considered a Forest Management Plan, a Reforestation Plan, a Forest Harvest Plan, or a Prescribed Grazing Plan, but should complement the needs of those plans if they exist and if desired by the decision maker. The DIA plan will fully describe all aspects of the prescribed burn including, but not limited to objectives of the burn (i.e., site preparation, wildlife habitat, etc.), site conditions (i.e., fuel load, fuel type, etc.), implementation strategies (i.e., method of ignition, number of persons required, equipment needs, etc.), tolerable weather parameters (i.e., wind direction, relative humidity, mixing height, etc.) and identification of Smoke Sensitive Areas. Additional DIA plan criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide and potentially state developed technical criteria.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,542.18 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,542.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 160 - Prescribed Burning Design

**Scenario:** #73 - Burn Implementation, 101 to 250 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Non Industrial Private Forest Land, Pasture or Range Land typically greater than 101 acres in size and less than 250 acres and is dominated by fire tolerant species that are competing with undesirable vegetation and accumulating fuel load. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no existing plan or an obsolete plan that is insufficient for current stand condition. A Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA is needed to enable the producer to apply for financial assistance through EQIP or other financial assistance programs in

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) for development of the Prescribed Burning Plan DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Prescribed Burning Plan DIA is not considered a Forest Management Plan, a Reforestation Plan, a Forest Harvest Plan, or a Prescribed Grazing Plan, but should complement the needs of those plans if they exist and if desired by the decision maker. The DIA plan will fully describe all aspects of the prescribed burn including, but not limited to objectives of the burn (i.e., site preparation, wildlife habitat, etc.), site conditions (i.e., fuel load, fuel type, etc.), implementation strategies (i.e., method of ignition, number of persons required, equipment needs, etc.), tolerable weather parameters (i.e., wind direction, relative humidity, mixing height, etc.) and identification of Smoke Sensitive Areas. Additional DIA plan criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide and potentially state developed technical criteria.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,118.49

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,118.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 160 - Prescribed Burning Design

**Scenario:** #89 - Burn Implementation, 21 to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Non Industrial Private Forest Land, Pasture or Range Land typically greater than 21 acres and less than 100 acres in size and is dominated by fire tolerant species that are competing with undesirable vegetation and accumulating fuel load. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has no existing plan or an obsolete plan that is insufficient for current stand condition. A Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA is needed to enable the producer to apply for financial assistance through EQIP or other financial assistance programs in

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) for development of the Prescribed Burning Plan or DIA. The DIA criteria require the plan to identify approved Field Office Technical Guide conservation practices where needed to address identified resource concerns. The Prescribed Burning Plan DIA is not considered a Forest Management Plan, a Reforestation Plan, a Forest Harvest Plan, or a Prescribed Grazing Plan, but should complement the needs of those plans if they exist and if desired by the decision maker. The DIA plan will fully describe all aspects of the prescribed burn including, but not limited to objectives of the burn (i.e., site preparation, wildlife habitat, etc.), site conditions (i.e., fuel load, fuel type, etc.), implementation strategies (i.e., method of ignition, number of persons required, equipment needs, etc.), tolerable weather parameters (i.e., wind direction, relative humidity, mixing height, etc.) and identification of Smoke Sensitive Areas. Additional DIA plan criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide and potentially state developed technical criteria.

**Feature Measure:** 1

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,694.79 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,694.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 161 - Pest Management Conservation System Design

**Scenario:** #9 - High Complexity Conservation Practices, Greater Than or Equal to Five

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will implement high complexity conservation practices and PAMS activities as part of an overall Pest Management Conservation System. Natural resources relating to CPS 595 Pest Management Conservation System will be addressed. Will address resource concerns with 5 or more, high complexity conservation practices and/or PAMS activities.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using few pest management strategies. The producer will collaborate with a certified TSP to develop implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices and PAMS activities t

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to address resource concerns. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. PAMS activities according to IPM plan and Land Grant University guidelines. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,510.65 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,510.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 161 - Pest Management Conservation System Design

**Scenario:** #25 - High Complexity Conservation Practices, One to Four

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will implement high complexity conservation practices and PAMS activities as part of an overall Pest Management Conservation System. Natural resources relating to CPS 595 Pest Management Conservation System will be addressed. Will address resource concerns with 1 - 4, high complexity conservation practices and/or PAMS activities.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using few pest management strategies. The producer will collaborate with a certified TSP to develop implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices and PAMS activities t

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to address resource concerns. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. PAMS activities according to IPM plan and Land Grant University guidelines. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,901.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,901.80

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 161 - Pest Management Conservation System Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Low Complexity Conservation Practices, Greater Than or Equal to Five

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will implement low complexity conservation practices and PAMS activities as part of an overall Pest Management Conservation System. Natural resources relating to CPS 595 Pest Management Conservation System will be addressed. Will address resource concerns with 5 or more, low complexity conservation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using few pest management strategies. The producer will collaborate with a certified TSP to develop implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices and PAMS activities t

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to address resource concerns. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. PAMS activities according to IPM plan and Land Grant University guidelines. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,860.81 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,860.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 161 - Pest Management Conservation System Design

**Scenario:** #57 - Low Complexity Conservation Practices, One to Four

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation where producer will implement low complexity conservation practices and PAMS activities as part of an overall Pest Management Conservation System. Natural resources relating to CPS 595 Pest Management Conservation System will be addressed. Will address resource concerns with 1 - 4, low complexity conservation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural operation currently managed using few pest management strategies. The producer will collaborate with a certified TSP to develop implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices and PAMS activities t

**After Situation:**

After NRCS program contract is approved, participant will obtain services from a certified TSP to develop the required implementation requirements and/or designs and specifications for all conservation practices required to address resource concerns. All practices installed according to field office technical guide requirements. PAMS activities according to IPM plan and Land Grant University guidelines. Implementation requirements, designs and specifications all complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,251.96 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,251.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Organic Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for up to 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU and can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has collabor

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,094.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,094.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Crops Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for more than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has a written

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,099.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,099.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has a written

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,542.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,542.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #57 - Small Farm, Less Than or Equal to 10 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for a small farm operation of less than 10 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has collabor

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,325.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,325.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #73 - Crops Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU and can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has collabor

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,212.41 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,212.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #89 - Organic Crops Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU and can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has collabor

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,877.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,877.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #105 - Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Less Than Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for fewer than 5 Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has a written

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,434.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,434.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #121 - Organic Crops Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has a written

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,651.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,651.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 162 - Soil Health Management System Design

**Scenario:** #137 - Organic Crops and Livestock Soil Health Management, Greater Than or Equal to Five Units

**Scenario Description:**

Evaluate soil health concerns and develop a transitional cropping management plan to improve overall soil health and address all 4 soil health principles. The plan includes management activities or land management practices associated with crop and forage production. The soil health management plan ensures that the purposes of crop and forage production and preservation of natural resources related to soil health are compatible. May simultaneously implement 216 Soil Health Testing CEMA to evaluate baseline soil health and inventory basic or additional soil health indicators. The plan is developed for 5 or more Soil Health Management Units (SHMU) for organic crops and livestock. A SHMU is 1 or more planning land units with similar soil type, land use, and management. A SHMU can vary in size or acreage depending on soil texture, topography, and cropping system.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management. Producer has a written

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Soil Health Management Plan consistent with the criteria in DIA 162. The DIA criteria requires the plan address all 4 soil health principles. Meets the planning criteria for DIA 162 and facilitating soil health practices as referenced in FOTG.

**Feature Measure:** each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,868.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,868.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 163 - Irrigation Water Management Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Designs without Pump Test, One to Two

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address irrigation water use inefficiency and all other appropriate resource concerns through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) irrigation practice scenario. The pump for the irrigation system is of known performance and less than 3 years old. Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components is closely related to other devices or components of the irrigation water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Irrigation Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Irrigation Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated irrigation practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Insufficient Water - Inefficient Irrigation Water Use; Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, Nutrients transported to surface and groundwater, pesticides transported to surface and groundwater, pathogens and chemicals from manure, and biosolids or compost applications transported to surface and groundwater, excess salts in surface and groundwater; Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health; Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve irrigation water management on their agricultural operation to address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use concerns. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Irrigation Water Management DIA. The DIA 163 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use. The Irrigation Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 164 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,018.72 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,018.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 163 - Irrigation Water Management Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Designs without Pump Test, Greater Than or Equal to Three

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address irrigation water use inefficiency and all other appropriate resource concerns through an EQIP contract with multiple irrigation practice scenario. The pump for the irrigation system is of known performance and less than 3 years old. Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components is closely related to other devices or components of the irrigation water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Irrigation Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Irrigation Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated irrigation practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Insufficient Water - Inefficient Irrigation Water Use; Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, Nutrients transported to surface and groundwater, pesticides transported to surface and groundwater, pathogens and chemicals from manure, and biosolids or compost applications transported to surface and groundwater, excess salts in surface and groundwater; Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health; Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve irrigation water management on their agricultural operation to address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use concerns. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Drainage Water Management DIA. The DIA 164 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address water quality, plant condition, or soil health. The Drainage Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 164 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,437.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,437.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 163 - Irrigation Water Management Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Designs with Pump Test, One to Two

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address irrigation water use inefficiency and all other appropriate resource concerns through an EQIP contract with multiple irrigation practice scenario through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) irrigation practice scenario. The pump for the irrigation system is of unknown performance and older than 3 years. Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components is closely related to other devices or components of the irrigation water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Irrigation Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Irrigation Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated irrigation practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Insufficient Water - Inefficient Irrigation Water Use; Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, Nutrients transported to surface and groundwater, pesticides transported to surface and groundwater, pathogens and chemicals from manure, and biosolids or compost applications transported to surface and groundwater, excess salts in surface and groundwater; Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health; Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve irrigation water management on their agricultural operation to address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use concerns. The pump for the irrigation system is of unknown

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Irrigation Water Management DIA. The DIA 163 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use. The Irrigation Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 163 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,354.49

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,354.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 163 - Irrigation Water Management Design

**Scenario:** #57 - Designs with Pump Test, Greater Than or Equal to Three

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address irrigation water use inefficiency and all other appropriate resource concerns through an EQIP contract with multiple irrigation practice scenario through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) irrigation practice scenario. The pump for the irrigation system is of unknown performance and older than 3 years. Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components is closely related to other devices or components of the irrigation water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Irrigation Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Irrigation Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated irrigation practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Insufficient Water - Inefficient Irrigation Water Use; Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, Nutrients transported to surface and groundwater, pesticides transported to surface and groundwater, pathogens and chemicals from manure, and biosolids or compost applications transported to surface and groundwater, excess salts in surface and groundwater; Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health; Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve irrigation water management on their agricultural operation to address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use concerns. The pump for the irrigation system is of unknown

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Irrigation Water Management DIA. The DIA 163 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address insufficient water, water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, or inefficient energy use. The Irrigation Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 163 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,253.74 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13,253.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 164 - Improved Management of Drainage Water Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Designs with Tile Map, One to Two

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address water quality degradation, poor plant productivity and health, and/or oxidation of organic matter in soils on a relatively flat crop field with a patterned drainage system through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) drainage practice scenario. A map of the tile system is available. Each "Design" indicates that each new device or component is closely related to other devices or components of the drainage water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Drainage Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Drainage Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated drainage practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Water Quality - Excess nutrients in surface and groundwaters, Plant Condition - Plant Productivity and Health, and Soil Health - Subsidence.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve drainage water management on their agricultural operation to address water quality, plant condition, or soil health concerns. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scen

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Drainage Water Management DIA. The DIA 164 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address water quality, plant condition, or soil health. The Drainage Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 164 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,851.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,851.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 164 - Improved Management of Drainage Water Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Designs with Tile Map, Greater Than or Equal to Three

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address water quality degradation, poor plant productivity and health, and/or oxidation of organic matter in soils on a relatively flat crop field with a patterned drainage system through an EQIP contract with multiple drainage practice scenario. A map of the tile system is available. Each "Design" indicates that each new device or component is closely related to other devices or components of the drainage water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Drainage Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Drainage Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated drainage practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Water Quality - Excess nutrients in surface and groundwaters, Plant Condition - Plant Productivity and Health, and Soil Health - Subsidence.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve drainage water management on their agricultural operation to address water quality, plant condition, or soil health concerns. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scen

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Drainage Water Management DIA. The DIA 164 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address water quality, plant condition, or soil health. The Drainage Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 164 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,769.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10,769.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 164 - Improved Management of Drainage Water Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Designs with No Tile Map, One to Two

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address water quality degradation, poor plant productivity and health, and/or oxidation of organic matter in soils on a relatively flat crop field with a patterned drainage system through an EQIP contract with at least one (1) drainage practice scenario. A map of the tile system is not available. Each "Design" indicates that each new device or component is closely related to other devices or components of the drainage water management system even if numerous practices are contracted. The Drainage Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Drainage Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated drainage practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Water Quality - Excess nutrients in surface and groundwaters, Plant Condition - Plant Productivity and Health, and Soil Health - Subsidence.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve drainage water management on their agricultural operation to address water quality, plant condition, or soil health concerns. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scen

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Drainage Water Management DIA. The DIA 164 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address water quality, plant condition, or soil health. The Drainage Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 164 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,332.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,332.06

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 164 - Improved Management of Drainage Water Design

**Scenario:** #57 - Designs with No Tile Map, Greater Than or Equal to Three

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to address water quality degradation, poor plant productivity and health, and/or oxidation of organic matter in soils on a relatively flat crop field with a patterned drainage system through an EQIP contract with multiple drainage practice scenario. A map of the tile system is not available. Each "Design" indicates that new devices or components are closely related to other devices or components of the drainage water management system even if numerous designs are contracted. If more than one practice is contracted, then "2-5 Designs" shall be contracted for the Drainage Water Management DIA. The Drainage Water Management DIA includes reviewing, and, when needed, revising alternatives to address the identified concern(s). The Drainage Water Management DIA documents: a) the client's final decisions related to the associated drainage practice scenarios; and b) design deliverables described in the associated NRCS Conservation Practice Statements of Work. Natural Resource Concern(s): Water Quality - Excess nutrients in surface and groundwaters, Plant Condition - Plant Productivity and Health, and Soil Health - Subsidence.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wants to improve drainage water management on their agricultural operation to address water quality, plant condition, or soil health concerns. Producer intends to work with a certified TSP to develop designs to implement one or more practice scen

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop practice scenario designs using the Drainage Water Management DIA. The DIA 164 criteria include tasks needed to document the client's decisions and design of conservation practices which address water quality, plant condition, or soil health. The Drainage Water Management DIA meets the quality criteria for the DIA 164 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,730.35

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,730.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 165 - Forest Management Practice Design

**Scenario:** #9 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, Less Than or Equal to 20 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 1 to 20 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Design and Implementation Activities is needed to allow the producer to apply for financial assi

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Design and Implementation Activities (DIA). The DIA criteria requires the design of site-specific forestry activities as a component of a forest management plan to address identified resource concerns. Additional DIA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$423.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$423.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 165 - Forest Management Practice Design

**Scenario:** #25 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 501 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 501 to 1000 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Design and Implementation Activities is needed to allow the producer to apply for financial assi

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Design and Implementation Activities (DIA). The DIA criteria requires the design of site-specific forestry activities as a component of a forest management plan to address identified resource concerns. Additional DIA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,610.05 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,610.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 165 - Forest Management Practice Design

**Scenario:** #41 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 101 to 250 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 101 to 250 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Design and Implementation Activities is needed to allow the producer to apply for financial assi

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Design and Implementation Activities (DIA). The DIA criteria requires the design of site-specific forestry activities as a component of a forest management plan to address identified resource concerns. Additional DIA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,016.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,016.87

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 165 - Forest Management Practice Design

**Scenario:** #57 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 1001 acres or greater in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Design and Implementation Activities is needed to allow the producer to apply for financial assi

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Design and Implementation Activities (DIA). The DIA criteria requires the design of site-specific forestry activities as a component of a forest management plan to address identified resource concerns. Additional DIA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,949.01

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,949.01

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 165 - Forest Management Practice Design

**Scenario:** #73 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 251 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 251 to 500 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Design and Implementation Activities is needed to allow the producer to apply for financial assi

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Design and Implementation Activities (DIA). The DIA criteria requires the design of site-specific forestry activities as a component of a forest management plan to address identified resource concerns. Additional DIA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,355.83 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,355.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 165 - Forest Management Practice Design

**Scenario:** #89 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 21 to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 21 to 100 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Design and Implementation Activities is needed to allow the producer to apply for financial assi

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a certified TSP for development of the Forest Management Design and Implementation Activities (DIA). The DIA criteria requires the design of site-specific forestry activities as a component of a forest management plan to address identified resource concerns. Additional DIA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$677.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$677.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #25 - Small Farm

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The small farm planning scenario involves combinations of various specialty crops, small fruits, tree and vine crops, and small livestock enterprises on less than or equal to 10 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, or (if applicable to the enterprise) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,339.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,339.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #41 - One Land Use, 10 to 199 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use and one agricultural enterprise covering up to less than 200 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, or (if applicable to the enterprise) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,232.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,232.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #57 - One Land Use, 200 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use and one agricultural enterprise covering 200-1,000 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, or (if applicable to the enterprise) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,235.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,235.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #73 - One Land Use, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use and one agricultural enterprise covering more than 1,000 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, or (if applicable to the enterprise) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,298.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,298.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #89 - Two Land Uses, 10 to 199 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use with two agricultural enterprises, or two land uses with one agricultural enterprise (ex. farmstead and cropland used for a dairy enterprise) covering less than 200 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, and/or (if applicable to the enterprises) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,235.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,235.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #105 - Two Land Uses, 200 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use with two agricultural enterprises, or two land uses with one agricultural enterprise (ex. farmstead and cropland used for a dairy enterprise) covering 200-1000 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, and/or (if applicable to the enterprises) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,298.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,298.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #121 - Two Land Uses, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use with two agricultural enterprises, or two land uses with one agricultural enterprise (ex. farmstead and cropland used for a dairy enterprise) covering more than 1,000 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, and/or (if applicable to the enterprises) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,109.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10,109.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #137 - Three or More Land Uses, 10 to 199 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use supporting three or more agricultural enterprises, two land uses supporting two or more agricultural enterprises, or three or more land uses and any number of enterprises on up to less than 200 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, and/or (if applicable to the enterprises) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,298.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,298.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #153 - Three or More Land Uses, 200 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves three or more agricultural enterprises, two land uses supporting two or more agricultural enterprises, or three or more land uses and any number of enterprises on 200-1000 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, and/or (if applicable to the enterprises) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,109.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10,109.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 199 - Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #169 - Three or More Land Uses, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a Farm Bill program contract. The TSP completes NRCS conservation planning process, steps 1 through 7 as described in NRCS National Planning Procedures Handbook. The steps identify problems and opportunities (step 1), determine objectives (step 2), include inventory and analyze resources (steps 3 and 4), formulate and evaluate alternatives (steps 5 and 6) and document client's preferred alternative(s) (step 7). The Planning Land Unit involves one land use supporting three or more agricultural enterprises, two land uses supporting two or more agricultural enterprises, or three or more land uses and any number of enterprises on more than 1,000 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Client and NRCS have identified a need to develop a conservation plan to address resource concern(s) using a Technical Service Provider.

**After Situation:**

TSP has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop at least one conservation system alternative for each planning land unit that meet the producer's objectives; and obtain the client's decision for a schedule of practices to implement. TSP provides deliverables that meet the requirements of the CPA 199, and/or (if applicable to the enterprises) the requirements of conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,668.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,668.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #1 - Surface Year One Plus, No Quality Assurance Project Plan

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for surface run-off for one control and one treatment site. The scenario requires the collection and analysis of edge-of-field water quality data with an average sample collection of 20 per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 240 total water quality tests). The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual report which include some preliminary annual analysis. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 to next to the last year of monitoring of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP will be not prepared as this is for an existing monitoring system that has been accepted as meeting both Activity 201 and 202. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared as part of an existing monitoring system installation where the QAPP and monitoring plan meets Activity 201 requirements and no major changes are needed to meet Activity 202 requirements. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,972.42 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24,972.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #142 - Tile Year One, Quality Assurance Project Plan

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for tile and subsurface drainage run-off for one control and one treatment site with an average of 40 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 40 samples x 6 parameters = 480 total water quality tests). A subsurface system also requires the addition of a surface sampling system at the same outlet to capture overland flow with 20 samples per year, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 240 total water quality tests). Without the surface system then not all runoff is captured for calculating a true event mean concentration as per the 201 Standard. The scenario requires the creation of a survey to site a monitoring station, preparation of monitoring plan and a quality assurance project plan to detail how data will be collected, handled and analyzed, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual report, and annual report. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP need to be prepared prior to installation under Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring - System Installation (202). THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will not have a plan or quality assurance project plan prepared for installing equipment nor collecting data for sediment and nutrients leaving the edge of field.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual report, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared prior to installation under Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring - System Installation (202). The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$69,964.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$69,964.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #149 - Tile Year One and Less Quality Assurance Project Plan, Two Treatment Sites

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for tile and subsurface drainage run-off for one control and two treatment sites with an average of 40 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 40 samples x 6 parameters = 720 total water quality tests). A subsurface system also requires the addition of a surface sampling system at the same outlet to capture overland flow with 20 samples per year, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 360 total water quality tests). Without the surface system then not all runoff is captured for calculating a true event mean concentration as per the 201 Standard. The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual reports, which include some preliminary annual analysis. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP will not be prepared as this is for an existing monitoring system be accepted as meeting both Activity 201 and 202. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and two treatment sites. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared as part of an existing monitoring system installation where the QAPP and monitoring plan meets Activity 201 requirements and no major changes are needed to meet Activity 202 requirements. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$85,866.59 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$85,866.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #156 - Tile Year One Plus, No Quality Assurance Project Plan

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for tile and subsurface drainage run-off for one control and one treatment site with an average of 40 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 40 samples x 6 parameters = 480 total water quality tests). A subsurface system also requires the addition of a surface sampling system at the same outlet to capture overland flow with 20 samples per year, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 240 total water quality tests). Without the surface system then not all runoff is captured for calculating a true event mean concentration as per the 201 Standard. The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual reports, which include some preliminary annual analysis. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 to next to the last year of monitoring of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP will be not prepared as this is for an existing monitoring system be accepted as meeting both Activity 201 and 202. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared as part of an existing monitoring system installation where the QAPP and monitoring plan meets Activity 201 requirements and no major changes are needed to meet Activity 202 requirements. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$60,017.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$60,017.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #163 - Tile Last Year, Two Treatment Sites

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for tile and subsurface drainage run-off for one control and two treatment sites with an average of 40 samples per year per station with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 40 samples x 6 parameters = 720 total water quality tests). A subsurface system also requires the addition of a surface sampling system at the same outlet to capture overland flow with 20 samples per year with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 360 total water quality tests). Without the surface system then not all runoff is captured for calculating a true event mean concentration as per the 201 Standard. The scenario requires the collection and analysis of edge-of-field water quality data along with a comprehensive report to statistically prove relationship between select conservation practices and water quality. The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual report and a comprehensive report of practice effectiveness. This scenario will be used in the last year of monitoring. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and two treatment sites. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201 to provide a comprehensive report of statistical testing of data collected during to complete monitoring period.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$93,719.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$93,719.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #170 - Tile Last Year

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for tile and subsurface drainage run-off for one control and one treatment site with an average of 40 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 40 samples x 6 parameters = 480 total water quality tests). A subsurface system also requires the addition of a surface sampling system at the same outlet to capture overland flow with 20 samples per year, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 240 total water quality tests). Without the surface system then not all runoff is captured for calculating a true event mean concentration as per the 201 Standard. The scenario requires the collection and analysis of edge-of-field water quality data along with a comprehensive report to statistically prove relationship between select conservation practices and water quality. The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual report and a comprehensive report of practice effectiveness. This scenario will be used in the last year of monitoring. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201 to provide a comprehensive report of statistical testing of data collected during to complete monitoring period.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$65,253.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$65,253.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #177 - Surface Year One Quality Assurance Project Plan, Two Treatment Sites

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for surface run-off for one control and two treatment sites with an average of 20 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 360 total water quality tests). The scenario requires the creation of a survey to site a monitoring station, preparation of monitoring plan and a quality assurance project plan to detail how data will be collected, handled and analyzed, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual report, and annual report. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP need to be prepared prior to installation under Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring - System Installation (202). THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will not have a plan or quality assurance project plan prepared for installing equipment nor collecting data for sediment and nutrients leaving the edge of field.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual report, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared prior to installation under Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring - System Installation (202). The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Sites

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$48,200.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$48,200.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #184 - Surface Year One Quality Assurance Project Plan

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the design and use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for surface run-off for one control and one treatment site with an average of 20 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 240 total water quality tests). The scenario requires the creation of a survey to site a monitoring station, preparation of monitoring plan and a quality assurance project plan to detail how data will be collected, handled and analyzed, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual report, and annual report. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP need to be prepared prior to installation under Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring - System Installation (202). THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will not have a plan or quality assurance project plan prepared for installing equipment nor collecting data for sediment and nutrients leaving the edge of field.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual report, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared prior to installation under Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring - System Installation (202). The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Sites

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$34,919.11

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$34,919.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #193 - Surface Year One and Less Quality Assurance Project Plan, Two Treatment Sites

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for surface run-off for one control and two treatment sites. The scenario requires the collection and analysis of edge-of-field water quality data with an average sample collection of 20 per year for each surface system, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 360 total water quality tests). The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual report, which include some preliminary annual analysis. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP will not be prepared as this is for an existing monitoring system be accepted as meeting both Activity 201 and 202. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semi-annual submittal, and annual report for one control and two treatment sites. This scenario will normally be used in year 1 of the contract when a monitoring plan and QAPP have been prepared as part of an existing monitoring system installation where the QAPP and monitoring plan meets Activity 201 requirements and no major changes are needed to meet Activity 202 requirements. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$35,898.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$35,898.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #200 - Surface Last Year

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for surface run-off for one control and one treatment site with an average of 20 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (2 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 240 total water quality tests). The scenario requires the collection and analysis of edge-of-field water quality data along with a comprehensive report to statistically prove relationship between select conservation practices and water quality. The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual report and a comprehensive report of practice effectiveness. This scenario will be used in the last year of monitoring. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and one treatment site. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201 to provide a comprehensive report of statistical testing of data collected to complete monitoring period.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$30,207.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$30,207.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #207 - Surface Last Year, Two Treatment Sites

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario provides for the use of an edge-of-field WQ monitoring station(s) for surface run-off for one control and two treatment sites with an average of 20 samples per year per station, with each sample analyzed for 6 separate parameters (3 sites x 20 samples x 6 parameters = 360 total water quality tests). The scenario requires the collection and analysis of edge-of-field water quality data along with a comprehensive report to statistically prove relationship between select conservation practices and water quality. The data will be transferred through semi-annual submittal and annual report and a comprehensive report of practice effectiveness. This scenario will be used in the last year of monitoring. THIS IS PLACED IN A PAIRED SITUATION IF THE CONTROL AND TREATMENT ARE ON DIFFERENT LANDOWNERS FIELDS THEN A JOINT CONTRACT WILL BE NECESSARY.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing this practice will have an existing system for collecting water quality data but not have been operating with a long enough time frame to measure practice effectiveness.

**After Situation:**

This practice scenario after installation of the WQ monitoring stations, provides for the data collection, analysis, semiannual submittal, and annual report for one control and two treatment sites. The operator will be able to collect field level water quality data of sufficient quality to measure loss of nutrients as listed in 201 to provide a comprehensive report of statistical testing of data collected during to complete monitoring period.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring site

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$43,751.14 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$43,751.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #219 - Discrete Sampling, Single Parameter, Year One

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is to be used for targeted, periodic WQ grab sampling design and implementation for evaluating and assessing conservation practice performance. This scenario provides for collection and analysis of one of the following water quality constituents: Ammonium, Nitrite plus Nitrate, Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, Soluble Reactive P (Orthophosphate), Total Phosphorus, Suspended Sediment Concentration, or Total Suspended Solids. A monitoring plan is created by a qualified individual to achieve monitoring goals. Event-based or regularly re-occurring grab samples are acquired from the concentrated flow streams at 2 locations, typically in a before-and-after or a side-by-side sampling design and then analyzed at a laboratory.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to implementing this activity will not have a monitoring plan prepared for evaluating and assessing the performance of a conservation practice.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after implementing this activity will have produced and implemented a water quality monitoring plan for a single water quality constituent to evaluate and assess the performance of a conservation practice with respect to that constituent.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring sites

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,709.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,709.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 201 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-Data Collection and Evaluation

**Scenario:** #235 - Discrete Sampling, Single Parameter, Additional Year

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario extends, by an additional year, discreet WQ grab sampling design and implementation for evaluating and assessing conservation practice performance. This scenario provides for analysis of one of the following water quality constituents: Ammonium, Nitrite plus Nitrate, Total Kjeldahl Nitrogen, Soluble Reactive P (Orthophosphate), Total Phosphorus, Suspended Sediment Concentration, or Total Suspended Solids. A monitoring plan is created by a qualified individual to achieve monitoring goals. Event-based or regularly re-occurring synoptic grab samples are acquired from the concentrated flow streams at 2 locations, typically in a before-and-after or a side-by-side sampling design and then analyzed at a laboratory.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to implementing this activity will not have a monitoring plan prepared for evaluating and assessing the performance of a conservation practice.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after implementing this activity will have produced and implemented a water quality monitoring plan for a single water quality constituent to evaluate and assess the performance of a conservation practice with respect to that constituent.

**Feature Measure:** Measuring Sites

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,139.36

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,139.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #103 - Tile, Cold Climate

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with tile or other subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The component monitoring equipment are associated with a typical system for northern latitudes where winter time heating is required for sampling. It will allow for installation of automated sampling data collection system for a subsurface collection and separate surface automated sample collection system with protective housing to reduce potential for vandalism, battery backup for operation during periods when electricity is down or solar panels are not creating an electrical current, an area velocity sensor for pipe flow and estimation of submerged flow, a calf hut or other structure with heat is required over the flume to allow sampling under northern latitude winter conditions and a berm or other directional flow structure to guide the runoff to a sampling flume.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing the monitoring equipment is guessing about the effects of the conservation system with regards to meeting practice intent of avoid, controlling, or trapping sediment and nutrients. Nothing is known about the

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$41,738.83

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$41,738.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #112 - Tile

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with tile or other subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The component monitoring equipment are associated with a typical system for southern latitudes where winter time heating is not required for sampling. It will allow for installation of automated sampling data collection system for a subsurface collection and separate surface automated sample collection system with protective housing to reduce potential for vandalism, battery backup for operation during periods when electricity is down or solar panels are not creating an electrical current, an area velocity sensor for pipe flow and estimation of submerged flow, and a berm or other directional flow structure to guide the runoff to a sampling flume.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing the monitoring equipment is guessing about the effects of the conservation system with regards to meeting practice intent of avoid, controlling, or trapping sediment and nutrients. Nothing is known about the

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$41,738.83

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$41,738.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #119 - Surface, Cold Climate

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with surface runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The component monitoring equipment are associated with a typical system for northern latitudes where winter time heating is required for sampling. It will allow for installation of automated sampling data collection system with protective housing to reduce potential for vandalism, battery backup for operation during periods when electricity is down or solar panels are not creating an electrical current, a calf hut or other structure with heat is required over the flume to allow sampling under northern latitude winter conditions, and a berm or other directional flow structure to guide the runoff to a sampling flume.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing the monitoring equipment is guessing about the effects of the conservation system with regards to meeting practice intent of avoid, controlling, or trapping sediment and nutrients. Nothing is known about the

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$30,532.26

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$30,532.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #126 - Surface

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with surface runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The component monitoring equipment are associated with a typical system for southern latitudes where winter time heating is not required for sampling. It will allow for installation of automated sampling data collection system with protective housing to reduce potential for vandalism, battery backup for operation during periods when electricity is down or solar panels are not creating an electrical current, and a berm or other directional flow structure to guide the runoff to a sampling flume.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing the monitoring equipment is guessing about the effects of the conservation system with regards to meeting practice intent of avoid, controlling, or trapping sediment and nutrients.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$29,792.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$29,792.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #134 - Retrofit, Surface or Subsurface, One

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is to retrofit an existing above and below monitoring designed system that is being used in associated with the 799 interim practice or comparable system. The retrofit is applicable to an above and below system that has a field defined with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The data represents the installation of an automated and manual backup rain gauge and two back-up/solar power supply be added to existing paired system.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to retrofit has an edge-of-field data collection system but it does not meet the present standards for accuracy or reliability as detailed in either or both of Activity 201 and Activity 202.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,441.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,441.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #143 - Retrofit, Above Three

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is to retrofit an existing above and below monitoring designed system that is being used in associated with the 799 interim practice or comparable system. The retrofit is applicable to an above and below system that has a field defined with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The data represents the installation of an automated and manual backup rain gauge, two back-up/solar power supplies, two communications devices, two pre-calibrated flumes, and two depth (stage) sensors to be added to existing paired system.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to retrofit has an edge-of-field data collection system but it does not meet the present standards for accuracy or reliability as detailed in either or both of Activity 201 and Activity 202.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,937.74

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24,937.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #151 - Retrofit, Three

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is to retrofit an existing system that is being used in associated with the 799 interim practice or comparable system. The retrofit is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The data represents the installation of an automated and manual backup rain gauge, back-up/solar power supply, communications device, pre-calibrated flow control structure, and depth (stage) sensor to be added to existing system.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to retrofit has an edge-of-field data collection system but it does not meet the present standards for accuracy or reliability as detailed in either or both of Activity 201 and Activity 202.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,173.89 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14,173.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #159 - Retrofit, Two

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is to retrofit an existing system that is being used in associated with the 799 interim practice or comparable system. The retrofit is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The data represents the installation of an automated and manual backup rain gauge, back-up/solar power supply, communications device, and depth (stage) sensor to be added to existing system.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to retrofit has an edge-of-field data collection system but it does not meet the present standards for accuracy or reliability as detailed in either or both of Activity 201 and Activity 202.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,300.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10,300.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #167 - Retrofit, One

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is to retrofit an existing system that is being used in associated with the 799 interim practice or comparable system. The retrofit is applicable to a single control or treatment site that has a field defined with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The data represents the installation of an automated and manual backup rain gauge and back-up/solar power supply be added to existing system.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to retrofit has an edge-of-field data collection system but it does not meet the present standards for accuracy or reliability as detailed in either or both of Activity 201 and Activity 202.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,510.91 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,510.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #175 - Above and Below System, Cold Climate

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is applicable where a conservation practice has a pre- and post treatment area in the same field drainage with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The component monitoring equipment are associated with a typical system for northern latitudes where winter time heating is required for sampling. It will allow for installation of automated sampling data collection system with protective housing to reduce potential for vandalism, battery backup for operation during periods when electricity is down or solar panels are not creating an electrical current, a calf hut or other structure with heat is required over the flume to allow sampling under northern latitude winter conditions, and a berm or other directional flow structure to guide the runoff to a sampling flume. The actual installation will differ on the subsurface flow by allowing a smaller pre-calibrated flume with the addition of a velocity sensor meter as in the tile alternative.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing the monitoring equipment is guessing about the effects of the conservation system with regards to meeting practice intent of avoid, controlling, or trapping sediment and nutrients. Nothing is known about the

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$45,762.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$45,762.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 202 - Edge-of-Field Water Quality Monitoring-System Installation

**Scenario:** #183 - Above and Below System, Warm Climate

**Scenario Description:**

This edge-of-field water quality monitoring system is applicable where a conservation practice has a pre- and post treatment area in the same field drainage with surface or subsurface drainage runoff that can be captured and sampled at the edge of a field before entering a ditch or receiving water body or water course. The component monitoring equipment are associated with a typical system for southern latitudes where winter time heating is not required for sampling. It will allow for installation of automated sampling data collection system with protective housing to reduce potential for vandalism, battery backup for operation during periods when electricity is down or solar panels are not creating an electrical current, and a berm or other directional flow structure to guide the runoff to a sampling flume. The actual installation will differ on the subsurface flow by allowing a smaller precalibrated flume with the addition of a velocity sensor meter as in the tile alternative.

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation prior to installing the monitoring equipment is guessing about the effects of the conservation system with regards to meeting practice intent of avoid, controlling, or trapping sediment and nutrients.

**After Situation:**

The agricultural operation after installing the monitoring equipment will be receiving feedback in the form of edge-of-field runoff water quality samples. The samples will allow the operator to understand the relationship between rain/irrigation, practice choice, and nutrient inputs effecting nutrient and sediment loss for the field. Thus, providing an opportunity to make adaptive management changes to the agricultural operation to reduce sediment and nutrient loss and/or profitability.

**Feature Measure:** System installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$41,692.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$41,692.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 204 - Adaptive Management for Soil Health

**Scenario:** #9 - Basic

**Scenario Description:**

Field study with replicated plots for implementation of any of the conservation practices outlined in CEMA 204 Adaptive Management for Soil Health. Allows comparison of management and treatments on crop, grassland, forest, or rangeland small plots. Replicated treatment plots allow the producer to learn how to manage conservation practice on their operation and evaluate the management strategy effectiveness on soil health indicators particularly soil organic carbon, aggregate stability, pH, respiration. Scenario includes following the guidelines of the Conservation Practice in CEMA 204 Adaptive Management for Soil Health and CEMA 216 Soil Health Testing in small, replicated plots. Follow NRCS Technical Note 10- Adaptive Management. Study plot typical sizes range from 2-10 acres. Typical acre for scenario is 5.

**Before Situation:**

A producer is adopting the practice for the first time and desires to learn how to best to apply the practice within their unique landscape and management style or the producer is interested in improving the effectiveness of an existing practice or evalua

**After Situation:**

The study plots were installed with at least 4 replicated plots (control + treatment) designed, laid out, managed and evaluated with the assistance of a consultant knowledgeable in the selected practice. Data has been collected. Results are summarized in a report showing effectiveness of the treatments and any determined statistical analysis of collected data. Results are used to make management decisions to address soil health principles, erosion and water quality issues. Soil Health indicators and yields will be measured and statistically summarized following the procedures in Agronomy Technical Note 10 - Adaptive Management. This would be repeated yearly for 3 years.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Study Plots

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,735.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,735.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 204 - Adaptive Management for Soil Health

**Scenario:** #25 - Basic with Soil Health Test

**Scenario Description:**

Field study with replicated plots for implementation of any of the conservation practices outlined in CEMA 204 Adaptive Management for Soil Health. Allows comparison of management and treatments on crop, grassland, forest, or rangeland small plots. Replicated treatment plots allow the producer to learn how to manage conservation practice on their operation and evaluate the management strategy effectiveness on soil health indicators particularly soil organic carbon, aggregate stability, active carbon, pH, texture and respiration. Scenario includes following the guidelines of the Conservation Practice in CEMA 204 Adaptive Management for Soil Health in small replicated plots. Follow NRCS Technical Note 10- Adaptive Management. Study plot typical sizes range from 2-10 acres. Typical acre for scenario is 5.

**Before Situation:**

A producer is adopting the practice for the first time and desires to learn how to best to apply the practice within their unique landscape and management style or the producer is interested in improving the effectiveness of an existing practice or evalua

**After Situation:**

Study plots were installed with treatments applied per the study design. Plot field data is collected. Soil health soil samples were collected in the fall and analyzed for include at least SOC by dry combustion, Active Carbon, pH, texture (soil texture in year 1 only to calculate AWC), aggregate stability, and 24-hr respiration. Soil Health indicators and yields will be measured and statistically summarized following the procedures in Agronomy Technical Note 10 - Adaptive Management. A final report summarizes the effect of the treatment on soil health using interpretation of lab analysis and any statical analysis of collected field data. Results will inform future management decisions for the conservation practice to improve or maintain soil health.

**Feature Measure:** Number of field study plots

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,829.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,829.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 206 - Feed and Forage Analysis

**Scenario:** #9 - Nutrient Composition Analysis

**Scenario Description:**

Testing of feed or forage for nutrient composition. Each lot (forage lot or lot of feed) should be sampled and tested separately. Testing of bale or stack forage for nutrient composition. Factors to consider when determining lot size include forage species, stage of maturity, cutting schedule, soil type, soil fertility, presence of weeds, harvest conditions, storage effects. Each lot should be sampled and tested separately. Testing of standing forage for nutrient composition. Forage can be tested to determine if it is worth cutting for hay or to determine if grazing animals require supplemental feed. Select at least eight representative locations and clip the forage at grazing or harvest height from a one square foot area at each location. In grazing situations try and select the species being selectively grazed. Cut the samples into 2- to 3-inch pieces, combine in a bucket and mix well. Spread the sample on paper and allow it to air-dry for two days or place in a pan and dry overnight in an oven at 150°F before mailing it to the laboratory. Analysis of silage (fresh or silo) for nutrient composition. Remove two to three gallons of silage from different sections of a load and save about a quart using the quartering method. Freeze the samples until all loads are sampled. Combine samples, mix thoroughly, and reduce to about one quart by quartering. The final sample should be placed in the cloth forage sample bag, and the full forage bag inserted into a plastic bag to prevent moisture loss during mailing. Remove excess air from the plastic bag before sealing. Do not insert the plastic bag inside the cloth forage bag since damage may result when it is processed by the laboratory. Freeze the sample prior to mailing and mail samples early in the week to avoid weekend delays and reduce chances of molding. Upright silos- 12 handfuls of silage as it is discharged from the silo. Horizontal silos-hand grab same as upright but access the entire surface of the open face. Analysis of dietary ration, feed, or diet for nutrient composition.

**Before Situation:**

Producer wishes to reduce nutrient excretion or emission from livestock or poultry to air, soil, or water. To accomplish a reduction in nutrient excretion and emissions, knowledge of nutrient input from silage is required to optimally balance the diet for

**After Situation:**

Animal diet is optimally balanced for nutrient composition and nutrients excreted or emitted by the animal are reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,339.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,339.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 207 - Site Assessment and Soil Testing for Contaminants Activity

**Scenario:** #9 - Site Evaluation

**Scenario Description:**

This practice applies to urban sites where the desired land use is cropland. Sites may have been residential, industrial or commercial land use in the past and the risk for soil contaminants is unknown.

**Before Situation:**

Soil suitability for agricultural production is unknown with potential risk of contamination from prior land use activities.

**After Situation:**

Site history has been researched and findings indicate a potential for the presence of contaminants. Final report provides the landowner with the level of risk and recommendation for further testing. Reports may be used in the conservation planning process to explore non-remedial conservation practices to reduce risk of contaminants entering the food products.

**Feature Measure:** Each Site

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,276.22

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,276.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 207 - Site Assessment and Soil Testing for Contaminants Activity

**Scenario:** #25 - Site Evaluation and Testing for Soil Contaminants

**Scenario Description:**

This practice applies to urban sites where the desired land use is cropland. Sites may have been residential, industrial or commercial land use in the past and the risk for soil contaminants is unknown.

**Before Situation:**

Soil suitability for agricultural production is unknown with potential risk of contamination from prior land use activities.

**After Situation:**

Site history has been researched and findings indicate a potential for the presence of contaminants. The soil has been collected and tested for heavy metals, VOCs and PAHs. Final reports provide the landowner with the level of risk. Reports may be used in the conservation planning process to explore non-remedial conservation practices to reduce risk of contaminants entering the food products.

**Feature Measure:** Each Site

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,828.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12,828.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 207 - Site Assessment and Soil Testing for Contaminants Activity

**Scenario:** #41 - Soil Testing, Subsurface Investigation

**Scenario Description:**

This practice applies to urban sites where the desired land use is cropland. Sites may have been residential, industrial or commercial land use in the past and the risk for soil contaminants is unknown. The landowner has a prior Environmental Site Assessment completed by an Environmental Professional. The ESA report recommends further subsurface investigation. OR Landowner has NRCS report from portable Xray Fluorescence screening that detected soil contaminants.

**Before Situation:**

Soil suitability for agricultural production is unknown with potential risk of contamination from prior land use activities.

**After Situation:**

Site history has been researched and findings indicate a potential for the presence of contaminants. The soil has been collected and tested for heavy metals, VOCs and PAHs. Final reports provide the landowner with the level of risk. Reports may be used in the conservation planning process to explore non-remedial conservation practices to reduce risk of contaminants entering the food products.

**Feature Measure:** Each Site

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,552.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,552.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 207 - Site Assessment and Soil Testing for Contaminants Activity

**Scenario:** #57 - Low Risk Sites

**Scenario Description:**

This practice applies to urban sites where the desired land use is cropland. Sites may have been residential, industrial or commercial land use in the past and the risk for soil contaminants is unknown. The landowner has a prior Environmental Site Assessment completed by an Environmental Professional. The ESA report does not require further investigation. OR Landowner has NRCS report from portable Xray Fluorescence screening that detected soil contaminants. Screening detection levels are below the State Environmental Protection Agency or equivalent agency published safety thresholds for bare soil residential use.

**Before Situation:**

Soil suitability for agricultural production is unknown with potential risk of contamination from prior land use activities.

**After Situation:**

Site history has been researched and findings indicate a potential for the presence of contaminants. The soil has been collected and tested for heavy metals only. Soil test reports provide the landowner with the level of risk. Reports may be used in the conservation planning process to explore non-remedial conservation practices to reduce risk of contaminants entering the food products.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Soil Tested

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$918.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$229.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 209 - PFAS Testing in Water or Soil

**Scenario:** #9 - Low Complexity, Single Sample

**Scenario Description:**

A single sample of water or soil is required to provide prescreening information to the landowner to determine if PFAS may be present in water or soils at their operation. In this scenario, the environmental media being sampled by the qualified individual is of low complexity: there is little temporal or spatial variation to account for in sampling, therefore no pre-sampling planning needed. This could include a single well used for stockwater or irrigation systems. The typical number of tests is 1, assuming that a landowner has a single well or a single field that can be represented by a single composite sample.

**Before Situation:**

Water or soil on an agricultural operation are of unknown PFAS status. PFAS laboratory analysis has not been conducted on the water or soil of interest.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory PFAS analysis was completed, and the results were interpreted and explained to the landowner. The landowner now has pre-screening information that suggests if PFAS may be present in water (or soil) on their operation. If testing detects PFAS in water or soil at levels that exceed State or Federal screening levels, the landowner can decide to pursue non-NRCS sources for follow-up detailed PFAS assessment.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,324.93 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,324.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 209 - PFAS Testing in Water or Soil

**Scenario:** #25 - Low Complexity, Multiple Samples

**Scenario Description:**

Multiple samples of water or soil are needed to provide prescreening information to the landowner to determine if PFAS may be present in water or soils at their operation. In this scenario, the environmental media being sampled by the qualified individual is of low complexity. There is little temporal or spatial variation to account for in sampling, therefore no pre-sampling planning needed. This scenario could apply to small ponds or wells used for stockwater or irrigation systems, a small field, or a small number of fields of uniform soil composition. This scenario assumes that additional time is needed for each collection of multiple samples. The typical number of tests is 5, assuming that a landowner has four fields and a well and each field can be represented by a single composite sample.

**Before Situation:**

Water or soil on an agricultural operation are of unknown PFAS status. PFAS laboratory analysis has not been conducted on the water or soil of interest.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory PFAS analysis was completed, and the results were interpreted and explained to the landowner. The landowner now has pre-screening information that suggests if PFAS may be present in water (or soil) on their operation. If testing detects PFAS in water or soil at levels that exceed State or Federal screening levels, the landowner can decide to pursue non-NRCS sources for follow-up detailed PFAS assessment.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,530.61 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$906.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 209 - PFAS Testing in Water or Soil

**Scenario:** #41 - High Complexity, Multiple Samples

**Scenario Description:**

Multiple samples of water or soil are needed to provide prescreening information to the landowner to determine if PFAS may be present in water or soils at their operation. In this scenario, the environmental media being sampled is of high complexity. There is a need to account for this temporal or spatial variation in sampling. Therefore, additional time is needed to prepare and discuss a comprehensive sampling strategy to detect PFAS and the final comprehensive report with the landowner. This scenario could apply to the agricultural use of multiple sources of water (ponds, wells, and reclaimed water) for stockwater or irrigation systems or to assess multiple fields with variable soil composition. This scenario assumes that additional time is needed for each collection of multiple samples. The typical number of tests is 5, assuming that a farmer has many fields, and the producer doesn't want to test all or has large fields with highly variable soil composition.

**Before Situation:**

Water or soil on an agricultural operation are of unknown PFAS status. PFAS laboratory analysis has not been conducted on the water or soil of interest.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory PFAS analysis was completed, and the results were interpreted and explained to the landowner. The landowner now has pre-screening information that suggests if PFAS may be present in water (or soil) on their operation. If testing detects PFAS in water or soil at levels that exceed State or Federal screening levels, the landowner can decide to pursue non-NRCS sources for follow-up detailed PFAS assessment.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,577.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,115.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 216 - Soil Health Testing

**Scenario:** #172 - Basic

**Scenario Description:**

A laboratory soil health assessment for a suite of indicators is conducted using recommended methods to evaluate and/or monitor conservation practices. Laboratory tests for five (~6 2 pH methods) indicators: soil organic carbon concentration, active carbon, soil texture, pH CaCl, pH H2O and aggregate stability. Sample collection is completed by a qualified individual and includes time for soil sampling and submission. Lab method for organic carbon concentration is dry combustion. For calcareous soil: Total C - Inorganic C. Lab method for carbon mineralization potential is 24-hr CO2 burst resulting from rewetting air dried, sieved soil. Lab method for aggregate stability is slaking.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory soil health test of was completed for the suite of three soil health indicators and results explained to the producer and used to establish benchmark conditions for soil health management practices or evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice.

**Feature Measure:** Test

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$650.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$650.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 216 - Soil Health Testing

**Scenario:** #188 - Single Indicator

**Scenario Description:**

A laboratory soil health assessment for a single indicator is conducted using recommended methods to evaluate and/or monitor conservation practices. Laboratory tests available: soil organic carbon concentration, carbon mineralization potential, pH, PoxC, soil texture, ACE Protein, PLFA, Enzymes, Respiration 1,2,3, or 4-day, and aggregate stability. Sample collection is completed by a qualified individual and includes time for soil sampling and submission. Lab method for organic carbon concentration is dry combustion. For calcareous soil: Total C - Inorganic C. Lab method for carbon mineralization potential is 24-hr CO<sub>2</sub> burst resulting from rewetting air dried, sieved soil.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory soil health test of was completed for a single indicator and results explained to the producer and used to establish benchmark conditions for soil health management practices or evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice.

**Feature Measure:** polygon

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$422.83

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$422.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 216 - Soil Health Testing

**Scenario:** #277 - Minimal Suite

**Scenario Description:**

A laboratory soil health assessment for a suite of indicators is conducted using recommended methods to evaluate and/or monitor conservation practices. Laboratory tests for three indicators: soil organic carbon concentration, carbon mineralization potential, and aggregate stability. Sample collection is completed by a qualified individual and includes time for soil sampling and submission. Lab method for organic carbon concentration is dry combustion. For calcareous soil: Total C - Inorganic C.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory soil health test of was completed for the suite of six soil health indicators and results explained to the producer and used to establish benchmark conditions for soil health management practices or evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice.

**Feature Measure:** Test

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$787.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$787.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 216 - Soil Health Testing

**Scenario:** #293 - Basic and Single Indicator

**Scenario Description:**

A laboratory soil health assessment for a suite of indicators is conducted using recommended methods to evaluate and/or monitor conservation practices. Laboratory tests for five (~6 2 pH methods) indicators: soil organic carbon concentration, active carbon, soil texture, pH CaCl, pH H2O and aggregate stability. Sample collection is completed by a qualified individual and includes time for soil sampling and submission. Lab method for organic carbon concentration is dry combustion. For calcareous soil: Total C - Inorganic C. Lab method for carbon mineralization potential is 24-hr CO2 burst resulting from rewetting air dried, sieved soil. Lab method for aggregate stability is slaking. Producer also selects 1 additional indicator from the Single Indicator List.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory soil health test was completed for the suite of three soil health indicators and results explained to the producer and used to establish benchmark conditions for soil health management practices or evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice.

**Feature Measure:** Test

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$833.02

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$833.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 216 - Soil Health Testing

**Scenario:** #309 - Minimal Suite and Single Indicator

**Scenario Description:**

A laboratory soil health assessment for a suite of indicators is conducted using recommended methods to evaluate and/or monitor conservation practices. Laboratory tests for three indicators: soil organic carbon concentration, carbon mineralization potential, and aggregate stability. Sample collection is completed by a qualified individual and includes time for soil sampling and submission. Lab method for organic carbon concentration is dry combustion. For calcareous soil: Total C - Inorganic C.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural producer has been farming a system that has not addressed all 4 of the soil health principles. Producer has noticed yield declines, soil degradation, or is simply interested in learning more about soil health management.

**After Situation:**

A laboratory soil health test of was completed for the suite of six soil health indicators and results explained to the producer and used to establish benchmark conditions for soil health management practices or evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice.

**Feature Measure:** Test

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$970.54

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$970.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #9 - Soil Testing

**Scenario Description:**

A qualified individual will develop a nutrient testing strategy, collect soil samples and prepare for laboratory analysis; and interpret soil nutrient needs. Typical management unit is 100 acres. Includes Comprehensive Soil Testing to provide both Macro and micro soil nutrient levels.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have soil test laboratory analysis documenting the level of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium or pH for each field or management unit in crop production. Nutrients are applied without knowledge of soil test levels.

**After Situation:**

Soil samples have been collected and analyzed. The strategy for sampling is described and a map of sampling points is provided. Qualified individual concludes nutrients are needed or not based on soil test results. Follow up by developing a nutrient management plan with DIA 157 Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity or implement Nutrient Management 590.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$952.12 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$952.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #41 - Zone or Grid Soil Testing

**Scenario Description:**

A qualified individual will develop a nutrient testing strategy, collect soil samples based on a 2.5 acre grid or zone, and prepare for laboratory analysis; and interpret soil nutrient needs. Typical management unit is 100 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have soil test laboratory analysis documenting the level of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium or pH for each field or management unit in crop production. Nutrients are applied without knowledge of soil test levels.

**After Situation:**

Soil samples have been collected and analyzed. The strategy for sampling is described and a map of sampling points is provided. Qualified individual concludes nutrients are needed or not based on soil test results. Follow up by developing a nutrient management plan with DIA 157 Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity or implement Nutrient Management 590.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,221.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,221.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #57 - Manure or Compost

**Scenario Description:**

A qualified individual will develop a nutrient testing strategy, collect manure or compost samples and prepare for laboratory analysis; and interpret crop nutrient needs. Sampling protocol for liquid manure includes agitation per LGU guidelines. Dry manure and compost sampling protocol are performed per LGU guidelines.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have manure or compost laboratory analysis documenting the level of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium or pH of the organic source. Nutrients are applied without knowledge of manure or compost nutrient levels.

**After Situation:**

Manure or Compost samples have been collected and analyzed. The strategy for sampling is described. Qualified individual concludes the amount of nutrients needed for the crop based on manure or compost test results. Follow up by developing a nutrient management plan with DIA 157 Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity or implement Nutrient Management 590.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,088.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,088.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #73 - Water Sampling

**Scenario Description:**

A qualified individual will develop a nutrient testing strategy, collect source water samples and prepare for laboratory analysis; and interpret crop nutrient needs. Typical irrigation water sampling for nutrients, may include drainage water sampling for monitoring nutrient loss or if drainage water is being reused.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have Source Water Nutrient laboratory analysis documenting the level of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium or pH of the water source. Nutrients are applied without knowledge of source water nutrient levels.

**After Situation:**

Water samples have been collected and analyzed. The strategy for sampling is described. Qualified individual concludes the amount of nutrients needed for the crop based on Source Water test results. Follow up by developing a nutrient management plan with DIA 157 Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity or implement Nutrient Management 590.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$699.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$699.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #89 - Acidic or Alkaline Soil Testing

**Scenario Description:**

Soil analysis is used as a diagnostic tool to identify fields with soil acidification problems in no-till cropping systems. One soil sample is collected every 40 acres from only the top 3 inches of soil and analyzed for both pH and buffer pH. A recommended three cores should be taken from a 4 sq ft sampling area every 40 acres and composited to provide at least 100 grams of soil for the laboratory test. Test results are georeferenced on a map and can be used to build a lime application budget for the field.

**Before Situation:**

Field shows crop yield decline and areas of lower pH are suspected but not tested. No-till application of nitrogen fertilizers is causing acidification. Soil is sampled to 6-inch depth, multiple sub-samples are collected from random locations in the field

**After Situation:**

One composited soil sample is collected in a 4 sq ft area from the top 3 inches of soil every 40 acres,. The sample is analyzed for pH and buffer pH. Sample results are georeferenced on a map and used to identify and diagnose soil acidification problems. Follow up by developing or updating a nutrient management plan with DIA 157 Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity or implement Nutrient Management 590. Producers can then use this diagnostic information to apply lime to raise the soil pH. Topsoil pH and plant productivity and health are both maintained at desirable levels.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$247.07

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$247.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #105 - Soil Test with Organic Nutrients, Less Than or Equal to One Acre

**Scenario Description:**

A qualified individual will develop a nutrient testing strategy, collect soil and nutrient source samples, prepare for laboratory analysis and interpret soil and crop nutrient needs. Typical field size is less than or equal to 0.5 acres (22000 sq ft). Includes Comprehensive Soil Testing to provide both Macro and micro soil nutrient levels.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have soil and nutrient source laboratory analysis documenting the level of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium or pH for the soil and nutrient source. Nutrients are applied without knowledge of soil and nutrient source test levels.

**After Situation:**

Soil and nutrient source samples have been collected and analyzed. The strategy for sampling is described. Qualified individual concludes nutrients are needed or not based on soil test results. The amount of nutrients needed is based on Nutrient Source results. Follow up by developing a nutrient management plan with DIA 157 Nutrient Management Design and Implementation Activity or implement Nutrient Management 590.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$473.02

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$473.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 217 - Soil and Source Testing for Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #121 - Soil Testing, Small Production Beds

**Scenario Description:**

A qualified individual will develop a nutrient testing strategy, collect 5 soil subsamples and combine to one representative sample, prepare for laboratory analysis, and interpret soil nutrient needs. This scenario considers costs for 5 or less raised beds. Cost includes comprehensive soil test based on expected specialty crop production.

**Before Situation:**

Producer does not have soil test laboratory analysis documenting the level of nitrogen, phosphorus, potassium or pH for each field or management unit in crop production. Nutrients are applied without knowledge of soil test levels.

**After Situation:**

Soil samples have been collected and analyzed. The strategy for sampling is described and a map of sampling points is provided. Qualified individual concludes nutrients are needed or not based on soil test results. A Nutrient Management Plan CPS 590 or DIA 157 may be developed after the report is complete.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$612.18 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$612.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 218 - Carbon Sequestration and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Assessment

**Scenario:** #9 - Low Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

An evaluation of the quantifiable carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation effects using the COMET-Farm tool. The information on the type of operation, land use, and management history is collected initially as part of the planning process for a conservation plan focused on carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation. The carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation CEMA includes a complete COMET-Farm project designed to evaluate the current conservation plan and the baseline and historic management impacts on carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation. The COMET-Farm evaluation can occur concurrently or following a conservation plan. Low complexity would include simple systems of a single enterprise, low number of management units, detailed available history.

**Before Situation:**

The producer's objectives are to improve soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation and to quantify the effects of a conservation plan. The quantifiable effects on soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation of the current and his

**After Situation:**

Producer receives a detailed report from COMET-Farm that quantifies the soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation effects of historic, baseline, and (scenario management) proposed conservation plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,047.02 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,047.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 218 - Carbon Sequestration and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Assessment

**Scenario:** #25 - Medium Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

An evaluation of the quantifiable carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation effects using the COMET-Farm tool. The information on the type of operation, land use, and management history is collected initially as part of the planning process for a conservation plan focused on carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation. The carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation CEMA includes a complete COMET-Farm project designed to evaluate the current conservation plan and the baseline and historic management impacts on carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation. The COMET-Farm evaluation can occur concurrently or following a conservation plan. Medium complexity would include systems with more than one enterprises, a moderate number of management units, complex or difficult to define history.

**Before Situation:**

The producer objectives are to improve soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation and quantify the effects of a conservation plan. The quantifiable effects on soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation of the current and historic

**After Situation:**

Producer receives a detailed COMET-Farm report that quantifies the soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation effects of historic, baseline, and (scenario management) proposed conservation plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,570.53 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,570.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 218 - Carbon Sequestration and Greenhouse Gas Mitigation Assessment

**Scenario:** #41 - High Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

An evaluation of the quantifiable carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation effects using the COMET-Farm tool. The information on the type of operation, land use, and management history is collected initially as part of the planning process for a conservation plan focused on carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation. The carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation CEMA includes a complete COMET-Farm project designed to evaluate the current conservation plan and the baseline and historic management impacts on carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation. The COMET-Farm evaluation can occur concurrently or following a conservation plan. High complexity would include systems with multiple enterprises, high number of management units, and complex or incomplete management history.

**Before Situation:**

The producer objectives are to improve soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation and quantify the effects of a conservation plan. The quantifiable effects on soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation of the current and historic

**After Situation:**

Producer receives a detailed report from COMET-Farm that quantifies the soil carbon sequestration and greenhouse gas mitigation effects of historic, baseline, and (scenario management) proposed conservation plan .

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,094.04 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,094.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 219 - Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity

**Scenario:** #9 - Grazed Lands, Less Than or Equal to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Small agricultural operation with less than 100 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, or appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer is not utilizing a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR), and/or DIA 159. Information is not being gathered to evaluate the effect

**After Situation:**

Producer will utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all grazing management practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA 159. Evaluation and monitoring activities will provide all needed information to evaluate the effectiveness of the grazing management plan (CPS 528) and any associated practices. A monitoring plan will be implemented with appropriate protocols and data records that evaluate whether the grazing strategy identified in the grazing plan is resulting in a movement toward meeting goals and objectives. Specific evaluation activities will be chosen based on stated objectives and pertinent resource concerns assessments identified in the Conservation Plan, CPA, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA. Evaluation and monitoring will meet the applicable "plans and specifications" and "operation and maintenance" sections found in CPS 528. Other supporting and facilitating conservation practices will also be monitored and evaluated. The CEMA narrative will describe the overall methodology, decision support tools and recommended management actions to meet purposes and criteria within practice standards. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's FOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used.

**Feature Measure:** number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,047.26

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,047.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 219 - Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity

**Scenario:** #25 - Grazed Lands, 101 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation between 101 and 500 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, or appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer is not utilizing a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR), and/or DIA 159. Information is not being gathered to evaluate the effect

**After Situation:**

Producer will utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all grazing management practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA 159. Evaluation and monitoring activities will provide all needed information to evaluate the effectiveness of the grazing management plan (CPS 528) and any associated practices. A monitoring plan will be implemented with appropriate protocols and data records that evaluate whether the grazing strategy identified in the grazing plan is resulting in a movement toward meeting goals and objectives. Specific evaluation activities will be chosen based on stated objectives and pertinent resource concerns assessments identified in the Conservation Plan, CPA, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA. Evaluation and monitoring will meet the applicable "plans and specifications" and "operation and maintenance" sections found in CPS 528. Other supporting and facilitating conservation practices will also be monitored and evaluated. The CEMA narrative will describe the overall methodology, decision support tools and recommended management actions to meet purposes and criteria within practice standards. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's FOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used.

**Feature Measure:** number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,570.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,570.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 219 - Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity

**Scenario:** #41 - Grazed Lands, 501 to 1,500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Small agricultural operation with 501 to 1,500 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, or appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer is not utilizing a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR), and/or DIA 159. Information is not being gathered to evaluate the effect

**After Situation:**

Producer will utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all grazing management practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA 159. Evaluation and monitoring activities will provide all needed information to evaluate the effectiveness of the grazing management plan (CPS 528) and any associated practices. A monitoring plan will be implemented with appropriate protocols and data records that evaluate whether the grazing strategy identified in the grazing plan is resulting in a movement toward meeting goals and objectives. Specific evaluation activities will be chosen based on stated objectives and pertinent resource concerns assessments identified in the Conservation Plan, CPA, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA. Evaluation and monitoring will meet the applicable "plans and specifications" and "operation and maintenance" sections found in CPS 528. Other supporting and facilitating conservation practices will also be monitored and evaluated. The CEMA narrative will describe the overall methodology, decision support tools and recommended management actions to meet purposes and criteria within practice standards. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's FOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used.

**Feature Measure:** number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,618.16 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,618.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 219 - Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity

**Scenario:** #57 - Grazed Lands, 1,501 to 5,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation with 1,501 to 5,000 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, or appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer is not utilizing a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR), and/or DIA 159. Information is not being gathered to evaluate the effect

**After Situation:**

Producer will utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all grazing management practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA 159. Evaluation and monitoring activities will provide all needed information to evaluate the effectiveness of the grazing management plan (CPS 528) and any associated practices. A monitoring plan will be implemented with appropriate protocols and data records that evaluate whether the grazing strategy identified in the grazing plan is resulting in a movement toward meeting goals and objectives. Specific evaluation activities will be chosen based on stated objectives and pertinent resource concerns assessments identified in the Conservation Plan, CPA, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA. Evaluation and monitoring will meet the applicable "plans and specifications" and "operation and maintenance" sections found in CPS 528. Other supporting and facilitating conservation practices will also be monitored and evaluated. The CEMA narrative will describe the overall methodology, decision support tools and recommended management actions to meet purposes and criteria within practice standards. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's FOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used.

**Feature Measure:** number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,665.42 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,665.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 219 - Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity

**Scenario:** #73 - Grazed Lands, 5,001 to 10,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation with 5,001 to 10,000 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, or appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer is not utilizing a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR), and/or DIA 159. Information is not being gathered to evaluate the effect

**After Situation:**

Producer will utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all grazing management practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA 159. Evaluation and monitoring activities will provide all needed information to evaluate the effectiveness of the grazing management plan (CPS 528) and any associated practices. A monitoring plan will be implemented with appropriate protocols and data records that evaluate whether the grazing strategy identified in the grazing plan is resulting in a movement toward meeting goals and objectives. Specific evaluation activities will be chosen based on stated objectives and pertinent resource concerns assessments identified in the Conservation Plan, CPA, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA. Evaluation and monitoring will meet the applicable "plans and specifications" and "operation and maintenance" sections found in CPS 528. Other supporting and facilitating conservation practices will also be monitored and evaluated. The CEMA narrative will describe the overall methodology, decision support tools and recommended management actions to meet purposes and criteria within practice standards. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's FOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used.

**Feature Measure:** number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,712.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,712.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 219 - Prescribed Grazing Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity

**Scenario:** #89 - Grazed Lands, Greater Than 10,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Agricultural operation with greater than 10,000 acres grazed land. Natural Resource Concern: Soil erosion, water quality, fish and wildlife, plant condition, or appropriate resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Producer is not utilizing a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR), and/or DIA 159. Information is not being gathered to evaluate the effect

**After Situation:**

Producer will utilize a certified Technical Service Provider (TSP) to evaluate and monitor all grazing management practices planned in a Conservation Plan, CPA 110, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA 159. Evaluation and monitoring activities will provide all needed information to evaluate the effectiveness of the grazing management plan (CPS 528) and any associated practices. A monitoring plan will be implemented with appropriate protocols and data records that evaluate whether the grazing strategy identified in the grazing plan is resulting in a movement toward meeting goals and objectives. Specific evaluation activities will be chosen based on stated objectives and pertinent resource concerns assessments identified in the Conservation Plan, CPA, Implementation Requirement (IR) and/or DIA. Evaluation and monitoring will meet the applicable "plans and specifications" and "operation and maintenance" sections found in CPS 528. Other supporting and facilitating conservation practices will also be monitored and evaluated. The CEMA narrative will describe the overall methodology, decision support tools and recommended management actions to meet purposes and criteria within practice standards. Job sheets and implementation requirement documents found in State's FOTG Section IV Conservation practices may be used.

**Feature Measure:** number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,283.57 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,283.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 221 - Soil Organic Carbon Stock Monitoring

**Scenario:** #9 - Soil Carbon Stock Sampling

**Scenario Description:**

Soil is collected for organic carbon testing following the measurement, monitoring, reporting and verification (MMRV) protocol. PODS land use and management information is collected and documents. Soil sample collection strategy is planned in an area of interest (AOI) of <10 acres. Soil samples are collected by a Qualified Individual (QI) at 6 different locations within the AOI (3 locations in 3 different strata). Soil bulk density is measured before being analyzed for organic carbon by dry combustion. Payment includes time for collecting management information, developing sampling strategy, soil sampling and sample preparation, submission to the laboratory, and interpretation/delivery of results.

**Before Situation:**

No recent measurements of soil organic carbon stocks have been made in the AOI. Conservation practices are planned or installed for the purpose of improving soil health and sequestering carbon.

**After Situation:**

Land use and management information is collected. Soil bulk density was measured before being analyzed for organic carbon by dry combustion. The results were interpreted and explained to the producer. Initial measurements are used to establish benchmark conditions for soil organic carbon stocks. Subsequent measurements are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice on carbon sequestration and report the change over time.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Interest Polygon

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,939.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,939.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 221 - Soil Organic Carbon Stock Monitoring

**Scenario:** #89 - Citizen Science

**Scenario Description:**

Soil is collected for organic carbon testing following the measurement, monitoring, reporting and verification (MMRV) protocol. PODS land use and management information is collected and documents. Soil sample collection strategy is planned in an area of interest (AOI) of <10 acres. Soil samples are collected by a Qualified Individual (QI) at 9 different locations within the AOI (3 locations in 3 different strata). Soil bulk density is measured before being analyzed for organic carbon by dry combustion. Payment includes time for collecting management information, developing sampling strategy, soil sampling and sample preparation, submission to the laboratory, and interpretation/delivery of results.

**Before Situation:**

No recent measurements of soil organic carbon stocks have been made in the AOI. Conservation practices are planned or installed for the purpose of improving soil health and sequestering carbon.

**After Situation:**

Land use and management information is collected. Soil bulk density was measured before being analyzed for organic carbon by dry combustion. The results were interpreted and explained to the producer. Initial measurements are used to establish benchmark conditions for soil organic carbon stocks. Subsequent measurements are used to evaluate the effectiveness of a conservation practice on carbon sequestration and report the change over time.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Interest Polygon

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,255.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,255.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 222 - Indigenous Stewardship Methods Evaluation

**Scenario:** #9 - Indigenous Knowledge, 301 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario involves obtaining assistance from a Qualified Individual, designated by the governing body of a Tribe or Indigenous culture, to evaluate the designated planning area, then gather knowledge about indigenous knowledge, and deliver results to the client and NRCS. The resulting information can be used to inform the conservation planning and implementation processes, meet the client's objectives by addressing one or more NRCS-recognized resource concerns using techniques that align with Tribal or Indigenous knowledge.

**Before Situation:**

Through the NRCS conservation planning process, a conservation planner has identified client objectives for addressing natural resource concerns (Soil, Water, Animals, Plants, Air + Energy) and socio-economic considerations such as increasing capacity for

**After Situation:**

The client hired a QI to provide the CEMA assistance. The QI has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop an understanding of its capabilities, limitations, and needs within a culturally appropriate context. Indigenous knowledge about the planning area has been gathered from sources approved by a Tribe or Indigenous culture. The QI verifies with the Tribe's or Indigenous culture's governing body, that the information gathered is accurate- then provides a report, map and other supporting documentation of their ISM evaluation of the planning area to the client; and a copy is shared with NRCS. In the future, the information this CEMA provides can assist the participant and the planner refine conservation objectives; and realize opportunities to incorporate Indigenous knowledge into a conservation plan and/or conservation practice implementations.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,470.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17,470.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 222 - Indigenous Stewardship Methods Evaluation

**Scenario:** #25 - Indigenous Knowledge, 1,001 to 3,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario involves obtaining assistance from a Qualified Individual, designated by the governing body of a Tribe or Indigenous culture, to evaluate the designated planning area, then gather knowledge about indigenous knowledge, and deliver results to the client and NRCS. The resulting information can be used to inform the conservation planning and implementation processes, meet the client's objectives by addressing one or more NRCS-recognized resource concerns using techniques that align with Tribal or Indigenous knowledge.

**Before Situation:**

Through the NRCS conservation planning process, a conservation planner has identified client objectives for addressing natural resource concerns (Soil, Water, Animals, Plants, Air + Energy) and socio-economic considerations such as increasing capacity for

**After Situation:**

The client hired a QI to provide the CEMA assistance. The QI has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop an understanding of its capabilities, limitations, and needs within a culturally appropriate context. Indigenous knowledge about the planning area has been gathered from sources approved by a Tribe or Indigenous culture. The QI verifies with the Tribe's or Indigenous culture's governing body, that the information gathered is accurate- then provides a report, map and other supporting documentation of their ISM evaluation of the planning area to the client; and a copy is shared with NRCS. In the future, the information this CEMA provides can assist the participant and the planner refine conservation objectives; and realize opportunities to incorporate Indigenous knowledge into a conservation plan and/or conservation practice implementations.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$23,160.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$23,160.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 222 - Indigenous Stewardship Methods Evaluation

**Scenario:** #41 - Indigenous Knowledge, Less Than or Equal to 10 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario involves obtaining assistance from a Qualified Individual, designated by the governing body of a Tribe or Indigenous culture, to evaluate the designated planning area, then gather knowledge about indigenous knowledge, and deliver results to the client and NRCS. The resulting information can be used to inform the conservation planning and implementation processes, meet the client's objectives by addressing one or more NRCS-recognized resource concerns using techniques that align with Tribal or Indigenous knowledge.

**Before Situation:**

Through the NRCS conservation planning process, a conservation planner has identified client objectives for addressing natural resource concerns (Soil, Water, Animals, Plants, Air + Energy) and socio-economic considerations such as increasing capacity for

**After Situation:**

The client hired a QI to provide the CEMA assistance. The QI has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop an understanding of its capabilities, limitations, and needs within a culturally appropriate context. Indigenous knowledge about the planning area has been gathered from sources approved by a Tribe or Indigenous culture. The QI verifies with the Tribe's or Indigenous culture's governing body, that the information gathered is accurate- then provides a report, map and other supporting documentation of their ISM evaluation of the planning area to the client; and a copy is shared with NRCS. In the future, the information this CEMA provides can assist the participant and the planner refine conservation objectives; and realize opportunities to incorporate Indigenous knowledge into a conservation plan and/or conservation practice implementations.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,206.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,206.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 222 - Indigenous Stewardship Methods Evaluation

**Scenario:** #57 - Indigenous Knowledge, 11 to 300 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario involves obtaining assistance from a Qualified Individual, designated by the governing body of a Tribe or Indigenous culture, to evaluate the designated planning area, then gather knowledge about indigenous knowledge, and deliver results to the client and NRCS. The resulting information can be used to inform the conservation planning and implementation processes, meet the client's objectives by addressing one or more NRCS-recognized resource concerns using techniques that align with Tribal or Indigenous knowledge.

**Before Situation:**

Through the NRCS conservation planning process, a conservation planner has identified client objectives for addressing natural resource concerns (Soil, Water, Animals, Plants, Air + Energy) and socio-economic considerations such as increasing capacity for

**After Situation:**

The client hired a QI to provide the CEMA assistance. The QI has met with client and visited the planning area, in order to develop an understanding of its capabilities, limitations, and needs within a culturally appropriate context. Indigenous knowledge about the planning area has been gathered from sources approved by a Tribe or Indigenous culture. The QI verifies with the Tribe's or Indigenous culture's governing body, that the information gathered is accurate- then provides a report, map and other supporting documentation of their ISM evaluation of the planning area to the client; and a copy is shared with NRCS. In the future, the information this CEMA provides can assist the participant and the planner refine conservation objectives; and realize opportunities to incorporate Indigenous knowledge into a conservation plan and/or conservation practice implementations.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,537.57 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,537.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 223 - Forest Management Assessment

**Scenario:** #9 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, Less Than or Equal to 20 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 1 to 20 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity is needed to provide a forest inventory to allow

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a qualified individual for development of the Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activities (CEMA) - Forest Inventory. The CEMA criteria requires a forest inventory as a component of a forest management plan to determine current site condition and identify resource concerns. Additional CEMA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$847.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$847.39

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 223 - Forest Management Assessment

**Scenario:** #25 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 21 to 100 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 21 to 100 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity is needed to provide a forest inventory to allow

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a qualified individual for development of the Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activities (CEMA) - Forest Inventory. The CEMA criteria requires a forest inventory as a component of a forest management plan to determine current site condition and identify resource concerns. Additional CEMA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,610.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,610.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 223 - Forest Management Assessment

**Scenario:** #41 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 101 to 250 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 101 to 250 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity is needed to provide a forest inventory to allow

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a qualified individual for development of the Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activities (CEMA) - Forest Inventory. The CEMA criteria requires a forest inventory as a component of a forest management plan to determine current site condition and identify resource concerns. Additional CEMA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,050.62 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,050.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 223 - Forest Management Assessment

**Scenario:** #57 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 251 to 500 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 251 to 500 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity is needed to provide a forest inventory to allow

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a qualified individual for development of the Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activities (CEMA) - Forest Inventory. The CEMA criteria requires a forest inventory as a component of a forest management plan to determine current site condition and identify resource concerns. Additional CEMA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,575.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,575.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 223 - Forest Management Assessment

**Scenario:** #73 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, 501 to 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 501 to 1000 acres in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity is needed to provide a forest inventory to allow

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a qualified individual for development of the Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activities (CEMA) - Forest Inventory. The CEMA criteria requires a forest inventory as a component of a forest management plan to determine current site condition and identify resource concerns. Additional CEMA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,762.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,762.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 223 - Forest Management Assessment

**Scenario:** #89 - Nonindustrial Private Forest, Greater Than 1,000 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Nonindustrial Private Forest Land with a forest management plan. Typical site is approximately 1001 acres or greater in size and consists of existing uneven-aged mixed species stands of harvestable trees. Natural Resource Concern: Fish and Wildlife; Soil Erosion; Soil Condition; Water Quality; Plant Condition; on Forest Land.

**Before Situation:**

The producer currently manages forested lands with an existing forest management plan. Resource concerns exist which are not addressed by a management plan. A Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activity is needed to provide a forest inventory to allow

**After Situation:**

After EQIP contract approval, participant has obtained services from a qualified individual for development of the Conservation Evaluation and Monitoring Activities (CEMA) - Forest Inventory. The CEMA criteria requires a forest inventory as a component of a forest management plan to determine current site condition and identify resource concerns. Additional CEMA criteria are detailed in the Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,711.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,711.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 224 - Aquifer Flow Test

**Scenario:** #10 - Aquifer Testing

**Scenario Description:**

The typical scenario supports the utilization of an existing or planned vertical turbine or submersible pump in an existing or planned water well for pressurizing an irrigation or stockwater system where water well flow rate is unknown. An aquifer flow test (e.g., step drawdown or constant rate) will be done to determine the flow rate from the well and select a pumping plant to match the pumping requirements of the irrigation or livestock system. Resource Concerns: Water Quality degradation - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters; Insufficient water for livestock - Inefficient use of irrigation water; inefficient energy use. Associated Practices: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 430 - Irrigation Pipeline; 441 - Irrigation System, Micro-irrigation; 449 - Irrigation Water Management, 642 - Water Well, 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Before Situation:**

Livestock or irrigation system is delivering insufficient water due to unknown volume and flow rate of the aquifer.

**After Situation:**

With the completion of the aquifer flow test, a known flow rate of the well will determine the correct flow rate and TDH on which a pump can be selected to support an irrigation of stockwater system.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,405.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,405.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 226 - Waste Facility Site Suitability and Feasibility Assessment

**Scenario:** #9 - Non-Dairy Livestock Operations, Onsite Evaluation for Planned Storage

**Scenario Description:**

Non-Dairy livestock operation. A Qualified Individual will conduct an onsite investigation. Soil data collection, investigation and interpretation of the properties and characteristics, results of tests and samples will be used to determine the appropriateness of the site for the storage facility. Scenario based on one proposed location for the planned storage.

**Before Situation:**

A waste storage, handling or treatment facility is planned for the operation. The proposed location has not be investigated for determination of suitability and feasibility.

**After Situation:**

An onsite investigation for soil properties and characteristics was conducted. The proposed location met the criteria to allow the type and size of the planned storage facility. The report documents all data and results.

**Feature Measure:** One site evaluated

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,399.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,399.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 226 - Waste Facility Site Suitability and Feasibility Assessment

**Scenario:** #25 - Dairy Livestock Operations, Onsite Evaluation for Planned Storage

**Scenario Description:**

Livestock operation is Dairy. A Qualified Individual will conduct an onsite investigation. Soil data collection, investigation and interpretation of the properties and characteristics, results of tests and samples will be used to determine the appropriateness of the site for the storage facility. Scenario based on one proposed location for the planned storage.

**Before Situation:**

A waste storage, handling or treatment facility is planned for the operation. The proposed location has not be investigated for determination of suitability and feasibility.

**After Situation:**

An onsite investigation for soil properties and characteristics was conducted. The proposed location met the criteria to allow the type and size of the planned storage facility. The report documents all data and results.

**Feature Measure:** One site evaluated

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,746.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,746.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 227 - Evaluation of Existing Waste Storage Facility Components

**Scenario:** #9 - Livestock Operation, One to Two Components

**Scenario Description:**

A Qualified Individual conducts an on-site investigation of up to 2 manure and wastewater handling and storage structures and equipment at the facilities where the livestock are housed. The investigation report will determine whether or not an existing component is in good operating condition. Typical evaluation of 1-2 storage structures, collection, may include pump.

**Before Situation:**

A waste storage facility and associated equipment is in use on the production area. The existing structure has not been evaluated for good operating condition. New or expanded waste storage and handling facilities could fail if the existing structure is not

**After Situation:**

The Qualified Individual concludes that the existing storage components are in good working order OR has identified the component needs corrective. The CEQA report contains all data and recommendations.

**Feature Measure:** Per Production Site structure

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,908.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,908.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 227 - Evaluation of Existing Waste Storage Facility Components

**Scenario:** #25 - Livestock Operation, Three to Five Components

**Scenario Description:**

A Qualified Individual conducts an on-site investigation of all manure and wastewater handling and storage structures and equipment at the facilities where the livestock are housed. The investigation report will determine whether or not an existing component is in good operating condition. Typical livestock production site has 2-5 storage and collection structures and may include pump.

**Before Situation:**

A waste storage facility and associated equipment is in use on the production area. The existing structure has not been evaluated for good operating condition. New or expanded waste storage and handling facilities could fail if the existing structure is not in

**After Situation:**

The Qualified Individual concludes that the existing storage components are in good working order OR has identified the component needs corrective. The CEQA report contains all data and recommendations.

**Feature Measure:** Per Operation 2-5 Structure

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,618.85

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,618.85

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 227 - Evaluation of Existing Waste Storage Facility Components

**Scenario:** #41 - Livestock Operation, Greater Than Five Components

**Scenario Description:**

A Qualified Individual conducts an on-site investigation of all manure and wastewater handling and storage structures and equipment at the facilities where the livestock are housed. The investigation report will determine whether or not an existing component is in good operating condition. Typical livestock production site has 5 or more storage and collection structures and pump(s).

**Before Situation:**

A waste storage facility and associated equipment is in use on the production area. The existing structure has not been evaluated for good operating condition. New or expanded waste storage and handling facilities could fail if the existing structure is not in

**After Situation:**

The Qualified Individual concludes that the existing storage components are in good working order OR has identified the component needs corrective. The CEQA report contains all data and recommendations.

**Feature Measure:** Per Operation Structures

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,970.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,970.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #9 - Large, Three Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 3 enterprises where at least 1 consists of > 2500 acres of crops, > 1000 animal units, more than 6 irrigation pumps, or > 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Large operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,476.77 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,476.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #25 - Large, Greater Than or Equal to Four Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 4 or more enterprises where at least 1 consists of > 2500 acres of crops, > 1000 animal units, more than 6 irrigation pumps, or > 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Large operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,156.14 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10,156.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #41 - Large, Two Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 2 enterprises where at least 1 consists of > 2500 acres of crops, > 1000 animal units, more than 6 irrigation pumps, or > 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Large operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,797.40 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,797.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #57 - Medium, Greater Than or Equal to Four Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 4 or more enterprises where at least 1 consists of 301 to 2500 acres of crops, < 301 to 1000 animal units, 3 - 6 irrigation pumps, or 20,001 to 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Medium operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,930.59 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,930.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #73 - Small, Greater Than or Equal to Four Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 4 or more enterprises where 1 is not larger than < 300 acres of crops, < 300 animal units, 1 - 2 irrigation pumps, < 20,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse, or maple syrup processing. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Small operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,918.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,918.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #89 - Medium, Three Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 3 enterprises where at least 1 consists of 301 to 2500 acres of crops, < 301 to 1000 animal units, 3 - 6 irrigation pumps, or 20,001 to 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Medium operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,251.21 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,251.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #105 - Small, Three Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 3 enterprises where 1 is not larger than < 300 acres of crops, < 300 animal units, 1 - 2 irrigation pumps, < 20,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse, or maple syrup processing. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Small operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,239.46 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,239.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #121 - Medium, Two Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 2 enterprises where at least 1 consists of 301 to 2500 acres of crops, < 301 to 1000 animal units, 3 - 6 irrigation pumps, or 20,001 to 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Medium operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,571.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,571.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #137 - Small, Two Enterprises

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has 2 enterprises where 1 is not larger than < 300 acres of crops, < 300 animal units, 1 - 2 irrigation pumps, < 20,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse, or maple syrup processing. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. Small operations are described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,560.09 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,560.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #153 - Large, One Enterprise

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has either > 2500 acres of crops, > 1000 animal units, more than 6 irrigation pumps, or > 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. A large operation is described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,118.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,118.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #169 - Medium, One Enterprise

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has either 301 to 2500 acres of crops, < 301 to 1000 animal units, 3 - 6 irrigation pumps, or 20,001 to 40,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. A medium operation is described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,892.47

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,892.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 228 - Agricultural Energy Assessment

**Scenario:** #185 - Small, One Enterprise

**Scenario Description:**

An agricultural producer wishes to obtain an energy assessment of their agricultural operation. The operation has either < 300 acres of crops, < 300 animal units, 1 - 2 irrigation pumps, < 20,000 sq. ft. of heated greenhouse, or maple syrup processing. An enterprise is defined in the ASABE S612 Performing On-farm Energy Audits Standard. A small operation is described above. The Ag Energy CEMA is an assessment of the energy consuming activities and components of an agricultural operation and includes the requirements of a Type 2 energy audit as described in the ASABE S612 standard. An Ag Energy CEMA includes a baseline assessment of the of systems, equipment, and facilities using a typical year of energy use and recommended measures to prioritize on-farm opportunities to increase energy efficiency and reduce energy use. A Certified TSP will accomplish all work in accordance with the requirements of the CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment Activity. Natural Resource Concern: Energy Efficiency of Equipment and Facilities.

**Before Situation:**

Producer currently has minimal knowledge of and no plan for energy conservation. The producer currently manages an operation as described above. Producer intends to collaborate with a certified TSP to develop an energy use assessment of their entire opera

**After Situation:**

The producer has obtained services from a certified TSP to develop an energy assessment. The CEMA 228 criteria include a baseline assessment using a typical year of energy use, energy savings of recommended improvement measures, and information useful for prioritizing implementation of the measures. The documentation may include recommendations for associated conservation practices which address energy efficiency. The Ag Energy CEMA meets the basic quality criteria for the CEMA 228 activity as cited in the NRCS Field Office Technical Guide.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,880.72 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,880.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 309 - Agrichemical Handling Facility

**Scenario:** #13 - Liquid Storage with Pad

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen lined agrichemical handling facility is constructed for storage of liquid agrichemicals along with a concrete handling pad for mixing and loading operations. This practice addresses water quality degradation and due to mis-handling, storing, and mixing of agrichemicals where nutrients and/or chemicals are running off into surface waters or leaching into ground water. Associated practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Diversion (362), Access Road (560), Pipeline (516), Pumping Plant for Water Control (533), Nutrient Management (590), Pest Management (595), Roofs and Covers (367).

**Before Situation:**

Agrichemicals are improperly stored on the ground or next to a well. Operator mixes the agrichemicals and fills the sprayer tank next to a hydrant. Spills or overflows of agrichemicals contaminate the soil, runoff to surface waters and leaching to ground

**After Situation:**

An agrichemical handling facility is constructed for storage of liquid agrichemicals along with a concrete pad for mixing and loading operations or storage of dry chemicals or both. The average size of the agrichemical handling facility for proper storage of liquid agrichemicals is in an earthen lined containment with bottom dimensions of 30 ft x 40 ft. A concrete pad for mixing and loading and storage of dry chemicals, if necessary, is located next to the liquid containment and is 20' x 40' with an application equipment length of 36 ft. The concrete pad for mixing and loading operations is sized to contain the length of the agrichemical spray tank and its volume. Install a curbed (12 in.) reinforced concrete handling pad for mixing and loading. The reinforced concrete meets the requirements of ACI 350. The concrete is sealed and sloped to a collection sump. Appurtenances to provide walls for storage of dry chemicals, if necessary, are included. This practice will contain agrichemicals and prevent contamination of surface and ground water resources.

**Feature Measure:** Floor surface area of Liquid

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,988.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 309 - Agrichemical Handling Facility

**Scenario:** #14 - Fabricated Liquid Storage with Pad

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario is a fabricated agrichemical handling facility for storage of liquid agrichemicals along with an adjacent concrete mixing and loading pad. Due to topography, limited site space and/or geological conditions a fabricated structure is needed. This practice addresses water quality degradation and due to mis-handling, storing, and mixing of agrichemicals where nutrients and/or chemicals are running off into surface waters or leaching into ground water. Associated practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Diversion (362), Access Road (560), Pipeline (516), Pumping Plant for Water Control (533), Nutrient Management (590), Pest Management (595).

**Before Situation:**

Agrichemicals are improperly stored on the ground or next to a well. Operator mixes the agrichemicals and fills the sprayer tank next to a hydrant. Spills or overflows of agrichemicals contaminate the soil, runoff to surface waters and leaching to ground

**After Situation:**

An agrichemical handling facility is constructed for storage of liquid agrichemicals along with an adjacent handling pad for mixing and loading operations. The average size of the fabricated containment is 30 ft x 40 ft with flexible membrane lined walls. The walls are of modular blocks stacked two high for a 4ft wall height on four sides. A handling pad for mixing and loading is located adjacent to the liquid containment and is 16' x 32' with an application equipment length of 28 ft. The handling pad for mixing and loading operations is sized to contain the length of the agrichemical spray tank and its volume. Install a curbed (6") reinforced concrete handling pad for mixing and loading. The concrete is sealed and sloped to a collection sump. This practice will contain agrichemicals and prevent contamination of surface and ground water resources.

**Feature Measure:** Liquid Containment Area +

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,712.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$31,975.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 309 - Agrichemical Handling Facility

**Scenario:** #15 - Concrete Storage and Pad

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario is an agrichemical handling facility for storage and mixing and loading operations. This practice addresses water quality degradation and due to mis-handling, storing and mixing of agrichemicals where nutrients and/or chemicals are running off into surface waters or leaching into ground water. Associated practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Diversion (362), Access Road (560), Pipeline (516), Roof Runoff Management (558), Pumping Plant for Water Control (533), Nutrient Management (590), Pest Management (595), Roofs and Covers (367).

**Before Situation:**

Agrichemicals are improperly stored on the ground or next to a well. Operator mixes the agrichemicals and fills the sprayer tank next to a hydrant. Spills or overflows of agrichemicals contaminate the soil, runoff to surface waters and leaching to ground

**After Situation:**

An agrichemical storage and handling facility pad is constructed of concrete. The storage and handling pad may be constructed inside an existing building, in a new building using Roofs and Covers (367) for new building structures or outdoors without any type of cover. The average size of the agrichemical handling facility for storage and handling is 35' x 40' with an application equipment length of 36 ft. The handling pad for mixing and loading operations is sized to contain the length of the agrichemical spray tank and its volume. The reinforced concrete meets the requirements of ACI 350. Install a curbed reinforced concrete handling pad for mixing and loading with proper storage of associated dry and/or liquid agrichemicals. The concrete is sealed and sloped to a collection sump. Facility containment is surrounded by square and ramped curbs. Appurtenances to provide fresh water, install doors to buildings, walls for storage of chemicals or demolish old concrete in existing buildings are included. This practice will contain agrichemicals and prevent contamination of surface and ground water resources.

**Feature Measure:** Total Containment Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,077.34

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 309 - Agrichemical Handling Facility

**Scenario:** #16 - Drum Pallet Containment and Pad

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario is an agrichemical storage and handling facility for mixing and loading operations within a greenhouse. This practice addresses water quality degradation and due to mis-handling, storing, and mixing of agrichemicals where nutrients and/or chemicals are running off into surface waters or leaching into ground water. Associated practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Diversion (362), Pipeline (516), Pumping Plant for Water Control (533), Nutrient Management (590), Pest Management (595)

**Before Situation:**

Agrichemicals are improperly stored on the ground or next to a well. Operator mixes the agrichemicals and fills the sprayer tank next to a hydrant. Spills or overflows of agrichemicals contaminate the soil, runoff to surface waters and leaching to ground

**After Situation:**

This scenario is an agrichemical handling facility storage an impermeable barrier poly pad for mixing and loading operations. The average size of the agrichemical handling storage is for a pallet drum on a 5 ft x 5 ft containment pallet with sump capacity included. A poly pad is used for mixing and loading that is 8ft x 8ft with an application equipment length of 4 ft. The handling pad for mixing and loading operations is sized to contain the length of the agrichemical spray tank and its volume. This practice will contain agrichemicals and prevent contamination of surface and ground water resources.

**Feature Measure:** Storage Area + Mixing Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 89.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,257.74 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$25.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 311 - Alley Cropping

**Scenario:** #249 - Single Row

**Scenario Description:**

The crop or grass land is planted with rows of trees to increase crop diversity. Final row width, and spacing of trees within the row, is based on farm equipment size, growth form of trees, light needs of annual crop or grass, and intent of the landowner. The resource concerns are plant condition - inadequate structure and composition.

**Before Situation:**

The landscape has been cropped or in perennial grass for many years. It is void of any perennial tree vegetation. On cropland site preparation needs may need deep ripping to eliminate any plow pan and on grass land competing vegetation control is accompli

**After Situation:**

Trees have been established to diversify the crop production of the field. Typically the area planted is 10 acres on approximately 12 x 40 foot spacing.

**Feature Measure:** planted seedling

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 900.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$39,472.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$43.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 311 - Alley Cropping

**Scenario:** #250 - Three Row Sets

**Scenario Description:**

Cropland is planted with trees in 3-row sets with 40 foot alleyways in between. The outside rows of trees are conifers and the center row a mast-producing high-value hardwood timber species. Between row spacing is 16 feet and between tree spacing is 10 feet. The resource concerns are Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/ Insufficient Water (inefficient moisture management); Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity).

**Before Situation:**

The landscape has been cropped for many years. It is void of any perennial tree vegetation. Wind erosion is evident, insufficient water for crops occurs due to excessive winds, wildlife habitat score is very low due to the lack of any perennial vegetation

**After Situation:**

Trees have been established to diversify the crop production, reduce erosion by wind and water and improve growing conditions for crops in alleyways. Typically the area planted is 10 acres.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,824.69

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$982.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 311 - Alley Cropping

**Scenario:** #272 - Single Row, Less Than or Equal to Five Acres

**Scenario Description:**

The crop or grass land is planted with rows of trees to increase crop diversity. Final row width, and spacing of trees within the row, is based site size, growth form of trees, light needs of annual crop or grass, and intent of the landowner. The resource concerns are plant condition - inadequate structure and composition.

**Before Situation:**

The landscape has been cropped or in perennial grass for many years. It is void of any perennial tree vegetation. On grassland competing vegetation control is accomplished prior to tree planting.

**After Situation:**

Trees have been established to diversify crop production of the field. Typically the area planted is less than 5 acres on approximately 12 x 40 foot spacing.

**Feature Measure:** Planted Seedling

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 450.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,179.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$31.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #1 - Embankment Pond

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen waste impoundment constructed to store wastes such as manure, wastewater, and contaminated runoff as part of an agricultural waste management system. This scenario has a design storage volume of more than 865,400 ft<sup>3</sup>. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Earthen storage liners are addressed with another standard. Vehicular and equipment access is addressed in Heavy Use Area Protection (561). Adequately protect liner at agitation and access points. The impoundment will have constructed berms greater than 3' high. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membrane (521A), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roofs and Covers (367), and Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility (632), Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Operator presently has a confined animal feeding operation without a waste management system adequate to handle the waste stream leaving the animal production facilities. Manure and other agricultural waste by-products are not being utilized or controlled

**After Situation:**

An earthen storage structure constructed from on-site material provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Typical design size: design storage volume 865,400 ft<sup>3</sup>; The design storage of the pond is 250' x 250' bottom, with 10.8 feet of depth. The pond is constructed by a combination of excavation and earthfill with an embankment fill height greater than 3 feet. 3:1 inside and outside side slopes are utilized for the excavation and embankment; (not include in design volume - freeboard and sludge accumulation).

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 865,400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$73,241.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #2 - Excavated Pond

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen waste impoundment constructed to store wastes such as manure, wastewater, and contaminated runoff as part of an agricultural waste management system. This scenario has a design storage volume of more than 382,000 ft<sup>3</sup>. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Earthen storage liners are addressed with another standard. Vehicular and equipment access is addressed in Heavy Use Area Protection (561). Adequately protect liner at agitation and access points. The impoundment will have constructed berms less than 3' high. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membrane (521A), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roofs and Covers (367), and Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility (632), Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Operator presently has a confined animal feeding operation without a waste management system adequate to handle the waste stream leaving the animal production facilities. Manure and other agricultural waste by-products are not being utilized or controlled

**After Situation:**

An earthen storage structure constructed from on-site material provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Typical design size: design storage volume 382,000 ft<sup>3</sup>; The pond bottom is 280' x 120' x 10' deep with a small berm normally less than 3' high around the outside of the pond. 3:1 inside and outside side slopes; (not included in design volume - freeboard and sludge accumulation).

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 382,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$58,021.34 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #3 - Buried Concrete Tank, Less Than or Equal to 14,999 Cubic Feet

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a concrete tank that has a design storage volume from 5,000 to 14,999 CF that is totally or partially buried and has an open top. The tank can also be under an animal facility with the top cover of either slats or solid concrete lid/floor. Design volume does not include freeboard. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membrane (521A), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roof and Covers (367), Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility (632), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Tank typically 7' deep, with a bottom area of 1400 SF, and a design storage volume of approximately 9,000 cubic feet plus 6" freeboard. Sizing based on manure, other wastes, rainfall, lot runoff, etc. as appropriate. Volume does not include 6" of freeboard.

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 9,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$41,227.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #4 - Buried Concrete Tank, 15,000 to 110,000 Cubic Feet

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a concrete tank that has a design storage volume from 15,000 to 110,000 CF that is totally or partially buried and has an open top. The tank can also be under an animal facility with the top cover of either slats or solid concrete lid/floor. Design volume does not include freeboard. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membrane (521A), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roof and Covers (367), Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility (632), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Tank typically 10' deep, with a bottom area of 2,947 SF, and a design storage volume of 20,659 cubic feet plus 2' freeboard and 1' residual. Sizing based on manure, other wastes, rainfall, lot runoff, etc. as appropriate. Volume does not include 2' of freeboard, or 1' of residual.

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20,659.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$61,397.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #5 - Buried Concrete Tank, Greater Than 110,000 Cubic Feet

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a concrete tank that has a design storage volume of 110, 000 or more CF. Tank is totally or partially buried and has an open top. Tank can also be under a animal facility with the top cover using slats or concrete lid/floor. The design volume does not include freeboard. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential to soil, surface water and ground water. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Flexible Membrane (521A), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roof and Covers (367), Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility (632), Diversion (362), Pipeline (516), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Tank typically 102' X 160' X 8' deep with a bottom area of 16,320 SF and a design storage volume of 81,600 CF plus 2' freeboard, and 1' residual. Sizing based on manure, other wastes, rainfall, lot runoff, etc. as appropriate. Volume does not include 2' of freeboard, and 1' residual.

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 81,600.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$235,611.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #6 - Above Ground Steel or Concrete Structure

**Scenario Description:**

An above ground circular glass lined steel or concrete structure constructed to store wastes such as manure, wastewater, and contaminated runoff as part of an agricultural waste management system. This typical scenario has a design storage volume of 66,000 ft<sup>3</sup>. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Potential Associated Practices: Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility (632), Waste Treatment (629), and Pumping Plant (533).

**Before Situation:**

Operator presently has a confined animal feeding operation without a waste management system adequate to handle the waste stream leaving the animal production facilities. Manure and other agricultural waste by-products are not being utilized or controlled

**After Situation:**

An above ground storage structure provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Typical design size : design storage volume 66,000 ft<sup>3</sup>, (not included - 1' freeboard); based on 73' X 19' glass lined steel tank

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 66,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$263,732.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #7 - Composted Bedded Pack, Concrete Floor and Walls

**Scenario Description:**

A composted bedded pack facility is constructed to store wastes such as manure, wastewater, and contaminated runoff as part of an agricultural waste management system. This scenario is intended for situations where consistency of manure or geological conditions prohibit the use of earthen floors. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Concrete walls required to withstand the heavy equipment that the producer operates. Potential Associated Practices: Fence (382), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561) and Roofs and Covers (367).

**Before Situation:**

Operator presently has a confined animal feeding operation without a waste management system adequate to handle the waste stream leaving the animal production facilities. Manure and other agricultural waste by-products are not being utilized or controlled

**After Situation:**

Using a bedded pack provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Typical design: floor area 4,000 ft<sup>2</sup>, (40' X 100'); 4' concrete wall height, 3' footing depth with a 6" concrete floor; 20' openings on each end of structure.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$58,303.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #9 - Composted Bedded Pack, Earthen Floor and Wood Walls

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of a dry stack facility with compacted earthen floor with wooden walls, posts and a concrete curb. This scenario is intended for dryer material such as poultry litter. The purpose of this practice is to properly store manure and other agricultural by-products until they can be hauled away from the site for proper disposal or utilization on land at agronomical rates. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential to soil, surface water and ground water. Potential Associated practices: 342-Critical Area Planting, 362-Diversion, 561-Heavy Use Area Protection, 367-Roofs and Covers, 558-Roof Runoff Structure, 317-Composting Facility, 633-Waste Recycling, 634-Waste Transfer, 635-Vegetated Treatment Area

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

The typical is 4,000 SqFt (40' x 100'). The earthen floor will be prepared by stripping the top 1' of soil and roller compacting an 18" thick compacted floor. Walls are 5' pressure treated wood (2" x 8" boards), 6" x 6" x 8' posts set 4' c-c with 6" concrete curbing. Walls allow for greater storage volume. Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,691.90 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #10 - Composted Bedded Pack, Earthen Floor and Concrete Walls

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of a dry stack facility (covered) with compacted earthen floor with concrete walls. This scenario is intended to provide storage for manure and agricultural by-products that is protected from the environment and can be either inside the animal housing area or a separate facility for separated solids. The purpose of this practice is to properly store manure and other agricultural by-products until they can be removed from the site for proper utilization on land at agronomical rates. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential to soil, surface water and ground water. Compacted earth floors required to meet state guidelines for seepage should be installed with CPS 521-D, Pond Sealing or Lining - Compacted Clay Treatment. Potential Associated practices: 521D-Pond Sealing or Lining; Compacted Clay Treatment, 342-Critical Area Planting, 362-Diversion, 561-Heavy Use Area Protection, 367-Roofs and Covers, 558-Roof Runoff Structure, 317-Composting Facility, 632 - Solid/Liquid Waste Separation, 633-Waste Recycling, 634-Waste Transfer, 635-Vegetated Treatment Area

**Before Situation:**

Livestock are currently on open lots with runoff un-controlled. Un-controlled runoff is causing off-site damage due to sedimentation and elevated nutrient levels in receiving waters.

**After Situation:**

The typical size of the bedded pack Facility is 40' x 100' (4,000 SF). Facility has an earth floor and 4' high walls with 3' deep footings. A 10' opening is located on each end for access. When used as housing, the animal density can be increased by placing under roof and existing open lots abandoned. Using a bedded pack provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,697.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #11 - Composted Bedded Pack, Concrete Walls and Apron with Earthen Floor

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of a dry stack facility (covered) with compacted earthen floor with concrete walls. This scenario is intended to provide storage for manure and agricultural by-products that is protected from the environment and can be either inside the animal housing area or a separate facility for separated solids. The purpose of this practice is to properly store manure and other agricultural by-products until they can be removed from the site for proper utilization on land at agronomical rates. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential to soil, surface water and ground water. Compacted earth floors required to meet state guidelines for seepage should be installed with CPS 521-D, Pond Sealing or Lining - Compacted Clay Treatment. Concrete floor will be constructed behind the feed bunk in the area with largest manure accumulation, and also to provide an adequate base where equipment will be frequently removing manure. Potential Associated practices: 521D-Pond Sealing or Lining; Compacted Clay Treatment, 342-Critical Area Planting, 362-Diversion, 561-Heavy Use Area Protection, 367-Roofs and Covers, 558-Roof Runoff Structure, 317-Composting Facility, 632 - Solid/Liquid Waste Separation, 633-Waste Recycling, 634-Waste Transfer, 635-Vegetated Treatment Area

**Before Situation:**

Livestock are currently on open lots with runoff un-controlled. Un-controlled runoff is causing off-site damage due to sedimentation and elevated nutrient levels in receiving waters.

**After Situation:**

The typical size of the bedded pack Facility is 40' x 100' (4,000 SF). Facility has an earth floor and 4' high walls with 3' deep footings. It has a 12' x 100' concrete apron. A 10' opening is located on each end for access. When used as housing, the animal density can be increased by placing under roof and existing open lots abandoned. Using a bedded pack provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$35,065.41

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #13 - Dry Stack with Concrete Floor and No Walls

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of a dry stack facility with reinforced concrete floor without side walls. This scenario is intended for situations where consistency of manure or geographical conditions prohibit earthen floors. The purpose of this practice is to properly store manure and other agricultural by-products until they can be hauled away from the site for proper disposal or utilization on land at agronomical rates. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential to soil, surface water and ground water. Potential Associated practices: 342-Critical Area Planting, 362-Diversion, 561-Heavy Use Area Protection, 367-Roofs and Covers, 558-Roof Runoff Structure, 317-Composting Facility, 633-Waste Recycling, 634-Waste Transfer, 635-Vegetated Treatment Area

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

The typical is 4,000 SqFt (40' x 100'). The facility floor is 6" reinforced concrete without side walls. Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$39,344.56

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #14 - Dry Stack with Concrete Floor and Walls

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of a dry stack facility with reinforced concrete floor with side walls. This scenario is intended for situations where consistency of manure or geographical conditions prohibit earthen floors. The purpose of this practice is to properly store manure and other agricultural by-products until they can be hauled away from the site for proper disposal or utilization on land at agronomical rates. Concrete walls required to withstand the heavy equipment that the producer operates. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential to soil, surface water and ground water. Potential Associated practices: 342-Critical Area Planting, 362-Diversion, 561-Heavy Use Area Protection, 367-Roofs and Covers, 558-Roof Runoff Structure, 317-Composting Facility, 633-Waste Recycling, 634-Waste Transfer, 635-Vegetated Treatment Area

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

The typical is 4,000 SqFt (40' x 100'). The facility floor is 6" reinforced concrete with 4' walls on 3 sides. Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$51,243.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 313 - Waste Storage Facility

**Scenario:** #43 - Earthen Storage, Greater Than 50,000 Cubic Feet

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen waste impoundment constructed to store wastes such as manure, wastewater, and contaminated runoff as part of an agricultural waste management system. This scenario has a design storage volume of more than 50,000 ft<sup>3</sup>. This practice will address soil and water quality by reducing the pollution potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Earthen storage liners are addressed with another standard. Vehicular and equipment access is addressed in Heavy Use Area Protection (561) to adequately protect liner at agitation and access points. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment (520), Pond Sealing or Lining, Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner (521), Pond Sealing or Lining, Concrete (522), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roofs and Covers (367), and Waste Separation Facility (632), Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Operator presently has a confined animal feeding operation without a waste management system adequate to handle the waste stream leaving the animal production facilities. Manure and other agricultural waste by-products are not being utilized or controlled

**After Situation:**

An earthen storage structure constructed from on-site material provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Typical design size: design storage volume 199,475 ft<sup>3</sup>; 157'X162' (top); 3:1 inside and outside side slopes; cut/fill ratio = 1.25; total depth = 13' 8" (operational depth = 12', operational volume = 170,775 ft<sup>3</sup>); (1' freeboard and 8" sludge accumulation).

**Feature Measure:** Design Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 199,475.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$48,235.84

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #3 - Mechanical and Chemical Control, Low Infestation

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of woody vegetation on gently sloping to moderately deep to deep soils. The practice requires the felling of trees and brush using a mechanical cutter, chopper or other light equipment, and applying herbicide to cut stump resprouting tree/brush species, as necessary, in order to improve ecological site conditions. Brush density has met or exceeded low or light infestation (1-5% canopy depending upon species) levels based on ecological site potential as determined by state specific criteria. Typical unit is 80 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Area consist of low or light infestations of trees and shrub species which degrade desirable plant productivity, health and vigor of pasture or range units, thus promoting invasive non-herbaceous species and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Woody species are removed to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend; hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,355.73

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$79.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #5 - Mechanical and Chemical Control, Heavy Infestation

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of woody vegetation on gently sloping terrain with moderately deep to deep soils. The practice requires the felling and potential piling of trees and brush using a mechanical cutter, chopper, or other light equipment, and applying herbicide to cut stump resprouting tree/brush species, as necessary, in order to improve ecological site conditions. Brush density has met or exceeded heavy or high infestation (averaging >15% canopy depending upon species) levels based on ecological site potential as determined by state specific criteria. Typical unit is 10 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Area consist of heavy or high infestations of trees and shrub species which degrade desirable plant productivity, health and vigor of pasture or range units, thus promoting invasive non-herbaceous species and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Woody species are removed to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,371.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$537.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #6 - Chemical Control, Upland Areas

**Scenario Description:**

This practice is for the implementation of brush management on range, pasture or native pasture to reduce undesirable brush in uplands, and other areas not in, or directly adjacent to, streams, ponds, or wetlands. The typical method of control uses aerial or broadcast application of herbicides to control undesirable plants. Entire unit has infestation levels exceeding state identified levels; entire unit is treated with broadcast application.

**Before Situation:**

Brush species exceed desired levels resulting in degraded plant condition, loss of forage production, or degraded wildlife habitat. Densities of brush exceed levels indicated in the ecological site descriptions.

**After Situation:**

Brush has been treated to a level which results in improved plant condition, forage production, or wildlife habitat. The typical method of control is application of herbicides (basal or foliar location) on select individual plants.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,557.42

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$31.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #7 - Chemical Control, Riparian Area

**Scenario Description:**

Apply chemical brush management techniques on an isolated riparian area within a 80 acre planning unit which is directly adjacent to a stream (may include ponds or wetlands) associated with rangeland (may include grazed forest, pasture, or other landuses) to control undesirable deciduous species in order to improve ecological/range site condition. Treatment is applied to a 2 acres isolated area adjacent to a stream which uses broadcast/aerial specialized herbicide(s) application on the entire 2 acres to reduce or remove trees and/or brush which are not appropriate for the site(s).

**Before Situation:**

Plant, animal, or wildlife resource concerns associated with riparian areas and other areas in or adjacent to the stream (incl. ponds or wetlands) on grazed range (incl. grazed forest, pasture, or other landuses) which are adversely affected by undesirabl

**After Situation:**

Isolated riparian community infested with undesirable tree and/or shrub species within a range unit (incl. grazed forest, pasture, or other landuse) where reduction or removal of undesirable deciduous species adjacent to a stream (incl. ponds or wetlands) has been accomplished through the use of appropriate chemical application to address plant, animal, and wildlife resource concerns, thus improving ecological/range site condition.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$908.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$454.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #8 - Chemical Control, Spot Application

**Scenario Description:**

Apply foliar chemical brush management techniques (aerial fixed wing or ground rig) on isolated upland areas within a 80 acre planning unit (not directly adjacent to streams, ponds or wetlands) associated with rangeland (may include grazed forest, pasture, or other landuses) to control undesirable deciduous species in order to improve ecological/range site conditions. Treatment is applied to 10 acre isolated areas (not adjacent to a stream, wetland or pond), using broadcast/aerial herbicide(s) application, on the entire 10 acres to reduce or remove trees and/or brush which are not appropriate for the site(s). Foliar application of material using the most effective, low cost chemical(s).

**Before Situation:**

Plant, animal, or wildlife resource concerns associated with upland areas (not in or adjacent to streams, ponds, or wetlands) on grazed range (incl. grazed forest, pasture, or other landuses) which are adversely affected by undesirable trees and/or brush

**After Situation:**

Isolated upland areas infested with undesirable tree and/or shrub species within a range unit (incl. grazed forest, pasture, or other landuse) where reduction or removal of undesirable deciduous species (not adjacent to or within a stream, ponds, or wetlands) has been accomplished through the use of appropriate foliar chemical application to address plant, animal, and wildlife resource concerns, thus improving ecological/range site conditions.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$526.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$52.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #38 - Mechanical and Chemical Control, Medium Infestation

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of woody vegetation on gently sloping to moderately deep to deep soils. The practice requires the felling of trees and brush using a mechanical cutter, chopper or other light equipment, and applying herbicide to cut stump resprouting tree/brush species, as necessary, in order to improve ecological site conditions. Brush density has met or exceeded medium or moderate infestation (averaging 6-15% canopy depending upon species) levels based on ecological site potential as determined by state specific criteria. Typical unit is 80 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Area consist of medium or moderate infestations of trees and shrub species which degrade desirable plant productivity, health and vigor of pasture or range units, thus promoting invasive non-herbaceous species and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Woody species are removed to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend; hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,298.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$191.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #78 - Mechanical and Chemical Control, Severe Infestation

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of woody vegetation on gently sloping terrain with moderately deep to deep soils. The practice requires the felling and potential piling of trees and brush using a mechanical cutter, chopper, or other light equipment, and applying herbicide to cut stump resprouting tree/brush species, as necessary, in order to improve ecological site conditions. Brush density has met or exceeded severe infestation (averaging 45% or greater canopy depending upon species) levels based on ecological site potential as determined by state specific criteria. Typical unit is 5 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Area consist of severe infestations of trees and shrub species which degrade desirable plant productivity, health and vigor of pasture or range units, thus promoting invasive non-herbaceous species and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Woody species are removed to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,101.15 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$820.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #375 - Mechanical Control, Less Than or Equal to One Acre

**Scenario Description:**

Using hand tools and small power tools to remove or cut off invasive woody plants at or below the root collar. Typically this scenario is for woody and non-herbaceous species that are in early phases of invasion and are degrading herbaceous plant health and vigor for the 1 acre small farm.

**Before Situation:**

Small farm area is in various phases of woody non-herbaceous species encroachment that degrades the biotic integrity of the site resulting in poor herbaceous plant health and vigor. Continued degradation results in increased invasive woody species and poor

**After Situation:**

Woody species are removed to achieve desirable biotic conditions for herbaceous plant health and vigor. Hydrological site characteristics and plant health and vigor are improved, and plant pest pressure from invasive woody species is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$550.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$550.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 314 - Brush Management

**Scenario:** #382 - Manual Control, Difficult Terrain

**Scenario Description:**

Using hand tools, including chainsaws, to mechanically treat woody plants on steep slopes or areas inaccessible by machines. Typical area is steep terrain (>25% slopes) or isolated infestations where mechanical cutter, chopper, or other light equipment cannot access mature woody plants to perform treatment. Application of herbicide to girdles and cuts of resprouting tree/brush species will be completed as necessary.

**Before Situation:**

Woody species (including mature, seed-bearing trees) are present and creating on-site degradation to ecosystem services as well as increasing vulnerability to woody encroachment in adjacent lands. Resource concern of plant pest pressure (invasive species

**After Situation:**

Woody species are removed to achieve the desired plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition improves and risk of woody encroachment to adjacent lands declines.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,212.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,042.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #1 - Chemical Control, Ground or Aerial Application

**Scenario Description:**

Land unit on which weed control would be beneficial in order to set back the plant community succession, improve the ecological condition, and improve forage conditions for domestic livestock or wildlife. The practice entails the eradication of vegetation by use of weed treatment using ground or aerial equipment to apply chemicals, in order to eliminate noxious weeds, promote forage productivity, and improve ecological condition.

**Before Situation:**

Area consists of excessive stands of herbaceous weeds in existing or newly seeded or planted stands. Excessive weed growth degrades health and vigor of native herbaceous species, promoting noxious and invasive species or undesirable plant species and degr

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous weeds are treated and controlled to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Desirable plant community is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,673.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$22.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #2 - Chemical Control, Wetland Area

**Scenario Description:**

Using ground rigs and hand held equipment to treat herbaceous plants in wetland and riparian areas. Typical area is moderately rolling to gently sloping terrain with moderately deep to deep soils that have herbaceous weed species in the early phases of invasions. Typical unit is 10 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Area is in the very early phases of herbaceous weed encroachment that degrade habitat for desired wildlife species. Future degradation of wildlife habitat and ecological site condition promotes noxious, invasive, and undesirable species encroachment.

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous weeds are treated and controlled to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological condition continues to progress in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor are improved or sustained, wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$403.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$40.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #3 - Mechanical Control

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of light infestations of herbaceous weeds on gently sloping terrain with moderately deep to deep soils. The practice entails the removal of herbaceous weeds by the use of a mower, brush hog, disc, or other light equipment, in order to reduce fuel load and improve the ecological site condition. Weeds have exceeded desired levels based on ecological site potential. For organic and non-organic farms.

**Before Situation:**

Area consists of excessive stands of herbaceous weeds degrading the health and vigor of native herbaceous species and wildlife habitat while promoting noxious and invasive species encroachment.

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous weeds are removed to achieve the desired plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor are returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$288.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #4 - Mechanical Control, Tree Establishment

**Scenario Description:**

Land unit on which weed control would be beneficial to set back the plant community succession, improve the ecological condition, and improve stand establishment of herbaceous or deciduous plantings. The practice entails the eradication of vegetation by use of weed treatment, through tillage, to eliminate undesirable weeds, promote stand establishment, improve ecological condition and wildlife habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Area consists of excessive stands of herbaceous weeds degrading the health and vigor of tree species in rows or plantings.

**After Situation:**

Undesirable herbaceous weeds are controlled or removed in and around tree planting, through tillage, to achieve a desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, and density. Tree stand condition is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor are returning to near normal levels, and wildlife habitat is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$397.15 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$397.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #6 - Chemical Control, Post-Emergent

**Scenario Description:**

Tree establishment in which weed control would be beneficial in order to set back the plant community succession, improve the ecological condition, and improve the health and vigor of the stand. The practice entails the management of undesirable plants (including invasive and non-invasive species) with a post-emergent selective herbicide for the establishment of a tree planting on four acres. Broadcast or spot treatment application of a narrow band of herbicide (2-4 feet wide) along the tree row or around individual trees is an example of banding herbicides to control weeds. In order to receive payment, the landowner, at a minimum, must utilize and maintain Integrated Pest Management (IPM) principles including scouting, biological and/or low risk pesticides.

**Before Situation:**

Area consists of excessive stands of herbaceous weeds degrading the health and vigor of tree rows and timber establishments promoting undesirable plants, noxious and invasive species, and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous weeds are controlled with post-emergent herbicides to achieve the desired plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Permits individual trees and timber stands to be planted to promote/improve soil health and condition, hydrology, plant health and vigor, and wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$302.60

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$75.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #23 - Chemical Control, Aerial Application

**Scenario Description:**

Land unit on which weed control would be beneficial in order to set back the plant community succession, improve the ecological condition, and improve forage conditions for domestic livestock or wildlife. The practice entails the eradication of vegetation by use of weed treatment using airplane or helicopter to apply chemicals, in order to eliminate noxious weeds, promote forage productivity, and improve ecological condition.

**Before Situation:**

Area consist of excessive stands of herbaceous weeds degrading health and vigor of native herbaceous species promoting noxious and invasive species and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous weeds are removed to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and improved wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$668.10

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$33.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #26 - Chemical Control, Spot Application

**Scenario Description:**

Land unit on which weed control would be beneficial in order to set back the plant community succession, improve the ecological condition, and improve forage conditions for domestic livestock or wildlife. The practice entails the eradication of vegetation by use of weed treatment, either initial or retreatment using hand-carried equipment (such as a backpack and hand-sprayer) to apply chemicals, in order to eliminate noxious weeds, promote forage productivity, and improve ecological condition.

**Before Situation:**

Area consist of excessive stands of herbaceous weeds degrading health and vigor of native herbaceous species promoting noxious and invasive species and degrading wildlife habitat.

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous weeds are removed to achieve the desirable plant community based on species composition, structure, density, and canopy cover or height. Ecological site condition is progressing in an upward trend, hydrology and plant health and vigor is returning to near normal levels, and improved wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,296.36 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$64.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 315 - Herbaceous Weed Treatment

**Scenario:** #85 - Mechanical Control, Less Than or Equal to One Acre

**Scenario Description:**

Using hand and small power tools to remove or cut off herbaceous invasive plants at or below the root collar. Typically this scenario is for herbaceous invasive species that are degrading the 1 acre small farm.

**Before Situation:**

Small farm area is in various phases of herbaceous species encroachment that degrades the biotic integrity resulting in poor plant health and vigor, and/or wildlife habitat. Continued degradation results in increased plant pest pressure, loss of plant div

**After Situation:**

Herbaceous species are removed to achieve desirable biotic conditions and improved plant health and vigor, and/or wildlife habitat. Hydrological site characteristics are improved, and plant pest pressure from invasive herbaceous species are reduced.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$380.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$380.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #4 - In-Vessel-Rotary Drum, Less Than 700 Cubic Feet

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a horizontal rotary drum to compost smaller poultry and swine facility mortality. It can handle between 250 and 600 lbs. per day of mortality plus equal or higher volumes of carbon material (i.e. wood chips). A secondary composting storage area is required to finish materials. Payment quantity based on interior volume of rotary composter in cubic feet of smallest drum that can process daily mortality as per manufacturers' recommendations. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Scenario is needed where the producer has a limited footprint for the installed practice. Potential Associated Practices: Roofs and Covers (367), Waste Storage Facility (313), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Installed a 5' diameter by 22' long rotary drum on two concrete pads that can process 325 lbs. of mortality per day. Drum rotation moves and mixes mortality and wood chips. Site preparation includes topsoil removal, gravel pad, and concrete pads and slab at two locations plus small floor and walls to complete composting. Input material reduced by 40-60 percent and put into 4' high, three sided, 20'x 20' concrete bin with 10'x20 concrete pad for secondary composting. Carbon source is placed into a three sided 30' x 30' with 4' high walls. Area can be protected by adding Roofs and Covers (367) standard.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Drum

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 432.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$62,019.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$143.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #5 - In-Vessel-Rotary Drum, Greater Than or Equal to 700 Cubic Feet

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a horizontal rotary drum to compost larger poultry and swine facility mortality. It can handle between 600 and 1,000 lbs. per day of mortality plus equal or higher volumes of carbon material (i.e. wood chips). A secondary composting storage area is required to finish materials. Payment quantity based on interior volume of rotary composter in cubic feet of smallest drum that can process daily mortality as per manufacturers' recommendations. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Scenario is needed where the producer has a limited footprint for the installed practice. Potential Associated Practices: Roofs and Covers (367), Waste Storage Facility (313), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Installed a 5' diameter by 54' long rotary drum on two concrete pads that can process 810 lbs. of mortality per day. Drum rotation moves and mixes mortality and wood chips. Site preparation includes topsoil removal, gravel pad, concrete pads, slab at two locations plus concrete floor and walls to complete composting. Input material reduced by 40-60 percent and put into 4' high, three sided, 30'x 30' concrete bin with 10'x30' concrete pad for secondary composting. Area can be protected by adding Roofs and Covers (367) standard.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Drum

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,079.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$83,300.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$77.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #6 - Static Pile with Earthen Pad

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing an impervious earthen pad to compost large animal mortalities, typically dairy cow mortality, in a static windrow or single pile. Additional carbon based bulking material is added to facilitate aeration and provide a proper C:N ratio. Piles turned at least once to go into another heat cycle prior to land application. Access is infrequent. This option may not be desirable for sites with limited area, karst topography, and not isolated from public view. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (378), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620). Vegetative Treatment Area (635), Composting (317), Roofs and Covers (367), Heavy Use Area Protection (561)

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Construct a 50' x 150' compacted earth surface. Site can handle mortality for a 100 cow dairy with associated heifers and calves. On site soils can be recompacted to meet required imperviousness. Include sufficient area for processing equipment access. Single piles or windrows to minimize runoff. Site to be located out of drainage areas, off-site water diverted and any runoff to spread out into a grassed area or vegetated treatment area as per regulations. Site preparation includes removal of top 1' and recompacting.

**Feature Measure:** Pad Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 7,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,732.56 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #9 - Static Pile with Concrete Pad

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a concrete pad over permeable soils, karst topography, frequently accessed sites or sites with regulatory requirements. Typically associated with large dairy (1,000 cows plus heifers ) or beef animal mortality with an average daily mortality of 175 lbs./day. Area sized to compost animal mortality as a static pile or windrow with equipment around materials. Sufficient carbon based bulking material added to allow natural aeration and a proper C:N ratio. Water is added to maintain moisture content. Piles typically turned at least once to go into another heat cycle prior to final disposal, typically land application. Site to be located out of drainage areas, off-site water diverted and any runoff to spread out into a grassed area or vegetated treatment area as per regulations. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Construct a 60'x95' concrete surface to process mortality. Concrete 5" thick with light reinforcement. A hydrant is installed at the site to allow for moisture content control. Typical layout is 18' wide piles with 8' wide access area is around each pile or windrow. Site preparation includes topsoil removal, minimal regrading and compaction, installing gravel or sand subbase and then concrete.

**Feature Measure:** Pad Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,700.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$46,062.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #10 - Static Pile with Wood Bins

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a group of small bins along one side and a long narrow bin on the backside of a concrete pad to compost poultry or small swine mortality in static pile(s) that have sufficient bulking material to allow natural aeration. Piles are turned to go through a second heat cycle prior to final land application. The roofed portion of the facility is addressed with Roofs and Covers (367). Size of facility based on daily mortality and sizing procedures accepted in particular state. Organic sites will require more frequent replacement of lumber. Potential Associated Practices: Roofs and Covers (367), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Selected method for carcass treatment and disposal meet or are permitted by federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulation. Install facility on a 18' x 40' concrete pad with 4 bins ( 5' H x 10' W x 6' Length) along the front side and one 8'w by 40' long secondary bin. Bin wall consists of a 1' concrete curb and 4' of treated lumber. Roofed portion is addressed under Roofs and Covers (367). Site preparation includes topsoil removal, installing 4" of gravel, setting posts , installing concrete slab, and installing wooden walls and doors. Piles turned to go through a second heat cycle prior to final land application.

**Feature Measure:** Total Bin Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 720.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,514.71 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$25.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #13 - Static Pile with Concrete Bins, Hydrant

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a two or more of concrete bins, open on one end on a concrete pad to compost larger quantities of poultry or mature swine mortality in static pile(s) that have sufficient bulking material to allow natural aeration. Piles are turned to go through a second heat cycle prior to final land application. Water is added to maintain moisture content. The roofed portion of the facility is addressed in Cover and Roofs (367). Size of facility based on daily mortality and sizing procedures accepted in particular state. Scenarios are needed to meet permit differences between states and sizes of operations (some states in the region do not approve wood walls). Potential Associated Practices: Roofs and Cover ( 367 ), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Selected method for carcass treatment and disposal meet or are permitted by federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulation. Install a 20' deep by 48' long pad with four bins with 8' high walls and one end open. Roofed portion is addressed under Roofs and Covers (367). Site preparation includes topsoil removal, installing 4" of gravel, installing concrete slab, and installing 8' high concrete walls. A hydrant is installed to aid in maintaining moisture content. Piles are turned by moving to adjacent bin to go through a second heat cycle prior to final land application.

**Feature Measure:** Total Bin Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$31,162.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$32.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #25 - Small Animal, Less Than or Equal to 9 Pounds

**Scenario Description:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Selected method for carcass treatment and disposal meet or are permitted by federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulation. The typical mortality facility is based on a concrete wall static bin composting facility with the primary and secondary bins, of equal volume. A typical broiler operation produces a total of 240,000 (6 turns of 40,000) chickens per year. Average bird weight is 4 pounds with an average mortality rate of 5%. The average daily mortality is 130 lb./day. Total compost facility volume is 6,400 CF. A total of 12 bins (5 primary + 5 secondary + 2 management/bulk storage) at 10' wide x 12' deep x 6' high. Bin walls and floors will be reinforced concrete. Cost includes: site preparation, installation of 6" of gravel, installing concrete slab (6") and walls (6"). Piles are turned to go through a second heat cycle in the secondary bins prior to final land application.

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is addressed in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Selected method for carcass treatment and disposal meet or are permitted by federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulation. The typical mortality facility is based on a concrete wall static bin composting facility with the primary and secondary bins, of equal volume. A typical broiler operation produces a total of 240,000 (6 turns of 40,000) chickens per year. Average bird weight is 4 pounds with an average mortality rate of 5%. The average daily mortality is 130 lb/day. Total compost facility volume is 6,400 CF. A total of 12 bins (5 primary + 5 secondary + 2 management/bulk storage) at 10' wide x 12' deep x 6' high. Bin walls and floors will be reinforced concrete. Cost includes: site preparation, installation of 6" of gravel, installing concrete slab (6") and walls (6" thick). Piles are turned to go through a second heat cycle in the secondary bins prior to final land application.

**Feature Measure:** Daily Death Loss (DDL)

**Scenario Unit:** Pounds per Day

**Scenario Typical Size:** 130.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$29,263.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$225.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #26 - Medium Animal, 10 to 50 Pounds

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario will address animal mortalities for medium animal types, typically from 10 to 50 pounds average weight (i.e. turkeys and nursery pigs) and large animal types (typically from 50 to 300 average weight (i.e. grower/finishing pigs, sheep, and goats). It was developed for various types of animal mortality facilities as listed below (which is not an exhaustive list): - Static of a group of small bins (concrete or wood walls) on a concrete pad to compost mortality in static pile(s) that have sufficient bulking material to allow natural aeration. Piles are turned to go through a second heat cycle prior to final land application. - In vessel Rotary Drum. A commercially manufactured horizontal rotary drum to compost animal mortalities mixed with a carbon material (i.e. sawdust or wood chips). A secondary composting storage area is required to finish materials. - In vessel Grinding Batch. A commercially manufactured grinding batch composter with a minimum capacity of 1,000 lbs. per batch. A secondary composting storage area is required to finish materials. - Forced Air Composting Bins: Consisting of a group of small bins with an aeration and leachate collection system. (This scenario does not address incinerators.) The least cost scenario is based on a static bin system with concrete walls. The roofed portion of the facility is addressed with Roofs and Covers (367). Approach apron is addressed with Heavy Use Area Protection (561). Size of facility is based on daily mortality and sizing procedures accepted in particular state. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. Organic sites will require more frequent replacement of lumber (if used). Potential Associated Practices: Roofs and Cover ( 367 ), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Normal animal mortality is being addressed in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events, but only normal mortality is addressed with this scenario. Selected method for carcass treatment and disposal meet or are permitted by federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulation. The typical normal mortality facility is based on a concrete wall static bin composting facility with the primary and secondary bins of equal volume. A typical livestock operation consists of a 6,400 finishing pigs with 2.5 litters per year. Average animal weight is 160 pounds with an average mortality rate of 4%. The average normal daily mortality is 280 lb./day which requires a minimum of 18,000 CF of total (primary + secondary) composting volume. Bin volumes will have adequate capacity for 30 days of normal mortality. The minimum volume includes additional bins for management and storage of bulking materials. The facility will be installed on a 120' X 28' concrete pad with 10 bins (4 primary, 4 secondary, and 2 management/storage bins) for a total bin capacity of 18,000 CF. Bin dimensions are 6' Height x 12' Width x 28' Deep. Bin walls are concrete, 6" thick and 6' high. Costs include topsoil removal, installing 6" of gravel, installing concrete slab (6"), and concrete walls. Piles are turned to go through a second heat cycle in the secondary bins prior to final land application.

**Feature Measure:** Daily Death Loss

**Scenario Unit:** Pounds per Day

**Scenario Typical Size:** 280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$53,556.60 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$191.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.





**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #86 - Thermal Dehydration, Small Poultry

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of installing a manufactured mortality thermal dehydration unit designed to handle up to 1,300 lbs. of average daily mortality for the species and size of the operation. System shall use simultaneous mixing and heating to 194 degrees Fahrenheit and will result in approximately 60% mortality volume reduction over a 12-hour cycle time. After determining average daily mortality in lbs., select the smallest unit that meets capacity. Payment made based on the size of the unit obtained from manufacturers' product literature. This option is not typically least-cost. In most states a roofed static compost pile with concrete floor and bins would be considered least cost. Therefore consider reducing payment rate as per State Conservationist discretion. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed, however, in non-attainment areas, certain states may require a higher level of processing such as gasification or other approved methods. Potential Associated Practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Access Road (560), Waste Storage Facility (313), Nutrient Management (590), Roofs and Covers (367), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete incineration, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. Selected method for carcass treatment and disposal meet or are permitted by federal, state, and local laws, rules, regulation. Typical thermal dehydrator installed to handle up to 1300 lbs. per day average mortality for a poultry operation. Included is a 16'x16' concrete slab to set the thermal dehydrator on. Thermally dehydrated materials to be stored in suitable containers until land disposal as per the nutrient management plan or landfilled.

**Feature Measure:** Number of units

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$70,185.77 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$70,185.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #101 - Rotary Drum, Greater Than 523 Pounds per Day

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario consists of installing a horizontal rotary drum to compost larger poultry and swine facility mortality. The system provides a composted material that is 100% contained during the composting process reducing the chance of pathogens and virus contact. A secondary composting storage area is required to finish materials. Material will be composted in accordance with NRCS standards and specifications before land application. A large unit can process more than 523 # of daily animal mortality or more plus equal volume of carbon material (i.e. wood chips). Scenario: 750 lbs. per day of poultry mortality (270,000-5# birds for 90 days @ 5% mortality) plus bulking agent (i.e. wood chips) requires a 750 mortality #/day drum system placed on a concrete pad. Install a mechanical, horizontal continuous flow, completely contained, large rotary drum to compost poultry mortality. It can process more than 750 # of daily animal mortality plus equal volume of carbon material (i.e. wood chips). Payment quantity based on each facility. Rotary drum is installed due to space constraints and/or odor concerns. Associated Practices: Roofs and Covers (367), Waste Storage Facility (313), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606) and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is handled in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from i

**After Situation:**

A rotary drum system is installed on a concrete pad that contains and composts the daily animal mortality and secretions, allows for continuous temperature management to assure even temperature distribution and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading of viruses. The secondary composter volume is expected to be 40-60% of the original volume of material and the secondary composter will meet NRCS standards and specifications. Final product material will be composted in accordance with NRCS standards and specifications before land application. Additional practices, if needed, are Roofs and Covers (367) and Heavy Use area Protection (561).

**Feature Measure:** Each Facility

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$80,105.35 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$80,105.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 316 - Animal Mortality Facility

**Scenario:** #102 - Rotary Drum, 270 to 523 Pounds of Daily Mortality

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario consists of installing a horizontal rotary drum to compost smaller poultry and swine facility mortality. The system provides a composted material that is 100% contained during the composting process reducing the chance of pathogens and virus contact. A secondary composting storage area is required to finish materials. Material will be composted in accordance with NRCS standards and specifications before land application. A small unit can process between 270 and 523 pounds of daily animal mortality plus equal volume of carbon material (i.e. wood chips). Scenario: 300 lbs. per day of poultry mortality (135,000-5# birds for 90 days @ 4% mortality) plus bulking agent (i.e. wood chips) requires a 300 mortality #/day small drum (22' long) system placed on a concrete pad. Payment quantity based on each facility. Rotary drum is installed due to space constraints and/or odor concerns. Associated Practices: Roofs and Covers (367), Waste Storage Facility (313), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Diversion (362), Subsurface Drain (606) and Underground Outlet (620).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is handled in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from i

**After Situation:**

A rotary drum system is installed on a concrete pad that contains and composts the daily animal mortality and secretions, allows for continuous temperature management to assure even temperature distribution and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading of viruses. The secondary composter volume is expected to be 40-60% of the original volume of material and the secondary composter will be composted in a facility that meet's NRCS standards and specifications. Final product material will be composted in accordance with NRCS standards and specifications before land application. Additional practices, if needed, are Roofs and Covers (367) and Heavy Use area Protection (561).

**Feature Measure:** Each Facility

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$59,497.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$59,497.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 317 - Composting Facility

**Scenario:** #1 - Concrete Floor and Walls

**Scenario Description:**

The composting facility, with concrete floor and walls between bins only, is installed to address water quality concerns and disease vectors resulting from improper waste disposal by providing a dedicated facility for storage and treatment, and by creating a compost product that can be used in multiple ways including land application for enrichment of crop ground. This scenario is applicable when geological, soil, or climate conditions, or space limitations for structure footprint, or other site limitations make this scenario more suitable than a structure with wood bin walls on a concrete floor. All animal mortality composting shall be done using Practice Standard 316 - Animal Mortality Facility. Potential Associated Practices: Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for water control (587), Diversion (362), Pipeline (516), Subsurface Drain (606), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roofs and Covers (367), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Underground Outlet (620) and Vegetative Treatment Area (635).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

Manure, litter and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored properly, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan. The typical composter is designed to handle organic material from a livestock operation. The typical composter is 42' x 14' with 5' high concrete walls. Strip top 1' of soil and roll compact same back into sub-floor. The bins are constructed on a 7" concrete slab used to store and stabilize manure, litter and other agricultural by-products from a four house complex on any farm.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 588.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,422.72

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$21.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 317 - Composting Facility

**Scenario:** #3 - Open Lot and Earthen Floor

**Scenario Description:**

The composting facility is installed to address water quality concerns and disease vectors resulting from improper waste disposal by providing a dedicated facility for storage and treatment, and by creating a compost product that can be used in multiple ways including land application for enrichment of crop ground. This scenario is applicable when geological, soil, and climate conditions are appropriate for earth floors and are allowed by state and local regulations. All animal mortality composting shall be done using Practice Standard 316 - Animal Mortality Facility. Potential Associated Practices: Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for water control (587), Diversion (362), Pipeline (516), Subsurface Drain (606), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roofs and Covers (367), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Underground Outlet (620) and Vegetative Treatment Area (635).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed of. This

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled, by the collection at the source, and stored temporarily, at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are disposed of or utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan. This scenario consists of removing 0.5' of surface material and compacting back into place 1' of soil to create a compacted, impervious earthen floor to act as a working area to store organic material in a static pile or windrow that has sufficient carbon based bulking material to allow natural aeration. Piles typically turned at least once to go into another heat cycle prior to final disposal, typically land application. Typical pad 50' x 200' on an improved compacted earthen surface. Include sufficient area for processing equipment access. Single piles or windrows to minimize runoff. Site to be located out of drainage areas, off-site water diverted and any runoff to spread out into a grassed area or vegetated treatment area as per regulations. Site preparation includes topsoil removal, compaction of subsoil, and reinstalling topsoil, compacted.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,989.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 317 - Composting Facility

**Scenario:** #31 - Farm Pad and Bins

**Scenario Description:**

The typical facility size is 6 feet by 9 feet and is comprised of a two-bin system, NOT TO EXCEED 75 sq-ft. The composting facility is installed on a small, urban or organic farm to address water quality concerns, pest/rodent concerns, and disease vectors resulting from improper vegetative waste disposal by providing a dedicated facility for storage and treatment, and by creating a compost product that can be used in multiple ways including land application for enrichment of crop ground. Screening is provided to limit access by vermin. Cost may be higher per unit than traditional compost facilities due to construction access limitations. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil (520), Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner (521), Pond Sealing or Lining, Concrete (522), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Structure for Water Control (587), Diversion (362), Livestock Pipeline (516), Subsurface Drain (606), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roofs and Covers (367), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Underground Outlet (620) and Vegetative Treatment Area (635), Stormwater Runoff Control (570).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other vegetative waste are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed. This situation p

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being controlled by collection at the source and properly stored at an environmentally suitable location, until such time that they are utilized in a proper manner, typically in accordance with a nutrient management plan. This is incorporated as part of the overall waste management system meeting the National Engineering Handbook (NEH), Part 651, Agricultural Waste Management Field Handbook (AWMFH) that has been developed to also account for end use of the product from the composting facility. This scenario consists of installing a composting structure on a concrete pad. Concrete pad is 6'x9' on a compacted gravel surface. Include sufficient area for accessing compost structure. Site to be located out of drainage areas, off-site water diverted and any runoff to spread out into a grassed area or vegetated treatment area as per regulations. Site preparation includes topsoil removal, compaction of subsoil, and installing a geotextile plus compacted gravel, concrete pad, and composting structure.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot Floor Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 54.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,087.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$75.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 317 - Composting Facility

**Scenario:** #64 - In-Vessel, Less Than 8 Cubic Yards

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of an in-vessel composter (rotary drum, forced air, or containerized with mechanical turning) to facilitate the decomposition of manure and/or other organic material into a final product sufficiently stable for storage, on farm use and application to land as a soil amendment. The raw inputs are primarily obtained for agricultural production or processing. The compost can be reused in the operation, utilized for crop production, soil improvement and/or marketed to the public. Typical size is for an in-vessel composter with a drum capacity of 4 CY with an approximate width of 4ft and length of 10 ft. The drum capacity is typically 85% of the nominal dimensions of the drum. This includes a concrete foundation for the composter of 6ft x 20ft to facilitate an area to collect finished compost. A secondary storage facility may require additional bin storage, which is not included. This scenario does not apply to routine disposal of livestock or poultry carcasses. Potential associated practices: Roofs and Covers (367), Waste Storage Facility (313), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590)

**Before Situation:**

Raw materials are stockpiled on-site and hauled to a landfill or directly to a field without treatment. Odors and vectors are routinely an issue following rain events.

**After Situation:**

An in-vessel composter with a drum capacity of 4 CY is installed to facilitate the composting of the organic materials as described. Potential for runoff, vectors, and odors are significantly reduced. The compost material is more stable and can be reused as described in the standard.

**Feature Measure:** Drum Capacity

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 108.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,594.35 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$227.73

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 319 - On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility

**Scenario:** #1 - Tank, Double-Wall

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the replacement of an existing single wall fuel storage tank with a new double wall tank. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to the excessive release of organics into ground and surface waters or excessive sediment and turbidity in surface waters. Associated practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561).

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation has an existing single wall fuel/oil storage tank(s) without any spill prevention protection. The producer has developed an SPCC plan in accordance with EPA requirements, which requires an above ground secondary containment faci

**After Situation:**

This scenario is based on the replacement of an existing single wall tank(s) with a new double wall tank(s). Installation of "used" double wall tank(s) will not be allowed. A 4000 gallon horizontal or vertical antiroll tank (U/L 142-23 Secondary Containment Vessel) double walled which meets EPA regulations will be installed. Payment Schedule is based on the cost difference between a new single wall tank and new double wall tank of the same size. The double wall tank will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of oil products stored on the farm. Any accidental spills will be contained.

**Feature Measure:** Tank volume

**Scenario Unit:** Gallon

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,066.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 319 - On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility

**Scenario:** #2 - Earthen Containment

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the construction of an earthen containment wall with a flexible membrane liner around an existing storage tank. The containment will not have a roof. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to the excessive release of organics into ground and surface waters or excessive sediment and turbidity in surface waters. Associated practices: Heavy Use Area Protection (561).

**Before Situation:**

The agricultural operation has a single walled fuel/oil storage tank(s) without any spill prevention protection. The producer has developed an SPCC plan in accordance with EPA requirements, which requires an above ground secondary containment facility for

**After Situation:**

This scenario is based on containment for a 10,000 gallon tank. The containment will be lined with a flexible membrane liner. The containment volume is designed for 125% of the tank volume (10,000 gallons X 125% = 12,500 gallons). The bottom dimensions of the containment are 40 ft x 24 ft. The wall is 2.5 feet high with a 2 ft top width and 2:1 sideslopes. The total volume of earthfill = 114 CY. The flexible liner size = 1,872 SF. Tanks will be moved or raised to install base materials. Hauled in earthfill will be used to construct the dike. The flexible liner will be installed in conformance with the design and specifications. The completed structure will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of oil products stored on the farm. Any accidental spills will be contained.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yard of compacted ea

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 114.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,277.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$72.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 319 - On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility

**Scenario:** #4 - Wall, Concrete Containment

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the installation of a reinforced concrete wall containment with a concrete slab around an existing storage tank. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to the excessive release of organics into ground and surface waters or excessive sediment and turbidity in surface waters. Due to topography, limited site space and/or geological conditions a fabricated structure is needed. Structure will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of these products. Associated practices may include: Heavy Use Area Protection (561).

**Before Situation:**

Existing agricultural operation that has single walled fuel/oil storage tank(s) not protected. The producer has developed an SPCC plan in accordance with EPA requirements, that requires an above ground secondary containment facility for on-farm oil produc

**After Situation:**

This scenario is based on containment for a 4,700 gallon tank. The containment volume is designed for 125% of the tank volume (4,700 gallons X 125% = 5,875 gallons). Structure will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of these products. Typical containment dimensions are 196 sqft bottom x 6" thick slab with 6" thick x 4' tall formed sidewalls. Tanks will be moved or raised to install base materials. The fabricated containment structure will be installed in conformance with the design and specifications. The on-farm oil products stored on the farm have secondary containment of accidental release that controls the excessive release of organics, suspended sediments, and turbidity. Structure will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of these products.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of concrete in the w

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.3

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,214.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,910.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 319 - On-Farm Secondary Containment Facility

**Scenario:** #6 - Polyvinyl Chloride Containment Basin

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the installation of a PVC containment tub around an existing storage tank. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to the excessive release of organics into ground and surface waters or excessive sediment and turbidity in surface waters. Due to topography, limited site space and/or geological conditions a fabricated structure is needed. Structure will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of these products. Associated practices may include: Heavy Use Area Protection (561).

**Before Situation:**

Existing agricultural operation that has single walled fuel/oil storage tank(s) not protected. The producer has developed an SPCC plan in accordance with EPA requirements, that requires an above ground secondary containment facility for on-farm oil produc

**After Situation:**

This scenario is based on the installation of a PVC containment tub around an existing fuel tank. A containment tub which meets EPA regulations will be installed and sized to hold 110% of the fuel stored in the fuel tank. Payment rate is based on the area of the containment tub. The containment tub will provide an environmentally safe facility for handling and storage of oil products stored on the farm. Any accidental spills will be contained.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Tub bottom

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 36.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,382.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 320 - Irrigation Canal or Lateral

**Scenario:** #1 - Irrigation Canal

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is the construction of an Irrigation Canal or Lateral. Typical construction dimensions are 4' wide bottom x 3' deep x 1320' length with a side slope of 2:1. Resource concerns: Excess/Insufficient Water - Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water. Associated Conservation Practices: 388-Irrigation Field Ditch; 443-Irrigation System, Surface or Subsurface; 533-Pumping Plant; 430-Irrigation Pipeline; 587 - Structure for Water Control; 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Before Situation:**

Water supply for an area is inadequate for crop production and irrigation water application is inefficient.

**After Situation:**

An earthen canal that has adequate capacity to convey sufficient irrigation water to meet the demands of the system and make irrigation practical for the crops being grown.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of earth excavated

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,467.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,096.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 325 - High Tunnel System

**Scenario:** #98 - Gothic for Snow and Wind

**Scenario Description:**

Used for contiguous US states in areas with high snowfall. A gothic style (peaked) manufactured frame of tubular steel (30 x 70 ft.) with end walls and/or truss supports covered with 4-year 6 mil plastic. Costs are based on purchase of manufactured kit and landowner installing the structure. Structure must be installed to manufacturer's specifications.

**Before Situation:**

Cropland where extension of the growing season is needed. Additional resource concerns that may need to be addressed include soil erosion, soil condition, water quality, water quantity, and plant condition.

**After Situation:**

A high tunnel structure has been installed and the growing season has been extended for 1-4 months on average. Plant health and vigor has been improved.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Tunnel Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,472.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 325 - High Tunnel System

**Scenario:** #116 - Gothic for Snow and Wind, Small

**Scenario Description:**

Use in areas with expected snow and wind loads on sites less than 1 acre. Gothic-style (arched) manufactured frame of tubular steel (less than or equal to 20 ft x 30 ft.) covered with 4-year warrantee, 6 mil UV resistant plastic. Costs are based on purchase of manufactured kit and landowner installation of structure. Structure must be installed to manufacturer's specifications. Associated practices might include CPS Roof Runoff Structure (588), Underground Outlet (620), Critical Area Planting (342), Mulching (484).

**Before Situation:**

Cropland where extension of the growing season is needed. Primary resource concern addressed will be plant health and vigor.

**After Situation:**

High Tunnel structure has been installed and the growing season has been extended for 1-4 months on average. Plant health and vigor is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Area of High Tunnel Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 600.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,907.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 326 - Clearing and Snagging

**Scenario:** #25 - Heavy, Greater Than 400 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of vegetation, logs, or other material that impedes the proper functioning on over 400 linear feet of a stream channel or water course to restore flow capacity; prevent bank erosion by eddies; reduce the formation of sediment bars; and/or minimize blockages by debris. Addresses resource concerns such as water quantity and soil erosion-streambanks.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetation, logs, or other material provide a flow restriction or divert flowing water against the streambank causing excess erosion. Approximately two-thirds of the channel flow capacity is obstructed. The flow blockage may encourage deposition in the ma

**After Situation:**

Vegetation, logs, or other material have been removed to allow unrestricted flow in the channel and appurtenant structures. Material that poses no blockage threat is left in place to enhance aquatic habitat. Channel bed and banks are in equilibrium with the flow.

**Feature Measure:** Linear Feet

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,623.54

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$26.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #46 - Native Species with Forgone Income

**Scenario Description:**

This practice applies on conventional or organically managed land needing permanent protective cover. This practice typically involves conversion from an intensive cropping system to permanent native vegetation (scenario includes native grass/legume mix). The typical size of the practice is 50 acres. This practice scenario is typically used to reduce soil erosion, reduce soil quality degradation, improve water quality, develop wildlife habitat, and reduce air quality impacts. Applies to conventional or organic systems.

**Before Situation:**

Crops such as vegetables and small fruit crops may be conventionally or organically grown and harvested. Full width tillage is utilized, weeds controlled mainly by cultivation. Soil surface residue amounts average 10% or less. Soil erosion exceeds tolerab

**After Situation:**

The 327 Implementation Requirements have been developed for the site and applied. Managed land covered with permanent native grass/legume mix vegetation has reduced soil erosion, reduced water/sediment runoff, and improved air quality due to the elimination of dust emissions. Plants sown for conservation cover may provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife. This scenario does not apply to plantings for forage production or to critical area plantings.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$27,054.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$541.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #47 - Pollinator Species with Forgone Income

**Scenario Description:**

Permanent vegetation, including a mix of native grasses, legumes, and forbs (mix may also include non-native species), established on land needing permanent vegetative cover that provides habitat for pollinators. Typical practice size is variable depending on site; this scenario uses 1 ac as the typical size. In addition to providing pollinator habitat, this practice scenario may also reduce sheet and rill erosion, improve soil quality, improve water quality, and improve air quality. The practice may also provide wildlife habitat. Practice applicable on cropland, odd areas, corners, etc. Applies to conventional or organic systems.

**Before Situation:**

Crops such as vegetables and small fruit crops may be conventionally or organically grown and harvested. Full width tillage is utilized, weeds controlled mainly by cultivation. Soil surface residue amounts average 10% or less. Soil erosion exceeds tolerab

**After Situation:**

The 327 Implementation Requirements have been developed for the site and applied. Managed land covered with permanent pollinator habitat including a mix of native grasses, legumes, and forbs (mix may also include non-native species). This practice may also reduce soil erosion, reduce water/sediment runoff, and improve air quality due to the elimination of dust emissions. Plants sown for pollinator habitat may also provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife. This scenario does not apply to critical area plantings.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$956.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$956.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #48 - Introduced Species

**Scenario Description:**

The land is covered with permanent non-native grass vegetation resulting in reduced soil erosion and water/sediment runoff, and the elimination of dust emissions which improves air quality significantly. Plants sown for conservation cover may provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife. This scenario does not apply to plantings for forage production or to critical area plantings. Applies to conventional or organic systems.

**Before Situation:**

Crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton may be conventionally or organically grown and harvested. Full width tillage is utilized, weeds controlled by cultivation and/or chemical application. Soil surface residue amounts average 10% or less. Soil erosion e

**After Situation:**

The 327 Implementation Requirements have been developed for the site and applied. The land is covered with permanent non-native grass vegetation resulting in reduced soil erosion and water/sediment runoff, and the elimination of significant dust emissions which improves air quality. Plants sown for conservation cover may provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife. This scenario does not apply to plantings for forage production or to critical area plantings.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,376.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$227.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #49 - Native Species

**Scenario Description:**

This practice applies on land to be retired from agricultural production and on other lands needing permanent protective cover. This practice typically involves conversion from a clean-tilled (conventional tilled) intensive cropping system to permanent native vegetation (scenario includes native grass). The typical size of the practice is 50 acres. This practice scenario is typically used to reduce soil erosion, reduce soil quality degradation, improve water quality, develop wildlife habitat, and reduce air quality impacts. Applies to conventional or organic systems

**Before Situation:**

Crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton may be conventionally or organically grown and harvested. Full width tillage is utilized, weeds controlled by cultivation and/or chemical application. Soil surface residue amounts average 10% or less. Soil erosion e

**After Situation:**

The 327 Implementation Requirements have been developed for the site and applied. The land is covered with permanent native grass vegetation which reduces soil erosion and water/sediment runoff, and eliminates dust emissions which improves air quality. Plants sown for conservation cover may provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife. This scenario does not apply to plantings for forage production or to critical area plantings.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,791.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$295.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #50 - Pollinator Species

**Scenario Description:**

Permanent vegetation, including a mix of native grasses, legumes, and forbs (mix may also include non-native species), established on any land needing permanent vegetative cover that provides habitat for pollinators. Typical practice size is variable depending on site; this scenario uses 1 ac as the typical size. In addition to providing pollinator habitat, this practice scenario may also reduce sheet, rill, and wind erosion, improve soil quality, improve water quality, and improve air quality. The practice may also provide wildlife habitat. Practice applicable on cropland, odd areas, corners, etc. Applies to conventional or organic systems.

**Before Situation:**

Crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton may be conventionally or organically grown and harvested. Full width tillage is utilized, weeds controlled by cultivation and/or chemical application. Soil surface residue amounts average 10% or less. Erosion exceed

**After Situation:**

The 327 Implementation Requirements have been developed for the site and applied. Land is covered with permanent pollinator habitat including a mix of native grasses, legumes, forbs (mix may also include non-native species). This practice may also have reduced soil erosion, reduced water/sediment runoff, and improved air quality as a result of the elimination of dust emissions. Plants sown for pollinator habitat may also provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife. This scenario does not apply to critical area plantings.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$905.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$905.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #54 - Monarch Species Mix

**Scenario Description:**

Establish permanent vegetative cover for pollinator habitat according to state specifications. Typically used for high quality nectar and pollen species. Assumes seed/plugs, equipment and labor for seed bed prep/planting, and weed management during establishment. Used for conventional or organic land on small, intensive areas that are central to specialty crop production. Not typically used for large-scale plantings. This is applicable to both organic and non-organic conditions.

**Before Situation:**

Old hayfields that are mowed typically in the fall lack milkweed needed for monarchs. Other crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton are conventionally grown and harvested. The system provides little to no wildlife or pollinator habitat.

**After Situation:**

The 327 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. Land covered with permanent monarch habitat including a mix of milkweed species, native grasses, legumes, and forbs. Plants sown for monarch habitat may also provide cover for beneficial insects and wildlife.

**Feature Measure:** area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,136.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,136.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 327 - Conservation Cover

**Scenario:** #102 - Pollinator Mix-Small Footprint

**Scenario Description:**

Permanent vegetation, including a mix of grasses, legumes and forbs established on any land needing permanent vegetative cover that provides habitat, cover, and food for pollinators. Typical size varies depending on the site feasibility for length and width. Urban sites typical size is 2000 square feet (20x100 ft). This scenario included mechanical site preparation. This practice scenario may also reduce wind and water erosion, improve soil quality, reduce water quality degradation and reduce air emissions of particulate matter or greenhouse gases. Applies to conventional and organic systems. This scenario does not applied to areas needing Critical Area Planting.

**Before Situation:**

Crop rotation include specialty crops such as vegetable and fruit/berry production that benefit from pollinator activity. Urban agricultural sites do not provide for pollinator habitat at this time. Planting operations include mechanical removal of weeds.

**After Situation:**

The 327 implementation requirements have been developed for the site and applied. Land is in permanent vegetative cover reducing erosion and sediment delivery to water. Pollinator habitat has successfully established providing habitat and cover for pollinators and beneficial insects.

**Feature Measure:** Area of conservation Cover I

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$344.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$172.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #64 - Basic, Organic and Inorganic

**Scenario Description:**

In this region this practice may be part of a conservation management system on both organic and non-organic operations to: 1) Reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, 2) Maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, 3) Reduce water quality degradation due to excess nutrients, 4) Improve soil moisture efficiency, 5) Reduce the concentration of salts and other chemicals from saline seeps, 6) Reduce plant pest pressures, 7) Provide feed and forage for domestic livestock, and 8) Provide food and cover habitat for wildlife, including pollinator forage, and nesting. This practice payment is provided to the producer for the time needed to plan and implement the logistics of changing the rotation to effectively implement a conservation crop rotation on a typical 200 acre cropland farm. No foregone income. Cost represents typical situations for conventional and organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

The rotation consists primarily of low residue producing row crops. Fields range from nearly flat to C and D slopes. Erosion, soil quality, and pest management are the primary concerns.

**After Situation:**

A rotation is established that provides additional high residue and/or perennial crops that may treat one or more of the following purposes: reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, reduce water quality degradation due to excess nutrients, improve soil moisture efficiency, reduce the concentration of salts and other chemicals from saline seeps, reduce plant pest pressures, provide feed and forage for domestic livestock, or provide food and cover habitat for wildlife, including pollinator forage, and nesting.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,415.32 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #65 - Irrigated to Dryland, Organic and Inorganic

**Scenario Description:**

In this region this practice may be part of a conservation management system to primarily convert from an irrigated cropping system to dryland farming. In addition to improving water use efficiency the rotation may to: 1) Reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, 2) Maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, 3) Reduce water quality degradation due to excess nutrients, 4) Improve soil moisture efficiency, 5) Reduce the concentration of salts and other chemicals from saline seeps, 6) Reduce plant pest pressures, 7) Provide feed and forage for domestic livestock, and 8) Provide food and cover habitat for wildlife, including pollinator forage, and nesting. This practice payment is provided to acquire the technical knowledge and skills necessary to effectively implement a conservation crop rotation on a typical 200 cropland farm. There is foregone income involved with this conversion from irrigated to dryland farming due to lower yields and net return. Cost represents typical situations for conventional (non-organic) producers converting from irrigated cropping to dryland farming.

**Before Situation:**

This rotation consisted of growing row crop grains that received a significant (more than half) of the required water via irrigation. The water demands are impacting the area's water availability. Erosion, soil condition, and future water availability are

**After Situation:**

The dryland rotation, using the same crops or a rotation that grows crops over different periods, will be part of a management system capable of utilizing available rainfall and soil moisture more efficiently and controlling wind and water erosion. Corn yields will be expected to be reduced from 150 to 80 bu/acre.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$50,841.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$254.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #95 - Specialty Crop, Small

**Scenario Description:**

Scenario applies to Urban sites less than a 1/2 acre with a rotation of organic or non-organic specialty crops (fruits and vegetable) are produced as part of a conservation management system to treat one or more of the following resource concerns: 1) Reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, 2) Maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, 3) Reduce water quality degradation due to excess nutrients, 4) Improve soil moisture efficiency, 5) Reduce the concentration of salts and other chemicals from saline seeps, 6) Reduce plant pest pressures, 7) Provide feed and forage for domestic livestock, and 8) Provide food and cover habitat for wildlife, including pollinator forage, and nesting. This practice payment is provided to acquire the technical knowledge and skills necessary to effectively implement a conservation crop rotation on a typical urban specialty crop farm. Cost represents typical situations for organic and non-organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

This rotation consisted of growing specialty crops. Fields range from nearly flat to B and C slopes. Erosion, soil quality, and pest management are the primary concern. Removal of residue from the planted area is common leaving bare soil.

**After Situation:**

The rotation established adds diversity of plant material organic matter, higher residue amounts that will treat one or more of the following resource concerns on organic and non- organic farms: reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, improve soil moisture efficiency or reduce plant pest pressure.

**Feature Measure:** area planned

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$553.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$36.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #113 - Small Grain

**Scenario Description:**

Current crop rotation includes at least two different crop types. This practice payment is provided to the producer for the time needed to plan and implement the logistics of adding a winter annual or spring planted small grain into crop rotation to effectively implement a conservation crop rotation on a cropland farm by adding a small grain crop for either forage or grain to their cropping system. The crop is intended to be a harvested. No foregone income. Cost represents typical situations for conventional and organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

Small grain has not been grown on field within the past 3 years. Growth of a small grain included as a cover crop on field does not restrict implementation. Fields range from nearly flat to C and D slopes. Erosion, soil quality, and pest management are th

**After Situation:**

A rotation is established with a small grain that may treat one or more of the following purposes: reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, reduce water quality degradation due to excess nutrients, improve soil moisture efficiency, reduce plant pest pressures, provide feed and forage for domestic livestock, and provide openings for other conservation practice implementation. This scenario would allow for earlier harvest window compared to other row crops potentially allowing for better implementation of cover crops.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,345.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$58.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #114 - Perennial, Short-Term

**Scenario Description:**

This practice payment is provided to the producer for the time needed to plan and implement the logistics of adding a short-term perennial such as alfalfa or intermediate wheatgrass into crop rotation to effectively implement a conservation crop rotation on a cropland farm by adding a perennial crop for either forage, grain, or dual-purpose use to their cropping system. The crop is intended to be a harvested and must be grown for at least 2 years after planting. No foregone income. Cost represents typical situations for conventional and organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

Annual field crops being grown. Cover crops are not part of the crop rotation or are infrequently used. Perennials have not been grown on field within the past 3 years. Erosion, soil quality, and pest management are the primary resource concerns.

**After Situation:**

A conservation crop rotation is established with a perennial crop for a short-term (3-5 years). The crop rotation achieves resource conserving benefits by returning and building soil organic matter, reduces wind and water erosion, improves soil fertility and tilth, interrupts pest cycles, and improves soil moisture retention. The perennial crop rotation provides same or greater conservation benefits than annual crop plus cover crop system.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,631.74

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$65.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 329 - Residue and Tillage Management, No Till

**Scenario:** #9 - No-Till and Strip-Till

**Scenario Description:**

This practice typically involves conversion from a clean-tilled (conventional tilled) system to no-till or strip-till system on 100 acres of cropland. This involves managing the amount, orientation and distribution of crop and other plant residue on the soil surface year round while limiting soil-disturbing activities used to establish and harvest crops. The practice is used to reduce sheet and rill erosion, reduce wind erosion, improve soil quality, reduce CO2 losses from the soil, reduce energy use, increase plant available moisture and provide food and escape cover for wildlife. The no-till/strip-till system includes non-tillage types of weed control and may also include a period of no till fallow. System is applicable in both irrigated and non-irrigated fields of organic and non-organic operations.

**Before Situation:**

Row crops or small grains are grown and harvested. Full width tillage is performed prior to planting and weed control during crop production is typically cultivation and chemical application. Fields are disked immediately following harvest, with additiona

**After Situation:**

The Implementation Requirements for 329 Residue Management, No Till is prepared and installed. Managing crop residue on the surface of a field (typical 100 acre) year around according to the 329 practice plan while limiting soil disturbing activities to those which place nutrients, and plant crops that meet the minimum criteria in the 329 practice standard. All crops are seeded/planted with a no-till drill or no-till/strip-till planter, which minimizes soil disturbance while establishing good seed-soil contact. All residues are to be maintained on the soil surface in a uniform distribution over the entire field and not burned or removed. Crop residues provide soil surface cover throughout the year. Runoff and erosion are reduced and no rills are visible on the soil surface. Wind erosion is reduced by standing residues and surface cover. Over time, soil health is improved due to the additional biomass (crop residues), ground cover, and soil infiltration. Crop residues and/or cover crop residues left on the soil surface may maximize weed control by increasing allelopathic and mulching effect, and provides cover for wildlife. The practice would require reducing soil disturbance and erosion and increasing biomass returned to the soil in sufficient amounts to achieve increased SCI and decreased STIR.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,466.85 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 329 - Residue and Tillage Management, No Till

**Scenario:** #16 - No-Till and Strip-Till, Herbicide

**Scenario Description:**

This practice typically involves conversion from a clean-tilled (conventional tilled) system to no-till or strip-till system on 100 acres of cropland. This involves managing the amount, orientation and distribution of crop and other plant residue on the soil surface year round while limiting soil-disturbing activities used to establish and harvest crops. The practice is used to reduce sheet and rill erosion, reduce wind erosion, improve soil quality, reduce CO2 losses from the soil, reduce energy use, increase plant available moisture and provide food and escape cover for wildlife. The no-till/strip-till system includes non-tillage types of weed control, which may include the use of herbicides and may also include a period of no till fallow. System is applicable in both irrigated and non-irrigated fields organic and non-organic operations. Herbicide treatment is to burndown weeds in the residue prior to planting the crop.

**Before Situation:**

Row crops or small grains are grown and harvested. Full width tillage is performed prior to planting and weed control during crop production is typically cultivation and chemical application. Fields are disked immediately following harvest, with additiona

**After Situation:**

The Implementation Requirements for 329 Residue Management, No Till/Strip Till is prepared and installed. Managing crop residue on the surface of a field (typical 100 acre) year around according to the 329 practice plan while limiting soil disturbing activities to those which place nutrients, and plant crops that meet the minimum criteria in the 329 practice standard. All crops are seeded/planted with a no-till drill or no-till/strip-till planter, which minimizes soil disturbance while establishing good seed-soil contact. All residues are to be maintained on the soil surface in a uniform distribution over the entire field and not burned or removed. Crop residues provide soil surface cover throughout the year. Runoff and erosion are reduced and no rills are visible on the soil surface. Wind erosion is reduced by standing residues and surface cover. Over time, soil health is improved due to the additional biomass (crop residues), ground cover, and soil infiltration. Crop residues and/or cover crop residues left on the soil surface may maximize weed control by increasing allelopathic and mulching effect, and provides cover for wildlife. The practice would require reducing soil disturbance and erosion and increasing biomass returned to the soil in sufficient amounts to achieve increased SCI and decreased STIR.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,107.40 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$41.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 329 - Residue and Tillage Management, No Till

**Scenario:** #31 - No-Till, Less Than Half Acre

**Scenario Description:**

Scenario applies to Urban sites less than a 1/2 acre with a rotation of organic or non-organic specialty crops (fruits and vegetable) are produced as part of a conservation management system to treat one or more of the following resource concerns: 1) Reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, 2) Maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, 3) Improve soil moisture efficiency, 4) Reduce plant pest pressures. This practice payment is provided to effectively implement no-till or strip-till management on a typical urban specialty crop farm. Cost represents typical situations for organic and non-organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

This rotation consisted of growing specialty crops. Fields range from nearly flat to B and C slopes. Erosion, soil quality, and pest management are the primary concern. Removal of residue from the planted area is common leaving bare soil-residue amounts a

**After Situation:**

The implementation requirements are written following CPS 329 Residue and Tillage Management to will treat one or more of the following resource concerns on organic and non- organic farms: reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, improve soil moisture efficiency or reduce plant pest pressure. Soil disturbance is minimized with no-till drill or planter use. May include single slot opener and seedling or plugs follow. When pest management requires the removal of crop residue then planting beds are covered with cover crop using the 340 Cover Crop conservation practice. Runoff and erosion are reduced below T. No observed rills. Wind erosion reduced by maintaining surface cover. They system meets the soil condition index and STIR requirements.

**Feature Measure:** area planted

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$627.25

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$41.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 330 - Contour Farming

**Scenario:** #4 - Contour Farming

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario meets the specifications of the NRCS Contour Farming Standard. This scenario applies to fields greater than 5 acres. Payment reflects the extra labor and initial supervision costs in laying out and implementing contour farming. Annual erosion rates for the rotation exceeds tolerance levels. Excessive runoff leads to sedimentation of waterways

**Before Situation:**

The typical field size in this geographical region for this scenario is 30 acres. The field slope averages 6% while the slope length averages 160 feet. All farming operations on this cropland field including disking, bedding, planting, and cultivation are

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared and implemented according to 330 Contour Farming. This practice is installed on the entire field. A survey is completed by trained and certified Federal, State, local personnel or consultant to determine and "stake" contour row arrangement. Permanent row markers are established to ensure that this practice is maintained for the life of this practice. All field operations including disking, bedding, planting, and cultivation are performed on the contour which is near perpendicular to the field slope. The farm manager is initially on site to ensure that equipment operators are properly following contour methods. Soil erosion rates are reduced by nearly half and may be below tolerance depending on the rotation. Likewise, sedimentation has been significantly reduced.

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$337.84

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 332 - Contour Buffer Strips

**Scenario:** #56 - Introduced Species Organic or Inorganic, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

Narrow strips of permanent, herbaceous vegetative cover established around the hill slope and alternated down the slope with wider cropped strips in between that are farmed on the contour. This practice applies to all cropland. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species. The area of the contour grass strip is taken out of production. This applies to both organic and non-organic.

**Before Situation:**

The NRCS water erosion prediction software indicates that there is a significant amount of sheet and rill erosion and/or a significant amount of sediment potentially delivered to the downslope edge of the field. A secondary concern is that there may not b

**After Situation:**

Introduced grasses and legumes will be established in strips in the field to meet the Contour buffer Strips (332) criteria, resource needs, and producer objectives. Minimum widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Introduced species shall be selected that do not function as a host for diseases of a field crop and have physical characteristics necessary to control water erosion to tolerable levels in the cropped area of the field.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$390.71 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$390.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 332 - Contour Buffer Strips

**Scenario:** #57 - Native Species Organic or Inorganic, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

Narrow strips of permanent, herbaceous vegetative cover established around the hill slope and alternated down the slope with wider cropped strips in between that are organically or non-organically farmed on the contour. This practice applies to all cropland. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species. The area of the contour grass strip is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

The NRCS water erosion prediction software indicates that there is a significant amount of sheet and rill erosion and/or a significant amount of sediment potentially delivered to the downslope edge of the field. A secondary concern is that there may not b

**After Situation:**

Native grasses, legumes and forbs will be established in strips in the field to meet the Contour buffer Strips (332) criteria, resource needs, and producer objectives. Minimum widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Native species shall be selected that do not function as a host for diseases of a field crop and have physical characteristics necessary to control water erosion to tolerable levels in the cropped area of the field.

**Feature Measure:** number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$449.75 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$449.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 334 - Controlled Traffic Farming

**Scenario:** #4 - Reduced Compaction Area

**Scenario Description:**

This practice must be part of a conservation management system to reduce soil compaction. This scenario considers the time needed to modify equipment, develop the technical skills necessary to effectively implement a controlled traffic farming system on a typical 200 acre cropland farm. The controlled traffic generally utilizes RTK automatic steering technology to locate and maintain high load field traffic. This scenario represents the costs associated with reducing the amount of surface area tracked/compacted to 33% or less. Cost represents typical situations for conventional, organic, and transitioning to organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

The typical scenario for this practice is a 200 acre row crop operation on high clay, poorly drained soils. Studies show that when high wheel load traffic is not controlled, up to 85% of the field is tracked causing some degree of soil compaction. Before

**After Situation:**

An Implementation Requirement for Controlled Traffic (334) is developed and the controlled traffic lanes installed per the implementation requirements. After the practice is installed wheel/track traffic is confined to designated traffic lanes/tramlines. Wheel/track soil compaction is confined to the traffic lanes to protect the remaining surface area and subsoil from wheel/track compaction. The wheel/track traffic follows the installed traffic lanes/tramlines each year.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,670.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$68.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #53 - Compost

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario uses compost from an offsite source to maintain, increase, or improve organic matter content and improve aggregate stability, habitat for soil organisms, and plant productivity and health. Compost has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods. Compost is applied at the recommended rate to treat the identified resource concerns. Typical application rate is 3 ton compost/acre.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified compost is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

Compost was tested and applied at the recommended rate that will improve soil organic matter and organism habitat without creating unacceptable risk of N or P loss. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the application.

**Feature Measure:** acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,723.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$287.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #54 - Biochar

**Scenario Description:**

Apply 100% biochar (this assumes that it has been charged/inoculated) to sequester carbon, reduce N losses, and improve other soil health related resource concerns. Biochar has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods and is imported from an outside source. Biochar is applied at the recommended rate to treat the identified resource concerns. Typical application is 4 cubic yards per acre.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site-specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified biochar is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

Biochar was applied at the recommended rate and proportion. Soil health resource concerns were treated. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the biochar application.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,732.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,732.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #55 - Other Carbon Amendment

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is used for the application of different types of other carbon amendments, such as woodchips, bagasse, high carbon wood ash or distillation residue that are obtained at a negligible cost. The primary purpose of this scenario is to facilitate transport and application of the other carbon amendment. The carbon amendment is tested and brought on site. Addition of the carbon amendment directly improves the carbon content of the soil and improves soil health related resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site-specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified amendment is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

The carbon amendment was applied at the recommended rate based on the product analysis and the purpose for the application. Soil health resource concerns were treated. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the application.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,019.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$169.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #56 - Compost, Less Than 10,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario uses compost from an offsite source to maintain, increase, or improve organic matter content and improve aggregate stability, habitat for soil organisms, and plant productivity and health. This scenario is used for situations where manual labor is typically used to apply or incorporate compost amendments. Compost has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods. Compost is applied at the recommended rate to treat the identified resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified compost is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

Compost was tested and applied at the recommended rate that will improve soil organic matter and organism habitat without creating unacceptable risk of N or P loss. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the compost application.

**Feature Measure:** Area treated.

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$599.84

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$59.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #57 - Compost and Biochar, Less Than 10 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Apply a blend of  $\geq 50\%$  biochar and  $\leq 50\%$  compost (by volume) to sequester carbon, reduce nitrogen loss, improve organic matter content and improve aggregate stability, habitat for soil organisms, and plant productivity and health. Biochar and compost has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods and is imported from an outside source. Analysis from supplier.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site-specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified compost or manure and biochar is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

Compost and biochar were tested and applied at the recommended rate that will improve soil organic matter and organism habitat without creating unacceptable risk of N or P loss. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the application.

**Feature Measure:** Area treated

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$711.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$71.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #59 - Biochar, Compost

**Scenario Description:**

Apply a blend of  $\geq 60\%$  biochar and  $\leq 40\%$  compost (by volume) to sequester carbon, reduce nitrogen loss, and improve other soil health related resource concerns. Biochar and compost has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods and is imported from an outside source. Supplier provides product analysis. The blend contains at least 60% biochar and is applied at the recommended rate to treat the identified resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site-specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified biochar and compost or manure is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

Biochar and compost or manure were tested and applied at the recommended rate that will improve soil organic matter and organism habitat without creating unacceptable risk of N or P loss. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the application.

**Feature Measure:** Area

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,363.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$872.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #60 - Compost, Biochar

**Scenario Description:**

Apply a blend of  $\geq 40\%$  biochar and  $\leq 60\%$  compost (by volume) to sequester carbon, reduce nitrogen loss, and improve other soil health related resource concerns. Biochar and compost has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods and is imported from an outside source. The blend contains at least 40% biochar and is applied at the recommended rate to treat the identified resource concerns. Typical application of blend at 4 cu yd per ace.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field assessment or a site-specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified biochar and compost or manure is needed to improve the condition of the soil.

**After Situation:**

Biochar and compost or manure were tested and applied at the recommended rate that will improve soil organic matter and organism habitat without creating unacceptable risk of N or P loss. A follow up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the application.

**Feature Measure:** Area

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,882.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$776.55

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 336 - Soil Carbon Amendment

**Scenario:** #168 - Compost, Onsite

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario uses compost of known origin (feedstock) and production methods to maintain, increase, or improve organic matter content, aggregate stability, habitat for soil organisms, and soil C stock. Compost produced in a compost facility on- farm has been tested according to the Test Methods for the Examination of Composting and Compost (TMECC), or by other Land Grant University (LGU) recognized methods and contains the results of analyses of variables listed in Tables 1 and 3 of the practice standard. Components of total cost include procurement of amendment, amendment analysis, installation of amendment, and mobilization of amendment onsite. Typical application rate is 3-ton compost/acre.

**Before Situation:**

An in-field soil health assessment or a site-specific resource assessment tool or test indicates that soil health resource concerns are present and the addition of analyzed and verified compost as outlined in the practice standard (Tables 1 and 3) is need

**After Situation:**

Compost was tested and verified before application and applied at the recommended rate that will improve the resource concerns identified onsite as outlined in the practice standard without creating unacceptable risk of N or P loss. A follow-up assessment is planned to determine the effect of the application.

**Feature Measure:** acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,018.41 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$336.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 338 - Prescribed Burning

**Scenario:** #1 - Small Acreage / Limited Fire Resources

**Scenario Description:**

Applying a prescribed burn according to a designed burn plan and NRCS Prescribed Burning (338) standard and specifications in order to control undesirable species, improve wildlife habitat, improve plant productivity and/or quality, facilitate grazing distribution and maintain ecological processes. This scenario is based on a small burn area and typically applies under the following conditions: where the terrain of the majority of the area to be burned <15% slopes with herbaceous and/or low volatile woody fuel with no high volatile fuels. Scenario is also applicable on larger scale burns in Northern Great Plains but where trained personnel and/or locally available fire equipment is not readily available. Burned firebreaks used to achieve total firebreak width are part of these burns. (Constructed firebreak cost is not included in the cost of the burn. Refer to Firebreak (394) standard and cost scenarios).

**Before Situation:**

Desirable plant composition is lacking due to reduced plant vigor, invasive species, or improper livestock distribution.

**After Situation:**

Desirable plant composition is restored, plant vigor improved, and invasive species reduced. Forage production and quality for livestock and /or wildlife is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,199.11

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$39.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 338 - Prescribed Burning

**Scenario:** #66 - Slope Fuel, Low to Medium Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

Applying a prescribed burn according to designed burn plan and NRCS Prescribed Burning (338) standard and specifications in order to control undesirable species, improve wildlife habitat, improve plant productivity and/or quality, facilitate grazing distribution and maintain ecological processes. This scenario is based on a burn area designated as a low to medium complexity prescribed burn due to slopes and/or fuels present (refer to state-specific job classification). Burned firebreaks used to achieve total firebreak width are part of these burns. (Constructed firebreak cost is not included in cost of burn. Refer to Firebreak (394) standard and cost scenarios).

**Before Situation:**

Desirable plant composition is lacking due to reduced plant vigor, invasive species or improper livestock distribution.

**After Situation:**

Desirable plant composition is restored, plant vigor improved and invasive species reduced. Forage production and quality for livestock and /or wildlife is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,891.94 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 338 - Prescribed Burning

**Scenario:** #68 - High Complexity (Slope/Fuels)

**Scenario Description:**

Applying a prescribed burn according to designed burn plan and NRCS Prescribed Burning (338) standard and specifications in order to control undesirable species, improve wildlife habitat, improve plant productivity and/or quality, facilitate grazing distribution and maintain ecological processes. This scenario is based on a burn area designated as a high complexity prescribed burn due to steeper slopes and/or larger volatile fuels present (refer to state-specific job classification). Burned firebreaks used to achieve total firebreak width are part of these burns. (Constructed firebreak cost is not included in cost of burn. Refer to Firebreak (394) standard and cost scenarios)

**Before Situation:**

Desirable plant composition is lacking due to reduced plant vigor, invasive species or improper livestock distribution.

**After Situation:**

Desirable plant composition is restored, plant vigor improved and invasive species reduced. Forage production and quality for livestock and /or wildlife is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,267.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$28.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 338 - Prescribed Burning

**Scenario:** #69 - Growing Season Prescribed Burning (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Applying prescribed burning during the growing season which removes a portion of the current year's grazeable forage. Burn is conducted according to a designed burn plan and NRCS Prescribed Burning (338) standard and specification in order to control undesirable species, improve wildlife habitat and plant productivity/quality, facilitate grazing distribution, maintain ecological processes, or alter seasonal smoke emissions. Burning during the active growing season can reduce invasive plant occurrence and seed production (on both herbaceous and woody plant species). Implementing growing season burning also reduces the volume of acres that are typically burned in the spring and thus spreads out smoke emissions over more seasons. Burned firebreaks used to achieve total firebreak width are part of these burns (constructed firebreak costs are not included in the cost of the scenario. Refer to Firebreak (394) standard and payment scenarios).

**Before Situation:**

Prescribed burning has either not been utilized or has traditionally been applied in spring. Burns have not been an effective means to control/decrease sericea lespedeza infestations and certain woody invasive plants of managed grazing lands.

**After Situation:**

Growing season prescribed burns produce a marked decrease in sericea lespedeza seed production and/or woody plant presence. Desired plant composition is restored, plant vigor improved and invasive species reduced. Forage production and quality for livestock and/or wildlife is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,838.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$30.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 340 - Cover Crop

**Scenario:** #17 - Basic

**Scenario Description:**

Typically a small grain or legume (may also use forage sorghum, radishes, turnips, buckwheat, etc.) will be planted as a cover crop immediately after harvest of a row crop, and will be followed by a row crop that will utilize the residue as a mulch. This scenario assumes that seed will be planted with a drill. The cover crop should be allowed to generate as much biomass as possible, without delaying planting of the following crop. The cover crop will be terminated using an approved herbicide prior to planting the subsequent crop.

**Before Situation:**

Row crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton are grown and harvested in mid-late fall. Fields are disked immediately following harvest, with rows in some fields being hipped for drainage. Residue amounts after harvest average 30% or less, resulting in bare

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements according to Cover Crop (340) are prepared and implemented. Within 30 days after harvest of the row crop, fields are planted with a small grain or legume cover crop (may also use forage sorghum, radishes, turnips, buckwheat, etc.), typically rye or clover. The average field size is 40 acres. The cover crop is seeded with a drill. No additional fertilizer is applied with the cover crop. The cover crop provides soil cover by late fall, throughout the winter, and into the early spring. Runoff and erosion are reduced. Wind erosion is reduced by standing residues. The cover crop is terminated with an approved herbicide prior to spring planting as late as feasible to maximize plant biomass production. Over time, soil health is improved due to the additional biomass, ground cover, soil infiltration, and plant diversity introduced to the cropping system. Cover crop residues left on the surface may maximize weed control by increasing allelopathic and mulching effect.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,436.62

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$85.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 340 - Cover Crop

**Scenario:** #18 - Adaptive Management

**Scenario Description:**

The practice scenario is for the implementation of cover crops in small replicated plots to allow the producer to learn how to manage cover crops on their operation. Scenario includes implementing replicated strip trials on a field plot to evaluate, identify and implement a particular cover crop management strategy (e.g., cover crop vs no cover crop, multiple species vs, single species, evaluate different termination methods or timings, using a legume vs no legume for nitrogen credits). This will be done following the guidance in the NRCS Technical Note 10 - Adaptive Management.

**Before Situation:**

Row crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton are grown and harvested in mid-late fall. Fields are disked immediately following harvest, with rows in some fields being hipped for drainage. Residue amounts after harvest average 30% or less, resulting in bare

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements for Cover Crop (340) will be prepared along with the Adaptive Management plan for the replicated cover crop plots and implemented. Installation of this scenario will result in establishment of a cover crop replicated plots to compare to different management strategies for cover crop management following the guidance in the Agronomy Technical Note 10 - Adaptive Management. Implementation involves establishing the replicated plots to evaluate one or more cover crop management strategies. The plot will consist of at least 4 replicated plots designed, laid out, managed and evaluated with the assistance of a consultant knowledgeable in cover crop management. Results are used to make cover crop management decisions to address erosion and water quality issues. Yields will be measured and statistically summarized following the procedures in Agronomy Technical Note 10 - Adaptive Management. The yields for each plot will be adjusted to the appropriate moisture content. This would be repeated for 3 years.

**Feature Measure:** Based on 10 acres

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,975.42 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,975.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 340 - Cover Crop

**Scenario:** #19 - Multi-Species

**Scenario Description:**

Typically the multi-species cover crop (two or more species) mix includes a small grain, a legume, and may include other species such as forage sorghum, radishes, turnips, buckwheat, etc.). This mix will address all the purposes of the Cover Crop (340) standard. Typically the cover crop is seeded immediately after harvest of a row crop, but may be inter-seeded into a row crop using a broadcast seeder, drill, or similar device. The cover crop will be followed by another row crop and will utilize the residue as a mulch. The cover crop should be allowed to generate as much biomass as possible without delaying planting of the following crop. The cover crop will be terminated using an approved herbicide or tillage prior to planting the subsequent crop and terminated per the NRCS Cover Crop Termination Guidelines.

**Before Situation:**

Row crops such as corn, soybeans, or cotton are grown and harvested in mid-late fall. Fields are disked immediately following harvest with rows in some fields being hipped for drainage. Residue amounts after harvest average 30% or less resulting in bare s

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements according to Cover Crop (340) are prepared and implemented. Within 30 days after the harvest of row crop, fields are planted with a multi-species (2 or more species) cover crop mix that generally includes a small grain, a legume, and may include other species such as forage sorghum, radishes, turnips, buckwheat, etc. The average field size is 40 acres. The cover crop is seeded with a drill, broadcast seeder, aerial broadcast, or other method. No additional fertilizer is applied with the cover crop. The cover crop provides soil cover by late fall, throughout the winter, and into the early spring. Runoff and erosion are reduced. Wind erosion is reduced by standing residues. The cover crop is terminated with an approved herbicide prior to spring planting as late as feasible to maximize plant biomass production. Over time, soil health is improved due to the additional biomass, ground cover, soil infiltration, and plant diversity introduced to the cropping system. Cover crop residues left on the surface may maximize weed control by increasing allelopathic and mulching effect.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,226.62 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$105.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 340 - Cover Crop

**Scenario:** #85 - Multi-Species, 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Typical cover crop is more than one plant species, planted immediately after harvest of a crop and will be followed by a new crop. Cover crops are planted in the production bed typically 4000 square feet. Implementation is mostly hand labor or labor intensive. Cover crop is mechanically terminated in urban agricultural sites with State and local laws, ordinance and zoning restrictions on use of agrichemicals.

**Before Situation:**

Crop rotation include specialty crops such sweet corn, vegetables, or root crops are grown and harvested through out growing season and into mid-late fall. Residue amounts after harvest average 30% or less, resulting in bare soil being exposed to wind ero

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements according to Cover Crop (340) are prepared and implemented. The cover crop is seeded by hand. No additional fertilizer is applied with the cover crop. The cover crop provides soil cover at the critical period when cover is needed usually late fall, throughout the winter, and into the early spring. Runoff and erosion are reduced. Wind erosion is reduced by standing residues. The cover crop is mechanically terminated as late as feasible to maximize cover crop biomass production and meet the planting date needs of the next crop. Over time, soil health is improved due to additions of biomass, improvement of aggregate stability and infiltration/aeration.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Cover Crop Installed

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$258.86

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$64.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 340 - Cover Crop

**Scenario:** #95 - Mechanical Termination, 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Typical cover crop is more than one plant species, planted immediately after harvest of a crop and will be followed by a new crop. Cover crops are planted in the production bed typically 4000 square feet. Implementation is mostly hand labor or labor intensive. Cover crop is mechanically terminated in urban agricultural sites with State and local laws, ordinance and zoning restrictions on use of agrichemicals.

**Before Situation:**

Crop rotation include specialty crops such sweet corn, vegetables, or root crops are grown and harvested through out growing season and into mid-late fall. Residue amounts after harvest average 30% or less, resulting in bare soil being exposed to wind ero

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements according to Cover Crop (340) are prepared and implemented. The cover crop is seeded by hand. No additional fertilizer is applied with the cover crop. The cover crop provides soil cover at the critical period when cover is needed usually late fall, throughout the winter, and into the early spring. Runoff and erosion are reduced. Wind erosion is reduced by standing residues. The cover crop is mechanically terminated as late as feasible to maximize cover crop biomass production and meet the planting date needs of the next crop. Over time, soil health is improved due to additions of biomass, improvement of aggregate stability and infiltration/aeration.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Cover Crop Installed

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$132.16

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$33.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 342 - Critical Area Planting

**Scenario:** #26 - Normal Tillage, Native or Introduced

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of permanent vegetation (Native and Introduced) on a site (both organic and non-organic) that is void or nearly void of vegetation due to a natural occurrence or a newly constructed conservation practice. Costs include seedbed preparation with typical tillage implements, grass/legume seed, companion crop, and fertilizer and lime with application.

**Before Situation:**

Areas that are void or nearly void of vegetation, resulting in bare soil being exposed to erosive processes. The exposed areas may be caused from recent natural occurrences (fire, flood, wind, etc.) or due to newly constructed conservation practices such

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared and implemented according to the Critical Area Planting (342) standard. This typical 1.0 acre critical area is stabilized by applying fertilizer, lime and seed. Soil amendments will be incorporated at a depth of four to six inches to improve fertility and ensure establishment of permanent vegetative cover. The site will be stabilized, erosion reduced, and offsite damages reduced/eliminated.

**Feature Measure:** area seeded

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$407.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$407.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 342 - Critical Area Planting

**Scenario:** #27 - Moderate Grading, Native or Introduced

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of permanent vegetation (native and introduced) on a site that is void or nearly void of vegetation due to a natural or human disturbance. Costs include a dozer for grading and shaping of small gullies, seedbed preparation with typical tillage implements, grass/legume seed, companion crop, and fertilizer and lime with application.

**Before Situation:**

Areas that are void or nearly void of vegetation, resulting in bare soil being exposed to erosive processes. The exposed areas may be caused from natural occurrences (fire, flood, etc.) or human disturbance. The exposed areas have visible rills and small

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared and implemented according to the Critical Area Planting (342) standard.. This typical 1.0 acre critical area is stabilized by grading and shaping the small gullies with a dozer and then applying fertilizer, lime and seed. The site will be stabilized, erosion reduced, and offsite damages reduced/eliminated.

**Feature Measure:** area seeded

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$983.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$983.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 342 - Critical Area Planting

**Scenario:** #28 - Heavy Grading, Native or Introduced

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of permanent vegetation on a site that is void or nearly void of vegetation due to a natural or human disturbance. Costs include a dozer for grading and shaping of moderate to severe gullies, seedbed preparation with typical tillage implements, grass/legume seed, companion crop, and fertilizer and lime with application.

**Before Situation:**

Areas that are void or nearly void of vegetation, resulting in bare soil being exposed to erosive processes. The exposed areas may be caused from natural occurrences (fire, flood, etc.) or human disturbance. The exposed areas have visible rills and modera

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared and implemented according to the Critical Area Planting (342) standard. This typical 1.0 acre critical area is stabilized by grading and shaping the moderate to severe gullies with a dozer and then applying fertilizer, lime and seed. The site will be stabilized, erosion reduced, and offsite damages reduced/eliminated.

**Feature Measure:** area seeded

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,435.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,435.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 342 - Critical Area Planting

**Scenario:** #69 - Permanent Cover

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of permanent vegetation on a site that is void of vegetation or needs to improve the vegetation to adequately cover the existing site soil to reduce particulate matter dust emissions. Costs include seedbed prep with light tillage, seed, fertilizer and lime. Small Scale fields and urban sites have soil conditions limiting vegetation growth or sensitive areas that need protection.

**Before Situation:**

Fields are bare or sparsely vegetated exposed to wind and water erosion. Soil physical or chemical properties limit vegetative growth. Urban site soils contain heavy metal contaminants at risk of emissions as particulate dust from field activities.

**After Situation:**

The Implementation Requirement with site specific instruction is prepared for each treatment site. The establishment of permanent vegetation will stabilize the soil. Sensitive areas are protected. Particulate dust is reduced. Wind and water erosion loss is within tolerance levels (T).

**Feature Measure:** planted area

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$348.85

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$23.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Scenario:** #46 - Reduced Tillage

**Scenario Description:**

Mulch-till is managing the amount, orientation and distribution of crop and other plant residue on the soil surface year round while limiting the soil-disturbing activities used to grow crops in systems where the entire field surface is tilled by the planter/drill or tillage tools prior to planting. This practice includes tillage methods commonly referred to as mulch tillage, vertical tillage, chiseling and disking, or the use of high disturbance drills without additional tillage. It applies to stubble mulching on summer-fallowed land, to tillage for annually planted crops, to tillage for planted crops and to tillage for planting perennial crops. All residue shall be uniformly spread or managed over the surface throughout the critical erosion period(s). All residue shall be uniformly distributed over the entire field and not burned or removed. These periods of intensive tillage have led to excessive soil loss, often above the soil loss tolerance (T), due to the loss of crop residue on the soil surface. The NRCS erosion prediction model(s) will be used to review the farming operations and determine the amount of surface residue to manage throughout the rotation to keep soil loss below T. The producer will adopt a reduced till system to meet one or more of the practice purposes.

**Before Situation:**

Crops such as corn, soybeans, small grains, or cotton are grown and harvested. Fields are tilled immediately following harvest, with rows in some fields being hipped for drainage. Residue amounts after harvest average 30% or less, resulting in bare soil b

**After Situation:**

The Implementation Requirements are prepared following the criteria in the 345 Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till conservation practice standard. Reduced till applies to all cropland and other lands where crops are planted. This scenario includes the use of a reduce till systems and high disturbance drills, such as a hoe drill, air seeder, or no-till drill that disturbs a large percentage of soil surface during the planting operation. The residue that remains on the soil surface provides soil cover during late fall, throughout the winter, and into the early spring. Runoff and water/wind erosion are reduced and water quality improves. Over time, soil health is improved due to less tillage, the additional biomass, ground cover, soil infiltration, and plant diversity in the cropping system.

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,580.58 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$25.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Scenario:** #77 - Reduced Tillage, Less Than 0.5 Acres

**Scenario Description:**

Scenario applies to Urban sites less than a 1/2 acre with a rotation of organic or non-organic specialty crops (fruits and vegetable) are produced as part of a conservation management system to treat one or more of the following resource concerns: 1) Reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, 2) Maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, 3) Improve soil moisture efficiency, 4) Reduce plant pest pressures. This practice payment effectively implements a reduced tillage system on a typical urban specialty crop farm. Cost represents typical situations for organic and non-organic producers.

**Before Situation:**

This rotation consisted of growing specialty crops. Fields range from nearly flat to B and C slopes. Erosion, soil quality, and pest management are the primary concern. Removal of residue from the planted area is common leaving bare soil-residue amounts a

**After Situation:**

The implementation requirements are written following CPS 345 Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Tillage to treat one or more of the following resource concerns on organic and non-organic farms: reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, maintain or increase soil health and organic matter content, improve soil moisture efficiency or reduce plant pest pressure. Soil disturbance is minimized with no-till drill or planter use. May include single slot opener and seedling or plug planting follows. When pest management requires the removal of crop residue then planting beds are covered with cover crop using the 340 Cover Crop conservation practice. Runoff and erosion are reduced below T. No observed rills. Wind erosion reduced by maintaining surface cover. Over time, soil health is improved due to less tillage, the additional biomass, ground cover, soil infiltration, and plant diversity in the cropping system.

**Feature Measure:** area planted

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$543.35

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$36.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 348 - Dam, Diversion

**Scenario:** #67 - Fill, Rock and Gravel

**Scenario Description:**

A rock structure with a gravel bedding on geotextile is built to divert all or part of the water from a waterway or a stream to provide water in such a manner that it can be controlled and used beneficially for irrigation, livestock water, fire control, municipal or industrial uses, develop renewable energy systems, or recreation, to divert periodic damaging flows from one watercourse to another watercourse thereby reducing the damage potential of the flows. This structure will address the resource concerns of inefficient water use on Irrigated Land, inadequate water for livestock, and inadequate water supply for other beneficial uses.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies where a diversion dam is needed as an integral part of an irrigation system or a water-spreading system designed to facilitate the conservation use of soil and water resources, Diversion of water from an unstable watercourse to a sta

**After Situation:**

A rock structure of approximately 1050 cubic yards with a gravel bedding of approximately 450 cubic yards on approximately 200 square yards of geotextile, built to divert all or part of the water from a waterway or a stream. This standard applies to structures of a permanent nature, constructed of materials having an expected life span consistent with the purpose for which the structure is designed. This structure will be an integral part of an irrigation system or a water-spreading system designed to facilitate the conservation use of soil and water resources, or diversion of water from an unstable watercourse to a stable watercourse as needed. The water supply available is adequate for the purpose for which it is to be diverted. Adverse environmental impacts resulting from the installation of the practice must be overcome. The rock structure provides beneficial uses for irrigation, livestock water, fire control, municipal or industrial uses, renewable energy systems, recreation, or to divert periodic damaging flows from one watercourse to another watercourse thereby reducing the damage potential of the flows. Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as Channel Vegetation (322), Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395), Channel Stabilization (584) will be as appropriate. Any needed head gates or flap gates to control the quantity of water being diverted must use Structure for Water Control (587).

**Feature Measure:** Fill in Cubic Yards

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$178,609.52

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$119.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 348 - Dam, Diversion

**Scenario:** #70 - Structure, Sheet Pile

**Scenario Description:**

A sheet pile structure with rock, built to divert all or part of the water from a waterway or a stream to provide water in such a manner that it can be controlled and used beneficially for irrigation, livestock water, fire control, municipal or industrial uses, develop renewable energy systems, or recreation, to divert periodic damaging flows from one watercourse to another watercourse thereby reducing the damage potential of the flows. This structure will address the resource concerns of inefficient water use on Irrigated Land, inadequate water for livestock, and inadequate water supply for other beneficial uses.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies where a diversion dam is needed as an integral part of an irrigation system or a water-spreading system designed to facilitate the conservation use of soil and water resources, Diversion of water from an unstable watercourse to a sta

**After Situation:**

A sheet pile structure of approximately 3000 square feet with approximately 660 cubic yards of riprap is built to divert all or part of the water from a waterway or a stream. This standard applies to structures of a permanent nature, constructed of materials having an expected life span consistent with the purpose for which the structure is designed. This structure will be an integral part of an irrigation system or a water-spreading system designed to facilitate the conservation use of soil and water resources, or diversion of water from an unstable watercourse to a stable watercourse as needed. The water supply available is adequate for the purpose for which it is to be diverted. Adverse environmental impacts resulting from the installation of the practice must be overcome. The sheet pile structure provides beneficial uses for irrigation, livestock water, fire control, municipal or industrial uses, renewable energy systems, recreation, or to divert periodic damaging flows from one watercourse to another watercourse thereby reducing the damage potential of the flows. Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as Channel Vegetation (322), Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395), Channel Stabilization (584) will be as appropriate. Any needed head gates or flap gates to control the quantity of water being diverted must use Structure for Water Control (587).

**Feature Measure:** Area of sheet pile

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$223,249.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$74.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 348 - Dam, Diversion

**Scenario:** #78 - Earthfill

**Scenario Description:**

An earth fill built to divert all or part of the water from a waterway or a stream to provide water in such a manner that it can be controlled and used beneficially for irrigation, livestock water, fire control, municipal or industrial uses, develop renewable energy systems, or recreation, to divert periodic damaging flows from one watercourse to another watercourse thereby reducing the damage potential of the flows. This structure will address the resource concerns of inefficient water use on Irrigated Land, inadequate water for livestock, and inadequate water supply for other beneficial uses.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies where a diversion dam is needed as an integral part of an irrigation system or a water-spreading system designed to facilitate the conservation use of soil and water resources, Diversion of water from an unstable watercourse to a sta

**After Situation:**

An earth fill structure of approximately 1500 cubic yards is built to divert all or part of the water from a waterway or a stream. This standard applies to structures of a permanent nature, constructed of materials having an expected life span consistent with the purpose for which the structure is designed. This structure will be an integral part of an irrigation system or a water-spreading system designed to facilitate the conservation use of soil and water resources, or diversion of water from an unstable watercourse to a stable watercourse as needed. The water supply available is adequate for the purpose for which it is to be diverted. Adverse environmental impacts resulting from the installation of the practice must be overcome. The earth fill structure provides beneficial uses for irrigation, livestock water, fire control, municipal or industrial uses, renewable energy systems, recreation, or to divert periodic damaging flows from one watercourse to another watercourse thereby reducing the damage potential of the flows. Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as Channel Vegetation (322), Stream Habitat Improvement and Management (395), Channel Stabilization (584) will be as appropriate. Any needed head gates or flap gates to control the quantity of water being diverted must use Structure for Water Control (587).

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Earth Fill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,133.94

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 350 - Sediment Basin

**Scenario:** #1 - Basin, Excavated

**Scenario Description:**

A basin constructed by excavation in an existing drainage way on agricultural, urban, or construction sites for the purpose of trapping sediment to preserve the capacity of reservoirs, ditches, canals, diversions, waterways and streams and to prevent undesirable deposition on bottom lands and other developed lands. The sediment basin is created by excavation and impounds less than 3 feet against any embankment or spoil. Excavated material is spoiled, not placed in a designed embankment. Earthen spillway is constructed as needed. Resource concerns addressed include excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition. Surface water causes the sediment (and potentially pesticides and nutrients) to be transported into the riparian areas and water bodies downstream. The typical sediment basin has a drainage area of 5 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Disturbed areas on agricultural or urban land, or construction sites, have excessive erosion that leads to deterioration of downstream waters due to excessive sedimentation.

**After Situation:**

The typical sediment basin is constructed by excavating 900 cubic yards and spreading the spoil outside the pool area using a dozer or similar excavation equipment. Sediments will be collected in the basin and the basin will be emptied through an engineered outlet. Associated practice(s): Other practices that may need to be implemented along with sediment basin to address all of the site specific resource concerns include: Critical Area Planting (342) and Mulching (484) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities, Structure for Water Control (587) or Underground Outlet (620) if using a dewatering device, Pond Sealing or Lining (521A,521B,521C,521D).

**Feature Measure:** Excavated volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 900.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,781.75 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 350 - Sediment Basin

**Scenario:** #2 - Basin

**Scenario Description:**

A sediment basin constructed with a low hazard class earthen embankment in an existing drainage way on agricultural, urban, or construction sites for the purpose of trapping sediment to preserve the capacity of reservoirs, ditches, canals, diversions, waterways and streams and to prevent undesirable deposition on bottom lands and other developed lands. The sediment basin is created by a compacted earth embankment and impounds more than 3 feet of water against the embankment. Resource concerns addressed include excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition. Surface water causes the sediment (and potentially pesticides and nutrients) to be transported into the riparian areas and water bodies downstream. The typical sediment basin has a drainage area of 5 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Disturbed areas on agricultural or urban land, or construction sites, have excessive erosion that leads to deterioration of downstream waters due to excessive sedimentation.

**After Situation:**

The typical sediment basin is an embankment of 1000 cy with excavated material from the pool area used to construct the embankment and auxiliary spillway. The embankment will be compacted earthfill. Sediments will be collected in the basin and the basin will be emptied through an engineered outlet. Associated practice(s): Other practices that may need to be implemented along with sediment basin to address all of the site specific resource concerns include: Critical Area Planting (342) and Mulching (484) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities, Structure for Water Control (587) or Underground Outlet (620) if using a dewatering device, Pond Sealing or Lining (521A,521B,521C,521D).

**Feature Measure:** Embankment volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,564.71

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 351 - Well Decommissioning

**Scenario:** #1 - Shallow Well, Greater Than 15 Inch Diameter

**Scenario Description:**

A licensed well driller will seal and permanently close an inactive, abandoned, or unusable water well to prevent excess nutrients in surface and groundwater and to eliminate pesticides transported to surface and ground water. Well will be cleared of all equipment and materials. Residual water column must be treated with chlorine concentration of >50 ppm or according to local, State, Tribal, or Federal regulations. Install fill material (gravel, earth, concrete, and/or bentonite) consisting of 80% Gravel, 10% Cement or Bentonite, and 10% Earthfill.

**Before Situation:**

Shallow well or hand dug well that is greater than 15" diameter and less than 20 feet deep. Assume 30" diameter casing. Well will be cleared of all equipment and materials. Residual water column must be treated with chlorine concentration of >50 ppm or ac

**After Situation:**

Procedures and sealing materials shall conform to ASTM D5299 and be compatible with all local, State, Tribal, and Federal requirements. Backfill shall be placed and compacted in a manner that minimizes segregation and bulking to prevent surface subsidence. Associated practices: 342 Critical Area Seeding

**Feature Measure:** Length of well casing

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,612.49

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$80.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 351 - Well Decommissioning

**Scenario:** #2 - Shallow Well, Less Than or Equal to 15 Inch Diameter

**Scenario Description:**

A licensed well driller will seal and permanently close an inactive, abandoned, or unusable water well to prevent excess nutrients in surface and groundwater and to eliminate pesticides transported to surface and ground water. Well will be cleared of all equipment and materials. Residual water column must be treated with chlorine concentration of >50 ppm or according to local, State, Tribal, or Federal regulations. Install fill material (gravel, earth, concrete, and/or bentonite) consisting of 60% Gravel, 20% Concrete or Bentonite, and 20% Earthfill.

**Before Situation:**

Shallow well or hand dug well that is less than 15" diameter and less than 80 feet deep. Assume 12" diameter casing. Well will be cleared of all equipment and materials. Residual water column must be treated with chlorine concentration of >50 ppm or accor

**After Situation:**

Procedures and sealing materials shall conform to ASTM D5299 and be compatible with all local, State, Tribal, and Federal requirements. Backfill shall be placed and compacted in a manner that minimizes segregation and bulking to prevent surface subsidence. Associated practices: 342 Critical Area Seeding.

**Feature Measure:** Length of well casing

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,512.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 351 - Well Decommissioning

**Scenario:** #3 - Drilled Well, Less Than 300 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

A licensed well driller will seal and permanently close an inactive, abandoned, or unusable water well to prevent excess nutrients in surface and groundwater and to eliminate pesticides transported to surface and ground water.

**Before Situation:**

Drilled well with surface casing that is approximately 250 feet deep. Typically will be a well of less than 6" in diameter, or an artesian well which will require grout pumped and well filled from bottom up. Resource Concern - Water Quality Degradation

**After Situation:**

Procedures and sealing materials shall conform to ASTM D5299 and be compatible with all local, State, Tribal, and Federal requirements. Backfill shall be placed and compacted in a manner that minimizes segregation and bulking to prevent surface subsidence. Associated practices: 342 Critical Area Seeding

**Feature Measure:** Length of well casing

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 250.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,032.08

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$32.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 351 - Well Decommissioning

**Scenario:** #4 - Drilled Well, 300 to 1,000 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

A licensed well driller will seal and permanently close an inactive, abandoned, or unusable water well to prevent excess nutrients in surface and groundwater and to eliminate pesticides transported to surface and ground water.

**Before Situation:**

Drilled well that is greater than 300 feet deep. Assume 6" diameter casing. Resource Concern - Water Quality Degradation

**After Situation:**

Procedures and sealing materials shall conform to ASTM D5299 and be compatible with all local, State, Tribal, and Federal requirements. Backfill shall be placed and compacted in a manner that minimizes segregation and bulking to prevent surface subsidence. Associated practices: 342 Critical Area Seeding

**Feature Measure:** Length of well casing

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,202.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$26.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 353 - Monitoring Well

**Scenario:** #16 - Borehole, Less Than or Equal to 200 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

A vertical borehole designed and installed 200 feet or less in depth to obtain representative groundwater quality samples and hydrogeologic information. The well provides controlled access for sampling groundwater near an agricultural waste storage or treatment facility to detect seepage and monitor groundwater quality. Installation methods must be in conformance with ASTM D5092. The resource concerns addressed include groundwater contamination and groundwater quality.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to the design, installation, and development of monitoring wells where contamination of groundwater from an agricultural waste storage or treatment facility is a concern, detection of seepage and monitoring of groundwater quality is

**After Situation:**

Typical installation of a vertical borehole for a monitoring well 100 feet deep that provides controlled access to obtain water samples for detecting seepage and monitoring of groundwater quality from an agricultural waste storage or treatment facility as a component of an agricultural waste management system. The monitoring well is installed by drilling an 8 inch borehole, installing a protective casing, a 2 inch riser pipe, a well screen, and filter pack. The installation method was in conformance with ASTM D5092. Vegetation of disturbed areas will be completed under critical area planting (342). Erosion control during construction activities will use Stormwater Runoff Control (570). Other associated practices include Access Control (472), Water Well Decommissioning (351), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Treatment Lagoon (359), and Pumping Plant (533).

**Feature Measure:** Depth of Well

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,787.60

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$157.88

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 356 - Dike and Levee

**Scenario:** #1 - Dike, Wetland

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a barrier, constructed of an earthen embankment, to control water level. Embankment structure to provide adequate freeboard, allowance for settlement, and foundation and embankment stability. Payment includes stripping prior to fill placement and earthfill for embankment. Associated practices include, but are not limited to: PS327 Conservation Cover, PS656 Constructed Wetland, PS342 Critical Area Planting, PS378 Ponds, PS382 Fence, PS464 Irrigation Land Levelling, PS500 Obstruction Removal, PS528 Prescribed Grazing, PS587 Structure for Water Control, PS620 Underground Outlet, PS645 Upland Wildlife Management, PS658 Wetland Creation, PS659 Wetland Enhancement, PS657 Wetland Restoration, PS644 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management.

**Before Situation:**

Site requires control of water level for purposes connected with crop production; fish and wildlife management; or wetland maintenance, improvement, restoration, or construction. An adequate quantity of soil suitable for constructing an earthen dike is av

**After Situation:**

Water level controlled by a stable earthen structure. Potential hazard to public safety, land or property mitigated; environmental benefit provided.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Earthfill (includi

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,890.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,441.71

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 356 - Dike and Levee

**Scenario:** #2 - Dike, Less Than or Equal to Six Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a barrier 6' or less in height, constructed of an earthen embankment, to control water level. Embankment structure to provide adequate freeboard, allowance for settlement, and foundation and embankment stability. Payment includes stripping prior to fill placement, excavation of a core trench, and earthfill for embankment. Associated practices include, but are not limited to: PS327 Conservation Cover, PS656 Constructed Wetland, PS342 Critical Area Planting, PS378 Ponds, PS382 Fence, PS464 Irrigation Land Levelling, PS500 Obstruction Removal, PS528 Prescribed Grazing, PS587 Structure for Water Control, PS620 Underground Outlet, PS645 Upland Wildlife Management, PS658 Wetland Creation, PS659 Wetland Enhancement, PS657 Wetland Restoration, PS644 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management.

**Before Situation:**

Site is subject to flooding or inundation which poses a potential hazard to public safety, damage to land or property. Site may also require control of water level for purposes connected with crop production; fish and wildlife management; or wetland maint

**After Situation:**

Water level controlled by a stable earthen structure 6' or less in height. Potential hazard to public safety, land or property mitigated; environmental benefit provided.

**Feature Measure:** Length of constructed dike

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$32,061.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$32.06

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 356 - Dike and Levee

**Scenario:** #3 - Dike, Greater Than Six Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a barrier > 6' in height, constructed of an earthen embankment, to control water level. Embankment structure to provide adequate freeboard, allowance for settlement, and foundation and embankment stability. Payment includes stripping prior to fill placement, excavation of a core trench, and earthfill for embankment. Associated practices include, but are not limited to: PS327 Conservation Cover, PS656 Constructed Wetland, PS342 Critical Area Planting, PS378 Ponds, PS382 Fence, PS464 Irrigation Land Levelling, PS500 Obstruction Removal, PS528 Prescribed Grazing, PS587 Structure for Water Control, PS620 Underground Outlet, PS645 Upland Wildlife Management, PS658 Wetland Creation, PS659 Wetland Enhancement, PS657 Wetland Restoration, PS644 Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management.

**Before Situation:**

Site is subject to flooding or inundation which poses a potential hazard to public safety, damage to land or property. Site may also require control of water level for purposes connected with crop production; fish and wildlife management; or wetland maint

**After Situation:**

Water level controlled by a stable earthen structure > 6' in height. Potential hazard to public safety, land or property mitigated; environmental benefit provided.

**Feature Measure:** Length of constructed dike

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$46,902.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$46.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 359 - Waste Treatment Lagoon

**Scenario:** #14 - Waste Treatment Lagoon

**Scenario Description:**

A waste treatment lagoon is a component of a waste management system that provides biological treatment of manure and other byproducts of animal agricultural operations by reducing the pollution potential. Resource concern addressed is water quality by reducing the pollution potential to surface and groundwater by treating and storing liquid waste. Earthen lagoon liners are addressed with another standard. This scenario intended for embankment or excavated lagoon. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil (520), Pond Sealing or Lining, Concrete (522), Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner (521), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), and Waste Separation Facility (632).

**Before Situation:**

Operator presently has a confined animal feeding operation without a waste management system adequate to handle the waste stream leaving the animal production facilities. Manure and other agricultural waste by-products are not being utilized or controlled

**After Situation:**

A waste treatment lagoon constructed from on-site material provides an environmentally safe facility for storing manure and other agricultural waste by-products. This facility provides the landowner a means of storing and treating waste until it can be utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. Excavated material used to build an embankment around the lagoon so this is a combination excavated/embankment design. Typical design size : Design Volume 492,129 cf = 18,227 cy; 260' X 208' (top); 3:1 inside and outside side slopes; cut/fill ratio = 1.25; total depth = 13' which includes 1' freeboard Feature Measure = Design Volume [Operational Volume + emergency volume + freeboard]

**Feature Measure:** Design Volume (Operational)

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 492,129.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$105,706.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 360 - Waste Facility Closure

**Scenario:** #1 - Decommission, Concrete Storage

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the decommissioning of a concrete storage and/or treatment structure or impoundment. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excess nutrient and pathogens in ground and/or surface waters and air quality impacts from greenhouse gases, particulate matter and associated precursors, and objectionable odors. This practice scenario does not include payment for the removal and land application of the manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge; however, all manure wastes shall be removed and properly land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to decommissioning of the structure. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590), Critical Area Planting (342)

**Before Situation:**

An existing concrete waste storage structure is no longer functioning correctly or is not being used for its intended purpose. The structure may or may not contain manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge. It poses a safety hazard for humans and livestock

**After Situation:**

This scenario assumes a concrete waste storage structure with a volume of 48000 cubic feet (200' x 30' x 8') with 8" thick walls. The volume of earthwork (earthfill and/or excavation, final grading) required is approximately 75% of the storage volume. Decommissioning of a concrete waste storage structure will consist of collapsing the concrete sidewalls to 20% of their original height and filling the storage structure with earthfill. The concrete may be disposed off site if necessary. All manure and wastewater nutrient material shall be removed and land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to fill. After collapsing the side walls the remaining void will be filled with earthen material from a borrow source. The disturbed areas shall be vegetated in accordance with Critical Area Planting (342) or planted to crops in accordance with Nutrient Management (590). Removing and properly utilizing the manure and waste water from the impoundment, demolition of any above grade concrete and the fill in of the concrete waste structure will address water quality degradation, air quality impacts and safety hazards The site may also become available for another use.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Feet of storage to be

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 48,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,517.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 360 - Waste Facility Closure

**Scenario:** #2 - Decommission, Earthen Impoundment

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the decommissioning of an earthen storage and/or treatment structure or impoundment (embankment or excavated type) include any basins intended for sediment removal. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excess nutrient and pathogens in ground and/or surface waters and air quality impacts from greenhouse gases, particulate matter and associated precursors, and objectionable odors. This practice scenario does not include payment for the removal and land application of the manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge; however, all manure wastes shall be removed and properly land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to decommissioning of the structure. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590), Critical Area Planting (342)

**Before Situation:**

The existing manure, runoff and/or waste water lagoon, storage pond or pit is no longer functioning correctly or is not being used for its intended purpose. The structure may or may not contain manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge. It poses a safety h

**After Situation:**

This scenario assumes a waste storage pond with total storage volume of 100,000 cubic feet over a footprint of 12150 square feet. The volume of earthwork (earthfill and excavation) required to breach the embankment and/or fill in the impoundment and perform final grading of the site is approximately 75% of the storage volume. The volume of earthwork will include 60% as excavation and 40% as compacted earthfill. An additional excavation of 450 cubic yards is assumed to remove contaminated soil below original design over the entire footprint of pond. Structural removal, as necessary, may include the removal and disposal of the synthetic liner, sealing or removal and disposal of waste transfer components and other appurtenances associated with closure of the facility. This practice scenario does not include payment for the removal and land application of the manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge; however, all manure wastes shall be removed and properly land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to decommissioning of the structure. If present, the synthetic liner will be removed and properly disposed of. All inflow devices and associated appurtenances will be removed and properly disposed of. The embankment will be breached and the excavation filled in with the embankment material or hauled in earthfill. The disturbed areas shall be vegetated in accordance with Critical Area Planting (342) or planted to crops in accordance to Nutrient Management (590). Closure of the waste impoundment will address water quality degradation, air quality impacts and safety hazards by removing and properly utilizing the waste from the impoundment and earthfill of the structure. The site will also become available for another use.

**Feature Measure:** Storage Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,497.53 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 360 - Waste Facility Closure

**Scenario:** #3 - Convert to Freshwater

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the conversion of an earthen storage and/or treatment structure or impoundment (embankment or excavated type) to fresh water storage. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excess nutrient and pathogens in ground and/or surface waters and air quality impacts from greenhouse gases, particulate matter and associated precursors, and objectionable odors. This practice scenario does not include payment for the removal and land application of the manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge; however, all manure wastes shall be removed and properly land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to decommissioning of the structure. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590), Critical Area Planting (342)

**Before Situation:**

The existing manure, runoff and/or waste water lagoon, storage pond or pit is no longer functioning correctly or is not being used for its intended purpose. The structure may or may not contain manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge. It poses a safety h

**After Situation:**

This scenario assumes a waste storage pond with total storage volume of 100,000 cubic feet over a footprint of 12150 square feet. Excavation of 450 cubic yards is assumed to remove contaminated soil below original design over the entire footprint of pond. Structural removal, as necessary, may include the removal and disposal of the synthetic liner, sealing or removal and disposal of waste transfer components and other appurtenances associated with closure of the facility. This practice scenario does not include payment for the removal and land application of the manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge; however, all manure wastes shall be removed and properly land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to decommissioning of the structure. If present, the synthetic liner will be removed and properly disposed of. All inflow devices and associated appurtenances will be removed and properly disposed of. The embankment will be breached and the excavation filled in with the embankment material or hauled in earthfill. The disturbed areas shall be vegetated in accordance with Critical Area Planting (342) or planted to crops in accordance to Nutrient Management (590). Closure of the waste impoundment will address water quality degradation, air quality impacts and safety hazards by removing and properly utilizing the waste from the impoundment and earthfill of the structure. The site will also become available for another use.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic feet of structural stor

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,725.53 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 360 - Waste Facility Closure

**Scenario:** #13 - Decommission, Feedlot

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the remediation of the soil on an abandoned feedlot previously used to feed animals on a bare earthen lot. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excess nutrient and pathogens in ground and/or surface waters and air quality impacts from greenhouse gases, particulate matter and associated precursors, and objectionable odors. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Before Situation:**

The feedlot is abandoned. Vegetation has not been reestablished. The high level of nutrients in the soil is preventing volunteer establishment of native vegetation. Rainfall and nutrients on the bare earth feedlot pose a risk to surface water from contami

**After Situation:**

This scenario is based on a 3 acre feedlot. Surveys and testing have determined the manure pack averages 8 inches in depth and the level of nutrients in the 4 inches of soil below the manure pack is too high to treat insitu with vegetation. Payment under this scenario includes only activities associated with the soil remediation. Soil remediation activities in this scenario include removing the nutrient enriched manure pack and soil, an average of 12 inches below the existing surface (130,680 CF). The excavated surface will be vegetated with a mix of salt tolerant plants in conformance with Critical Area Planting, Code 342. Nutrient level testing and field application of the removed soil shall be performed according to nutrient planning in conformance with Nutrient Management, Code 590. Shaping and crowning of the soil material on the disturbed area and critical area seeding will be done to provide drainage, complete the site remediation and establish vegetation. Operation and maintenance of the site will include nutrient testing the following year to determine if the soil has been remediated and surface and ground water resource concerns have been addressed. In this scenario, samples at four (4) locations will be taken at 6, 12, 18 and 24 inches at the end of Year 1. Fence and feed bunk removal is to be performed under Obstruction Removal, Code 500.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of soil remediated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$51,271.16

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17,090.39

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 360 - Waste Facility Closure

**Scenario:** #37 - Decommission, Underbarn

**Scenario Description:**

This practice scenario includes the decommissioning of a concrete waste storage facility which is located under an existing building, which will remain after the waste storage structure is closed. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excess nutrient and pathogens in ground and/or surface waters and air quality impacts from greenhouse gases, particulate matter and associated precursors, and objectionable odors. This practice scenario does not include payment for the removal and land application of the manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge; however, all manure wastes shall be removed and properly land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to decommissioning of the structure. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590).

**Before Situation:**

An existing underbarn concrete waste storage structure is no longer functioning correctly or is not being used for its intended purpose. The structure may or may not contain manure, wastewater, slurry and/or sludge. It poses a safety hazard for humans and

**After Situation:**

This scenario assumes a concrete waste storage structure, which is located under a building, with the top dimensions of 40 ft x 60 ft .x 8 ft total depth with vertical walls, with 10" thick walls. The total structural storage volume of 19,200 cubic feet. The majority of the walls will remain in place, but a 15' section of wall will be removed as well as breaking up 4, 4' x 4' holes to inspect for contamination and removing the beams and slats on the top of the structure. The rest of the floor or slats are broken up, but doesn't need to be removed. The structure is then filled with material. All manure and wastewater nutrient material shall be removed and land applied in accordance with Nutrient Management (590) prior to fill. Removing and properly utilizing the manure and waste water from the impoundment, demolition of any above grade concrete and the fill in of the concrete waste structure will address water quality degradation, air quality impacts and safety hazards The site may also become available for another use.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic feet of total storage

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 19,200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$26,110.02 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 362 - Diversion

**Scenario:** #1 - Diversion

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen channel constructed across long slopes with supporting ridge on lower side, to divert runoff away from farmsteads, gullies, critical erosion areas, construction areas or other sensitive areas. Outlet may be waterway, underground outlet, or other suitable outlet. Typical diversion is, 2300 feet long and requires 1 CY excavation per LF. Channel may be level or gradient and ridge may be vegetated or farmed. The quantity of excavation and fill is balanced.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribute

**After Situation:**

Diversion is 2300 feet long installed using a dozer and/or scraper. Storm water runoff is diverted away from the area to be protected. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Underground Outlet (620), Mulching (484), and Subsurface Drainage (606).

**Feature Measure:** Diversion Excavated Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,851.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 366 - Anaerobic Digester

**Scenario:** #1 - Anaerobic Digester

**Scenario Description:**

An anaerobic digester can be part of a waste management system. It provides biological treatment of the waste in the absence of oxygen. This process for manure and other by-products of animal agricultural operations will manage odors, reduce the net effect of greenhouse gas emissions, and/or reduce pathogens. This scenario is for a generic anaerobic digester. Energy generation is not included with this scenario. Potential Associated Practices: Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roof and Covers (367), Waste Separation Facility (632), Waste Treatment Lagoon (359), and Waste Storage Facility (313).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed. This sit

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being treated such that odors are managed and/or pathogens are reduced. Effluent from the digester is disposed of or utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. The typical scenario also includes items necessary to maintain mesophylic or thermophilic temperatures for bacterial activity (i.e. piping and boiler or other heat source). Typical Design Scenario is each.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,969,229.34

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,969,229.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 366 - Anaerobic Digester

**Scenario:** #7 - Covered Lagoon or Holding Pond

**Scenario Description:**

A covered lagoon can be part of a waste management system. It provides biological treatment of the waste in the absence of oxygen. This process for manure and other by-products of animal agricultural operations will manage odors, reduce the net effect of greenhouse gas emissions, and/or reduce pathogens. This scenario is for all livestock operation sizes. The waste holding/treatment area is covered by waste treatment lagoon (359) or waste storage facility (313) and the cover is addressed under roofs and covers (367). Selection of digester type will be based on effluent consistency. Costs for this scenario are only for system controls, gas collection, and flaring system. Energy generation is not included with this scenario. Potential Associated Practices: Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Waste Transfer (634), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Roof and Covers (367), Waste Separation Facility (632), Waste Treatment Lagoon (359), and Waste Storage Facility (313).

**Before Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are not being utilized or controlled in an environmentally safe manner. The wastes are either accumulating at the source, or other location, or are being transported but not properly utilized or disposed. This sit

**After Situation:**

Manure and other agricultural by-products are being treated such that odors are managed and/or pathogens are reduced. Effluent from the digester is disposed of or utilized in a proper manner in accordance with a nutrient management plan. A covered lagoon/holding pond typically has a flexible top installed over an earthen storage/treatment facility for the purpose of capturing the biogas. Typical Design Scenario: 1,000 animal units (715 - 1,400 lbs. dairy cows).

**Feature Measure:** Animals Units Contributing t

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$485,443.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$485.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 367 - Roofs and Covers

**Scenario:** #1 - Roof, Hoop

**Scenario Description:**

A flexible membrane or fabric-like roof placed on a steel truss hoop-like supports and supporting foundation. Manure is stored as a liquid in basins, tanks, and as a solid on concrete and earthen surfaces. Excess precipitation can cause premature filling of storages or cause nutrients to leach from solid manure piles leading to uncontrolled runoff as well as odor issues. Associated practices include Waste Storage Facility (313), Animal Mortality Facility (316), Composting Facility (317), Roof Runoff Structure (558), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable where the exclusion of precipitation from an animal waste storage and/or treatment facility will improve of an existing or planned system. Manure is stored as a liquid in basins, tanks, and as a solid on concrete and earthen surfaces. Excess pr

**After Situation:**

A flexible membrane or fabric-like roof placed on a steel truss hoop-like supports and supporting foundation. Roof or cover will be engineered and installed in accordance with appropriate building codes and permits. Typical size is 9,000 square feet (36' X 250') and is over an approved animal waste management facility as a component of a CNMP. It is designed to prevent precipitation to allow proper management of animal waste streams (manure or compost streams), thus mitigating the negative factors from the "before practice implementation".

**Feature Measure:** Footprint of the building

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 9,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$110,454.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 367 - Roofs and Covers

**Scenario:** #2 - Roof, Timber or Steel Sheet

**Scenario Description:**

A timber framed structure without enclosing sidewalls with a timber or steel "sheet" roof and supporting foundation. Manure is stored as a liquid in basins, tanks, and as a solid on concrete and earthen surfaces. Excess precipitation can cause premature filling of storages or cause nutrients to leach from solid manure piles leading to uncontrolled runoff as well as odor issues. Associated practices include Waste Storage Facility (313), Animal Mortality Facility (316), Composting Facility (317), Agrichemical Handling Facility (309), Roof Runoff Structure (558), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable where the exclusion of precipitation from an animal waste storage and/or treatment facility will improve of an existing or planned system. Manure is stored as a liquid in basins, tanks, and as a solid on concrete and earthen surfaces. Excess pr

**After Situation:**

A timber framed building with a timber or steel "sheet" roof and supporting foundation. Engineered and installed in accordance with appropriate building codes and permits. Typical size is 5,000 square feet and is over an approved animal waste management facility as a component of a CNMP. It is designed to prevent precipitation to allow proper management of animal waste streams (manure or compost streams), thus mitigating the negative factors from the "before practice implementation".

**Feature Measure:** Area under roof

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$69,539.34

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 367 - Roofs and Covers

**Scenario:** #3 - Flexible Membrane Cover

**Scenario Description:**

A fabricated rigid, semi-rigid, or flexible membrane over a waste storage or treatment facility. The membrane will cover the entire surface of a waste storage or treatment facility (e.g. waste treatment lagoon or anaerobic digester). Cover will exclude precipitation and/or capture biogas for controlled release for flaring or anaerobic digestion. This scenario does not include the flare to convert methane to carbon dioxide. Associated practices include Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Treatment Lagoon (359), Anaerobic Digester (366), Animal Mortality Facility (316), Composting Facility (317), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Pumping Plant (533), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable where the exclusion of precipitation from an animal waste storage or treatment lagoon will improve the management of an existing or planned system, capture and controlled release or flaring of emissions from an existing or planned agricultural

**After Situation:**

A 50,000 SF fabricated rigid, semi-rigid, or flexible membrane over a waste storage or treatment facility. The membrane will cover the entire surface of a waste storage or treatment facility (e.g. waste treatment lagoon or anaerobic digester). Precipitation is excluded from the animal waste storage or treatment lagoon

**Feature Measure:** Surface of Membrane

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$63,233.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 367 - Roofs and Covers

**Scenario:** #4 - Flexible Membrane Cover, Flare

**Scenario Description:**

A fabricated rigid, semi-rigid, or flexible membrane over a waste storage or treatment facility. The membrane will cover the entire surface of a waste storage or treatment facility (e.g. waste treatment lagoon or anaerobic digester). Cover will exclude precipitation and/or capture biogas for controlled release for flaring or anaerobic digestion. This scenario includes the flare to convert methane to carbon dioxide. Associated practices include Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Treatment Lagoon (359), Anaerobic Digester (366), Animal Mortality Facility (316), Composting Facility (317), Roof Runoff Structure (558), Pumping Plant (533), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable where the exclusion of precipitation from an animal waste storage or treatment lagoon will improve the management of an existing or planned system, capture and controlled release or flaring of emissions from an existing or planned agricultural

**After Situation:**

A 50,000 SF fabricated rigid, semi-rigid, or flexible membrane over a waste storage or treatment facility. The membrane will cover the entire surface of a waste storage or treatment facility (e.g. waste treatment lagoon or anaerobic digester). This scenario includes the flare to convert methane to carbon dioxide.

**Feature Measure:** Surface of Membrane

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$534,983.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 368 - Emergency Animal Mortality Management

**Scenario:** #185 - Shallow Burial, Swine or Cattle

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of the disposal of animal carcasses by burial in a shallow trench resulting from impacts related to the National Emergency. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, and organics being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. This scenario has been written to exclude feathered animals since early research has indicated that feathered animals do not break down quickly using this method. Potential Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Fence (384)

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality disposal is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, and organics being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from incom

**After Situation:**

Emergency animal mortalities resulting from causes not related to disease are being buried in a shallow trench, that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, and organics being transported into surface and groundwater resources. This is a new method of mortality disposal recommended by APHIS. 50 animal units (50,000 pound) of animal mortality is the maximum allowed for this method. Proper operation results in little to no odors, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers the disposal of animals as a result of catastrophic mortality events. This typical scenario was developed based on the disposal of livestock animal mortality by burial in an 18 inch deep by 8 foot wide trench. A 12 inch thick layer of carbon material is placed in the bottom of the trench. The carcass is placed in the trench and covered with 4 inches of carbon material. Then the excavated soil is placed over the entire trench area. The scenario includes equipment time and labor to excavate the trench, place carbon layer in the trench bottom, recover and transport carcasses to the shallow burial location, place carcasses in the trench and cover with more carbon and the excavated soil. Wood chips (45 pcf) will be used as the carbon source.

**Feature Measure:** Number of 1000 lbs. Animal

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,964.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$219.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 368 - Emergency Animal Mortality Management

**Scenario:** #201 - Composting, Carbon Material and Mobilization

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of the disposal of animal carcasses by composting in a static windrow resulting from impacts related to the National Emergency. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, and organics being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. Potential Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560)

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality disposal is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors from incomplete composti

**After Situation:**

Emergency animal mortalities resulting from causes not related to disease are being disposed by composting in a static windrow that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, and organics being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, and protection from predators. An overall plan covers the disposal of animals as a result of catastrophic mortality events. This typical scenario was developed based on the disposal of 30,000 pounds of animal mortality by composting on-site. The scenario includes equipment time and labor to recover and transport carcasses to the composting location and the building and turning of the pile at the appropriate time. Composting requires 5 cubic yards of carbon material per 1000 pounds of animal. Wood chips (45 pcf) will be used as the carbon source.

**Feature Measure:** Number of 1000 lbs. Animal

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,147.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$604.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 368 - Emergency Animal Mortality Management

**Scenario:** #217 - Incineration, Landfill or Render

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of the disposal of animal carcasses by methods other than burial, incineration, landfill or rendering resulting from impacts related to the National Emergency. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. Potential Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560)

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality disposal is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens

**After Situation:**

Emergency animal mortalities resulting from causes not related to disease are being disposed in a manner, other than burial, incineration, landfill or rendering, that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers the disposal of animals as a result of catastrophic mortality events. This typical scenario was developed based on the disposal of livestock carcasses by composting on-site. The scenario assumes the grower will provide all equipment and labor and that 50% of the carbon for composting is available on-site.

**Feature Measure:** Number of 1000 lbs. Animal

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,017.41

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$400.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 368 - Emergency Animal Mortality Management

**Scenario:** #281 - Burial

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists of the on-site burial of animal mortalities resulting from impacts related to the National Emergency. An earthen pit is excavated to contain the mortalities, and earth cover is placed over the mortalities to provide protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), and Diversion (362).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality disposal is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens

**After Situation:**

Catastrophic Animal mortalities resulting from causes not related to disease are being disposed in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers the burial of animals as a result of catastrophic mortality events. This typical scenario was developed based on the disposal of 25 head of mature cattle located near the area where the cattle have been found. The scenario includes equipment time and labor to recover and transport carcasses to the burial location. The scenario also includes a burial trench 4' deep plus 3' additional cover over carcasses. Construct a 6' x 60' (surface dimensions) burial site with appropriate cover. Site can handle mortality for 25 mature beef cattle. On site soils can be recompacted to meet required imperviousness. Include 3' overfill or mounding excavated material to provide for settlement of the burial site and divert or minimize offsite runoff. Site to be located out of drainage areas, off-site water diverted and any runoff to spread out into a grassed area.

**Feature Measure:** Number of 1000 lbs. Animal

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,132.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$165.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 368 - Emergency Animal Mortality Management

**Scenario:** #292 - Composting, In-House

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario consists the emergency disposal of poultry mortality by composting in a static windrow. The cause of mortality is an event not related to disease. Additional carbon based bulking material is added to facilitate aeration and provide a proper C:N ratio. The windrow is turned at least once to go into another heat cycle prior to land application. Access is infrequent. This option may not be desirable for sites with limited area, karst topography, and not isolated from of public view. The purpose of the practice is to address resource concerns related to water quality degradation due to excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Air quality impacts due to odors will also be addressed. Potential Associated Practices: Pond Sealing or Lining, Bentonite Sealant (521C), Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Clay Treatment (521D), Pond Sealing or Lining, Soil Dispersant (521B), Fence (382), Critical Area Planting (342), Nutrient Management (590), Access Road (560), Diversion (362).

**Before Situation:**

Animal mortality is done in a manner that results in non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Improper operation results in odors and spread of pathogens from inco

**After Situation:**

Animal mortality is being done in a manner that prevents non-point source pollution of excessive nutrients, organics, and pathogens being transported into surface and groundwater resources. Proper operation results in little to no odors, complete composting, and protection from predators to minimize pathogen survival or spreading. An overall plan covers normal and catastrophic mortality events. The typical scenario number of birds to be disposed of is 20,000, 4 pound birds which can be composted in-house. Composting requires 1.5 pounds of carbon per pound of bird. There is 0.5 pounds of litter per bird already on site. Wood chips (45 pcf) will be used as the additional carbon source. The composting windrow construction operation consists of 2 pieces of equipment and 2 add'l laborers: 1) stockpiling birds and litter in center of house; 2) construct 2 windrow bases using carbon material; 3) place carcass/litter mix on bases; 4) cover with carbon material; 5) cap windrows with any remaining litter; 6) after first heat cycle remove windrow from house and reconstruct outside house for finishing. Site to be located out of drainage areas, off-site water diverted and any runoff to spread out into a grassed area.

**Feature Measure:** Number of 1000 lbs. Animal

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,580.26 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$119.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 372 - Combustion System Improvement

**Scenario:** #6 - Combustion Engine to Electric Motor, 12 to 74 Horsepower

**Scenario Description:**

Replace an existing IC engine operating an irrigation well with a new electric motor (12-74 HP). An existing IC engine is stationary or portable (does not propel a vehicle and is not an auxiliary IC engine on a vehicle). This replacement provides the greatest emission reductions by eliminating NOx, VOC, and PM emissions from the source. Resource Concerns: Air Quality Impacts - Emissions of Ozone Precursors; Air Quality Impacts - Emissions of Particulate Matter (PM) and PM Precursors; Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and Facilities; Inefficient Energy Use - Farming/Ranching Practices and Field Operations. Associated Practices include: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 533 - Pumping Plant; 430 - Irrigation Pipeline; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 442 - Irrigation System, Sprinkler; 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery; 449 - Irrigation Water Management; 516 - Pipeline; 313 - Waste Storage Facility; 634 - Waste Transfer; 614 - Watering Facility; 642 - Water Well, CAP 126 Comprehensive Air Quality Management Plan, CAP 122 Agricultural Energy Management Plan - Headquarters, and CAP 124 Agricultural Energy Management Plan - Landscape.

**Before Situation:**

Irrigation pump with IC engine withdraws water from a well and provides water through a center pivot irrigation system. The emissions of oxides of nitrogen and/or particulate matter from the engine are identified to contribute to an air quality resource c

**After Situation:**

The electric motor replaces the existing older engine; the engine being replaced will be disabled and a certificate of inoperability submitted prior to certification of practice completion. The existing engine is supported by a concrete pad; no costs have been included for a new pad. Additional costs may be incurred if a concrete pad is not present. For Air Quality: The electric motor does not produce any on-farm emissions of oxides of nitrogen or particulate matter, resulting in a substantial emissions reduction on the farm. For Energy: Energy efficiency will be improved by at least 20%. For Plant Condition: Plant condition and vigor will be improved. For Water Quality: The potential for environmental damage due to leaks from the tanks and fuel lines has been eliminated. Plant uptake of available nutrients will be increased and less nutrients will be lost to surface and ground waters.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Combustion Unit

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,721.58 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,721.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #1 - Ventilation, Exhaust

**Scenario Description:**

Replacement of a conventional exhaust fan with high volume, low speed, efficient exhaust fan. Fans being installed should be models previously tested by BESS Lab or the Air Movement and Control Association and be in top 20 percentile of fans tested. Practice certification will be through receipts and pictures from the applicant. Typical scenario includes the replacement of a 48" fan.

**Before Situation:**

Inefficient ventilation in an agricultural building.

**After Situation:**

High-efficiency ventilation system which reduces energy use. The new ventilation equipment will provide suitable air quality and reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing ventilation system as evidenced in an energy audit. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,285.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,285.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #2 - Ventilation, Horizontal Air Flow

**Scenario Description:**

A system of fans are installed to create a horizontal air circulation pattern; the new system promotes efficient heat and moisture distribution. In a typical 10,000 square foot greenhouse, 10 HAF fans are needed. Fan performance meets Energy Audit efficiency criteria as tested by AMCA or BESS Labs.

**Before Situation:**

Inefficient air circulation system in a greenhouse.

**After Situation:**

High-efficiency air circulation system which reduces energy use. The new equipment will provide suitable air quality and reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing system as evidenced in an energy audit. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$276.14

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$276.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #4 - Plate Cooler

**Scenario Description:**

The installation of all stainless steel dual pass plate cooler, type 316 stainless steel. Practice certification will be through receipts and pictures from the applicant.

**Before Situation:**

Inefficient milk cooling (minimal pre-cooling of milk before entering the bulk tank).

**After Situation:**

High-efficiency milk cooling system which reduces energy use. The new milk cooling equipment will pre-cool the milk and reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing milk cooling system (where most of the cooling was accomplished in the bulk tank) as evidenced in an energy audit. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$42,130.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$42,130.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #5 - Scroll Compressor

**Scenario Description:**

Install a new scroll compressor, associated controls, wiring, and materials to retrofit an existing refrigeration system. A new condenser is not included in this typical scenario. Typical scenario includes a new 5 horsepower scroll compressor.

**Before Situation:**

Inefficient reciprocating compressor as a key component of the refrigeration system used to cool milk. The compressor is a critical part of a milk cooling system, affecting milk quality, system reliability, and system efficiency.

**After Situation:**

A more efficient scroll compressor, which will reduce energy use, is evidenced by the energy audit. A comparably sized scroll compressor provides refrigeration capacity at a higher efficiency than a reciprocating compressor. Newer scroll compressor systems typically reduce electricity use by 15 to 25 percent compared to reciprocating compressors. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Horse Power

**Scenario Unit:** Horsepower

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,700.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$740.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #6 - Variable Speed Drive, Less Than 5 Horsepower

**Scenario Description:**

The typical scenario consists of a variable speed drive (VSD) and appurtenances, such as hook-ups, control panels, wiring, control blocks, filters, switches, pads, etc. attached to an electric motor used to drive a ventilation fan, irrigation pumps, vacuum pump, or similar equipment involved with agricultural production. The motor size, on which the VSD is added, is less than 5 HP.

**Before Situation:**

The system is inefficient when a motor operates at constant speed to satisfy a load which varies as to flow rate and/or pressure requirements.

**After Situation:**

An on-farm energy audit has determined that energy use can be reduced through use of a VSD to control electric motors. After the VSD is applied, the motor speed can be adjusted to reduce power requirements and better match varied flow or pressure requirements. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** HP

**Scenario Unit:** Horsepower

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,100.18 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,100.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #13 - Heater, High Efficiency

**Scenario Description:**

Replace existing low efficiency heaters with new high efficiency heaters. High-efficiency heating systems include any heating unit with efficiency rating of 80%+ for fuel oil and 90%+ for natural gas and propane. Applications may be air heating/building environment and hydronic (boiler) heating for agricultural operations, including under bench, or root zone heating. An alternative to heater replacement might be the addition of climate control system and electronic temperature controls with +/- 1 degree F differential, to reduce the annual run time.

**Before Situation:**

Buildings heated with low efficiency heaters or heaters without proper electronic climate controls

**After Situation:**

Higher efficiency heaters reduce energy consumption, energy costs, and GHG emissions. These replacement systems can be fueled by natural gas, propane, or fuel oil. Associated practices/activities: 122-AgEMP - HQ and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Rated Heat Output

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 BTU/Hour

**Scenario Typical Size:** 750.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,096.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #40 - Variable Speed Drive, Greater Than 15 Horsepower

**Scenario Description:**

The typical scenario consists of a variable speed drive (VSD) and appurtenances, such as hook-ups, control panels, wiring, control blocks, filters, switches, pads, etc. attached to an electric motor used to drive a ventilation fan, irrigation pumps, vacuum pump, or similar equipment involved with agricultural production. The motor size, on which the VSD is added, is larger than 15 HP.

**Before Situation:**

The system is inefficient when a motor operates at constant speed to satisfy a load which varies as to flow rate and/or pressure requirements.

**After Situation:**

An on-farm energy audit has determined that energy use can be reduced through use of a VSD to control electric motors. After the VSD is applied, the motor speed can be adjusted to reduce power requirements and better match varied flow or pressure requirements. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** HP

**Scenario Unit:** Horsepower

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,224.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$144.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #41 - Variable Speed Drive, 5 to 15 Horsepower

**Scenario Description:**

The typical scenario consists of a variable speed drive (VSD) and appurtenances, such as hook-ups, control panels, wiring, control blocks, filters, switches, pads, etc. attached to an electric motor used to drive a ventilation fan, irrigation pumps, vacuum pump, or similar equipment involved with agricultural production. The motor size, on which the VSD is added, is between 5 and 15 HP.

**Before Situation:**

The system is inefficient when a motor operates at constant speed to satisfy a load which varies as to flow rate and/or pressure requirements.

**After Situation:**

An on-farm energy audit has determined that energy use can be reduced through use of a VSD to control electric motors. After the VSD is applied, the motor speed can be adjusted to reduce power requirements and better match varied flow or pressure requirements. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ, and other activities within 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** HP

**Scenario Unit:** Horsepower

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,116.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$211.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 374 - Energy Efficient Agricultural Operation

**Scenario:** #192 - Telemetry

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of an automatic control system with wireless communications installed on a manually controlled agricultural system that is functioning. Typical components may include, but are not limited to, any of the following: wiring, sensors, data logger, logic controller, communication link, software, switches, and relay. The new automatic control system will be used to reduce energy use by equipment, or to reduce fuel use by mobile equipment that is used to travel to manually verify or adjust systems.

**Before Situation:**

A manually controlled system uses energy inefficiently in an agricultural operation. To reduce energy use, the system should be modified to either automatically control equipment directly or to minimize travel by vehicles, trucks, tractors, etc. to manual

**After Situation:**

Energy use is reduced by proper controls of equipment or by reducing the number of trips by vehicles to monitor and control equipment. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,244.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,244.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 376 - Field Operations Emissions Reduction

**Scenario:** #10 - Crops per Year, One

**Scenario Description:**

Utilize equipment that allows a reduction the tillage passes through the field and/or utilizing precision GPS guidance to avoid overlap of tillage passes across the field per crop rotation. Utilize this practice only when residue and STIR values cannot be achieved when using the associated Residue and Tillage Management Practices: 329-No Till or 345-Reduced Tillage to achieve the air quality resource concern. The resource concern addressed is improved air quality by reducing combustion and particulate matter emissions primarily from tillage. The scenario costs are based on tillage equipment or GPS technology to achieve reduce tillage passes.

**Before Situation:**

Tillage operations are performed individually; each operation requiring a tractor or other power implement to pull the tillage implement resulting in multiple passes across the field. Each pass creates soil particulate emissions contributing to the area's

**After Situation:**

A 376 Field Operations Emissions Reduction plan is developed showing a reduced number of field passes across the field (benchmark system compared to the planned system). As a result of applying this practice soil particulates in the air is reduced and the area's air quality is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$966.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 376 - Field Operations Emissions Reduction

**Scenario:** #11 - Crops per Year, Two

**Scenario Description:**

Utilize equipment that allows a reduction of tillage passes through the field and/or precision GPS guidance to avoid overlap of tillage passes across the field per crop rotation. Utilize this practice only when residue and STIR values cannot be achieved when using the associated Residue and Tillage Management Practices: 329-No Till or 345-Reduced Tillage to achieve the air quality resource concern. The resource concern addressed is improved air quality by reducing combustion and particulate matter emissions primarily from tillage. The scenario cost is based on tillage equipment or GPS technology to achieve reduced tillage passes.

**Before Situation:**

Tillage operations are performed individually; each operation requiring a tractor or other power implement to pull the tillage implement resulting in multiple passes across the field. Each pass creates soil particulate emissions contributing to the area's

**After Situation:**

A 376 Field Operations Emissions Reduction plan is developed showing a reduced number of field passes across the field (benchmark system compared to the planned system). As a result of applying this practice soil particulates in the air is reduced and the area's air quality is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,933.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$48.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 378 - Pond

**Scenario:** #1 - Excavated Pond

**Scenario Description:**

A low-hazard water impoundment structure on agricultural lands to maintain or improve water quality and to provide water for livestock, fish and wildlife, recreation, fire control, developing renewable energy systems and other related uses. Pond is created solely by excavation and impounds less than 3 feet against the embankment or spoil. Excavated material is spoiled, not placed in a designed embankment. Earthen spillway is constructed as needed. The resource concerns addressed include inadequate livestock water, excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition.

**Before Situation:**

Area exists where water could naturally pool or run off to create a pond for livestock, wildlife, fire control or developing renewable energy systems, and other related uses, and to maintain or improve water quality. Failure of the pond will not result in

**After Situation:**

The typical pond is constructed by excavating 3000 cubic yards and spreading the spoil outside the pool area using a dozer or similar excavation equipment. Vegetation will be completed under critical area planting (342). Other associated practices include 382, 516, 521A, 533, 614, 587, 396.

**Feature Measure:** Excavated Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,302.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 378 - Pond

**Scenario:** #2 - Excavated Pond with Embankment

**Scenario Description:**

A low-hazard water impoundment structure on agricultural lands to maintain or improve water quality and to provide water for livestock, fish and wildlife, recreation, fire control, developing renewable energy systems, and other related uses. Pond is created by excavation and impounds more than 3 feet against the embankment or spoil. Excavated material is placed in a designed embankment. Earthen spillway is constructed as needed, a trickle tube (pipe) is installed. The resource concerns addressed include inadequate livestock water, excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition.

**Before Situation:**

Area exists where water could naturally pool or run off to create a pond for livestock, wildlife, fire control or developing renewable energy systems, and other related uses, and to maintain or improve water quality. Failure of the pond will not result in

**After Situation:**

The typical pond is constructed by excavating 3000 cubic yards and utilizing 1000 cy of excavated material to construct a compacted embankment which is approximately 800 CY. Vegetation will be completed under critical area planting (342). Other associated practices include 382, 516, 521A, 533, 614, 587, 396.

**Feature Measure:** Excavated Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,301.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 378 - Pond

**Scenario:** #3 - Embankment Pond, No Principal Spillway

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam without a principal spillway pipe. A low flow tube of 6 inches or less to reduce saturation of the auxiliary spillway is installed, anti-seep collars or sand diaphragms are not required. A low-hazard water impoundment structure on agricultural land to maintain or improve water quality and to provide water for livestock, fish and wildlife, recreation, fire control, developing renewable energy systems and other related uses. An earthen embankment will be constructed with a principle spillway conduit and earthen auxiliary spillway, as designed. The resource concerns addressed include inadequate livestock water, excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 2,000 cubic yards, and 80 feet of pipe 6" PVC pipe. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Area exists where water could naturally pool or run off to create a pond for livestock, wildlife, fire control or developing renewable energy systems, and other related uses, and to maintain or improve water quality. Failure of the embankment will not res

**After Situation:**

The typical pond is constructed by excavating the pool area, constructing the auxiliary spillway, preparing the foundation as designed, and creating an embankment. The product of the storage times the effective height of the dam is less than 3,000. The effective height of the dam is 35 feet or less. The earthen auxiliary spillway will be constructed as designed. No principle spillway pipe will be used. Vegetation will be completed under critical area planting (342). Other associated practices include 382, 516, 521A, 533, 614, 587, 396.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,264.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 378 - Pond

**Scenario:** #4 - Embankment Pond with less than 24 inch Pipe

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principle spillway pipe less than 24 inches, anti-seep collars or sand diaphragm, and excavated plunge pool basin. A low-hazard water impoundment structure on agricultural land to maintain or improve water quality and to provide water for livestock, fish and wildlife, recreation, fire control, developing renewable energy systems and other related uses. An earthen embankment will be constructed with a principle spillway conduit and earthen auxiliary spillway, as designed. The resource concerns addressed include inadequate livestock water, excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 4000 cubic yards, 90 feet of 18" PVC, pipe with a canopy inlet, and 3 cubic yard sand diaphragm. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Area exists where water could naturally pool or run off to create a pond for livestock, wildlife, fire control or developing renewable energy systems, and other related uses, and to maintain or improve water quality. Failure of the embankment will not res

**After Situation:**

The typical pond is constructed by excavating the pool area, constructing the auxiliary spillway, preparing the foundation as designed, and creating an embankment. The product of the storage times the effective height of the dam is less than 3,000. The effective height of the dam is 35 feet or less. The earthen auxiliary spillway will be constructed as designed, and a principle spillway pipe will be used. Vegetation will be completed under critical area planting (342). Other associated practices include 382, 516, 521A, 533, 614, 587, 396.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$30,005.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 378 - Pond

**Scenario:** #5 - Embankment Pond with greater than or equal to 24 inch Pipe

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principle spillway pipe greater than or equal to 24 inches, anti-seep collars or sand diaphragm, and excavated plunge pool basin. A low-hazard water impoundment structure on agricultural land to maintain or improve water quality and to provide water for livestock, fish and wildlife, recreation, fire control, developing renewable energy systems and other related uses. An earthen embankment will be constructed with a principle spillway conduit and earthen auxiliary spillway, as designed. The resource concerns addressed include inadequate livestock water, excessive suspended sediment and turbidity in surface water, damage from sediment deposition, and reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 10,000 cubic yards, corrugated metal drop inlet principle spillway with a 11 ft riser and 100 ft barrel, and 82 Square feet of anti-seep collars. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Area exists where water could naturally pool or run off to create a pond for livestock, wildlife, fire control or developing renewable energy systems, and other related uses, and to maintain or improve water quality. Failure of the embankment will not res

**After Situation:**

The typical pond is constructed by excavating the pool area, constructing the auxiliary spillway, preparing the foundation as designed, and creating an embankment. The product of the storage times the effective height of the dam is less than 3,000. The effective height of the dam is 35 feet or less. The earthen auxiliary spillway will be constructed as designed, and a principle spillway pipe will be used. Vegetation will be completed under critical area planting (342). Other associated practices include 382, 516, 521A, 533, 614, 587, 396.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$61,991.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #1 - Manual Plant, Bareroot

**Scenario Description:**

Single 600 foot row of bare root shrubs, conifers, hardwoods, or combination for wind protection, wildlife habitat, or snow management. Shrubs will be planted with a spacing of 4 to 6 feet and hardwoods/conifers 8 to 12 feet apart. The scenario will include 1/3 shrubs, 1/3 hardwoods, and 1/3 conifers based on feet of trees. This practice is typically applied to crop, pasture or range lands. Resource Concerns to be addressed may include: Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/Insufficient Water (drifted snow, inefficient moisture management); Water Quality Degradation (excess nutrients in surface waters, excessive sediment in surface waters,); Degraded Plant Condition (undesirable plant productivity and health); Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity); Inefficient Energy Use (facilities, farming/ranching practices and field operations).

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field, livestock paddock, feedlot or farmstead needing protection from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, or management of snow deposition

**After Situation:**

Wind velocity suitably reduced to minimize soil erosion, or to manage snow deposition. Additional wildlife food and cover.

**Feature Measure:** Number of trees

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$249.58 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #5 - Machine Plant Trees

**Scenario Description:**

Tree planting consisting of 2500 feet of trees for wind protection, energy conservation, wildlife habitat, air quality, snow management or to provide a visual screen. The planting may consist of shrubs, hardwood trees, conifers, or a combination. Trees and shrubs planted with a tree planting machine. Shrubs will be planted with a spacing of 4 to 6 feet and hardwoods/conifers 8 to 12 feet apart in the row with rows 16 feet apart. The scenario will include 1/4 shrubs, 1/2 hardwoods, and 1/4 conifers based on feet of trees. Herbivores (deer, rabbits, etc.) are NOT expected to browse tree seedlings, tree protection is not needed. This practice is typically applied to crop, pasture or range lands. This scenario includes an herbicide application to significantly reduce competition from annual and perennial grass weeds in the windbreak. Resource Concerns to be addressed include: Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/Insufficient Water (drifted snow, inefficient moisture management); Water Quality Degradation (excess nutrients in surface waters, pesticides transported to surface waters, excessive sediment in surface waters,); Degraded Plant Condition (undesirable plant productivity and health); Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity); Livestock Production Limitation (inadequate shelter); Air Quality Impacts (emission of particulate matter, objectionable odors); Inefficient Energy Use (facilities, farming/ranching practices and field operations).

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field, livestock paddock, feedlot or farmstead needing protection from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, odor mitigation, visual screen or management of snow deposition

**After Situation:**

Wind velocity suitably reduced to minimize soil erosion, energy loss or to manage snow deposition. Additional wildlife food and cover, mixing of odor plumes and visual screening.

**Feature Measure:** length of planted windbreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,860.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #6 - Machine Plant Trees with Tubes

**Scenario Description:**

Tree planting consisting of 2500 feet of trees for wind protection, energy conservation, wildlife habitat, air quality, snow management or to provide a visual screen. The planting may consist of shrubs, hardwood trees, conifers, or a combination. Trees and shrubs planted with a tree planting machine. Shrubs will be planted with a spacing of 4 to 6 feet and hardwoods/conifers 8 to 12 feet apart in the row with rows 16 feet apart. The scenario will include 1/4 shrubs, 1/2 hardwoods, and 1/4 conifers based on feet of trees. Herbivore (deer, rabbits, etc.) damage is likely, so each tree must be protected with a rigid tube tree shelter. This practice is typically applied to crop, pasture or range lands. This scenario includes an herbicide application to significantly reduce competition from annual and perennial grass weeds in the windbreak. Resource Concerns to be addressed include: Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/Insufficient Water (drifted snow, inefficient moisture management); Water Quality Degradation (excess nutrients in surface waters, pesticides transported to surface waters, excessive sediment in surface waters,); Degraded Plant Condition (undesirable plant productivity and health); Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity); Livestock Production Limitation (inadequate shelter); Air Quality Impacts (emission of particulate matter, objectionable odors); Inefficient Energy Use (facilities, farming/ranching practices and field operations).

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field, livestock paddock, feedlot or farmstead needing protection from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, odor mitigation, visual screen or management of snow deposition

**After Situation:**

Wind velocity suitably reduced to minimize soil erosion, energy loss or to manage snow deposition. Additional wildlife food and cover, mixing of odor plumes and visual screening.

**Feature Measure:** length of planted windbreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,901.54 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #7 - Manual Plant, Bareroot with Supplemental Water

**Scenario Description:**

Tree planting in an area where supplemental water is needed for successful establishment. Generally these areas would be considered arid or drought stricken, but other factors may contribute to requiring supplemental water. Single 600 foot row of bare root shrubs, conifers, hardwoods, or combination for wind protection, wildlife habitat, or snow management. Shrubs will be planted with a spacing of 4 to 6 feet and hardwoods/conifers 8 to 12 feet apart. The scenario will include 1/3 shrubs, 1/3 hardwoods, and 1/3 conifers based on feet of trees. This practice is typically applied to crop, pasture or range lands. Resource Concerns to be addressed may include: Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/Insufficient Water (drifted snow, inefficient moisture management); Water Quality Degradation (excess nutrients in surface waters, excessive sediment in surface waters,); Degraded Plant Condition (undesirable plant productivity and health); Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity); Inefficient Energy Use (facilities, farming/ranching practices and field operations).

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field, livestock paddock, feedlot or farmstead needing protection from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, or management of snow deposition. The area generally includes arid or drought conditions that greatly reduce the success of tree

**After Situation:**

Wind velocity suitably reduced to minimize soil erosion, or to manage snow deposition. Additional wildlife food and cover. Greatly improved success rate of the windbreak due to the supplemental water during establishment.

**Feature Measure:** Number of trees

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$755.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #11 - Machine Plant Trees with Supplemental Water

**Scenario Description:**

Tree planting in an area where supplemental water is needed for successful establishment. Generally these areas would be considered arid or drought stricken, but other factors may contribute to requiring supplemental water. The planting consists of 2500 feet of trees for wind protection, energy conservation, wildlife habitat, air quality, snow management or to provide a visual screen. The planting may consist of shrubs, hardwood trees, conifers, or a combination. Trees and shrubs planted with a tree planting machine. Shrubs will be planted with a spacing of 4 to 6 feet and hardwoods/conifers 8 to 12 feet apart in the row with rows 16 feet apart. The scenario will include 1/4 shrubs, 1/2 hardwoods, and 1/4 conifers based on feet of trees. Herbivores (deer, rabbits, etc.) are NOT expected to browse tree seedlings, tree protection is not needed. This practice is typically applied to crop, pasture or range lands. Resource Concerns to be addressed include: Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/Insufficient Water (drifted snow, inefficient moisture management); Water Quality Degradation (excess nutrients in surface waters, pesticides transported to surface waters, excessive sediment in surface waters,); Degraded Plant Condition (undesirable plant productivity and health); Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity); Livestock Production Limitation (inadequate shelter); Air Quality Impacts (emission of particulate matter, objectionable odors); Inefficient Energy Use (facilities, farming/ranching practices and field operations).

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field, livestock paddock, feedlot or farmstead needing protection from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, odor mitigation, visual screen or management of snow deposition. The area generally includes arid or drought conditions that grea

**After Situation:**

Wind velocity suitably reduced to minimize soil erosion, energy loss or to manage snow deposition. Additional wildlife food and cover, mixing of odor plumes and visual screening. Greatly improved success rate of the windbreak due to the supplemental water during establishment.

**Feature Measure:** length of planted windbreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,480.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #12 - Machine Plant Trees with Supplemental Water and Shelters

**Scenario Description:**

Tree planting in an area where supplemental water is needed for successful establishment. Generally these areas would be considered arid or drought stricken, but other factors may contribute to requiring supplemental water. Planting consists of 2500 feet of trees for wind protection, energy conservation, wildlife habitat, air quality, snow management or to provide a visual screen. The planting may consist of shrubs, hardwood trees, conifers, or a combination. Trees and shrubs planted with a tree planting machine. Shrubs will be planted with a spacing of 4 to 6 feet and hardwoods/conifers 8 to 12 feet apart in the row with rows 16 feet apart. The scenario will include 1/4 shrubs, 1/2 hardwoods, and 1/4 conifers based on feet of trees. Herbivore (deer, rabbits, etc.) damage is likely, so each tree must be protected with a rigid tube tree shelter. This practice is typically applied to crop, pasture or range lands. Resource Concerns to be addressed include: Soil Erosion (wind); Excess/Insufficient Water (drifted snow, inefficient moisture management); Water Quality Degradation (excess nutrients in surface waters, pesticides transported to surface waters, excessive sediment in surface waters,); Degraded Plant Condition (undesirable plant productivity and health); Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife (food, cover/shelter, continuity); Livestock Production Limitation (inadequate shelter); Air Quality Impacts (emission of particulate matter, objectionable odors); Inefficient Energy Use (facilities, farming/ranching practices and field operations).

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field, livestock paddock, feedlot or farmstead needing protection from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, odor mitigation, visual screen or management of snow deposition. The area generally includes arid or drought conditions that grea

**After Situation:**

Wind velocity suitably reduced to minimize soil erosion, energy loss or to manage snow deposition. Additional wildlife food and cover, mixing of odor plumes and visual screening. Greatly improved success rate of the windbreak due to the supplemental water during establishment.

**Feature Measure:** length of planted windbreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,368.10 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #84 - Renovation, Greater Than 8 Inches Diameter Breast Height, Machine Plant

**Scenario Description:**

Windbreak/shelterbelt renovation to remove and replace deteriorated, damaged, diseased, or unsuitable trees or shrubs. The treatment may include removal of entire rows, or removal of selected trees/shrubs in order to prepare for the necessary planting of replacement trees and shrubs within the footprint of an existing windbreak, to improve the health and function of the windbreak. The treatment uses mechanized equipment to remove trees and/or shrubs with average DBH > 8 inches. Trees and shrubs are cleared with a Dozer. All slash material from cutting and pruning is either scattered and crushed, piled and crushed, chipped, or removed from the treatment area. Machine planting is used to replace the trees/shrubs that were removed, to improve the effectiveness and longevity of the windbreak. Various types and combinations of plant materials may be used, including bare root and/or containerized trees/shrubs, and conifer and/or deciduous species or mixtures. Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. For planting that expands the footprint of an existing windbreak, use scenarios for Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment. Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/ shelterbelt has been restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Restoration

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,427.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #111 - Renovation, Sod Release

**Scenario Description:**

Renovation to reduce competition from grass sod around trees/shrubs within a windbreak/shelterbelt. Apply appropriate herbicide to stress or kill competing sod vegetation between and/or within tree/shrub rows. The herbicide application is completed to significantly reduce competition from sod (grass) in the windbreak. Use WIN-PST or equivalent approved tool to evaluate herbicide impacts.

Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations, resulting in an area of 1 acre.

**Before Situation:**

The health of an existing windbreak/shelterbelt is deteriorating due to competition with grass sod. Trees/shrubs are dying or growth rate is reduced, and the windbreak/shelterbelt is not functioning as intended.

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/ shelterbelt has been restored and it is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Renovation

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$512.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #112 - Coppicing

**Scenario Description:**

Coppicing of selected trees and understory vegetation in a windbreak/shelterbelt is needed to ensure that species composition and stand structure continue to serve their intended purpose. Windbreak/shelterbelt renovation is carried out through manipulating species composition, structure, and stocking by the cutting of selected trees and understory vegetation for coppicing and by removing or disposing of slash so as to not interfere with the windbreak/shelterbelt renovation or other management operations. Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. For planting that expands the footprint of an existing windbreak, use scenarios for Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment. Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Plant composition and structure, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/shelterbelt has been restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Renovation

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,695.69

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #115 - Renovation, Thinning or Removal of Trees and Shrubs, Machine Plant

**Scenario Description:**

Windbreak/shelterbelt renovation to remove and replace deteriorated, damaged, diseased, or unsuitable trees or shrubs. The treatment may include removal of entire rows, or removal of selected trees/shrubs in order to prepare for the necessary planting of replacement trees and shrubs within the footprint of an existing windbreak, to improve the health and function of the windbreak. The treatment uses mechanized equipment to remove trees and/or shrubs with average DBH < 8 inches. Trees and shrubs are cleared by a Skidsteer with a tree shear or saw. All woody debris produced by cutting and pruning is either scattered and crushed, piled and crushed, chipped, or removed from the treatment area. Machine planting is used to replace the trees/shrubs that were removed, to improve the effectiveness and longevity of the windbreak. Various types and combinations of plant materials may be used, including bare root and/or containerized trees/shrubs, and conifer and/or deciduous species or mixtures. Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. For planting that expands the footprint of an existing windbreak, use scenarios for Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment. Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/ shelterbelt has been restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Renovation

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,904.27

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #116 - Renovation, Removal of Trees and Shrubs, Manual Plant

**Scenario Description:**

Windbreak/shelterbelt renovation to remove and replace deteriorated, damaged, diseased, or unsuitable trees or shrubs. The treatment may include removal of entire rows, or removal of selected trees/shrubs in order to prepare for the necessary planting of replacement trees and shrubs within the footprint of an existing windbreak, to improve the health and function of the windbreak. Supplemental plantings of bare root and/or containerized trees/shrubs, of conifer and/or deciduous species, or mixtures, are applied to improve the effectiveness and longevity of the windbreak. Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. For planting that expands the footprint of an existing windbreak, use scenarios for Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment. Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/shelterbelt has been restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Renovation

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,506.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #125 - One Row, Small

**Scenario Description:**

One row of containerized shrubs planted to address resource concerns; Inefficient Energy Use, Air Quality Impacts and/or Fish and Wildlife Habitat. This practice is typically applied on cropland at field edges and around homesteads.

**Before Situation:**

Agricultural field or farmstead needing protections from wind, additional wildlife food and cover, odor mitigation, visual screening. The area generally includes arid or drought conditions that greatly reduce the success of tree survival.

**After Situation:**

A windbreak of containerized shrubs is installed by hand planting shrubs 6 ft apart. Wind velocity suitably diminished to reduce soil erosion or energy loss. Additional wildlife food and cover, mixing of odor plumes and visual screening. Greatly improved success rate of the windbreak due to the supplemental water during establishment.

**Feature Measure:** Length of windbreak row

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$450.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #239 - Renovation, Greater Than 8 Inches Diameter Breast Height, Manual Plant

**Scenario Description:**

Windbreak/shelterbelt renovation to remove and replace deteriorated, damaged, diseased, or unsuitable trees or shrubs. The treatment may include removal of entire rows, or removal of selected trees/shrubs in order to prepare for the necessary planting of replacement trees and shrubs within the footprint of an existing windbreak, to improve the health and function of the windbreak. The treatment uses mechanized equipment to remove trees and/or shrubs with average DBH >8 inches. Trees and shrubs are cleared with a Dozer. All woody debris from cutting and pruning is either scattered and crushed, piled and crushed, chipped, or removed from the treatment area. Hand planting is used to replace the trees/shrubs that were removed, improving the effectiveness and longevity of the windbreak. Various types and combinations of plant materials may be used, including bare root and/or containerized trees/shrubs, and conifer and/or deciduous species or mixtures. Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. For planting that expands the footprint of an existing windbreak, use scenarios for Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment. Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/ shelterbelt has been restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Renovation

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,045.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.95

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 380 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment and Renovation

**Scenario:** #250 - Renovation, Supplemental Manual Plant with Container or Bareroot Stock

**Scenario Description:**

Parts of the windbreak being renovated have died, but it is not necessary to cut or mechanically remove the dead wood. Supplemental plantings of containerized or bare root trees/shrubs within the existing footprint of the windbreak will improve its effectiveness and longevity. The windbreak/shelterbelt is renovated through hand planting of containerized tree and/or shrub seedlings at a average spacing of 8' (shrubs 4'-6', deciduous/conifer trees 8'-12') within row and 15'-20' between rows. A windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. For planting that expands the footprint of an existing windbreak, use scenarios for Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment. Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/ shelterbelt has been restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Renovation

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 726.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,452.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 381 - Silvopasture

**Scenario:** #17 - Native Perennial Grass, Non-Commercial

**Scenario Description:**

Non-commercial thinning of an existing stand of trees followed by establishment of native grasses.

**Before Situation:**

10-acre stand of trees that is overstocked, with a basal area of 100 sq. ft. per acre. There is very little available forage for livestock, due to the dense shade of the tree canopy. Resource Concerns include Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable Plant P

**After Situation:**

The stand is thinned non-commercially to a basal area of 50 sq. ft. per acre, which will allow adequate sunlight to the forest floor for grass production, yet still provide shade and some protection from the elements for livestock and wildlife. Debris is removed, all tree cutting will leave the shortest possible stump height. The soil is prepared for planting using chemical and mechanical means, then a mix of native grasses will be established, providing forage to livestock and wildlife. All Resource Concerns listed above are addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of silvopasture establi

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,139.54

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,413.95

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 381 - Silvopasture

**Scenario:** #18 - Native Perennial Grass, Commercial

**Scenario Description:**

Commercial thinning of an existing stand of trees followed by establishment of native grasses.

**Before Situation:**

10-acre pine plantation that is overstocked, with a basal area of 100 sq. ft. per acre. There is very little available forage for livestock, due to the dense shade of the tree canopy. Resource Concerns include Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable Plant

**After Situation:**

The stand is thinned commercially to a basal area of 50 sq. ft. per acre, which will allow adequate sunlight to the forest floor for grass production, yet still provide shade and some protection from the elements for livestock and wildlife. Since thinning is done commercially, no harvesting costs are incurred. Debris is removed, all tree cutting will leave the shortest possible stump height. The soil is prepared for planting using chemical and mechanical means, then a mix of native warm-season grasses will be established, providing forage to livestock and wildlife. All Resource Concerns listed above are addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of silvopasture establi

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,470.84

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$547.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 381 - Silvopasture

**Scenario:** #19 - Introduced Perennial Grass

**Scenario Description:**

Non-commercial thinning of an existing stand of trees followed by establishment of introduced grasses.

**Before Situation:**

10-acre stand of trees that is overstocked, with a basal area of 100 sq. ft. per acre. There is very little available forage for livestock, due to the dense shade of the tree canopy. Resource Concerns include Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable Plant P

**After Situation:**

The stand is thinned non-commercially to a basal area of 50 sq. ft. per acre, which will allow adequate sunlight to the forest floor for grass production, yet still provide shade and some protection from the elements for livestock and wildlife. Debris is removed, all tree cutting will leave the shortest possible stump height. The soil is prepared for planting using chemical and mechanical means, then a mix of introduced perennial grasses, legumes, and/or forbs will be established, providing forage to livestock and wildlife. All Resource Concerns listed above are addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of silvopasture establi

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,047.04

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,304.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #1 - Barbed Wire, Multi-Strand

**Scenario Description:**

Multi-strand, Barbed Wire - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive area, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Constructed using fencing materials rather than a pre-manufactured gate. The fence is typically 4 strands over 3/4 of a mile (3,960 ft).

**Before Situation:**

On grazing lands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, cattle access to water bodies is uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that allows adequate rest and recovery periods, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, etc. Four strand wire is commonly installed. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,312.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #2 - Barbed Wire, Multi-Strand with Markers

**Scenario Description:**

Multi-strand, Barbed Wire - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, and reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Constructed using fencing materials rather than a pre-manufactured gate. The fence is typically 4 strands with wildlife markers, over 3/4 of a mile (3,960 ft).

**Before Situation:**

On grazing lands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, cattle access to water bodies is uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, etc. Four strand wire is commonly installed. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations. The after condition includes markers placed on the fence to protect and deter wildlife, primarily protected wildlife include Sage grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, etc.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,183.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #3 - Barbed Wire for Difficult Terrain, Multi-Strand

**Scenario Description:**

Multi-strand, Barbed Wire - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that provides adequate rest and recovery periods, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, and reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Constructed using fencing materials rather than a pre-manufactured gate. Installed on rugged land or where site conditions require longer time to install the fence than the typical scenario.

**Before Situation:**

On grazing lands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing, and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, cattle access to water bodies is uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that provides an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, etc... Four strand wire is commonly installed. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,599.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #4 - Barbed Wire for Difficult Terrain, Multi-Strand with Markers

**Scenario Description:**

Multi-strand, Barbed Wire - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that provides adequate rest and recovery periods, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, and reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Constructed using fencing materials rather than a pre-manufactured gate. Installed on rugged land or where site conditions require longer time to install the fence than the typical scenario. Some of the sites that may be considered as difficult terrain are steep slopes, badlands, or rocky soils.

**Before Situation:**

On grazing lands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, cattle access to water bodies is uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that provides for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, etc... Four strand wire is commonly installed. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations. The after condition includes markers placed on the fence to protect and deter wildlife, primarily protected wildlife include Sage grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, etc.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,284.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #5 - Woven Wire

**Scenario Description:**

Woven - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that promotes adequate rest and recovery periods, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Woven wire is typically used in applications with sheep, goats, hogs, wildlife exclusion, shelterbelt/tree protection, etc. Constructed using fencing materials rather than a pre-manufactured gate. Includes 32" woven wire with 2 strands of barbed wire.

**Before Situation:**

On grazing lands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing, and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, livestock access to water bodies is uncontrolled

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of a rotational grazing plan that promotes adequate rest and recovery periods, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Woven wire fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, etc. Woven wire is typically used in applications with sheep, goats, hogs, wildlife exclusion, shelterbelt/tree protection, etc. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,872.01

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #7 - Electric, high tensile with energizer

**Scenario Description:**

Electric - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of a grazing management plan that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Includes 3 strands of high tensile wire with energizer.

**Before Situation:**

On grazinglands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing, and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, cattle access to water bodies is uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of grazing management that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, fence charger, etc. Two to three strand wire is commonly installed. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,989.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #8 - Electric, high tensile with energizer and fence markers

**Scenario Description:**

Electric - Installation of fence will allow for implementation of grazing management that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Includes 3 strands of high-tensile wire with energizer.

**Before Situation:**

On grazing lands, health and vigor are negatively impacted by poor grazing distribution, timing of grazing, and inadequate rest and recovery periods. Water quality is impacted by increased erosion and runoff, cattle access to water bodies is uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Installation of interior fencing will allow for implementation of grazing management that allows for an adequate rest and recovery period, protection of sensitive areas, improved water quality, reduction of noxious and invasive weeds. Fence includes posts, wire, fasteners, gates, fence charger, etc. Two to three strand wire is commonly installed. Fence will be installed with wildlife friendly considerations. The after condition includes markers placed on the fence to protect and deter wildlife, protected wildlife species include Sage grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, etc.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,626.16

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #159 - Woven Wire, 96 Inch

**Scenario Description:**

Woven Wire fencing installed for large livestock such as Bison, large ungulate herbivores, captive cervidae that are not domesticated. Because of the size and behavior differences relative to domesticated livestock, fences, handling facilities and loading facilities must be more robust to accommodate bison. Fence allows for the implementation of a grazing management under a CPS 528 Prescribed Grazing plan. Fence facilitates the movement of livestock for forage management and protection of sensitive areas. All fence components are included. Fence encloses  $\leq$  20 acres or 2640 foot linear run connection with 5-8 wire fencing. Install fence with considerations for wildlife corridors.

**Before Situation:**

Livestock have access to forage and sensitive areas without management of intensity, duration and frequency of grazing events. Plant productivity and health is degraded. Water quality may be impaired by sediment and livestock access to water.

**After Situation:**

Installation of the tall woven wire high tensile electric fence allows for grazing management to be implemented. Fence is installed to specifications meeting the producer's objective and livestock type. Fence is installed with wildlife friendly considerations and known wildlife corridors.

**Feature Measure:** length

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$22,226.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #175 - High Tensile, Eight Wire Electric

**Scenario Description:**

A high tensile wire fence which is electrified for large livestock such as Bison, large ungulate herbivores, captive cervidae that are not domesticated. Eight strands of wire are used for visual barrier with a minimum of 3 wires electrified. Fence allows for the implementation of a grazing management plan. Because of the size and behavior differences relative to domesticated livestock, fences, handling facilities and loading facilities must be more robust to accommodate bison. Fence allows for the implementation of grazing management under CPS Prescribed Grazing plan. Fence facilitates the movement of livestock for forage management and protection of sensitive areas. All fence components are included. Fence encloses 40 acres. Install fence considering wildlife and known wildlife corridors.

**Before Situation:**

Livestock have access to forage and sensitive areas without management of intensity, duration and frequency of grazing events. Plant productivity and health is degraded. Water quality may be impaired by sediment and livestock access to water.

**After Situation:**

Installation of the 8 wire high tensile electric fence allows for grazing management to be implemented. Fence is installed to specifications meeting the producer's objective and livestock type. Fence is installed with wildlife friendly considerations and known wildlife corridors.

**Feature Measure:** length

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,699.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 382 - Fence

**Scenario:** #191 - High Tensile, Five Wire Electric

**Scenario Description:**

A five strand high tensile wire fence which is electrified for large livestock such as Bison, large ungulate herbivores, captive cervidae that are not domesticated. Because of the size and behavior differences relative to domesticated livestock, fences, handling facilities and loading facilities must be more robust to accommodate bison. Fence allows for the implementation of a grazing management under CPS 528 Prescribed Grazing plan. Fence facilitates the movement of livestock for forage management and protection of sensitive areas. All fence components are included. Fence encloses 40 acres. Install fence considering wildlife friendly design and adjustment for wildlife corridors.

**Before Situation:**

Livestock have access to forage and sensitive areas without management of intensity, duration and frequency of grazing events. Plant productivity and health is degraded. Water quality may be impaired by sediment and livestock access to water.

**After Situation:**

Installation of the 5 wire high tensile electric fence allows for grazing management to be implemented. Fence is installed to specifications meeting the producer's objective and livestock type. Fence is installed with wildlife friendly considerations and known wildlife corridors.

**Feature Measure:** length

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,794.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #13 - Mechanical and Manual Control, Chipping and Hauling Offsite

**Scenario Description:**

Reducing woody waste created during forestry, agroforestry activities by gathering, chipping, and hauling off site to achieve management objectives. Does not include transport from property to a commercial facility. Resource concerns include potential Emissions of particulate matter, potential Excessive plant pest pressure, and Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation .

**Before Situation:**

Woody residue causes management issues including resource access, fire hazard and sites for harboring pests.

**After Situation:**

Fire and pest issues are reduced. Air and energy resources are conserved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,537.94

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$376.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #42 - Mechanical Control, Chaining

**Scenario Description:**

The use of heavy equipment (2 dozers with winches pulling a single anchor chain) to break over, crush, and scatter standing dead trees to achieve a conservation objective such as improving access for management purposes, recovering desirable plant community structure, reducing plant pest pressure (eliminating avian seed-dispersing perches), and/or enhancing wildlife habitat (eliminating raptor perches and vertical structure).

**Before Situation:**

Area consists of standing dead trees caused by a previous management activity or natural disturbance. The standing dead trees limit access for management purposes, degrade desirable plant community structure, increase plant pest pressure, and/or degrade w

**After Situation:**

Standing dead trees are broken over, crushed, and scattered within and amongst the lower herbaceous plant community to achieve conservation objectives such as improved access, improved desirable plant community structure, reduced plant pest pressure, and/or enhanced wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,404.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$173.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #56 - Mechanical and Manual Control for Slash, Less Than 5 Tons per Acre

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario treats woody residue that is considered to be of low complexity. Low complexity could include residue amount, size, volatility and accessibility by equipment. An increase in one factor could cause the use of the medium scenario. Typically, treatment is implemented by hand tools and light equipment to lop and scatter, hand pile to reduce continuity of woody residue that addresses a resource concerns. In General, these could be used following a light thinning/pruning. Resource concerns include Excessive plant pest pressure, Air Quality emissions, Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, and degraded plant condition and habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Area has low amount of woody residue (i.e. <5 tons/ac, 6in diameter) that is easily accessible. Residue was created by management activity or natural weather event that is causing a resource concern or potential resource concern.

**After Situation:**

The residue is treated to an acceptable level to address the resource concern.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,669.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$166.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #72 - Mechanical and Manual Control for Slash, 5 to 15 Tons per Acre

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario treats woody residue that is considered to be a medium complexity. Medium complexity could include residue amount, size, volatility, and accessibility by equipment (moderate terrain). An increase in any of these factors could cause the need for the Heavy scenario. Typical treatment is implemented by medium sized equipment such as chipper, masticator, skid steer to reduce the dimensions of the woody residue to address resource concerns. Resource concerns include; Excessive plant pest pressure, Air Quality emissions, Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, and degraded plant condition and habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Area has moderate amount of woody residue (i.e. 5-15 tons/ac, 8-12 in diameter). Residue was created by management activity or natural weather event that is causing a resource concern or potential resource concern.

**After Situation:**

The residue is treated to an acceptable level to address resource concern.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,666.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$683.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #88 - Mechanical and Manual Control for Slash, Greater Than 15 Tons per Acre

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario treats woody residue that is considered to be a high complexity. high complexity could include residue amount, size, volatility, and accessibility by equipment (steep/rough terrain). Typical treatment is implemented by heavy sized equipment such as masticators, mulchers, drum choppers, (Hand work with chainsaws could be used on steep slopes) to reduce the dimensions of the woody residue to address resource concerns. Resource concerns include: Excessive plant pest pressure, Air Quality emissions, Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, and degraded plant condition and habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Area has high amount of woody residue (i.e. >15 tons/ac, >12 in diameter). Residue was created by management activity or natural weather event that is causing a resource concern or potential resource concern.

**After Situation:**

The residue is treated to an acceptable level to address resource concern

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$35,683.71 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,784.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #104 - Restoration, Conservation Treatment After Catastrophic Events

**Scenario Description:**

Use equipment to treat slash and woody residue within an area following a Catastrophic Event such as fire, wind, severe pest outbreak, ice storm, etc. to help restore/rehabilitate the site. Resource concerns could include: Excessive plant pest pressure, Air Quality emissions, Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, and degraded plant condition and habitat.

**Before Situation:**

A large amount of slash and woody residue is created as a result of a Catastrophic event. The event has caused tree-lodging, snags, broken tops, etc.; and treatment is both difficult and dangerous. The presence of this material causes many adverse effects

**After Situation:**

The material resulting from the catastrophic event is reduced to a level that will minimize the resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$55,096.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,754.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #120 - Air Curtain Burner

**Scenario Description:**

Addressing Air Quality Emissions Resource concerns by using an air curtain burner to replace open pile burning.

**Before Situation:**

Woody residue would typically be burned in open piles, resulting in substantial air quality issues

**After Situation:**

Air quality concerns are lessened by using air curtain burner instead of open pile burning.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,823.90

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$236.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**Scenario:** #128 - Mechanical and Manual Control, Consolidated Slash Pile

**Scenario Description:**

Treating the forest slash generated from a forest management activity to: Reduce hazardous fuels; Reduce the risk of insect and disease; Improve wildlife habitat. Slash is to be piled in small piles made by hand. Piles will be in forest openings and away from nearby trees so not to impact them when the piles are burned (burning to be contracted under practice 338-Prescribed Burning). Slash will be burned when the conditions are safe for burning. Hand work with chainsaws are used on steep slopes. Resource concerns include: Potential emission of particulate matter; Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation; Excessive plant pest pressure; and Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Forest slash resulting from a forest management activity such as pre-commercial thinning, pruning or creating a fuel break. Excessive amounts of slash that can not be managed by the lop and scatter method. Chipping or mastication of slash is not available

**After Situation:**

Fire, access, and pest issues are reduced with slash piled and subsequently burned. Additional benefits are improved wildlife habitat and reduced harm to humans/animals.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,672.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$222.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #31 - Native Species, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of an agricultural field. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species. The area of the field border is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary widely. Fields may have erosion issues from wind or water, a field border may be needed to manage pest populations, protect soil and water quality, provide wildlife food and cover, provide pollinator habitat, or a field

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. This practice when applied around a field may support and connect other buffer practices within and between fields. Native grasses, legumes and forbs will be established in the field borders to the extent needed to meet the resource needs and producer objectives. Minimum field border widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Native species shall be selected that do not function as a host for diseases of a field crop and have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$479.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$479.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #32 - Introduced Species, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of an agricultural field. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of introduced species. The area of the field border is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary widely. Fields may have erosion issues from wind or water, a field border may be needed to manage pest populations, protect soil and water quality, provide wildlife food and cover, provide pollinator habitat, or a field

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. This practice when applied around a field may support and connect other buffer practices within and between fields. Introduced grasses and legumes will be established for the field border to the extent needed to meet the resource needs and producer objectives. Minimum field border widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Introduced species of grasses, legumes, forbs or shrubs shall be selected that are adapted to site, will not function as a host for diseases of a field crop and have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$371.21

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$371.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #33 - Pollinator, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of an agricultural field. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of pollinator friendly herbaceous species. The area of the field border is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary widely. Fields may have erosion issues from wind or water, a field border may be needed to manage pest populations, protect soil and water quality, provide wildlife food and cover, provide pollinator habitat, or a field

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. This practice when applied around a field may support and connect other buffer practices within and between fields. Pollinator herbaceous plantings will provide species which flower throughout the growing season. This provides a source of nectar for adult pollinators and a diversity of herbaceous material for immature pollinator life stages and for nesting. Minimum field border widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Species selected shall meet the pollinator habitat requirements of the state and be adapted to site; not function as a host for diseases of a field crop and; have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$894.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$894.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #34 - Native Species

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of an agricultural field. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of organic seed for herbaceous species.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary widely. Fields may have erosion issues from wind or water, a field border may be needed to manage pest populations, protect soil and water quality, provide wildlife food and cover, provide pollinator habitat, or a field

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. This practice when applied around a field may support and connect other buffer practices while creating a buffer between organic systems and conventional cropping systems. Native grasses and legumes will be established in the field border to the extent needed to meet the resource needs and producer objectives. Minimum field border widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Species selected shall be adapted to the site, not function as a host for diseases of a field crop, and have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$234.56

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$234.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #35 - Introduced Species

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of an agricultural field. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of introduced species.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary widely. Fields may have erosion issues from wind or water, a field border may be needed to manage pest populations, protect soil and water quality, provide wildlife food and cover, provide pollinator habitat, or a field

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. This practice when applied around a field may support and connect other buffer practices within and between fields. Introduced grasses and legumes will be established in the field border to the extent needed to meet the resource needs and producer objectives. Minimum field border widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Species selected shall be adapted to site, will not function as a host for diseases of a field crop, and have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$125.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$125.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #36 - Pollinator

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of a field. This practice may also apply to recreation land or other land uses where agronomic crops including forages are grown. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of pollinator friendly species.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary widely. Fields may have erosion issues from wind or water, a field border may be needed to manage pest populations, protect soil and water quality, provide wildlife food and cover, provide pollinator habitat, or a field

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. This practice when applied around a field may support and connect other buffer practices within and between fields. Pollinator herbaceous plantings will provide species which flower throughout the growing season. This provides a source of nectar for adult pollinators and a diversity of herbaceous material for immature pollinator life stages and for nesting. Minimum field border widths shall be based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practice. Species selected shall be adapted to site, will not function as a host for diseases of a field crop, and have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$649.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$649.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 386 - Field Border

**Scenario:** #81 - Field Border, Small

**Scenario Description:**

A strip of permanent vegetation established at the edge or around the perimeter of an agricultural field. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of introduced plant species.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions may vary based on farm size and location. Fields may have erosion by wind or water. Site provides little wildlife food or cover or pollinator habitat. Site soil organic matter is depleting. Particulate matter as dust is generate

**After Situation:**

The 386 Implementation Requirements have been developed and applied for the site. Field border widths are based on NRCS local design criteria specific to the purpose for installing the practices. Species selected shall be adapted to site and not host disease or pests of the adjacent field crop. Species have physical characteristics necessary to control wind and water erosion to tolerable levels on the field border area.

**Feature Measure:** planted area

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$160.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$80.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 388 - Irrigation Field Ditch

**Scenario:** #5 - Irrigation Field Ditch

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is the construction of an Irrigation Field Ditch. Typical construction dimensions are 2' wide bottom x 2' deep x 1320' length with a side slope of 2:1. Resource concerns: Excess/Insufficient Water - Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water Associated Conservation Practices: 320-Irrigation Canal or Lateral; 443-Irrigation System, Surface or Subsurface Water; 533-Pumping Plant; 430-Irrigation Pipeline.

**Before Situation:**

Water supply for an area is inadequate for crop production and irrigation water application is inefficient.

**After Situation:**

An earthen canal that has adequate capacity to convey sufficient irrigation water to meet the demands of the system and make irrigation practical for the crops being grown.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of earth excavated

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 587.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,210.54 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Scenario:** #1 - Native Perennial Grasses, Low Density

**Scenario Description:**

Native Species: This scenario addresses inadequate herbaceous plant community function or diversity within the specific transitional zone between terrestrial and aquatic habitats in rangeland, pasture, cropland, and forest where natural seeding methods and/or management is unlikely to improve the plant community within a reasonable time period. This scenario applies to work not covered under NRCS Conservation Practice Range Planting (550), Forage and Biomass Planting (512), Critical Area Planting (342), Filter Strip (393), Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats (643), Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Wetland Enhancement (659), or Wetland Restoration (657). The typical setting for this scenario is usually a narrow strip between the aquatic and terrestrial habitats subject to intermittent flooding and saturated soils where the existing plant community has been disturbed, destroyed, or the species diversity is unable to provide proper function and/or adequate habitat. Where the establishment of a diverse riparian herbaceous plant community is desired, an adapted mix of native grasses, legumes, and/or forbs tolerant to the site conditions will be planted by broadcast and/or no-till or range drill seeding methods as necessary to accomplish the intended purpose(s). Where chemical control of undesirable vegetation, including invasives, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, the Herbaceous Weed Control (315) practice should be used. Seedbed preparation may require LIGHT TILLAGE (disking). WHEN POLLINATOR HABITAT IS A CONSIDERATION: Include 5-10 adapted forb species that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season where feasible.

**Before Situation:**

The riparian zone, the specific area between terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is currently an undesirable or inadequate stand of perennial or annual vegetation and natural reseeding or vegetation management is unlikely to improve the plant community with

**After Situation:**

The riparian zone, the transitional zone between the terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is established to an adapted, diverse vegetative plant community and is under close management to ensure long term survival and ecological succession. The quality and quantity of the riparian zone components are managed to support the species that depend on it for habitat as well as the functions it performs for stabilizing the streambank and/or shoreline, dissipating stream energy and trapping sediment, and improving and/or maintaining water quality. These functions include: stream temperature moderation through shading, recruitment of non-woody organic matter, habitat for terrestrial insects and other riparian dependent species, streambank integrity, and filtration of contaminants from surface run-off into the stream.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Riparian Herbaceous

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,069.46 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$213.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Scenario:** #2 - Native Perennial Grasses, Low Density, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

Native Species: This scenario addresses inadequate herbaceous plant community function or diversity within the specific transitional zone between terrestrial and aquatic habitats in rangeland, pasture, cropland, and forest where natural seeding methods and/or management is unlikely to improve the plant community within a reasonable time period. This scenario applies to work not covered under NRCS Conservation Practice Range Planting (550), Forage and Biomass Planting (512), Critical Area Planting (342), Filter Strip (393), Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats (643), Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Wetland Enhancement (659), or Wetland Restoration (657). The typical setting for this scenario is a narrow strip between the aquatic and terrestrial habitats, subject to intermittent flooding and saturated soils, where the existing plant community has been disturbed, destroyed, or the species diversity is unable to provide proper function and/or adequate habitat. Where the establishment of a diverse riparian herbaceous plant community is desired, an adapted mix of native grasses, legumes, and/or forbs tolerant to the site conditions will be planted, by broadcast and/or no-till or range drill seeding methods as necessary, to accomplish the intended purpose(s). Where chemical control of undesirable vegetation, including invasives, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, the Herbaceous Weed Control (315) practice should be used. Seedbed preparation may require LIGHT TILLAGE (disking). WHEN POLLINATOR HABITAT IS A CONSIDERATION: Include 5-10 adapted forb species that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season where feasible. All grazing will be deferred during plant establishment which will consist of a minimum of one year, and in many cases longer. Typically there is no haying, and the only clipping during establishment will be for removal of weeds.

**Before Situation:**

The riparian zone, the specific area between terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is currently an undesirable or inadequate stand of perennial or annual vegetation and natural reseeding or vegetation management is unlikely to improve the plant community with

**After Situation:**

The riparian zone, the transitional zone between the terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is established to an adapted, diverse vegetative plant community and is under close management to ensure long term survival and ecological succession. The quality and quantity of the riparian zone components are managed to support the species that depend on it for habitat as well as the functions it performs for stabilizing the streambank and/or shoreline, dissipating stream energy and trapping sediment, and improving and/or maintaining water quality. These functions include: stream temperature moderation through shading, recruitment of non-woody organic matter, habitat for terrestrial insects and other riparian dependent species, streambank integrity, and filtration of contaminants from surface run-off into the stream. All grazing will be deferred during plant establishment which will consist of a minimum of one year, and in many cases longer. Typically there is no haying, and the only clipping during establishment will be for removal of weeds.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Riparian Herbaceous

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,181.10 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$236.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Scenario:** #3 - Native Perennial Grasses, Legumes, and Forbs Mix

**Scenario Description:**

Native Species: This scenario addresses inadequate herbaceous plant community function or diversity within the specific transitional zone between terrestrial and aquatic habitats in rangeland, pasture, cropland, and forest where natural seeding methods and/or management is unlikely to improve the plant community within a reasonable time period. This scenario applies to work not covered under NRCS Conservation Practice Range Planting (550), Forage and Biomass Planting (512), Critical Area Planting (342), Filter Strip (393), Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats (643), Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Wetland Enhancement (659), or Wetland Restoration (657). The typical setting for this scenario is usually a narrow strip between the aquatic and terrestrial habitats subject to intermittent flooding and saturated soils where the existing plant community has been disturbed, destroyed, or the species diversity is unable to provide proper function and/or adequate habitat. Where the establishment of a diverse riparian herbaceous plant community is desired, an adapted mix of native grasses, legumes, and/or forbs tolerant to the site conditions will be planted by broadcast and/or no-till or range drill seeding methods as necessary to accomplish the intended purpose(s). Where chemical control of undesirable vegetation, including invasives, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, the Herbaceous Weed Control (315) practice should be used. Seedbed preparation may require LIGHT TILLAGE (disking). WHEN POLLINATOR HABITAT IS A CONSIDERATION: Include 5-10 adapted forb species that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season where feasible.

**Before Situation:**

The riparian zone, the specific area between terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is currently an undesirable or inadequate stand of perennial or annual vegetation and natural reseeding or vegetation management is unlikely to improve the plant community with

**After Situation:**

The riparian zone, the transitional zone between the terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is established to an adapted, diverse vegetative plant community and is under close management to ensure long term survival and ecological succession. The quality and quantity of the riparian zone components are managed to support the species that depend on it for habitat as well as the functions it performs for stabilizing the streambank and/or shoreline, dissipating stream energy and trapping sediment, and improving and/or maintaining water quality. These functions include: stream temperature moderation through shading, recruitment of non-woody organic matter, habitat for terrestrial insects and other riparian dependent species, streambank integrity, and filtration of contaminants from surface run-off into the stream.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Riparian Herbaceous

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,413.03 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$282.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Scenario:** #4 - Native Perennial Grasses, Legumes, and Forbs Mix, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

Native Species: This scenario addresses inadequate herbaceous plant community function or diversity within the specific transitional zone between terrestrial and aquatic habitats in rangeland, pasture, cropland, and forest where natural seeding methods and/or management is unlikely to improve the plant community within a reasonable time period. This scenario applies to work not covered under NRCS Conservation Practice Range Planting (550), Forage and Biomass Planting (512), Critical Area Planting (342), Filter Strip (393), Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats (643), Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Wetland Enhancement (659), or Wetland Restoration (657). The typical setting for this scenario is usually a narrow strip between the aquatic and terrestrial habitats subject to intermittent flooding and saturated soils where the existing plant community has been disturbed, destroyed, or the species diversity is unable to provide proper function and/or adequate habitat. Where the establishment of a diverse riparian herbaceous plant community is desired, an adapted mix of native grasses, legumes, and/or forbs tolerant to the site conditions will be planted by broadcast and/or no-till or range drill seeding methods as necessary to accomplish the intended purpose(s). Where chemical control of undesirable vegetation, including invasives, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, the Herbaceous Weed Control (315) practice should be used. Seedbed preparation may require LIGHT TILLAGE (disking). WHEN POLLINATOR HABITAT IS A CONSIDERATION: Include 5-10 adapted forb species that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season where feasible. All grazing will be deferred during plant establishment which will consist of a minimum of one year, and in many cases longer. Typically there is no haying, and the only clipping during establishment will be for removal of weeds.

**Before Situation:**

The riparian zone, the specific area between terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is currently an undesirable or inadequate stand of perennial or annual vegetation and natural reseeding or vegetation management is unlikely to improve the plant community with

**After Situation:**

The riparian zone, the transitional zone between the terrestrial and aquatic habitats, is established to an adapted, diverse vegetative plant community and is under close management to ensure long term survival and ecological succession. The quality and quantity of the riparian zone components are managed to support the species that depend on it for habitat as well as the functions it performs for stabilizing the streambank and/or shoreline, dissipating stream energy and trapping sediment, and improving and/or maintaining water quality. These functions include: stream temperature moderation through shading, recruitment of non-woody organic matter, habitat for terrestrial insects and other riparian dependent species, streambank integrity, and filtration of contaminants from surface run-off into the stream. All grazing will be deferred during plant establishment which will consist of a minimum of one year, and in many cases longer. Typically there is no haying, and the only clipping during establishment will be for removal of weeds.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Riparian Herbaceous

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,524.67 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$304.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Scenario:** #48 - Pollinator Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Pollinator Habitat: This scenario addresses inadequate herbaceous plant community function or diversity within the specific transitional zone between terrestrial and aquatic habitats in rangeland, pasture, cropland, and forest where natural seeding methods and/or management is unlikely to improve the plant community within a reasonable time. The typical setting for this scenario is a narrow strip between the aquatic and terrestrial habitats subject to intermittent flooding and saturated soils where the existing plant community has been disturbed, destroyed, or the species diversity is unable to provide adequate habitat. Where the establishment of a diverse riparian herbaceous plant community is desired, an adapted mix of grasses, sedges, rushes, ferns, legumes, and/or forbs tolerant to the site conditions will be planted. Site adapted species of grasses, legumes, and/or forbs will be planted by no-till or range drill seeding methods as necessary to accomplish the intended purpose(s). Where chemical control of undesirable vegetation, including invasive species, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community the Herbaceous Weed Control (315) practice should be used. Include 5-10 adapted forb species that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season. This scenario applies to work not covered under NRCS Conservation Practice Range Planting (528), Forage and Biomass Planting (512), Critical Area Planting (342), Filter Strip (393), Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats (643), Streambank and Shoreline Protection (580), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Wetland Enhancement (659), or Wetland Restoration (657). This practice can be used nationwide.

**Before Situation:**

Riparian zone vegetation is currently an undesirable or inadequate stand of perennial or annual vegetation as determined by the NRCS Stream Visual Assessment Protocol. Natural reseeding or vegetation management is unlikely to improve the plant community w

**After Situation:**

The riparian zone is established to an adapted, diverse vegetative plant community and is under close management to insure long term survival and ecological succession. The quality and quantity of the riparian zone components are managed to support the species that depend on it for habitat as well as the functions it performs for stabilizing the streambank and/or shoreline, dissipating stream energy and trapping sediment, and improving and/or maintaining water quality. These functions include: stream temperature moderation through shading, recruitment of non-woody organic matter, habitat for terrestrial insects and other riparian dependent species, streambank integrity, and filtration of contaminants from surface run-off into the stream.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Riparian Herbaceous

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 0.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$764.45 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,528.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #1 - Direct Seeding (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs to restore riparian plant communities and associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to, and up-gradient from, a watercourse or water body, extending a minimum of 35 feet wide and 3000 feet long. The planting will consist of trees or shrubs planted through direct seeding. Planting rate will be approximately 3000 seeds per acre. Resource concerns to be addressed are Soil Erosion - excessive bank erosion; Water Quality - excess sediment and organics in surface waters and elevated water temperature; Degraded Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests and habitat used for forage, cropland, speculation property, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and or

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs will be established through broadcasting seeds, nuts, and mast (fruit of woody species), and mechanically raking to provide seed to soil contact along the riparian corridor. This will provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the above mentioned resource concerns. Seedbed preparation prior to seeding will be conducted using 490 - Tree/Shrub Site Preparation.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,325.69

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,730.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #2 - Bare-root, machine planted (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs into a suitably prepared site to restore riparian plant communities and provide other associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to, and up-gradient from, a watercourse or water body, extending a minimum of 35 feet wide. The planting will consist of machine planted bare-root shrubs, evergreen, and deciduous trees in rows. Area will be planted using 3 rows and will use each of the woody plant types. Spacing between plants in each row: shrubs will be 6', evergreen tree spacing will be 12', and deciduous tree spacing will be 15'. Tree rows will be 15' apart. A total tree row length of 3000'. Tree shelters will be placed on the hardwoods and evergreens. Resource concerns to be addressed are Soil Erosion - excessive bank erosion; Water Quality - excess sediment and organics in surface waters and elevated water temperature; Degraded Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests and habitat used for forage, cropland, speculation property, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and or

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs will be established along the riparian corridor which will provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the above mentioned resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,402.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,134.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #3 - Small container, machine planted (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs into a suitably prepared site to restore riparian plant communities and other associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to, and up-gradient from, a watercourse or water body, extending a minimum of 35 feet wide. The planting will consist of machine planted containerized shrubs, evergreen, and deciduous trees in rows. Area will be planted using 3 rows. Spacing between plants in-rows: shrub spacing will be 6', evergreen tree spacing will be 12', and deciduous tree spacing will be 15'. Tree rows will be 15' apart. Tree row is a total length of 3000'. Tree shelters will be placed on hardwoods and evergreens. Resource concerns to be addressed are Soil Erosion - excessive bank erosion; Water Quality - excess sediment and organics in surface waters and elevated water temperature; Degraded Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests and habitat used for forage, cropland, speculation property, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and or

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs will be established along the riparian corridor which will provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the above mentioned resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,034.01

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,344.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #15 - Seeding

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs to restore riparian plant communities and provide associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to and up-gradient from a watercourse or water body and will be at least 35 feet wide. The planting will consist of trees and/or shrubs planted through direct broadcast seeding, incorporated with light tillage. The planting rate will be approximately 30 pounds of seeds per acre. Resource concerns to be addressed are: Nutrients Transported to Surface Water; Sediment Transported to Surface Water; Bank Erosion from Streams, Shorelines or Water Conveyance Channels; Elevated Water Temperature; Plant Structure and Composition; Plant Productivity and Health; Terrestrial Habitat for Wildlife and Invertebrates; Aquatic Habitat for Fish and other Organisms.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests, and habitat used for forage, cropland, associated ag land, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and org

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs has been established along the riparian corridor to provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,594.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$459.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #16 - Cuttings

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs into a suitably prepared site to restore riparian plant communities and associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to and up-gradient from a watercourse or water body extending a minimum of 35 feet wide. The planting will consist of tree and/or shrub poles and live stakes (whips) planted by hand. Materials will be from a nearby, off-site location. The ratio of whips to poles will be 5:1. The cuttings will be planted in a mosaic pattern while still dormant. Tree mesh will be placed on the large cuttings. Resource concerns to be addressed are Soil Erosion - excessive bank erosion; Water Quality - excess sediment and organics in surface waters and elevated temperature; Degraded Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests and habitat used for forage, cropland, speculation property, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and or

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs will be established along the riparian corridor which will provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the above mentioned resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,512.35 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,512.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #17 - Bare-root, hand planted

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs into a suitably prepared site to restore riparian plant communities and associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to and up-gradient from a watercourse or water body extending a minimum of 35 feet wide. The planting will consist of hand planted bare-root shrubs, evergreen, and deciduous trees. One third of the area will be planted to each woody plant type. Planting for shrubs will be done at 6' x 6' spacing, evergreen tree spacing will be 12' x 15' and deciduous tree spacing at 15' x 15'. Tree shelters will be placed on the hardwoods and evergreens. Resource concerns to be addressed are Soil Erosion - excessive bank erosion; Water Quality - excess sediment and organics in surface waters and elevated temperature; Degraded Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests and habitat used for forage, cropland, speculation property, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and or

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs will be established along the riparian corridor which will provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the above mentioned resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,213.42

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,404.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Scenario:** #18 - Bare-root, machine planted

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a buffer of trees and/or shrubs into a suitably prepared site to restore riparian plant communities and associated benefits. The buffer will be located adjacent to and up-gradient from a watercourse or water body extending a minimum of 35 feet wide. The planting will consist of machine planted bare-root shrubs, evergreen, and deciduous trees. One third of the area will be planted to each woody plant type. Planting for shrubs will be done at 6' x 6' spacing, evergreen tree spacing will be 12' x 15' and deciduous tree spacing at 15' x 15'. Tree shelters will be placed on the hardwoods and evergreens. Resource concerns to be addressed are Soil Erosion - excessive bank erosion; Water Quality - excess sediment and organics in surface waters and elevated temperature; Degraded Plant Condition - inadequate structure and composition; and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Typical sites include former riparian forests and habitat used for forage, cropland, speculation property, or other nonforest condition which contains undesirable amounts or types of vegetation. Active bank erosion is depositing sediment, nutrients and or

**After Situation:**

A buffer of trees and shrubs will be established along the riparian corridor which will provide stability, filtration, shade, and desirable habitat to address the above mentioned resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area of planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,841.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,280.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 393 - Filter Strip

**Scenario:** #25 - Native Species, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A strip or area of herbaceous vegetation that removes contaminants from overland flow. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species. The area of the filter strip is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

Annual cropland, grazing land, or disturbed land (including forestland) allows for runoff of suspended solids, dissolved and/or associated contaminants into environmentally-sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, critical habitat and neighboring

**After Situation:**

The 393 Implementation Requirements are developed for the site and applied. The planned filter strip will be established and maintained per the practice plan that will meet the criteria for the planned purpose(s). The vegetation will consist of native species. The filter strip will have adequate width to filter the planned pollutants. The practice includes seedbed preparation, seeding, and seed. Species selected shall be able to withstand partial burial by sediment and tolerant of herbicides used on the contribution area while protecting environmentally-sensitive areas. The area of the filter strip is taken out of production.

**Feature Measure:** number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$582.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$582.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 393 - Filter Strip

**Scenario:** #26 - Introduced Species, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A strip or area of herbaceous vegetation that removes contaminants from overland flow. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of introduced species. The area of the filter strip is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

Annual cropland, grazing land, or disturbed land (including forestland) allows for runoff of suspended solids, dissolved and/or associated contaminants into environmentally-sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, critical habitat and neighboring

**After Situation:**

The 393 Implementation Requirements are developed for the site and applied. The planned filter strip will be established and maintained per the practice plan that will meet the criteria for the planned purpose(s). The vegetation will consist of introduced species. The filter strip will have adequate width to filter the planned pollutants. The practice includes seedbed preparation, seeding, and seed. Species selected shall be able to withstand partial burial by sediment and tolerant of herbicides used on contribution area while protecting environmentally-sensitive areas. The area of the filter strip is taken out of production.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$490.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$490.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 393 - Filter Strip

**Scenario:** #27 - Native Species

**Scenario Description:**

A strip or area of herbaceous vegetation that removes contaminants from overland flow. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species.

**Before Situation:**

Annual cropland, grazing land, or disturbed land (including forestland) allows for runoff of suspended solids, dissolved and/or associated contaminants into environmentally-sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, critical habitat and neighboring

**After Situation:**

The 393 Implementation Requirements are developed for the site and applied. The planned filter strip will be established and maintained per the practice plan that will meet the criteria for the planned purpose(s). The vegetation will consist of native species. The filter strip will have adequate width to filter the planned pollutants. The practice includes seedbed preparation, seeding, and seed. Species selected shall be able to withstand partial burial by sediment and tolerant of herbicides used on contribution area while protecting environmentally-sensitive areas.

**Feature Measure:** number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$337.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$337.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 393 - Filter Strip

**Scenario:** #28 - Introduced Species

**Scenario Description:**

A strip or area of herbaceous vegetation that removes contaminants from overland flow. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of introduced species.

**Before Situation:**

Annual cropland, grazing land, or disturbed land (including forestland) allows for runoff of suspended solids, dissolved and/or associated contaminants into environmentally-sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, critical habitat and neighboring

**After Situation:**

The 393 Implementation Requirements are developed for the site and applied. The planned filter strip will be established and maintained per the practice plan that will meet the criteria for the planned purpose(s). The vegetation will consist of introduced species. The filter strip will have adequate width to filter the planned pollutants. The practice includes seedbed preparation, seeding, and seed. Species selected shall be able to withstand partial burial by sediment and tolerant of herbicides used on contribution area while protecting environmentally-sensitive areas.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$245.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$245.39

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 393 - Filter Strip

**Scenario:** #55 - Native Species with Moderate Grading

**Scenario Description:**

A strip or area of herbaceous vegetation that removes contaminants from overland flow. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species.

**Before Situation:**

Annual cropland, grazing land, or disturbed land (including forestland) allows for runoff of suspended solids, dissolved and/or associated contaminants into environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, critical habitat and neighboring

**After Situation:**

The 393 Implementation Requirements are developed for the site and applied. The planned filter strip will be established and maintained per the practice plan that will meet the criteria for the planned purpose(s). The vegetation will consist of native species. The filter strip will have adequate width to filter the planned pollutants. The practice includes moderate grading to ensure even flow through the filter strip, seedbed preparation, seeding, and seed. Species selected shall be able to withstand partial burial by sediment and tolerant of herbicides used on contribution area while protecting environmentally sensitive areas.

**Feature Measure:** number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,727.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,727.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 393 - Filter Strip

**Scenario:** #56 - Native Species with Moderate Grading, Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A strip or area of herbaceous vegetation that removes contaminants from overland flow. Practice includes seedbed prep and planting of native species. The area of the filter strip is taken out of production.

**Before Situation:**

Annual cropland, grazing land, or disturbed land (including forestland) allows for runoff of suspended solids, dissolved and/or associated contaminants into environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, riparian zones, critical habitat and neighboring

**After Situation:**

The 393 Implementation Requirements are developed for the site and applied. The planned filter strip will be established and maintained per the practice plan that will meet the criteria for the planned purpose(s). The vegetation will consist of native species. The filter strip will have adequate width to filter the planned pollutants. The practice includes moderate grading to ensure even flow through the filter strip, seedbed preparation, seeding, and seed. Species selected shall be able to withstand partial burial by sediment and tolerant of herbicides used on the contribution area while protecting environmentally sensitive areas. The area of the filter strip is taken out of production.

**Feature Measure:** Number of acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,972.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,972.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 394 - Firebreak

**Scenario:** #1 - Permanent Vegetation, 30 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing 2 acres (30 foot wide strip approximately 1/2 mile in length) of permanent vegetation that will serve as a green firebreak. Scenario includes clearing the site, preparing the seedbed, seeding (typically cool season grasses and/or legumes), and applying needed soil amendments. Clearing will be achieved with the use of a bush hog or similar equipment. Seedbed preparation and vegetation establishment will be accomplished with farm equipment. Soil amendments will be applied according to local FOTG guidance. This scenario does not include follow-up maintenance operations such as weed control, mowing, etc. Resource concerns include Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, Soil erosion, and Excessive sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Tract, field, or farm lacks adequate firebreaks to either reduce the spread of wildfires or contain a prescribed burn.

**After Situation:**

The property is adequately protected from wildfire or can be safely prescribe burned. Wildlife habitat will also be enhanced and the potential for erosion from the firebreak is minimized.

**Feature Measure:** Length of firebreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,358.04

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 394 - Firebreak

**Scenario:** #2 - Vegetation with Bush Hog, 30 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of a short vegetative firebreak a minimum width of 30' around a 40 acre field/farm using a bush-hog mower. Generally water control devices such as water bars are not needed due either to the lack of steep terrain or the temporary nature of the firebreak. Resource concerns include Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, Undesirable plant productivity and health, Inadequate plant structure and composition, and Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Tract, field, or farm lacks adequate firebreaks to either reduce the spread of wildfires or contain a prescribed burn.

**After Situation:**

The property is adequately protected from wildfire or can be safely prescribe burned.

**Feature Measure:** Length of firebreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,054.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 394 - Firebreak

**Scenario:** #3 - Bare Soil, Bladed or Disked, Less Than or Equal to 15 Percent Slope

**Scenario Description:**

Use of medium equipment such as small dozers to blade, disk, plow, etc. to create a 30' wide bare-soil firebreaks on slopes less than 15% around a 40 acre field. Resource concerns include Wildfire hazards from excessive biomass accumulation, Undesirable plant productivity and health, Inadequate plant structure and composition, and Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Tract, field, or farm lacks adequate firebreaks to either reduce the spread of wildfires or contain a prescribed burn. Conditions such as topography, the presence of brush and trees, etc. make the use of typical farm equipment impractical.

**After Situation:**

The property is adequately protected from wildfire or can be safely prescribe burned and the potential for excessive erosion from the firebreak is negligible.

**Feature Measure:** Length of firebreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$973.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 394 - Firebreak

**Scenario:** #6 - Vegetation, 5 to 45 Percent Slope

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of a short vegetative firebreak a minimum width of 50' on the upwind side of unit and 100' on the downwind side of unit around an entire 160 acre field/farm using mechanical trees shears, chainsaws, and bush hog mowers. Vegetation is reduced in height but not down to bare mineral soil. Generally water control devices such as water bars are not needed due either to the lack of steep terrain or the temporary nature of the firebreak. Typical slopes are between 5 and 45%. Resource concerns include Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, Undesirable plant productivity and health, Inadequate plant structure and composition, and Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

Tract, field, or farm lacks adequate firebreaks to either reduce the spread of wildfires or contain a prescribed burn.

**After Situation:**

The property is adequately protected from wildfire or can be safely prescribe burned.

**Feature Measure:** Length of firebreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10,560.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,735.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 394 - Firebreak

**Scenario:** #15 - Bare Soil, Bladed or Disked, Greater Than or Equal to 30 Feet

**Scenario Description:**

Installing a bare-ground firebreak with a width of 30' or more on gently to strongly sloping slopes with equipment such as a dozer with a heavy disk. Using smaller equipment, erosion control devices such as water bars will be installed at approximately 15 to 25 per 1,000 feet of firebreak length. Devices will have stable outlets. Resource concerns include Wildfire hazard from excessive biomass accumulation, Undesirable plant productivity and health, Inadequate plant structure and composition, Habitat degradation, Soil erosion, and Excessive sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Tract, field, or farm lacks adequate firebreaks to either reduce the spread of wildfires or contain a prescribed burn. Wide firebreaks are needed due to topography, high wildfire risk or to their use as down-wind breaks for prescribed burns. Conditions su

**After Situation:**

The property is adequately protected from wildfire or can be safely prescribe burned and the potential for excessive erosion from the firebreak is minimized.

**Feature Measure:** Length of firebreak

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,035.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 395 - Stream Habitat Improvement and Management

**Scenario:** #2 - Wood Structure, Root Wads, Instream

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario involves placement of large wood (logs, root wads, log structures) into a stream channel in order to improve aquatic habitat that currently does not meet planning criteria for stream species habitat. A stream assessment (i.e. Stream Visual Assessment Protocol) should be conducted in order to document habitat components lacking for aquatic species (i.e. large wood, pools). A project design for wood placement will be based on an assessment of the target stream reach characteristics and those of a suitable reference reach. These characteristics include channel geometry, channel slope, stream bottom substrate size and composition, and the geomorphic setting influencing the channel form, pattern and profile. Large wood and root wads placed into the stream will mimic genus, age, and size of mature trees found in intact, reference riparian areas in the MLRA where the project is located. Large wood/trees with root wads intact should be placed in streams to create pool habitat according to NRCS engineering specifications and with close review & approval of a fish habitat biologist. Boulders placed to provide ballast shall only be used if the geomorphic setting and project design demand this component. The planned activity will meet the current 395 standard, and facilitating practice standards utilized, including timing of work windows required for protected aquatic and riparian species, and protecting/restoring vegetation and substrates of/to areas impacted by heavy equipment. Implementation will result in the improvement of instream habitat complexity, hiding and resting cover, and/or increased food availability for fish and other stream species. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of project implementation. Monitoring records, demonstrating implementation of this scenario addressing resource concerns for stream species of concern, are required.

**Before Situation:**

In this stream reach, habitat for fish, aquatic insects and/or other stream species, is sub-optimal (as determined by the NRCS Stream Visual Assessment Protocol score of less than 5 overall). The site does not have adequate food, cover, and/or habitat con

**After Situation:**

Stream habitat within the project reach is improving as a result of placing logs, root wads, and/or wood structures in the channel and/or along the stream bank. Hiding cover, food availability, refuge and pool habitat, for all stream species in the reach, is improving.

**Feature Measure:** Bankfull width x reach length

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,953.59 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$20,953.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 395 - Stream Habitat Improvement and Management

**Scenario:** #3 - Rock Structure, Boulders Instream

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario describes the implementation of a stream habitat improvement and management project that places rock structures, individual boulders or boulder clusters in or adjacent to the stream channel as habitat components. A project design for boulder placement will be based on assessment of the target stream reach characteristics and those of a suitable reference reach. These characteristics include channel geometry, channel slope, stream bottom substrate size and composition, and the geomorphic setting influencing the channel form, pattern and profile. Large rocks/boulders placed in the stream channel will mimic geologic material sizes typically present in the watershed or observed in intact, reference stream reaches in the MLRA where the project is located. Boulders should be placed in streams to create pool habitat and hydraulic complexity according to NRCS engineering specifications and with close review & approval of a fish habitat biologist onsite during implementation of the project design. Spawning gravel placement should be placed to restore spawning area substrates potentially disturbed by rock placement. The planned activity will meet the current 395 standard, and facilitating practice standards utilized. Implementation will result in the improvement of instream habitat complexity, hiding and resting cover, spawning habitat, and/or increased food availability for fish and other stream species. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of stream habitat assessment, and project implementation. Records, demonstrating implementation of this scenario addressing resource concerns for stream species of concern, are required.

**Before Situation:**

In this stream reach, habitat for fish, aquatic insects and other stream species is sub-optimal (as determined by the NRCS Stream Visual Assessment Protocol score of less than 5 overall). The site does not have adequate food, cover, and/or habitat connect

**After Situation:**

Stream habitat within the project reach is improving as a result of placing boulders or constructing rock structures in the channel and/or along the stream bank. Hydraulic complexity of the habitat in the reach is increased, and hiding cover, food availability and refuge habitat for stream species is improving. Streambank vegetation is increasing and contributing to stability of the streambanks.

**Feature Measure:** Bankfull width x reach length

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,404.53 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$19,404.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 395 - Stream Habitat Improvement and Management

**Scenario:** #4 - Rock and Wood Structure

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario describes the implementation of a stream habitat improvement and management project where practices are focused on instream habitat improvement with a combination of rock AND wood structures. This scenario involves placement of large wood and rock structures into a stream channel in order to improve aquatic habitat that currently does not meet planning criteria for stream species habitat. A stream assessment (i.e. Stream Visual Assessment Protocol) should be conducted in order to document habitat components (such as large wood, pools ) are not currently present in the stream or are limited for aquatic species. A project design for placement of habitat structures (boulders, boulder clusters, wood, wood structures) will be based on an assessment of (a) the target stream reach characteristics and (b) those of a suitable reference reach. These characteristics include channel geometry, channel slope, stream bottom substrate size and composition, and the geomorphic setting influencing the channel form, pattern and profile. Large rocks/boulders placed in the stream channel will mimic geologic material sizes typically present in the watershed or observed in intact, reference stream reaches in the MLRA where the project is located. Rock boulder sizes should also reflect the geomorphic setting of the stream reach. Large wood placed into the stream under this scenario should be similar in species, age, and size (diameter) as trees found in the surrounding riparian area, to the extent possible. Wood, boulders and/or boulder clusters will be placed in the stream to create pool habitat and hydraulic complexity according to NRCS engineering specifications and with close review & approval of a fish habitat biologist onsite during the planning and implementation of the project. This scenario involves restoring one acre of stream. The planned activity will meet the current 395 standard, and facilitating practice standards utilized. Implementation will result in the improvement of instream habitat complexity, hiding and resting cover, and/or increased food availability for fish and other stream species. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of project implementation. Records demonstrating implementation of this scenario addressing resource concerns for stream species of concern will be required.

**Before Situation:**

In this stream reach, habitat for fish, aquatic insects and/or other stream species is sub-optimal as determined by the NRCS Stream Visual Assessment Protocol score of less than 5. The site does not have adequate food, cover, and/or habitat connectivity f

**After Situation:**

Stream habitat within the project reach is improving as a result of placing logs, rocks, or constructing wood and rock structures in the channel and/or along the stream bank. Hiding cover, food availability, refuge and pool habitat, for all stream species in the reach, is improving.

**Feature Measure:** Bankfull width x reach lengt

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$37,196.26 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$37,196.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 395 - Stream Habitat Improvement and Management

**Scenario:** #5 - Fish Barrier

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario describes the implementation of a stream habitat improvement and management project where practices are focused on the stream channel. The planned activity will meet the current 395 standard, and facilitating practice standards utilized. Implementation will result in protecting native aquatic fauna in the reach from competition or harassment from non-native fish. This action may also increase food availability for fish and other stream species located above the constructed barrier. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of stream habitat assessment above the barrier, and project implementation. Records demonstrating that the implementation of this scenario will address resource concerns for aquatic and riparian species of concern will be required.

**Before Situation:**

In this stream corridor, native aquatic species are at risk as determined by the state fish and wildlife agency. NRCS Stream Visual Assessment Protocol for the reach being protected by a barrier meets planning criteria and provides habitat for native spec

**After Situation:**

Native fish inhabiting areas upstream of the newly constructed concrete barrier will not be adversely affected by interactions with non-native species/competitors.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$42,950.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,590.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 396 - Aquatic Organism Passage

**Scenario:** #1 - Removal, Passage Barriers

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of passage barriers, including small relict earthen diversions (remnant formations, e.g., splash dams), failing or undersized culverts, and sediment or large woody material (>10cm diameter and 2m length) from mass wasting or major flood events. Instream material associated with the previously mentioned circumstances or structures prevents aquatic organism passage by the creation of channel-spanning blockages, or areas of shallow depth, high velocities, or extensive changes in water surface elevation. In addition, these features may encourage abrupt channel changes that endanger adjacent capital infrastructure or transportation corridors. Excessive streambank erosion by flows deflected around or impounded behind these features may impair water quality by introducing fine sediment out of phase with the natural hydrography and the life history requirements of native aquatic species. Removal is done with an assortment of equipment, including tracked excavators outfitted with buckets with "thumbs", bull dozers, skid steers, front-end loaders, and dump trucks. The channel and adjacent floodplain are restored to pre-blockage conditions to the fullest extent practicable. Removed materials are trucked away and disposed of or recycled offsite, unless native streambed material found in the blockage can be used in site reclamation. Large woody material, if present, is used for instream reclamation, replaced in the channel downstream of the blockage, or trucked offsite for disposal or stockpiling for future projects. Disturbed areas are revegetated with a mix of site-adapted species. Scenario does not include additional measures needed in the active channel and floodplain. RESOURCE CONCERNS: INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE –Habitat degradation; EXCESS WATER – Ponding, flooding, seasonal high water table, seeps, and drifted snow; WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION – Elevated water temperature; SOIL EROSION– Excessive bank erosion from streams, shorelines, or water conveyance channels Payments for these associated practices are made separately and are covered by other typical scenarios and payment schedules. See relevant CPS for additional information. ---Site Preparation and Reclamation associated with project footprint: (342) Critical Area Planting, (382) Fence, (390) Riparian Herbaceous Cover, (391) Riparian Forest Buffer, (612) Tree/Shrub Establishment; (643) Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats. ---Reach Planning/Habitat Enhancement: (395) Stream Habitat Improvement and Management, ---Structural Measures Associated with Scenario but outside of project footprint: (410) Grade Stabilization Structure, (584) Channel Bed Stabilization, (580) Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**Before Situation:**

An instream feature spanning the active channel creates hydraulic conditions that exceed the swimming or crawling abilities of native aquatic organisms. Event-driven mass wasting or instream deposits of coarse sediment create channel blockages or areas of

**After Situation:**

The instream barrier is removed by a combination of methods and equipment and the channel and affected floodplain are restored to pre-blockage conditions to the fullest extent practicable. Resource Concerns are addressed within the context of the site.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of mineral sedi

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,607.85 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$48.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 396 - Aquatic Organism Passage

**Scenario:** #2 - Fishway, Nature-Like

**Scenario Description:**

Nature-like fishways, also known as roughened channels, rock ramps, or bypass channels, are constructed features that provide passage around an instream barrier or in place of a removed barrier. Fishway design is based on simulating or mimicking adjacent stream characteristics, using natural materials, and providing suitable passage conditions over a range of flows for a wide variety of fish species and other aquatic organisms. Nature-like fishways provide enhanced passage conditions compared to concrete or aluminum (Alaskan Steeppass) ladders, and are not as susceptible to debris-related operational issues. When used to bypass an instream barrier, they require a larger footprint than instream structures, and may also require control structures to regulate flow through the fishway or address tailwater fluctuations affecting the fishway entrance (downstream end). Fishway design includes an assessment of adjacent stream characteristics, including channel geometry, slope, sediment texture and composition, and major geomorphic units that govern channel plan, pattern and profile. In the case of a fishway that bypasses an instream barrier, the design is tailored to these elements, the elevation required to ascend the barrier, and the known range of flow variation or operations. For fishways constructed in the place of a removed barrier, the design may be a hybrid approach that meets the same criteria, although in a smaller instream footprint. Nature-like fishways are constructed with an assortment of equipment used for excavation, placing material, and delivering and removing material. Construction elements generally include an assortment of rock used to create riffles, cascades, or riffle-pool sequences with between 6 to 12 inches of water surface elevation drop between adjacent structures. Large woody material is used to create channel structural elements in some settings, when available and where approved by oversight agencies. Removed materials are trucked away and disposed or recycled off-site, unless excavated native streambed material can be used in fishway construction. Large woody material or removed trees, if present, are used for fishway construction trucked offsite for disposal, or trucked offsite for stockpiling for future projects. Disturbed areas are revegetated with a mix of site-adapted species, and access control and signage are provided. Scenario does not include additional measures needed in the active channel and floodplain or at an existing dam necessary to control flow associated with nature-like fishway. RESOURCE CONCERNS: INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE –Habitat degradation; EXCESS WATER – Ponding, flooding, seasonal high water table, seeps, and drifted snow; WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION – Elevated water temperature; EROSION– Excessive bank erosion from streams shorelines or water conveyance channels Payments for these associated practices are made separately and are covered by other typical scenarios and payment schedules. See relevant CPS for additional information. ---Site Preparation and Reclamation associated with project footprint: (326) Clearing and Snagging, (342) Critical Area Planting, (382) Fence, (390) Riparian Herbaceous Cover, (391) Riparian Forest Buffer, (612) Tree/Shrub Establishment ---Reach Planning/Habitat Enhancement: (395) Stream Habitat Improvement and Management, ---Structural Measures Associated with Scenario but outside of project footprint: (410) Grade Stabilization Structure, (582) Open Channel, (584) Channel Bed Stabilization, (580) Streambank and Shoreline Protection, (587) Structure for Water Control

**Before Situation:**

An instream barrier prevents upstream migration of native aquatic organisms and no support exists for removal. Similarly, an instream barrier is removed, and interested parties require maintenance of an upstream pool or pond. The subject stream contains a

**After Situation:**

A nature-like fishway is constructed in place of a removed barrier or around an existing barrier. The fishway is designed to mimic the adjacent natural stream, and is constructed of rock and/or large woody material that provides quality passage conditions for a number of species and geomorphic stability over a range of flows. Resource Concerns are addressed within the context of the site.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of constructed fishwa

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$47,566.66 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$47,566.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 396 - Aquatic Organism Passage

**Scenario:** #3 - Culvert, Corrugated Metal Pipe

**Scenario Description:**

A corrugated metal (galvanized steel or aluminum) pipe culvert (CMP) of any shape (round, elliptical, or squash) used at a road-stream crossing to provide aquatic organism passage (AOP) and promote stream ecological and geomorphic function. CMPs used for AOP are sized according to geomorphic analyses, not just an estimate of runoff and streamflow at the site from the contributing watershed. In addition, CMPs used for AOP are filled with a mixture of rock and gravel sized to emulate site stream conditions and geomorphic units in the channel. The simulated streambed material is continuous throughout the culvert barrel, and blended with the intact streambed at the culvert inlet and outlet. The first estimate of culvert size--diameter or span--is obtained by analyzing bank full channel width on a reach of stream not affected by an existing road crossing or other conditions that alter self-formed conditions. In the case of a culvert replacement, bank full investigations are begun at least 10-20 estimated bank full channel widths above the existing stream crossing. Culvert diameter or span is then increased according to channel bed composition and texture, bank characteristics, channel alignment at the crossing section, and other parameters that may affect channel dynamics and stability. Once the CMP diameter or span is determined, culvert length will be determined by roadway geometry and loading requirements, and site stream conditions. Concrete headwalls and/or wingwalls may be necessary in shorter installations and/or where fill/roadway cover is limited or the stream alignment is not perpendicular to the road axis. Culvert wall thickness and corrugations are determined by road loading requirements. Stream geomorphic characteristics, including the reach longitudinal profile, channel cross-sectional shape, substrate composition and arrangement, and bank shape and composition are determined. CMPs are installed with an assortment of equipment used for excavation, placing material, and delivering and removing material. Construction elements generally include an assortment of rock used to create riffles, cascades, or riffle-pool sequences with between 6 to 12 inches of water surface elevation drop between adjacent structures. Stream dewatering and diversion around the work site is often required, and temporary road closure or re-routing may also be required. Channel bed material within the culvert barrel varies according to prevailing stream characteristics at the crossing site. The culvert is placed within the roadway on a sub excavated compacted bed, set at a slope that matches the design longitudinal profile, and backfilled with a bed mixture that mimics adjacent stream characteristics with special attention to channel pattern. Backfill depths are typically at least 20% of the culvert diameter or rise, but may deviate based on the shape of the culvert used, channel dimensions, substrate size, and the site longitudinal profile. Special equipment such as motorized wheelbarrows may be necessary to backfill smaller CMPs. Once the simulated streambed in the culvert barrel is complete, the roadway is replaced and any necessary armoring and revegetating material is placed at the culvert inlet and outlet where it intersects the road fill prism. Other actions include construction staking and signage, soil erosion and pollution control, removal and disposal of the old culvert, and topsoil conservation for site reclamation. Disturbed areas are revegetated with a mix of site-adapted species. Scenario does not include additional measures needed to address channel incision, bank stability, and other factors associated with the presence of the stream crossing. RESOURCE CONCERNS: INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE –Habitat degradation; EXCESS WATER – Ponding, flooding, seasonal high water table, seeps, and drifted snow; WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION – Elevated water temperature; SOIL EROSION– Excessive bank erosion from streams shorelines or water conveyance channels Payments for these associated practices are made separately and are covered by other typical scenarios and payment schedules. See relevant CPS for additional information. ---Site Preparation and Reclamation associated with project footprint: (342) Critical Area Planting, (382) Fence, (390) Riparian Herbaceous Cover, (391) Riparian Forest Buffer, (612) Tree/Shrub Establishment; ---Reach Planning/Habitat Enhancement: (395) Stream Habitat Improvement and Management, ---Structural Measures Associated with Scenario but outside of project footprint: (410) Grade Stabilization Structure, (584) Channel Bed Stabilization, (580) Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**Before Situation:**

An existing undersized culvert as contributed to general bed and bank scour downstream of a road crossing, and may have contributed to the deposition of a wedge of sediment upstream of the road crossing. The road may be overtopped by high flows, resulting

**After Situation:**

The undersized culvert is replaced with a CMP sized, placed, and backfilled with material determined by geomorphic analyses performed in a reference reach upstream of the crossing location. Geomorphic and ecological functions are preserved through the crossing site, enhancing AOP, water quality, and culvert longevity. In addition, because the culvert is sized to promote the transport of streamflow and the materials it carries, it requires decreased maintenance activities over time. Landowners are able to access their holdings across a range of flows, and are able to seek and receive emergency and post-flood recovery services. Resource Concerns are addressed within the context of the site.

**Feature Measure:** CMP

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,776.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,776.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 396 - Aquatic Organism Passage

**Scenario:** #4 - Crossing, Low Water

**Scenario Description:**

Structure installed on low volume or on unimproved roads at watercourse crossings. Primary use is to allow livestock and equipment access to other parcels of land or operational units. Low-water crossings provide safe and stable stream crossings that do not negatively impact water and ecological quality while remaining stable across a wide range of flows. Variations exist, but a common application consists of an improved or hardened ford located above a hydraulic control (e.g., bedrock outcropping, riffle, or step composed of coarse substrates). Properly designed and installed low water crossings provide aquatic organism passage (AOP), promote stream ecological and geomorphic function, remain stable over time, and can pass sediment and woody debris. Conservation planning and interaction with the landowner is vital to determine if existing crossings can be consolidated into fewer, more reliable locations. Characterizing a site according to its watershed position and geomorphic function will aid design decisions. Optimal AOP conditions are usually realized when the backfill is composed of a mixture that mimics bed material as evaluated from a reference reach adjacent to the crossing—preferably at least 10-20 estimated bank full channel widths above an existing crossing to avoid effects that alter channel geometry or bedform composition and spacing. Low water crossings are installed with an assortment of equipment used for excavation, placing material, and delivering and removing material. Low water crossings provide the best mix of function and longevity when they are designed and built to conform to existing channel geometry and slope, constructed to match the shape of the existing channel, and oriented to cross the stream at a 90 degree angle. Crossing width, measured along the downstream axis, should not exceed 2 times the bank full width. Low water crossings are commonly constructed by over excavating the crossing section 6-12 inches below the existing streambed and backfilling the void with well-graded rock back to natural bed elevation. Geotextile lining may be required in some settings. Rock size and gradation is the smallest mix needed to remain stable under prevailing flow conditions—larger rock can endanger livestock and turbulence impairs passage. Sand or soil may be added into the mix to seal the section to ensure that the stream doesn't percolate into the crossing substrate. Smaller material increases bed diversity, chokes voids between bigger stones, and helps preserve passage quality. Rocks smaller than 2 inches at the finished surface may become lodged in livestock hooves. The road/trail surface of the crossing should be extended to an elevation that exceeds the known high water level on each side of the crossing. The downstream edge of the crossing should not produce a sharp drop in water surface to preserve AOP quality and discourage sediment deposition and debris accumulation. Other actions include construction staking and signage, soil erosion and pollution control, removal and disposal of the old culvert, and topsoil conservation for site reclamation. Disturbed areas are revegetated with a mix of site-adapted species. Scenario does not include additional measures needed to address channel incision, bank stability, and other factors associated with the presence of the stream crossing. Stream corridor fencing should be considered to control livestock access and preserve water and riparian quality. RESOURCE CONCERNS: INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE –Habitat degradation Payments for these associated practices are made separately and are covered by other typical scenarios and payment schedules. See relevant CPS for additional information. ---Site Preparation and Reclamation associated with project footprint: (326) Clearing and Snagging, (342) Critical Area Planting, (382) Fence, (390) Riparian Herbaceous Cover, (391) Riparian Forest Buffer, (612) Tree/Shrub Establishment ---Reach Planning/Habitat Enhancement: (395) Stream Habitat Improvement and Management, ---Structural Measures Associated with Scenario but outside of project footprint: (410) Grade Stabilization Structure, (582) Open Channel, (584) Channel Bed Stabilization, (580) Streambank and Shoreline Protection, (587) Structure for Water Control

**Before Situation:**

Small farming operations have pastures and hay meadows where seasonal movement of equipment and livestock between parcels is required. Farm equipment has gotten stuck in the past, and uncontrolled livestock access and frequent crossing or loafing in the s

**After Situation:**

An improved ford is constructed by excavating the channel just upstream of the boulder/cobble hydraulic control. The cut is lined with geotextile to control seepage and subsurface flow, and backfilled up to the existing bed elevation with a well-graded mix of rock sized to mimic the material in the channel upstream of the crossing. The finished crossing surface is at grade with the up and downstream channel elevation, and no drop exists along the downstream edge. Approaches on either side of the crossing are extended up to the adjacent floodplain surface, and the finished instream portion of the ford matches the existing channel cross section. Approach slopes are shallow enough for expected equipment traffic, including towed combinations, and armored as needed with larger rock to protect against erosion that may occur when the floodplain is inundated. Resource Concerns are addressed within the context of the site.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,550.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$259.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 397 - Aquaculture Pond

**Scenario:** #14 - Pond, Aquaculture

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 1 acre pond surface area, 3:1 side slopes, average 5' depth. The construction of an aquaculture pond to facilitate the efficient collection and transfer of waste, the containment of cultured fish, efficient use of water and the maintenance of water quality. The resource concerns addressed include excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, inefficient water use, and habitat degradation. Typical pond outlet is a Structure for Water Control (587). Costs include all equipment necessary to excavate, grade and shape an aquaculture pond. Water Control Structure and Seeding not included.

**Before Situation:**

In the before situation, an aquaculture producer has an aquaculture pond system that has one or more of the following concerns: excessive seepage or frequent release of nutrient laden aquaculture water, potential of loss of non-native aquaculture producti

**After Situation:**

Aquaculture pond is typically 1 acre in surface area, 5 feet deep with 3:1 side slopes. The practice is installed using a dozer. Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606). Outlets, if needed will be installed using Structure for Water Control (587). A liner, if needed, will be installed using Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment 520, or Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner. Water Well, Pumps, and Access Roads may also be needed and will be installed using those standards as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of Aquaculture Pond

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$27,952.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$27,952.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 397 - Aquaculture Pond

**Scenario:** #15 - Pond, Aquaculture with Harvest Kettle

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 1 acre pond surface area, 3:1 side slopes, average 5' depth with a harvest kettle constructed with 10 CY of reinforced concrete. The construction of an aquaculture pond to facilitate the efficient collection and transfer of waste, the containment of cultured fish, efficient use of water and the maintenance of water quality. The resource concerns addressed include excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, inefficient water use, and habitat degradation. Typical pond outlet is a Structure for Water Control (587). Costs include all equipment necessary to excavate, grade and shape an aquaculture pond, and reinforce concrete "kettle". Water Control Structure and Seeding not included.

**Before Situation:**

In the before situation, an aquaculture producer has an aquaculture pond system that has one or more of the following concerns: excessive seepage or frequent release of nutrient laden aquaculture water, potential of loss of non-native aquaculture producti

**After Situation:**

Aquaculture pond is typically 1 acre in surface area, 5 feet deep with 3:1 side slopes with a reinforced concrete harvest kettle. The practice is installed using a dozer. Reinforce concrete harvest kettle is installed with laborers. Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606). Outlets, if needed will be installed using Structure for Water Control (587). A liner, if needed, will be installed using Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment 520, or Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner 521. Water Well, Pumps, and Access Roads may also be needed and will be installed using those standards as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of Aquaculture Pond

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$34,104.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$34,104.87

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 399 - Fishpond Management

**Scenario:** #2 - Structure, Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Fishpond lacks the diversity of habitat to provide adequate habitat for desired fish species. Creation of habitat structures as recommended by a conservation planner or other individual with appropriate credentials including a qualified biologist. Suggested improvements will determine type of structure needed, number of structures, density and location of structures. Habitat structures are typically submerged or emergent. Structures may include log cribs, rock piles, log and rock cribs, pipe and limber cribs, conifer cribs, PVC-tree structures, gravel spawning beds, catfish cages, concrete blocks stacked and filled with sticks or cuttings or plastic barrels filled with sand and sticks. Resource Concerns addressed include: Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - Habitat degradation. Practice installation may also address: Water Quality Degradation - Elevated water temperatures.

**Before Situation:**

Existing fish pond lacks sufficient habitat diversity to provide optimum conditions for desired fish species.

**After Situation:**

Habitat structures within fishpond are appropriate for desired fish species. Typical installation in 1 ac pond: 6 structures of 25 concrete blocks stacked and wired together, with sticks placed within blocks. Other structures can be created including brush piles or pallet cribs wired together and weighted with concrete. Resource concern of habitat degradation has been addressed by providing artificial habitat features. Participant will follow Operation and Maintenance guidance to ensure created habitat is maintained and continues to provide the benefits to the resources.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of pond managed

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,295.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,295.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 399 - Fishpond Management

**Scenario:** #3 - Vegetation, Native

**Scenario Description:**

Native, aquatic vegetation will be established by plugs, tubers, sod mats, soil inoculation, local ecotype seeding or similar methods. Both emergent and submerged vegetation will be established using hand tools or other small equipment as needed. Vegetation will be established to ensure appropriate cover for desired fish species. Plants will be established at a rate, location and density as prescribed by the conservation planner or other natural resource professional. A typical setting will plant between 2-5 aquatic plants per 10 SF. This scenario may include the replacement of non desired plants with appropriate native plants. Resource Concerns addressed include: Degraded Plant Condition - Excessive plant pest pressure; Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - Habitat degradation. Practice installation may also address: Water Quality Degradation - Elevated water temperatures.

**Before Situation:**

Established fish pond which has had insufficient vegetation for desired fish species. Vegetation consists either primarily of non-desired plants or is not of a density to provide adequate cover for fish species. Fishpond is typically 1 acre in size, 1/4 a

**After Situation:**

Vegetation in fishpond is of a density and composition that is suitable for desired fish species. Vegetation is native plants. Resource concern of habitat degradation has been addressed by adding desired vegetation. Participant will follow Operation and Maintenance guidelines to ensure established plants will thrive. If plant die-off occurs prior to lifespan of practice, participant is required to re-establish vegetation according to NRCS Standards and Specifications.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of vegetation planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,184.02 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,184.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 399 - Fishpond Management

**Scenario:** #4 - Depth Management

**Scenario Description:**

Management of existing fishpond by excavation or placement of material to create deep open water or littoral shelves. Fishpond currently does not provide optimum habitat for desired species. Excavated material will either be relocated within fish pond (i.e. island, jetty, shallow bench, etc.) or sited appropriately so as to not cause any negative environmental effects in adjacent uplands. Changes to depth will be based upon recommendations by a conservation planner or other individual with appropriate credentials, including a qualified biologist. Resource Concerns addressed include: Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife - Habitat degradation. Practice installation may also address: Water Quality Degradation - Elevated water temperatures. Associated Practice (if required): Critical Area Planting - 342

**Before Situation:**

Existing fish pond lacks sufficient depth, diversity of depth, or desired bottom structure to provide optimum habitat for desired fish species.

**After Situation:**

Depth and bottom structure of fishpond are appropriate for desired fish species. Resource concern of habitat degradation has been addressed by adding additional depth to the fishpond. Participant will follow Operation and Maintenance guidance to ensure created habitat is maintained and continues to provide the benefits to the resources.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of pond managed

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,274.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,274.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 402 - Dam

**Scenario:** #3 - Pipe, Spillway

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is the construction of an earthen embankment to impound water. A corrugated metal pipe (CMP) principal spillway will be constructed. A metal trash guard protects the spillway inlet. A circular CMP riser connects to a CMP barrel that runs through the dam to outlet safely downstream. A sand diaphragm is installed in the embankment. This scenario assists in addressing the resource concerns: excessive runoff, flooding or ponding, inefficient water use on irrigated land, reduced capacity of conveyances by sediment deposition.

**Before Situation:**

Area exists where water could naturally pool or run off to create a pond for livestock, wildlife, fire control, flood control, or irrigation. The site meets satisfactory conditions according to the standard.

**After Situation:**

The typical dam is constructed by excavation and compaction to create an embankment. The principal spillway is completed by using a CMP riser with a metal trash guard and a CMP barrel. A sand diaphragm is installed. Vegetation will be completed under Critical Area Planting (342) standard. . Other associated practices such as; Fence (382), Pipeline (516), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), Structure For Water Control (587), and Aquatic Organism Passage (396) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Embankment Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$183,281.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #1 - Embankment, No Spillway Pipe

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam without a principal spillway pipe. A low flow tube of 6 inches or less to reduce saturation of the auxiliary spillway is installed, anti-seep collars or sand diaphragms are not required. To stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 2,000 cubic yards, and 80 feet of pipe 6" PVC pipe. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,246.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #2 - Embankment, Pipe <24 inch

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principle spillway pipe less than 24 inches, anti-seep collars or sand diaphragm, and excavated plunge pool basin. Installed to stabilized the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 4000 cubic yards, 90 feet of 18" PVC, pipe with a canopy inlet, and 3 cubic yard sand diaphragm. A non-lined plunge pool protects the outlet channel. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$30,005.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #3 - Embankment, Pipe  $\geq$ 24 inch

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principle spillway pipe equal to or greater than 24 inches. Installed to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 10,000 cubic yards, corrugated metal drop inlet principle spillway with a 11 ft riser and 100 ft barrel, and 82 Square feet of anti-seep collars. A rock lined plunge pool protects the outlet channel. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$62,037.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #4 - Pipe Drop, Plastic

**Scenario Description:**

A pipe drop (i.e.: riser and barrel) grade stabilization structure designed and constructed using plastic pipe without anti-seep collars. This is typically an earthen dry dam structure with no permanent storage (water or sediment), however some structures may have some permanent pool / storage but do not have 35 years of sediment life. Payment rate is based upon the riser weir length (Diameter x 3.14) in feet times the length of the pipe barrel in (feet). Installed to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a 2000 CY structure with a 6 ft high 24" (2') PVC riser with a 40 ft long barrel (2' x 3.14 x 40' = 251 SF). Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), and Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Riser Weir Length x Barrel L

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 251.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,122.42

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$76.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #5 - Pipe Drop, Corrugated Metal Pipe

**Scenario Description:**

A pipe drop (i.e.: riser and barrel) grade stabilization structure designed and constructed with a metal anti-seep collar. This is typically a earthen dry dam structure with no permanent storage (water or sediment), however some structures may have some permanent pool / storage but do not have 35 years of sediment life. Payment rate is based upon the riser weir length (Diameter x 3.14) in feet times the length of the pipe barrel in (feet). Installed to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a corrugated metal pipe drop structure with a 30", 12' tall riser and a 100' long 24" barrel (Riser Weir length x Barrel Length = 2.5ft x 3.14 x 100ft = 785). Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), and Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Riser Weir Length x Barrel L

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 785.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,541.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$26.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #6 - Drop Structure, Box

**Scenario Description:**

A Straight, semicircular, or Box Drop structure composed of reinforced concrete used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a wall structure with a drop of 4 ft and weir length of 6 ft wide and is 6 ft deep with 3 ft above the crest. The unit of payment measurement is defined as cubic yards of concrete. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Concrete

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 11.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,394.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,217.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #7 - Drop Structure, Weir with Sheet Pile

**Scenario Description:**

A Straight structure composed of sheet pile metal used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a structure with a crest of 30 ft. The unit of payment measurement is defined as the area of sheet piling in square feet. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Sheet piling

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 350.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$28,050.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$80.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #8 - Drop Structure, Gabion Mattress

**Scenario Description:**

A Straight Drop structure constructed of rock riprap held in place by galvanized wire, such as, gabion baskets, fence panels, or "sausage" baskets. These structures are used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a gabion wall structure with a drop of 3ft and weir length of 18ft (54 square feet). The unit of payment measurement is defined as volume of rock used in the gabion basket or mat. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Gabion Rock

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 72.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,743.42 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$232.55

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #9 - Chute Structure, Concrete Block

**Scenario Description:**

A trapezoidal structure constructed of concrete masonry blocks. These structures are used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a concrete block structure with a drop of 5 feet and a width of 20 feet on a 10% slope. The unit of payment measurement is defined as the area covered by the concrete blocks in square feet. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Blocks

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,260.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,523.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #10 - Drop Structure, Precast Modular Blocks

**Scenario Description:**

A drop structure constructed of precast modular blocks, typically 2'x2'x4, 2.5'x2.5'x5', or 2'x2'x6'. These structures are used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a concrete block structure with a drop of 5 feet and a weir width of 12 feet with a stepped slope of 2:1 (H:V), for a total of 67 modular blocks. The unit of payment measurement is defined as the volume of concrete blocks in cubic yards. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Blocks

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$31,791.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$529.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #11 - Chute Structure, Rock

**Scenario Description:**

A trapezoidal structure constructed of rock riprap with a geotextile base. These structures are used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a rock chute with a vertical drop of 6.5 feet and a width of 12'. The unit of payment measurement is defined as the volume of rock used in the chute in cubic yards. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Rock

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 144.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$23,683.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$164.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #12 - Drop Structure, Concrete Block Mat

**Scenario Description:**

A drop structure placed in a water course constructed of concrete blocks joined by cable or other means to form a flexible mat. These structures are used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, prevent the formation/advancement of gullies, and enhance water quality and reduce pollution hazards. These are generally applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade, and vegetation alone will not protect the structure from erosion. The typical structure is 16' wide and removes 5' of grade in the channel with a 4:1 outlet slope. The unit of payment is the area of matting installed and includes inlet and outlet transition areas and side slopes. All associated earthwork and materials are included in the cost. Required re-vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342) or other appropriate seeding practices. Resource concerns addressed: gully erosion, concentrated flow erosion, degraded water quality due to suspended solids.

**Before Situation:**

The operator currently has gullies forming and/or advancing into crop or pasture land which negatively impacts the land use and downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies results in soil loss and allows soil and nutrients to be transported to down

**After Situation:**

The advancement of and/or formation of gullies is stopped, and soil from gullies no longer leaves the field. Land use is restored or maintained and sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and downstream water quality is protected. Other associated practices include: Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (366), Grassed waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Square Feet of Mat.

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,350.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,265.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #29 - Dam and Spillway, Rehabilitation

**Scenario Description:**

A previously built earthen embankment dam with a principal spillway pipe that is greater than 24" in diameter. Previously installed structure had embankment and pipe failure, and is in need of new pipe installation and embankment repair. Cost estimate is based upon shaping side slopes, replacing pipe and riser, and replacing with a typical amount of earthfill of 4250 cubic yards. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the structure and impacting the downstream water quality. Also presents a safety hazard of potential dam failure. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transpo

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Diameter Inch Foot of Barrel

**Scenario Unit:** Diameter Inch Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$37,818.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$15.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #32 - Drop Structure, Metal

**Scenario Description:**

A Straight, semicircular, or Box Drop structure composed of metal and used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a semicircular steel toe wall structure with a drop of 3ft and total weir length of 30 ft (13.4 feet in diameter with 4.5 foot sidewall extensions) and 11.3 foot long by 5.4 foot high headwalls. The unit of payment measurement is defined as the area of metal used to construct the headwalls and semicircular weir. Example:  $30 \times 3$  (weir length \* drop) +  $2 \times (11.3 \times 5.4)$  (two headwalls) = 212.04 (round to nearest foot). Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Total Area of Metal Walls an

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 212.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,270.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$67.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #111 - Embankment, Soil Treatment

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principal spillway pipe where on site soils are not acceptable and require extra processing or hauling from off farm, distances greater than one mile. Installed to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 2,500 cubic yards, 90 feet of 10" pipe, pipe with a canopy inlet, and 3 cubic yard sand diaphragm. A non-lined plunge pool protects the outlet channel. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$30,381.54

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #112 - Pipe, Less Than or Equal to 6 Inch

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principal spillway pipe of 6 inches or less. Assessment shows anti-seep collars or sand diaphragms are not required. To stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 2,000 cubic yards, and 80 feet of pipe 6" PVC pipe with a canopy inlet. A small, non-lined plunge pool protects the outlet channel. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,048.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #113 - Pipe, 8 to 12 Inch

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principle spillway pipe between 8 and 12 inches, anti-seep collars or sand diaphragm, and excavated plunge pool basin. Installed to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 2,500 cubic yards, 90 feet of 10" pipe with a canopy inlet, and 3 cubic yard sand diaphragm. A non-lined plunge pool protects the outlet channel. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,559.04

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #114 - Pipe, Greater Than 12 Inch

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment dam with a principle spillway pipe greater than 12 inches. Installed to stabilized the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a typical amount of earthfill of 2,500 cubic yards, smooth steel drop inlet principle spillway with a 7 ft riser and 90 ft barrel, and 82 Square feet of anti-seep collars. A rock lined plunge pool protects the outlet channel. Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Livestock Pipeline (516) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$27,254.14

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #115 - Pipe Drop, Steel

**Scenario Description:**

A full flow pipe drop (i.e.: riser and barrel) grade stabilization structure designed and constructed with a metal anti-seep collar. This is typically a earthen dry dam structure with no permanent storage (water or sediment), however some structures may have some permanent pool / storage but do not have 35 years of sediment life. Payment rate is based upon the riser weir length (Diameter x 3.14) in feet times the length of the pipe barrel in (feet). Installed to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a smooth steel pipe drop structure with a 36", 12' tall riser and a 100' long 30" barrel (Riser Weir length x Barrel Length = 3ft x 3.14 x 30ft = 940). Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), and Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Riser Weir Length x Barrel L

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 940.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,772.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$21.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #117 - Drop Structure, Weir

**Scenario Description:**

A Straight, semicircular, or Box Drop structure composed of metal or reinforced concrete used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a semicircular steel toe wall structure with a drop of 3ft and weir length of 30ft (90 square feet). The unit of payment measurement is defined as weir length times drop in "feet". The drop (feet) is defined as the structure inlet crest elevation minus the control outlet elevation (i.e.: outlet apron elevation). Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Feet of Weir length times Dr

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 90.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,780.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$153.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 410 - Grade Stabilization Structure

**Scenario:** #118 - Rock Drop

**Scenario Description:**

A Straight Drop structure constructed of rock riprap held in place by galvanized wire, such as, gabion baskets, fence panels, or "sausage" baskets. These structures are used to stabilize the grade and control erosion in natural or artificial channels, to prevent the formation or advancing of gullies, and to enhance environmental quality and reduce pollution hazards. Applied in areas where the concentration and flow velocity of water require structures to stabilize the grade in channels or to control gully erosion. Cost estimate is based upon a gabion wall structure with a drop of 3ft and weir length of 8ft (48 square feet). The unit of payment measurement is defined as weir length times drop in "feet". The drop (feet) is defined as the structure inlet crest elevation minus the control outlet elevation (i.e.: outlet apron elevation). Disturbed areas are protected with permanent vegetative cover. Addresses resource concerns such as soil erosion-concentrated flow erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently has gullies forming and/or worsening on the farmland and impacting the useable area and the downstream water quality. Erosion from the gullies is allowing soil and possibly nutrients to be transported to downstream receiving waters

**After Situation:**

Area is stabilized. The advancement and/or formation of gullies is stopped, soil from gullies no longer leaves the farm, useable farm area is increased, sedimentation and other pollution hazards are decreased, and water quality downstream is protected. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Pond (378), Dam (402), Fence (382), Channel Bed Stabilization (584), Dike (356), Grassed Waterway (412), Structure for Water Control (587), Subsurface Drain (606), and Underground Outlet (620) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Feet of Weir length times Dr

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 48.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,478.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$114.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 412 - Grassed Waterway

**Scenario:** #1 - Waterway, less than 25 ft<sup>2</sup>

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 1500' long, 12' bottom, 8:1 side slopes, 1.1' depth. A grass waterway that is a shaped or graded channel and is established with suitable vegetation to carry surface water at a non-erosive velocity to a stable outlet. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion (Classic Gully & Ephemeral Erosion) and Excessive Sediment in surface waters. Waterway area measured from top of bank to top of bank. Seeding will be completed under the Critical Area Planting (342) Practice Standard with seeding area up to 20% greater than waterway area to account for buffer area along the waterway. Costs include excavation and associated work to construct the overall shape and grade of the waterway. This scenario would apply to Grassed Waterways with a design cross sectional area less than 25 square feet per lineal foot of waterway.

**Before Situation:**

The field has a small gully which is cutting deeper into the field as time goes on, so it needs to be stopped or controlled. Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result from ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Gully has formed in field as a result

**After Situation:**

Installed grassed waterway is 1500' long, 12' bottom, 8:1 side slopes, 1.1' depth. The practice is installed using a dozer and/or scraper, with final grading with motor grader. Use Critical Area Planting (342) for establishment of waterway vegetation. If erosion control blankets or mulching for seedbed establishment/protection are needed, use conservation practice Mulching (484). Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606). Outlets, if needed will be installed using Structure for Water Control (587). If inlet Structures are needed with the drainage tile, then those will be installed using Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Acre of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,055.69 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,956.55

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 412 - Grassed Waterway

**Scenario:** #2 - Waterway, 25 to 50 ft2

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 1500' long, 12' bottom, 8:1 side slopes, 1.5' depth. A grass waterway that is a shaped or graded channel and is established with suitable vegetation to carry surface water at a non-erosive velocity to a stable outlet. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion (Classic Gully & Ephemeral Erosion) and Excessive Sediment in surface waters. Waterway area measured from top of bank to top of bank. Seeding will be completed under the Critical Area Planting (342) Practice Standard with seeding area up to 20% greater than waterway area to account for buffer area along the waterway. Costs include excavation and associated work to construct the overall shape and grade of the waterway. This scenario would apply to Grassed Waterways with a design cross sectional area greater than 25 square feet up to 50 square feet per lineal foot of waterway.

**Before Situation:**

The field has a small gully which is cutting deeper into the field as time goes on, so it needs to be stopped or controlled. Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result from ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Gully has formed in field as a result

**After Situation:**

Installed grassed waterway is 1500' long, 12' bottom, 8:1 side slopes, 1.5' depth. The practice is installed using a dozer and/or scraper, with final grading with motor grader. Use Critical Area Planting (342) for establishment of waterway vegetation. If erosion control blankets or mulching for seedbed establishment/protection are needed, use conservation practice Mulching (484). Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606). Outlets, if needed will be installed using Structure for Water Control (587). If inlet Structures are needed with the drainage tile, then those will be installed using Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Acre of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.2

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,391.83 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,961.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 412 - Grassed Waterway

**Scenario:** #3 - Waterway, 50 to 100 ft<sup>2</sup>

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 2000' long, 40' bottom, 6:1 side slopes, 1.6' depth. A grass waterway that is a shaped or graded channel and is established with suitable vegetation to carry surface water at a non-erosive velocity to a stable outlet. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion (Classic Gully & Ephemeral Erosion) and Excessive Sediment in surface waters. Waterway area measured from top of bank to top of bank. Seeding will be completed under the Critical Area Planting (342) Practice Standard with seeding area up to 20% greater than waterway area to account for buffer area along the waterway. Costs include excavation and associated work to construct the overall shape and grade of the waterway. This scenario would apply to Grassed Waterways with a design cross sectional area from 51 square feet up to 100 square feet per lineal foot of waterway.

**Before Situation:**

The field has a small gully which is cutting deeper into the field as time goes on, so it needs to be stopped or controlled. Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result from ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Gully has formed in field as a result

**After Situation:**

Installed grassed waterway is 2000' long, 40' bottom, 6:1 side slopes, 1.8' depth. The practice is installed using a dozer and/or scraper, with final grading with motor grader. Use Critical Area Planting (342) for establishment of waterway vegetation. If erosion control blankets or mulching for seedbed establishment/protection are needed, use conservation practice Mulching (484). Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606). Outlets, if needed will be installed using Structure for Water Control (587). If inlet Structures are needed with the drainage tile, then those will be installed using Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Acre of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.7

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,637.74 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,219.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 412 - Grassed Waterway

**Scenario:** #5 - Waterway with Side Dikes or Checks

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 2000' long, 40' bottom, 6:1 side slopes, 1.6' depth. A grass waterway that is a shaped or graded channel and is established with suitable vegetation to carry surface water at a non-erosive velocity to a stable outlet. Fabric or stone checks are installed every 100 feet along the length of the waterway perpendicular to waterflow and are 2/3 the waterway top width to reduce maintenance and provide temporary protection until vegetation is established. Fabric Checks are installed 18" deep with 12" laid over on the surface. (Alternatively, rock checks or side dikes could be installed). This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion (Classic Gully & Ephemeral Erosion) and Excessive Sediment in surface waters. Waterway area measured from top of bank to top of bank. Seeding will be completed under the Critical Area Planting (342) Practice Standard with seeding area up to 20% greater than waterway area to account for buffer area along the waterway. Costs include excavation and associated work to construct the overall shape and grade of the waterway.

**Before Situation:**

The field has a small gully which is cutting deeper into the field as time goes on, so it needs to be stopped or controlled. Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result from ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Gully has formed in field as a result

**After Situation:**

Installed grassed waterway is 2000' long, 40' bottom, 6:1 side slopes, 1.8' depth. Fabric checks are installed every 100 feet along the length of the waterway. The practice is installed using a dozer and/or scraper, with final grading with motor grader. Fabric or stone checks are installed with small backhoe and labor. Use Critical Area Planting (342) for establishment of waterway vegetation. If erosion control blankets or mulching for seedbed establishment/protection are needed, use conservation practice Mulching (484). Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606). Outlets, if needed will be installed using Structure for Water Control (587). If inlet Structures are needed with the drainage tile, then those will be installed using Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Acre of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.7

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,732.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,622.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #172 - High Species Diversity on Fallow or Non-Cropland, no Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A wildlife habitat evaluation or plant community inventory indicates a potential to improve wildlife habitat by altering the current vegetation conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) by establishing herbaceous plants. This practice scenario applies to areas not in production (e.g. – fallow areas, forest understory, and non-cropped areas in and around crop fields). Control or suppression of a well-established existing stand of undesirable vegetation should have been completed prior to implementation of this practice scenario through successful implementation of other practice standards, including CPS 314 or CPS 315. This scenario, when appropriately installed, will address the inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern by planting a moderately diverse mix of seeds that is readily available for purchase from multiple vendors in combination with minor seed bed preparation. Seed is typically not available from traditional agricultural vendors and requires making a special order or ordering online. Other practices are planned and installed after planting to manage the habitat as needed.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and do not have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria through vegetative management activities alone. Current conditions and ma

**After Situation:**

Desired species have been planted and the Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. The area will provide the identified habitat requirements for target species and will meet or exceed planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** acres planted (per acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,539.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$707.94

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #173 - Specialized Habitat Requirements on Non-Cropland, no Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A wildlife habitat evaluation or plant community inventory indicates a potential to improve wildlife habitat by altering the current vegetation conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) by establishing herbaceous plants. This practice scenario applies to areas not in production (e.g. – fallow areas, forest understory, and non-cropped areas in and around crop fields). Control or suppression of a well-established existing stand of undesirable vegetation should have been completed prior to implementation of this practice scenario through successful implementation of other practice standards, including CPS 314 or CPS 315. This scenario, when appropriately installed, will address the inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern by planting a specialized and often diverse mix of seeds that is NOT readily available for purchase, in combination with minor seed bed preparation. Seed is not available from traditional agricultural vendors and requires making a special order. Cost of seed is high due to limited availability and plant materials selected are needed to meet specific habitat requirements or ecosystem functions. Other practices are planned and installed after planting to manage the habitat as needed.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and do not have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria through vegetative management activities alone. Current conditions and ma

**After Situation:**

Desired species have been planted and the Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. The area will provide the identified habitat requirements for target species and will meet or exceed planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** acres planted (per acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,750.09 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,550.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #174 - High Species Diversity on Cropland with Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A wildlife habitat evaluation or plant community inventory indicates a potential to improve wildlife habitat by altering the current vegetation conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) and changing use (annual crop to permanent vegetation) by establishing herbaceous plants. This practice scenario applies to cropland currently in production. The inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern is met by planting a moderately diverse mix of seeds that is readily available for purchase from multiple vendors in combination with minor seed bed preparation. Seed is typically not available from traditional agricultural vendors and requires making a special order or ordering online. Weed pressure is minimal due to current and past management. Control or suppression of existing undesirable vegetation is accomplished through a single herbicide treatment. Post-planting weed treatment, beyond normal practice maintenance if necessary, will be accomplished by applying additional practice standards as appropriate.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and do not have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria through vegetative management activities alone. Current conditions and ma

**After Situation:**

The land is no longer in crop production. Desired species have been planted and the Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. As a result, the site will meet or exceed planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** acres planted (per acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,666.11 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,133.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #175 - Specialized Habitat Requirements on Cropland with Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A wildlife habitat evaluation or plant community inventory indicates a potential to improve wildlife habitat by altering the current vegetation conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) and changing use (annual crop to permanent vegetation) by establishing herbaceous plants. This practice scenario applies to cropland currently in production. The inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern is met by planting a specialized and often diverse mix of seeds that is NOT readily available for purchase, in combination with minor seed bed preparation. Seed is not available from traditional agricultural vendors and requires making a special order. Cost of seed is high due to limited availability and plant materials selected are needed to meet specific habitat requirements or ecosystem functions. Weed pressure is minimal due to current and past management. Control or suppression of existing undesirable vegetation is accomplished through a single herbicide treatment. Post-planting weed treatment, beyond normal practice maintenance if necessary, will be accomplished by applying additional practice standards as appropriate.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and do not have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria through vegetative management activities alone. Current conditions and ma

**After Situation:**

The land is no longer in crop production. Desired species have been planted and the Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. As a result, the site will meet or exceed planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** acres planted (per acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,872.20 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,774.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #177 - Low Species Diversity on Non-Cropland, no Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A wildlife habitat evaluation or plant community inventory indicates a potential to improve wildlife habitat by altering the current vegetation conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) by establishing herbaceous plants. This practice scenario applies to areas not in production (e.g. – fallow areas, forest understory, and non-cropped areas in and around crop fields). Control or suppression of a well-established existing stand of undesirable vegetation should have been completed prior to implementation of this practice scenario through successful implementation of other practice standards, including CPS 314 or CPS 315. This scenario, when appropriately installed, will address the inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern by planting a low diversity, low cost mix of readily available seeds in combination with minor seed bed preparation. Other practices are planned and installed after planting to manage the habitat as needed.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and do not have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria through vegetative management activities alone. Current conditions and ma

**After Situation:**

Desired species have been planted and the Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. The area will provide the identified habitat requirements for target species and will meet or exceed planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** acres planted (per acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,811.83

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$362.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #178 - Low Species Diversity on Cropland with Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

A wildlife habitat evaluation or plant community inventory indicates a potential to improve wildlife habitat by altering the current vegetation conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) and changing use (annual crop to permanent vegetation) by establishing herbaceous plants. This practice scenario applies to cropland currently in production. The inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern is met by planting a low diversity, low cost mix of readily available seeds in combination with minor seed bed preparation. Weed pressure is minimal due to current and past management. Control or suppression of existing undesirable vegetation is accomplished through a single herbicide treatment. Post-planting weed treatment, beyond normal practice maintenance if necessary, will be accomplished by applying additional practice standards as appropriate.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and do not have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria through vegetative management activities alone. Current conditions and ma

**After Situation:**

The land is no longer in crop production. Desired species have been planted and the Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. As a result, the site will meet or exceed planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** acres planted (per acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,436.10

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$687.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Scenario:** #272 - Very Small Acreage (<.5 ac) Planting with Seedlings

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is applicable to very small areas (typical size is ¼ acre) in need of wildlife habitat establishment by planting of potted plants, plugs, or similar non-seed plant materials. A wildlife habitat evaluation found the need to improve habitat by altering the current vegetative conditions (diversity, richness, structure or pattern). Potted herbaceous plants and/or shrubs are planted in 6' rows and a 4' spacing (1815 plants/acre) to facilitate access of the site with mechanical equipment (e.g., ATV, hand or riding mower) for weed control or other management after establishment. The site preparation requires treatment with broad spectrum herbicide to kill the existing vegetation. Then tillage, smoothing and firming of the soil is conducted prior to planting the plant materials.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetative habitat conditions (species diversity, richness, structure and pattern) do not meet planning criteria and have the potential to meet or exceed the minimum criteria. Current conditions and management are insufficient to address identified limitations.

**After Situation:**

The Wildlife Habitat Planting criteria have been successfully implemented. The site has been mechanically and chemically treated and planting has occurred. The area is adequately stocked with desired species and full coverage of permanent vegetation is expected. The vegetative cover will provide the desired habitat requirements for target wildlife. The site meets or exceeds planning criteria for inadequate wildlife habitat.

**Feature Measure:** sq ft planted (1/4 acre)

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10,890.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,576.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 422 - Hedgerow Planting

**Scenario:** #1 - Bareroot, machine plant (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is for machine planting of bareroot woody species. Typically installed in or at the edge of cropland or pasture this scenario is used to address Wind Erosion and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife resource concerns. Specifically, the establishment of dense vegetation in a linear design can be used to reduce erosion caused by wind and provide for several habitat elements depending on the needs identified in the habitat assessment. Tree rows are spaced 15 feet apart. Depending on design and plant species selection, this scenario can provide: habitat connectivity, food, and cover for wildlife . The 422 standard for wildlife criteria calls for a minimum of two species of native plants. Typical installation involves tillage to prepare the site for planting using Site Preparation (490). Trees and/or shrubs adapted for local climatic and soil conditions are typically planted at 8 foot intervals (this will vary with species selection and density goals). Plant species adapted to the local climatic and soil conditions that address the resource concern will be stated in the specification for the site. There is tremendous overlap between this practice and conservation practice 380 Windbreak/Shelterbelt establishment. The main difference is that conservation practice 380 is exclusively woody plants where practice 422 provides for the use of herbaceous materials. If a fence is needed to facilitate establishment use practice 382, Fence. Seedbed preparation will be completed thru 490, Tree/Shrub Site Preparation.

**Before Situation:**

Erosion by wind exceeds soil loss tolerance. Habitat patches lack connectivity and cover is inadequate to allow wildlife to exploit cropland food resources.

**After Situation:**

Erosion by wind is reduced to tolerable limits. Inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife is addressed for needs identified in the resource assessment. Habitat patches are connected by dense hedgerow vegetation. Food resources in crop fields are made available by their proximity to hedgerow cover. Planting may include fruit and mast (fruit produced by trees such as nuts) bearing species, improving food supply, depending on needs being addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Hedgerow

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,031.42 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 422 - Hedgerow Planting

**Scenario:** #2 - Container, Machine Plant (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is for machine planting of containerized woody species. Typically installed in or at the edge of cropland or pasture this scenario is used to address Wind Erosion and Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife resource concerns. Specifically, the establishment of dense vegetation in a linear design can be used to reduce erosion caused by wind and provide for several habitat elements depending on the needs identified in a habitat assessment. Tree rows are spaced 15 feet apart. Depending on design and plant species selection, this scenario can provide: habitat connectivity, food, and cover for wildlife. The 422 standard for wildlife criteria calls for a minimum of two species of native plants. Typical installation involves tillage to prepare the site for planting using Site Preparation (490). Trees and/or shrubs adapted for local climatic and edaphic (pertaining to the soil) conditions are typically planted at 8 foot intervals (this will vary with species selection and density goals). Plant species adapted to the local climatic and edaphic conditions that address the resource concern will be stated in the specification for the site. There is tremendous overlap between this practice and conservation practice 380 Windbreak/Shelterbelt establishment. The main difference is that conservation practice 380 is exclusively woody plants where practice 422 provides for the use of herbaceous materials. If a fence is needed to facilitate establishment use practice 382, Fence. Seedbed preparation will be completed thru 490, Tree/Shrub Site Preparation.

**Before Situation:**

Erosion by wind exceeds soil loss tolerance. Habitat patches lack connectivity and cover is inadequate to allow wildlife to exploit cropland food resources.

**After Situation:**

Erosion by wind is reduced to tolerable limits. Inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife is addressed for needs identified in the resource assessment. Habitat patches are connected by dense hedgerow vegetation. Food resources in crop fields are made available by their proximity to hedgerow cover. Planting may include fruit and mast (fruit of trees such as nuts) bearing species, improving food supply, depending on needs being addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Hedgerow

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,164.83

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 422 - Hedgerow Planting

**Scenario:** #12 - Pollinator Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

In addition to the traditional hedgerow purposes where pollinator habitat is an additional wildlife habitat concern this scenario addresses the resource concern of inadequate fish and wildlife habitat. It provides both physical habitat by providing areas that are not disturbed by annual tillage and supplemental pollen and nectar by establishing flowering Trees or shrubs. Typical installation is in or at the edge of cropland or pasture. Typical installation involves tillage to prepare the site for planting. Flowering trees and shrubs adapted for local climatic and edaphic conditions are typically planted at eight foot intervals (this will vary with species selection and density goals). A native grass adapted to the local climatic and edaphic conditions will be drilled into the site at a rate that will achieve a minimum of 20 seeds per square foot. Species adapted to local climatic and edaphic conditions will be listed in the specification for the site. There is tremendous overlap between this practice and conservation practice 380 Windbreak/Shelterbelt establishment. The main difference is that conservation practice 380 is exclusively woody plants where practice 422 provides for the use of herbaceous materials. If a fence is needed to facilitate establishment use practice 382, Fence.

**Before Situation:**

Pollen and nectar sources are lacking or are only available for part of the growing season. Large cropland tracks lack undisturbed areas for ground nesting bees

**After Situation:**

Flowering plants supply pollen and nectar throughout the growing season. Undisturbed areas provide nesting sites for bees and other native pollinators.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Hedgerow

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,297.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 422 - Hedgerow Planting

**Scenario:** #13 - Wildlife, Warm Season Grass

**Scenario Description:**

Typically installed in or at the edge of cropland or pasture this scenario is used to address the Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife resource concern. Specifically, the establishment of dense vegetation in a linear design can be used to provide for several habitat elements depending on the needs identified in the habitat assessment. This scenario can provide: habitat connectivity, food, and cover for wildlife depending on design and plant species selection. The 422 standard for wildlife criteria calls for a minimum of two species of native plants. Typical installation involves tillage to prepare the site for planting. 2 Trees and/or shrubs adapted for local climatic and edaphic conditions are typically plant at eight foot intervals (this will vary with species selection and density goals). A mix of 2 native warm season grasses adapted to the local climatic and edaphic conditions will be drilled into the site at a rate that will achieve a minimum of 20 seeds per square foot. The species list in the component section of this scenario are strictly for deriving a cost. Plant species adapted to the local climatic and edaphic conditions that address the resource concern will be stated in the specification for the site. There is tremendous overlap between this practice and conservation practice 380 Windbreak/Shelterbelt establishment. The main difference is that conservation practice 380 is exclusively woody plants where practice 422 provides for the use of herbaceous materials. If a fence is needed to facilitate establishment use practice 382, Fence.

**Before Situation:**

Habitat patches lack connectivity. Cover is inadequate to allow wildlife to exploit cropland food resources. Berries and mast are limited.

**After Situation:**

Inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife is addressed for needs identified in the resource assessment. Habitat patches are connected by dense hedgerow vegetation. Food resources in crop fields are made available by their proximity to hedgerow cover. Planting may include fruit and mast bearing species, improving food supply, depending on needs being addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Hedgerow

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,379.48 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 422 - Hedgerow Planting

**Scenario:** #14 - Wildlife machine plant

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is for machine planting of woody species. Typically installed in or at the edge of cropland or pasture this scenario is used to address the Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife resource concern. Specifically, the establishment of dense vegetation in a linear design can be used to provide for several habitat elements depending on the needs identified in the habitat assessment. This scenario can provide: habitat connectivity, food, and cover for wildlife depending on design and plant species selection. The 422 standard for wildlife criteria calls for a minimum of two species of native plants. Typical installation involves tillage to prepare the site for planting. 2 Trees and/or shrubs adapted for local climatic and edaphic conditions are typically plant at eight foot intervals (this will vary with species selection and density goals). A mix of 2 native grasses adapted to the local climatic and edaphic conditions will be drilled into the site at a rate that will achieve a minimum of 20 seeds per square foot. The species list in the component section of this scenario are strictly for deriving a cost. Plant species adapted to the local climatic and edaphic conditions that address the resource concern will be stated in the specification for the site. There is tremendous overlap between this practice and conservation practice 380 Windbreak/Shelterbelt establishment. The main difference is that conservation practice 380 is exclusively woody plants where practice 422 provides for the use of herbaceous materials. If a fence is needed to facilitate establishment use practice 382, Fence.

**Before Situation:**

Habitat patches lack connectivity. Cover is inadequate to allow wildlife to exploit cropland food resources. Berries and mast are limited.

**After Situation:**

Inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife is addressed for needs identified in the resource assessment. Habitat patches are connected by dense hedgerow vegetation. Food resources in crop fields are made available by their proximity to hedgerow cover. Planting may include fruit and mast bearing species, improving food supply, depending on needs being addressed.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Hedgerow

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$693.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.87

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 422 - Hedgerow Planting

**Scenario:** #21 - Contour

**Scenario Description:**

Typically installation of this scenario is within an annually cropped field. The hedge row is planted on the contour to provide a physical and visual aid to contour farming. This scenario is used to facilitate additional measures that address the resource concerns of; sheet and rill soil erosion and Water Quality Degradation, excess sediment in surface waters. Trees, shrubs, and grasses adapted for local climatic and edaphic conditions are typically planted at eight foot intervals (this will vary with species selection and density goals). Species selected should be at least three feet tall at maturity. There is tremendous overlap between this practice and conservation practice 380 Windbreak/Shelterbelt establishment. The main difference is that conservation practice 380 is exclusively woody plants where practice 422 provides for the use of herbaceous materials. If a fence is needed to facilitate establishment use practice 382, Fence.

**Before Situation:**

Contour farming practices are made difficult or less effective due to a lack of visual clues as to the location of the contours. Soil is lost to sheet and rill erosion. Sediments are deposited into surface waters.

**After Situation:**

Hedgerow planted on the contour presents a physical and visual guide for tillage and planting operations on the contour. Soil erosion from sheet and rill sources is reduced and the resultant deposition of sediment to surface waters is in turn reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Hedgerow

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,261.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 428 - Irrigation Ditch Lining

**Scenario:** #10 - Concrete Lining

**Scenario Description:**

Construct quarter mile of concrete (2.5 inch in thickness) lining in an existing ditch alignment to convey water from the source of supply to a field or fields in a farm distribution system. Typical scenario includes filling the old ditch with on-site fill material, compacting, and constructing an 8 ft pad with on site fill material. This scenario does not include any check or outlets gates. A trapezoidal trencher forms the ditch (typical cross-section: 1 ft bottom, 2 ft depth including freeboard, and 1:1 side slope) and lining with concrete slip forms (total width = 7.32 ft). Resource Concerns: Insufficient water - Inefficient use of irrigation water; Soil erosion - Excessive bank erosion from streams shorelines or channels. Associated Practices: 320-Irrigation Canal or Lateral; 388-Irrigation Field Ditch; 443-Irrigation System, Surface or Subsurface Water; 533-Pumping Plant; 430-Irrigation Pipeline; 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Before Situation:**

Leaky and erosive earthen irrigation ditch.

**After Situation:**

Impervious lining prevents seepage, reduces energy use and improves water quality and irrigation efficiency.

**Feature Measure:** Surface Area of Lining

**Scenario Unit:** Square Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,074.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$22,880.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$21.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 428 - Irrigation Ditch Lining

**Scenario:** #11 - Flexible Lining

**Scenario Description:**

Construct quarter mile of uncovered flexible membrane (30mil HDPE) lining in an existing ditch alignment to convey water from the source of supply to a field or fields in a farm distribution system. Typical scenario includes subgrade preparation via clearing & grubbing, shaping old channel with no bedding or geotextile cushion to place, and placing membrane with 8 inch tuck/anchor on each side (total liner width = 8 ft). Scenario assumes typical trapezoidal ditch (1 ft bottom, 2 ft depth including freeboard, and 1:1 side slope). Resource Concerns: Insufficient water - Inefficient use of irrigation water; Soil erosion - Excessive bank erosion from streams shorelines or channels. Associated Practices: 320-Irrigation Canal or Lateral; 388-Irrigation Field Ditch; 443-Irrigation System, Surface or Subsurface Water; 533-Pumping Plant; 430-Irrigation Pipeline; 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Before Situation:**

Leaky and erosive earthen irrigation ditch.

**After Situation:**

Impervious lining prevents seepage, reduces energy use and improves water quality and irrigation efficiency.

**Feature Measure:** Surface Area of Lining

**Scenario Unit:** Square Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,173.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,385.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 430 - Irrigation Pipeline

**Scenario:** #1 - PVC, by the pound

**Scenario Description:**

Description: Below ground installation of PVC pipeline. Typical practice sizes range from 6-inch to 12-inch. Construct 1,300 feet of 6-inch, pressure rating 80 psi (SDR 51), PVC plastic irrigation pipe (PIP) with appurtenances, installed below ground with a minimum of 2.5 feet of ground cover. The unit is weight of pipe in pounds. 1,300 feet of 6-inch, SDR 51 PVC PIP weighs 1.49 lb./ft, or a total of 1,937 pounds. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, dog-legs (risers), and inline valves. Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. Resource Concerns: Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water; Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: 436 - Irrigation Reservoir; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 442 - Irrigation System, Sprinkler; 443 - Irrigation System, Surface & Subsurface; 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery; 533 - Pumping Plant

**Before Situation:**

Pipeline needed to replace or supplement inefficient irrigation conveyance systems.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline installed to convey and/or distribute water to irrigation systems, minimizing non-beneficial water use, reducing soil erosion, and/or reducing energy use.

**Feature Measure:** Weight of pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Pound

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,937.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,888.27

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 430 - Irrigation Pipeline

**Scenario:** #33 - PVC, by pound, boring

**Scenario Description:**

Below ground installation of PVC pipeline. Typical practice sizes range from 6-inch to 12-inch. Construct 1,300 feet of 6-inch, pressure rating 80 psi (SDR 51), PVC plastic irrigation pipe (PIP) with appurtenances, installed below ground with a minimum of 2.5 feet of ground cover. Includes boring 52 lineal feet under a heavily used road, such as a state or county highway which has an average of 12' wide lanes, 6' shoulder width, and 8' width sideslopes. The unit is weight of pipe in pounds. 1,300 feet of 6-inch, SDR 51 PVC PIP weighs 1.49 lb./ft, or a total of 1,937 pounds. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, dog-legs (risers), and inline valves. Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. Resource Concerns: Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water; Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: 436 - Irrigation Reservoir; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 442 - Irrigation System, Sprinkler; 443 - Irrigation System, Surface &Subsurface; 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery; 533 -Pumping Plant

**Before Situation:**

Pipeline needed to replace or supplement inefficient irrigation conveyance systems.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline installed to convey and/or distribute water to irrigation systems, minimizing non-beneficial water use, reducing soil erosion, and/or reducing energy use.

**Feature Measure:** weight of pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Pound

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,937.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,526.21

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 430 - Irrigation Pipeline

**Scenario:** #97 - PVC (Iron Pipe Size), less than or equal to 4 inch, Small Scale System

**Scenario Description:**

Below ground installation of PVC (Iron Pipe Size) pipeline. PVC (IPS) is manufactured in sizes (nominal diameter) from ½-inch to 36-inch; typical practice sizes range from 2-inch to 24-inch; and typical scenario size is 3-inch. Construct 260 feet of 3-inch, Class 125 (SDR-32.5), PVC pipeline with appurtenances, installed below ground with a minimum of 2 feet of ground cover. The unit is weight of pipe material in pounds. 260 feet of 3-inch, Class 125 (SDR-32.5) PVC pipe weighs 0.730 lb./ft, or a total of 189.8 pounds. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. Resource Concerns: Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water; Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: 436 - Irrigation Reservoir; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 442 - Irrigation System, Sprinkler; 443 - Irrigation System, Surface &Subsurface; 447 - Irrigation and Drainage Tailwater Recovery; 533 - Pumping Plant; 634 - Waste Transfer.

**Before Situation:**

Pipeline needed to replace or supplement inefficient irrigation conveyance systems.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline installed to convey and/or distribute water to irrigation systems or reservoirs, minimizing non-beneficial water use, reducing soil erosion, and/or reducing energy use.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 260.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,788.01

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 430 - Irrigation Pipeline

**Scenario:** #98 - HDPE (Iron Pipe Size and Tubing), less than or equal to 2 inch, Small Scale, No Joint Fusing

**Scenario Description:**

Below ground installation of HDPE (Iron Pipe Size & Tubing) pipeline. HDPE (IPS & Tubing) is manufactured in sizes (nominal diameter) from ½-inch to 24-inch; and typical scenario size is 1-inch. Construct 260 feet of 1-inch, Class 130 (SDR 13.5), HDPE pipeline with appurtenances, installed below ground with a minimum 2 feet of ground cover. The unit is weight of pipe material in pounds. 260 feet of 1-inch, Class 130 (SDR-13.5), HDPE weighs 0.16 lb./ft, or a total of 42 pounds. Appurtenances include: fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. Resource Concerns: Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water; Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: 436 - Irrigation Reservoir; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 442 - Irrigation System, Sprinkler; 443 - Irrigation System, Surface & Subsurface; 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery; 533 - Pumping Plant; 634 - Waste Transfer

**Before Situation:**

Pipeline needed to replace or supplement inefficient irrigation conveyance systems.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline installed to convey and/or distribute water to irrigation systems or reservoirs, minimizing non-beneficial water use, reducing soil erosion, and/or reducing energy use.

**Feature Measure:** Weight of Pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Pound

**Scenario Typical Size:** 42.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,044.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 432 - Dry Hydrant

**Scenario:** #6 - PVC

**Scenario Description:**

A non-pressurized permanent PVC pipe assembly system installed into an adequate water source with an all weather access that permits the withdrawal of water by suction for fire suppression, livestock, small acreage irrigation, or wetland management. The location must have an adequate volume of water available, facilitate movement to and from the hydrant site, and where a source of water is needed for fire suppression, livestock, small acreage irrigation, or wetland management.

**Before Situation:**

A location where an adequate volume of water is available, facilitate movement to and from the hydrant site, and where an adequate source of water is needed for fire suppression, livestock, small acreage irrigation, or wetland management

**After Situation:**

The typical dry hydrant will use 200 ft. of 6 inch PVC pipe, installed into an adequate water source with an all weather access that permits the withdrawal of water by suction. The pipe is fitted with an intake strainer and hydrant head for quick connect/release. Plastic pipe is protected from ultraviolet rays. The dry hydrant is constructed by installing the pipe using a backhoe or other trenching equipment. Vegetation of disturbed areas will be completed under critical area planting (342). All weather access will use Heavy Use Area Protection (561). Erosion control during construction activities will use Stormwater Runoff Control (570). Other associated practices include Pond (378), Dam (402), Access Road (560), and Access Control (472).

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,691.03

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,691.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation

**Scenario:** #2 - Surface PE, with emitters, trees and shrubs

**Scenario Description:**

A micro-irrigation system, utilizing surface PE tubing (can be placed on trellis or above ground) with emitters to provide irrigation for an orchard, vineyard, windbreak, or other specialty crop grown in a grid pattern. The typical system is a permanent system, installed on a 3 row 1000' windbreak on the ground surface (total of 3000' lf). The windbreak has a plant spacing of 8 feet between trees. This system utilizes emitters at each tree or plant as the water application device, amounting to 375 emitters for this system. This system typically includes a filter system, PE tubing, HDPE or PVC manifolds, emitters, etc. This practice applies to systems designed to discharge < 60 gal/hr. at each individual lateral discharge point. Does not include Pump, Power source, Water source (well or reservoir). Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 380-Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment, 533-Pumping Plant, 449- Irrigation Water Management, 430 - Irrigation Pipeline, 433 - Irrigation Flow Measurement, 610 - Salinity & Sodic Soil Management, 434 - Soil Moisture Measurement, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, and 590 Nutrient Management.

**Before Situation:**

A tree row has an insufficient available water source causing plant health (establishment and persistence) concerns.

**After Situation:**

A surface placed microirrigation system is utilized to provide highly efficient irrigation to a tree row to address plant health concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number of trees or shrubs

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 375.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,468.52 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation

**Scenario:** #3 - Surface PE, with emitters, high tunnel

**Scenario Description:**

A micro-irrigation system, utilizing surface PE tubing (can be placed on trellis or above ground) with emitters to provide irrigation in a seasonal high tunnel used for various vegetables or specialty crops grown in a grid pattern. The typical system is a permanent system, installed in a 30 ft by 72 ft high tunnel, with crop rows spaced at 12" to 18" with narrow alley walkways every other row. This system utilizes emitters at or near each plant as the water application device. This system typically includes a filter system, PE tubing, HDPE or PVC manifolds, emitters, etc. This practice applies to systems designed to discharge < 60 gal/hr. at each individual lateral discharge point. Does not include Pump, Power source, Water source (well or reservoir). Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 798-Seasonal High Tunnel System for Crops, 533-Pumping Plant, 449- Irrigation Water Management, 430 - Irrigation Pipeline, 433 - Irrigation Flow Measurement, 610 - Salinity & Sodic Soil Management, 434 - Soil Moisture Measurement, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, and 590 Nutrient Management.

**Before Situation:**

Vegetable or specialty crop has an insufficient available water source causing plant health (establishment and persistence) concerns.

**After Situation:**

A surface placed microirrigation system is utilized to provide highly efficient irrigation to vegetable or specialty crop to address plant health concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Area inside high tunnel syst

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,550.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation

**Scenario:** #15 - Surface Tape <5 acres

**Scenario Description:**

A micro-irrigation system using drip tape or similar type micro-irrigation material placed on the soil surface for vegetables or field crops. Spacing of drip tape or similar type micro irrigation material is based on soil type or row alignment but will typically vary from 18" to 36". This system typically includes a filter system, PE manifolds fittings, drip tape, etc. This practice applies to systems designed to discharge < 60 gal/hr. at each individual discharge point. Does not include Pump, power source, water source. Surface placed drip tape will not meet the 441 practice life and will normally need replacement every year. After first installation drip tape will be replaced as operation and maintenance issue as required for proper operation of the system. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and Facilities. Associated Practices: 533-Pumping Plant, 449-Irrigation Water Management, 430 - Irrigation Pipeline, 610 - Salinity & Sodic Soil Management, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, 590 Nutrient Management, and 595-Integrated Pest Management.

**Before Situation:**

A typical before irrigation situation would normally be an existing inefficient sprinkler or surface irrigation system for vegetable or other crop production system. The existing irrigation system would experience poor, nonuniform irrigation applications

**After Situation:**

A surface placed microirrigation system is utilized to provide highly efficient irrigation to a field. Water applications are reduced and runoff eliminated. Offsite water quality is improved, and on site water use is reduced. Drip tape will be replaced as operation and maintenance issue as required for proper operation of the system. A typical scenario consists of a 1/2 acre irrigated field with lateral spacing of 2 feet.

**Feature Measure:** Acres in System

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 0.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,505.09 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,010.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation

**Scenario:** #75 - Small Microirrigation System

**Scenario Description:**

A small scale surface microirrigation system using drip tape or similar type micro-irrigation material placed on the soil surface to irrigate vegetables or field crops. Typically applied on a 40' by 40' plot, with 24" spaced rows, and emitters on a 12" spacing. Submains break plot into several smaller zones. System includes disk filter and chemical injection for chemigation. Water meter is not included. Natural Resource Concern(s): Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 533 - Pumping Plant, 449 - Irrigation Water Management, 430 - Irrigation Pipeline, 436 - Irrigation Reservoir, 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation, and 590 - Nutrient Management.

**Before Situation:**

A field has an inefficient garden-hose based sprinkler irrigation system causing irrigation water loss that impacts water quality and water quantity.

**After Situation:**

A surface placed microirrigation system is utilized to provide highly efficient irrigation to a small plot. Water applications are reduced and runoff eliminated. Offsite water quality is improved, and on-site water use is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Microirrigation area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,600.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,066.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation

**Scenario:** #88 - SDI (Subsurface Drip Irrigation)

**Scenario Description:**

A subsurface drip irrigation system (SDI) with a lateral spacing between 37-59 inches. This buried drip irrigation system utilizes a thin wall dripperline or tape with inline emitters at a uniform spacing for the system laterals. The dripperline or tape is normally installed by being plowed in approx. 10-14 inches deep with a chisel shank type plow equipped with tape reels. This type of drip irrigation system utilizes a buried supply manifold with automated zone control valves and a buried flush manifold with manual flush valves. This permanent micro-irrigation system includes an automated filter station, flow meter, backflow prevention device, automated control box or timer, the thin wall dripperline or tape for laterals, both a supply and a flushing manifold and numerous types of water control valves. This is an all-inclusive system starting with the filter station including all required system components out to the flush valves. The water supply line from the water source to the filter station is an irrigation pipeline (430) and is not included as part of this system Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, Water Quality Degradation - Excessive sediment in surface waters, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 533-Pumping Plant, 449- Irrigation Water Management, 430 - Irrigation Pipeline, 433 - Irrigation Flow Measurement, 610 - Salinity & Sodic Soil Management, 434 - Soil Moisture Measurement, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, and 590 Nutrient Management.

**Before Situation:**

Typical before irrigation situation would normally be an existing inefficient surface or sprinkler irrigation system on a cropland or hayland field. The existing irrigation system would experience poor, non-uniform irrigation applications and significant

**After Situation:**

A typical practice would be the installation of a subsurface drip irrigation system (SDI) on a 60 acre cropland or hayland field. The system lateral (thin wall dripperline or tape) spacing would 40 inches. This highly efficient SDI (buried) irrigation system provides irrigation water directly to the plant root zone eliminating application losses resulting in a very high water application efficiency and properly designed these SDI systems are capable of very uniform water applications. Typical field size is 60 acres.

**Feature Measure:** Acres in System

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$156,956.55 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,615.94

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #1 - Gravity to Pivot Conversion

**Scenario Description:**

Description: Installation of a low pressure center pivot system. Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications). Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449)

**Before Situation:**

A 160 acre field is flood irrigated. Application of irrigation water is inefficient and non-uniform. Irrigation water is typically over applied in some parts of the field, and under applied in others. Deep percolation from the excess irrigation delivers e

**After Situation:**

The existing surface irrigation system is converted to a low pressure center pivot. Corners are converted to non-irrigated cropland. The pivot is 1300 feet in length with pressure regulators and low pressure sprinklers. The new irrigation system applies water efficiently and uniformly to maintain adequate soil water for the desired level of plant growth. Deep percolation and field runoff is eliminated and there are no excess nutrients, salts or pathogens delivered to the receiving waters. Irrigation induced runoff is eliminated. This center pivot scenario includes all hardware from the pivot point, including the concrete pad the pivot is placed on.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Center Pivot Later

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$118,268.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$90.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #3 - System Renovation, Renozzle with Drops

**Scenario Description:**

Center Pivot and Linear Move sprinkler systems are used in large crop fields with fairly regular field borders and flat topography. The scenario involves changing nozzles on center pivot or lateral move irrigation systems to low-pressure systems to improve efficiency of water use and reduce energy use. This scenario is intended for cropland areas where the objective is water or energy conservation. A typical scenario assumes a 1300 LF span, renozzled with low-pressure nozzles and pressure regulators on drops. Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications), Inefficient Energy Use (Equipment and facilities e.g. pumping)  
Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449)

**Before Situation:**

A center pivot is irrigating cropland that is being irrigated using a system in which all nozzles are operating above 35 psi on the mainline pipe. The nozzles are worn and water is applied non-uniformly. Water runs off the field and degrades the receiving

**After Situation:**

A Center Pivot or Linear Move sprinkler system with a span of 1300 linear feet is re-nozzled with low-pressure nozzles ( $\leq 35$  psi) and pressure regulators on drops. The irrigation water is applied efficiently and uniformly to maintain adequate soil moisture for optimum plant growth. Runoff and deep percolation are eliminated, and the surface and ground water is no longer degraded. The irrigation induced soil erosion caused by runoff is also eliminated. The lower pressure sprinklers reduce the energy used by the pump when the pump is modified to match lower pressure requirements.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Nozzles Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 232.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,948.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$38.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #4 - Gravity to Pivot Conversion with VRI

**Scenario Description:**

Upgrading existing irrigation system with a more uniform and efficient (vendor provided and installed modular system) Center Pivot system for the purpose of protecting water quality and utilizing water effectively. Integrating variable application technology onto a center pivot system for precision zone placement of water along the length of the system for water savings. A variable application over the field based either 1) EM mapping and a grid system, 2) previous year(s) harvest yield maps or 3) soil properties, or combination of each. This scenario is a new system to replace an existing gravity system, with the proper components, nozzles, and pressure regulating devices, along with other needed components for installation of a VRI system for more effective utilization of water. Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications), Inefficient Energy Use (Equipment and facilities e.g. pumping), and protection of wetland areas enrolled in conservation program and other environmentally sensitive areas. Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449), Wetland Restoration (657), Wetland Enhancement (658) Wetland Creation (659)

**Before Situation:**

Flood application of irrigation water is inefficient and non-uniform. Irrigation water is typically over applied in some parts of the field, and under applied in others. Deep percolation from the excess irrigation delivers excess nutrients salts, and chem

**After Situation:**

A new Center Pivot or Linear Move sprinkler system with a span of 1300 linear feet and a modular VRI system which increases irrigation efficiency and uniformity utilizing a modern center pivot system resulting in water savings. The irrigation water is applied efficiently and uniformly to maintain adequate soil moisture for optimum plant growth. Runoff and deep percolation are eliminated, and the surface and ground water is no longer degraded. The irrigation induced soil erosion caused by runoff is also eliminated. The lower pressure requirements of the sprinklers reduces the energy used by the pump.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Center Pivot or La

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$178,900.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$137.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #5 - VRI System Retrofit Zone

**Scenario Description:**

Integrating variable application technology onto a center pivot system for precision zone placement of water along the length of the system for water savings. A variable application over the field based either 1) EM mapping and a grid system, 2) previous year(s) harvest yield maps or 3) soil properties, or combination of each. This scenario is to renovate a previously irrigation system with proper modular components and pressure regulating devices, with GPS for field location and new control panel to update existing panel, along with other needed components to install a VRI system for more effective utilization of water. Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications), Inefficient Energy Use (Equipment and facilities e.g. pumping), and protection of wetland areas enrolled in conservation program and other environmental sensitive areas. Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449), Wetland Restoration (657), Wetland Enhancement (658) Wetland Creation (659)

**Before Situation:**

A center pivot or lateral move system has low pressure sprinklers. Water runs off the field and degrades the receiving waters. Deep percolation in some parts of the field degrades the ground water quality. The runoff from the field causes soil erosion. Th

**After Situation:**

A Center Pivot or Linear Move sprinkler system with a span of 1300 linear feet is has modular VRI components added to the system which increases irrigation efficiency and uniformity utilizing a modern center pivot system resulting in water savings. The irrigation water is applied efficiently and uniformly to maintain adequate soil moisture for optimum plant growth. Runoff and deep percolation are eliminated, and the surface and ground water is no longer degraded. The irrigation induced soil erosion caused by runoff is also eliminated. The lower pressure requirements of the sprinklers reduces the energy used by the pump.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Center Pivot or La

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$65,119.11

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$50.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #67 - Small Solid Set, Above Ground Laterals

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent solid set irrigation system with buried submains and above ground laterals such as polyethylene flexible tubing. The typical system is installed on a 2 acre orchard or nursery, with plant spacing of 15 feet x 22 feet. Laterals are spaced 22 feet apart, however other spacing for this scenario apply. This system utilizes sprayers or minisprinklers at each tree or plant. This system typically includes a filter system, PE tubing laterals, PVC manifolds, and submains, valves, fittings, and emitters. System installation does not include a flowmeter, Pump, Power source, Irrigation Water Conveyance to the irrigated field, or Water source (well or reservoir). Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications) Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449).

**Before Situation:**

The typical installation will be on an orchard, nursery, or vineyard with an existing inefficient irrigation system.

**After Situation:**

An irrigation system is utilized to provide improved distribution uniformity and irrigation efficiency to an orchard, nursery, or vineyard. Runoff and water applications are reduced, resulting in offsite water quality improvement and on site water use reduction.

**Feature Measure:** Area in Irrigation System

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,174.86

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,587.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #72 - Linear Move System

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of a linear or lateral move sprinkler system with sprinklers on drops with or without drag hoses to improve irrigation efficiency and reduce soil erosion. Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications), Inefficient Energy Use (Equipment and facilities e.g. pumping) Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449) Payment rate is figured per foot of installed hardware length.

**Before Situation:**

A 76 acre field is flood irrigated. Application of irrigation water is inefficient and non-uniform. Irrigation water is typically over applied in some parts of the field, and under applied in others. Deep percolation from the excess irrigation delivers ex

**After Situation:**

A typical unit is approximately 76 acres in size with the sprinkler system up to 1280 feet in length with drop tubes that have a minimum of 30" spacing. The new irrigation system has a coefficient of uniformity above 85%. Irrigation water is efficiently and uniformly applied to maintain adequate soil water for the desired level of plant growth. Deep percolation and field runoff is eliminated and there are no excess nutrients, salts or pathogens delivered to the receiving waters. Irrigation induced runoff is eliminated.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Linear Move Later

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$183,994.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$143.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 442 - Sprinkler System

**Scenario:** #112 - Mobile Drip Irrigation Retrofit, Center Pivot

**Scenario Description:**

Center pivot sprinkler systems are used to irrigate low-profile crops (e.g., alfalfa or small grains) to medium-profile crops (e.g., corn) in fields with regular field borders and flat to slightly sloping terrain. The scenario involves retrofitting an existing center pivot irrigation system to incorporate dragged low-pressure drip irrigation lines to improve efficiency of water use and reduce energy use. A typical scenario assumes a 1,300 linear foot span, retrofitted to include heavy wall drip hoses in place of nozzles or sprinkler heads. Drip hoses are spaced 20 to 60 inches apart and include drippers of 1 to 2 gallon per hour flowrate and are spaced approximately every 6 to 12 inches on the driplines. Systems with shorter profile crops may have a manifold that is 3 to 4 feet from the ground. Crops are typically planted in a circular pattern relative to the center pivot path. In-line mesh filtration and chemigation is included. Sand separator not included. Resource concerns include: Soil Erosion (Concentrated flow erosion e.g. irrigation induced), Insufficient Water (Inefficient use of irrigation water), Water Quality Degradation (Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, Excessive salts in surface and ground waters, Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio solids or compost applications), Inefficient Energy Use (Equipment and facilities e.g. operating pressure and volume pumped) Associated Practices: Irrigation Pipeline (430), Pumping Plant (533), Irrigation Water Management (449)

**Before Situation:**

A center pivot system that has high pressure sprinklers. The nozzles are worn and water is applied non-uniformly. Water runs off the field and degrades receiving waterbodies. Deep percolation in some parts of the field degrades groundwater quality. The hi

**After Situation:**

A center pivot sprinkler system with a span of 1,300 linear feet is retrofitted to apply water through dragged surface drip irrigation lines. Irrigation water is applied efficiently and uniformly directly to the soil surface to maintain soil moisture for optimal plant growth. Runoff and deep percolation are addressed, and surface waterbodies are no longer degraded. Lower pressure requirements and higher application efficiency of the center mobile drip irrigation retrofit reduces the energy used by the pump.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Lateral Retrofitted

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,321.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #1 - IWM, Basic Technique

**Scenario Description:**

A low Intensity irrigation water management system for producers using a checkbook method (crop grown, soil moisture conditions prior to irrigation, dates of irrigation start and stop, depths of irrigation applied, duration of irrigations, and amount of rainfall). For a typical scenario, soil moisture is determined by the feel method, volumes of irrigation water are based on energy or water district bills, records are kept on paper copies, and calculations are made by hand. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water Supply-Inefficient use of irrigation water; Degraded Plant Condition-Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Inefficient Energy Use-Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 441-Irrigation System Microirrigation, 442-Irrigation System Sprinkler, 443-Irrigation System Surface and Subsurface, 449- Irrigation Water Management, 587-Structure for water Control.

**Before Situation:**

The irrigator decides when to irrigate based on general crop or soil appearance or limited soil moisture monitoring. System run times are based on past apparent success. The typical irrigated field is a 125 acre corn field with a sprinkler irrigation syst

**After Situation:**

Irrigations are scheduled based on measured crop water requirements. Records are used to evaluate results of past irrigation events and influence future irrigations. The irrigator keeps records of soil moisture, crop water use, rainfall amounts and irrigation timing and amounts. At the end of the irrigation season all the data has been reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season have been determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres under irrigation

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 125.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$824.90

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #2 - IWM, Intermediate Technique, 1st year

**Scenario Description:**

This practice includes the installation of electrical soil moisture sensors such as capacitance or resistance sensors that are monitored to determine soil moisture. This scenario includes purchasing soil moisture sensors, installation equipment (probe or auger), and a data logger to log continuous soil moisture data that can be downloaded to a personal computer and associated graphing software. This scenario is intended to be used as a one-time payment for the first year in multiple year IWM contracts. Typical Scenario involves installation of sensors at a single location in a 125 acre field of sprinkler irrigated cropland. Producer periodically monitors soil moisture sensors during the growing season. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, and Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 449- Irrigation Water Management, 587-Structure for water Control, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, 590-Nutrient Management, 442-Irrigation System, Sprinkler, and Irrigation System, Microirrigation 441.

**Before Situation:**

Producer uses feel method to estimate soil moisture for scheduling irrigation in the field.

**After Situation:**

Producer has installed at least three sensors at each monitoring site to a depth of three feet with one sensor representing each foot of depth. Producer periodically downloads continuously recorded soil moisture measurements that are used to schedule irrigation more effectively resulting in improved irrigation water management and reduced energy use.

**Feature Measure:** Number of measuring sites

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,122.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,122.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #3 - IWM, Intermediate Technique, Subsequent Years

**Scenario Description:**

This practice includes the installation of electrical soil moisture sensors such as capacitance or resistance sensors that are monitored to determine soil moisture. This scenario includes the installation of soil moisture sensors and a data logger(s) to log continuous soil moisture data that can be downloaded to a personal computer and associated graphing software. This scenario is intended to be used as a subsequent payment for multiple year IWM contracts after the monitoring equipment was purchased or is already available. Typical Scenario involves installation of sensors at a single location in a 125 acre field of sprinkler irrigated cropland. Producer periodically monitors soil moisture sensors during the growing season. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water - Inefficient use of irrigation water, and Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Inefficient Energy Use - Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 449- Irrigation Water Management, 587-Structure for water Control, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, 590-Nutrient Management, 442-Irrigation System, Sprinkler, and Irrigation System, Microirrigation 441.

**Before Situation:**

Producer uses feel method to estimate soil moisture for scheduling irrigation in the field.

**After Situation:**

Producer has installed at least three sensors at each monitoring site to a depth of three feet with one sensor representing each foot of depth. Producer periodically downloads continuously recorded soil moisture measurements that are used to schedule irrigation more effectively resulting in improved irrigation water management and reduced energy use.

**Feature Measure:** Acres under irrigation

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 125.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,143.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #4 - IWM, Advanced Technique

**Scenario Description:**

A high intensity irrigation water management system for producers using a checkbook method with advanced methods of determining irrigation water applied, and estimating crop evapotranspiration, monitoring field soil moisture, or monitoring crop temperature stress. Typical methods include flow measurement, daily record keeping, and use of real-time evapotranspiration estimates (such as those provided dedicated weather stations) and/or soil moisture sensors with automated data logging to monitor field soil moisture content and/or crop temperature. For this scenario, soil moisture is determined by automated soil moisture monitoring stations equipped with telemetry data. Irrigation amounts are recorded from a flow meter near the pump. Telemetry data is automatically sent to a computer with irrigation software. Irrigator also receives real time data via mobile phone applications. Some data such as total water applied may be entered into computer software manually. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water Supply- Inefficient use of irrigation water; Degraded Plant Condition-Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Inefficient Energy Use- Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 449- Irrigation Water Management, 587-Structure for water Control, 328-Conservation Crop Rotation, 590-Nutrient Management, 442-Irrigation System, Sprinkler, and Irrigation System, Microirrigation 441.

**Before Situation:**

The farmer decides when to irrigate based on general crop or soil appearance or limited soil moisture monitoring. System run times are based on past apparent success. The typical irrigated field is a 125 acre corn field with sprinkler irrigation.

**After Situation:**

Irrigations are scheduled based on measured crop water requirements. Records are used to evaluate results of past irrigation events and influence future irrigations. The irrigator keeps records of soil moisture, crop water use, rainfall amounts and irrigation timing and amounts. At the end of the irrigation season all the data has been reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season have been determined.

**Feature Measure:** Irrigation system

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,159.46 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,159.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #27 - IWM, Advanced Technique Incorporating Precision Irrigation

**Scenario Description:**

A high intensity irrigation water management system for producers using a prescription method with advanced methods of determining irrigation water applied, and estimating crop evapotranspiration, monitoring field soil moisture, or monitoring crop temperature stress. Typical methods include flow measurement, daily record keeping, and use of real-time evapotranspiration estimates (such as those provided by dedicated weather stations) and/or soil moisture sensors with automated data logging to monitor field soil moisture content and/or crop temperature. For this scenario, soil moisture is determined by automated soil moisture monitoring stations equipped with telemetry data. Irrigation amounts are recorded from a flow meter near the pump. Telemetry data is automatically sent to a computer with irrigation software. Irrigator also receives real time data via mobile phone applications. Some data such as total water applied may be entered into computer software manually. Incorporate Precision Irrigation technology that is currently a part of the irrigation system, into the Irrigation Water Management Plan. Variable Rate Irrigation (VRI) speed control technology that is integral to an electronic control panel with GPS for field location is an example of Precision Irrigation. An irrigation prescription must be developed and uploaded into the irrigation control system. Irrigation application rates and ranges are then varied based on management zones or sectors within the field defined by soil mapping, previous year(s) yield maps, soil properties, field topography and features, or similar criteria. Updated prescriptions will be included as data changes during the season, where applicable.

**Before Situation:**

The farmer decides when to irrigate based on general crop or soil appearance or limited soil moisture monitoring. System run times are based on past apparent success. The typical irrigated field is a 125 acre corn field with sprinkler irrigation.

**After Situation:**

Irrigations are scheduled and application rates varied based on measured crop water requirements and criteria used to develop the irrigation prescription. The irrigator keeps records of prescriptions, soil moisture, crop water use, rainfall amounts, and irrigation timing and amounts. Records are used to evaluate results of past irrigation events and influence future irrigation prescriptions. At the end of the irrigation season all data and prescriptions will be reviewed and evaluated. Improvements will be planned and implemented for the next season.

**Feature Measure:** Irrigation System

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,515.26 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,515.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #33 - Consultant Based IWM No Equipment

**Scenario Description:**

An irrigation water management system that consists of a consultant providing irrigation scheduling information to a producer. For the typical scenario, the consultant uses local evapotranspiration data and appropriate crop coefficients to develop irrigation recommendations. The consultant provides these recommendations to the farmer on a regular basis and includes the timing and amount of irrigation water to be applied to the crop during the season. In this scenario, no equipment is installed in the field and the evapotranspiration data is obtained from local sources. In addition to the in-season IWM recommendations, the consultant discusses the irrigation water management plan with the producer before the start of the growing season. At the end of the season, the consultant meets with the producer to discuss the results. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water Supply-Inefficient use of irrigation water; Degraded Plant Condition-Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Inefficient Energy Use-Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 441-Irrigation System, Microirrigation, 442-Sprinkler System, 443-Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface.

**Before Situation:**

The farmer decides when to irrigate based on general crop or soil appearance or limited soil moisture monitoring. System run times are based on past apparent success. The typical irrigated field is a 125 acre corn field with a sprinkler irrigation system.

**After Situation:**

A season long set of irrigation recommendations is provided to the irrigator by the consultant that includes irrigation event timing and amount. The recommendations are developed by the consultant and are based on tracking evapotranspiration from the irrigated field. Irrigator understands the irrigation water management plan developed by the consultant, follows the recommendations concerning the timing and amount of each irrigation event, and discusses the results and areas for improvement at the end of the season with the consultant.

**Feature Measure:** Irrigation System

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$754.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$754.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Scenario:** #88 - IWM w weather station

**Scenario Description:**

This practice includes the installation of a weather station that is monitored to determine crop water use, status of heat and/or frost conditions to permit the producer to make informed irrigation decisions. The installation includes the purchase and installation of equipment, and a data logger to log continuous weather data including rainfall, temp, solar radiation, humidity, wind speed and soil moisture sensors that can be downloaded to a personal computer and associated graphing software. Typical Scenario involves installation on a 120 acre field of irrigated cropland. Producer periodically monitors the station during the growing season to determine timing and amounts of water to apply based on soil moisture sensors, field checks and weather station data. Producer keeps records of collected data and resulting irrigation decisions. This scenario only applies to year one of IWM. The appropriate labor-only IWM scenario applies in subsequent contract years. Resource Concerns: Insufficient Water Supply-Inefficient use of irrigation water; Water Quality; Degraded Plant Condition-Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Inefficient Energy Use-Equipment and facilities. Associated Practices: 441-Irrigation System Microirrigation, 442-Irrigation System Sprinkler, 443-Irrigation System Surface and Subsurface

**Before Situation:**

To meet crop water requirements, the producer schedules irrigations based on the calendar and what has apparently worked in the past. For cooling/frost protection, irrigation start and run times are based on broad regional weather forecasts.

**After Situation:**

Producer has installed a weather station and periodically downloads continuously recorded data that is used to schedule irrigation more effectively resulting in improved irrigation water management and reduced energy use. Field checks are made by irrigator to ground truth station data with crop.

**Feature Measure:** Number of weather stations

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,317.08

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,317.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 450 - Anionic Polyacrylamide (PAM) Application

**Scenario:** #8 - PAM Application

**Scenario Description:**

Control of irrigation induced erosion (typically in furrow irrigated fields) through the direct application of water-soluble Polyacrylamide (PAM) into the irrigation water supply (1 to 3 ounce sprinkled at 3-5 ft furrow inlet or metered at 10 ppm directly into the head ditch). PAM comes in granular, liquid oil emulsion, tablet, and block forms. This typical application is for an 80-acre furrow irrigated row crop field, with one PAM application (1-1.5 lb./ac, creating a 10 ppm concentration of the granular PAM in the head ditch metered via large fish feeder) at first irrigation followed by two additional applications (reduced rates of 0.5-1 lb./ac, or about 1-5 ppm in the inflow water) after cultivations. Resource Concern: Soil erosion. Associated Practices: 443-Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface, 449-Irrigation Water Management.

**Before Situation:**

Irrigated lands susceptible to irrigation-induced erosion, excluding peat soils, and where the sodium adsorption ratio (SAR) of irrigation water is less than 15.

**After Situation:**

Erosion is minimized in furrow irrigated field.

**Feature Measure:** Weight of PAM Applied

**Scenario Unit:** Pound

**Scenario Typical Size:** 240.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,104.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 462 - Precision Land Forming and Smoothing

**Scenario:** #3 - Land Forming

**Scenario Description:**

Large areas of the land surface are shaped or leveled to a specific elevation and grade for various land uses. Cuts and fills are small. The resource concerns are EXCESS / INSUFFICIENT WATER -( Ponding, Flooding) and SOIL EROSION -(Sheet, Rill)

**Before Situation:**

The site, commonly a crop field or AFO, has localized topographic issues causing drainage or erosion problems.

**After Situation:**

Land has been shaped to the required elevations and grades. Typical situation require re-grading an area approximately 10 acres in size requiring an average depth of earthfill or excavation of 0.4 feet. Construction would be completed with a scraper and grader (dozer) that is able to average 100 cy of earth moved per hour. Resource concerns have been treated. Associated practices, like plantings or drainage water management practices, would be contracted separately as needed.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Field re-graded.

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,883.55

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,288.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 462 - Precision Land Forming and Smoothing

**Scenario:** #28 - Minor Shaping

**Scenario Description:**

The land surface is shaped or leveled to a specific elevation and grade for various land uses. Cuts and fills are small. The resource concerns are EXCESS / INSUFFICIENT WATER -( Ponding, Flooding) and SOIL EROSION -(Sheet, Rill)

**Before Situation:**

The field has minor topographic issues or problems with surface drainage or erosion which can be corrected without land leveling or land smoothing. Site conditions require attention to elevation and grade. Typical situation is a 5 acre field. Material to

**After Situation:**

Land has been shaped to the required elevations and grades. Resource concerns have been treated. Associated practices, like plantings or drainage water management practices, would be contracted separately as needed.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of land treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,183.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$836.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 462 - Precision Land Forming and Smoothing

**Scenario:** #29 - Site Stabilization

**Scenario Description:**

The site contains a gully or other site specific topographic problem. Site conditions require attention to elevation and grade. Resource concerns are EXCESS / INSUFFICIENT WATER -( Ponding, Flooding) and SOIL EROSION -(Sheet, Rill)

**Before Situation:**

The site, commonly a crop field or CAFO, has localized gully or topographic issues causing drainage or erosion problems. Typical situation is a gully 10 feet wide and 5 feet deep.

**After Situation:**

Land has been shaped to the required elevations and grades. Resource concerns have been treated. Associated practices, like plantings or drainage water management practices, would be contracted separately as needed.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic yards of material plac

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,155.01

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 462 - Precision Land Forming and Smoothing

**Scenario:** #33 - Terrace Removal

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and dispose of an existing terrace system by placing earthfill, excavation, grading, leveling or other means required for removal. Dispose of terrace ridge earthfill material by placing it into the adjacent terrace channel, so that the disturbed area slope matches the adjacent field slope, and it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Removing an existing terrace system will address the resource concerns of localized topographic issues causing drainage or erosion problems.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where an existing terrace system interfere with planned land use development or infrastructure. The site, commonly a crop field that is being developed into a pasture/range field, has localized topographic issues causing drainage or erosion pr

**After Situation:**

The typical length will be a 12,460 linear feet of terraces. The removal of an existing terrace system will be performed by placing earthfill, excavation, grading, leveling or other means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment. Dispose of terrace ridge earthfill material by placing it into the adjacent terrace channel, so that the disturbed area slope matches the adjacent field slope, and it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect the disturbed areas from erosion as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice will improve localized topographic issues causing drainage or erosion problems. It will also improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Length of removed terraces

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 12,460.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,123.08

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 462 - Precision Land Forming and Smoothing

**Scenario:** #34 - Minor Shaping - Field Scale

**Scenario Description:**

Removing irregularities on the land surface of cropland by use of heavy equipment.

**Before Situation:**

Field damaged by flooding, past agricultural practices, or other topographic issues causing drainage or field workability issues.  
Typically less than 100 cy/acre material moved.

**After Situation:**

Land level, backhoe, bulldozer or other heavy equipment used to correct irregularities and address drainage or workability issues.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of land treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,424.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$110.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 462 - Precision Land Forming and Smoothing

**Scenario:** #35 - Heavy Shaping

**Scenario Description:**

Removing irregularities on the land surface of cropland or pastureland by use of heavy equipment.

**Before Situation:**

Field damaged by erosion, past agricultural practices, or other topographic issues causing drainage or field workability issues.

**After Situation:**

Bulldozer or other heavy equipment used to correct irregularities and address drainage or workability issues.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of land treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,472.50 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,736.25

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 464 - Irrigation Land Leveling

**Scenario:** #19 - Small Scale Irrigation Land Leveling

**Scenario Description:**

This is scenario will level a typical 10 acres of irrigated crop land surface to enhance uniform flow of surface water to improve irrigation efficiency using dirt pans/carry-all/pan-scraper equipment. The typical volume of earth moved is 100 to 500 cubic yards per acre. Resource Concern: Excess/Insufficient - Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water Associated Conservation Practices: 433 - Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface; 607 - Surface Drain, Field Ditch; 388 - Irrigation Field Ditch; 449 - Irrigation Water Management; or 587 - Structure for Water Control.

**Before Situation:**

Irregular field surface reduces uniformity of surface application and thus irrigation efficiency by localized ponding and/or excess runoff/run-on.

**After Situation:**

Cropland will be reshaped to provide uniform distribution of irrigation water in order to promote irrigation efficiencies.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Area

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,253.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,225.39

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 464 - Irrigation Land Leveling

**Scenario:** #33 - Irrigation Land Leveling

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario will level a typical 80 acres of irrigated crop land surface to enhance uniform flow of surface water to improve irrigation efficiency using dirt pans/carry-all/pan-scraper equipment. The typical volume of earth moved is 100 to 500 cubic yards per acre. Resource Concern: Excess/Insufficient - Inefficient Use of Irrigation Water Associated Conservation Practices: 433 - Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface; 607 - Surface Drain, Field Ditch; 388 - Irrigation Field Ditch; 449 - Irrigation Water Management; or 587 - Structure for Water Control.

**Before Situation:**

Irregular field surface reduces uniformity of surface application and thus irrigation efficiency by localized ponding and/or excess runoff/runon.

**After Situation:**

Cropland will be reshaped to provide uniform distribution of irrigation water in order to promote irrigation efficiencies.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Earth Moved

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 28,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$72,094.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #1 - Turf Reinforced Matting, Moderate Stress

**Scenario Description:**

Install approximately 46' long trapezoidal (or similar parabolic shape) waterway, with 20' wide bottom, 1.1' depth, and 4:1 side slopes, lined with Turf Reinforced Matting (TRM). The profile includes a 4' long level approach apron, a 32' long section at 12.5% grade (4' drop), and a 10' long level exit apron depressed 1' below outlet channel grade. Ideally, all TRM is placed on an excavated surface, typically immediately upstream of a headcut. Excess excavation is spread in the immediate area. TRM is installed on the bottom and side slopes of the waterway to prevent scour and aid in waterway establishment. Costs include excavation to channel grade, earthfill in transverse approach berm and side berms, earthwork to blend aprons to existing ground, spreading of excess material, and furnishing and installing TRM. TRM is installed by laborers. Required TRM has a moderate allowable stress of less than 12 pounds per square foot in the fully vegetated condition. Unit cost for TRM is assumed to include a surcharge for anchorage and overlap, typically 1' at upstream end, 0.5' at downstream end, side terminations, and 0.5' overlaps; such associated additional quantities are generally not part of the measured quantity for payment.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive soil erosion and sedimentation are a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway without a lining material.

**After Situation:**

The TRM lined waterway provides a surface capable of withstanding moderate flow velocity and stress to maintain a stable channel configuration. The measured quantity for payment excludes amounts necessary for terminal anchorage and overlap. Associated practices are Grassed Waterway (412), Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,340.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,124.75 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #4 - Rock Lined, 24 in

**Scenario Description:**

Install 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep with 2:1 side slopes trapezoidal or parabolic shaped waterway lined with 24" thick riprap (D100 = 18", Velocity ~ 11 ft/sec). 1/2 the channel is excavated, before excavation for riprap. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. Riprap is installed over 100% of the width of the waterway to prevent scour. Cost include excavation, spoiling of excess material, geotextile underlayment and installing 18" Rock Riprap. Lined waterway width is measured from top of bank to top of bank.  $(9'+3.35'+3.35') \times 300' = 4710$  Square Feet

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway.

**After Situation:**

Rock lined waterway is 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep with 2:1 side slopes. Waterway is excavated and rock is placed using a hydraulic excavator. Geotextile underlayment is installed by laborers. Associated practices are Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,710.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$75,611.94

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #5 - Concrete - NP Reg 1

**Scenario Description:**

Install 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep with 2:1 sides slopes trapezoidal or parabolic shaped waterway lined with concrete. 1/2 the channel is excavated, before excavation for concrete and subgrade material. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. Concrete is installed over 100% of the width of the waterway to prevent scour. Cost include excavation, spoiling of excess material, 6" of clean sand or gravel subgrade, and 5" reinforced concrete slab. Lined waterway width is measured from top of bank to top of bank.  $(9'+3.35'+3.35') \times 300' = 4710$  Square Feet

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway. Usually installed in locations where rock or othe

**After Situation:**

Concrete lined waterway is 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep with 2:1 side slopes. Waterway is excavated using a hydraulic excavator. Concrete slab is placed on 6" of clean sand or #57 stone. Concrete is placed, graded and screeded by laborers. Associated practices are Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,710.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$40,514.85

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #6 - Articulated Concrete Block

**Scenario Description:**

Install 300' long by 15' wide (at top) by 1.5' deep with 2:1 sides slopes trapezoidal or parabolic shaped waterway lined with articulated concrete block (ACB). 1/2 the channel is excavated, before excavation for ACB and subgrade material. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. Articulated concrete block is installed over 100% of the width of the waterway to prevent scour. Cost include excavation, spoiling of excess material, 3" of clean sand or gravel subgrade, and 6" height articulated concrete block. Lined waterway width is measured from top of bank to top of bank.  $(9'+3.35'+3.35') \times 300' = 4710$  Square Feet

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway. Usually installed in locations where rock or othe

**After Situation:**

Articulated Concrete Block lined waterway is 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep with 2:1 side slopes. Waterway is excavated using a hydraulic excavator. Articulated concrete block is placed on 3" of clean sand or gravel subgrade and installed with a hydraulic excavator, loader and laborers. Associated practices are Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,710.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$54,150.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #7 - Splash Pad

**Scenario Description:**

Install a 10'x10', 1' thick rock riprap pad at outlet into streams. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. Costs include 12" and smaller rock riprap installed. It does not include the cost of the required vegetation. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of concentrated water flow. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to maintain a stable outlet.

**After Situation:**

Runoff water is released through a stable outlet into streams or water courses without erosion or sedimentation. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Area of Splash Pad

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,242.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #47 - Turf Reinforced Matting

**Scenario Description:**

Install 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep trapezoidal or parabolic shaped waterway lined with Turf Reinforced Matting (TRM). 1/2 the channel is excavated. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. TRM is installed over 100% of the width of the waterway to prevent scour and aid in waterway establishment. Cost include excavation, spoiling of excess material, and furnishing and installing TRM. Lined waterway width is measured from top of bank to top of bank.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway.

**After Situation:**

TRM lined waterway is 300' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep. The practice is installed using a hydraulic excavator. TRM is installed by laborers. Associated practices are Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,705.02

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #49 - Concrete Block

**Scenario Description:**

Install 36' long (including inlet and outlet aprons) by 15' wide by 1.5' deep trapezoidal shaped waterway or chute lined with concrete blocks. 1/2 the channel is excavated. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. 8"x8"x16" standard concrete blocks are installed over 100% of the width of the waterway/chute to prevent scour. Cost include excavation, spoiling of excess material, 3" stone subgrade, geotextile and furnishing and installing standard concrete blocks. Lined waterway width is measured from top of bank to top of bank.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway. Usually installed in locations where rock or othe

**After Situation:**

Concrete block lined waterway or chute is 36 ' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep. Chute is installed on a 3 to 1 slope. The practice is installed using a hydraulic excavator. Geotextile and concrete blocks are installed by laborers. Associated practices are Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 540.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,015.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 468 - Lined Waterway or Outlet

**Scenario:** #57 - Rock Lined, 12 inch

**Scenario Description:**

Install 300 ' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep trapezoidal or parabolic shaped waterway lined with riprap (D100 = 9", Velocity ~ 8 ft/sec). 1/2 the channel is excavated, before excavation for riprap. Excess excavation is spoiled in the immediate area. Riprap is installed over 100% of the width of the waterway to prevent scour. Cost include excavation, spoiling of excess material, geotextile underlayment and installing 9" Rock Riprap. Lined waterway width is measured from top of bank to top of bank.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of ephemeral or classic gully erosion. Velocities are generally too high or saturated soil conditions make it difficult to establish a grassed waterway.

**After Situation:**

Rock lined waterway is 300 ' long by 15' wide by 1.5' deep. Waterway is excavated and rock is placed using a hydraulic excavator. Geotextile underlayment is installed by laborers. Associated practices are Subsurface Drain (606), Underground Outlet (620), Structure for Water Control (587), and Critical Area Seeding (342).

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Waterway

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$33,993.91

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.55

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 472 - Access Control

**Scenario:** #1 - Animal exclusion from sensitive areas (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Exclude animals from an area in order to address identified resource concerns. This is for facilitating exclusion of animals to protect or enhance natural resource values and/or to allow for fuel loads to accumulate to address other resource issues. Control will be by permanent or temporary electric fencing. Any need for permanent fencing will be planned and installed using the Fence practice (382). Clearing of brush and trees is not necessary. Resource concerns include wildlife habitat degradation, undesirable plant productivity and health, and/or excessive sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Sensitive areas are threatened by the adverse actions of domestic and/or wild animals. The importance of the sensitive areas can include (but are not limited to): wildlife habitat, plant species composition, newly established trees and/or plants, stream b

**After Situation:**

Adequate fuel loads are permitted to accumulate so that other conservation practices may be implemented and/or sensitive areas are protected from adverse actions of domestic and/or wild animals by excluding them from the area.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$960.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.01

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 472 - Access Control

**Scenario:** #16 - Animal exclusion from sensitive areas

**Scenario Description:**

Excluding animals from an area in order to address identified resource concerns. This is for facilitating exclusion of animals to protect or enhance natural resource values. Control will be by temporary electric fencing. Any need for permanent fencing will be planned and installed using the Fence practice (382). Clearing of brush and trees is not necessary. Resource concerns include Wildlife Habitat degradation, Undesirable plant productivity and health, and/or Excessive sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Sensitive areas are threatened by the adverse actions of domestic and/or wild animals. The importance of the sensitive areas can include (but are not limited to): wildlife habitat, plant species composition, newly established trees and/or plants, stream b

**After Situation:**

Sensitive areas are protected from the adverse actions of domestic and/or wild animals by excluding them from the area.

**Feature Measure:** Length of fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,600.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$741.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #2 - Erosion Control Blanket

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of erosion control blanket on critical areas with steep slopes, grassed waterways or diversions. Blanket is typically made of coconut coir, wood fiber, or straw, and is typically covered on both sides with polypropylene netting. Used to help control erosion and establish vegetative cover.

**Before Situation:**

There are areas of concentrated flow and a grassed waterway is being installed and seeded to permanent cover. Soil erosion is a concern and there is little to no vegetation.

**After Situation:**

The erosion control blanket is placed on concentrated flow areas and secured with ground staples. Soil erosion is minimized and vegetative cover is established.

**Feature Measure:** Total Area Mulched

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,561.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #3 - Woven Material, Square

**Scenario Description:**

Barrier fabric or other suitable natural or synthetic mulch is installed with a new tree and shrub planting. Typically used to retain moisture during the installation of conservation practices. Rate is per tree/shrub and assumes 1 square yard of barrier fabric and 5 staples/tree.

**Before Situation:**

Site conditions vary and erosion and wildlife habitat have been identified as concerns. Fabric squares (as mulch) are added to address soil moisture and temperature issues. Sites are often remote and trees may not be planted in rows, requiring each tree t

**After Situation:**

Barrier fabric squares are installed with 5 sod staples each, around individual trees and shrubs to retain moisture and regulate soil temperature.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Trees Mulched

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$147.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #4 - Woven Material, Roll

**Scenario Description:**

Barrier fabric or other suitable natural or synthetic mulch is installed with a new tree and shrub planting. Typically used to retain soil moisture, control soil temperature, and minimize erosion by providing cover during the installation of conservation practices. Two 300 foot tree rows will use barrier fabric to conserve moisture. Rate is per linear foot (300' roll x 2= 600') and 3 staples/pins per tree.

**Before Situation:**

Site conditions vary, and erosion and wildlife habitat have been identified as concerns. Barrier fabric (as mulch) is added to address soil moisture loss. Sites are typically on field edges, each tree row to be mulched individually.

**After Situation:**

Barrier fabric rolls are installed with 3 metal pins/staples per tree. Moisture is retained, temperature controlled, and erosion is minimized.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Trees Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 600.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$502.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #5 - Hydromulch

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of mulch through hydraulic methods on critical areas with steep slopes, grassed waterways or diversions. The mulch is comprised of wood cellulose fiber pulp and may include seed, fertilizer, and other approved materials. Mulch is typically applied at a rate of 1500 pounds per acre as a slurry by using hydroseeding methods. Used to help control erosion and establish vegetative cover.

**Before Situation:**

Areas being seeded to permanent cover. Soil erosion is a concern and there is little to no vegetation.

**After Situation:**

The hydro-mulch is applied to appropriate areas as needed for vegetation establishment. Soil erosion is minimized and vegetative cover is established.

**Feature Measure:** Area Covered by Mulch

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,285.78

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,285.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #57 - Synthetic Material

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of geotextile, biodegradable plastic, polyethylene plastic, or other state approved synthetic mulch to conserve soil moisture, moderate soil temperature, suppress weed growth and provide erosion control. Payment based on actual area covered by mulching material based on 5 foot on center spacings.

**Before Situation:**

Site conditions vary. Typically scenarios include new tree and shrub plantings, irrigated orchards or vineyards, or annual and perennial specialty crops. Water quantity efficiency and maintaining soil moisture is a concern.

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared according to the 484 Mulching Standard and implemented. Synthetic mulch is applied in rows with a mulch layer or by other mechanized means. Soil moisture is conserved, energy use associated with irrigation is decreased, and weed growth is suppressed.

**Feature Measure:** Area Covered by Mulch

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,574.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,574.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #58 - Natural Material, Temporary

**Scenario Description:**

Application of straw mulch or other state approved natural material to reduce erosion and facilitate the establishment of vegetative cover. Mulch provides full coverage and is typically used with critical area planting. Assumes 2 tons of straw mulch per acre

**Before Situation:**

Typical scenario ranges from a 0.1 to 1.0 acre disturbed site around a newly constructed structural practice. The potential for soil erosion is high and mulch is needed to stabilize the soil and facilitate the establishment of vegetative cover.

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared according to the 484 Mulching Standard and implemented. Straw mulch has been applied to areas needing mulch. Erosion and sedimentation is reduced, water and soil quality is protected, and vegetative cover is established.

**Feature Measure:** Area Covered by Mulch

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$545.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$545.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 484 - Mulching

**Scenario:** #77 - Natural Material, Small Bale

**Scenario Description:**

Application of straw mulch or other state approved natural material to reduce erosion and facilitate the establishment of vegetative cover. Mulch provides full coverage over the row, shaped bed or raised bed. Typical row length is 2000 ft. Mulch is hand applied/spread minimum of 2 inches thick.

**Before Situation:**

Current crop production does not manage natural precipitation and soil moisture efficiently. Weed competition for soil moisture degrades plant productivity. Pesticides applied for full area coverage.

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements are prepared according to the 484 Mulching Standard. Straw mulch has been applied to areas needing mulch. Rows or beds received natural mulch to improve efficiency of naturally available water use. Pesticide use is reduced because the mulch prevents weeds in the crop rows.

**Feature Measure:** Area Covered by Mulch

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$758.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 490 - Tree/Shrub Site Preparation

**Scenario:** #2 - Mechanical, Medium

**Scenario Description:**

This practice involves the use of light/moderate machinery and chemical application to clear above ground vegetation and to also rip/cut/lift underground root systems in order to improve site conditions for establishing trees and/or shrubs. Chemical application is needed to treat resprouting and smaller trees. Typical sites include abandoned fields, pastures, rangelands, or forestlands that have been harvested. This following resource concerns: soil quality degradation - compaction, soil erosion - sheet and rill, and degraded plant condition - undesirable plant productivity and health, and inadequate structure and composition.

**Before Situation:**

Undesirable vegetation is present on the site including herbaceous plants and sparse woody competition. Noxious and invasive species may also be present on the site. If left uncontrolled, undesirable vegetation will inhibit successful establishment of tar

**After Situation:**

Undesirable vegetation has been removed using medium equipment; material cut, removed and piled. This enhances site conditions for planting and survival of trees and/or shrubs. Site conditions are favorable for successful establishment of trees and/or shrubs. The typical size of the practice is 6 acres.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,610.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$435.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 490 - Tree/Shrub Site Preparation

**Scenario:** #6 - Windbreak, chemical only

**Scenario Description:**

This practice involves the use of chemical treatment in order to prepare a site for tree row planting and remove undesirable vegetation and improve site conditions for establishing trees and/or shrubs. Typical sites include abandoned fields, pastures, rangelands, or forestland that was recently harvested. This practice is typically used to address the following resource concerns: degraded plant condition - undesirable plant productivity and health, and inadequate structure and composition.

**Before Situation:**

Ground needs prepared for establishment of trees and shrubs in rows. Undesirable vegetation is present on the site including herbaceous and woody vegetation. Noxious and invasive species may also be present. If left uncontrolled, undesirable vegetation wi

**After Situation:**

Ground has been prepare to establish tree and shrub rows. Undesirable vegetation has been treated using appropriate herbicides, reducing competition for target trees and/or shrubs. Site conditions are favorable for successful establishment of trees and/or shrubs. The typical size of the practice is 1.5 acres.

**Feature Measure:** Area of treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$252.07

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$168.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 490 - Tree/Shrub Site Preparation

**Scenario:** #33 - Windbreak - Site Preparation

**Scenario Description:**

This practice involves the use of various chemical/tillage methods to allow for the planting of a windbreak. Site preparation includes chemically killing vegetation prior to mechanical site preparation that includes appropriate methods to allow for planting of the site which may include one or all of the following, ripping, disking, and harrowing. This practice may be applied on all lands needing treatment to facilitate establishment of trees and/or shrubs to facilitate establishment of a windbreak. Typical sites include open land such as old fields, pastures, rangelands and agricultural fields. Resource concerns: Soil erosion--Wind erosion, .

**Before Situation:**

Undesirable vegetation, including woody and herbaceous plants, is present on the site. Noxious and invasive species may also be present on the site. If left uncontrolled, undesirable vegetation will inhibit successful establishment of target species of tr

**After Situation:**

Undesirable vegetation has been treated using appropriate herbicides, reducing competition for target trees and/or shrubs. Site conditions are favorable for successful establishment of trees and/or shrubs. The typical size is 1.5 acres.

**Feature Measure:** area of treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$979.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$652.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 490 - Tree/Shrub Site Preparation

**Scenario:** #64 - Tree-Shrub Site Prep - small acreage

**Scenario Description:**

This practice involves the use of various chemical and tillage methods to allow for the planting of agroforestry practices and hedgerows. Site preparation includes chemically killing vegetation prior to mechanical site preparation that includes appropriate methods to allow for planting of the site which may include one or all of the following: ripping, disking, and harrowing. This practice may be applied on all lands needing treatment to facilitate establishment of trees and shrubs to facilitate establishment of agroforestry practices (alley cropping, forest farming, riparian forest buffer, silvopasture, and windbreak) and hedgerows. Resource concern: Soil erosion - wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

Undesirable vegetation, including woody and herbaceous plants, is present on the site. Noxious and invasive species may also be present on the site. If left uncontrolled, undesirable vegetation will inhibit successful establishment of target species of tr

**After Situation:**

Undesirable vegetation has been treated using appropriate herbicides, reducing competition for target trees and shrubs. Site conditions are favorable for successful establishment of trees and shrubs. The typical size is 0.5 acre.

**Feature Measure:** Area of treatment

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 22.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$453.55

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$20.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 490 - Tree/Shrub Site Preparation

**Scenario:** #73 - Windbreak/Shelterbelt Renovation - Heavy

**Scenario Description:**

Windbreak/shelterbelt renovation to remove deteriorated, damaged, diseased, or unsuitable trees or shrubs. The treatment may include removal of entire rows, or removal of selected trees/shrubs in order to prepare for the necessary planting of replacement trees and shrubs within the footprint of an existing windbreak, to improve the health and function of the windbreak. The treatment uses mechanized equipment to remove trees and/or shrubs with average DBH > 8 inches. Trees and shrubs are cleared with a Dozer, Excavator, and Skid Steer. All slash material from cutting and pruning is either scattered and crushed, piled and crushed, chipped, or removed from the treatment area. Windbreak width of 60' and length of 726' are used in calculations; this is equivalent to an area of 1 acre. Replanting of trees will use practice (380). Resource concerns include: Plant pest pressure, Plant productivity and health, Inadequate livestock shelter, Wind erosion.

**Before Situation:**

The health of trees and/or shrubs in a windbreak/shelterbelt has degraded as plants age, or plants may have been damaged by weather events or pests, decreasing the effectiveness of the original windbreak design. Plants lack leaf cover, have dead branches,

**After Situation:**

The integrity of 726 linear feet (one acre) of windbreak/ shelterbelt will be restored and is functioning properly to reduce wind impacts to plants, animals, humans, and structures.

**Feature Measure:** Length of removal

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,664.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,664.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #1 - Removal and Disposal of Fence, Feedlot

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of all existing fences around a livestock feeding/waste facility by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all fence materials from the site so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all materials by removal to an approved landfill, wood chipping and land distribution, or recycling center, burial at an approved location or burning. If burning is used, implement appropriate smoke management to protect public health and safety. Fence removal will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On headquarters or any land where existing feedlot fence interferes with planned land use development, public safety, or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natu

**After Situation:**

The typical feedlot fence will be 300 in linear feet. The removal of the fence will be performed with the use of equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all debris from the fence removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape such as Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,043.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #2 - Removal and Disposal of Fence, landscape

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of all existing fences by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all fence materials from the site so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all materials by removal to an approved landfill, wood chipping and land distribution, or recycling center, burial at an approved location or burning. If burning is used, implement appropriate smoke management to protect public health and safety. Remove and dispose of the unwanted fence obstruction in order to apply conservation practices such as Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645) or facilitate the planned land use. Fence removal will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment and reduce hazards to wildlife.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing fence interferes with planned land use development, public safety, wildlife movement and habitat, or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected

**After Situation:**

The typical fence will be 2640 in linear feet. The removal of the fence will be performed with the use of equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all debris from the fence removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape such as Upland Wildlife Habitat Management (645).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,346.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #3 - Removal and Disposal of Power Lines and Poles

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of power lines and poles thru demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all power lines and poles so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all power lines and poles by removal to an approved location, or reuse location. Remove and dispose all power lines and poles in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Rocks and or boulders will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This

**After Situation:**

The typical length is 2640 linear feet of an impaired area. The removal of power lines and poles will be performed by using means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all lines and poles from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Power Lines

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,692.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #4 - Removal and Disposal of Steel and or Concrete Structures

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of large steel and or concrete structures by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all steel and or concrete structures so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all steel and or concrete structures by removal to an approved location, or reuse location. Remove and dispose all steel and or concrete structures in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Steel and or concrete structure removal will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be a 2000 square feet of impaired land. The removal of steel and or concrete structures will be performed by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all steel and or concrete structures from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Land Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$32,078.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #5 - Removal and Disposal of Wood Structures

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of wood structures (including large isolated trees) by demolition, excavation or other similar means required for removal. Dispose of all wood structures so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all wood structures by removal to an approved location, landfill, or reuse location. Remove and dispose all wood structures in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Wood structure removal will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be a 2000 square feet of impaired land. The removal of wood structures will be performed by demolition, excavation or other similar means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all wood structures from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Land Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,484.62

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #6 - Removal and disposal of individual landscape structures

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of individual landscape structures (windmills, large trees, etc.) by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all landscape structures so that it does not impede wildlife movement and/or subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all associated materials by removal to an approved location, or reuse location. Remove and dispose all materials in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Landscape structure removal will address the resource concerns of wildlife collision or avoidance at the landscape level.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas. This is not intended for the removal of obstructions from aquatic environmen

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be an area of 15 feet by 15 feet (225 square feet) of impaired land. The removal of landscape structures will be performed by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all materials from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede wildlife movement or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Land Area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 225.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,331.91 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #7 - Removal and Disposal of Brush and Trees <= 6 inch Diameter

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and dispose of brush and trees predominantly <= 6 inches in diameter by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all brush and trees so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all brush and trees by removal to an approved landfill, wood chipping and or land distribution, or recycling center, burial at an approved location or burning. If burning is used, implement appropriate smoke management to protect public health and safety. Remove and dispose of brush and trees in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Brush and tree removal will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This

**After Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This is not intended for the removal of obstructions from aquatic environments.

**Feature Measure:** Land Area

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,449.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,724.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #8 - Removal and Disposal of Brush and Trees > 6 inch Diameter

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and dispose of brush and trees predominantly > 6 inches in diameter by demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all brush and trees so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all brush and trees by removal to an approved landfill, wood chipping and or land distribution, or recycling center, burial at an approved location or burning. If burning is used, implement appropriate smoke management to protect public health and safety. Remove and dispose of brush and trees in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Brush and tree removal will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be a 2.0 acre impaired area. The removal of brush and trees > 6 inch diameter will be performed with the use of equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all brush and trees from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Land Area

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,118.60 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,059.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #114 - Removal and Disposal of Rock and or Boulders

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of rock and or boulders by drilling, blasting, demolition, excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all rocks and or boulders so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all rock and or boulders by removal to an approved location, or reuse location. Remove and dispose all rock and or boulders in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate the planned land use. Rocks and or boulders will address the resource concerns of the prevention or hindrance to the installation of conservation practices or present a hazard to their use and enjoyment.

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site may be abandoned mine lands, construction sites, recreation areas, farms, ranches, and areas affected by natural disasters. This

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be a 5.0 acre impaired area. The removal of rock and or boulders will be performed by drilling, blasting, demolition, excavation or other means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all rocks and boulders from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** Volume

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$79,950.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$159.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #119 - Removal and disposal of light sand and flood sediment > 30 inches

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of > 30" of sand and flood deposited sediments by excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all sand and flood deposited sediments so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all sand and flood deposited sediments by removal to an approved location, or re-use location. Sand and/or silt removal will only address sand and/or silt obstructing farmland and cropland

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with the return of land to its function prior to the occurrence of a natural disaster. The site may be recreation areas, farms, ranches, or other areas affected by natural disasters. This is not intended f

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be a 30 acre impaired area. The removal of sand and flood deposited sediments will be performed by excavation or other means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all sand and flood deposited sediments from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** area covers by sediment gre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$160,798.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,359.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #120 - Removal and disposal of heavy scattered debris

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of a heavy concentration of debris from farmland deposited by natural disaster. Includes the cost of all labor, equipment and disposal from area of debris. Debris is defined as woody material, rock, concrete, trash, and personal property deposited by natural disaster. This disposal shall be in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws, rules, and regulations. Dispose of all scattered debris so it does not impede farm operations or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all scattered debris by removal to an approved location, landfill, or reuse location. Scattered debris removal will only address debris obstructing farmland not in the footprint of a structure

**Before Situation:**

On any crop, farm or ranch land where debris from storm damage interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site is covered with light debris, (wood, trees, metal, and other damage materials). Debris is scattered over

**After Situation:**

Scattered debris is removed from a affected area of the field.

**Feature Measure:** Area of debris

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 12,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,973.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #121 - Removal and disposal of light sand and flood sediment 12-30 inches

**Scenario Description:**

Remove and disposal of 12" to 30" of sand and flood deposited sediments by excavation or other means required for removal. Dispose of all sand and flood deposited sediments so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all sand and flood deposited sediments by removal to an approved location, or re-use location. Sand and/or silt removal will only address sand and/or silt obstructing farmland and cropland

**Before Situation:**

On any land where existing obstructions interfere with the return of land to its function prior to the occurrence of a natural disaster. The site may be cropland, farms, or ranches affected by natural disasters. This is not intended for the removal of obs

**After Situation:**

The typical area will be a 30 acre impaired area. The removal of sand and flood deposited sediments will be performed by excavation or other means required for removal with the use of heavy equipment and hand labor. Dispose of all sand and flood deposited sediments from the obstruction removal so that it does not impede subsequent work or cause onsite or offsite damage. Revegetate or otherwise protect from erosion disturbed areas as soon as possible. Refer to NRCS Conservation Practice Standard 342, Critical Area Planting for seedbed preparation, seeding, fertilizing, and mulching requirements. The practice is to improve site conditions in order to apply conservation practices or facilitate better use of the landscape.

**Feature Measure:** area covered by sediment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$111,795.55

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,726.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 500 - Obstruction Removal

**Scenario:** #122 - Removal and disposal of light scattered debris

**Scenario Description:**

Removal of debris from farmland deposited by natural disaster. Includes the cost of all labor, equipment and disposal. Debris is defined as woody material, rock, trash, and personal property deposited by natural disaster. This disposal shall be in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and local laws, rules, and regulations. Dispose of all scattered debris so it does not impede farm operations or cause onsite or offsite damage. Dispose of all scattered debris by removal to an approved location, landfill, or reuse location. Scattered debris removal will only address debris obstructing farmland not in the footprint of a structure

**Before Situation:**

On any crop, farm, or ranch land where debris from storm damage interfere with planned land use development, public safety or infrastructure. The site is covered with light debris, (wood, trees, metal, and other damage materials) on a percentage of the fi

**After Situation:**

Debris is removed from the field and land returned to prior use

**Feature Measure:** Area of debris scatter

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,449.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$544.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 511 - Forage Harvest Management

**Scenario:** #1 - Improved Forage Quality

**Scenario Description:**

Improved cultural practices and recordkeeping result in better forage quality and better livestock performance.

**Before Situation:**

Forage cutting heights are as close to the ground as equipment will allow resulting in very low stubble height. Plant regrowth is very slow. Forage quality tests are not regularly done. Records of forage quality components, cutting heights, moisture conte

**After Situation:**

Forage cutting heights are raised to leave at least 3-4" stubble height for cool season grasses and 6" for warm season grasses. Increased residual forage results in much faster plant regrowth. Forage quality tests are submitted to an accredited lab for analysis. Records of forage quality components, cutting heights, moisture content, and harvest schedule are regularly kept to track increased forage quality and improved livestock performance.

**Feature Measure:** Improved Relative Feed Val

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$222.86 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #3 - Native Perennial Grasses, multi species

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted perennial native warm season grasses to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of perennial native warm season grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding.

**Before Situation:**

Poorly managed/degraded pasture land or cropland being converted to pasture and/or hay.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,216.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$202.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #4 - Native Perennial Grasses, multi species, forgone income

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted perennial native warm season grasses to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of perennial native warm season grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding. The land being seeded was previously cropland with a typical rotation of wheat and corn.

**Before Situation:**

Cropland being converted to pasture and/or hay.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$28,147.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$351.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #5 - Introduced Perennial Grasses-Legume

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted perennial introduced grasses and legumes to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of perennial introduced grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding.

**Before Situation:**

Poor or nonexistent stand of grass species. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,607.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$93.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #6 - Introduced Perennial Grasses-Legume, foregone income

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted perennial introduced grasses and legumes to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of perennial introduced grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding. The land being seeded was previously cropland with a typical rotation of wheat and corn.

**Before Situation:**

Cropland being converted to grass. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,555.40

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$242.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #7 - Introduced Perennial & Native Grass Mix

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted introduced grasses and at least one native species to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. Native grass species, which have a significantly greater cost than introduced species, comprise one third of the grass mixture. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding.

**Before Situation:**

Existing stand of perennial grasses, a monoculture, or no grasses present. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,486.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$143.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #8 - Introduced Perennial & Native Grass Mix, foregone income

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted introduced grasses and at least one native species to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. Native grass species, which have a significantly greater cost than introduced species, comprise one third of the grass mixture. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding. The land being seeded was previously cropland with a typical rotation of wheat and corn.

**Before Situation:**

Land currently being cropped. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$23,417.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$292.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #9 - Introduced Perennial Grasses with lime application

**Scenario Description:**

Establish or reseed adapted perennial introduced grasses to improve or maintain livestock/wildlife nutrition and health, extend the length of the grazing season, and provide soil cover to reduce erosion. Used for either conventional or no-till seeding of perennial introduced grasses for pasture, hayland, and wildlife openings. Includes a lime application. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes seed, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, and seeding.

**Before Situation:**

Poor or nonexistent stand of grass species. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,464.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$173.25

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #10 - Bermuda Grass Establishment-Sprigging with fertilizer

**Scenario Description:**

Sprigging new grasses with sprigging application for the purpose of providing forage, increasing plant diversity, soil quality and fertility, and plant health. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes fertilizer, sprigs, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, sprigging, and spreading.

**Before Situation:**

Poor or nonexistent stand of grass species. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,520.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$226.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Scenario:** #11 - Bermuda Grass Establishment-Sprigging with fertilizer and lime

**Scenario Description:**

Sprigging new grasses with sprigging application for the purpose of providing forage, increasing plant diversity, soil quality and fertility, and plant health. This practice may be utilized for organic or regular production. This scenario includes fertilizer, sprigs, equipment and labor for seedbed prep, tillage, sprigging, and spreading.

**Before Situation:**

Poor or nonexistent stand of grass species. Resource concerns may include undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, soil erosion and soil quality.

**After Situation:**

Suitable species are established to improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on cropland, hayland, pasture, and/or biomass production.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Forage and Biomass

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,116.26

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$305.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Scenario:** #2 - Standard Installation, 2 inch dia. or less (KS/NE)

**Scenario Description:**

Description: The 1,500 foot 1 1/4" PE pipeline installed at a depth of 48" will meet the needs of domestic animals. This type of installation is only appropriate in the warmer climate of the northern plains region (KS & NE). This item includes installation, all materials, appurtenances, and labor required to construct and install the pipeline. Appurtenances include: fittings, anchors, thrust blocks, gate valves, air release valves, drain valve, and pressure relief valve, and are included in the cost of pipe material. Revegetation is not included. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Water Harvesting Catchment (636), Spring Development (574), and Prescribed Grazing (528).

**Before Situation:**

Inadequate water supply for domestic animals located on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the warmer climate of the northern plains region (KS & NE).

**After Situation:**

Pipeline(s) convey and/or distribute water to storage and/or watering facilities, for use by livestock or wildlife. Pipeline will supply adequate water for domestic animals on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the NE and KS (warmer climate). The 1,500 feet of 1 1/4" diameter PE pipe will be installed below ground at a depth of 48" to 60" to meet the water quantity requirements of domestic animals.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,197.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Scenario:** #4 - Standard Installation, greater than 2 inch dia.

**Scenario Description:**

Description: The 5,000 feet of 3" PVC pipeline installed at a depth of 72" will meet the needs of domestic animals. This type of installation is appropriate in the northern plains region. This item includes installation, all materials, appurtenances, and labor required to construct and install the pipeline. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, thrust blocks, gate valves, air release valves, drain valve, and pressure relief valve, and are included in the cost of pipe material. Revegetation is not included. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Water Harvesting Catchment (636), Spring Development (574), and Prescribed Grazing (528).

**Before Situation:**

Water supplies need to be conveyed through pipelines for use by livestock or wildlife. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline(s) convey and/or distribute water to storage and/or watering facilities, for use by livestock or wildlife. Pipeline will supply adequate water for domestic animals on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the northern plains region (ND & SD). The 5,000 feet of 3" diameter PVC pipe will be installed below ground at a depth of greater than 60" to meet the water quantity requirements of domestic animals.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$25,588.94

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Scenario:** #5 - Backhoe, 2 inch dia. or less

**Scenario Description:**

Description: The 2,640 feet 2" PVC pipeline installed at a depth of 60" in rocky conditions to meet the needs of domestic animals. Trencher installation is not possible due to site conditions. This item includes installation, all materials, appurtenances, and labor required to construct and install the pipeline. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, expansion joints, anchors, thrust blocks, gate valves, air release valves, drain valve, and pressure relief valve, and are included in the cost of pipe material. Revegetation is not included. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Water Harvesting Catchment (636), Spring Development (574), and Prescribed Grazing (528).

**Before Situation:**

Water supplies need to be conveyed through pipelines for use by livestock or wildlife. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline(s) convey and/or distribute water to storage and/or watering facilities, for use by livestock or wildlife. Pipeline will supply adequate water for domestic animals on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the northern plains. The 2,640 feet of 2" diameter PVC pipe will be installed in rocky conditions at a depth of 60" or more to meet the water quantity requirements of domestic animals.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,091.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Scenario:** #7 - Boring, any diameter

**Scenario Description:**

Description: 200 feet of 2" PVC pipeline installed by boring through road bed or under streams to meet the needs of domestic animals. Typical trencher or plowing installation is not possible due to site disturbance or environmental concerns. This item includes installation, all materials, appurtenances, and labor required to construct and install the pipeline. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, expansion joints, anchors, thrust blocks, gate valves, air release valves, drain valve, and pressure relief valve, and are included in the cost of pipe material. Revegetation is not included. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Water Harvesting Catchment (636), Spring Development (574), and Prescribed Grazing (528).

**Before Situation:**

Water supplies need to be conveyed through pipelines for use by livestock or wildlife. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use.

**After Situation:**

Pipeline(s) convey and/or distribute water to storage and/or watering facilities, for use by livestock or wildlife. Pipeline will supply adequate water for domestic animals on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the northern plains. The 200 feet of 2" diameter PVC pipe will be installed under roads or streams at a depth of 60" or more to avoid unnecessary disturbance and to meet the water quantity requirements of domestic animals.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,318.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$91.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Scenario:** #8 - Rural Water Connection Equipment

**Scenario Description:**

The rural water connection includes the 4' manhole, meter, 500' of pipe, valves, and necessary installation for connecting from a rural water pipeline to a livestock distribution pipeline. This item includes installation, all materials, appurtenances, and labor required to construct and install the meter pit. This item does not include the hook-up fees to the rural water system. Resource Concerns: Inadequate Livestock Water, Inefficient Energy Use. Associated Practices: Critical Area Planting (342), Pumping Plant (533), Watering Facility (614), and Water Harvesting Catchment (636), Spring Development (574), and Prescribed Grazing (528).

**Before Situation:**

Inadequate water supply for domestic animals located on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the northern plains region.

**After Situation:**

A rural water connection which provides access to a reliable, high quality water supply for meeting the needs of domestic animals on grazed range, pasture, or grazed forest in the northern plains region. The 4' manhole, meter, pipe and appurtenances will enable the pipeline to meet the quantity requirements of domestic animals.

**Feature Measure:** Rural Water Connection

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,830.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,830.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 520 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment

**Scenario:** #61 - Soil Dispersant - Covered

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a compacted soil liner, treated with a soil dispersant, to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes incorporation of the dispersant with the soil liner under proper moisture conditions, compaction to the designed liner thickness, and placement of soil cover over the treated liner. Practice implementation may require filter compatibility with the subgrade (graded filter or geotextile). Associated practice PS378, PS313.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits. Soils are suitable for treatment with dispersants.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Liner Material inc

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,420.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,898.49

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 520 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment

**Scenario:** #64 - Material haul > 1 mile

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a compacted soil liner, treated with compacted clay, to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes compaction of the soil liner under proper moisture conditions to the designed liner thickness, and protection of the finished liner. Material haul > 1 mile. Associated practices include PS378, PS313, & other waste water impoundments.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits. An adequate quantity of soil suitable for constructing a clay liner without amendments is available at an economical haul distance.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Liner Material (in

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,420.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$36,235.49

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 520 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment

**Scenario:** #66 - Bentonite Treatment - Covered

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a compacted soil liner, treated with bentonite, to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes incorporation of the bentonite with the soil under proper moisture conditions, compaction to the designed liner thickness, and placement of soil cover over the treated liner. Practice implementation may require filter compatibility with the subgrade (graded filter or geotextile). Associated practice PS378, PS313.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits. Soils are suitable for treatment with bentonite.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Liner Material (in

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,227.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$279,717.22

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$86.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 520 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment

**Scenario:** #83 - Use On-Site Material

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a compacted soil liner, using materials available on-site, to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes compaction of the subgrade and soil line under proper moisture conditions to the designed liner thickness using materials available at the construction site. Associated practices include PS378, PS313, and other waste water impoundments.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits without proper moisture and density control. An adequate quantity of soil suitable for constructing a clay liner without amendments is available on-site.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Liner Material (in

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,613.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,869.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 520 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Compacted Soil Treatment

**Scenario:** #84 - Use On-Site Material with Soil Cover

**Scenario Description:**

Construction of a compacted soil liner, treated with compacted clay, to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes compaction of the soil liner under proper moisture conditions to the designed liner thickness, and soil cover to protect the finished liner using materials available at the construction site. Associated practices include PS378, PS313, and other waste water impoundments.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits. An adequate quantity of soil suitable for constructing a clay liner without amendments is available on-site.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Liner Material (in

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,420.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,781.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 521 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner

**Scenario:** #2 - Flexible Membrane - Uncovered with liner drainage or venting

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of a flexible geosynthetic membrane liner, uncovered, to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes a geotextile or soil cushion to protect the liner from subgrade damage, and liner drainage or venting. Associated practices include PS378 Pond, PS313 Waste Storage Facility.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Surface area of Liner Materi

**Scenario Unit:** Square Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,420.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$48,799.82

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$20.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 521 - Pond Sealing or Lining, Geomembrane or Geosynthetic Clay Liner

**Scenario:** #4 - Flexible Membrane - Covered with liner drainage or venting

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of a flexible geosynthetic membrane liner to reduce seepage from ponds or waste storage impoundment structures. Practice implementation includes 1 foot of soil cover for liner protection, a geotextile or soil cushion to protect liner from subgrade damage, and liner drainage or venting. Associated practices include PS378 Pond, PS313 Waste Storage Facility.

**Before Situation:**

In-place soils at site exhibit seepage rates in excess of acceptable limits.

**After Situation:**

Water conservation and environmental protection provided by limiting seepage losses from ponds or waste storage impoundments.

**Feature Measure:** Surface area of Liner Materi

**Scenario Unit:** Square Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,420.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$52,549.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$21.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 527 - Sinkhole Treatment

**Scenario:** #8 - Linear Opening

**Scenario Description:**

Installing a sinkhole protection cap on a sinkhole with a linear opening. The area around a sinkhole may be unstable and slippage or subsidence may occur. Sinkholes present fall hazards to people and livestock. Sinkholes are direct conduits to groundwater. Nutrient or chemical laden runoff may flow directly into sinkholes polluting groundwater. Sinkholes are routinely used for waste pits by landowners. Critical Area Planting (342), Fence (382), Vertical Drain (630), Obstruction Removal (500) & Filter Strips (393) may be associated practices for this scenario.

**Before Situation:**

Open sinkhole poses threat to people, livestock, & wildlife. Absence of buffer allows nutrients and chemicals to flow into the open sinkhole untreated. Trash & Debris have accumulated in the sinkhole from years of use as a waste pit. Typical Sinkhole tre

**After Situation:**

Debris removed and properly disposed of off site. The sinkhole protection cap installation resolves the safety issue for people, livestock, & wildlife. The open crevice is filled with porous material so as not to disrupt the hydrology of the karst system while filtering runoff. Typical Sinkhole treated is 25' length and 10' top width, depth varies.

**Feature Measure:** LF of opening

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,383.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$455.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 527 - Sinkhole Treatment

**Scenario:** #9 - Circular Opening

**Scenario Description:**

Installing a sinkhole protection cap on a circular sinkhole with a vertical opening. The area around a sinkhole may be unstable and slippage or subsidence may occur. Sinkholes present fall hazards to people and livestock. Sinkholes are direct conduits to groundwater. Nutrient or chemical laden runoff may flow directly into sinkholes polluting groundwater. Sinkholes are routinely used for waste pits by landowners. Critical Area Planting (342), Fence (382), Vertical Drain (630), Obstruction Removal (500) & Filter Strips (393) may be associated practices for this scenario.

**Before Situation:**

Open sinkhole poses threat to people, livestock, & wildlife. Absence of buffer allows nutrients and chemicals to flow into the open sinkhole untreated. Trash & Debris have accumulated in the sinkhole from years of use as a waste pit. Typical Sinkhole trea

**After Situation:**

Debris removed and properly disposed of off site. The sinkhole protection cap installation resolves the safety issue for people, livestock, & wildlife. The sinkhole is filled with porous material so as not to disrupt the hydrology of the karst system while filtering runoff.

**Feature Measure:** SF of opening

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,777.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #8 - Livestock Deferment (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Defer livestock grazing for a 12 month period to allow for regrowth and recovery to occur on a 40 acre grazed range unit where a plant or animal resource concerns exists. Complete livestock exclusion is required during the specified time period. Deferment may be necessary on whole units or portions of units as determined by appropriate assessment.

**Before Situation:**

Inadequate plant cover exists for nesting, brooding, and/or winter habitat for upland birds on grazing/wildlife lands. Inadequate plant growth or regrowth after livestock use does not permit the use by wildlife and/or creates a plant condition resource co

**After Situation:**

Adequate cover exists after deferment which provides adequate cover for wildlife or plant growth/recovery.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$960.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.01

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #10 - Cover Crop/Aftermath

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation of a grazing system using multiple fields of cover crops or cover crops in combination with crop aftermath. Use of these crop fields will provide additional forage and relieve pressure on rangeland fields, thereby enhancing rangeland health and ecosystem function as well as optimizing efficiency and economic return through monitoring (ex: trend, composition, production, etc.), and record keeping. This grazing will typically occur in the fall. If the grazing occurs on cover crop that is being used as part of pollinator system the field can not be grazed until after the honey bees are moved from the area which is usually early September.

**Before Situation:**

Current grazing system exhibits undesirable and inefficient use of forage plants as well as soil and water resources. Stocking rates are likely higher than the current level of production and efficiency of use can support without management changes. There

**After Situation:**

Prescribed grazing system is designed to protect the health and vigor of the plant communities that are in place, as well as utilizing the cover crops to a level that will continue to improve the soil health of the cropland. Livestock are managed in rotation in a way that enhances soil health and function through proper use and distribution, and efficient harvest of forage resources. Grazing system success will be evaluated through monitoring.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,922.82

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #39 - Livestock Deferment (FI) High Production Sites

**Scenario Description:**

Defer livestock grazing for a 12 month period to allow for regrowth and recovery to occur on a 40 acre grazed range unit where a plant or animal resource concerns exists. Complete livestock exclusion is required during the specified time period. Deferment may be necessary on whole units or portions of units as determined by appropriate assessment.

**Before Situation:**

Inadequate plant cover exists for nesting, brooding, and/or winter habitat for upland birds on grazing/wildlife lands. Inadequate plant growth or regrowth after livestock use does not permit the use by wildlife and/or creates a plant condition resource co

**After Situation:**

Adequate cover exists after deferment which provides adequate cover for wildlife or plant growth/recovery.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,228.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$30.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #55 - Prescribed Grazing Management, 5 acres or less

**Scenario Description:**

Plan, implement and monitor a rotational grazing system that will enhance and maintain ecosystem function as well as optimize efficiency and economic return on small farm (5 acres or less) grazing lands.

**Before Situation:**

Area is degraded due to inappropriate timing, duration, frequency and intensity of animal utilization resulting in impaired ecosystem functions. Overuse and degradation of the soil and plant resources are occurring and animal health is compromised.

**After Situation:**

Planned rotational movement of animals meet ecosystem functions due to proper timing, duration, frequency and intensity of animal utilization. Monitoring is showing that animals are in balance with available forage resources and ecological function and processes for soil, water and plant resources are being improved.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,354.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$270.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #73 - Grazing Management, Basic

**Scenario Description:**

Implementing a basic forage-animal balance that is foundational to enhancing plant community health and ecosystem function. Monitoring (as outlined in the grazing plan) will evaluate plant health and/or utilization parameters to make adjustments in livestock demand. Adjustments in the intensity and/or duration of the grazing event are likely to occur as part of implementation.

**Before Situation:**

Current grazing is not balanced with the forage supply of the land unit (livestock demand exceeds carrying capacity). Grazing is negatively impacting desirable plant species resulting in a negative impact to plants, as well as soil and water resources. Th

**After Situation:**

Grazing is being implemented to protect the health and vigor of the plant communities that are in place. A forage-animal balance allows livestock to be managed in a way that enhances plant community health and function through protection of sensitive areas, and proper utilization of forage resources. Adjustments in grazing intensity and duration will be evaluated through monitoring (as outlined in the grazing plan).

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 480.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,492.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #74 - Grazing Management, Adaptive + Monitoring

**Scenario Description:**

Implementing adaptive grazing management (that includes a forage-animal balance) to enhance plant community health and ecosystem function in conjunction with long-term monitoring. Monitoring (as outlined in the grazing plan) will be designed so data inventory is repeatable and results comparable. Monitoring data is used to make adjustments in the grazing intensity, frequency, timing and/or duration to meet resource objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current grazing may or may not be balanced with the forage supply of the land unit. Significant adjustments to the intensity, frequency, timing and/or duration of grazing are needed to meet objectives for plant, soil, animal (including wildlife), and/or w

**After Situation:**

Grazing is being adaptively implemented to enhance/recover the health, vigor, structure, and/or composition of desired plant communities. Implementation allows plant, soil, animal (including wildlife), and/or water resources resource concerns to be addressed and outcomes recorded via monitoring protocols. A grazing schedule is utilized to assist in the proper seasonal timing and frequency of grazing events. On-site measurements and observations are utilized to adjust the intensity and duration of individual grazing events. Monitoring (as outlined in the grazing plan) is performed with repeatable methodology and comparable results. Records of adaptive decision-making and monitoring are utilized for future adjustments in grazing.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 480.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,007.69

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$27.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Scenario:** #75 - Grazing Management, Adaptive

**Scenario Description:**

Implementing adaptive grazing management (that includes a forage-animal balance) to enhance plant community health and ecosystem function. Monitoring (as outlined in the grazing plan) will evaluate plant health and/or utilization parameters to make adjustments in the grazing intensity, frequency, timing and/or duration to meet resource objectives.

**Before Situation:**

Current grazing may or may not be balanced with the forage supply of the land unit. Significant adjustments to the intensity, frequency, timing and/or duration of grazing are needed to meet objectives for plant, soil, animal (including wildlife), and/or w

**After Situation:**

Grazing is being adaptively implemented to enhance/recover the health, vigor, structure, and/or composition of desired plant communities. Implementation allows plant, soil, animal (including wildlife), and/or water resources resource concerns to be addressed. A grazing schedule is utilized to assist in the proper seasonal timing and frequency of grazing events. On-site measurements and observations are utilized to adjust the intensity and duration of individual grazing events. Monitoring (as outlined in the grazing plan) and records of adaptive decision-making are utilized for future adjustments in grazing.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 480.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,386.40

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$19.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #1 - Irrigation, Modify Pump

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario includes the modification and/or replacement of vertical turbine pumps in conjunction with an irrigation conversion practice to ensure energy and water savings are realized. This includes an inventory or evaluation of existing pump performance data. This scenario includes all materials, equipment and labor to test and repair the inner column of the pump assembly and rebowling. Resource Concerns: Water Quality degradation - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters; Insufficient water - Inefficient use of irrigation water. Associated Practices include: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 430 - Irrigation Pipeline; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 449 - Irrigation Water Management; 313 - Waste Storage Facility; 634 - Waste Transfer; 436 - Irrigation Reservoir; and 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery; and 614 - Watering Facility.

**Before Situation:**

160 acres of cropland is being irrigated with a less efficient system than a properly designed low pressure center pivot or linear move system.

**After Situation:**

Irrigation system on 160 acres of cropland has been converted to use a more efficient method of irrigation. The new pump and irrigation delivery are designed as a system that maximizes efficiency in energy and water use.

**Feature Measure:** Number of pumps

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$43,172.04

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$43,172.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #3 - Irrigation, Variable Frequency Drive

**Scenario Description:**

Description: This is an installation of electrical and electronic components designed to vary the frequency of the voltage to vary the speed of an electric motor in an irrigation system. This directly affects pressure and flowrate. This would give the operator the flexibility to operate several systems separately or at the same time. Resource concerns: Insufficient water - Inefficient use of irrigation water; Inefficient energy use - Equipment and facilities and Farming/ranching practices and field operations. Associated Practices: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 430 - Irrigation Pipeline; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**Before Situation:**

Standard electrical connection from electrical utility to pump motor. No capability to match pump output pressure and/or flowrate to field(s) need(s). Result is over/under pressure(s) and/or flow rate(s), possible hydraulic anomalies, energy loss, and or

**After Situation:**

VFD Modifications are implemented at the pump site to allow for varying the speed of electric motor to match the pressure and flow requirements for a center pivot irrigation system.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Pumps

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,448.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,448.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #5 - Livestock, Manure Transfer

**Scenario Description:**

Description: Pump and accessories to move manure from storage location to manure distribution site/equipment. Part of a animal waste management system. Resource Concerns: Water Quality degradation - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters. Associated Practices include: 313 - Waste Storage Facility; 634 - Waste Transfer

**Before Situation:**

Livestock facility that is not in compliance with federal and/or state regulations for animal feeding operations for handling livestock manure.

**After Situation:**

A manure transfer pump is installed as part of animal manure handling system. The typical installation includes a 15 hp chopper/screw pump installed at the facility with all necessary appurtenances and controls. Other pump types may be substituted as needed to transfer manure. Waste is properly managed in accordance federal and/or state regulations for animal feeding operations to address water quality concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Pumps

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$26,341.84

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$26,341.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #7 - Livestock, w/ Pressure Tank, Low HP

**Scenario Description:**

Descriptions: A submersible electric-powered pump (typically less than or equal to 1.5 HP) is installed in a well or structure. It is used to provide water for livestock as part of a prescribed grazing system. Submersible pump installed to deliver stockwater from a well or waterbody to a watering facility. Installation includes drop pipe, pump, and all necessary appurtenances and includes a pressure tank. Resource Concerns: Livestock Production Limitation - Inadequate livestock water. Associated Practices include: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 516 - Livestock Pipeline.

**Before Situation:**

Grazing system has an inadequate water supply for livestock that prevents efficient use of pasture.

**After Situation:**

Properly designed water supply system including pump, pipeline, and watering facilities are in place. Water is delivered at a sufficient rate to meet the requirements of a prescribed grazing system.

**Feature Measure:** No. of Pumps Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,647.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,647.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #8 - Livestock, With Pressure Tank, High HP

**Scenario Description:**

A submersible electric-powered pump (greater than 1.5 hp) is installed in a well or structure. It is used to provide water for livestock as part of a prescribed grazing system. Submersible pump installed to deliver stockwater from a well or waterbody to a watering facility. Installation includes drop pipe, pump, and all necessary appurtenances and includes a pressure tank. Resource Concerns: Livestock Production Limitation - Inadequate livestock water. Associated Practices include: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 516 - Livestock Pipeline

**Before Situation:**

Grazing system has an inadequate water supply for livestock that prevents efficient use of pasture.

**After Situation:**

Properly designed water supply system including pump, pipeline, and watering facilities are in place. Water is delivered at a sufficient rate to meet the requirements of a prescribed grazing system.

**Feature Measure:** Pump Power Requirement

**Scenario Unit:** Horsepower

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,466.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,233.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #9 - Livestock, without Pressure Tank (HP)

**Scenario Description:**

Description: A 1 Hp submersible electric-powered pump is installed in a well or structure. It is used for watering livestock as part of a prescribed grazing system. Submersible pump installed to deliver stockwater from a well or waterbody to a watering facility. Installation includes drop pipe, pump, and all necessary appurtenances. Installation without pressure tank is typically used during warm seasons. Resource Concerns: Livestock Production Limitation - Inadequate livestock water; Insufficient water - Inefficient use of irrigation water. Associated Practices include: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 516 - Livestock Pipeline.

**Before Situation:**

Grazing system that has an inadequate water supply for livestock.

**After Situation:**

Water is transferred at a sufficient rate and pressure to meet the requirements of a prescribed grazing system. Irrigation: A properly designed pump is installed to improve irrigation efficiency and reduce energy usage.

**Feature Measure:** Pump Power Required

**Scenario Unit:** Horsepower

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,745.41 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,745.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #12 - Solar-Powered Pump 1hp

**Scenario Description:**

Description: The typical scenario assumes installation of a submersible solar-powered pump in a well or a live stream. The installation includes the pump, wiring, drop pipe, solar panels, mounts, inverter, and all appurtenances. Grazing - Livestock exclusion from surface water will result in improved surface water quality and reduced erosion. Irrigation - energy consumption will be reduced and the increased pressure and flow rates will improve irrigation efficiency. Resource Concerns: Insufficient stockwater. Associated Practices include: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 382 - Fence; 516 - Livestock Pipeline; 561 - Heavy Use Area Protection; and, 614 - Watering Facility.

**Before Situation:**

Inadequate supply or location of water for a prescribed grazing system. Eroded stream banks and degraded water quality due to livestock access to stream. Cattle are not well-distributed because of remote water location.

**After Situation:**

The typical scenario assumes installation of a photovoltaic (PV) panel, capable of operating a solar-powered submersible pump in a well or other water source. The installation includes the pump, wiring, pipeline in the well, solar panels, frame mounts, inverter, and all appurtenances. Water will be pumped to a Livestock Pipeline (516). Grazing - Livestock exclusion from surface water will result in improved surface water quality and reduced erosion. Grazing has potential to be well distributed.

**Feature Measure:** Each Pumping Plant

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,017.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8,017.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #192 - Variable Frequency Drive

**Scenario Description:**

This is an installation of electrical and electronic components designed to vary the frequency of the voltage to an electric motor and thus the ability to vary the speed of the motor. This directly affects pressure and flowrate. This also could give the operator the flexibility to operate several systems separately or at the same time. Resource concerns: Insufficient water - Inefficient use of irrigation water; Inefficient energy use - Equipment and facilities and Farming/ranching practices and field operations. Associated Practices: 374 - Farmstead Energy Improvement; 430 - Irrigation Pipeline; 441 - Irrigation System, Microirrigation; 449 - Irrigation Water Management; 516 - Livestock Pipeline; and 614 - Watering Facility.

**Before Situation:**

Standard electrical connection from electrical utility to pump motor. No capability to match pump output pressure and/or flowrate to field(s) need(s). Result is over/under pressure(s) and/or flow rate(s), possible hydraulic anomalies, energy loss, and or

**After Situation:**

VFD Modifications are implemented at the pump site to allow for varying the speed of a 40 Hp electric motor to match the pressure and flow requirements for a center pivot irrigation system.

**Feature Measure:** Pump Power Requirement

**Scenario Unit:** Brake Horse Power

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,904.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$138.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 533 - Pumping Plant

**Scenario:** #197 - Windmill-Powered Pump

**Scenario Description:**

A windmill is installed in order to supply a reliable water source for livestock and/or wildlife. The windmill includes the tower, concrete footings, wheel blade unit, sucker rod, down pipe, gear box, pump, plumbing, and well head protection concrete pad. The typical scenario will be a windmill system with a 10 ft diameter mill and 27-foot tower which is pumping from a 150-foot well. As a result of installing this windmill, resource concerns of inadequate stock water, plant establishment, growth, productivity, health, and vigor, and water quantity can be addressed. Resource Concerns: Insufficient stockwater.

**Before Situation:**

In a rangeland or pasture setting, a reliable source of water for livestock is not available, or the spacing between water sources is such that grazing distribution and plant health are adversely impacted.

**After Situation:**

A windmill, with a wheel ranging from 6' to 16' in diameter, will be installed over a well that is located to provide a reliable source of livestock water at the rate of at least 2 gpm, to facilitate proper grazing distribution and improved plant health. To increase reliability, water is pumped into a storage tank to provide a given number of days of supply. Installation includes the footings, wellhead protection concrete pad, tower, gear box, sail, sucker rod, down hole accessories, and a short outlet pipe to a storage tank.

**Feature Measure:** Diameter of Mill Wheel

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,978.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,397.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 550 - Range Planting

**Scenario:** #1 - Native, Standard Prep

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of a mixture of NATIVE adapted perennial species on a grazed land unit to improve forage condition, improve wildlife habitat and/or reduce erosion. Seed mix of Native species is chosen based on range conditions and availability of seed. Planting by preparing a seedbed with LIGHT TO MODERATE TILLAGE and seeding with a no-till drill, range drill, or by broadcasting.

**Before Situation:**

Rangeland or cropland with or without an existing stand of perennial or annual grasses, OR a monoculture, OR no grasses are present, where natural reseeding or vegetation enhancement by grazing management alone is unlikely. Resource concerns may include:

**After Situation:**

Establishment of NATIVE adapted perennial vegetation such as grasses, forbs, and legumes improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on grazed range, pasture, forest or other suitable location.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Range Planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,216.44

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$202.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 550 - Range Planting

**Scenario:** #2 - Native, Standard Prep (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of a mixture of NATIVE adapted perennial species on a grazed land unit to improve forage condition, improve wildlife habitat and/or reduce erosion. Seed mix of Native species is chosen based on range conditions and availability of seed. Planting by preparing a seedbed with LIGHT TO MODERATE TILLAGE and seeding with a no-till drill, range drill, or by broadcasting.

**Before Situation:**

Rangeland or cropland with or without an existing stand of perennial or annual grasses, OR a monoculture, OR no grasses are present, where natural reseeding or vegetation enhancement by grazing management alone is unlikely. Resource concerns may include:

**After Situation:**

Establishment of NATIVE adapted perennial vegetation such as grasses, forbs, and legumes improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on grazed range, pasture, forest or other suitable location.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Range Planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,002.62

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$225.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 550 - Range Planting

**Scenario:** #3 - Native, Heavy Prep

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of a mixture of NATIVE adapted perennial species on a grazed land unit to improve forage condition, improve wildlife habitat and/or reduce erosion. Seed mix of Native species is chosen based on range conditions and availability of seed. Planting by preparing a seedbed with MODERATE TO HEAVY TILLAGE (ex: ripping & heavy disk) and seeding with a no-till drill, range drill, or by broadcasting.

**Before Situation:**

Rangeland or cropland with or without an existing stand of perennial or annual grasses, OR a monoculture, OR no grasses are present, where natural reseeding or vegetation enhancement by grazing management alone is unlikely. Existing conditions often requi

**After Situation:**

Establishment of NATIVE adapted perennial vegetation such as grasses, forbs, and legumes improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion on grazed range, pasture, forest or other suitable location.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Range Planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,150.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$226.88

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 550 - Range Planting

**Scenario:** #5 - Native, Wildlife, or Pollinator (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of a mixture of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE adapted perennial species on a grazed land unit to improve habitat for pollinators, beneficial insects, and wildlife species. Seed mix of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE SPECIES IS CHOSEN TO SPECIFICALLY BENEFIT WILDLIFE (ex: big game spp, Sage grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, others) or POLLINATORS (e.g. inclusion of 5-10 forb species) based on range conditions. FOR POLLINATOR HABITAT: Consideration is given to selecting plants that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season, where feasible. For honeybee foraging habitat, species are selected which will be in bloom when hives are in the area. Planting by preparing a seedbed with MODERATE TO HEAVY TILLAGE (ex: ripping & heavy disk) and seeding with a no-till drill, range drill, or by broadcasting.

**Before Situation:**

Rangeland or cropland with or without an existing stand of perennial or annual grasses, OR a monoculture, OR no grasses are present, where natural reseeding or vegetation enhancement by grazing management alone is unlikely. Existing conditions often requi

**After Situation:**

Establishment of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE adapted perennial vegetation, such as grasses, forbs, legumes, with an emphasis on species beneficial to wildlife or Pollinators on grazed range, pasture, forest, or other suitable location. For Pollinator habitat: Plants that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season are established, where feasible.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Range Planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,929.25

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$318.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 550 - Range Planting

**Scenario:** #67 - Native -Wildlife or Pollinator

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of a mixture of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE adapted perennial species on a rangeland unit to improve wildlife habitat, benefit pollinators & beneficial insects, improve forage condition, and/or reduce erosion. Seed mix of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE SPECIES IS CHOSEN TO SPECIFICALLY BENEFIT WILDLIFE (ex: big game spp, Sage grouse, Lesser Prairie Chicken, others) or POLLINATORS (ex: inclusion of 5-10 forb species) based on range conditions and availability of seed. FOR POLLINATOR HABITAT: Consideration is given to selecting plants that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season where feasible. Planting by preparing a seedbed with MODERATE TO HEAVY TILLAGE (ex: ripping & heavy disk) and seeding with a no-till drill, range drill, or broadcasting.

**Before Situation:**

Rangeland with existing stand of perennial or annual grasses OR monoculture OR no grasses present where natural reseeding or vegetation enhancement by grazing management alone is unlikely. Existing conditions often require complete removal, suppression, o

**After Situation:**

Establishment of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE adapted perennial vegetation such as grasses, forbs, legumes, shrubs, and trees with an emphasis on species beneficial to wildlife or Pollinators on rangeland, native or naturalized pasture, grazed forest or other suitable location. For Pollinator habitat: Plants that bloom sequentially throughout the growing season are established, where feasible.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Range Planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,579.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$151.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 550 - Range Planting

**Scenario:** #74 - Native Perennial, Conversion from Dryland Cropland, with FI

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of a mixture of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE adapted perennial species on a rangeland unit to improve forage condition, improve wildlife habitat and/or reduce erosion. Seed mix of predominantly Native species is chosen based on range conditions and availability of seed. Planting by preparing a seedbed with LIGHT TO MODERATE TILLAGE and seeding with a no-till drill, range drill, or by broadcasting. This scenario includes foregone income when land is converted from DRYLAND cropland.

**Before Situation:**

A monoculture of DRYLAND crops are grown on cropland. The resource concerns include soil erosion, soil quality degradation, inadequate feed and forage for livestock, and undesirable plant productivity and health.

**After Situation:**

Establishment of PREDOMINANTLY NATIVE adapted perennial vegetation such as grasses, forbs, and legumes improve forage quality and quantity and reduce soil erosion.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Range Planting

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$29,865.62

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$373.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 554 - Drainage Water Management

**Scenario:** #1 - Drainage Water Management (DWM)

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is the process of managing water discharges from surface and/or subsurface agricultural drainage systems by reducing nutrient loading into surface waters. Typical systems consist of a 80 acre field with existing drainage tile lines and installed water control structures. The operator goes to the field in order to adjust water control structures (riser boards). While on site the date and adjustment information is recorded/logged. The number of yearly adjustments is based on 6 trips to a field 5 miles from headquarters. The field time to make and record each adjustment is 0.5 hours per structure (including travel time). The typical field will contain 3 structures to control field water levels. Resource Concern: Water Quality - Excess Nutrients in surface and ground waters. Associated Practices: 606-Subsurface Drain; 607-Surface Drain, Field Ditch; 608-Surface Drain, Main or Lateral; 587-Structure for Water Control; 590-Nutrient Management .

**Before Situation:**

Existing drainage systems are in place and water flows uncontrolled.

**After Situation:**

Existing drainage systems are managed to reduce flow of field drainage waters from the site and reduce nitrate loading.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Control Structur

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$399.42

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$133.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 554 - Drainage Water Management

**Scenario:** #22 - Automated Drainage Water Management

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is the process of managing the drainage water discharge volume and water table elevation by regulating the flow from surface and/or subsurface agricultural drainage systems utilizing automation. Typical systems consist of a field with a fairly flat slope (less than 2% and preferably less than 1%) with existing drainage tile lines and installed water control structures which are operated with automated slide gates, and telemetry data systems coupled with cloud data management. Typical affected area for an automated drainage water management structure is 10 to 20 acres. The operator, from handheld device, adjusts water control structures (gate elevation) and logs data. Educational meeting is conducted between consultant and operator(s) annually for essential knowledge transfer Resource Concern: Water Quality - Excess Nutrients in surface and ground waters. Associated Practices: 606-Subsurface Drain; 607-Surface Drain, Field Ditch; 608-Surface Drain, Main or Lateral; 587-Structure for Water Control; 590-Nutrient Management.

**Before Situation:**

Existing inefficient drainage systems are in place and water flows uncontrolled, resulting in sediment and nutrient laden outflow entering ditches or streams.

**After Situation:**

Existing drainage systems are managed utilizing telemetry and real-time data to retain moisture in the soil for plant uptake and to allow for enhanced nutrient utilization.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Managed Drainage

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$466.57

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 558 - Roof Runoff Structure

**Scenario:** #1 - Roof Gutter

**Scenario Description:**

A roof runoff structure, consisting of gutter(s), downspout(s), and appropriate outlet facilities on a 200 feet long building by 10 feet tall side walls. Used to keep roof clean water runoff uncontaminated and provide a stable outlet to ground surface. Facilitates waste management and protects environment by minimizing clean water additions to waste systems and addresses water quality concerns. Associated practices include Waste Storage Facility (313), Composting Facility (317), Heavy Use Area Protection (561), Watering Facility (614), Underground Outlet (620), Diversion (362), Roofs and Covers (367), and any relevant irrigation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Applicable where: (1) a roof runoff management facility is included in an overall plan for an overall plan for a waste management system; (2) roof runoff needs to be diverted away from structures or contaminated areas; (3) there is a need to collect, cont

**After Situation:**

A gutter, downspout, and outlet system servicing the portion of the building roof that would otherwise drain into a waste management system or create erosion. Roof line of 200 feet serviced with gutter, downspouts, and appurtenances.

**Feature Measure:** Linear Length of Roof to be

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,130.82 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 560 - Access Road

**Scenario:** #2 - New 6 inch gravel road with Geotextile, less than 2.5 Ft.

**Scenario Description:**

Newly Constructed gravel road with min. 6 inch thick compacted gravel surface over woven geotextile fabric on relatively level ground and weak bearing capacity soils. A properly constructed, well defined access road will address resource concerns related with compaction, emissions of fugitive dust, and excessive sediment in surface water. It also improves the plant productivity, vigor and health and substantially reduces the chance of wild fire hazards. Short term air quality deterioration may result if proper dust control measures are not implemented during the practice installation. Costs include excavation, shaping, grading, and all equipment, labor and incidental materials necessary to install the practice.

**Before Situation:**

An agricultural enterprise which requires, but does not have, a fixed travel way for equipment and vehicles for various resource activities and where use of equipment and vehicles within the enterprise without a defined access road would result in compact

**After Situation:**

The road will be 16 feet wide with 6 inch gravel surfacing at the top over woven geotextile fabric. It is mostly in embankment less than 2.5 feet in height, (average 1.5 ft) typical side slopes 3:1. A properly constructed, well defined access road will greatly reduce sheet, rill and wind erosion, eliminate compaction in land use areas where it is harmful, reduce emissions of particulate matter (PM) and PM precursors and also reduce excessive sediment in surface water by reducing uncontrolled sediment transport. Planned grades will include all dips and water bars. If clearing and grubbing of land in the alignment area is required, use Land Clearing (460). Pipe culverts installed as part of access road should be covered by either Structures for Water Control (587) or Stream Crossings (578) depending on the type of structure. Earthfill embankment above the culvert structure would still be covered by this Practice. Diversions constructed as part of access road should be covered by Diversion (362). When seeding or revegetation is required, use Critical Area Planting (342). Dust control must be addressed under Dust Control on Unpaved Roads and Surfaces (373).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Roadway

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16,666.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 561 - Heavy Use Area Protection

**Scenario:** #1 - Reinforced Concrete with sand or gravel foundation - cubic yard - NP Region

**Scenario Description:**

The stabilization of areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles by surfacing with reinforced concrete on a sand or gravel foundation to provide a stable, non-eroding surface. Installation includes all materials, equipment, and labor to install this practice, The stabilized area will address the resource concerns soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to agricultural, urban, recreational and other frequently and/or intensively used areas requiring treatment to address soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**After Situation:**

The stabilized area is surfaced with approximately 600 square feet of approximately 11 cubic yards of welded wire mesh reinforced concrete with 11 cubic yards of sand or gravel foundation material for surfacing areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles and will address soil erosion and water quality degradation. All needed roads must use Access Road (560). Any needed treatment of stream crossings must use Stream Crossing (578). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Provisions to collect, store, utilize, and or treat contaminated runoff must use Sediment Basin (350), Waste Storage Facility (313), or Waste Treatment (629) as appropriate. To reduce the potential for air quality problems from particulate matter associated with heavy use areas, consider the use of Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380) or Herbaceous Wind Barriers (603).

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Concrete

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 11.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,222.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$565.73

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 561 - Heavy Use Area Protection

**Scenario:** #2 - Rock/Gravel on Geotextile - cubic yard - NP Region

**Scenario Description:**

The stabilization of areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles by surfacing with rock and or gravel on a geotextile fabric foundation to provide a stable, non-eroding surface. Installation includes all materials, equipment, and labor to install this practice, The stabilized area will address the resource concerns of soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to agricultural, urban, recreational and other frequently and/or intensively used areas requiring treatment to address soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**After Situation:**

The stabilized area is surfaced with approximately 30 cubic yards of rock and or gravel on approximately 160 square yards of geotextile fabric foundation material for surfacing areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles and will address soil erosion and water quality degradation. All needed roads must use Access Road (560). Any needed treatment of stream crossings must use Stream Crossing (578). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Provisions to collect, store, utilize, and or treat contaminated runoff must use Sediment Basin (350), Waste Storage Facility (313), or Waste Treatment (629) as appropriate. To reduce the potential for air quality problems from particulate matter associated with heavy use areas, consider the use of Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380) or Herbaceous Wind Barriers (603).

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Rock and/or Grav

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,970.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$65.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 561 - Heavy Use Area Protection

**Scenario:** #3 - Rock/Gravel

**Scenario Description:**

The stabilization of areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles by surfacing with rock and or gravel to provide a stable, non-eroding surface. Installation includes all materials, equipment, and labor to install this practice. The stabilized area will address the resource concerns of soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to agricultural, urban, recreational and other frequently and/or intensively used areas requiring treatment to address soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**After Situation:**

The stabilized area is surfaced with approximately 270 cubic yards of rock and or gravel for surfacing areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles and will address soil erosion and water quality degradation. All needed roads must use Access Road (560). Any needed treatment of stream crossings must use Stream Crossing (578). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Provisions to collect, store, utilize, and or treat contaminated runoff must use Sediment Basin (350), Waste Storage Facility (313), or Waste Treatment (629) as appropriate. To reduce the potential for air quality problems from particulate matter associated with heavy use areas, consider the use of Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380) or Herbaceous Wind Barriers (603).

**Feature Measure:** Volume of Rock and/or Grav

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 270.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,823.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$25.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 561 - Heavy Use Area Protection

**Scenario:** #19 - Rock/Gravel-GeoCell-Geotextile

**Scenario Description:**

The stabilization of areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles by surfacing with rock and or gravel in a cellular containment grid on a geotextile fabric foundation to provide a stable, non-eroding surface. Installation includes all materials, equipment, vegetation of disturbed areas and labor to install this practice. The stabilized area will address the resource concerns of soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where frequently and/or intensively used areas require treatment to address soil erosion and water quality degradation.

**After Situation:**

The stabilized area is surfaced with approximately 630 square feet of rock and or gravel in approximately 70 square yards of cellular containment grid on approximately 70 square yards of geotextile fabric foundation material for surfacing areas around facilities that are frequently and intensively used by people, animals or vehicles and will address soil erosion and water quality degradation. All seeding or revegetation of disturbed areas is provided. All needed roads must use Access Road (560). Any needed treatment of stream crossings must use Stream Crossing (578). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas must use Critical Area Planting (342). Provisions to collect, store, utilize, and or treat contaminated runoff must use Sediment Basin (350), Waste Storage Facility (313), or Waste Treatment (629) as appropriate. To reduce the potential for air quality problems from particulate matter associated with heavy use areas, consider the use of Windbreak/Shelterbelt Establishment (380) or Herbaceous Wind Barriers (603).

**Feature Measure:** Area of Rock and or Gravel

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 630.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,831.97

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 574 - Spring Development

**Scenario:** #16 - Spring Development

**Scenario Description:**

Develop a water source from a natural spring or seep (i.e., spring development) to provide water for livestock and/or wildlife needs. This typical scenario includes excavating and exposing the water source at the spring/seep (typically on a hillside), constructing a water collection structure by installing a 50 ft long, 4 inch diameter HDPE perforated pipe enclosed in a sand/gravel envelope overlaid by 2 ft wide filter fabric (50 ft long) and behind a concrete cutoff wall (6 inch x 4 ft height x 25 ft long) to retain water. Water is directed (via 20 ft long, 4 inch PVC) to a spring box (48 inch diameter x 6 ft long CMP) that is located at the cutoff wall or below the wall, equipped with a watertight lid and two outlets. One outlet serves as overflow pipe to account for occasions where inflow exceeds outflow. The collection system is commonly composed of a single or a network of perforated 4 inch diameter drainage pipe placed in an excavated collection trench that runs across the slope. The outflow pipe from the spring box can be directed to buried large storage (not included), and to a watering facility (not included) for use Resource Concern: Livestock production limitation - Inadequate livestock water. Associated Practices: 516-Livestock Pipeline; 614-Watering Facility; 382-Fence; Critical Area Planting (342).

**Before Situation:**

Livestock operation with inadequate fresh water for livestock and an on-site undeveloped spring/seep.

**After Situation:**

Spring development system provides adequate water for the intended use. The system typically runs all year long in most zones.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Developments

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,510.04

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,510.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 576 - Livestock Shelter Structure

**Scenario:** #21 - Permanent Fabricated Wind Shelter, equal to or greater than 8 foot

**Scenario Description:**

Permanent Livestock Fabricated Wind Shelter is installed to provide protection for livestock.

**Before Situation:**

Herds are held and fed in fragile riparian areas in order to reduce stress on domestic animals from harsh winter conditions and provide protection from wind. The concentration of animals in these areas degrade streambanks, cause excessive sedimentation, d

**After Situation:**

Permanent fabricated wind shelters are installed in order to provide shelter for livestock in upland grazing areas away from the riparian zones. As a result, animals can be held in an area away from the riparian zone thereby eliminating the impacts to water quality and riparian health. A typical scenario is a Fabricated Wind Shelter installed in association with an animal feeding operation (AFO). The AFO has been moved out of the riparian zone where shelter was previously provided by the surrounding riparian woody vegetation. The AFO has been moved to a location where shelter is not naturally provided and needs to be fabricated. The typical fabrication involves a permanent, wood framed, metal or wood faced, 8.5 - foot high, 200 - foot long, fabricated wind shelter, 80% solid face, secured to the ground with wood posts.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Wind Shelter

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,280.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$46.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 576 - Livestock Shelter Structure

**Scenario:** #22 - Portable Fabricated Wind Shelter, equal to or greater than 8 foot

**Scenario Description:**

Portable Livestock Fabricated Wind Shelter is installed to provide protection for livestock. The shelter can be moved around the grazing unit in order to prevent heavy use resource concerns at any one location.

**Before Situation:**

Herds are held and fed in fragile riparian areas in order to reduce stress on domestic animals from harsh winter conditions and provide protection from wind. The concentration of animals in these areas degrade streambanks, cause excessive sedimentation, d

**After Situation:**

Portable fabricated wind shelters are utilized to provide shelter for livestock in upland grazing areas from the riparian zones. The portable shelters are moved in rotation with feeding areas thereby limiting soil disturbance and reducing the impacts of heavy use at any one location. As a result of implementing this practice, the herd can be moved out of the impacted area and water quality and vegetation health resource concerns will be addressed. A typical portable wind shelter involves a series of steel framed panels faced with corrugated metal. Each unit is approximately 9.5 feet tall and 24 feet long. Four panels (96 - feet) would be utilized to provide shelter to a herd size of 125 animals.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Wind Shelter

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 96.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,712.94

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$49.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 578 - Stream Crossing

**Scenario:** #2 - Culvert installation

**Scenario Description:**

Install a new culvert. Work includes dewatering, site preparation and removing any old crossing, acquiring and installing culvert pipe with gravel bedding and fill (compacted), and building headwalls. If a different travel surface is needed, refer to another appropriate standard for the surfacing. 48 inch Culvert installation with > 75 cy of fill needed and > 2 yds rock riprap for headwalls. Pipe is 50 feet long. Use (396) Aquatic Organism Passage instead, when the primary intent is biological concerns, not hydrologic. Use (587) Structure for Water Control instead, for ditch cross culverts and other intermittent flows.

**Before Situation:**

Water flow could not cross access road or trail without erosion; or access road or trail could not cross channel.

**After Situation:**

Access road and waterflow are able to cross each other in a stable manner. Stream flow is not impeded and a stable base exists for equipment, people and/or animals to cross. Associated practices could be (342) Critical Area Planting, (560) Access Road, (575) Animal Trails and Walkways, (566) Recreational Trails and Walkways.

**Feature Measure:** Culvert

**Scenario Unit:** Diameter Inch Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,632.22

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 578 - Stream Crossing

**Scenario:** #3 - Low water crossing, rock armor

**Scenario Description:**

Stabilize the bottom and slope of a stream channel using rock riprap. This scenario includes site preparation, dewatering, acquiring and installing gravel or geotextile with rock riprap on channel bottom and approaches. Final travel surface shall be rock. If a different travel surface is needed, refer to another appropriate standard for the surfacing. Typical stream has 75 foot bottom width and approaches. Width is 12 feet for a total area as 900 square feet. Use (396) Aquatic Organism Passage instead, when the primary intent is biological concerns, not hydrologic.

**Before Situation:**

Water flow could not cross access road or trail without erosion; or access road or trail could not cross channel.

**After Situation:**

Stream flow is not impeded and a stable base exists for equipment, people and/or animals to cross. Associated practices could be (342) Critical Area Planting, (560) Access Road, (575) Animal Trails and Walkways, (566) Recreational Trails and Walkways, (500) Obstruction Removal, or (584) Channel Stabilization.

**Feature Measure:** Crossing dimensions

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 900.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,091.27

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 578 - Stream Crossing

**Scenario:** #4 - Low water crossing, concrete slab

**Scenario Description:**

Stabilize the bottom and slope of a stream channel using concrete in place. This scenario includes site preparation, dewatering, acquiring and installing cast in place concrete on channel bottom and approaches. Final travel surface shall be concrete. If a different travel surface is needed, refer to another appropriate standard for the surfacing. Typical stream has 50 foot bottom width and 8 foot approach on each side. Width is 12 feet for a total area of 792 square feet. Use (396) Aquatic Organism Passage instead, when the primary intent is biological concerns, not hydrologic.

**Before Situation:**

Water flow could not cross access road or trail without erosion; or access road or trail could not cross channel.

**After Situation:**

Stream flow is not impeded and a stable base exists for equipment, people and/or animals to cross. Associated practices could be (342) Critical Area Planting, (560) Access Road, (575) Animal Trails and Walkways, (566) Recreational Trails and Walkways, (500) Obstruction Removal, or (584) Channel Stabilization.

**Feature Measure:** Crossing dimensions

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 792.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,994.40

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.88

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 578 - Stream Crossing

**Scenario:** #6 - Low water crossing, geocell

**Scenario Description:**

Stabilize the bottom and slope of a stream channel using geocell mats filled with rock, typically suited for a "low energy" channel. This scenario includes site preparation, dewatering, acquiring and installing geocell mats on channel bottom and approaches. Final travel surface shall be a rock aggregate covering above the geocell. If a different travel surface is needed, refer to another appropriate standard for the surfacing. Typical stream has 50 foot bottom width and 8 foot approach on each side. Width is 12 feet for a total area of 792 square feet. Use (396) Aquatic Organism Passage instead, when the primary intent is biological concerns, not hydrologic.

**Before Situation:**

Water flow could not cross access road or trail without erosion; or access road or trail could not cross channel.

**After Situation:**

Stream flow is not impeded and a stable base exists for equipment, people and/or animals to cross. Associated practices could be (342) Critical Area Planting, (560) Access Road, (575) Animal Trails and Walkways, (566) Recreational Trails and Walkways, (500) Obstruction Removal, or (584) Channel Stabilization.

**Feature Measure:** Crossing dimensions

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 792.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,169.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 580 - Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**Scenario:** #27 - Bioengineering with High Earthwork Volume

**Scenario Description:**

Protection of deeply incised streambanks consisting of plantings of rhizomatous vegetation and establishment/re-establishment of a bankfull bench to stabilize and protect against scour and erosion. Environmental benefits derived from woody vegetation include diverse and productive riparian habitats, shade, organic additions to the stream, cover for fish, and improvements in aesthetic value and water quality. The purpose of this practice is to maintain, improve, or restore physical, chemical, and biological functions of a stream to provide diverse aquatic communities to improve habitat for desired aquatic species. Payment cost include protection by re-establishing riparian-corridor vegetation through use of annual grasses/ fescue (upland/terrace), shrubs (seedlings or t+B1ransplants) willows cuttings/willow revetments, vertical willow bundles, and bankfull bench construction, bank shaping, and erosion control fabric. Establishment of bankfull bench 10- to 20-foot width; excavation also includes 15-foot high bank at 3:1 slope for 1000 linear feet; 1.1 acres is used for typical scenario. Resource Concerns: Soil Erosion - Excessive Bank Erosion from Streams, Shoreline and Water Conveyance Channels; Water Quality Degradation - Excessive Sediment in Surface Waters; Water Quality Degradation - Elevated Water Temperature; Excess/Insufficient Water - Excessive Sediment in Surface Waters; Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife- Habitat Degradation.

**Before Situation:**

A stream bisects the agricultural property and much of the woody vegetation is gone due to channel instability, overgrazing, or human manipulation; the stream has marginally degraded streambanks that are unstable and show signs of active erosion. Soil Er

**After Situation:**

The streambank is stable against further erosion and encourages natural sediment transport and deposition. Loss of riparian areas and sediment load is reduced in the stream. For Soil Erosion: The streambank is stable. For Water Quality Degradation: The sediment load has decreased in the stream resulting in improved aquatic habitat. For Excess/Insufficient Water: The water conveyance capacity, storage capacity and flow within the stream has been stabilized. For Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife: The reduction in the sediment load promotes survival, growth, reproduction, and/or diversity of aquatic organisms within the stream's habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Length of installed bioengin

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$133,148.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$133.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 585 - Stripcropping

**Scenario:** #4 - Erosion, Wind and Water

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario describes the implementation of a strip cropping system that is designed specifically for the control of wind and water erosion or minimizing the transport of sediments or other water borne contaminants originating from runoff on cropland. The planned strip cropping system will meet the current 585 standard. Implementation will result in alternating strips of erosion susceptible crops with erosion resistant crops that are oriented as close to perpendicular to water flows as possible. The designed system will reduce erosion/sediment/contaminants to desired objectives. The scenario includes the costs of designing the system, installing the strips on the landscape appropriately, and integrating a crop rotation that includes water erosion resistant species.

**Before Situation:**

In this geographic area, excessive water erosion is caused by raising crops in a manner that allows sheet water flows to travel down the slope causing sheet and rill erosion or concentrated flow conditions, degradation of soil health through loss of topsoil.

**After Situation:**

A strip cropping system that includes at least two or more strips within the planning slope will be designed to include parallel strips of approximately equal widths of water erosion resistant crop species with non-water erosion resistant crop species. Widths will be determined using current water erosion prediction technology to meet objectives. The design and implementation of a stripcropping system will minimize wind, sheet and rill erosion, protect soil quality, reduce offsite sedimentation, and benefit offsite aquatic wildlife habitat. Erosion prediction before and after practice application will be recorded showing the design and benefits of the practice. Erosion resistant strips in rotation must be managed to maintain the planned vegetative cover and surface roughness.

**Feature Measure:** area of strips

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$188.55 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #3 - Commercial Inline Flashboard Riser - NP Reg 1

**Scenario Description:**

An Inline Water Control Structure (WCS) composed of plastic that maintains a desired water surface elevation, controls the direction or rate of flow, or conveys water to address the resource concern: Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife. The water surface elevation is controlled by addition or removal of slats or "stoplogs". This scenario is applicable to variable crest weir structures where the elevation is controlled at point along a pipe extending through an embankment, providing ease of access to the structure and provide better protection against beaver activity. There are commercially available models composed of plastic that are commonly used when the width of the weir is 24" or less. Payment rate is based upon the Flashboard Weir Length in inches multiplied by the outlet length in feet (Inch-Foot). Cost estimate is based on a using such a commercial product. The typical scenario is an inline structure with a width of 24" and height of six feet. The pipe is 70' of 18" PVC (inlet and outlet combined). Earthwork is included in the associated practice.

**Before Situation:**

The landowner wishes to provide for a way to control the water surface elevation in a wetland area. The landowner wishes to enhance and enlarge the area to provide habitat for fish and wildlife.

**After Situation:**

A WCS is installed in a flow line allowing shallow water impoundments. A wetland area is enhanced and water levels can be varied to better accommodate wildlife needs. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Wetland Creation (658), Wetland Enhancement (659) Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management (644), Dike (356), and Grade Stabilization Structure (410) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Flashboard Weir Length (in)

**Scenario Unit:** Diameter Inch Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,680.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,016.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #4 - Culvert <30 inches HDPE - NP Reg 1

**Scenario Description:**

Install a new HDPE culvert under 30 inches in diameter to convey water under roads or other barriers. A typical scenario would be an 24 inch diameter pipe, 40 feet in length. Work includes site preparation, acquiring and installing culvert pipe with gravel bedding and fill (compacted), and riprap protection of side slopes. Use (396) Aquatic Organism Passage when the primary intent is biological concerns, not hydrologic. Use (578) Stream Crossing for culverts = 30 inches or perennial flow. Earthwork is included in the associated practice.

**Before Situation:**

Water flow needs to be conveyed under an access road, ditch or other barrier. Water must be conveyed in a controlled fashion.

**After Situation:**

Water is conveyed in a controlled manner. Associated practices could be Access Road (560), Animal Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342), Drainage Water Management (554), Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320), Irrigation Pipeline (430), Irrigation Reservoir (436), Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface (443), Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery (447), Irrigation Water Management (449), Lined Waterway or Outlet (468), Obstruction Removal (500), Pond (378), Stormwater Runoff Control (570), Surface Drain, Field Ditch (607), Surface Drain, Main or Lateral (608), and Trails and Walkways (568).

**Feature Measure:** Pipe Diameter (In) x Pipe Le

**Scenario Unit:** Diameter Inch Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,057.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #5 - Culvert <30 inches CMP - NP Reg 1

**Scenario Description:**

Install a new Corrugated Metal Pipe (CMP) culvert under 30 inches in diameter to convey water under roads or other barriers. A typical scenario would be an 24 inch diameter pipe, 40 feet in length. Work includes site preparation, acquiring and installing culvert pipe with gravel bedding and fill (compacted), and riprap protection of side slopes. Use (396) Aquatic Organism Passage when the primary intent is biological concerns, not hydrologic. Use (578) Stream Crossing instead for culverts = 30 inches or perennial flow. Earthwork is included in the associated practice.

**Before Situation:**

Water flow needs to be conveyed under an access road, ditch or other barrier. Water must be conveyed in a controlled fashion.

**After Situation:**

Water is conveyed in a controlled manner. Associated practices could be Access Road (560), Animal Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342), Drainage Water Management (554), Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320), Irrigation Pipeline (430), Irrigation Reservoir (436), Irrigation System, Surface and Subsurface (443), Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery (447), Irrigation Water Management (449), Lined Waterway or Outlet (468), Obstruction Removal (500), Pond (378), Stormwater Runoff Control (570), Surface Drain, Field Ditch (607), Surface Drain, Main or Lateral (608), and Trails and Walkways (568).

**Feature Measure:** Pipe Diameter (In) x Pipe Le

**Scenario Unit:** Diameter Inch Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 960.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,690.65 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.01

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #6 - Slide Gate - Flood Dike

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario includes installation of 15" CMP with a 15" slide gate (screw activated) through a flood control dike. Pipe is typically 48 feet long. During normal conditions the pipe provides un-restricted drainage from areas protected by the dike. During high water events on the downstream side of the dike, the gate can be closed to prevent flood water from backing into the protected area above the dike.

**Before Situation:**

A dike to protect an area from flooding is either in place or planned. Adequate drainage is required during normal operating periods to prevent saturating the area being protected, and flood waters need to be prevented from entering during periods of flood

**After Situation:**

Tide or flood inundation is controlled. Associated practices could be Dike (356), Field Ditch (607), Surface Drain, Main or Lateral (608). After installation of the Dike and Water Control Structure, the area protected by the dike will have proper drainage and protection during high water conditions downstream.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 48.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,087.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$85.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #10 - Rock Check

**Scenario Description:**

This is a structure constructed with rock placed in existing, recently formed and active minor gullies located near the upper end of a watershed. Multiple structures are generally required, with downstream structures placed to force tail water at an upstream structure. The furthest upstream structure is located to control existing head cutting. Resource concerns addressed included gully erosion and water quality.

**Before Situation:**

Small gullies are actively forming in locations with relatively small drainage areas that result in increased downstream sedimentation and decreased water quality.

**After Situation:**

Construction of the structures will result in preventing further head cutting in the channel and improved downstream water quality due to a decrease of sediment in the runoff. Construction will consist of minor site shaping, excavation to tie rock into the embankment, and placement of rock rip rap. Typical dimensions used are 2:1 upstream slope, 5:1 downstream slope with a 3' top width, approximately 4' wide within the channel. The rock will be placed in a key way 1' deep with 1:1 side slopes located below the level top section. The typical height is 3' above the existing channel elevation.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Structures

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,180.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,180.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #11 - Earth Check

**Scenario Description:**

This is a structure constructed with compacted earth placed in existing, recently formed and active, minor gullies located near the upper end of a watershed. Multiple structures are generally required, with downstream structures placed to force tail water at an upstream structure. The furthest upstream structure is located to control existing head cutting. Resource concerns addressed included gully erosion and water quality.

**Before Situation:**

Small gullies are actively forming in locations with relatively small drainage areas that result in increased downstream sedimentation and decreased water quality.

**After Situation:**

Construction of the structures will result in preventing further head cutting in the channel and improved downstream water quality due to a decrease of sediment in the runoff. Construction will consist of minor site shaping, and placement of earthfill. Typical dimensions used are 3:1 upstream slope, 5:1 downstream slope with a 3' top width, approximately 4' wide within the channel. The typical height is 3' above the existing channel elevation.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Structures

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,415.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,415.23

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #12 - Buried Automatic Valve

**Scenario Description:**

A buried inline water control valve constructed of plastic that maintains a desired water surface, controls the direction or rate of flow, or conveys water to address resource concerns. The water surface elevation is automatically controlled. Cost estimate is based on using a commercially available product.

**Before Situation:**

The landowner wishes to provide a way to control the water surface elevation in tile drained land.

**After Situation:**

The water surface elevation in the tile drained land is controlled with an automatic valve to provide a 1' increase in water level elevation upstream of each valve.

**Feature Measure:** No. of Valves

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,137.35

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,137.35

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #347 - Automated DWM Control Structure, 12 to 18 inch diameter pipe

**Scenario Description:**

A subsurface drainage system on a field with a fairly flat slope (less than 2% and preferably less than 1%) that outlets through a control structure which is operated with an automated slide gate and accommodates 12 to 18 inch diameter pipe sizes. This structure configuration facilitates meeting the conservation practice standard 554 - Drainage Water Management by managing the subsurface water table year-round. This allows the operator to keep the water in the soil profile when it is not critical to dry the soil for crop health or field operations. This retention time reduces the volume of water discharged and thereby the quantity of nutrients lost. A single automated structure may have its influence extended by buried float-activated structures to provide a greater area of control. Resource Concerns: Water Quality Degradation (Nutrients). Associated Practices: 606 - Subsurface Drain; 554 - Drainage Water Management

**Before Situation:**

Uncontrolled discharge from a subsurface drainage system enters ditches or streams, often laden with sediment and nutrients.

**After Situation:**

The water surface profile in the subsurface drainage system is managed in a manner which retains moisture in the soil for plant update and to allow for enhanced nutrient utilization. The use of automated control structures allow water levels to be monitored and adjusted remotely to allow for more active management in accordance with the drainage systems Drainage Water Management plan. Typical affected area for a single structure is 10 to 20 acres. A single structure with an automated slide gate may have its influence extended by use of buried float-activated control structures.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Structures

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,184.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12,184.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #363 - Automation Retrofit to Manual Drainage Water Management Control Structure

**Scenario Description:**

A subsurface drainage system on a field with a fairly flat slope (less than 2% and preferably less than 1%) that outlets through a control structure which has been retrofitted to operate with an automated slide gate. This structure configuration facilitates meeting the conservation practice standard 554 - Drainage Water Management by managing the subsurface water table year-round. This allows the operator to keep the water in the soil profile when it is not critical to dry the soil for crop health or field operations. This retention time reduces the volume of water discharged and thereby the quantity of nutrients lost. A single retrofitted automated retrofit structure may have its influence extended by buried float-activated structures to provide a greater area of control. Resource Concerns: Field Sediment, Nutrient and Pathogen Loss. Associated Practices: 606 - Subsurface Drain; 554 - Drainage Water Management.

**Before Situation:**

Control structure with manually operated slide gate.

**After Situation:**

The water surface profile in the subsurface drainage system is managed in a manner which retains moisture in the soil for plant update and to allow for enhanced nutrient utilization. The use of retrofitted control structures for automated slide gate operation allow water levels to be monitored and adjusted remotely to allow for more active management in accordance with the drainage systems Drainage Water Management plan. Typical affected area for a single structure is 10 to 20 acres. A single structure with a retrofitted automated slide gate may have its influence extended by use of buried float-activated control structures.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Structures

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,022.12 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6,022.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #425 - Automated DWM Control Structure, 6 to 10 inch diameter pipe

**Scenario Description:**

A subsurface drainage system on a field with a fairly flat slope (less than 2% and preferably less than 1%) that outlets through a control structure which is operated with an automated slide gate and accommodates 6 to 10 inch diameter pipe sizes. This structure configuration facilitates meeting the conservation practice standard 554 - Drainage Water Management by managing the subsurface water table year-round. This allows the operator to keep the water in the soil profile when it is not critical to dry the soil for crop health or field operations. This retention time reduces the volume of water discharged and thereby the quantity of nutrients lost. A single automated structure may have its influence extended by buried float-activated structures to provide a greater area of control. Resource Concerns: Water Quality Degradation (Nutrients). Associated Practices: 606 - Subsurface Drain; 554 - Drainage Water Management

**Before Situation:**

Uncontrolled discharge from a subsurface drainage system enters ditches or streams, often laden with sediment and nutrients.

**After Situation:**

The water surface profile in the subsurface drainage system is managed in a manner which retains moisture in the soil for plant update and to allow for enhanced nutrient utilization. The use of automated control structures allow water levels to be monitored and adjusted remotely to allow for more active management in accordance with the drainage systems Drainage Water Management plan. Typical affected area for a single structure is 10 to 20 acres. A single structure with an automated slide gate may have its influence extended by use of buried float-activated control structures.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Structures

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,267.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,267.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 587 - Structure for Water Control

**Scenario:** #454 - Inlet Flashboard Riser, Metal

**Scenario Description:**

A Flashboard Riser fabricated of metal and used in a water management system that maintains a desired water surface elevation, controls the direction or rate of flow, or conveys water to address the resource concerns: Inadequate Water - Inefficient use of Irrigation Water and Inadequate habitat for Fish and Wildlife. The water surface elevation is controlled by addition or removal of slats or "stoplogs". This scenario is applicable to variable crest weir structures where the elevation is controlled at the inlet (Half-Rounds). They are often fabricated from half pipes (i.e. half-rounds) or sheet steel in a box shape. Payment rate is based upon the Flashboard Weir Length in inches multiplied by the outlet length in feet (Inch-Foot). Cost estimate is based on a "Half-Round" flashboard riser shop fabricated using a longitudinal cut 36" smooth steel pipe, a 50' long - 30" outlet pipe passing through an embankment.

**Before Situation:**

The operator presently flood irrigates his field and has no means to accurately maintain a constant water level at varying elevations resulting in a lack of flexibility, and inefficient use of water and energy during pumping. The operator also desires to

**After Situation:**

The operator has the capability to more efficiently control and maintain a range of water surface elevations thereby reducing the flow rate needed. Less water is wasted and both water and energy is conserved. The operator is now able to maintain adequate water during the winter as a benefit to waterfowl. Any needed re-vegetation of disturbed areas use Critical Area Planting (342). Other associated practices such as; Irrigation Water Management (449), Irrigation Land Leveling (464), Irrigation Canal or Lateral (320), Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery (447), Dike (356), and Grade Stabilization Structure (410) will use the corresponding Standard(s) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Flashboard Weir Length (in)

**Scenario Unit:** Diameter Inch Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,250.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 590 - Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #274 - Adaptive NM

**Scenario Description:**

The practice scenario is for the implementation of nutrient management on a small plot, as detailed in outlined in Agronomy Technical Note 7 - Adaptive Nutrient Management. Scenario includes implementing replicated strip trials on a field plot to evaluate, identify and implement various nutrient use efficiency improvement methods for timing, rate, method of application, or source of nutrients.

**Before Situation:**

The practice will be installed on cropland (small grain rotation or typical corn-soybean rotation) to address water quality degradation, air quality degradation and energy concerns. The scenario applies to non-organic and organic operations.

**After Situation:**

Installation of this scenario will result in adopting the four R's of nutrient management following the procedures outlined in Agronomy Technical Note 7 - Adaptive Nutrient Management. Implementation involves establishing the replicated plots to evaluate one or more of the 4 R's. The plot will consist of at least 4 replicated plots designed, laid out, managed and evaluated with the assistance of a consultant or extension professional knowledgeable in nutrient management and experimental design and data collection. Results are used to make nutrient application decisions to address water quality degradation issues and nutrient use efficiencies. Yields will be measured and statistically analyzed and summarized following the procedures in Agronomy Technical Note 7. The yields for each plot will be adjusted to the appropriate moisture content.

**Feature Measure:** <Unknown>

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,412.27

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,412.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 590 - Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #297 - Small Scale Basic Nutrient Management

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario applies to small farms with diversified cropping systems which will improve the current level of management in applying nutrients. Improved level of management will be such to prevent nonpoint source pollution of surface and ground waters. Typical size is less than 1.0 acre. This scenario includes hand-labor as well as equipment.

**Before Situation:**

Little to no soil or manure testing is being conducted and typically lacks a nutrient budget. Application of fertilizers, including manures and amendments, are conducted based upon traditional fertilizer recommendations from LGU or based on historic use r

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements have been developed to manage nutrients according to the criteria found in Nutrient Management (590) Conservation Practice Standard for either organic or non-organic operations as appropriate. A nutrient budget has been developed for each field or management zone. Nutrients are applied according to the 4 R's. (Right rate, Right time, Right place and Right source). Records needed to complete the nutrient budget are provided which may include variety of pre-season, in-season, and post-season soil nutrient and plant tissue tests and analysis; compost or manure tests; application timing, method and rate; nutrient sources; and yield data for each field or management zone. Nutrient runoff into adjacent streams is minimized improving water quality and preventing leaching into shallow ground water sources.

**Feature Measure:** planted area

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 43.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,633.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$37.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 590 - Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #304 - Precision Nutrient Application

**Scenario Description:**

The planned Precision Nutrient Application system will meet the current Nutrient Management (590) CPS General and Additional Criteria. The Application system will include soil sampling methodology for variable rate application and systems. Use of additional nutrient/soil tests including chlorophyll meters, and/or spectral analysis may be used to further refine nutrient applications. Management of nutrients is based on the 4Rs of Nutrient Stewardship & SMART Nutrient Management (apply the right nutrient source at the right rate, time and place) including activities to reduce nutrient loss by Assessment of comprehensive, site-specific conditions within the field. Nutrient management intensity must be sufficient to address site-specific risk for nutrient loss. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of Precision Nutrient Application system, equipment to implement the practice, implementation of the NMP and recordkeeping. Typical treatment area is 40 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Currently, a nutrient management system for the farm operation accounting for all know measurable nutrient sources does not exist or does not meet the Nutrient Management (590) CPS requirements for General and Additional Criteria. Management of nutrients

**After Situation:**

A Precision Nutrient Application system will be developed to meet the current Nutrient Management (590) CPS General and Additional Criteria with nutrient management intensity sufficient to address site-specific risks for nutrient loss. Development and implementation of the NM system is based on site-specific risk assessment of comprehensive, site-specific conditions for the application of nutrients for each nutrient loss pathway that can negatively impact soil, water and air quality with excess nutrient loss. The NM system utilizes the 4Rs of nutrient stewardship and SMART Nutrient Management – the right Source, right Method, right Rate, and right Timing to meet both plant productivity and natural resource conservation goals. Utilizing GIS and GPS technologies, nutrients are applied based on soil test results for each grid or management zone using automated variable rate application equipment. Records provided annually include, the current soil test reports, planned nutrient application rates for each grid or management zone (prescription maps) and/or as applied maps, source, timing, and placement of all nutrients applied, actual crop yields and/or generated yield maps.

**Feature Measure:** acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,681.13 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$92.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 590 - Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #305 - Prescription Nutrient Efficiency

**Scenario Description:**

The planned Precision Nutrient Efficiency system will meet the current Nutrient Management (590) CPS general and additional criteria. Precision nutrient efficiency system involves the testing or evaluation of crop and/or soil during the growing season to more accurately determine if additional nutrient application(s) are needed. This includes methods or technologies such as PPSN (pre-plant soil nitrate test), PSNT (pre-side dress nitrogen test), LSNT (late spring soil nitrate test), CSNT (corn stalk nitrate test) and chlorophyll meters, and/or spectral analysis may be used to determine if additional nutrients are needed. Nitrification or urease inhibitors (as well as other Enhanced Efficiency Fertilizer technologies recognized by Land Grant Universities) may also be used. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of additional soil and plant nutrient testing and analysis, in-season crop nutrient testing, equipment, labor, implementation of the NMP and recordkeeping. Typical treatment area is 40 acres.

**Before Situation:**

This scenario takes a conventional cropping system where either no nutrient management or only a basic level of nutrient management is being practiced and improves it to address air quality (reduce emissions for N fertilizer) and/or minimize agricultural

**After Situation:**

A Precision Nutrient Management Efficiency system will be developed to meet the current Nutrient Management (590) CPS general and additional criteria. When applicable the system will also meet NOP (National Organic Program) regulations, including reducing nitrogen emissions. Implementation of the adopted efficiency system improves the 4R Stewardship installation which will reduce nutrient loss reducing the potential of off-site movement of nutrients. A nutrient budget is developed for each field or management zone annually for the crop rotation or sequence. The Nutrient Management Plan will include current soil test results, nutrient application rates, source, timing, and placement of all nutrients applied, risk assessments and actual crop yields. Record keeping includes documentation of as applied nutrients by field annually plus and State record keeping requirements.

**Feature Measure:** acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,676.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 590 - Nutrient Management

**Scenario:** #350 - Nutrient Management

**Scenario Description:**

The scenario describes the development and implementation of a Nutrient Management (NM) system which will meet the current Nutrient Management (590) CPS General as well as Additional Criteria and utilizes synthetic fertilizer as well as animal manure as nutrient sources for crop production. The system provides crop nutrient recommendations which accounts for the removal of nitrogen (N), phosphorus (P), and potassium (K). Management of nutrients is based on the 4Rs of Nutrient Stewardship & SMART Nutrient Management (apply the right nutrient source at the right rate, time and place) including activities to reduce nutrient loss by Assessment of comprehensive, site-specific conditions within the field. Nutrient management intensity must be sufficient to address site-specific risk for nutrient loss. Payment is to defray the costs of implementation of the NM system and recordkeeping. Typical treatment area is 40 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Currently, a nutrient management system for the farm operation accounting for all know measurable nutrient sources does not exist or does not meet the Nutrient Management (590) CPS requirements for General and Additional Criteria. Management of nutrients

**After Situation:**

A Nutrient Management (NM) system is developed and implemented to meet the current Nutrient Management (590) CPS for General and Additional Criteria, with nutrient management intensity sufficient to address site-specific risks for nutrient loss. Development and implementation of the NM system is based on site-specific risk assessment of comprehensive, site-specific conditions for the application of nutrients for each nutrient loss pathway that can negatively impact soil, water and air quality with excess nutrient loss. The NM system utilizes the 4Rs of nutrient stewardship and SMART Nutrient Management – the right Source, right Method, right Rate, and right Timing to meet both plant productivity and natural resource conservation goals.

**Feature Measure:** Ac.

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,739.40 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$43.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 592 - Feed Management

**Scenario:** #25 - Animal Group

**Scenario Description:**

Feed ration management on an animal operation that does not have access to enough acres to spread all of its manure nutrients at an agronomic rate. The resource concerns are water quality degradation, excessive manure nutrients, particularly nitrogen and phosphorus. The goal of the practice is to reduce the amount of nutrients in the raw manure so that it is easier for “landlocked” farmers to apply the manure at agronomic rates, thereby reducing or eliminating water quality degradation concerns. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590), Prescribed Grazing (528), Forage Harvest Management (511).

**Before Situation:**

Producer is feeding a higher level of protein and/or phosphorus than is needed to meet National Research Council (NRC) recommendations for a group of animals of this type and at this stage of production. The operation does not have all of the available ac

**After Situation:**

The scenario assumes that a specific group of animals is being evaluated. A baseline analysis of 4 samples each with 4 quarterly reports of manure, and feed will be completed to determine the current inputs and outputs. The producer will reduce feed protein and phosphorus levels to that of NRC recommendations for a group of animals of this type and at this stage of production. The producer will explore alternative feedstuffs and alternative feeding strategies to bring manure nitrogen and/or phosphorus levels down without hurting production of the animals or profitability of the operation. Alternative feeding strategies can include such things as grouping animals by similar age, sex, or stage of production, feeding based on individual rolling average production, or feeding “homegrown” or local feedstuffs.

**Feature Measure:** Group

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,719.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,719.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 592 - Feed Management

**Scenario:** #41 - Feed Additive

**Scenario Description:**

Feed ration management on an animal operation by inclusion of a feed additive. The resource concerns may be water quality degradation (pathogens, soluble nutrients), air quality (odors, green house gas). The goal of the practice is to add an approved feed additive that has been proven to reduce pathogens, or tie up soluble nutrients, or improve air quality by reducing odors, ammonia, or green house gases to the animal diet. For this scenario, zeolite will be added to beef and dairy rations to reduce ammonia emissions. Associated practices: Nutrient Management (590).

**Before Situation:**

Producer is feeding a balanced diet to his animals. He knows that the diet, however is leading to resource concerns by soluble nutrients or pathogens entering the surface water from his operation, or that odors, NOx, or Methane are affecting air quality.

**After Situation:**

The scenario assumes that a specific group of animals is being evaluated for a resource concern, and that a proven feed additive can have an effect on that concern. For this particular scenario, a zeolite is added to a beef or dairy ration at a rate of 2% of the daily ration. The zeolite will absorb ammonia and other compounds, resulting in lower nitrogen excretion and thus lower ammonia emissions from the manure and result in improved air quality. Assume that one hour of general labor will be needed per year per animal unit to load/unload zeolite into feed mixing equipment. Assume that the zeolite is added based on a 2% inclusion rate of the dry matter ration of 25 pounds/day/animal unit or the amount of zeolite needed is 0.5 pounds/day/animal unit or about 0.1 tons/year/animal unit.

**Feature Measure:** Per Animal unit, per year

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$66.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 592 - Feed Management

**Scenario:** #54 - Enteric Methane Reduction

**Scenario Description:**

A livestock operation will incorporate an enteric-methane-reducing product into its lactating dairy cattle total mixed rations (TMR). The product substantially reduces enteric methane emissions (> 20%) when included continuously in balanced TMRs of lactating dairy cattle. Greenhouse gas (GHG) methane emissions, specifically enteric methane emissions (coming from fermentation within the ruminant animal's digestive tract) are an identified resource concern. The product has been determined to be safe and effective for use in the target species as allowed by law. Documentation of the safety and effectiveness of the product allows its addition to the ration. Addition to the diet conforms to the label instructions at the rate and conditions prescribed by the manufacturer.

**Before Situation:**

In this example, a producer is feeding a balanced custom diet to a herd of 700 mature lactating dairy cows. The producer knows that the diet being fed is contributing to detrimental effects of climate change because his animals are emitting enteric methane.

**After Situation:**

In this example, the product has been included in lactating dairy cattle TMRs at a prescribed rate and it results in lower enteric methane production and emissions, resulting in decreased detrimental effects of climate change.

**Feature Measure:** Head

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 700.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$132,132.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$188.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #22 - Basic IPM Field Crops – Herbicide Substitution

**Scenario Description:**

A basic IPM plan with LGU-approved pest monitoring techniques and pest thresholds (where available) is applied in Large Scale Field/Forage Crops to address the surface/subsurface water quality resource concern (e.g. Win-PST Water Quality - Impacts to Human Drinking Water) by substituting a lower risk pesticide based on WIN-PST Final Hazard Ratings. Selecting a lower risk herbicide with an alternate mode of action could also address potential herbicide resistance issues.

**Before Situation:**

The planned pest suppression technique utilizes a pesticide with a High or Extra High Final Hazard Rating in WIN-PST for humans and/or fish due to leaching and/or solution runoff.

**After Situation:**

After implementing the 595 practice, a basic IPM system has been implemented with Land Grant University approved pest monitoring techniques and pest thresholds (where available) where alternative pesticides are used to reduce the risk to humans and/or fish from leaching and/or solution runoff to Intermediate or lower based on WIN-PST Final Hazard Ratings.

**Feature Measure:** <Unknown>

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,690.54 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$42.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #194 - Plant Health PAMS (acs) Low labor only

**Scenario Description:**

PAMS activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a large scale crop production area.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any PAMS techniques to the client is using many different PAMS techniques for many different pests. In all cases at least one planned PAMS technique has risk to an ident

**After Situation:**

Planned Prevention (resistant cultivar selection, pest habitat removal, etc. ), Avoidance (IWM for disease avoidance, change in rotation to avoid problem spots, etc. ), and Monitoring (field scouting, etc.) activities have been implemented to help meet the minimum criteria for the identified resource concerns (i.e. Plant Pest Pressure).

**Feature Measure:** Acres of management appli

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$684.86

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #195 - Pest Management Precision Ag

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario takes a conventional cropping system where either no pest management or only a basic level of pest management is being practiced and improves it to address air quality and/or minimize agricultural nonpoint sources pollution of surface and groundwater. The planned Pest Management system will meet the current Pest Management Conservation System (595) CPS general and additional criteria. Precision pest management system includes such items as pest monitoring, targeted applications, eliminates overlap, tissue testing, specialized nozzles etc. to further refine pesticide applications. Payment for implementation is to defray the costs of tissue testing, additional testing and analysis, equipment implementation of the PMCS and recordkeeping. Typical treatment area is 40 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Conventional pest management programs involve little or no monitoring and testing. Application of pesticides are completed annually based upon product salesmen recommendations that do not specifically consider the detrimental affects of inexact applicatio

**After Situation:**

A precision pest management system will be developed to meet the current Pest Management Conservation System (595) CPS general and additional criteria, when applicable the system will also meet NOP regulations. Development and implementation of a PMCS will benefit plant productivity while reducing potential of off-site movement of pesticides. PMCS may include practices such as use of spot applications, proper timing of applications, more appropriate formulations etc. Additional monitoring and tissue testing may also be used to further refine pesticide applications. Smart sprayer and advanced nozzle technology may also be employed. Records will be provided annually of the current monitoring, test analysis, application rates, formulations for each field including crop yields.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of management appli

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,922.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$73.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #197 - Plant Health PAMS (acs) Low Labor, materials and mitigation.

**Scenario Description:**

PAMS activities with low labor and material costs will be implemented plus mitigation on a large scale crop production area.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any PAMS techniques to the client is using many different PAMS techniques for many different pests. In all cases at least one planned PAMS technique has risk to an ident

**After Situation:**

Planned Prevention (Netting to exclude insect or birds, resistant cultivar selection, etc. ), Avoidance (IWM for disease avoidance, change in rotation to avoid problem spots, etc. ), and Monitoring (Degree day monitoring, field scouting, etc.) activities have been implemented to help meet the minimum criteria for the identified resource concerns (i.e. Plant Pest Pressure). Mitigation up to 30 points.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Management Appli

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,749.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$68.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #198 - Water Quality Pesticide Mitigation > 30 Point AND/OR Beneficial Insect Pesticide Mitigation - Small Farm

**Scenario Description:**

The minimum amount of planned IPM mitigation techniques needed to reduce water quality pesticide-related resource concerns is > 30 mitigation index score. An IPM plan will be developed in accordance with this standard and the CPS 595 Implementation Requirement will document how specific pesticide hazards will be prevented or mitigated AND/OR impacts to wildlife-beneficial insects including pollinators.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using many pest suppression techniques (pesticides, tillage for weed control, burning, etc.) to the client is using many different pest suppression techniques for many differe

**After Situation:**

An IPM system with planned. Mitigation techniques (>30 points) have been implemented to meet the minimum criteria for the identified resource concerns (i.e. Water Quality - Impacts to Human Drinking Water or Fish) AND 10 points of mitigation for Wildlife (beneficial insects including pollinators) with either risk prevention (i.e. planned pesticides have no risk to the identified resource concern) or risk mitigation (i.e. planned pesticides have appropriate mitigation planned from Agronomy Technical Note 5 AND Agronomy Technical Note 9).

**Feature Measure:** Small Farm, typically <= 5 ac

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,239.73 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,239.73

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #200 - Water Quality Pesticide Mitigation > 30 Point AND/OR Beneficial Insect Pesticide Mitigation

**Scenario Description:**

The minimum amount of planned IPM mitigation techniques needed to reduce water quality pesticide-related resource concerns is > 30 mitigation index score. An IPM plan will be developed in accordance with this standard and the CPS 595 Implementation Requirement will document how specific pesticide hazards will be prevented or mitigated AND/OR impacts to wildlife-beneficial insects including pollinators.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using many pest suppression techniques (pesticides, tillage for weed control, burning, etc.) to the client is using many different pest suppression techniques for many differe

**After Situation:**

An IPM system with planned. Mitigation techniques (>30 points) have been implemented to meet the minimum criteria for the identified resource concerns (i.e. Water Quality - Impacts to Human Drinking Water or Fish) AND/OR 10 points of mitigation for Wildlife (beneficial insects including pollinators) with either risk prevention (i.e. planned pesticides have no risk to the identified resource concern) or risk mitigation (i.e. planned pesticides have appropriate mitigation planned from Agronomy Technical Note 5 AND/OR Agronomy Technical Note 9).

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Management Appli

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,217.61

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$80.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 595 - Pest Management Conservation System

**Scenario:** #202 - Plant health PAMS (Small Farm - each) labor only

**Scenario Description:**

PAMS activities with labor costs will be implemented on a small scale crop production area.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any PAMS techniques to the client is using many different PAMS techniques for many different pests. In all cases at least one planned PAMS technique has risk to an ident

**After Situation:**

Planned Prevention (resistant cultivar selection, pest habitat removal, etc. ), Avoidance (IWM for disease avoidance, change in rotation to avoid problem spots, etc. ), and Monitoring (field scouting, etc.) activities have been implemented to help meet the minimum criteria for the identified resource concerns (i.e. Plant Pest Pressure).

**Feature Measure:** Small farm, typically <= 5 ac

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$644.86 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$644.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #1 - Storage - Level or Flat Channel

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths, and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a flat channel (level) terrace storing runoff with a length of 6,000 feet and side slopes of 8:1 or greater in a field with slopes from 2% to 8% constructed in loam soils or similar with regard to workability. A stable outlet is provided in the form of a Grassed Waterway, Underground Outlet or through soil infiltration. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of flat channel (level) terraces with approximately 8:1 front and back slopes, 2.5 feet height, and 6,000 feet in length is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader. The installed terrace is typically farmed. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,966.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #2 - Non-Storage - Broadbase

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a broadbased terrace having 6:1 upstream and 6:1 downstream slopes measuring 2,600 feet in a field with slopes from 2% to 4% constructed in loam soils or similar with regard to workability. Channel and embankment slopes are farmed. A stable outlet is provided in the form of a Grassed Waterway, Underground Outlet or through soil infiltration. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of level or gradient, broadbased terraces measuring 2,600 feet in length, 1.4 height, and 6:1 front and back slopes is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader. The slopes of the installed terrace are typically farmed. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,600.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,986.61

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #3 - Storage - Broadbase

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a broadbased terrace having 5:1 upstream and 5:1 downstream slopes measuring 4,700 feet in a field with slopes from 2% to 8% constructed in loam soils or similar with regard to workability. Channel and embankment slopes are farmed. A stable outlet is provided in the form of a Grassed Waterway, Underground Outlet or through soil infiltration. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of level or gradient, broadbased terraces measuring 4,700 feet in length, 2.5 height, and 5:1 front and back slopes is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader. The slopes of the installed terrace are typically farmed. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,700.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,584.91

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #5 - Non-Storage - Grass Back

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a system of terraces (2,500 feet in length) that have one relatively flat (6:1) front slope and one steep (2:1) back slope constructed in a field with slopes steeper than 10% installed in loam soils or similar soils with regard to workability. The steep slope is established to permanent vegetation with the flatter slope farmed. The terrace is typically constructed at a gradient and is not designed to temporarily store water. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. Seeding is not included. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of terraces measuring 2,500 feet in length and approximately 2 C.Y. of earthwork per L.F. is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,059.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #6 - Storage - Grass Back

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a system of terraces (2,500 feet in length) that have one relatively flat (6:1) front slope and one steep (2:1) back slope constructed in a field with slopes steeper than 10% installed in loam soils or similar soils with regard to workability. The steep slope is established to permanent vegetation with the flatter slope farmed. Either all, or a portion of the terrace, is constructed to temporarily store water, which is then released with an underground outlet or by other means. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. Seeding is not included. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of terraces measuring 2,500 feet in length and approximately 3 C.Y. of earthwork per L.F. is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,334.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #7 - Non-Storage - Narrow Base

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a system of narrow base terraces with 2:1 slopes and 4,500' length in a field with slopes exceeding 8% constructed in loam soils or similar in regards to workability. The terrace is typically constructed at a gradient and is not designed to temporarily store water. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. Permanent vegetation is established. Seeding is not included. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of narrow base terraces measuring 4,500 feet in length and approximately 1.5 C.Y. of earthwork per L.F. is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is typically done with dozer. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,046.25

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 600 - Terrace

**Scenario:** #8 - Storage - Narrow Base

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen embankment with channel constructed across the field slope as part of a system to shorten slope lengths and reduce sheet, rill, and gully erosion in a cropped field. The typical installation is a system of narrow base terraces with 2:1 slopes and 4,500' length in a field with slopes exceeding 10% constructed in loam soils or similar in regards to workability. Either all, or a portion of the terrace, is constructed to temporarily store water, which is then released with an underground outlet or by other means. Costs include all equipment and forces necessary to excavate, shape, and compact terrace. Permanent vegetation is established. Seeding is not included. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion and Excessive Sediment in surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Long slope lengths contribute to excessive sedimentation and soil erosion in cropped fields as a result of gully, rill, and sheet erosion. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

A system of narrow base terraces measuring 4,500 feet in length and approximately 1.6 C.Y. of earthwork per L.F. is installed with spacing designed to intercept flow of water and shorten slope length to reduce erosion to acceptable levels. Work is typically done with dozer. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), and Underground Outlet (620).

**Feature Measure:** Length of Terrace

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,278.47

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.06

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 603 - Herbaceous Wind Barriers

**Scenario:** #6 - Annual Species, Small

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario describes the annual implementation of herbaceous barriers to reduce wind velocities and wind-borne particulate matter. In this scenario barriers are composed of annual living vegetation. Plant materials shall be selected for local adaptation and climatic conditions and are resistant to lodging and are non-spreading in their habit. Barriers will be designed as close to perpendicular to prevailing winds as practical. Barrier direction, spacing, and composition needed to achieve the desired purpose shall be designed using the currently approved wind erosion technology. Establishment is done either by using light tillage or chemical application and no till drill.

**Before Situation:**

Typically cropland has excessive soil disturbance and un-sheltered distance that results in excessive wind erosion that affect soil resources. Seedling development and wildlife habitat are negatively affected by wind-borne sediment and sediment-borne cont

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements will be prepared for the site according to the 603 Herbaceous Wind Barrier Standard and implemented. Implementation of herbaceous wind barriers will modify the flow and velocity of air dependent upon barrier height, porosity, spacing and wind speed. Orientation is generally placed across an entire field perpendicular to applicable prevailing wind direction. Implementation will reduce soil loss; protect growing plants from damage by wind blown soil particles, provide food and cover for wildlife. Payment is for the design and implementation of annual barriers and required reestablishment.

**Feature Measure:** Linear Feet Planted

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$371.07

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 603 - Herbaceous Wind Barriers

**Scenario:** #10 - Cool Season

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario describes the implementation of herbaceous barriers to reduce wind velocities and wind-borne particulate matter. In this scenario barriers are composed of cool season annual or perennial vegetation. Plant materials shall be selected for local adaptation and climatic conditions and are resistant to lodging and are non-spreading in their habit. Barriers will be designed as close to perpendicular to prevailing winds as practical. Barrier direction, spacing, and composition needed to achieve the desired purpose shall be designed using the currently approved wind erosion technology.

**Before Situation:**

Typically cropland has excessive soil disturbance and unsheltered distance that results in excessive wind erosion that affect soil resources. Seedling development and wildlife habitat are negatively affected by wind-borne sediment and sediment-borne conta

**After Situation:**

Implementation Requirements will be prepared and implemented for the site according to the Herbaceous Wind Barrier (603) standard. Implementation of herbaceous wind barriers will modify the flow and velocity of air dependent upon barrier height, porosity, spacing and wind speed. Orientation is generally placed across an entire field perpendicular to applicable prevailing wind direction. Implementation will reduce soil loss, protect growing plants from damage by wind-blown soil particles, and provide food and cover for wildlife. The scenario includes the design and implementation of annual barriers and required reestablishment.

**Feature Measure:** linear feet of barrier plante

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$154.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 606 - Subsurface Drain

**Scenario:** #1 - Corrugated Plastic Pipe (CPP), Single-Wall, <= 6 inch

**Scenario Description:**

Description: Below ground installation of perforated HDPE (Corrugated Plastic Pipe) pipeline, using a drainage plow. HDPE (CPP) Single-Wall is manufactured in sizes (nominal diameter) from 3-inch to 24-inch; typical practice sizes range from 3-inch to 12-inch; and typical scenario size is 5-inch. Construct 2,000 feet of 5-inch, Single-Wall, perforated HDPE Corrugated Plastic Pipe (CPP), installed below ground to a minimum depth 5 feet. The typical number of mainline connections for 2,000 feet of subsurface drainline is a total of 3 each. Consideration must be given to Section 404 of Clean Water Act and Food Security Act regarding wetlands. Resource Concerns: Excess Water (Seasonal High Water Table); Degraded Plant Condition; Water Quality Degradation (Nutrients). Associated Practices: 608 - Surface Drain, Main or Lateral; 587 - Structure for Water Control, 533 - Pumping Plant; and 554 - Drainage Water Management, 412-Grassed Waterway, 410- Grade Stabilization Structure, 313- Waste Storage Facility, 412-Grassed Waterway, 410-Grade Stabilization Structure, 313- Waste Storage Facility.

**Before Situation:**

Before installation soil conditions are excessively wet in the spring due to poor internal soil drainage. Excess soil water is causing crop stress and delay of field operations (seed bed preparation, planting, etc.).

**After Situation:**

The drainage modifications result in reduced plant stress due to excessive wetness caused by a seasonal high water table, or improved drainage water quality due to system retrofit enabling drainage water management.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,736.16 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 606 - Subsurface Drain

**Scenario:** #2 - Enveloped Corrugated Plastic Pipe (CPP), Single-Wall, <= 6 inch

**Scenario Description:**

Description: Below ground installation of perforated HDPE (Corrugated Plastic Pipe) pipeline with Sand-Gravel envelope, using a drainage trencher. HDPE (CPP) Single-Wall is manufactured in sizes (nominal diameter) from 3-inch to 24-inch; typical practice sizes range from 3-inch to 12-inch; and typical scenario size is 5-inch. Construct 2,000 feet of 5-inch, Single-Wall, perforated HDPE Corrugated Plastic Pipe (CPP), installed below ground to a minimum depth of 5 feet, and surrounded with a sand-gravel envelope. The typical volume sand-gravel for 2,000 feet of 12"wide x 12" high envelope is 64 cubic yards. The typical number of mainline connections for 2,000 feet of subsurface drainline is a total of 3 each. Consideration must be given to Section 404 of Clean Water Act and Food Security Act regarding wetlands. Resource Concerns: Excess Water (seasonal High Water Table); Degraded Plant Condition; Water Quality Degradation (Nutrients). Associated Practices: 608 - Surface Drain, Main or Lateral; 587 - Structure for Water Control, 533 - Pumping Plant; and 554 - Drainage Water Management, 412-Grassed Waterway, 410- Grade Stabilization Structure, 313- Waste Storage Facility.

**Before Situation:**

Before installation soil conditions are excessively wet in the spring due to poor internal soil drainage. Excess soil water is causing crop stress and delay of field operations (seed bed preparation, planting, etc.).

**After Situation:**

The drainage modifications result in reduced plant stress due to excessive wetness caused by a seasonal high water table, or improved drainage water quality due to system retrofit enabling drainage water management.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,415.55 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 606 - Subsurface Drain

**Scenario:** #3 - Corrugated Plastic Pipe (CPP), Single-Wall, >= 8 inch

**Scenario Description:**

Description: Below ground installation of HDPE (Corrugated Plastic Pipe) pipeline, using a drainage plow. HDPE (CPP) Single-Wall is manufactured in sizes (nominal diameter) from 3-inch to 24-inch; typical practice sizes range from 3-inch to 12-inch; and typical scenario size is 10-inch. Construct 1,000 feet of 10-inch, Single-Wall, HDPE Corrugated Plastic Pipe (CPP), installed below ground to a minimum depth 5 feet. Consideration must be given to Section 404 of Clean Water Act and Food Security Act regarding wetlands. Resource Concerns: Excess Water (Seasonal High Water Table); Degraded Plant Condition; Water Quality Degradation (Nutrients). Associated Practices: 607 - Surface Drain, Field Ditch; 608 - Surface Drain, Main or Lateral; 587 - Structure for Water Control, 533 - Pumping Plant; and 554 - Drainage Water Management, 412-Grassed Waterway, 410- Grade Stabilization Structure, 313- Waste Storage Facility.

**Before Situation:**

Before installation soil conditions are excessively wet in the spring due to poor internal soil drainage. Excess soil water is causing crop stress and delay of field operations (seed bed preparation, planting, etc.).

**After Situation:**

The drainage modifications result in reduced plant stress due to excessive wetness caused by a seasonal high water table, or improved drainage water quality due to system retrofit enabling drainage water management.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Pipe

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,405.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 609 - Surface Roughening

**Scenario:** #29 - Emergency Tillage

**Scenario Description:**

Emergency Tillage on soils that are stable enough to sustain effective ridges and cloddiness and have a high wind erosion potential due to lack of surface cover. Wind erodibility factor (I) is less than 104.

**Before Situation:**

Current well -planned and properly applied wind erosion control systems have failed. Tillage operations have not effectively reduced soil erosion from wind and wind-borne sediment, Particulate Matter emissions occur. Crop damage from wind-borne particles

**After Situation:**

Emergency Tillage has been conducted to produce random roughness (RR) values large enough to achieve a 25% reduction in the potential erosion rate, or reduced wind erosion during the management period by 25%.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Surface Roughenin

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,339.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$27.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 609 - Surface Roughening

**Scenario:** #30 - Ripper or Subsoiler

**Scenario Description:**

Emergency Tillage on soils that are stable enough to sustain effective ridges and cloddiness and have a high wind erosion potential due to lack of surface cover.

**Before Situation:**

Current well-planned and properly applied wind erosion control systems have failed. Tillage operations have not effectively reduced soil erosion from wind and wind-borne sediment, Particulate Matter emissions occur. Crop damage from wind-borne particles c

**After Situation:**

Emergency Tillage has been conducted to produce random roughness (RR) values large enough to achieve a 25% reduction in the potential erosion rate, or reduced wind erosion during the management period by 25%.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Surface Roughenin

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,772.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$29.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #1 - Individual tree - hand planting

**Scenario Description:**

Tree seedlings will be hand planted in the forested area where few or no forest trees are growing, the existing stand of trees needs underplanting, or the previously planted seedling tree stocking level is below desirable conditions. Wildlife habitat is degraded by loss of forest conditions. The resource concerns addressed are degraded plant condition: inadequate structure and composition, and inadequate wildlife & fish habitat.

**Before Situation:**

The stocking level of the forest does not meet the minimum recommended number of trees per acre. The existing condition of the forest stand does not meet the landowner's objectives. To be a viable forest, additional seedlings need planting. Wildlife habit

**After Situation:**

The prescribed number of trees are hand planted on 20 acres and the objectives of the landowner are met. The forest will provide wildlife habitat, long term ground cover, and capture atmospheric carbon.

**Feature Measure:** Area Planted

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,816.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #2 - Individual tree - hand planting w/browse protection

**Scenario Description:**

Tree seedlings will be hand planted in the forested area where few or no forest trees are growing, the existing stand of trees needs underplanting, or the previously planted seedling tree stocking level is below desirable conditions. Seedlings are protected from wildlife browsing. Wildlife habitat is degraded by loss of forest conditions. The resource concerns addressed include degraded plant condition: inadequate structure and composition and inadequate wildlife & fish habitat.

**Before Situation:**

The stocking level does not meet the minimum recommended number of trees per acre and does not meet the landowner's objectives. To be a viable forest, additional seedlings need planting. Wildlife habitat is rated poor. Wildlife are known to browse tree se

**After Situation:**

The prescribed number of trees are hand planted, and the objectives of the landowner are met. Seedlings are protected from wildlife browsing by installing some type of protective device. A forest will provide wildlife habitat, long term ground cover, and capture atmospheric carbon.

**Feature Measure:** Each Planted Seedling

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$45,194.26

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #3 - Trees, Machine planted with tubes for animal protection

**Scenario Description:**

This practice involves planting tree seedlings after the site has been prepared for seedling growth and establishment. The productivity of the site is good and will handle a medium density planting rate. Typical scenario will consist of 1000 feet of trees with tubes for animal protection. The resource concerns addressed are degraded plant condition: undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate structure and composition, and degraded wildlife habitat. Terrain is moderately sloping and will be planted with a mechanical tree planter. Smaller size seedlings (1-0) are planted.

**Before Situation:**

The land has little or no tree cover, or is stocked with the wrong tree species. Competing vegetation is a concern before and after planting. Soil condition is degraded due to the loss of the native forest ecosystem (organic matter in topsoil depleted). N

**After Situation:**

Land is established with permanent tree cover that will improve degraded plant condition, reduce soil erosion, establish wildlife habitat, sequester carbon and reduce invasive species presence. Establishing forest vegetation also creates corridors for wildlife movement. Planted trees have vexar tubes, or something similar, installed as protection from animal damage.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Trees

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,378.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #4 - Trees, Machine planted - no tubes

**Scenario Description:**

This practice involves planting tree seedlings after the site has been prepared for seedling growth and establishment. The productivity of the site is good and will handle a medium density planting rate. Typical scenario will consist of 1000 feet of trees. The resource concerns addressed are degraded plant condition: undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate structure and composition, and degraded wildlife habitat. Terrain is moderately sloping and will be planted with a mechanical tree planter. Smaller size seedlings (1-0) are planted.

**Before Situation:**

The land has little or no tree cover, or is stocked with the wrong tree species. Competing vegetation is a concern before and after planting. Soil condition is degraded due to the loss of the native forest ecosystem (organic matter in topsoil depleted). N

**After Situation:**

Land is established with permanent tree cover that will improve degraded plant condition, reduce soil erosion, establish wildlife habitat, sequester carbon and reduce invasive species presence. Establishing forest vegetation also creates corridors for wildlife movement.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Trees

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$433.85

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #6 - Trees, Machine planted, no tubes, supplemental water for establishment

**Scenario Description:**

Tree planting in an area where supplemental water is needed for successful establishment. Generally these areas would be considered arid or drought stricken, but other factors may contribute to requiring supplemental water. This practice involves planting of tree seedlings after the site has been prepared for seedling growth and establishment. The productivity of the site is good and will handle a medium density planting rate. Typical scenario will consist of 1000 feet of trees. The resource concerns addressed are degraded plant condition: undesirable plant productivity and health, inadequate structure and composition, and degraded wildlife habitat. Terrain is moderately sloping and will be planted with a mechanical tree planter. Smaller size seedlings (1-0) are planted.

**Before Situation:**

The land has little or no tree cover, or is stocked with the wrong tree species. Competing vegetation is a concern before and after planting. Soil condition is degraded due to the loss of the native forest ecosystem (organic matter in top soil depleted).

**After Situation:**

Land is established with permanent tree cover that will improve degraded plant condition, reduce soil erosion, establish wildlife habitat, sequester carbon and reduce invasive species presence. Establishing forest vegetation also creates corridors for wildlife movement. Greatly improved success rate of the windbreak due to the supplemental water during establishment.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Trees

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$952.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #9 - Shrub Planting

**Scenario Description:**

Shrubs are planted to provide a more diverse habitat. Plantings are in either uplands or bottomlands. The site lacks ground level habitat structure and diversity for wildlife. Resource concern is inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife - habitat fragmentation.

**Before Situation:**

No shrubby vegetation, or very little, is present in the forest understory. Wildlife species that need shrub cover are not present. An adequate stand of overstory trees is present, but it is a single level, versus the desired multi-level structure.

**After Situation:**

A 10 acre area is planted with shrubs. Shrubs are not planted over the entire 10 acres. They are planted in groups or motts. The motts, roughly circular in shape, are 50 feet in diameter, with 50 shrubs planted within each mott. 4 motts are planted per acre, for a total of 200 shrubs per acre. Motts are randomly established to take advantage of site conditions and shrub species being planted.

**Feature Measure:** Per plant

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,964.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Scenario:** #109 - Tree-Shrub Establishment - Small Acreage 5 acres or less

**Scenario Description:**

Seedling (potted) to be planted for conservation purposes other than reforestation. Planting will be by hand. The resource setting is an area that historically was an upland forest. Resource concerns are degraded plant condition - undesirable productivity and health, and inadequate structure and composition; inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife.

**Before Situation:**

The native forest has been removed and the land is either row cropped, farmstead, or associated agricultural land. If any upland trees exist, they are poor quality or undesirable species. Terrain is gently to moderately sloping with soil erosion-sheet and

**After Situation:**

Typical treatment area can range from less than 1 acre to 5 acres; typical scenario based on 1 ac, 150 TPA. Potted/containerized hardwood seedlings are planted by hand. Post vegetation control should be evaluated and conducted, if necessary.

**Feature Measure:** Planted Seedling

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 150.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,144.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$27.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 614 - Watering Facility

**Scenario:** #4 - Fiberglass Tank on Earth

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent watering facility for livestock constructed using a fiberglass tank with 1,200 gallon capacity placed on a gravel or compacted earth foundation that stores adequate quantity and quality of water for storage and or direct drinking access. All watering facilities will be constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation. This watering facility will address the resource concerns of inadequate supply of water for livestock, habitat degradation, water quality, and undesirable plant productivity and health.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where there is a need for new or improved watering facilities for livestock and or wildlife during the entire year in the Northern Plains Region, where water is not available in sufficient quantities at specific loca

**After Situation:**

A permanent watering facility with a capacity of greater than 1,200 gallons constructed using a fiberglass tank is installed on a gravel or compacted earth foundation with all tank materials, tank plumbing and float valve, to provide adequate water storage capacity to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock or wildlife for storage and or direct drinking access and provides improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Capacity in Gallons

**Scenario Unit:** Gallon

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,039.36

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 614 - Watering Facility

**Scenario:** #6 - Fiberglass Tank on Concrete

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent watering facility for livestock constructed using a fiberglass tank with 1,200 gallon capacity placed on a concrete foundation that stores adequate quantity and quality of water for storage and or direct drinking access. All watering facilities will be constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation. This watering facility will address the resource concerns of inadequate supply of water for livestock, habitat degradation, water quality, and undesirable plant productivity and health.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where there is a need for new or improved watering facilities for livestock and or wildlife, where water is not available in sufficient quantities at specific locations, and habitat, water quality, plant productivity

**After Situation:**

A permanent watering facility with a capacity of greater than 1,200 gallons constructed using a fiberglass tank is installed on a concrete foundation with all tank materials, tank plumbing and float valve, to provide adequate water storage capacity to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock or wildlife for storage and or direct drinking access and provides improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Capacity in Gallons

**Scenario Unit:** Gallon

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,694.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 614 - Watering Facility

**Scenario:** #8 - Steel Rim Tank - Concrete Base

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent watering facility for livestock constructed of a 20' diameter galvanized steel rim set in a reinforced concrete base with 4,700 gallons of capacity that stores adequate quantity and quality of water for storage and or direct drinking access. All watering facilities will be constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation. This watering facility will address the resource concerns of inadequate supply of water for livestock, habitat degradation, water quality, and undesirable plant productivity and health.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where there is a need for new or improved watering facilities for livestock and or wildlife, where water is not available in sufficient quantities at specific locations, and habitat, water quality, plant productivity

**After Situation:**

A permanent watering facility constructed of a galvanized steel rim set in a reinforced concrete base with a capacity of 10,500 gallons is installed with all tank materials, tank plumbing and float valve, to provide adequate water storage capacity to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock or wildlife for storage and or direct drinking access and provides improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns must be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Capacity in Gallons

**Scenario Unit:** Gallon

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,700.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,328.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 614 - Watering Facility

**Scenario:** #9 - Water Fountain

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent watering facility consisting of a commercially available water fountain for livestock set on a concrete base to be installed with all tank materials, and plumbing, to provide adequate water supply capacity to ensure an adequate quality of water for livestock and direct drinking access and provide improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where there is a need for new or improved watering facilities for livestock and or wildlife, where water is not available in sufficient quantities at specific locations, and habitat, water quality, plant productivity

**After Situation:**

A permanent watering facility consisting of a commercially available water fountain for livestock set on a concrete base is installed with tank plumbing to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock or wildlife for direct drinking access and provides improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Tanks Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,138.17 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,138.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 614 - Watering Facility

**Scenario:** #10 - Precast Concrete Tank

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent watering facility with a capacity of 500 gallons constructed of PreCast Concrete is installed with all tank materials, plumbing and float valve, to provide adequate water storage capacity to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock for storage and or direct drinking access and provide improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where there is a need for new or improved watering facilities for livestock and or wildlife, where water is not available in sufficient quantities at specific locations, and habitat, water quality, plant productivity

**After Situation:**

A permanent watering facility with a capacity of 500 gallons is constructed of PreCast concrete, tank plumbing and float valve, to provide adequate water storage capacity to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock or wildlife for storage and or direct drinking access and provides improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All watering facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Capacity in Gallons

**Scenario Unit:** Gallon

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,299.89 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 614 - Watering Facility

**Scenario:** #12 - Enclosed Storage Tank

**Scenario Description:**

A permanent below ground storage facility to provide water for a watering facility for livestock, wildlife and/or other conservation practices. All water storage facilities will be constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation. This watering facility will address the resource concerns of inadequate supply of water for livestock and or wildlife, habitat degradation, water quality, and undesirable plant productivity and health.

**Before Situation:**

This practice applies to all land uses where there is a need for new or improved watering facilities for livestock and or wildlife; where water is not available in sufficient quantities at specific locations; and habitat, water quality, plant productivity

**After Situation:**

A permanent water storage facility using a below ground concrete tank is installed with all tank materials, tank plumbing and float valve, to provide adequate water storage capacity to ensure an adequate supply and quality of water for livestock, wildlife or other conservation practices for storage and/or direct drinking access and provides improved plant productivity and health, water quality, and habitat. All water storage facilities are constructed from approved durable materials that have a life expectancy that meets or exceeds the planned useful life of the installation and placed on a properly prepared foundation with required plumbing. All needed pipelines are installed using Livestock Pipeline (516). Any needed vegetation of disturbed areas will use Critical Area Planting (342). All collectors or catchments for collecting precipitation will be addressed by using Water Harvesting Catchment (636). Any needed water source installation will use Water Well (642), Pumping Plant (533), Spring Development (574), or Livestock Pipeline (516) as appropriate. Areas around watering facilities where animal concentrations or overflow from the watering facility will cause resource concerns will be protected by using Heavy Use Area Protection (561) as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Capacity in Gallons

**Scenario Unit:** Gallon

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,015.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.80

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #4 - 4 inch - 6 inch PVC or DW Pipe, Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 400 feet of 4" & 6" approved plastic pipe (PVC or Dual Wall HDPE) to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in high pressure flow conditions, situations needing greater capacity or where rodent damage may be a concern. Trench excavation is 48" deep and 12" wide for 4" pipe, and 18-24" wide for 6" pipe. Costs include 6" PVC pipe, 6" Perforated PVC Riser Inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,507.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #6 - 6 inch or smaller Single Wall PE Pipe(non-perf or perf), Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 400 feet of 4" & 6" approved plastic pipe to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in non-pressure flow conditions. Trench excavation is 48" deep and 12" wide. Costs include 4" and 6" HDPE corrugated single wall plastic tubing, 6" Perforated PVC Riser Inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,282.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #7 - 8 inch - 10 inch PVC or DW Pipe, Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 400 feet of 8" and 10" approved plastic pipe (PVC or Dual Wall HDPE) to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in non-pressure flow conditions and when multiple practices drain into it. Trench Excavation is 48" deep and 24" wide. Typical costs include 8" and 10" PVC pipe, 10" riser inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,479.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$23.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #9 - 12 inch - 18 inch PVC or DW Pipe, Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 400 feet of 12" and 18" approved plastic pipe (PVC or Dual Wall HDPE) to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in non-pressure flow conditions and when multiple practices drain into it. Trench Excavation is 58" deep and 28" wide. Costs include 12" and 18" HDPE pipe, 10" Perforated PVC Riser Inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,377.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$48.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #10 - 12 inch - 18 inch PVC or DW Pipe, Single-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 80 feet of 12" approved plastic pipe (PVC or Dual Wall HDPE) to convey storm water from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in pressure flow conditions and when draining single practices. Trench Excavation is 48" deep and 24" wide. Costs include 12" PVC pipe, 12" canopy or hooded inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,192.60

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$52.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #11 - Over 18 inch PVC or DW Pipe, Single- or Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 60 feet of greater than 18" approved plastic (PVC or Dual Wall HDPE) or CMP pipe to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in non-pressure flow conditions and when multiple practices drain into it. Trench Excavation is 58" deep and 28" wide. Costs include 24" HDPE dual wall pipe, 36" dual wall HDPE pipe riser inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,375.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$72.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #57 - 6 inch - 10 inch PVC or DW Pipe, Single-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Install 80 feet of 8" approved plastic pipe (PVC or Dual Wall HDPE) to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in pressure flow conditions and when draining single practices. Trench Excavation is 48" deep and 24" wide. Typical costs include 8" PVC pipe, 8" canopy or hooded inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,089.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$38.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #65 - 8 inch Single Wall PE with Riser

**Scenario Description:**

Install 400 feet of 8" approved plastic pipe to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet in non-pressure flow conditions. Trench excavation is 48" deep and 24" wide. Costs include 8" HDPE corrugated single wall plastic tubing, 10" Perforated PVC Riser Inlet, labor to install pipe, trench excavation, trench backfill, and rodent guard. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices without causing erosion or flooding.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations. Also, roof runoff or surface runoff that becomes contaminated with agricultural wastes that significantly contribu

**After Situation:**

Field system meets "T" or "clean" storm water runoff is diverted away from an agricultural waste management system to minimize the volume of runoff that is contaminated by agricultural waste. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,642.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #70 - 8 inch Single Wall PE Pipe (non-perf or perf), Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Scenario is for the Installation of a 8" diameter approved plastic pipe to convey storm water from one location to a suitable and stable outlet. Payment includes pipe, perforated PVC riser inlet, trench excavation, and trench backfill. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations.

**After Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion is controlled after UGO is installed in association with terraces or water and sediment control basin. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,337.91

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #71 - 10 inch Single Wall PE Pipe (non-perf or perf), Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Scenario is for the Installation of a 10" diameter approved plastic pipe to convey stormwater from one location to a suitable and stable outlet. Payment includes pipe, perforated PVC riser inlet, trench excavation, and trench backfill. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations.

**After Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion is controlled after UGO is installed in association with terraces or water and sediment control basin. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,608.48

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 620 - Underground Outlet

**Scenario:** #72 - >=12 inch Single Wall PE Pipe (non-perf or perf), Multi-Inlet System

**Scenario Description:**

Scenario is for the Installation of a 12" diameter approved plastic pipe to convey storm water from one location to a suitable and stable outlet. Payment includes pipe, perforated PVC riser inlet, trench excavation, and trench backfill. This practice is often installed in conjunction with terraces, diversions, sediment control basins, waterways or similar practices.

**Before Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion as a result of gully, rill or sheet erosion which exceeds "T" from farm fields and other locations.

**After Situation:**

Excessive sedimentation and soil erosion is controlled after UGO is installed in association with terraces or water and sediment control basin. Associated practices are Critical Area Planting (342), Grassed Waterway (412), Terrace (600), Diversion (342), Water and Sediment Control Basin (638), and Subsurface Drainage (606)

**Feature Measure:** Length of Conduit

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,358.58

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 629 - Waste Treatment

**Scenario:** #21 - Aerobic Circulator

**Scenario Description:**

Aerobic circulators are added to an existing lagoon or liquid storage pond with adequate minimum treatment volume (at least 270 days storage) and depth (at least 4.5 feet) to circulate lagoon water in order to allow for oxygen interchange at the surface of the lagoon, creating aerobic conditions in the lagoon and reducing emissions of odors and other volatile gases. Associated practices: Waste Treatment Lagoon (359)

**Before Situation:**

The existing uncovered anaerobic lagoon or liquid storage pond results in emissions of odors, ammonia, methane, and other volatile gases.

**After Situation:**

One aerobic circulator is added to the existing lagoon or storage pond for each 100 animal units of manure input to the lagoon or storage pond, resulting in a conversion of the anaerobic liquid storage to an aerobic liquid storage and reducing emissions of odors and other volatile gases. The circulators are spaced at least 25 feet apart.

**Feature Measure:** Number of Animal Units Tre

**Scenario Unit:** Animal Unit

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$72,599.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$145.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 632 - Waste Separation Facility

**Scenario:** #1 - Mechanical Separator

**Scenario Description:**

A small mechanical separation facility to partition solids, liquids, and/or associated nutrients from animal waste streams. The partitioning of the previously mentioned components facilitates the protection of air and water quality, protects animal health, and improves the management of an animal waste management system. Mechanical separators may include, but are not limited to: static inclined screens, vibratory screens, rotating screens, centrifuges, screw or roller presses, or other systems. Associated practices include Nutrient Management (590), Composting Facility (317), Anaerobic Digester (366), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Amendments for the Treatment of Agricultural Waste (591), Pumping Plant (533), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Pond Lining or Sealing (521A-D), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable to situations where partitioning solids, liquids, and nutrients will facilitate the management of an animal waste management system, improve air quality (reduce odors), and address water quality concerns.

**After Situation:**

One small mechanical separation facility (a screw press) installed at livestock facility before storage or treatment or after treatment, for example, after an anaerobic digester. Part of an animal waste management system.

**Feature Measure:** Item

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$66,173.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66,173.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 632 - Waste Separation Facility

**Scenario:** #2 - Earthen Settling Structure with picket screen outlet

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen structure, such as a basin or a terrace or dike like structure, used to capture and separate a portion of the solids from a liquid stream from a feedlot or confinement facility. A concrete pad should be installed on the bottom of the basin and around outlet structures to facilitate cleanout. Removes a portion of the solids to facilitate waste handling and to address water quality concerns. Associated practices include Nutrient Management (590), Composting Facility (317), Anaerobic Digester (366), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Pond Lining or Sealing (521A-D), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable to situations where partitioning solids, liquids, and nutrients will facilitate the management of an animal waste management system, improve air quality (reduce odors), and address water quality concerns.

**After Situation:**

One earthen settling basin structure (60 ft wide by 200 ft long by 3 ft deep)(estimate 0.5' of freeboard above the design storage), with three screening outlet structures) constructed around or at a livestock feeding operation. Removes a portion of the solids that otherwise would leave with the runoff from an animal feeding operation. Part of an animal waste management system.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Foot of Design Storage

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,896.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 632 - Waste Separation Facility

**Scenario:** #4 - Concrete Settling Structure with pipe outlet

**Scenario Description:**

An earthen structure, such as a basin or a terrace or dike like structure, used to capture and separate a portion of the solids from a liquid stream from a feedlot or confinement facility. A concrete pad should be installed on the bottom of the basin and around outlet structures to facilitate cleanout. Removes a portion of the solids to facilitate waste handling and to address water quality concerns. Associated practices include Nutrient Management (590), Composting Facility (317), Anaerobic Digester (366), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Pond Sealing or Lining - Compacted Soil (520), Pond Sealing or Lining - Concrete (522), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable to situations where partitioning solids, liquids, and nutrients will facilitate the management of an animal waste management system, improve air quality (reduce odors), and address water quality concerns.

**After Situation:**

One earthen settling basin structure with a 30 ft wide by 200 ft long bottom area, 5 ft deep with 3:1 sideslopes. 4.0' depth is used for storage volume computation with 1.0' freeboard. One screening outlet structure is constructed around or at a livestock feeding operation. Removes a portion of the solids that otherwise would leave with the runoff from an animal feeding operation. The suspended solids and liquid is transferred to a Waste Storage Facility (313) using a Waste Transfer (634) pipe. Part of an animal waste management system.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Foot of Design Storag

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 35,800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$51,811.94

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 632 - Waste Separation Facility

**Scenario:** #5 - Concrete Settling Structure with picket screen outlet

**Scenario Description:**

A concrete structure, such as a basin with concrete walls and floor, used to capture and separate a portion of the solids from a liquid stream from a feedlot or confinement facility. Removes as portion of the solids to facilitate waste handling and to address water quality concerns. Associated practices include Nutrient Management (590), Composting Facility (317), Anaerobic Digester (366), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Pumping Plant (533), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Pond Lining or Sealing (521A-D), and Waste Treatment

**Before Situation:**

Applicable to situations where partitioning solids, liquids, and nutrients will facilitate the management of an animal waste management system, improve air quality (reduce odors), and address water quality concerns.

**After Situation:**

One concrete settling basin structure (20 ft wide by 40 ft long with 6 ft high walls and weeping wall/picket structure or outlet control) constructed around or at a livestock feeding operation. Removes a portion of the solids that otherwise would leave with the runoff from an animal feeding operation. Part of an animal waste management system.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Foot of Design Storag

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,050.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 632 - Waste Separation Facility

**Scenario:** #6 - Concrete Sand Settling Lane

**Scenario Description:**

A concrete structure, a concrete lane with curbs, used to capture and separate a portion of the solids, mainly sand, from a liquid stream from a confinement facility. Removes a portion of the solids to facilitate waste handling and to address water quality concerns. Associated practices include Nutrient Management (590), Composting Facility (317), Anaerobic Digester (366), Waste Storage Facility (313), Waste Recycling (633), Waste Transfer (634), Pumping Plant (533), Vegetated Treatment Area (635), Pond Lining or Sealing (521A-D), and Waste Treatment (629).

**Before Situation:**

Applicable to situations where partitioning solids, liquids, and nutrients will facilitate the management of an animal waste management system, improve air quality (reduce odors), and address water quality concerns.

**After Situation:**

One concrete settling lane structure (22 ft wide by 740 ft long by 5 in. thick) constructed around or at a livestock feeding operation. A 20' long opening in wall is allowed as an outlet for this lane. Removes a portion of the solids (sand) that otherwise would leave with the runoff from an animal feeding operation. Part of an animal waste management system.

**Feature Measure:** Square Foot of Settling Lane

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 16,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$184,123.35

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 633 - Waste Recycling

**Scenario:** #1 - Export Ag Waste By-products Recycled for Use Off Farm

**Scenario Description:**

Changes to the operation and farm have decreased total crop nutrient needs. By-products produced at the farm are accumulating in such a manner that the water, soil and/or air quality are potential resource concerns. The operation needs a temporary alternative to address the excess level of on-farm by-products while modifications are planned for the nutrient and/or waste management plans. Exporting by-products to area farmers can lower excess on-farm stockpiles, better distribute and recycle nutrients, and improve soil health. Associated practices: 313-Waste Storage Facility, 316-Mortality Facility, 317-Composting Facility, 590-Nutrient Management

**Before Situation:**

Unexpected loss of leased cropland by the operation; irrigation limitations, weather conditions have altered crop rotations and have decreased crop nutrient needs. Agricultural by-products are accumulating because less land application sites are available

**After Situation:**

The producer "exports" excess by-products to area growers. Growers are invited to pick up the by-products for nutrient use on their farms. Prior to export, all by-products will be sampled and analyzed annually in accordance with LGU guidelines. Nutrients and characteristics to be analyzed for include Total N, Total Ammonium-N, Total Phosphorus, Total Potassium and percent moisture/dry content. Depending on the type of by-product, the analysis may also include heavy metals and pathogens. The farm documents all by-product exports, including the date(s) and quantities, the recipient's name, address and phone number. Each recipient will receive a copy of applicable nutrient analysis report. The farm has modified nutrient and waste management plans to account for nutrients of by-products being generated. Additional practices may be installed as needed. The farm may continue to export by-products if a demand exists.

**Feature Measure:** Farm

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$559.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$559.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 633 - Waste Recycling

**Scenario:** #2 - Import Non-Ag Waste By-products for On-Farm Use

**Scenario Description:**

Traditional bedding materials for free stall barns, monoslope barns and hoop buildings can be expensive and difficult to find. Non-agricultural by-products, such as shredded newspapers, shredded office paper, saw dust, wood shavings, gypsum, etc., are alternatives to standard bedding material. Farms seek to lower energy cost by reducing their use of transportation fuels and are interested in utilizing locally available material. By-products blended with manure are a good fertilizer source and soil amendment for cropland with poor soil health. Associated practices: 313-Waste Storage Facility, 317-Composting Facility, 590-Nutrient Management

**Before Situation:**

The livestock operation is spending more money to purchase bedding material that is limited in their area, increasing operational costs. Cropland associated with this operation has soil resource concern with poor soil health. The operator seeks to reduce

**After Situation:**

Bedding material costs are lowered by use of locally produced, non-agricultural by-products. The blended mixture of newspaper and manure from the barns is stockpiled or composted at the farm. Prior to land application, it is sampled and analyzed for nutrient content in accordance with LGU guidelines. Nutrient and content analysis includes total nitrogen, total ammonium-N, total phosphorus, total potassium, and percent dry/moisture content (and as applicable, heavy metals and pathogens). Crop consultants will help determine application rates based on nutrient analysis. If composted, the product can also be recycled into bedding for the free stall barns. Recordkeeping documents the quantity of non-agricultural material received, ratio blended with manure solids (if not used as a bedding product). If composting, also document temperatures. Records are maintained of nutrient applications as part of their nutrient management plan.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$749.55 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.87

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 633 - Waste Recycling

**Scenario:** #3 - Import Non-Ag Waste By-products for Compost with Manure for On-farm Use

**Scenario Description:**

Area farmers are looking for sources of low cost soil amendments and nutrients for cropland with poor soil health. Dumping food waste (from restaurants, grocery stores, food manufacturers, and institutions such as hospitals, schools prisons), non-agricultural by-products (winery stalks/sludge and butcher shop waste) and municipal greens (grass clipping and leaves) into landfills can be costly and uses landfill space. Area livestock operations may be looking for ways to export solid manure or convert manure into a compost that can be easily transported. Composting food waste, non-agricultural products, municipal greens with manure and a carbon source can result in product that is beneficial to cropland with poor soil health issues. Nutrient sampling, analysis and recordkeeping is required. Additional nutrients are accounted for in the nutrient management plan. Associated practices: 313-Waste Storage Facility, 317-Composting Facility, 590-Nutrient Management

**Before Situation:**

Area farmers have cropland with low soil health and limited economical means to improve soil health. A livestock operation may have excess manure available for export. A local grocery store has weekly food waste that they will transport to farm/AFO. AFOs/

**After Situation:**

Farm receives non-agricultural by-products. Using manure and available carbon sources, the producer/farmer with the help of a consultant develops a composting system using the by-products. Guidance is provided on composting, such as carbon ratio, temperature, moisture, etc. The compost is sampled and tested according to LGU recommendations for nutrients / non-nutrients (Total N, Total Ammonium-N, Total Phosphorus, Total Potassium, and percent dry/moisture content, and, as applicable, heavy metals and pathogens). The compost is land-applied in accordance with the farm's waste management plan or exported to area farmers and used as a soil amendment and nutrient source. Recordkeeping includes the quantity of non-agricultural material received, amount of manure used in the compost, composting temperatures and times with the corresponding tested sample analysis. If the compost is exported, records include the date, amount and recipient of the compost, along with providing the recipient with a copy of the nutrient report.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,237.35 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 633 - Waste Recycling

**Scenario:** #4 - Import Non-Agricultural By-Products, Land-Applied

**Scenario Description:**

The municipal green waste contains material such as lawn clippings and leaves. Communities form dump sites for green waste for its members. Farmers can combine municipal green waste with manure and apply the blended mixture to cropland to recycle nutrients and improve soil health. Nutrient sampling, analysis and recordkeeping is required. Additional nutrients are accounted for in the nutrient management plan. Associated practices: 590-Nutrient Management, (Temporary Field) Waste Storage

**Before Situation:**

A farm has soil resource concerns of several fields with poor soil health. The fields are located where a source of municipal green waste is available. The farmer is concerned about land-applying the green waste directly to the fields and contributing to

**After Situation:**

The farm imports the green waste material that has been chopped and screened for land application. The imported material is blended with manure and briefly stockpiled (away from surface water), for no more than 7 days while a blended sample is tested. The sample is analyzed for nutrient content (Total N, Total Ammonium-N, Total Phosphorus, Total Potassium, percent moisture/dry content) and any potential chemicals of concern. Based on results of the tested sample, and in consultation with an agronomist, the waste material is land-applied on the agricultural fields. Soil is protected from compaction by applying the blend in an appropriate manner. Records of the nutrient analysis and rate of land application in the field are maintained. The nutrient analysis information is used to adjust fertilizer application rates and to prevent crop nutrient tie-up resulting from increased carbon in the soil. The green waste recycling activity on the farm is documented and included in the nutrient management plan records.

**Feature Measure:** Ton

**Scenario Unit:** Ton

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$465.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$23.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #1 - Concrete Channel

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of a concrete channel that consists of a slab with curb and footing on each side of the slab for the entire length of the channel to enable the facility manager to direct liquid waste to an existing collection basin and/or waste storage facility. Water quality concerns will be addressed by preventing liquid waste from entering surface waters, and to facilitate timely land application of manure and wastewater at agronomic rates according to the CNMP. This scenario addresses the potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling.

**Before Situation:**

Current facility operations are allowing liquid waste to flow uncontrolled during periods of precipitation events or cleaning operations such that water resources can be contaminated.

**After Situation:**

Typical installation of a 12 foot wide 100' long concrete channel that consists of a 5" thick concrete slab with curbing on each side of the slab that is 2' high, 6" thick with footing for the entire length. The purpose is to transfer liquids or manure slurry from one area to an existing collection basin or waste storage facility. Includes safety chain for equipment. Alternative configurations can consist of the installation of a more narrow or wider channel that may or may not have curbs or a deeper shaped channel and may include a half pipe on the bottom.

**Feature Measure:** Bottom surface area of conc

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,388.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #2 - Gravity flow, less than or equal to 18 inch diameter conduit

**Scenario Description:**

Gravity flow conduit is typically a large diameter water tight sanitary sewer pipe used to transfer manure by gravity from one location to another. The gravity transfer system typically consists of an existing inlet structure or hopper with attachment to a smooth interior large diameter pipe. The pipe conveys the slurry waste liquid between the waste collection point and a manure storage or waste treatment structure. Adequate head on the pipe flow or change in elevation must be available for the gravity system to function and should be evaluated by the design engineer. This practice includes the pipe attachment to an existing inlet structure and all other fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. This conduit is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to a waste storage or treatment facility to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling.

**Before Situation:**

An area of waste production is separated from the waste storage facility and current operations may cause water quality concerns as it is not efficient in transporting the waste to the storage. The site has a change in elevation between production area an

**After Situation:**

Install a 150 foot long 18" diameter water tight pipe to transfer manure by gravity from one location to another. A gravity transfer system typically consists of a sealed inlet at an existing waste collection structure to a smooth interior 18" sewer grade pipe that will gravity flow to an outlet at a site of manure treatment or storage. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet, outlet, couplers and all other fittings, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure there is adequate elevation drop before contracting. If required an inlet structure may be contracted under another scenario. The transfer conduit will provide collection and containment of the manure slurry, thereby protecting water quality resources.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 150.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,609.30

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$37.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #3 - Gravity flow, greater than 18 inch diameter conduit

**Scenario Description:**

Gravity flow conduit is typically a large diameter water tight sanitary sewer pipe used to transfer manure by gravity from one location to another. The gravity transfer system typically consists of an existing inlet structure or hopper with attachment to a smooth interior large diameter pipe. The pipe conveys the slurry waste liquid between the waste collection point and a manure storage or waste treatment structure. Adequate head on the pipe flow or change in elevation must be available for the gravity system to function and should be evaluated by the design engineer. This practice includes the pipe attachment to an existing inlet structure and all other fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. This conduit is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to a waste storage or treatment facility to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling.

**Before Situation:**

An area of waste production is separated from the waste storage facility and current operations may cause water quality concerns as it is not efficient in transporting the waste to the storage. The site has a change in elevation between production area an

**After Situation:**

Install a 150 foot long 30" diameter water tight pipe to transfer manure by gravity from one location to another. A gravity transfer system typically consists of a sealed inlet at an existing waste collection structure to a smooth interior 30" sewer grade pipe that will gravity flow to an outlet at a site of manure treatment or storage. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet, outlet, couplers and all other fittings, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure there is adequate elevation drop before contracting. If required an inlet structure may be contracted under another scenario. The transfer conduit will provide collection and containment of the manure slurry, thereby protecting water quality resources.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 150.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,542.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$63.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #4 - Pressure flow, less than or equal to 6 inch diameter conduit

**Scenario Description:**

Pressure flow pipeline used to transfer manure wastewater by pumping from the waste storage pond to the field where it is to be applied according to the CNMP. These pipelines may also be utilized to transfer waste within the waste treatment system. Pressure flow transfer pipelines can be between 3" and 12" diameter but 6" diameter is a commonly used pipe size. Pressure pipe will handle an internal pumping pressure between 130 and 200 psi depending on the designed pumping system and must have gasketed joints to seal for the wastewater transfer. The pressure pipe moves the water by pumping from the intake riser location, through a buried mainline with outlet risers spaced at 300 ft intervals for a traveler applicator. This practice includes the pipe plus an inlet riser structure, clean-out risers and outlet risers plus all other valves and fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. This pipeline is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to a waste storage or treatment facility to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling; PS 635, Vegetated Treatment Area.

**Before Situation:**

The waste storage structure is separated from the application fields where wastewater nutrients are needed. Soil nutrients in the near fields have high phosphorus levels from over application near the waste storage facility. The current application operat

**After Situation:**

Install a 1000 foot long 6 inch diameter PVC gasketed IPS pipe that has an SDR of 21 and is water tight under pressure flow to transfer the manure wastewater. An inlet riser and is located near the pump site of the waste storage pond and designed for the desired pressure and flow for the application system. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet riser, couplers, air-vac vents, all other fittings, and risers placed as specified by the design, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure the design will function. The transfer pipeline will deliver the manure slurry to the fields for agronomic nutrient utilization according to the CNMP, thereby protecting water quality resources.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,100.19 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #5 - Pressure flow, 8 inch diameter conduit

**Scenario Description:**

Pressure flow pipeline used to transfer manure wastewater by pumping from the waste storage pond to the field where it is to be applied according to the CNMP. These pipelines may also be utilized to transfer waste within the waste treatment system. Pressure flow transfer pipelines can be between 3" and 12" diameter but 8" diameter is a commonly used pipe size. Pressure pipe will handle an internal pumping pressure between 130 and 200 psi depending on the designed pumping system and must have gasketed joints to seal for the wastewater transfer. The pressure pipe moves the water by pumping from the intake riser location, through a buried mainline with outlet risers spaced at 300 ft intervals for a traveler applicator. This practice includes the pipe plus an inlet riser structure, clean-out risers and outlet risers plus all other valves and fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. This pipeline is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to a waste storage or treatment facility to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling; PS 635, Vegetated Treatment Area.

**Before Situation:**

The waste storage structure is separated from the application fields where wastewater nutrients are needed. Soil nutrients in the near fields have high phosphorus levels from over application near the waste storage facility. The current application operat

**After Situation:**

Install a 1000 foot long 8 inch diameter PVC gasketed IPS pipe that has an SDR of 21 and is water tight under pressure flow to transfer the manure wastewater. An inlet riser and is located near the pump site of the waste storage pond and designed for the desired pressure and flow for the application system. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet riser, couplers, air-vac vents, all other fittings, and risers placed as specified by the design, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure the design will function.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$24,603.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #6 - Pressure flow, 10 inch diameter conduit

**Scenario Description:**

PVC pipelines are used to transfer manure wastewater by a low pressure pump from the waste storage pond to the field where it is applied according to the CNMP. These pipelines may also be utilized to transfer waste within the waste treatment system. PVC transfer pipelines can be between 3" and 30" diameter. This practice includes the pipe plus an inlet riser structure, clean-out risers and outlet risers plus all other valves and fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. This pipeline is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling; PS 635, Vegetated Treatment Area.

**Before Situation:**

The waste storage structure is separated from the application fields where wastewater nutrients are needed or other components of the waste management system. Soil nutrients in the near fields have high phosphorus levels from over application near the was

**After Situation:**

Install a 1000 foot long 10 inch diameter PVC gasketed IPS pipe and is water tight to transfer the manure an/or wastewater. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet riser, couplers, air-vac vents, all other fittings, and risers placed as specified by the design, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure the design will function.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$34,997.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$35.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #7 - Pressure flow, 12 inch or greater diameter conduit

**Scenario Description:**

PVC pipelines are used to transfer manure wastewater by a low pressure pump from the waste storage pond to the field where it is applied according to the CNMP. These pipelines may also be utilized to transfer waste within the waste treatment system. PVC transfer pipelines can be between 3" and 30" diameter. This practice includes the pipe plus an inlet riser structure, clean-out risers and outlet risers plus all other valves and fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. This pipeline is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling; PS 635, Vegetated Treatment Area.

**Before Situation:**

The waste storage structure is separated from the application fields where wastewater nutrients are needed or other components of the waste management system. Soil nutrients in the near fields have high phosphorus levels from over application near the was

**After Situation:**

Install a 300 foot long 12 inch diameter PVC gasketed IPS pipe and is water tight to transfer the manure an/or wastewater. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet riser, couplers, air-vac vents, all other fittings, and risers placed as specified by the design, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure the design will function.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,579.46 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$51.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #43 - Pressure or gravity flow conduit that includes one boring under roadway

**Scenario Description:**

PVC pipelines are used to transfer manure wastewater by a low pressure pump from the waste storage pond to the field where it is applied according to the CNMP. These pipelines may also be utilized to transfer waste within the waste treatment system. PVC transfer pipelines can be between 3" and 30" diameter. This practice includes the pipe plus an inlet riser structure, clean-out risers and outlet risers plus all other valves and fittings, trench excavation and backfill, labor and a equipment for installation. Includes boring 52 lineal feet under a heavily used road, such as a state or county highway which has an average of 12' wide lanes, 6' shoulder width, and 8' width sideslopes. Appurtenances include: couplings, fittings, air vents, pressure relief valves, thrust blocks, risers, and inline valves, and are included in the cost of pipe material (additional 10% of pipe material quantity). Cost of appurtenances does not include flow meters or backflow preventers. Typical installation applies to soils with no special bedding requirements. This pipeline is part of a manure transfer system for a planned waste management or comprehensive nutrient management plan. This scenario addresses the transport of liquid waste to prevent a water quality resource concern of excessive nutrients/organics and harmful levels of pathogens in surface water and/or excessive nutrients/organics in ground water. Associated practices may include: PS 313 Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; PS 533, Pumping Plant; PS 430, Irrigation Pipeline; PS 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; PS 468, Lined Waterway or Outlet; PS 590 Nutrient Management for waste application; PS 633, Waste Recycling; PS 635, Vegetated Treatment Area.

**Before Situation:**

The waste storage structure is separated from the application fields where wastewater nutrients are needed or other components of the waste management system. Soil nutrients in the near fields have high phosphorus levels from over application near the was

**After Situation:**

Install a 1000 foot long 10 inch diameter PVC gasketed IPS pipe and is water tight to transfer the manure an/or wastewater. This scenario includes the pipe, inlet riser, couplers, air-vac vents, all other fittings, and risers placed as specified by the design, trench excavation, pipe bedding and backfill. The site should be evaluated by the designing engineer to make sure the design will function.

**Feature Measure:** Length of pipe installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$41,688.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$41.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 634 - Waste Transfer

**Scenario:** #60 - Lot Runoff Containment Wall

**Scenario Description:**

Typical installation consists of a 2' high concrete wall with an adjacent 5' wide, 5" thick concrete slab. Typical length is 300'. The purpose is to direct lot runoff to a collection basin or waste storage facility. Wall also allows manure to be scraped to waste storage facility. Associated practices may include: 313, Waste Storage Facility; 533, Pumping Plant; 632, Waste Separation Facility; 590, Nutrient Management; 633, Waste Recycling; 561, Heavy Use Protection Area.

**Before Situation:**

Current facility operations are allowing manure laden lot runoff to discharge from the feedlot and cause water resources to be contaminated.

**After Situation:**

Installation of a concrete wall with footing to direct manure laden lot runoff to a collection basin and/or waste storage facility. Water quality concerns will be addressed by preventing liquid waste from entering surface waters, and to facilitate timely land application of manure and wastewater at agronomic rates according to the CNMP. This scenario addresses the potential for surface water and groundwater quality degradation. Associated practices may include: 313, Waste Storage Facility for storage structures; 533, Pumping Plant; 632, Solid/Liquid Waste Separation Facility; 590, Nutrient Management for waste application; 633, Waste Recycling.

**Feature Measure:** Length of Wall Installed

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$25,371.61 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$84.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 638 - Water and Sediment Control Basin

**Scenario:** #1 - WASCOB base

**Scenario Description:**

Typical scenario for the construction of 700 CY earthen embankment. Outlet is typically an underground outlet. An earthen embankment or combination ridge and channel generally constructed across the slope and minor watercourses to form a sediment trap and water detention basin. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader. Costs include all equipment necessary to excavate, shape, grade and compact the Water and Sediment Control Basin and mobilization of equipment. This practice is utilized to reduce watercourse and gully erosion, trap sediment, reduce and manage onsite and downstream runoff. Sheet and rill erosion will be controlled by other conservation practices.

**Before Situation:**

Farming fields with excessive slope length has resulted in multiple rills and/or ephemeral gullies that will continue to worsen over time. The excessive erosion may lead to deterioration of receiving waters due to excessive sedimentation and nutrient tran

**After Situation:**

Water and Sediment Control Basis is constructed with 700 CY of excavation/earthfill with dozer, scraper and/or road grader. Rill and/or gully erosion is reduced. If riser and underground outlet are needed, then include Underground Outlet (620). Include Critical Area Planting (342) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities.

**Feature Measure:** CY of WASCOB Embankmen

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 700.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,989.94 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 638 - Water and Sediment Control Basin

**Scenario:** #2 - WASCOB topsoil

**Scenario Description:**

Typical scenario for the construction of 700 CY earthen embankment. Prior to building the embankment, 6 inches of topsoil is removed and stockpiled. Outlet is typically an underground outlet. An earthen embankment or combination ridge and channel generally constructed across the slope and minor watercourses to form a sediment trap and water detention basin. Topsoil is replaced following construction of the embankment. Costs include all equipment necessary to strip and stock pile topsoil, excavate, shape, grade and compact the Water and Sediment Control Basin, spread and replace topsoil after construction and mobilization of equipment. Seeding not included. This practice is utilized to reduce watercourse and gully erosion, trap sediment, reduce and manage onsite and downstream runoff. Sheet and rill erosion will be controlled by other conservation practices. Work is done with dozer, scraper, or road grader.

**Before Situation:**

Site has shallow topsoil which if removed by earthwork for construction of embankment will significantly impact yields. Farming fields with excessive slope length has resulted in multiple rills and/or ephemeral gullies that will continue to worsen over ti

**After Situation:**

Water and Sediment Control Basis is constructed with 700 CY of excavation/earthfill with dozer, scraper and/or road grader. Rill and/or gully erosion is reduced. If riser and underground outlet are needed, then include Underground Outlet (620). Include Critical Area Planting (342) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities.

**Feature Measure:** CY of WASCOB Embankmen

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 700.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,218.41

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 640 - Waterspreading

**Scenario:** #1 - Dikes

**Scenario Description:**

A waterspreading system of dikes installed to uniformly distribute surface water to the field. Dikes are commonly installed on 2% slopes. Dikes are installed with gates to manage the release of the water.

**Before Situation:**

A field managed for forage with uncontrolled surface water that is not uniformly applied to the field for crop use.

**After Situation:**

A waterspreading system of dikes are installed to uniformly distribute surface water to the field. The dikes are typically built with a height of 3 feet and have a 4 foot top with 5:1 sideslopes to allow the dike to mowed or cut. The dikes are seeded with a sod forming grass. Each dike will retain water on the field and allow the water to be drained through a 18" CMP pipe with a slide gate (typically a Waterman C8E gate). The typical field size would be 20 acres and would have three dikes approximately 1000' long installed with 200-300 feet between dikes. The system would address the resource concern of Water Quantity - Inefficient water use on nonirrigated land. Associated practices with the system are 342 Critical Area Planting, 412 - Grassed Waterway, 587 - Structure for Water Control, 511 - Forage Harvest Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acres with supplemental wa

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$45,392.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,269.63

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 642 - Water Well

**Scenario:** #1 - Well Point

**Scenario Description:**

Typical construction is for a 2 in diameter well screen, 36 in long, with 2 in diameter pipe and couplings are driven or water jetted to a typical depth of 20 feet into a shallow water bearing formation. The purpose of the practice is to provide water for livestock. The area near the well point is sloped to direct surface water away from entering the well.

**Before Situation:**

Livestock have insufficient water or are fenced from their water source.

**After Situation:**

Sufficient water is available for livestock. Utilize Pumping Plant (533) and Pipeline (516) as associated practices. Use Critical Area Seeding (342) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities.

**Feature Measure:** Depth of Well

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,597.62

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$373.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 642 - Water Well

**Scenario:** #3 - Shallow Well, 100 ft. deep or less

**Scenario Description:**

Typical construction is for the installation of a well, in areas where sufficient water is known to occur within 100 feet of the ground surface. The well shall be drilled, dug, driven, bored, jetted or otherwise constructed to an aquifer for water supply. The purpose of the practice is to provide water for livestock or irrigation. An average well depth is 75 feet. Well casings are 4-6 in diameter. Plastic casing is installed to a depth of 55 feet.

**Before Situation:**

Livestock have insufficient water or are fenced from their water source. There is insufficient water for use in micro-irrigation.

**After Situation:**

Sufficient water is available for livestock or irrigation. Utilize Pumping Plant (533) and Pipeline (516) as associated practices. Use Critical Area Seeding (342) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities.

**Feature Measure:** Depth of Well

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 75.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,723.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$142.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 642 - Water Well

**Scenario:** #6 - Single PVC Casing with pitless unit, greater than 100 ft. deep

**Scenario Description:**

Typical construction is for the installation of a well with a pitless unit, in areas where sufficient water is known to occur 100 - 300 feet of the ground surface. The well shall be drilled, dug, driven, bored, jetted or otherwise constructed to an aquifer for water supply. The purpose of the practice is to provide water for livestock or micro-irrigation. An average well depth is 200 feet. Well casings are 4-6 in diameter. Plastic casing and screen is installed to a depth of 200 feet.

**Before Situation:**

Livestock have insufficient water or are fenced from their water source. There is insufficient water for use in micro-irrigation.

**After Situation:**

Sufficient water is available for livestock or micro-irrigation. Utilize Pumping Plant (533) and Pipeline (516) as associated practices. Use Critical Area Seeding (342) where necessary to prevent erosion following construction activities.

**Feature Measure:** Depth of Well

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,279.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$86.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 643 - Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities

**Scenario:** #1 - Monitoring & Management, Low Intensity and Complexity - No Foregone Income

**Scenario Description:**

Setting is any land use with the potential to provide habitat for species of plants and animals identified as Rare and Declining and the habitat potential is not currently being captured. The identified habitat limiting factors can be restored, enhanced or created, with the application of this practice alone, or in combination with other supporting and facilitating practices. Monitoring will be used to determine if the conservation system meets or exceeds the minimum planning criteria for the targeted wildlife. Management will be implemented based on the findings of the habitat assessment and monitoring. Habitat management and monitoring needed to treat the resource concerns requires no training, no qualitative data assessment, no water quality monitoring and is low in complexity and intensity. Examples of prescribed monitoring, include but are not limited to: photo points taken, documentation of livestock utilization, regeneration/breeding success, completing an annual management records log, documenting wildlife sightings, documenting location and species of invasive plants and condition of vegetative and structural treatments. No decision or treatment associated with this practice or facilitating practices will require foregone income. The planner will specify locations and identify the methods to the customer who will implement the monitoring and management plan.

**Before Situation:**

Existing degraded plant conditions and resulting inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife have resulted in low use of the area by target species identified as Rare and Declining and other associated species.

**After Situation:**

Based on the results of a State approved upland wildlife habitat assessment process, the application of habitat management efforts and prescribed monitoring have been implemented. With the application of this practice alone, or in combination with other supporting and facilitating practices, the inadequate habitat conditions have been addressed. Monitoring and resulting management has maximized the benefits of the needed habitat treatment efforts.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Managed and Monito

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$758.10 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.58

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 643 - Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities

**Scenario:** #37 - Habitat Monitoring and Management, High Intensity and Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is applied to all landuse types including those with wildlife as a modifier, where any resource concern is identified for wildlife, and where high intensity and complexity of monitoring or management will treat the identified resource concern. Two - four monitoring efforts are needed and each requiring less than 2 people and less than 8 hours per effort. The adaptive management actions (2 - 5 efforts) such as cutting of limbs that are impeding access of birds into nest boxes, replacing damaged fence markers, cleaning of nest structures and debris around other structures requires hand labor and light equipment, requiring a 2-person crew less than 1 day per effort.

**Before Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is deficient due to the absence of annual monitoring and adaptive management actions of high intensity and complexity.

**After Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is improved by implementation of annual adaptive management actions of high intensity and complexity.

**Feature Measure:** Monitoring efforts and adap

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,587.37 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$32.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 643 - Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities

**Scenario:** #56 - Beaver Dam Analogues or Post-Assisted Log Structures

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario includes installation of low-tech woody structures (Beaver Dam Analogues (BDAs) or Post-Assisted Log Structures (PALS)) to facilitate process-based restoration in perennial, intermittent, or ephemeral streams and riparian areas. These simple structures are low, semi-permeable, and hand-built using native materials (wood, sod, etc.). Untreated wooden fence posts are added where necessary for extra stability. Structures are designed to be short-lived and used primarily as a temporary tool to promote natural process recovery. Structures mimic the function of natural beaver dams and wood accumulation in streams by reducing water velocities, raising water tables, enhancing floodplain connectivity, and inducing other dynamic ecological and hydrogeomorphic processes. Typically, complexes consisting of multiple structures within a reach are used to meet project objectives. Structures can be used on all land uses to address a variety of resource concerns and are strategically placed to meet specific purposes, such as, mesic and wetland vegetation expansion, floodplain development in incised channels, increased habitat complexity for fish and wildlife, and beaver re-establishment. Associated practices include: 528, 391, 644, 612, 382. Typical scenario includes 20 structures averaging 20 ft length each (total = 400 lin ft of structures). Crew of one biologist, one crew manager, and three laborers (one skilled).

**Before Situation:**

Degraded stream channel and associated riparian/mesic/wetland vegetation are impaired by lack of structural complexity, channel incision, reduced floodplain connectivity, or inadequate habitat features. Extent of potential riparian/mesic/wetland vegetatio

**After Situation:**

Low-tech structures mimic and promote ecological and physical processes that foster recovery of streams, riparian areas, wet meadows, or aquatic ecosystems. Channel complexity is increased and condition improved by promoting riparian/mesic/wetland vegetation expansion, reconnecting floodplains, and increasing habitat structure for fish and wildlife. Additional treatments may be needed through time until ecosystem is self-sustaining.

**Feature Measure:** Linear Feet

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,908.16

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$49.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 643 - Restoration of Rare or Declining Natural Communities

**Scenario:** #106 - Rock Structure

**Scenario Description:**

A low cost, low risk, rock structure will be installed at the head of the gully to arrest the continued cutting of the gully uphill. The structure is designed to protect the soil surface from further erosion while dissipating water energy. Below the head cut structure a series of structures will be installed to reduce water velocity and cause deposition of sediments to heal the gully and reduce drainage from the adjacent upland area. This will reduce the loss of and restore mesic riparian/meadow habitats. Typical installation involves the installation of one structure to address head-cutting and three additional structures to reduce stream velocity and collect sediment. The head cut structure typically requires 1.5 cubic yards of rock. Typical sediment checks require 1.0 cubic yards of rock. This scenario addresses Soil Erosion, classic gully and inadequate fish and wildlife habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Head cutting is proceeding uphill creating a gully that serves as a drain to the adjacent habitat lowering the local water table, reducing the available moisture to the adjacent mesic plant communities. Mesic riparian/meadow habitats shift to more xeric h

**After Situation:**

Head cut is arrested, stopping the advance of the gully uphill and protecting mesic riparian/meadow habitats upstream. Additionally, sediment is collected, raising the base of the gully and restoring the hydrologic regime and mesic riparian/meadow habitats. Re-vegetation is generally via natural regeneration. Should additional re-vegetation be needed, use vegetation standards, 612, Tree and shrub establishment, 550, Range Planting, 342 Critical Area Treatment, and/or 420 Wildlife Habitat Planting as appropriate.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,851.19 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$855.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 644 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #3 - Management and monitoring only, foregone income (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Site management will include managing/monitoring the site to provide food and cover for wetland wildlife species on cropland. Annual vegetation (crops or other annual vegetation) will be allowed to establish and persist during critical nesting and brood rearing seasons and will remain standing (not harvested) until migratory species have left the site. The setting is on lands used for the production of crops where the slope gradient is less than two percent and soils are not excessively drained. The State-approved habitat evaluation or appraisal found that a limiting factor for wetland wildlife is the absence of sufficient cover and food in the area. The manipulation of existing cover will be accomplished through mechanical methods to provide a diverse vegetation mosaic, within and adjacent to the existing wetland, addressing inadequate habitat for wetland wildlife. Where this occurs on cropped fields, annual crops will be lost for one growing season (foregone income is included).

**Before Situation:**

The site lacks sufficient and diverse cover and food needed for optimal wetland wildlife habitat or target species. Typically the site has been previously manipulated and utilized for agricultural. With the loss of abundant and diverse cover and food thro

**After Situation:**

Agricultural crop or annual vegetation has been allowed to persist providing needed food and cover for identified species. Crops and annual vegetation will not be harvested during the critical seasons as identified by the habitat evaluation. As a result of the installation, habitat needs have been adequately met.

**Feature Measure:** Wetland Wildlife Cover and

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,186.08 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$218.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 644 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #12 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Monitoring and Management, Low Intensity and Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is applied to wetlands on landuse types including those with wildlife as a modifier, where any resource concern is identified for wildlife, and where low intensity and complexity of monitoring or management will treat the identified resource concern. Only 1-2 monitoring efforts are needed and each requiring less than 2 people and 4 hours per effort. The adaptive management actions such as cutting of limbs that are impeding access of birds into nest boxes, replacing damaged fence markers, cleaning of nest structures and debris around other structures requires only hand labor and less than 8 hours labor per year.

**Before Situation:**

Wetland wildlife habitat is deficient due to the absence of annual monitoring and adaptive management actions of low intensity and complexity.

**After Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is improved by implementation of annual adaptive management actions of low intensity and complexity.

**Feature Measure:** Monitoring efforts and adap

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$863.79 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 644 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #26 - Establishment of seasonal wildlife forage or cover on non-cropland

**Scenario Description:**

The habitat assessment identifies the need to provide seasonal forage or cover for target wildlife species or guild. This habitat need will be met through the establishment of annual plants by planting of seed. The typical scenario will occur on areas supporting perineal herbaceous vegetation, not currently in cropland. Due to existing dense vegetation, these area will need to be mowed 2-3 weeks prior to disking (primarily disking), then followed by a light disking. Seed bed preparation will be furthered by firming the seed bed by cultipacking the site. Mixed fertilizer is required to establish planted wildlife forage. A seedmix consisting of annuals is typical for this activity.

**Before Situation:**

The existing habitat has an excess of herbaceous perineal habitat suitable for cover, but is lacking high quality forage seasonal forage, or the cover conditions is too thick and establishment of annuals create a diverse cover condition for the target wil

**After Situation:**

The availability of high-quality seasonal forage for the target wildlife species is provided and target wildlife health is improved, and populations are increased.

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,908.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$190.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 644 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #45 - Management and Monitoring on Idled Cropland for Wetland Wildlife, foregone income - Level 1 (Year 2-5)

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario addresses wildlife habitat management for wetter or more water saturated portions of cropland fields which are valuable source of forage and cover for many waterfowl, shorebird and wading bird species. The cession of cropping and maintenance of hydrology will provide adequate forage and cover in areas where normal cropland production restricts the growth of cover and forage sources. Where this occurs on cropped fields, annual crops will be lost for one growing season (foregone income is included).

**Before Situation:**

Setting is any prairie pothole. The wetlands must be wholly or partially in cropland. These wetlands are currently cropped, and hydrology has or could be diverted from the wetland by way of tiling, field or road ditching, diking or any other feature that

**After Situation:**

The planning unit is adequately covered with permanent and/or annual (non-persistent) vegetation. The cession of cropping and maintenance of hydrology provides adequate forage and cover in areas where normal cropland production restricts the growth of cover and forage sources. Monitoring assures hydrology is intact and provides wildlife water and habitat. Acres will be assessed and score 0.5 or greater as both Wetlands and Cropland on the Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Guide. Monitoring will be used to determine if the hydrology remains intact and cover is adequate and free of invasive weed species. Examples of monitoring include but are not limited to: photo points with comparisons to surrounding wetlands, use documentation by livestock, regeneration or breeding success, completing an annual management records log, documenting wildlife sightings, documenting location and species of invasive plants and condition of vegetative and structural treatments.

**Feature Measure:** Area idled from crop produc

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$485.97 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$242.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 644 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #46 - Idling Cropland for Wetland Wildlife - Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario addresses wildlife habitat management for wetter or more water saturated portions of cropland fields which are a valuable source of forage and cover for many waterfowl, shorebird and wading bird species. The cessation of cropping and maintenance of hydrology will provide adequate forage and cover in areas where normal cropland production restricts the growth of cover and forage sources. Where this occurs on cropped fields, annual crops will be lost for one growing season (foregone income is included).

**Before Situation:**

Setting is any wetland being 2 acres or less on the National Wetland Inventory with fully intact hydrology. The wetlands must be wholly or partially in cropland. These wetlands are currently cropped, and hydrology could be diverted from the wetland by way

**After Situation:**

The planning unit is adequately covered with annual (non-persistent) vegetation. The cessation of cropping and maintenance of hydrology provides adequate forage and cover in areas where normal cropland production restricts the growth of cover and forage sources. Monitoring assures hydrology is intact and provides wildlife water and habitat. Acres will be assessed and score 0.5 or greater as both Wetlands and Cropland on the Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Guide. Monitoring will be used to determine if the hydrology remains intact and cover is adequate and free of invasive weed species. Examples of monitoring include but are not limited to: photo points with comparisons to surrounding wetlands, use documentation by livestock, regeneration or breeding success, completing an annual management records log, documenting wildlife sightings, documenting location and species of invasive plants and condition of vegetative and structural treatments.

**Feature Measure:** Area idled from crop produc

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$501.89 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$250.95

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 644 - Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #47 - Monitoring and Management - Level 3

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario applies to cropped wetlands, two acres or less in size identified on the National Wetland Inventory, with intact hydrology, currently cropped (typically in a corn-wheat-soybean rotation) and lacking adequate food and cover for migratory water fowl during critical periods. The inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern can be addressed by allowing EXISTING annual vegetation (crops or other annual vegetation) to establish and persist during critical nesting and brood rearing seasons. Annual crops may be lost for one growing season.

**Before Situation:**

Existing habitat is a cropped wetland, lacking wildlife food and cover during the cropping season. Normal seeding and/or harvest occurs about 30% of the time. Excess wetness during the early planting season in the remaining years often cause ag producers

**After Situation:**

Agricultural crop or annual vegetation will be allowed to persist providing food and cover essential for migratory birds. Crops and annual vegetation will not be harvested during the primary nesting season as identified by the habitat evaluation guide. This allows for successful nesting and brood rearing. The Wildlife Habitat Evaluation Guide documents an increase in planning criteria (and at a minimum meet planning criteria) for the inadequate wildlife habitat resource concern. Monitoring (with supporting photo documentation) demonstrates wildlife habitat has been improved to levels consistent with management goals/objectives, as well as observed use of the wetland habitat by wildlife.

**Feature Measure:** NWI for sizing

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$368.29 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$184.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #2 - Greater Prairie Chicken Habitat Development

**Scenario Description:**

Field size is 640 acres. Each acre in the treatment unit will be burned only once in three years. Each acre in treatment unit will be burned once within the three year period. This is a monitoring for GPC habitat conditions not a burning scenario. Habitat conditions will be monitored 4 times a year and vegetative data will be collected using percent ground cover within a 30 foot radius plot at 10 locations.

**Before Situation:**

The grasslands of the Flint Hills region in Kansas, and the area east thereof, are commonly used for early intensive stocking. Annual spring burning of these native warm season range units is common for animal performance benefits. This cultural burning p

**After Situation:**

To benefit air quality, plant health and vigor and wildlife habitat, each acre will be burned only once in a three year period. Treatment units are range, pasture, or grazed forest. Nesting habitat for GPC will be developed through limiting burning, and improving habitat based on data collected at the 10 monitoring sites.

**Feature Measure:** Area monitored

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,813.23 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #4 - Wildlife Habitat Enhancement - Former Cropland (FI)

**Scenario Description:**

Setting is cropland with the potential to provide habitat for species of plants and animals identified as Rare and Declining and the habitat potential is not currently being captured. The identified habitat limiting factors can be restored, enhanced or created, with the application of this practice alone, or in combination with other supporting and facilitating practices. Monitoring will be used to determine if the conservation system meets or exceeds the minimum planning criteria for the targeted wildlife. Management will be implemented based on the findings of the habitat assessment and monitoring. Habitat management and monitoring needed to treat the resource concerns requires no training, no qualitative data assessment, no water quality monitoring and is low in complexity and intensity. Examples of prescribed monitoring, include but are not limited to: photo points taken, livestock utilization records, regeneration/breeding success, completing an annual management records log, documenting wildlife sightings, documenting location and species of invasive plants and condition of vegetative and structural treatments. The planner will specify locations and identify the methods to the customer who will implement the monitoring and management plan. Includes foregone income. Setting is cropland that will be managed to benefit rare and declining habitats through deferral or seeding to permanent or annual vegetation.

**Before Situation:**

Existing cropland production of a soybean, corn, and wheat rotation on cropped fields. This creates a degraded plant condition which results in inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife resulting in low use of the area by target species identified as Rare

**After Situation:**

Based on the results of a State-approved upland wildlife habitat assessment process, the application of habitat management efforts and prescribed monitoring have been implemented. With the application of this practice alone, or in combination with other supporting and facilitating practices, the inadequate habitat conditions have been addressed. Monitoring will highlight the benefits of the habitat treatment efforts.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Managed and Monito

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,627.60

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$196.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #32 - Establishment of seasonal wildlife forage or cover on cropland, no FI

**Scenario Description:**

This typical scenario occurs on cropland. The habitat assessment identified the need to provide seasonal forage or cover for target wildlife species or guild. This habitat need will be met through the establishment of annual food plants or cover plants by planting of seed. The typical scenario for seasonal forage or cover will be established outside of crop season, thus FI is not needed. Seedbed preparation (light tillage) will be furthered by firming the seed bed by cultipacking the site. The only fertilizer need is N as this is cropland and P and K levels are sufficient. Cropland, so mobilization of equipment not needed.

**Before Situation:**

Cropland that fails to provided food or cover for target species at the proper location and season to meet the needs of wildlife.

**After Situation:**

The availability of high-quality seasonal forage or seasonal cover for the target wildlife species is provided. Target wildlife health is improved and populations are increased.

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,322.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$132.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #33 - Establishment of seasonal forage or cover for wildlife on cropland, with FI

**Scenario Description:**

The habitat assessment identified the need to provide seasonal forage or cover for target wildlife species or guild. This habitat needs will be met through the establishment of annuals by planting of seed. The typical scenario is for cropland. Seed bed preparation is limited to one light disking, furthered by firming the seed bed by cultipacking the site. The only fertilizer need is N as this is cropland and P and K levels are sufficient. These wildlife forages or seasonal cover will be available for wildlife during the cropping season, and are in lieu of the cash crops typically planted on the field. Thus, income from the cash crop will be foregone for a year.

**Before Situation:**

Cropland does not provide forage or cover needed for wildlife during the season on dearth.

**After Situation:**

Annual wildlife forages are planted in lieu of a cash crop. Target wildlife health is improved and populations are increased.

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,664.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$366.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #307 - Habitat Monitoring and Management, Low Intensity and Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is applied to all landuse types including those with wildlife as a modifier, where any resource concern is identified for wildlife, and where low intensity and complexity of monitoring or management will treat the identified resource concern. Only 1-2 monitoring efforts are needed and each requiring less than 2 people and 4 hours per effort. The adaptive management actions such as cutting of limbs that are impeding access of birds into nest boxes, replacing damaged fence markers, cleaning of nest structures and debris around other structures requires only hand labor and less than 8 hours labor per year.

**Before Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is deficient due to the absence of annual monitoring and adaptive management actions of low intensity and complexity.

**After Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is improved by implementation of annual adaptive management actions of low intensity and complexity.

**Feature Measure:** Monitoring efforts and adap

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$863.79 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #308 - Habitat Monitoring and Management, Medium Intensity and Complexity

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is applied to all landuse types including those with wildlife as a modifier, where any resource concern is identified for wildlife, and where medium intensity and complexity of monitoring or management will treat the identified resource concern. Two or three monitoring efforts are needed and each requiring less than 2 people and less than 8 hours per effort. Two or three adaptive management efforts are required (such as cutting of limbs that are impeding access of birds into nest boxes, replacing damaged fence markers, cleaning of nest structures and debris around other structures). The adaptive mgmt. requires hand labor and the occasional use of light equipment. A crew of 2 is needed for the hand labor efforts and the crew will require less than 16 total hours of labor per mgmt. effort. Mowing of roads and trail is required to provide access for monitoring and management.

**Before Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is deficient due to the absence of annual monitoring and adaptive management actions of medium intensity and complexity.

**After Situation:**

Wildlife habitat is improved by implementation of annual adaptive management actions of medium intensity and complexity.

**Feature Measure:** Monitoring efforts and adap

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,681.43 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.76

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #310 - Interseeding Milkweed Into Existing Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Inter-seeding milkweed into an existing stand of vegetation that has sufficient nectar plant richness and distribution, but lacks reproductive habitat (milkweed is lacking). Existing vegetation will be treated with herbicides in strips. Entire area will be burned or mowed prior to application of herbicides to 6-10 foot wide strips. Drilling of milkweed will be in the treated (herbicide strips). Seeding in strips will be 25% of the field.

**Before Situation:**

An open field that may support enough forb species richness, abundance and distribution to provide good or excellent monarch nectaring habitat, but milkweed is lacking. These conditions fail to meet the limiting factor for monarchs as required to meet Upl

**After Situation:**

The open field supports good or excellent monarch reproductive habitat. Application of the Monarch WHEG finds the habitat quality rating to be good or excellent.

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,049.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$209.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Scenario:** #349 - Livestock Exclusion for Wildlife

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario is applied to grazed Pasture, Range, Forest NRCS Land Uses where wildlife habitat is identified as a resource concern. Livestock are excluded from the planning unit for at least a year to allow the existing plant community sufficient time to respond favorably, creating improved wildlife habitat vegetative conditions. In addition to habitat vegetative condition, livestock may be excluded to reduce interactions between livestock and associated livestock management activities, and wildlife species that are particularly sensitive to such interactions. This scenario is for livestock exclusion and not seasonal livestock deferment in support of Prescribed Grazing (Code 528). The area is monitored per the State developed Livestock Exclusion for Wildlife Habitat Implementation Requirement document. Monitoring data is used to trigger adaptive wildlife habitat management actions, as provided in the implementation requirements document.

**Before Situation:**

The vegetation has been grazed at levels that reduce the functional value (e.g. plant community structure, diversity and richness) of the area for wildlife as identified by NRCS, or the livestock and accompanying livestock management activities create str

**After Situation:**

The exclusion of livestock improves habitat conditions to the benefit of target wildlife species. Livestock exclusion, habitat or livestock exclusion monitoring, and resulting management actions has maximized the benefits of excluding livestock from the area. If fencing is required to exclude livestock, it will be planned and applied according to Fence (Code 382). Other associated practices might be Access Control (Code 472), Brush Management (Code 314), Herbaceous Weed Control (Code 315), Prescribed Burning (Code 338), and Structures for Wildlife (Code 649). The agricultural producer incurs a loss in income on the site, due to livestock exclusion.

**Feature Measure:** Acres excluded

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,356.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$33.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**Scenario:** #1 - Shallow Water Management-Low Level

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario addresses inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife on marginal cropland or hayland, pasture or rangeland. The resource concern is addressed by providing shallow water habitat for wildlife such as shorebirds, waterfowl, wading birds, mammals, fish, reptiles, amphibians, and other species that require shallow water or exposed mud flats for at least part of their life cycle. Sites are flooded up to a depth of 18" with an average depth of 9". Water is provided by natural flooding and/or precipitation.

**Before Situation:**

There is inadequate habitat to provide optimum resting, nesting, and feeding habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and other wildlife (amphibians, reptiles, mammals, invertebrates, etc.).

**After Situation:**

A single area or series of shallow water areas that are managed per standard and specification for target species or guild. Water levels are regulated to maintain temporary wildlife habitat. Timing and duration of flooding and de-watering is dependent on specific species requirements. Water is generally regulated by water control structure in area to be flooded. Flooded sites vary from mudflats to water depths of 18" with an average depth of 9". The hydrologic conditions of ponding and saturation (frequency, depth, duration, timing) provides optimum seasonal habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and other wildlife (amphibians, reptiles, mammals, invertebrates, etc.). If needed and dikes or water control structures are not currently present on the fields planned to be flooded, these practices may be planned for the same fields and cost shared under Dike (356) and Structure for Water Control (587). Depending on local conditions, other Conservation Practices may also be required.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of shallow water

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$175.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$175.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**Scenario:** #2 - Shallow Water Management, High Level

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario addresses inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife on marginal cropland or hayland, pasture or rangeland. The resource concern is addressed by providing shallow water habitat for wildlife such as shorebirds, waterfowl, wading birds, mammals, fish, reptiles, amphibians, and other species that require shallow water or exposed mud flats for at least part of their life cycle. Sites are flooded up to a depth of 18" with an average depth of 9". Monitoring and adaptive management accomplished with water control structures is used to meet very specific conditions needed to address previously identified degraded plant conditions or inadequate habitat for fish and/or wildlife. This high-level management is applied to lands used for crop, pasture, hay, forests or wildlife lands where target flora and fauna have been identified as a primary concern. Loss of some level of crop, forage, hay or forest products may occur depending on site specific conditions.

**Before Situation:**

There is inadequate habitat to provide optimum resting, nesting, and feeding habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and other wildlife (amphibians, reptiles, mammals, invertebrates, etc.). The site may not be subject to frequent natural flooding and water may

**After Situation:**

A single area or series of shallow water areas that are managed per standard and specification for target species or guild. Water levels are regulated to maintain temporary wildlife habitat. Timing and duration of flooding and de-watering is dependent on specific species requirements. Water is generally regulated by water control structure in area to be flooded but also includes supplying supplemental water from pumping or other means. Flooded sites vary from mudflats to water depths of 18" with an average depth of 9". The hydrologic conditions of ponding and saturation (frequency, depth, duration, timing) provides optimum seasonal habitat for waterfowl, shorebirds, and other wildlife (amphibians, reptiles, mammals, invertebrates, etc.). If needed and dikes or water control structures are not currently present on the fields planned to be flooded, these practices may be planned for the same fields and cost shared under Dike (356) and Structure for Water Control (587). If a natural water source (i.e. precipitation or flooding) is not available or adequate, Pumping Plant (533) may be cost shared to provide a water source. Depending on local conditions, other Conservation Practices may also be required.

**Feature Measure:** Acre of shallow water

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$390.42 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$390.42

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt

**Scenario:** #1 - Mowing

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario addresses inadequate habitat for fish and wildlife where succession is set back by mowing short, herbaceous vegetation prior to using another treatment, to create early successional habitat (disking, herbicide application, etc.). Mowing can be used to increase structural diversity by creating areas of shorter vegetation preferred by some species or during certain life stages of species. The typical setting for this scenario is at the edge of crop fields, in pastures, at the edge of woodlands or brushy areas, and in odd areas such as pivot corners. Where additional chemical control of weeds, including invasives grasses, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, conservation practice 315, herbaceous weed control, should be used. Where the seedbank is inadequate for natural regeneration and seeding is required, use conservation practice 327, Conservation Cover, or 550, Range Planting. Where the need is to create early successional habitat within or at the edge of a woodland or forest use conservation practice 666, forest stand improvement, to remove trees.

**Before Situation:**

The site is static or trending to a later successional plant community. The disturbance regime to maintain an earlier successional plant community is lacking. Pastures are often monotypic, lacking in diversity. Competition for sunlight from dense grass st

**After Situation:**

Early successional habitat created or maintained. Mowing has provided more sunlight for forb establishment or has prepared the site for another treatment (disking, herbicide application, etc.). Typically, mowing, by itself, is not an effective tool for the creation of early successional habitat unless the site already contains features such as bare ground, low litter, above average diversity of forbs, etc. The heterogeneity of the habitat structure has been increased.

**Feature Measure:** width and length of treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$272.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt

**Scenario:** #2 - Disking

**Scenario Description:**

This practice addresses inadequate wildlife habitat for species requiring early successional habitat. This scenario provides early successional habitat by setting back succession and manipulating species composition by disking vegetation and creating bare ground. The typical setting for this scenario is at the edge of crop fields, in pastures, and in odd areas such as pivot corners. This scenario is applicable nationwide. Where the management of woody plants is required to create or maintain early successional habitat, conservation practice 314, brush management, or 666, forest stand improvement, should be used. Where chemical control of weeds, including invasives, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, conservation practice 315, herbaceous weed control, should be used. Where the seedbank is inadequate for natural regeneration and planting is required, use conservation practice 550, range seeding, or 327, Conservation Cover. Where the need is to create early successional habitat within or at the edge of woodland or forest, use conservation practice 666, forest stand improvement, to remove trees.

**Before Situation:**

The site is static or trending to higher successional plant species. The disturbance regime to maintain a lower successional stage is lacking. Pastures are often monotypic, lacking in diversity. Bare ground for seedling establishment is absent. Stands are

**After Situation:**

The application of this scenario improves wildlife habitat for species requiring early successional plant communities by reducing competition and creating bare ground for the establishment of early successional plants. Additionally, brood rearing habitat is improved both by the resultant food resources and the increased openness of the plant community that allows chicks to negotiate the terrain and exploit those food resources.

**Feature Measure:** width and length of treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$725.16 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$36.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development-Mgt

**Scenario:** #3 - Chemical

**Scenario Description:**

This practice addresses inadequate wildlife habitat for species requiring early successional habitat. This scenario provides early successional habitat by setting back succession and manipulating species composition by disking vegetation and creating bare ground. The typical setting for this scenario is at the edge of crop fields, in pastures, and in odd areas such as pivot corners. This scenario is applicable nationwide. Where the management of woody plants is required to create or maintain early successional habitat, conservation practice 314, brush management, or 666, forest stand improvement, should be used. Where chemical control of weeds, including invasives, is required to reduce competition for the desired plant community, conservation practice 315, herbaceous weed control, should be used. Where the seedbank is inadequate for natural regeneration and planting is required, use conservation practice 550, range seeding, or 327, Conservation Cover. Where the need is to create early successional habitat within or at the edge of woodland or forest, use conservation practice 666, forest stand improvement, to remove trees.

**Before Situation:**

The site is static or trending to higher successional plant species. The disturbance regime to maintain a lower successional stage is lacking. Pastures are often monotypic, lacking in diversity. Bare ground for seedling establishment is absent. Stands are

**After Situation:**

The application of this scenario improves wildlife habitat for species requiring early successional plant communities by reducing competition and creating bare ground for the establishment of early successional plants. Additionally, brood rearing habitat is improved both by the resultant food resources and the increased openness of the plant community that allows chicks to negotiate the terrain and exploit those food resources.

**Feature Measure:** width and length of treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$486.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$24.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 649 - Structures for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #5 - Escape Ramp

**Scenario Description:**

Retrofit an existing watering trough/tank with an appropriately designed and installed wildlife escape ramp to reduce wildlife mortality and maintain water quality within the watering facility. The typical size range for this scenario is 4 watering facilities retrofitted to include an escape ramp (2 ramps per tank).

**Before Situation:**

Existing watering facilities lack escape potential for wildlife. This results in death of the small wildlife accessing the facility for water, and resulting poor water quality as the animal decays.

**After Situation:**

Watering facilities provide wildlife safe access. Water quality is improved within the watering facility and wildlife mortality is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Each Ramp

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 8.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$748.21

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$93.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 649 - Structures for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #6 - Fence Markers, Vinyl Undersill

**Scenario Description:**

Existing fences are retrofitted with vinyl markers that increase wire visibility and reduce mortality due to collision for wildlife species of concern. Markers are installed on the top and third wires according to state standards. Scenario is typically implemented along fences in potential high risk areas (red areas in SGI Fence Collision Risk Model) or where a known problem exists. The typical size range for this scenario is 1 mile of fence.

**Before Situation:**

Wire fences located in high risk areas pose a collision threat to wildlife of special concern.

**After Situation:**

Fence related mortality of species of special concern is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** feet of fence marked

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,262.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 649 - Structures for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #7 - Brush Pile - Small

**Scenario Description:**

Small brush piles are created to provide shrubby/woody escape cover for wildlife. Pushing or cutting select small trees and placement in selected locations to provide wildlife cover. Typical scenario of 10' x 20' area for structure covered by interlocking limbs of trees less than 12 inches in diameter.

**Before Situation:**

The existing habitat lacks escape, ground nesting and safe loafing cover.

**After Situation:**

Small brush piles provide needed escape, ground nesting and safe loafing cover for targeted wildlife species.

**Feature Measure:** brush piles

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$45.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$45.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 649 - Structures for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #8 - Brush Pile - Large

**Scenario Description:**

Downed tree structures are created to provide shrubby/woody escape cover for wildlife. Existing sod will be killed prior to placement of tree structures. Felling of select trees and placement in selected locations to provide wildlife cover. Typical scenario of 30' x 50' area for structure covered by interlocking limbs of trees at least 12" in diameter.

**Before Situation:**

The existing habitat lacks escape, ground nesting and safe loafing cover.

**After Situation:**

Large brush piles provide needed escape, ground nesting and safe loafing cover for targeted wildlife species.

**Feature Measure:** brush piles

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$185.75

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$185.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 649 - Structures for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #47 - Perch Deterrent

**Scenario Description:**

Existing structures or fabricated windbreaks are retrofitted with perch deterrents that decrease areas for predator perches. Decrease mortality of wildlife species of concern. Perch deterrent are installed on top of structures or on top of fabricated windbreak. Scenario is typically implemented on structures in priority areas for Sage Grouse.

**Before Situation:**

Structures and fabricated windbreaks create perches for predators that target wildlife species of concern.

**After Situation:**

Predator threat for mortality of the special species of concern is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Linear Feet

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,681.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.51

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 649 - Structures for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #53 - Wildlife Friendly Fence Retrofit, Replacement of Barbed Wire Only with Smooth Wire

**Scenario Description:**

Fences are retrofitted to meet wildlife-friendly fence guidelines by adjusting wire spacing, replacing barbed wire with smooth wire, making wires more visible, and reducing perching opportunities for avian predators. New wire may be installed to accomplish the objectives when needed to prevent wildlife mortality. Typically, 1,320 foot of fence is retrofitted to meet Fish & Wildlife criteria of 16.5-foot spacing of posts.

**Before Situation:**

Fences do not meet wildlife-friendly criteria, resulting in hazardous conditions for and unnecessary mortality to wildlife. Fences fragment habitat, provide avian predators of ground-nesting birds with places to perch and hunt. A habitat evaluation or oth

**After Situation:**

Fences are modified to reduce wildlife mortality. Typical fence is a smooth wire fence for a length of 1,320 feet. All line posts, corner brace assemblies, and wire in the finished structure must be of sound materials.

**Feature Measure:** Feet Planned

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,260.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 657 - Wetland Restoration

**Scenario:** #2 - Depression Sediment Removal

**Scenario Description:**

A Depressional HGM (Hydrogeomorphic approach to classifying the seven types of wetlands as defined by Brinson, 1993) class wetland is to be restored by removing sediment. The typical size of sediment removal is 1 acre. The site is a recharge depression, fed only from surface runoff. Resource Concerns are: 4-SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION - Organic matter depletion, 11- WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, 12 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters, 16 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excessive sediment in surface waters, 18 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION - Undesirable plant productivity and health, 19 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION, Inadequate structure and composition, 22- INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The wetland has been converted to agricultural production, and the tract may or may not be drained with a surface ditch. The watershed has been converted from a native to an agricultural landuse, and the resultant soil erosion has deposited an average of

**After Situation:**

The deposition has been removed down to the original topsoil layer. A herbaceous plant community has been seeded. Facilitative practices include 327-Conservation Cover. Restoration of hydrology and plant community functions will improve the WATER QUALITY and DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION concerns listed above. The hydrologic and vegetative practices will address the SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION and INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE concerns. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Excavation

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,613.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,452.40

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 657 - Wetland Restoration

**Scenario:** #3 - Sediment Removal - Saturated Site

**Scenario Description:**

A Depressional HGM class wetland (Hydrogeomorphic approach to classifying the seven types of wetlands as defined by Brinson, 1993) is to be restored by removing sediment. The typical size of sediment removal is 1 acre. The site is a recharge depression, fed only from surface runoff. Resource Concerns are: 4-SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION - Organic matter depletion, 11- WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, 12 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters, 16 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excessive sediment in surface waters, 18 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION - Undesirable plant productivity and health, 19 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION, Inadequate structure and composition, 22- INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The wetland has been converted to agricultural production, and the tract may or may not be drained with a surface ditch. The watershed has been converted from a native to an agricultural landuse, and the resultant soil erosion has deposited an average of

**After Situation:**

The deposition has been removed down to the original topsoil layer. A herbaceous plant community has been seeded. Facilitative practices include 327-Conservation Cover. Restoration of hydrology and plant community functions will improve the WATER QUALITY and DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION concerns listed above. The hydrologic and vegetative practices will address the SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION and INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE concerns. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Excavation

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,613.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,988.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 657 - Wetland Restoration

**Scenario:** #4 - Ditch plug - Lateral Restoration

**Scenario Description:**

A Depressional HGM class wetland (Hydrogeomorphic approach to classifying the seven types of wetlands as defined by Brinson, 1993) is to be restored by filling in the drainage ditch. The site is a recharge depression, fed only from surface runoff. Resource Concerns are: 4-SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION - Organic matter depletion, 11- WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, 12 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters, 16 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excessive sediment in surface waters, 18 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION - Undesirable plant productivity and health, 19 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION, Inadequate structure and composition, 22- INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The wetland has been converted to agricultural production, and the tract has been drained with a surface ditch. The watershed has been converted from a native to an agricultural landuse.

**After Situation:**

The drain has been closed by lateral restoration. The ditch has been filled for a distance determined by the permeability of the soil. The earthfill is done with compactive effort. Facilitative practices include 327-Conservation Cover. Restoration of hydrology and plant community functions will improve the WATER QUALITY and DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION concerns listed above. The hydrologic and vegetative practices will address the SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION and INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE concerns. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earthfill

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 111.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,494.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 658 - Wetland Creation

**Scenario:** #1 - Wetland Creation, Excavation

**Scenario Description:**

A wetland is created on a flat mineral upland at a location where surface runoff may be intercepted and ponded by excavation. The wetland is created by excavating a depression. Resource concern is 22 - INDEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The site is in cropland on an upland, non floodplain site (interfluve).

**After Situation:**

An excavation with an average depth of 24" has created a shallow depression in a broad swale which intercepts surface runoff. The excavated material has been spread on adjacent areas. The INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE resource concern has been addressed with the provision of seasonal open water for terrestrial, aquatic, and waterfowl species. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Excavation

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,613.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,140.36

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 658 - Wetland Creation

**Scenario:** #3 - Excavation and Embankment

**Scenario Description:**

A wetland is created on a flat mineral upland at a location where surface runoff may be intercepted and ponded by excavation. The wetland is created by excavating a depression and building a dike to intercept runoff. Resource concern is 22 - INDEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The site is in cropland on an upland, non floodplain site (interfluvium).

**After Situation:**

An excavation with an average depth of 24" has created a shallow depression in a broad swale which intercepts surface runoff. The excavated material has been spread on adjacent areas. A dike is also constructed at the site with a 8' topwidth, 3:1 sideslopes, 2' fill height for 200'. The INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE resource concern has been addressed with the provision of seasonal open water for terrestrial, aquatic, and waterfowl species. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earth Moved

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,613.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,323.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 659 - Wetland Enhancement

**Scenario:** #2 - Excavation on Saturated Site

**Scenario Description:**

A Depressional HGM class wetland (Hydrogeomorphic approach to classifying the seven types of wetlands as defined by Brinson, 1993) is to be enhanced. The tract size is 15 acres, and the actual wetland size is 10 acres. The site is a recharge depression, fed only from surface runoff. The soils are saturated requiring dewatering and tracked equipment. Resource Concerns are: 4-SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION - Organic matter depletion, 11- WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, 12 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters, 16 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excessive sediment in surface waters, 18 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION - Undesirable plant productivity and health, 19 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION, Inadequate structure and composition, 22- INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The wetland has been converted to agricultural production, and the wetland has lost size and storage volume from accumulated sediments. The wetland receives surface runoff from an adjacent upland watershed, and ponds water on a shallow perched layer. The

**After Situation:**

Any deposited sediment has been excavated and the depth of the wetland has been increased to add storage volume. A herbaceous plant community has been seeded. Facilitative practices include 327-Conservation Cover. Restoration of hydrology and plant community functions will improve the WATER QUALITY and DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION concerns listed above. The hydrologic and vegetative practices will address the SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION and INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE concerns. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Excavation

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 8,067.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$41,867.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 659 - Wetland Enhancement

**Scenario:** #3 - Depression Sediment Removal and Ditch Plug

**Scenario Description:**

A Depressional HGM class wetland (Hydrogeomorphic approach to classifying the seven types of wetlands as defined by Brinson, 1993) is to be enhanced. The tract size is 15 acres, and the actual wetland size is 10 acres. The site is a recharge depression, fed only from surface runoff. Resource Concerns are: 4-SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION - Organic matter depletion, 11- WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters, 12 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters, 16 - WATER QUALITY DEGRADATION - Excessive sediment in surface waters, 18 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION - Undesirable plant productivity and health, 19 - DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION, Inadequate structure and composition, 22- INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE - Habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The wetland has been converted to agricultural production, and the tract drained with a surface ditch. The ditch is 4' average depth, and 12' average width. The wetland receives surface runoff from an adjacent upland watershed, and ponds water on a shallow

**After Situation:**

The ditch has been plugged by the installation of a 50' long section of compacted clay fill, and the deposition has been removed down to the original topsoil layer. A herbaceous plant community has been seeded. Facilitative practices include 327-Conservation Cover. Restoration of hydrology and plant community functions will improve the WATER QUALITY and DEGRADED PLANT CONDITION concerns listed above. The hydrologic and vegetative practices will address the SOIL QUALITY DEGRADATION and INADEQUATE HABITAT FOR FISH AND WILDLIFE concerns. Associated practices are 342-Critical Area Planting, 550-Range Planting, 644-Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management, and 587-Structure for Water Control.

**Feature Measure:** Cubic Yards of Earth Moved

**Scenario Unit:** Cubic Yard

**Scenario Typical Size:** 8,317.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$23,672.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.85

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 660 - Tree-Shrub Pruning

**Scenario:** #10 - Pruning-Low Height

**Scenario Description:**

Pruning is done by hand with chain saws, tree loppers, hand shears, or hand saws. Trees are identified for pruning. To improve the quality of the stem wood, branches are pruned from the trees. Trees are growing at a fast pace, with leader growth on trees anywhere from 1.5 feet to 4 feet in length.

**Before Situation:**

Trees are retaining lower limbs along the entire tree bole, reducing wood quality. Pruning height will be based on overall stand diameter and height. Stand has been thinned and crop trees are identified for pruning. Degrade plant condition- undesirable pl

**After Situation:**

The typical forest pruning treatment is 20 acres. Trees are pruned to the desirable height of 8-10 feet. Pruned branches are treated if they are a hazard, see Woody Residue Treatment standard.

**Feature Measure:** area of treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,577.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$228.87

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 660 - Tree-Shrub Pruning

**Scenario:** #11 - Pruning- High Height

**Scenario Description:**

Pruning is done by hand with pole saws or with gas pole saw. Crop trees are identified for pruning. The forest is on highly productive soils. Trees are growing at a fast pace, with leader growth on trees anywhere from 1.5 feet to 4 feet in length. To improve the quality of the stem wood, branches are pruned from the trees.

**Before Situation:**

Trees are retaining limbs mostly along the mid to upper section of the tree bole, reducing quality. Lower branches (0-8 feet) may have already been pruned, have naturally self pruned to differing heights. Pruning height is at least to eighteen (18) feet a

**After Situation:**

The typical forest pruning treatment is 20 acres. Trees are pruned to the height of 18 feet or more. Pruned branches are treated so they do not become a fire or health hazard.

**Feature Measure:** area of treatment

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,461.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$423.06

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 660 - Tree-Shrub Pruning

**Scenario:** #12 - Pruning-Multistory Cropping Understory

**Scenario Description:**

Pruning trees and/or shrubs is accomplished to extend the life span of trees and or shrubs. Pruning reduces the time periods of replacement by 2/3rds, exposing less bare soil. Pruning is accomplished by hand with hand tools and/or chainsaw. Trees and or shrubs are growing where the average rainfall is very high, with cooler temperatures and deep steep soils. Resource concerns are degraded plant condition-undesirable plant productivity and health, soil erosion-sheet and rill.

**Before Situation:**

Trees and/or shrubs are showing signs of reduced health (thinning crowns/less branching) and fruit production. Loss of trees or shrubs will occur within a few years. Severe soil erosion and sedimentation is a great concern if trees or shrubs are removed.

**After Situation:**

Tree/shrub pruning is completed on trees and/or shrubs. Cut vegetative material is left on the ground providing cover, and increasing organic matter. Alternative row pruning, treating every other row (or one-half the plants), in the same field, is completed 2 times. Renovation pruning is conducted one time for the entire field.

**Feature Measure:** individual tree/shrub prune

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$872.85 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 660 - Tree-Shrub Pruning

**Scenario:** #13 - Pruning-MultiStory Cropping-Overstory

**Scenario Description:**

Overstory tree crowns are pruned to increase sunlight to understory shrubs and low growing trees that have been purposely established to grow on the same acre of ground. Resource concern is degraded plant condition - undesirable plant productivity and health.

**Before Situation:**

The overstory trees are expanding their crowns, providing too much shade on the understory plants. The shade is affecting the growth and production of the understory plants. Pruning of branches, leaves, frawns, etc. are needed to maintain the desired amount

**After Situation:**

Pruning of the overstory tree crowns is completed, allowing the proper amount of sunlight to reach the understory vegetation, maintaining their growth, health and vigor, and wildlife benefits.

**Feature Measure:** Overstory Trees Pruned

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 120.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,111.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 660 - Tree-Shrub Pruning

**Scenario:** #29 - Pruning Individual Agroforestry tree - small acreage

**Scenario Description:**

In agroforestry settings (crop or forest lands) overstory tree crowns are pruned to increase sunlight to understory shrubs, low growing trees, and crop plants that have been purposely established to grow on the same ground. Thirty trees or less per acre require pruning. Associated Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 384 - Woody Residue Treatment. Resource concern is degraded plant condition - undesirable plant productivity and health.

**Before Situation:**

Overstory trees are expanding their crowns, providing too much shade on the understory plants. The shade is affecting the growth and production of the understory plants. Pruning branches, leaves, frawns, etc. are needed to maintain the desired about of su

**After Situation:**

Pruning of the overstory tree crowns is completed, allowing the proper amount of sunlight to reach the understory vegetation, maintaining their grown, health and vigor, and wildlife benefits. Typical treatment area is less than 1 acre; typical scenario based on 1 ac, 30 TPA.

**Feature Measure:** Tree Pruned

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$429.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #2 - Timber Stand Improvement, Single Stem Treatment

**Scenario Description:**

Altering the composition and stocking of a stand of trees by means of individual stem treatment. The trees to be retained are marked by a consultant forester. Resource concerns include Undesirable plant productivity and health; Wildlife habitat degradation; Wildfire hazard; and Inadequate structure and composition.

**Before Situation:**

The existing condition of the stand cannot meet the landowners objectives because the composition consists of unwanted species and the stocking exceeds the recommended level. The species and quality of the trees to be controlled makes a commercial operati

**After Situation:**

The composition of the stand can meet the landowners objectives and the growth, condition and quality of the remaining trees is improved.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,510.47

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$451.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #3 - Timber Stand Improvement, Chemical, Ground

**Scenario Description:**

Using ground applied chemicals to release young desirable trees from competing and/or overtopping vegetation. Resource concerns include: Undesirable plant productivity and health, and Wildlife habitat degradation.

**Before Situation:**

An adequately stocked stand of desirable species and trees is not growing to its potential for the site due to severe competition from undesirable trees and brush. Releasing the desirable trees from the competition will be achieved through the application

**After Situation:**

The released stand of trees contains the composition and quality needed to meet the landowner's objectives and address the resource concerns.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,976.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$49.40

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #92 - Pre-commercial Thinning - Hand tools

**Scenario Description:**

Management of excessively dense young and developing tree stands. The treatment area will be marked and treatment activities will be supervised by a forester. Treatment to reduce density requires skilled labor using chainsaws and other hand tools. Resource concerns include: Degraded Plant Condition - Undesirable plant productivity and health, Inadequate structure and composition, and Wildfire Hazard, Excessive Biomass Accumulation; Soil Erosion - Concentrated flow erosion, Ephemeral gully erosion, and Classic gully erosion; Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter, and Food; and, Water Quality - Excessive sediment in surface water

**Before Situation:**

Stand density exceeds natural stand recruitment levels for the eco-site. Stand and canopy density shades out understory shrubs and herbaceous plants, reducing food and cover for wildlife. Stand density compromises eco-site productivity and landscape hydro

**After Situation:**

After management, stand density, structure and composition are at an acceptable level. Canopy gaps allow increased sunlight and air movement; understory plant growth, condition and quality are improved. Habitat for wildlife is improved. Stand density enhances eco-site diversity, and landscape hydrologic functions are improved. Trees are healthy and less susceptible to damaging levels of insect pests and diseases. The risk from catastrophic wild-land fire is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Area treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,439.38

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$443.94

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #95 - Pre-Commercial Thinning, Mastication

**Scenario Description:**

Stands are treated mechanically by a variety of machines that remove target trees by grinding. The work will be supervised. Resource concerns include: Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health,; Wildlife Habitat Degradation; Wildfire Hazard; and Inadequate Structure and Composition.

**Before Situation:**

Forest stands are overstocked which reduces productivity health and vigor and increases fire risk. Species composition may be undesirable. Stands occur over a wide range of density and composition and are limited to those areas where mechanical operations

**After Situation:**

Stands were treated mechanically by a variety of machines that removed target trees by grinding. Typically no further slash treatment is required on these sites. Proper stocking rates are achieved, improving forest productivity, health and vigor, with corresponding decreases in forest fuels and fire risk.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,520.26

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$700.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #96 - Intermediate Silvicultural Rx Using Ground Based Logging, Heavy Equipment all slopes

**Scenario Description:**

Trees are managed as part of a Forest Management Plan (or approved equivalent) to create the appropriate stocking density for forest health or wildlife. Overstocked species over 5 inches in diameter are cut with a feller buncher. Over stocked species under 5 inches in diameter are cut using a chainsaw. Activities are supervised, trees marked, and reviewed according to the management objectives by a specialist to ensure objectives are being achieved. Resource Concerns include: Inadequate Structure and Composition, Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health, and Wildlife Habitat Degradation.

**Before Situation:**

The density, species composition, and spatial arrangement of trees in a stand are close to achieving the silvicultural specifications, but still require management to achieve desired conditions. The stand in this scenario still exhibit an increased suscep

**After Situation:**

After adjusting the density, species composition, and spatial arrangement to an acceptable level, stand, and overall quality is improved. As a intermediate silvicultural action, the work is not intensive in nature, but meant to quickly and readily improve conditions related to the identified resource concern. and to achieve desired condition.

**Feature Measure:** Effective Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,373.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$868.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #97 - Intermediate Silvicultural Treatment

**Scenario Description:**

Adjusting the density, species composition, and spatial arrangement of larger diameter trees with low tree removals to achieve the desired condition in a forested stand. This silvicultural prescription is carried out using hand tools such as chainsaws, and light equipment like sheers and grapple on a skid steer, all of which are suited to the site and job. Resource concerns include: Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health, Wildlife Habitat Degradation, Wildfire Hazard, and Inadequate structure and composition.

**Before Situation:**

Stand is unhealthy or in an undesirable state; a function of insect, disease, natural disturbance, or previous management practices. Stand conditions compromise tree health and increase susceptibility to insect and disease outbreaks, adversely impacts wil

**After Situation:**

After management, stand composition, health and vigor are improved. Trees are healthy and less susceptible to insects and diseases. Wildlife habitat is enhanced. Risk of catastrophic wildfire is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Effective Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,038.36

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$701.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Scenario:** #98 - Comprehensive Forest Stand Treatment with Mastication, All Slopes

**Scenario Description:**

Trees are managed as part of a Forest Management Plan (or approved equivalent) to create the appropriate stocking density for forest health or wildlife. Overstocked species over 5 inches in diameter are removed with a feller buncher. Over stocked species under 5 inches in diameter are treated mechanically by a variety of machines that remove target trees by grinding. On slopes greater than 50% equipment is tethered to a dozer to prevent resource damages. Activities are supervised, trees marked, and reviewed according to the management objectives by a specialist to ensure objectives are being achieved. Resource Concerns include: Inadequate Structure and Composition, Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health, and Wildlife Habitat Degradation.

**Before Situation:**

An unhealthy forest contains over-stocked trees lacking diversity in variety and stand age. The effect is an increased susceptibility to insects and disease, an unacceptable uncharacteristic wildfire risk and/or hazard, and degraded understory plant and w

**After Situation:**

Forest health is managed and improved by manipulating the stand density and structure to restore natural/desirable plant communities. The stand may vary in tree/shrub spacing, density, and class size. After management, stand composition, health and vigor are improved. Trees are healthy and less susceptible to insects and diseases. Wildlife habitat is enhanced. Risk of catastrophic wildfire is reduced.

**Feature Measure:** Effective Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$29,450.36

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,945.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #47 - LED (using existing fixture) < 20 watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of an incandescent or compact fluorescent light or tube with a new light emitting diode (LED) lamp or tube on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp is properly disposed according to its contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The typical bulb installed is a 9-watt LED.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, or similar lamps. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been id

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of lamps replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12.91 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.91

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #63 - LED (using existing fixture)  $\geq 20$  watts and  $< 100$  watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of an incandescent, compact fluorescent, high-pressure sodium (HPS), or similar lamp or tube with new light emitting diode (LED) flood lamp on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp is properly disposed according to its contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The typical flood lamp installed is a 50-watt LED.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, or similar lamps. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been id

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of lamps replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$47.83 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$47.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #79 - LED (using existing fixture)  $\geq$  100 watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of an incandescent, compact fluorescent, mercury vapor, or similar lamp or tube with new light emitting diode (LED) flood lamp or tube on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp is properly disposed according to its contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The typical flood lamp installed is a 150-watt high bay.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of lamps replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$115.52 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$115.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #95 - Fixture (including LED) < 20 watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of an existing lamp and fixture with a new light emitting diode (LED) fixture on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp, fixture, and ballast are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The fixture is for indoor or exterior locations and generally known as general, flood, linear, canopy, pendant, wall pack, low intensity flood, ceiling mounted, or low bay. Low bay lighting is used when ceilings are 20 feet or less in height. Low bay fixtures usually have a diffuser mounted to the bottom of the fixture that serves to spread light over a large area. The typical fixture installed is a 9-watt fixture with diodes or lamp.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of fixtures replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$26.12 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$26.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #111 - Fixture (including LED)  $\geq$  20 watts and  $<$  40 watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of an existing lamp and fixture with a new light emitting diode (LED) fixture on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp, fixture, and ballast are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The fixture is for indoor or exterior locations and generally known as general, flood, linear, canopy, pendant, wall pack, low intensity flood, ceiling mounted, or low bay. Low bay lighting is used when ceilings are 20 feet or less in height. Low bay fixtures usually have a diffuser mounted to the bottom of the fixture that serves to spread light over a large area. The typical fixture installed is a 25-watt fixture with diodes or lamp.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of fixtures replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$73.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$73.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #127 - Fixture (including LED)  $\geq$  40 watts and  $<$  80 watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of an existing lamp and fixture with a new light emitting diode (LED) fixture on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp, fixture, and ballast are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The fixture is for indoor or exterior locations and generally known as general, flood, linear, canopy, pendant, wall pack, low intensity flood, ceiling mounted, or low bay. Low bay lighting is used when ceilings are 20 feet or less in height. Low bay fixtures usually have a diffuser mounted to the bottom of the fixture that serves to spread light over a large area. The typical fixture installed is a 50-watt fixture with diodes or lamp.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of fixtures replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$147.31 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$147.31

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #143 - Fixture (including LED)  $\geq$  80 watts

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixture with a new light emitting diode (LED) fixture on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixture and wiring is functioning. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamp, fixture, and ballast is properly disposed according to its contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The fixture is for indoor or exterior locations and generally known as high bay or high intensity flood light or linear. High bay lighting is used when ceilings are 20 - 45 feet in height and where fixtures are mounted at the ceiling height instead of being suspended down to a lower level. High bay fixtures usually have an aluminum or mirror-like reflector which directs light downwards to the floor area or a prismatic reflector to spread light over larger areas. The typical fixture installed is a 200-watt round high bay or 160-watt linear fixture.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of fixtures replaced

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$265.92 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$265.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #159 - Poultry house, Lamp replacement

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of incandescent or compact fluorescent lights with new light emitting diode (LED) lamps on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixtures and wiring are functioning. The retrofitted lighting system with a new dimmer will provide similar light level as the existing system. Existing lamps are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the poultry house. The typical system installed is in a 40x500-foot poultry house with 99 existing incandescent light bulbs that are removed and replaced with 99 9-watt LED grow out bulbs, and the typical size is 20,000 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, or similar lamps. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been id

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal area of building

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,664.73

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #175 - Poultry house, Fixture (including LED) replacement

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with new light emitting diode (LED) fixtures on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixtures and wiring are functioning. The retrofitted lighting system with a new dimmer will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the poultry house. The typical system installed is in a 40x500 foot poultry house with 99 existing incandescent light fixture and bulbs that are removed and replaced with 99 9-watt LED fixtures with diodes or new fixtures with LED grow out bulbs, and the typical size is 20,000 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, or similar lamps. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been id

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal area of building

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,066.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #191 - Poultry house, Fixture (including LED) replacement with new layout

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with new light emitting diode (LED) fixtures and wiring in a new layout. The replacement lighting system with a new dimmer will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the poultry house. The typical system installed is in a 40x500 ft. poultry house with 21 150W sodium or halide fixtures and bulbs that are removed and replaced with 100 9-watt LED fixtures with diodes or new fixtures with LED grow out bulbs in a new layout, and the typical size is 20,000 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, or similar lamps. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been id

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal area of building

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,236.41

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.21

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #207 - Swine facility, Fixture (including LED) replacement

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with new light emitting diode (LED) fixtures on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixtures and wiring are functioning. The areas of installation may include any combination of gestation, nursery, farrowing and finishing facilities. The retrofitted lighting system with a new dimmer will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the lighted area. The typical system installed is in a 60x500 ft. swine facility with 115 existing incandescent light fixture and bulbs that are removed and replaced with 115 25-watt LED fixtures with diodes and the typical size is 30,000 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal lighted area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 30,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,814.44 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #223 - Dairy housing, Fixture (including LED) replacement

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with new light emitting diode (LED) fixtures on a one-for-one basis where the existing fixtures and wiring are functioning. The areas of installation may include any combination of free stalls and dairy housing, and other areas where high bay fixtures are appropriate such as milking parlors, washrooms, and other interior spaces. The retrofitted lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the lighted area. The typical system installed is in a 105x230 ft. free stall barn with 30 existing mercury vapor lights that are removed and replaced with 30 180-watt high bay fixtures with diodes and the typical size is 24,150 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal lighted area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 24,150.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,510.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.39

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #239 - General agricultural area, Fixture (including LED) replacement

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with multiple, new light emitting diode (LED) fixtures and wiring in a new layout. The replacement lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the lighted area. The typical system installed is in a 25x65 ft. agricultural building with 20 high pressure sodium light fixtures that are removed and replaced with 25 12-watt LED fixtures with diodes, and the typical size of 1,625 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal lighted area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,625.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,203.90

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #255 - Specialty agricultural area, waterproof, Fixture (including LED) replacement

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with new vapor-tight and waterproof light emitting diode (LED) fixtures where the existing fixtures and wiring are functioning. The replaced lighting system will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the lighted area. The typical system installed is in a 43x43 ft. dairy parlor where existing fixtures are removed and replaced with 4 linear, waterproof, LED T8 fixtures with four tubes and the typical size of 1,849 square feet.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, high pressure sodium, mercury vapor, metal halide, halogen, T12 fluorescent tubes driven by magnetic

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal lighted area

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,849.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,027.43

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #271 - LED Dimmer or Controller

**Scenario Description:**

The typical application of this practice consists of the replacement of an existing dimmer or controller where the existing or retrofitted lighting system and wiring is functioning. The dimmer or controller shall be rated to operate with the retrofitted lighting system and includes all wiring, switches and controls. The existing dimmers and controls are properly disposed according to its contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations.

**Before Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system within an agricultural operation has none or an obsolete dimmer or controller. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been identified by an ASABE S612 compliant on-farm energy

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Number of dimmers installed

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$514.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$514.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 670 - Energy Efficient Lighting System

**Scenario:** #287 - Poultry breeding, Fixture (including LED) replacement with new layout

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the replacement of existing lamps and fixtures with new light emitting diode (LED) fixtures and wiring in a new layout. The replacement lighting system with a new dimmer will provide similar light levels as the existing system. Existing lamps, fixtures, and ballasts are properly disposed according to their contents and applicable environmental laws and regulations. The quantity for the scenario is based upon the nominal floor area, in square feet, of the poultry house. The typical system installed is in a 40' x 500' poultry breeder house with 21 150W sodium or halide fixtures and bulbs that are removed and replaced with 135 10-watt LED fixtures with diodes or new fixtures with LED grow out bulbs in a new layout, and the contract item number quantity is 20,000.

**Before Situation:**

A lighting system uses energy inefficiently within an agricultural operation. The existing lighting system consists of incandescent, compact fluorescent, or similar lamps. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement an improvement has been id

**After Situation:**

A replaced or retrofitted lighting system is installed in an agricultural operation that has a minimum rated efficacy of 90 lumens per watt, can withstand the environmental conditions, is designed for light levels suitable for the area and is expressed as lumens. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. The replaced or retrofitted lighting system will reduce overall power requirements (kW) compared to the existing lighting system. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment , DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal area of building

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,315.86

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 672 - Energy Efficient Building Envelope

**Scenario:** #1 - Building Envelope - Attic Insulation

**Scenario Description:**

Install a minimum R-7 insulation in addition to existing attic or ceiling to reduce heat transfer. Increased insulation reduces seasonal heat loss and heat gain which reduces the respective need for heating and cooling equipment to operate.

**Before Situation:**

A poultry house with an inefficient building envelope with limited attic insulation.

**After Situation:**

A more effective and efficient building envelope can be created through addition of, or increased, attic insulation. Associated practices/activities: 122-AgEMP - HQ and 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Attic Insulated

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,188.54

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 672 - Energy Efficient Building Envelope

**Scenario:** #2 - Building Envelope - Wall Insulation

**Scenario Description:**

Enclose both sidewalls and endwalls from ceiling to floor in one of two manners: 1) metal exterior, 3.5" fiberglass batts (R-11), vapor barrier, & interior plywood or OSB sheathing, or 2) closed-cell polyurethane foam application (minimum 1" thickness (R-7) of 2.5 lbs./cu.ft. or higher density, (3.0 or higher density preferred) with a form of physical protective barrier on lower 2' (may be 6 lbs./cu.ft. or higher density 1/8" thick foam, or treated lumber). Based on a 40' x 400' poultry house.

**Before Situation:**

A poultry house with an inefficient building envelope with limited wall insulation.

**After Situation:**

A more effective and efficient building envelope can be created through addition of, or increased, insulation. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ and 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Attic Insulated

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4,500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,502.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.33

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 672 - Energy Efficient Building Envelope

**Scenario:** #3 - Building Envelope - Sealant

**Scenario Description:**

A typical scenario is sealing the gaps between walls, gables, ceiling, etc. in a poultry house or greenhouse. Sealing is performed by a professional contractor, not merely use of spray foam from a can. The unit basis of payment in this scenario is each house based on 60' x 500' poultry house with an assumed need of sealant to seal 2400 linear feet of gap.

**Before Situation:**

An agricultural facility with an inefficient building envelope with gaps between walls, ceiling, etc. for a total of 2400 linear feet.

**After Situation:**

A more effective and efficient building envelope can be created through interior sealing of the exterior walls at the footer plate, eaves, ridge cap, and gable ends. The sealant reduces seasonal heat loss and heat gain due to infiltration which reduces the respective need for heating and cooling equipment to operate. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ and 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Perimeter of heated structu

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,472.40

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 672 - Energy Efficient Building Envelope

**Scenario:** #5 - Greenhouse - Insulate Unglazed Walls

**Scenario Description:**

A typical scenario is the installation insulation in green house to address energy loss. The insulation can be either of the cellulose or bubble type (or equivalent). The increased insulation reduces seasonal heat loss and heat gain which reduces the respective need for heating and cooling equipment to operate.

**Before Situation:**

Green house with standard glazing, plastic or polycarbonate walls and no insulation. Heating and cooling of an existing greenhouse is inefficient due to excessive heat loss.

**After Situation:**

The greenhouse is fitted with insulation installed truss-to-truss or gutter-to-gutter and/or non glazed endwalls and/or sidewalls, reducing heat loss and gain in the greenhouse. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ and 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Square Feet of insulation

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,142.74

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 672 - Energy Efficient Building Envelope

**Scenario:** #58 - Building Envelope - Greenhouse Screens

**Scenario Description:**

The mechanical energy screen system consists of a drive motor, support cables, controls, and shade material, which may be woven, knitted, or non-woven strips of aluminum fiber, polyethylene, nylon or other synthetic material. The screen provides a means to better control solar heat gain and heat transfer during night or cold weather conditions to reduce energy use. Screens and similar devices may also be used to divide internal areas and allow for differentiated heating, ventilation, or cooling system operation to reduce energy use.

**Before Situation:**

Heating and cooling of an existing greenhouse, or similar structure with conditioned spaces, is inefficient due to poorly regulated heat transfer. A need to regulate an entire space for uniform conditions when some portions have differing, intermittent re

**After Situation:**

The greenhouse is fitted with a mechanically controlled energy screen installed truss-to-truss or gutter-to-gutter, with side screens as necessary, reducing heat loss in the greenhouse. Associated practices/activities: may include 122-AgEMP - HQ and 374-Farmstead Energy Improvement. The resource concern is inefficient use of energy in the farm operation which increases dependence on non-renewable energy sources and can be addressed through improved energy efficiency. Any improvements are based on a Type 2 energy audit meeting the requirements of ASABE S612.

**Feature Measure:** Area of Screen

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$79,801.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 672 - Energy Efficient Building Envelope

**Scenario:** #99 - Energy Efficient Glazing

**Scenario Description:**

The application of this practice consists of the installation of new energy efficient glazing to replace the existing glazing on a structure to reduce heat loss and provide better heat transfer during cold weather conditions while reducing energy use where high-value crops are grown seasonally or year-round. The typical structure is a 30x100 ft. quonset or gothic style structure where the top and sides require 102 ft. length by 42 ft. wide glazing and each end wall requires 32 ft. length and 28 ft. width to replace the existing glazing. In addition, approximately 400 ft. of new spring wire is required for securing the glazing in the existing tracks.

**Before Situation:**

The existing heated or ventilated greenhouse uses energy inefficiently due to low quality or damaged coverings. Inefficient energy use and a recommendation to implement the improvement has been identified by an ASABE S612 compliant on-farm energy audit or

**After Situation:**

New greenhouse glazing is installed on an existing greenhouse. The glazing material consists of a multi-layer, minimum 6 mil, greenhouse grade, UV resistant copolymer with infrared retention and anti-condensate properties. The owner must replace the energy efficient glazing with similar qualities at least once during the lifespan of this practice at their expense. An analysis of the estimated annual energy savings is completed. Associated activities: CEMA 228 Agricultural Energy Assessment, DIA 120 Agricultural Energy Design.

**Feature Measure:** Nominal floor area of green

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,323.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 805 - Amending Soil Properties with Lime

**Scenario:** #5 - Low Rate Lime  $\leq$  2.0 Ton

**Scenario Description:**

Crop production is impacted by Soil pH. Lime will be applied based on cropping system and according to soil test recommendations to improve the soil physical, chemical, and biological properties.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has not used lime and as a result the soil pH is acidic and resulting in decrease in plant available nutrients, poor soil structure, soil health is reduced and poor crop production.

**After Situation:**

Plant productivity and health is improved due to a increase in availability for applied nutrient and less nutrients being lost. Soil structure & Health will improve resulting improved water infiltration and less runoff.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$810.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$20.25

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 805 - Amending Soil Properties with Lime

**Scenario:** #6 - Market/Gardens

**Scenario Description:**

Market/Garden production is impacted by Soil pH. Lime will be applied according to soil test recommendations to improve the soil physical, chemical, and biological properties.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has not used lime and as a result the soil pH is acidic and resulting in decrease in plant available nutrients, poor soil structure, soil health is reduced and poor crop production.

**After Situation:**

Plant productivity and health is improved due to a increase in availability for applied nutrient and less nutrients being lost. Soil structure & Health will improve resulting improved water infiltration and less runoff.

**Feature Measure:** 1,000 square foot

**Scenario Unit:** 1,000 Square Feet

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$206.87

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 805 - Amending Soil Properties with Lime

**Scenario:** #13 - Lime Rate > 2.0 Ton

**Scenario Description:**

Biogeochemical function of the soil is impacted by Soil pH. Lime will be applied based on cropping system and according to soil test recommendations to improve the soil physical, chemical, and biological properties.

**Before Situation:**

Producer has not used lime and as a result the soil pH is acidic and resulting in decrease in plant available nutrients, poor soil structure, soil health is reduced and poor crop production.

**After Situation:**

Implementation according to the plans and specification has occurred. Plant productivity and health is improved due to a increase in availability for applied nutrient and less nutrients being lost. Soil structure and health will improve resulting improved water infiltration and less runoff.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,380.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$34.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 809 - Conservation Harvest Management

**Scenario:** #11 - Maximum Residue Height for Snow Capture

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario involves increasing standing stubble height in small grain crops and other crops such as canola, mustard, flax and safflower by removing only the seed portion at harvest with a stripper header. This leaves the maximum length of standing stubble anchored to the soil surface, thereby catching more snow, reducing soil moisture loss to evaporation, and increasing the amount of plant available moisture for the following crop. The scenario maximizes precipitation-use efficiency, increases drought resilience, improves the energy efficiency of field harvesting operations, and provides greater over-winter cover for wildlife. The scenario is used in conjunction with a no-till disc drill and applied to both irrigated and non-irrigated fields. Residue is not baled or burned.

**Before Situation:**

Small grains and other crops are grown and harvested with a draper header mounted on a combine harvester. This type of header cuts the mature plant at 4 to 10 inches in height and spreads the remaining residue in a horizontal matt on the soil surface. Thi

**After Situation:**

The implementation requirements for 809, Conservation Harvest Management, are prepared and installed. Small grains or other suitable crops are harvested with a stripper header mounted on a combine harvester. This type of header only removes the mature seed, leaving the standing residue. The tall stubble left after use of a stripper header is still vertically attached to the root structure and is not horizontally scattered across the field. This vertical stubble structure catches more snow over the winter, increases plant available moisture, causes little hair-pinning when no-till seeding the subsequent crop, and results in better crop stand establishment the following year. Because very little straw is put through the combine harvester, the combine can operate at faster ground speed, using less fuel per acre and creating less wear on the threshing machinery. A no-till disc drill is used in this system as the tall residue will plug-up other drill types. Residue is not baled or burned.

**Feature Measure:** Acres in Field

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,633.70 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$81.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 812 - Raised Beds

**Scenario:** #23 - Unframed Raised Bed field size < 0.10 acres Contamination or Debris Sites only

**Scenario Description:**

The soil at this site has characteristics that restrict the ability to grow food and fiber crops directly in the soil. The soil has heavy metal contaminants and/or buried debris from past activities on the site. The owner/operator desires to bring the site into agricultural production. Typical size of raised bed is 4ft x 16 ft and minimum 16 inches deep and less than 100 sq ft. Field size 0.10 Acres (4356 sq ft ) or less.

**Before Situation:**

Soils on site are unsuitable for agricultural production. Soil cannot be remediated or debris cannot be removed practically.

**After Situation:**

Raised beds or mounds are created above the existing soil. Geomembrane may be used to separate plant roots from contacting soil contaminants. Raised beds are designed to meet the owner/operator objectives for overall size. Associated practices may include Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Feature Measure:** square feet of bed

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 85.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$435.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 812 - Raised Beds

**Scenario:** #24 - Unframed Raised Bedfield size < 0.5 acres Contamination or Debris Sites only

**Scenario Description:**

The soil at this site has characteristics that restrict the ability to grow food and fiber crops directly in the soil. The soil has heavy metal contaminants and/or buried debris from past activities on the site. The owner/operator desires to bring the site into agricultural production. Bed area is 100 to 500 square feet. Raised bed size and shape varies. Field size up to 0.5 acres. NOT TO BE USED FOR RIDGE TILLAGE.

**Before Situation:**

Soils on site are unsuitable for agricultural production. Soil cannot be remediated or debris cannot be removed practically.

**After Situation:**

Raised beds or mounds are created above the existing soil. Geomembrane may be used to separate plant roots from contacting soil contaminants. Raised beds are designed to meet the owner/operator objectives for overall size. Associated practices may include Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Feature Measure:** square feet per bed

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,049.59

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 812 - Raised Beds

**Scenario:** #25 - Framed Raised Bed Small Lot Contamination or Debris Sites only

**Scenario Description:**

The soil at this site has characteristics that restrict the ability to grow food and fiber crops directly in the soil. The soil has heavy metal contaminants and/or buried debris from past activities on the site. The owner/operator desires to bring the site into agricultural production. Typical size of raised bed 4ft x 16 ft less than or equal to 100 sq ft. Field size 0.10 Acres or less.

**Before Situation:**

Soils on site are unsuitable for agricultural production. Soil cannot be remediated or debris cannot be removed practically.

**After Situation:**

Raised beds or mounds are created above the existing soil. Geomembrane may be used to separate plant roots from contacting soil contaminants. Raised beds are designed to meet the owner/operator objectives for overall size. Associated practices may include Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Feature Measure:** sq ft

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 64.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$946.64

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 812 - Raised Beds

**Scenario:** #26 - Framed Raised Bed < 500 sq ft Contamination or Debris Sites only

**Scenario Description:**

The soil at this site has characteristics that restrict the ability to grow food and fiber crops directly in the soil. The soil has heavy metal contaminants and/or buried debris from past activities on the site. The owner/operator desires to bring the site into agricultural production. Typical size of raised bed ranges from 100 square feet to 500 square feet. Field size 0.10 Acres or less.

**Before Situation:**

Soils on site are unsuitable for agricultural production. Soil cannot be remediated or debris cannot be removed practically.

**After Situation:**

Raised beds or mounds are created above the existing soil. Geomembrane may be used to separate plant roots from contacting soil contaminants. Raised beds are designed to meet the owner/operator objectives for overall size. Associated practices may include Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Feature Measure:** sq ft

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,540.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 812 - Raised Beds

**Scenario:** #27 - Framed Raised Bed greater than or equal to 500 sq ft Contamination or Debris Sites only

**Scenario Description:**

The soil at this site has characteristics that restrict the ability to grow food and fiber crops directly in the soil. The soil has heavy metal contaminants and/or buried debris from past activities on the site. The owner/operator desires to bring the site into agricultural production. Typical size of raised bed ranges from 500 square feet to 2000 square feet. Scenario assumes 16\*50 ft bed size.

**Before Situation:**

Soils on site are unsuitable for agricultural production. Soil cannot be remediated or debris cannot be removed practically.

**After Situation:**

Raised beds or mounds are created above the existing soil. Geomembrane may be used to separate plant roots from contacting soil contaminants. Raised beds are designed to meet the owner/operator objectives for overall size. Associated practices may include Trails and Walkways (575), Critical Area Planting (342).

**Feature Measure:** sq ft

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 800.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,504.61 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 821 - Low Tunnel Systems

**Scenario:** #19 - Low tunnel < 1000 square feet- Year 1

**Scenario Description:**

Garden or small farm grows annual crops including vegetables and other truck crops. Rows require a tunnel or floating cover to extend the growing season (early and late) or to protect from other environmental damage. Typical tunnel floats over crop or is supported by hoop or frame above crop. Tunnel cover is less than 48 inches above the soil. Typical row ranges in size from 30 inches by 200 feet up to 400 feet in length. Producer manages seasonal conditions such as soil temperature, exposure to early or late frost, and insects of food crops. Year 1 of implementation only.

**Before Situation:**

Crop production occurs within the zone growing season. Plant productivity and health is negatively impacted due to weather/environmental conditions delaying planting.

**After Situation:**

Row covers are applied and managed to improve plant health and productivity by controlling the micro-climate under the tunnel.

**Feature Measure:** area covered by tunnel

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,049.10

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.10

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 821 - Low Tunnel Systems

**Scenario:** #20 - Low tunnel management- Year 2-3

**Scenario Description:**

Garden or small farm grows annual crops including vegetables and other truck crops. Rows require a tunnel or floating cover to extend the growing season (early and late) or to protect from other environmental damage. Typical tunnel floats over crop or is supported by hoop or frame above crop. Tunnel cover is less than 48 inches above the soil. Producer manages seasonal conditions such as soil temperature, exposure to early or late frost, and insects of food crops. Year 2-3 of implementation.

**Before Situation:**

Crop production occurs within the zone growing season. Low tunnel system Year 1 was implemented. Producer is building skill to manage the tunnel coverings as needed during the growing season to improve plant productivity and health.

**After Situation:**

Row covers are applied and managed to improve plant health and productivity by controlling the micro-climate under the tunnel.

**Feature Measure:** area of tunnel

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$556.81

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 821 - Low Tunnel Systems

**Scenario:** #21 - Low tunnel 1000-5000 square feet, Year 1

**Scenario Description:**

Garden or small farm grows annual crops including vegetables and other truck crops. Rows require a tunnel or floating cover to extend the growing season (early and late) or to protect from other environmental damage. Typical tunnel floats over crop or is supported by hoop or frame above crop. Tunnel cover is less than 48 inches above the soil. Typical row ranges in size from 30 inches by 500 feet up to 2000 feet in length. Producer manages seasonal conditions such as soil temperature, exposure to early or late frost, and insects of food crops. Year 1 of implementation only.

**Before Situation:**

Crop production occurs within the zone growing season. Plant productivity and health is negatively impacted due to weather/environmental conditions delaying planting.

**After Situation:**

Row covers are applied and managed to improve plant health and productivity by controlling the micro-climate under the tunnel.

**Feature Measure:** area covered by tunnel

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,942.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #9 - Small Scale

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical farm size is 5 acres or less and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and possibly livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,274.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,254.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #25 - Simple Crops Only

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical field size is 40 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Crop system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops and cover crops. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,491.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$287.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #41 - Simple Crops and Livestock

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical farm size is 40 acres or less and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and possibly livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,212.16 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$380.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #57 - Certified Organic

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Certified Organic. The typical farm size is 40 acres or less and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and possibly livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is using some organic management activities, to the client is using many organic management activities to address resource concerns. The client will improve or maintain at least

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,630.72 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$115.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #73 - Irrigated Pasture for Livestock

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical pasture system size is 100 acres supporting 100 to 150 cattle or cow-calf pairs, and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system includes irrigated forage/grass. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,098.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$170.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #89 - Complex Crops Only

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical field size is 40 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Crop system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops and cover crops. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,262.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$331.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #105 - Complex Crops and Livestock

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical field size is 40 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system includes cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$18,098.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$452.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #121 - Small Scale FI

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical farm size is 5 acres or less and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and possibly livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,406.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,481.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #137 - Simple Crops Only FI

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical farm size is 5 acres or less and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and possibly livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,154.15 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$303.85

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #153 - Simple Crops and Livestock FI

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical field size is 40 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,875.16 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$396.88

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #169 - Complex Crops FI

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical field size is 40 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Crop system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops and cover crops. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$21,431.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$535.80

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #185 - Complex Crops and Livestock FI

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical field size is 40 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Organic system includes cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops, cover crops and livestock. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$26,267.66 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$656.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #201 - Simple Crops Large Acreage

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical operation size is 1280 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Crop system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops and cover crops. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$126,808.23

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$99.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** 823 - Organic Management

**Scenario:** #217 - Simple Crops Large Acreage FI

**Scenario Description:**

The typical operation is Transitioning to Organic. The typical operation size is 1280 acres and fields may be in various stages of organic transition. Crop system include cash row crops, hay or pasture, perennial crops and cover crops. This practice may be part of a conservation management system to: 1) Improve soil health, 2) Reduce soil erosion, 3) Reduce emissions of greenhouse gases, 4) Reduce transport of pesticides and nutrients transported to surface water, groundwater and air, 5) Improve moisture management, 6) Improve plant productivity and health 7) Reduce plant pest pressure, 8) Enhance habitat for wildlife, pollinators, and other beneficial invertebrates, 9) Improve livestock feed and forage imbalance and 10) Improve or maintain quantity and/or quality of forage for grazing, browsing and productivity. Organic Management Activities with low labor costs will be implemented on a medium to large scale crop production area. In all cases at least one planned organic management activity has risk to an identified resource concern.

**Before Situation:**

Before practice conditions will vary widely. Conditions range from the client is not using any organic management activities, transitioning to organic on some or all acres, no or limited compliance with National Organic Program requirements; to the client

**After Situation:**

Planned organic management activities have been implemented to address the identified resource concern(s) and complies with the National Organic Program Requirements. Conservation and organic system actions or operations have been developed or updated with the producer and they have implemented conservation practices with organic management design to address resource concerns. Records are reviewed and evaluated. Improvements planned for the next season are determined.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,280.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$148,024.27

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$115.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000BFF1 - Buffer Bundle#1

**Scenario:** #1 - Bundle, Wildlife Habitat Buffer

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses water quality degradation, degraded plant condition, fish/wildlife inadequate habitat, and/or air quality impacts.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,327.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,442.38

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL10 - YEAR 1 Irrigated Cropland (MRBI/Ogallala)

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Year One Irrigated Cropland

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses water quality degradation, insufficient water, soil erosion, and inefficient energy.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,327.20 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$153.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL11 - YEAR 2+ Irrigated Cropland (MRBI/Ogallala)

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Year Two Irrigated Cropland

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses water quality degradation, insufficient water, and soil erosion.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,072.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$50.73

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL18 - Crop Bundle #18 - Precision Ag

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Precision Agriculture

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses water quality degradation, fish and wildlife inadequate habitat, air quality impairment, and either soil erosion or soil quality degradation resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,065.62

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$50.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL19 - Crop Bundle #19 - Soil Health Precision Ag

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Precision Agriculture for Soil Health

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses water quality degradation, soil quality degradation, fish and wildlife inadequate habitat, and insufficient water resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,035.67 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$50.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL20 - Crop Bundle #20 - Soil Health Assessment

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Soil Health Suite

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses water quality degradation, soil quality degradation, fish and wildlife inadequate habitat, and insufficient water resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,415.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$44.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL21 - Crop Bundle #21 - Crop Bundle (Organic)

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Organic Management

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses soil quality degradation, water quality degradation, and degraded plant condition resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,736.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$67.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** B000CPL22 - Crop Bundle #22 - Erosion Bundle (Organic)

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Organic Erosion Management

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses soil quality degradation, water quality degradation, soil erosion, and fish and wildlife inadequate habitat resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** acres of cropland where en

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,721.85 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$47.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL23 - Crop Bundle #23 - Pheasant and quail habitat

**Scenario:** #3 - Bundle, Pheasant and Quail Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses wildlife inadequate habitat, water quality degradation and/or air quality impacts, and soil health and/or degraded plant condition.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standards applied as part of the bundle.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of these enhancements will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** Acres where the bundle is i

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,649.98 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66.25

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL24 - Crop Bundle #24 - Cropland Soil Health Management System

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Soil Health on Cropland

**Scenario Description:**

Addresses soil health, water quality (or water quality and air quality), and either soil erosion, soil compaction, or plant pest pressure.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standards applied as part of the bundle.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of these enhancements will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,316.36 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$33.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000CPL25 - Climate Smart Advanced Soil Health

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Climate Smart

**Scenario Description:**

Improve crop land soil health by minimizing soil disturbance, PAMS pest management, building soil organic matter, providing habitat and reducing nutrient and pesticide loss to water.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standards applied as part of the bundle.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of these enhancements will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acres applied

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15,964.56 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$159.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000FST1 - Forest Bundle#1

**Scenario:** #1 - Bundle, Enhance Understory for Wildlife and Mast Production

**Scenario Description:**

?Addresses forest management on sites that are not adapted to natural fire disturbances. Addresses resource concerns air quality impacts, degraded plant condition and fish/wildlife inadequate habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$31,931.82

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,596.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000FST2 - Forest Bundle #2 - Post-fire Management

**Scenario:** #11 - Bundle, Post-Fire Management

**Scenario Description:**

Forest stand improvement that improves forest health to reduce the risk of wildfire and wildlife habitat. Addresses air quality impacts, degraded plant condition, and fish/wildlife inadequate habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of these enhancements will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,654.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,165.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000FST3 - Forest Bundle #3

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Forest Stand Improvement and Brush Management

**Scenario Description:**

Forest stand improvement that improves forest health due to poor logging practices. Addresses soil organic matter depletion, degraded plant condition, and inadequate fish/wildlife habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of these enhancements will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,740.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$587.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000FST4 - Forest Bundle #4

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Sugar Maple

**Scenario Description:**

Forest management to improve sugar maple stands. Addresses soil organic matter depletion, degraded plant condition, and inadequate fish/wildlife habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$29,163.24

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,458.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** B000FST5 - Forest Bundle #5 Climate Smart Increase Carbon Storage

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Carbon Sequestration and Storage

**Scenario Description:**

Improve forest and tree health, enhance wildlife, and reduce soil erosion to support climate change mitigation. Build carbon stocks by increasing sequestration and storage.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are enhanced above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the bundle.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this bundle will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$27,828.14 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,782.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000GRZ1 - Grazing Bundle 1 - Range and Pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Improve Ecological Site

**Scenario Description:**

This bundle addresses soil erosion, degraded plant condition, and fish and wildlife inadequate habitat resource concerns through adoption of enhancements E528L, E315A, and E645A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,201.21 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$105.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000GRZ2 - Grazing Bundle 2 - Range and Pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Streambank Protection

**Scenario Description:**

This bundle addresses water quality degradation, fish and wildlife inadequate habitat, and soil erosion resource concerns through adoption of enhancements E472A, E382A, and E580A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 3.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,602.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,743.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000GRZ3 - Grazing Bundle 3 - Range and Pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Manage Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Scenario Description:**

This bundle addresses water quality degradation, fish and wildlife inadequate habitat, and soil erosion resource concerns through adoption of enhancements E472A, E390B, and E580A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 6.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,682.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,780.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000GRZ4 - Grazing Bundle 4 - Range and Pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Manage Riparian Forest Cover

**Scenario Description:**

This bundle addresses water quality degradation, fish and wildlife inadequate habitat, and soil erosion resource concerns through adoption of enhancements E472A, E391C, and E580A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$13,843.16

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,460.79

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000GRZ5 - Grazing Bundle 5 - Range and Pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Enhance Forage Community

**Scenario Description:**

This bundle addresses livestock production limitation, degraded plant condition, and fish and wildlife inadequate habitat resource concerns through adoption of enhancements E528A, E315A, and E645A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,050.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,286.69

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.94

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000PST5 - Pasture Bundle 5

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Manage Riparian Areas

**Scenario Description:**

Implementation of site specific strategies applied to range or pasture land uses through adoption of the following CSP enhancements: E528J, E315A, and E645A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

Adoption of these bundled enhancements provides a combined benefit for resource protection that exceeds the minimum level for the associated practice standards in order to address the resource concerns Soil Erosion or Water Quality Degradation, Degraded Plant Condition, and Fish and Wildlife Inadequate Habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 60.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,302.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$71.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** B000PSTX - Pasture Bundle #6 - Pasture

**Scenario:** #6 - Bundle, Manage Soil Organic Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Managing the harvest of vegetation with grazing and/or browsing animals for the purposes of maintaining desired pasture composition/plant vigor and improving/maintaining quantity and quality of forage for the animals' health and productivity following the recommendations of a qualifying professional, as detailed in the documentation and implementation requirements. Establishing adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of perennial, herbaceous species that can provide the structure and composition needed to enhance livestock and wildlife habitat, particularly when targeted forage supply and quality, cover, and shelter are not available in other pastures.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing. Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting. Resources are prote

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing. The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting. The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 315-Herbaceous Weed Treatment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,534.15

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$105.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** B000RNG4 - Range Bundle 4

**Scenario:** #9 - Bundle, Range Monitoring

**Scenario Description:**

Implementation of site specific strategies applied to range through adoption of the following CSP enhancements: E528N, E315A, and E645A.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation practice standard(s) applied as part of the enhancement.

**After Situation:**

Adoption of these bundled enhancements provides a combined benefit for resource protection that exceeds the minimum level for the associated practice standards in order to address the resource concerns Soil Erosion, Degraded Plant Condition, and Fish and Wildlife Inadequate Habitat.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,029.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$100.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E199A - Comprehensive Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #9 - Single Enterprise, Low

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a contract through the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment and Ranking Tool (CART) to identify all State priority resource concern categories (PRCCs) that the TSP must include in the CSP CCP. TSP develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for one land use by each land management system included in the producer's operation. This typical scenario involves one agricultural enterprise and a.) 1 Land use with less than or equal to 4 priority resource concerns, OR b.) 2-3 Land Uses with less than or equal to two priority resource concern categories per land use.

**Before Situation:**

NRCS has identified priority resource concern categories that have not met stewardship thresholds. State priority resource concern categories need to be evaluated for one land use and each land management system.

**After Situation:**

TSP conducts an on-site inventory of all land uses and land management systems in the producer's operation. Assessment for each priority resource concern is completed by land use. Conservation practices, enhancements or bundles are identified. Develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for each land use that meet the producer's objectives. Plan document follows the requirements of E199A Guide sheet and meets Conservation Plan CPA 199 or applicable conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,122.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,122.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E199A - Comprehensive Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #25 - Single Enterprise, Medium

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a contract through the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment and Ranking Tool (CART) to identify all State priority resource concern categories (PRCCs) that the TSP must include in the CSP CCP. TSP develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for one land use by each land management system included in the producer's operation. This typical scenario involves one agricultural enterprise and a.) 1 Land Use with greater than 4 priority resource concerns, OR b.) 2-3 Land Use with 3 to 4 priority resource concern categories per land use, OR c.) 4 or more Land Use with less than or equal to 2 priority resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

NRCS has identified priority resource concern categories that have not met stewardship thresholds. State priority resource concern categories need to be evaluated for one land use and each land management system.

**After Situation:**

TSP conducts an on-site inventory of all land uses and land management systems in the producer's operation. Assessment for each priority resource concern is completed by land use. Conservation practices, enhancements or bundles are identified. Develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for each land use that meet the producer's objectives. Plan document follows the requirements of E199A Guide sheet and meets Conservation Plan CPA 199 or applicable conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,269.02 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9,269.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E199A - Comprehensive Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #41 - Single Enterprise, High

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a contract through the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment and Ranking Tool (CART) to identify all State priority resource concern categories (PRCCs) that the TSP must include in the CSP CCP. TSP develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for one land use by each land management system included in the producer's operation. This typical scenario involves one agricultural enterprise and a.) 2-3 Land Use with 4 or more priority resource concern categories per land use, OR b.) 4 or more Land Use with 3 to 4 priority resource concerns.

**Before Situation:**

NRCS has identified priority resource concern categories that have not met stewardship thresholds. State priority resource concern categories need to be evaluated for one land use and each land management system.

**After Situation:**

TSP conducts an on-site inventory of all land uses and land management systems in the producer's operation. Assessment for each priority resource concern is completed by land use. Conservation practices, enhancements or bundles are identified. Develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for each land use that meet the producer's objectives. Plan document follows the requirements of E199A Guide sheet and meets Conservation Plan CPA 199 or applicable conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,486.08

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,486.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E199A - Comprehensive Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #57 - Multiple Enterprise, Medium

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a contract through the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment and Ranking Tool (CART) to identify all State priority resource concern categories (PRCCs) that the TSP must include in the CSP CCP. TSP develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for one land use by each land management system included in the producer's operation. This typical scenario involves two or more agricultural enterprises and a.) 1 Land Use with up to 4 priority resource concerns, OR b.) 2-3 Land Use with 1 to 2 priority resource concern categories per land use.

**Before Situation:**

NRCS has identified priority resource concern categories that have not met stewardship thresholds. State priority resource concern categories need to be evaluated for one land use and each land management system.

**After Situation:**

TSP conducts an on-site inventory of all land uses and land management systems in the producer's operation. Assessment for each priority resource concern is completed by land use. Conservation practices, enhancements or bundles are identified. Develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for each land use that meet the producer's objectives. Plan document follows the requirements of E199A Guide sheet and meets Conservation Plan CPA 199 or applicable conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$12,773.41 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12,773.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E199A - Comprehensive Conservation Plan

**Scenario:** #73 - Multiple Enterprise, High

**Scenario Description:**

Conservation plan developed by a Technical Service Provider (TSP) for a participant enrolled in a contract through the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP). NRCS will use the Conservation Assessment and Ranking Tool (CART) to identify all State priority resource concern categories (PRCCs) that the TSP must include in the CSP CCP. TSP develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for one land use by each land management system included in the producer's operation. This typical scenario involves two or more agricultural enterprises and a.) 2-3 Land Use with 3 to 4 priority resource concern categories per land use, OR b.) 2-3 Land Use with 4 or more priority resource concerns, OR c.) 4 or more Land Use with any amount of priority resource concerns

**Before Situation:**

NRCS has identified priority resource concern categories that have not met stewardship thresholds. State priority resource concern categories need to be evaluated for one land use and each land management system.

**After Situation:**

TSP conducts an on-site inventory of all land uses and land management systems in the producer's operation. Assessment for each priority resource concern is completed by land use. Conservation practices, enhancements or bundles are identified. Develops a minimum of one conservation system alternative for each land use that meet the producer's objectives. Plan document follows the requirements of E199A Guide sheet and meets Conservation Plan CPA 199 or applicable conservation activities CPA 102 CNMP or CPA 106 Forestry Plan.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,741.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14,741.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #89 - EAP Cropland, Level 1

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers cropland.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on cropland that address two to three resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres tilled

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6.62 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #105 - EAP Cropland, Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers cropland.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on cropland that address four to six resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8.49 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #121 - EAP Cropland, Level 3

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers cropland.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on cropland that address seven or more resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11.82 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #137 - EAP Pasture, Level 1

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers pasture.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on pasture that address two to three resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5.17 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.17

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #153 - EAP Pasture, Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers pasture.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on pasture that address four to six resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6.89 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #169 - EAP Pasture, Level 3

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers pasture.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on pasture that address seven or more resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10.61 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.61

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #185 - EAP Range, Level 1

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers rangeland.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on rangeland that address two to three resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3.71 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.71

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #201 - EAP Range, Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers rangeland.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on rangeland that address four to six resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4.67 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #217 - EAP Range, Level 3

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers rangeland.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on rangeland that address seven or more resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5.96 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.96

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #233 - EAP Forest, Level 1

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers non-industrialized private forest.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on forest that address two to three resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #249 - EAP Forest, Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers non-industrialized private forest.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on forest that address four to six resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5.72 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #265 - EAP Forest, Level 3

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers non-industrialized private forest.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on forest that address seven or more resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8.47 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #281 - EAP AAL, Level 1

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers associated ag land.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on associated ag land that address two to three resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8.16 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.16

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #297 - EAP AAL, Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers associated ag land.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on associated ag land that address four to six resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$16.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.70

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #313 - EAP Farmstead, Level 1

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers farmsteads.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on farmsteads that address two to three resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP1 - Existing Activity Payment-Land Use

**Scenario:** #329 - EAP Farmstead, Level 2

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment (EAP1) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the land uses included in the operation. This scenario covers farmsteads.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities on farmsteads that address four or more resource concerns at the time of enrollment.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$15.90

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$15.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP2 - Existing Activity Payment-Resource Concern

**Scenario:** #25 - EAP2, General Contracts

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment component (EAP2) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the number of resource concerns met at the time of enrollment.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities across all land uses included in the operation.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Per contract

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,800.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,800.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E300EAP2 - Existing Activity Payment-Resource Concern

**Scenario:** #41 - EAP2, Renewal Contracts

**Scenario Description:**

This existing activity payment component (EAP2) provides a participant with a payment for existing stewardship specific to the number of resource concerns met at the time of enrollment.

**Before Situation:**

Producer implements conservation activities across all land uses included in the operation.

**After Situation:**

Through participation in the program, the producer continues to maintain or improve the base level of stewardship assessed at the time of enrollment.

**Feature Measure:** Per contract

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,000.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3,000.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E314A - Brush management to improve wildlife habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Wildlife Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Brush management is employed to create a desired plant community, consistent with the related ecological site steady state, which will maintain or enhance the wildlife habitat desired for the identified wildlife species. It will be designed to provide plant structure, density and diversity needed to meet those habitat objectives. This enhancement does not apply to removal of woody vegetation by prescribed fire or removal of woody vegetation to facilitate a land use change.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 314 - Brush Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 314 - Brush Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,044.83

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$20.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E315A - Herbaceous weed treatment to create plant communities consistent with the ecological site

**Scenario:** #1 - Enhance Plant Community within an Ecological Site

**Scenario Description:**

Mechanical, chemical, or biological, herbaceous weed treatment will be employed to control targeted, herbaceous weeds so as to create, release, or restore desired plant communities that are consistent with achievable, ecological site, steady state descriptions.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 315 - Herbaceous Weed Control

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 315 - Herbaceous Weed Control

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$163.70 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E327C - Wildlife habitat for nesting and brooding in non-cropped areas

**Scenario:** #9 - Nesting and Brooding Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Add new species to an existing stand of Conservation Cover or concurrently install. Grass and legume mixtures provide refuge areas for nesting, brood rearing and winter survival of wildlife in non-cropped areas.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 327 Conservation Cover.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 327.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$100.19

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$100.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328A - Resource conserving crop rotation

**Scenario:** #1 - Resource Conserving Crop Rotation

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a Resource Conserving Crop Rotation. Rotation must include AT LEAST one resource conserving crop as determined by the State Conservationist in a minimum three year crop rotation. The crop rotation will reduce soil erosion (water and wind), improve soil health, improve soil moisture efficiency, and reduce plant pest pressures.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,832.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328B - Improved resource conserving crop rotation

**Scenario:** #1 - Improved Resource Conserving Crop Rotation

**Scenario Description:**

Improve an existing Resource Conserving Crop Rotation. Must enrich an existing rotation which already includes AT LEAST one resource conserving crop as determined by the State Conservationist in a minimum three year crop rotation. The crop rotation will reduce soil erosion (water and wind), improve soil health, improve soil moisture efficiency, and reduce plant pest pressures.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$654.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328C - Conservation crop rotation on recently converted CRP grass/legume cover

**Scenario:** #1 - Water and Wind Erosion Protection

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a crop rotation management system on crop land acres that have recently converted from CRP grass/legume conservation cover to annual planted crops. Crop rotation minimizes disturbance resulting in a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) less than 10 and reduces soil erosion from water or wind to below soil tolerance (T) level. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document the rotation, soil erosion estimate, and STIR calculations. \*This enhancement is limited to acres where the conversion event took place not more than 2 years prior. Enhancement not applicable on hayland.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this rotation enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328D - Leave standing grain crops unharvested to benefit wildlife

**Scenario:** #1 - Unharvested Grain Crops

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a crop rotation which allows a portion of grain crops to be left in fields un-harvested to provide food and cover for wildlife during winter months.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$146.85 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328E - Soil health crop rotation

**Scenario:** #1 - Increase Diversity for Soil Health

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a crop rotation which addresses all four principle components of soil health: increases diversity of the cropping system; maintains residue throughout the year; keeps a living root; and minimizes soil chemical, physical and biological disturbance. The rotation will include at least 4 different crop and/or cover crop types (crop types include cool season grass, warm season grass, cool season broadleaf, warm season broadleaf) grown in a sequence that will produce a positive trend in the Organic Matter (OM) sub factor value over the life of the rotation, as determined by the Soil Conditioning Index (SCI). The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document the rotation and SCI calculations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$654.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E328F - Modifications to improve soil health and increase soil organic matter

**Scenario:** #1 - Soil Health Adaptive Management

**Scenario Description:**

Use of soil health assessment to evaluate impact of current conservation crop rotation in addressing soil organic matter depletion (primary assessment made in Year 1). Modifications to the crop rotation and/or crop management will be made as a result of the assessment results (adding a new crop and/or cover crop to the rotation; making changes to planting and/or tillage system, harvest timing of crops, or termination timing of cover crops). During Year 3 a follow up assessment will be completed to allow time for the modifications to show increased soil organic matter. Modified system must produce a positive trend in the Organic Matter (OM) sub factor value over the life of the rotation, as determined by the Soil Conditioning Index (SCI). The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document the rotation and SCI calculations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$267.61 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328G - Crop rotation on recently converted CRP grass/legume cover for soil organic matter improvement

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Soil Organic Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Crop rotation on acres converted, no more than 2 years prior, from CRP grass/legume cover to annual crops. Diverse rotation with living roots and residue cover throughout year and minimal disturbance. Enhancement not applicable on hayland.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$654.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328H - Conservation crop rotation to reduce the concentration of salts

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduction of Salts, Saline Seeps

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a crop rotation to reduce the concentration of salts and other chemicals from saline seeps. The rotation should include at least 3 crops and/or cover crops grown in a sequence in the recharge areas of saline seeps that have rooting depths and water requirements adequate to fully utilize all available soil water. Do not use summer fallow. Use an approved water balance procedure to determine crop selection and sequence. Select crops with a tolerance to salinity levels that match the salinity of the discharge area. (See state lists )

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328K - Multiple crop types to benefit wildlife

**Scenario:** #9 - Multiple Crop Types

**Scenario Description:**

Alternating crops in a systematic arrangement of strips across a field to provide diverse rotations of crops that provide wildlife food. At least two crops will be planted in adjacent strips a minimum of 0.5 acres in size.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$130.88

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328L - Leaving tall crop residue for wildlife

**Scenario:** #9 - Crop Residue for Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Fields may be harvested but must leave crop residue standing a minimum of 14 inches. Residue will be left through winter and into spring, providing valuable winter cover and forage for wildlife spanning late summer and through the following winter.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation.

**Feature Measure:** acres with small grain stubbl

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328M - Diversify crop rotation with canola or sunflower to provide benefits to pollinators

**Scenario:** #25 - Add Canola or Sunflower for Pollinators

**Scenario Description:**

Diversify the existing crop rotation by adding canola or sunflower into the rotation. Canola or sunflower must be planted on a minimum of 5% of cropland acres. Pesticide use is limited to pre-bloom or bloom and in accordance with IPM and industry best management practices.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level for the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328- Conservation Crop Rotation.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328-Conservation Crop Rotation

**Feature Measure:** Acres planned

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E3280 - Perennial Grain Conservation Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #9 - Perennial Grain

**Scenario Description:**

This practice payment is provided to the producer for the time needed to plan and implement the logistics of changing the rotation to effectively implement a conservation crop rotation on a cropland farm by adding a perennial grain as the third crop to their cropping system. The crop is intended to be a harvested and must be grown for at least 2 years after planting. No foregone income. Cost represents typical situations for conventional and organic producers. In this region this practice may be part of a conservation management system on both organic and non-organic operations that: (1) Reduces erosion; (2) Improves soil fertility and tilth; (3) Interrupts pest cycles; and (4) Builds soil organic matter. In applicable areas, reduces depletion of soil moisture or otherwise reduces the need for irrigation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level for the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328- Conservation Crop Rotation.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328-Conservation Crop Rotation.

**Feature Measure:** Area Planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,968.16

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$174.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E328P - Low Nitrogen Requirement Annual Crop Rotation

**Scenario:** #9 - Low Nitrogen Substitute

**Scenario Description:**

Design an annual crop rotation which less than the average annual nitrogen fertilizer requirement compared to the current (benchmark) crop rotation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,252.47

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$32.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E329A - No till to reduce soil erosion

**Scenario:** #1 - No-Till, Soil Erosion

**Scenario Description:**

Establish no till system to reduce sheet and rill erosion soil loss. Field(s) must have a soil loss at or below the soil tolerance (T) level for water and wind erosion for the crop rotation and a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 10 for each crop in the planned rotation. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to calculate soil loss and STIR.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E329B - No till to reduce tillage induced particulate matter

**Scenario:** #1 - No-Till, Particulate Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Establish no till system to reduce tillage induced particulate matter. Field(s) must have a soil loss at or below the soil tolerance (T) level for the crop rotation and a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 10 for each crop in the planned rotation. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document soil loss and STIR calculations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E329C - No till to increase plant-available moisture

**Scenario:** #1 - No-Till, Moisture

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a no till system to increase plant-available moisture. Each crop in the crop rotation shall have a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 20. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document STIR calculations. Maintain a minimum 60 percent surface residue cover throughout the year to reduce evaporation from the soil surface.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E329D - No till system to increase soil health and soil organic matter content

**Scenario:** #1 - No-Till, Soil Health and Organic Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a no till system to increase soil health and soil organic matter content. Each crop in the crop rotation shall have a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 20. The crop rotation must achieve a soil conditioning index (SCI) of zero or higher. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document STIR and SCI calculations. Residue shall not be burned, grazed, or harvested.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E329E - No till to reduce energy

**Scenario:** #1 - No-Till, Energy

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a no till system which reduces total energy consumption associated with field operations by at least 25% compared to current tillage system (benchmark). Each crop in the crop rotation shall have a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 20. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document STIR calculations and energy consumption.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 329 - Residue and Tillage Management - No-Till/ Strip Till/ Direct Seed

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E329F - No-till into green cover crop to improve soil organic matter quantity and quality

**Scenario:** #9 - Planting Green

**Scenario Description:**

This scenario applies to cropland where residue and tillage management prepares the field for “planting green” techniques where cash crops are planted into living cover crop residues. This practice is based on economic and social data obtained from the North Jersey RC&D On-Farm Trials Soil Health Demo CIG Project results. This scenario involves the site preparation and management of live cover crop residues during no-till planting events. The practice will be used to drastically reduce soil erosion, reduce CO2 losses from the field, maximize the four principles of soil health and related resource concerns, mitigate pesticide usage and amplify the benefits of supporting practices. The typical scenario size is 100 acres.

**Before Situation:**

Row crops or small grains are grown and harvested. Cover crop and/or crop residues that are present are too fragile or not in a quantity to adequately address soil, water, and air resource concerns. Residues are dead at the time of planting, leaving soils

**After Situation:**

Live residues are maintained for extended periods of time in the spring, providing soil coverage that is adequate to control erosion and runoff and sedimentation. Soils are no-tilled and cover crop residues accumulate carbon providing carbon sequestration benefits as well as increasing soil microbial activity which further increase the function of the soil. Chemical inputs are generally reduced due to increased soil function and protection from live residues. Producers gain knowledge through workshops and working with crop consultants to maintain the success and long-term adoption of the practice. All cover crop residues are to be maintained on the surface until planting. The cover crop must be terminated before crop emergence. See complete “NRCS Cover Crop Termination Guidelines” for more information.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,712.28 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$67.12

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E334A - Controlled traffic farming to reduce compaction

**Scenario:** #1 - Compaction Reduction

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a controlled traffic system where no more than 25% of the surface is tracked with heavy axel loads to minimize soil compaction. For row crops (e.g. corn in 30-inch rows) no tire should run on a row except for flotation tires on combines and/or fertilizer and lime spreading trucks. If wide flotation tires are used, they must be big enough that the inflation pressure will be below 18 psi to minimize compaction on trafficked rows.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 334 - Controlled Traffic Farming

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 334 - Controlled Traffic Farming

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$934.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E338A - Strategically planned, patch burning for grazing distribution and wildlife habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Patch Burning

**Scenario Description:**

Patch burn grazing is the application of prescribed fires on portions of an identified grazing unit at different times of the year. Patch burn grazing allows grazing animals to select where they want to graze creating a mosaic of vegetation structures and diversity that will maintain or enhance the wildlife habitat desired for the identified wildlife species and maintain livestock production.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 338 - Prescribed Burning

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 338 - Prescribed Burning

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$846.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$8.46

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E338B - Short-interval burns to promote a healthy herbaceous plant community

**Scenario:** #1 - Short-Interval Burns

**Scenario Description:**

The controlled use of fire is applied in a forest to restore fire-adapted plants while improving wildlife habitat, wildlife food supply, and reducing the risk of damage from intense, severe wildfires. The ideal interval between prescribed burns is not often achieved. To improve the effectiveness of prescribed burning, the frequency of prescribed burning is increased appropriately, for a specified time period, to help restore ecological conditions in forests and woodlands. Short return interval prescribed burning is used to regenerate desirable tree species, improve the condition of fire-adapted plants and native herbaceous vegetation, improve wildlife food supply, create wildlife habitat (snags and den/cavity trees), limit encroachment of competing vegetation including non-native species, and reduce the future risk of damage from intense, severe wildfires.

**Before Situation:**

The site has a mixture of woody sprouts and some herbaceous vegetation in the forest understory.

**After Situation:**

The site has a mixture of warm season perennial vegetation and cool-season annual forages. Grazing is occurring to manage the herbaceous vegetation and keep undesirable woody vegetation from occupying the forest understory.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,233.65

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$130.84

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E338C - Sequential patch burning

**Scenario:** #1 - Patch Burning, Sequential

**Scenario Description:**

Conduct prescribed under burning beneath a forest canopy (ground fire), burning a portion of the area each year to create a mosaic of vegetation in several stages of development, to provide a more diverse understory and contribute to wildlife habitat. The health of conifer and oak-conifer forests, particularly longleaf pine with a characteristic herbaceous understory, is dependent on fire or another means of controlling encroaching woody vegetation. A healthy longleaf or shortleaf pine, or pine-oak forest, can support a wide array of wildlife including pollinators and several endangered or threatened species.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 338 - Prescribed Burning

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 338 - Prescribed Burning

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,065.26

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$306.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340A - Cover crop to reduce soil erosion

**Scenario:** #1 - Soil Erosion Reduction

**Scenario Description:**

Cover crop added to current crop rotation to reduce soil erosion from water and wind to below soil tolerance (T) level. Cover crops grown during critical erosion period(s). Species are selected that will have physical characteristics to provide adequate erosion protection.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$948.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.48

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340B - Intensive cover cropping to increase soil health and soil organic matter content

**Scenario:** #1 - Cover Crop, Intensive

**Scenario Description:**

Implementation of cover crop mix to provide soil coverage during ALL non-crop production periods in an annual crop rotation. Cover crop shall not be harvested or burned. Planned crop rotation including cover crops and associated management activities must achieve a soil conditioning index (SCI) of zero or higher. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document SCI calculations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,564.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$15.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340C - Use of multi-species cover crops to improve soil health and increase soil organic matter

**Scenario:** #1 - Diversify Multi-Species

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a multi-species cover crop to add diversity and increase biomass production to improve soil health and increase soil organic matter. Cover crop mix must include a minimum of 4 different species. The cover crop mix will increase diversity of the crop rotation by including crop types currently missing, e.g. Cool Season Grass (CSG), Cool Season Broadleaves (CSB), Warm Season Grasses (WSG), Warm Season Broadleaves (WSB).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,383.21 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340D - Intensive orchard/vineyard floor cover cropping to increase soil health

**Scenario:** #1 - Orchard and Vineyard, Soil Health

**Scenario Description:**

Implement orchard or vineyard floor cover crops. Cover crop shall not be harvested, grazed, or burned. Must achieve a soil conditioning index of zero or higher and produce a positive trend in the Organic Matter subfactor over the life of the rotation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,383.21 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340E - Use of soil health assessment to assist with development of cover crop mix to improve soil health

**Scenario:** #1 - Soil Health Assessment

**Scenario Description:**

Soil health assessment (year 1) to evaluate current crop rotation in addressing soil organic matter depletion. Results are utilized to select a multi-species cover crop mix to add to the current crop rotation. Follow up assessment completed (year 3).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$372.77

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.73

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340F - Cover crop to minimize soil compaction

**Scenario:** #1 - Soil Compaction Treatment

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a cover crop mix that includes plants with both fibrous root and deep rooted systems. Fibrous to treat and prevent both near surface (0-4") and deep (>4") soil compaction and deep rooted to break up deep compacted soils. Cover crop shall not be harvested, grazed, or burned.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,343.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E340G - Cover crop to reduce water quality degradation by utilizing excess soil nutrients

**Scenario:** #1 - Scavenge Excess Soil Nutrients

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a cover crop mix to take up excess soil nutrients. Select cover crop species for their ability to effectively utilize nutrients. Terminate the cover crop as late as practical to maximize plant biomass production and nutrient uptake. Cover crop shall not be harvested, grazed, or burned.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,343.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.43

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340H - Cover crop to suppress excessive weed pressures and break pest cycles

**Scenario:** #1 - Weed and Pest Suppression

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a cover crop mix to suppress excessive weed pressures and break pest cycles. Select cover crop species for their life cycles, growth habits, and other biological, chemical and/or physical characteristics. Select cover crop species that do not harbor pests or diseases of subsequent crops in the rotation. Cover crop shall not be harvested, grazed, or burned.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 340 - Cover Crop

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,383.21

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340I - Using cover crops for biological strip till

**Scenario:** #9 - Bio-Strip Tillage

**Scenario Description:**

Establish alternating strips of cover crops in which one strip acts as a biological strip-tiller and the adjacent strip promotes soil health with high residue cover crops. This will facilitate planting of the subsequent cash crop into the biologically strip-tilled row without the need for mechanical disturbance.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 340 - Cover Crop.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 340 - Cover Crop.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,503.22

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$15.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E340J - Cover crop to improve moisture use efficiency and reduce salts

**Scenario:** #9 - Manage Salt and Moisture Use Efficiency

**Scenario Description:**

Cover crop used in a crop rotation to reduce damaging levels of salt from parent materials and or ground water. A salt tolerant cover crop species will be planted in the salt affected zone and a buffer zone extending into the commodity crop base acres.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of CPS 340 Cover Crop.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in CPS 340 Cover Crop.

**Feature Measure:** acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,126.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$51.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E345A - Reduced tillage to reduce soil erosion

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduced Tillage, Soil Erosion

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a reduced tillage system to reduce soil loss. Field(s) must have a soil loss at or below the soil tolerance (T) level for water and wind erosion for the crop rotation and a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 40 for each crop in the planned rotation. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to calculate soil loss and STIR.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E345B - Reduced tillage to reduce tillage induced particulate matter

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduced Tillage, Particulate Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a reduced tillage system to reduce tillage induced particulate matter. Field(s) must have a soil loss at or below the soil tolerance (T) level for the crop rotation and a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 40 for each crop in the planned rotation. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document soil loss and STIR calculations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E345C - Reduced tillage to increase plant-available moisture

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduced Tillage, Moisture

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a reduced till system to increase plant-available moisture. Each crop in the crop rotation shall have a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 80. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document STIR calculations. Maintain a minimum 60 percent surface residue cover throughout the year to reduce evaporation from the soil surface.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E345D - Reduced tillage to increase soil health and soil organic matter content

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduced Tillage, Soil Health and Organic Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a reduced till system to increase soil health and soil organic matter content. Each crop in the crop rotation shall have a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 80. The crop rotation must achieve a soil conditioning index (SCI) of zero or higher and produce a positive trend in the Organic Matter (OM) subfactor over the life of the crop rotation. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document STIR and SCI calculations. Residue shall not be burned, grazed, or harvested.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$523.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E345E - Reduced tillage to reduce energy use

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduced Tillage, Energy

**Scenario Description:**

Establish a reduced tillage system which reduces total energy consumption associated with field operations by at least 25% compared to conventional tillage systems (benchmark). Each crop in the crop rotation shall have a Soil Tillage Intensity Rating (STIR) of no greater than 80. The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document STIR calculations and energy consumption.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 345 - Residue and Tillage Management, Reduced Till

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E372A - Switch to Renewable Power Source

**Scenario:** #9 - Repower with Renewable Energy Source

**Scenario Description:**

Existing internal combustion system (5-30 HP) used for water pumping and or movement. The repower provides the pump and drive unit replacement and the conversion to renewable energy power source, typically solar. The repowered system will function at the same capacity as the original system. Addresses Air Quality Emissions of Particulate Matter, Ozone Precursors, and Nitrous oxides.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 372 Combustion System Improvement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard 372 Combustion System Improvement.

**Feature Measure:** per unit switched to renewa

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$20,915.14

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$20,915.14

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E372B - Renewable Energy Source for Large Internal Combustion Engines

**Scenario:** #9 - Renewable Energy Source for Large Internal Combustion Engines

**Scenario Description:**

Replace an existing pump motor with a drive unit that is powered by a renewable source such as wind, solar, geothermal, etc. that can adequately maintain the existing operating conditions, flow rates and pressures. The replacement, repower, or retrofit combustion system and related components or devices must serve the same function and perform similar type of work as the original equipment. Applies to existing, in-use agricultural combustion systems, including stationary, portable, and self-propelled mobile units. Addresses Resource Concerns for Air Quality- Emissions of Particulate Matter, Ozone Precursors, Airborne Reactive Nitrogen, and Greenhouse Gases. Inefficient energy may be addressed when the IC engine is repowered with a more efficient drive unit.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of Conservation Practice Standard 372 Combustion System Improvement.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level of Conservation Practice Standard 372 Combustion System Improvement.

**Feature Measure:** each IC system repowered

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$78,574.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$78,574.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E373A - Dust suppressant re-application for stabilization

**Scenario:** #25 - Dust Suppression, One Application

**Scenario Description:**

Limit dust emissions by maintaining the surfaces of unpaved roads and areas in a stabilized condition. The periodic re-application of dust suppressants to unpaved surface areas will limit dust generation from vehicle and machinery activities or wind action.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 373 - Dust Control on Unpaved Roads and Surfaces.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 373 - Dust Control on Unpaved Roads and Surfaces.

**Feature Measure:** Square Feet

**Scenario Unit:** Square Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15,840.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,419.21

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E376A - Modify field operations to reduce particulate matter

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Soil Disturbance

**Scenario Description:**

Modify tillage and/or harvest operations to reduce particulates by at least 20 percent below the required levels.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 376 - Field Operations Emissions Reduction

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 376 - Field Operations Emissions Reduction

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$392.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E381A - Silvestre to improve wildlife habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Silvestre for Wildlife

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing a combination of trees or shrubs and compatible forages on the same acreage, providing forage, shade, and/or shelter for livestock that include a purpose of enhancing wildlife cover and shelter.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 381 - Silvestre

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 381 - Silvestre

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,597.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$95.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E382A - Incorporating "wildlife friendly" fencing for connectivity of wildlife food resources

**Scenario:** #1 - Wildlife Friendly Fence

**Scenario Description:**

Retrofitting or constructing fences that provide a means to control movement of animals, people, and vehicles, but minimizes wildlife movement impacts.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 382 - Fence

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 382 - Fence

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$242.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E382B - Installing electrical fence offsets and wire for cross-fencing to improve grazing management

**Scenario:** #9 - Cross-Fencing, Electric

**Scenario Description:**

Retrofitting conventional fences such as barb wire, with new electrical offsets and electrical wire to facilitate cross-fencing for improved grazing management.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 382 - Fence

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 382 - Fence

**Feature Measure:** Feet

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2,640.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,513.24 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.57

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E383A - Grazing-maintained fuel break to reduce the risk of fire

**Scenario:** #1 - Fuel Break Management

**Scenario Description:**

The area has existing fuel break(s) of 30 to 60 feet in width, supporting a mixture of woody sprouts and some herbaceous vegetation. Warm-season perennial vegetation will be established on the fuel breaks, and will be over-seeded with cool-season annual forages in the fall. Grazing will be managed on the fuel breaks to remove or modify the fine fuel vegetation, thus reducing the risk of fire spread from ground fires. Ground cover will be maintained to control soil erosion and facilitate prescribed burning.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 383 - Fuel Break

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 383 - Fuel Break

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,192.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$319.30

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E384A - Biochar production from woody residue

**Scenario:** #10 - Biochar Production

**Scenario Description:**

The adoption of this enhancement will go above the minimum level of woody residue treatment by creating a product that improves air quality by storing carbon, decreases fuel loads and fire hazard, and can improve soil quality. It will utilize woody debris remaining after a silvicultural practice or natural disturbance to create biochar. Biochar stores carbon and is a useful soil amendment that improves SOM and water-holding capacity.

**Before Situation:**

Area has woody residue that is unmerchantable and available for creation of quality biochar. Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 384 - Woody Residue Treatment

**After Situation:**

Woody debris has been converted to biochar.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.5

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$14,405.91 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$5,762.36

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E386A - Enhanced field borders to reduce soil erosion along the edge(s) of a field

**Scenario:** #1 - Soil Erosion Reduction, Edges

**Scenario Description:**

Enhance existing field borders to a width of at least 30 feet and establish a single species or mixture of species that provide a dense ground cover along the edge(s) of the field.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,204.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,204.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E386B - Enhanced field borders to increase carbon storage along the edge(s) of the field

**Scenario:** #1 - Carbon Storage

**Scenario Description:**

Enhance existing field borders to a width of at least 30 feet and establish a single species or mixture of species that provide a dense ground cover and dense rooting system along the edge(s) of the field.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,314.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,314.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E386C - Enhanced field borders to decrease particulate emissions along the edge(s) of the field

**Scenario:** #1 - Particulate Emissions Reduction

**Scenario Description:**

Enhance existing field borders to a width of at least 40 feet and establish a mixture of species that decrease the particulate emissions along the edge(s) of the field.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,226.95

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,226.95

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E386D - Enhanced field borders to increase food for pollinators along the edge(s) of a field

**Scenario:** #1 - Pollinators

**Scenario Description:**

Enhance existing field borders to a width of at least 40 feet and establish a mixture of species that provide food for pollinators along the edge(s) of the field.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,314.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,314.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E386E - Enhanced field borders to increase wildlife food and habitat along the edge(s) of a field

**Scenario:** #1 - Wildlife Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Enhance existing field borders to a width of at least 40 feet and establish a mixture of species that provide wildlife food and habitat along the edge(s) of the field. The extended field border will also provide enhanced wildlife habitat continuity.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 386 - Field Border

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,314.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,314.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E390A - Increase riparian herbaceous cover width for sediment and nutrient reduction

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover Expansion

**Scenario Description:**

Where an existing herbaceous riparian buffer is located along a river, stream, pond, lake, or other waterbody, increase the width of the buffer in order to allow a greater percentage of sediment and nutrient removal from surface and subsurface flows.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,029.33 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$514.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E390B - Increase riparian herbaceous cover width to enhance wildlife habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover Expansion, Wildlife

**Scenario Description:**

Where an existing herbaceous riparian buffer is located along a river, stream, pond, lake, or other waterbody, increase the diversity of native species, control invasive species, install fencing and relocate equipment operations, trails, and livestock, and increase the width of the buffer.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 390 - Riparian Herbaceous Cover

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 4.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,435.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$358.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E391A - Increase riparian forest buffer width for sediment and nutrient reduction

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Forest Buffer Expansion

**Scenario Description:**

Where an existing forested riparian area is located along a river, stream, pond, lake, or other waterbody, increase the width of the buffer in order to allow a greater percentage of sediment and nutrient removal from surface and subsurface flows.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,957.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,478.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E391B - Increase stream shading for stream temperature reduction

**Scenario:** #1 - Increase Tree Canopy Cover for Shading

**Scenario Description:**

Riparian area tree canopy cover density is increased and the extent of the forested riparian area is increased to provide greater stream shading.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,013.56 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,506.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E391C - Increase riparian forest buffer width to enhance wildlife habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Forest Buffer Expansion, Wildlife

**Scenario Description:**

Where an existing riparian forest buffer is located along a river, stream, pond, lake, or other waterbody, increase the diversity of native species, control invasive species, install fencing and relocate equipment operations, trails, and livestock to increase the functional width of the buffer.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 391 - Riparian Forest Buffer

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,013.56

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,506.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E393A - Extend existing filter strip to reduce water quality impacts

**Scenario:** #1 - Filter Strip Expansion

**Scenario Description:**

Extend existing filter strips for water quality protection. Extend the existing buffer for a total of 60 feet or more to enhance water quality functions. The extended buffers must be composed of at least 5 species of non-noxious, wildlife friendly grasses and/or perennial forbs best suited to site conditions. Include species that provide pollinator food and habitat where possible.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 393 - Filter Strip

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 393 - Filter Strip

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,575.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,575.80

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E395A - Stream habitat improvement through placement of woody biomass

**Scenario:** #1 - Woody Biomass Placement

**Scenario Description:**

Flexible placement of wood (unanchored/unpinned) in small, 1st and 2nd order streams to improve stream habitat conditions for aquatic species and natural stream processes.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 395 - Stream Habitat Improvement and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 395 - Stream Habitat Improvement and Management

**Feature Measure:** Bankfull width X Length

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$21,981.93

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$21,981.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E399A - Fishpond management for native aquatic and terrestrial species

**Scenario:** #1 - Fishpond Management

**Scenario Description:**

Pond rehabilitation, buffer, and watershed management actions are taken to improve habitat for native species of fish, amphibians, and shorebirds.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 399 - Fishpond Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 399 - Fishpond Management

**Feature Measure:** Pond area + buffer area

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,290.56 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,645.28

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E412A - Enhance a grassed waterway

**Scenario:** #9 - Waterway Expansion

**Scenario Description:**

Typical practice is 1500' long, 12' bottom, 8:1 side slopes, 1.1' depth. A grass waterway that is a shaped or graded channel and is established with suitable vegetation to carry surface water at a non-erosive velocity to a stable outlet. This practice addresses Concentrated Flow Erosion (Classic Gully & Ephemeral Erosion) and Excessive Sediment in surface waters. Waterway area measured from top of bank to top of bank. Seeding will be completed under the Critical Area Planting (342) Practice Standard with seeding area up to 20% greater than waterway area to account for buffer area along the waterway. Costs include excavation and associated work to construct the overall shape and grade of the waterway. This scenario would apply to Grassed Waterways without erosion control blanket or rock checks.

**Before Situation:**

The field has a grassed waterway, but a gully cutting upstream, downstream, or adjacent to the existing grassed waterway has formed as time goes on, so the new gully needs to be stopped or controlled. The new gully has formed in field as a result of a cha

**After Situation:**

An installed grassed waterway has been installed that is possibly wider or longer than the original grassed waterway that wasn't functioning properly anymore. The new installed grassed waterway is 1500' long, 12' bottom, 8:1 side slopes, 1.1' depth. The practice is installed using a dozer and/or scraper, with final grading with motor grader. Use Critical Area Planting (342) for establishment of waterway vegetation. If erosion control blankets or mulching for seedbed establishment/protection are needed, use conservation practice Mulching (484). Drainage tile, if needed, will be installed according to Subsurface Drain (606).

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Waterway reshape

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,196.47 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,196.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E420A - Establish pollinator habitat

**Scenario:** #9 - Establish Pollinator Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Seed or plug nectar and pollen producing plants in non-cropped areas such as field borders, vegetative barriers, contour buffer strips, shelterbelts, hedgerows, windbreaks, conservation cover, and riparian forest and herbaceous buffers.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$632.99

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$632.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E420B - Establish monarch butterfly habitat

**Scenario:** #9 - Enhanced Plantings for Monarch Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Seed or plug milkweed (*Asclepias* spp.) and high-value monarch butterfly nectar plants on marginal cropland, field borders, contour buffer strips and similar areas.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting.

**After Situation:**

Adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 420 - Wildlife Habitat Planting.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,014.27 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,014.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E447A - Advanced Tailwater Recovery

**Scenario:** #9 - Tailwater Recovery

**Scenario Description:**

This enhancement is for a recovery system that capture 100% of excess irrigation and drainage runoff water from the contiguous land where the activity is implemented. Runoff water is conveyed through properly designed recovery ditches to a storage structure. Each recovery ditch and storage structure have adequate capacity to store excess irrigation water and reasonable runoff water. The system is designed to incorporate the collected water back into the delivery system so that excess water is reused. The system is fully automated to operate the recovery pumps, valves, and collection system. Key elements in the system are sensors that can evaluate data and operate devices through the system in opening/closing or on /off based on scientifically determined parameters.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 447 - Irrigation System, Tailwater Recovery.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 200.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,863.40 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449A - Complete pumping plant evaluation for water savings

**Scenario:** #1 - Pumping Plant Evaluation, Water Efficiency

**Scenario Description:**

The performance of pump tests and evaluations of all pumping plants to determine the potential to rehabilitate/replace/reconfigure pump performance to improve water delivery efficiency 10% or more. Develop and provide a written report with recordkeeping documents and list of adjustments and calculations of the reduction of water use based on before and after conditions.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard, (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Each pump evaluated

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,723.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,723.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449B - Alternated Wetting and Drying (AWD) of rice fields

**Scenario:** #1 - Alternate Wetting and Drying

**Scenario Description:**

Rice fields are drained and allowed to “dry down” to a saturated soil condition prior to re-flooding the field. System is installed in year 1 with Scenario E449144Z8 and this scenario used in years 2-5.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,401.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$35.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449C - Advanced Automated IWM - Year 2-5, soil moisture monitoring

**Scenario:** #1 - Years Two-Five, Soil Moisture Monitoring

**Scenario Description:**

Advanced automated irrigation water management using soil moisture or water level monitoring (installed as per IWM plan) with data loggers.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 125.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,732.41 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$21.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449D - Advanced Automated IWM - Year 1, Equipment and soil moisture or water level monitoring

**Scenario:** #1 - Year One, Equipment, Advanced Soil Moisture or Water Monitoring

**Scenario Description:**

Installing and monitoring soil moisture or water leveling equipment for advanced automated irrigation water management

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 120.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,790.82

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$64.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449E - Convert from Cascade to Furrow Irrigated Rice Production – reduce irrigation water consumption

**Scenario:** #9 - Cascade to Furrow Irrigation Conversion

**Scenario Description:**

Field currently flooded through a cascade levee system will be converted to furrow irrigation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,844.72 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$60.56

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E449F - Intermediate IWM - Year 1, Equipment with Soil or Water Level monitoring

**Scenario:** #9 - Year One, Equipment, Intermediate Soil Moisture or Water Monitoring

**Scenario Description:**

This activity involves monitoring soil moisture or water levels within a irrigated field for intermediate irrigation water management include installation of equipment year 1.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$8,017.40

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$50.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449G - Intermediate IWM - Years 2-5, Soil or Water Level monitoring

**Scenario:** #9 - Years Two-Five, Data Collection

**Scenario Description:**

Intermediate irrigation water management involves monitoring soil moisture or water levels within an irrigated field by utilizing technological equipment to gather field specific data concerning weather, soil moisture or water levels throughout the irrigation season. The equipment was bought in year one and is utilized to log data through the season to be retrieved periodically so irrigation decisions can be made based on scientific data. Maximum time between data retrieval is weekly.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 160.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,543.60

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$9.65

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449H - Intermediate IWM - Years 2 -5, using soil moisture or water level monitoring

**Scenario:** #25 - Years Two-Five, Interpretation of Data Log

**Scenario Description:**

Intermediate irrigation water management using soil moisture or water level monitoring with data loggers; specifically, multi-depth soil moisture sensors, water well and relift permanent flow meters, twice-daily water stage imaging water level devices, and quarter hour climate data element recording weather stations at approved IWM plan locations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the CPS 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,887.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$47.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449I - Sprinkler Irrigation Equipment Retrofit

**Scenario:** #25 - Year One, Retrofit Equipment with Speed Control

**Scenario Description:**

This activity involves installing speed control equipment to a sprinkler irrigated field for irrigation water management. The installation of the equipment is in year one. It is applicable to sprinkler irrigation systems that do not already have the functionality and are able to integrate the speed control technology.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 - Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,080.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,080.20

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E449J - Intermediate IWM – 20% Reducing Water Usage

**Scenario:** #9 - Irrigation Water Management, 20 Percent Reduction

**Scenario Description:**

Intermediate irrigation water management involves monitoring soil moisture or water levels within an irrigated field by utilizing technological equipment to gather field specific data concerning weather, soil moisture or water levels throughout the irrigation season. The equipment will be utilized to log data through the season to be retrieved periodically so irrigation decisions can be made based on scientific data. Maximum time between data retrieval is weekly. Monitoring will be for the entire irrigation season and data gathered will be used to make sound decisions on irrigation water use. Supplemental Water usage will be reduced by 20% from previous years use and remain at that level for the remainder of the contract.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 449 – Irrigation Water Management.

**Feature Measure:** Irrigated Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 125.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,378.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$43.02

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E472A - Manage livestock access to waterbodies to reduce nutrients or pathogens to surface water

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Livestock Access

**Scenario Description:**

Installation of structures and implementation of grazing management actions that restrict livestock access to streams, ditches, and other waterbodies in order to reduce nutrient loading or reduce the introduction of pathogens from manure, bio-solids or compost to surface waters.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 472 - Access Control

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 472 - Access Control

**Feature Measure:** (Stream length protected \*)

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,320.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,210.33

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E484A - Mulching to improve soil health

**Scenario:** #1 - Improve Soil Health

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a crop rotation which utilizes mulch and addresses all four principle components of soil health: increases diversity of the cropping system; maintains residue throughout the year; keeps a living root; and minimizes soil chemical, physical and biological disturbance. Plant-based mulching materials will be applied at least once during the rotation. The rotation will include at least 4 different crops and/or cover crops grown in a sequence that will produce a positive trend in the Organic Matter (OM) subfactor value over the life of the rotation, as determined by the Soil Conditioning Index (SCI). The current NRCS wind and water erosion prediction technologies must be used to document the rotation and SCI calculations.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 484 - Mulching

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 484 - Mulching

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$261.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E484B - Reduce particulate matter emissions by using orchard or vineyard generated woody materials as mulch

**Scenario:** #1 - Woody Mulch, Orchard and Vineyard

**Scenario Description:**

Reduce particulate matter emissions by using orchard or vineyard generated woody materials as mulch. At least 90% of all woody materials are to be used as mulch on the operation. An exception may be made when it is determined that infected material must be burned to preserve crop health.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 484 – Mulching

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 484 - Mulching

**Feature Measure:** Actual Acres of Crop produc

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$747.25 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E484C - Mulching with natural materials in specialty crops for weed control

**Scenario:** #9 - Specialty Crop

**Scenario Description:**

Application of straw mulch or other state approved natural material (such as wood chips, compost, green chop, dry hay or sawdust) for weed control in specialty crops.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 484 - Mulching

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 484 - Mulching

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$660.45

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66.04

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E484D - Lowbush Blueberry Field Mulching for Moisture Management

**Scenario:** #9 - Woody Mulch, Field

**Scenario Description:**

Full-field application of state-approved natural material such as wood chips for moisture retention to enhance resilience in low bush blueberries (aka wild blueberries).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of CPS 484 Mulching. 484 Mulching is typically used to fill bare spots on wild blueberry fields, which encourages "blueberry sod" to migrate into de-vegetated areas, stabilizing the soil. Blueberry field (barre

**After Situation:**

Wood chips are applied to a depth of 2 inches field-wide using typical dry manure spreading equipment. Wood chips hold precipitation in the root zone, preventing moisture loss in excessively-drained soils, and add organic matter into the system, improving soil quality over time.

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$150,264.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$15,026.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E511A - Harvest of crops (hay or small grains) using measures that allow desired species to flush or escape

**Scenario:** #1 - Wildlife Friendly Harvest

**Scenario Description:**

Harvest of crops (hay or small grains) using conservation measures that allow desired species to flush or escape. (For species list see State Wildlife Action Plan) Conservation measures include timing of harvest, idling land during the nesting or fawning period, and applying harvest techniques that reduce mortality to wildlife.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 511 - Forage Harvest Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 511 - Forage Harvest Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$229.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E511B - Forage harvest management that helps maintain wildlife habitat cover, shelter or continuity

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Harvest for Wildlife Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

The timely cutting and removal of forages from the field as hay, green-chop, or ensilage in such a way, and in time frames, to optimize both forage yield/quality and wildlife cover and shelter and/or continuity between otherwise disconnected habitats.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 511 - Forage Harvest Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 511 - Forage Harvest Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$605.36 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$6.05

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E511C - Forage testing for improved harvesting methods and hay quality

**Scenario:** #9 - Manage Harvest for Forage Quality

**Scenario Description:**

This enhancement results in participants obtaining hay samples and submitting them to a land grant university or other accredited lab for quality analysis. The participant will record data for multiple harvests and use the data to make future decisions. The participant will discuss the results with NRCS or with their cooperative extensions service. Technical recommendations are made to the participant based upon the test results.

**Before Situation:**

The participant has hay that doesn't have quality analysis or doesn't know the quality of previous hay harvests. The hay will be fed when needed.

**After Situation:**

The participant has hay with hay quality analysis. The participant records data based upon the results to reference and make future decisions. The participant has a better understanding on the quality of hay so that adjustments in feeding or supplementation can be made.

**Feature Measure:** Each

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$303.28

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$151.64

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E511D - Forage Harvest Management to Improve Terrestrial Habitat for Wildlife during Over-Winter Periods

**Scenario:** #9 - Delay or Forgo Harvest

**Scenario Description:**

Eliminate or forgo the last fall cutting of hay or haylage to optimize wildlife cover and shelter during critical over-winter periods and lengthen late season bloom period for invertebrates. Allowing late season stand maturity increases stand life and reduces risks of frost and winter damage while providing valuable wildlife habitat and an extended bloom periods.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 511-Forage Harvest Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in CPS - 511

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,164.56 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$29.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E512B - Forage and biomass planting to reduce soil erosion or increase organic matter to build soil health

**Scenario:** #1 - Build Soil Health

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of herbaceous species suitable for pasture, hay, or biomass production that can provide for reduced soil erosion, improving soil health.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,242.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$162.11

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E512D - Forage plantings that help increase organic matter in depleted soils

**Scenario:** #1 - Increase Organic Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of herbaceous species suitable for pasture, hay, or biomass production that can help improve soil quality of depleted sites through increase or conservation of the organic matter in the soil.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,709.74 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$85.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E512I - Establish pollinator and/or beneficial insect and/or monarch habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Improve Habitat for Wildlife, Pollinators, Beneficial Insects and Monarchs

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of herbaceous species that can provide nectar for Monarch butterflies and/or pollinators and forage and other habitat values for wildlife and livestock, particularly at times when targeted nectar, forage supply and quality, cover, and shelter are not available in other pastures.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,568.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$178.44

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E512J - Establish wildlife corridors to provide habitat continuity or access to water

**Scenario:** #1 - Wildlife Corridors

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of perennial, herbaceous species that can provide cover needed for wildlife species of concern to move from food/cover/water sources to other food/cover/water sources as needed for their life cycles, and/or to enhance the utility of underused wildlife habitat areas.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 - Pasture and Hay Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,273.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$113.68

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E512L - Diversifying Forage Base with Interseeding Forbs and Legumes to Increase Pasture Quality

**Scenario:** #9 - Interseed Forbs and Legumes

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of perennial, herbaceous species that increases the diversity to enhance livestock, forage supply and quality, not available in other pastures

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 Pasture and Hay Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 Pasture and Hay Planting

**Feature Measure:** acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,213.75

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$110.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E512M - Forage Plantings that Improve Wildlife Habitat Cover and Shelter or Structure and Composition

**Scenario:** #9 - Manage Wildlife Habitat Cover

**Scenario Description:**

Establishing native adapted and/or compatible species, varieties, or cultivars of herbaceous species for pasture, hay, or biomass production that provide cover and shelter or structure and composition for wildlife.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 Pasture and Hay Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 512 Pasture and Hay Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,999.80

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$399.99

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528A - Maintaining quantity and quality of forage for animal health and productivity

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Grazing

**Scenario Description:**

Managing the harvest of vegetation with grazing and/or browsing animals for the purposes of maintaining desired pasture composition/plant vigor and improving/maintaining quantity and quality of forage for the animals' health and productivity following the recommendations of a qualifying professional, as detailed in the documentation and implementation requirements.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,516.36

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528B - Grazing management that improves monarch butterfly habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Improve Monarch Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Implement a grazing management plan that will increase the abundance and diversity of monarch nectar-producing perennial forbs, including milkweed, while maintaining ecosystem benefits for other wildlife and livestock.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,074.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.74

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528C - Incorporating wildlife refuge areas in contingency plans for wildlife.

**Scenario:** #1 - Contingency Plans, Wildlife Refuge

**Scenario Description:**

A prescribed grazing plan that includes 12 month (or longer) rest (non-grazing period equal or greater than one year) of a grazing unit that consists of native grasses and/or legumes and/or perennial forbs for the purpose of meeting the needs for drought/disaster contingency plans that will also provide wildlife habitat or wildlife access to water for a period of time.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,880.31

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.80

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528D - Grazing management for improving quantity and quality of food or cover and shelter for wildlife

**Scenario:** #1 - Improve Wildlife Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed will provide the plant structure, density and diversity needed for improving the quantity and quality of cover, shelter and food for the desired wildlife species of concern.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$591.13

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$0.59

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E528E - Improved grazing management for enhanced plant structure and composition for wildlife

**Scenario:** #1 - Improve Structure and Composition for Wildlife Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Managing the harvest of vegetation with grazing and/or browsing animals for the purpose of improving the quantity and quality of the structure and composition of the plant community that is available for wildlife.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$382.09

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$3.82

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528F - Stockpiling cool season forage to improve structure and composition or plant productivity and health

**Scenario:** #1 - Stockpile Forage

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed to stop grazing events of selected paddock(s) to allow pasture forages to grow to maximum vegetative biomass accumulation before the end of the growing season.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,006.96

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$30.07

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528G - Improved grazing management on pasture for plant productivity and health with monitoring activities

**Scenario:** #1 - Monitor Pastureland Health

**Scenario Description:**

Managing the harvest of vegetation with grazing and/or browsing animals as adjusted when following recommendations of a qualifying professional, as detailed in the enhancement criteria, generated through pasture condition scoring (PCS).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,218.70

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528H - Prescribed grazing to improve/maintain riparian and watershed function-elevated water temperature

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Management, Water Temperature

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed will provide cover and density needed in the watershed in order to reduce runoff, improve infiltration, provide for above ground water filtration and sustain applicable fish and wildlife species habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,862.84 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.86

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528I - Grazing management that protects sensitive areas -surface or ground water from nutrients

**Scenario:** #1 - Protect Sensitive Areas

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed will provide cover and density needed in the watershed in order to protect sensitive areas such as sinkholes, streams, highly erodible areas, or locations with plants that cannot tolerate defoliation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,077.64 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.08

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528J - Prescribed grazing on pastureland that improves riparian and watershed function

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Management

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed will provide cover and density needed in the watershed in order to reduce runoff, improve infiltration, provide for above ground water filtration and sustain applicable fish and wildlife species habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,768.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528L - Prescribed grazing that improves or maintains riparian and watershed function-erosion

**Scenario:** #1 - Riparian Management, Erosion

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed will provide cover and density needed in the watershed in order to reduce runoff, improve infiltration, provide for above ground water filtration and sustain applicable fish and wildlife species habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,151.68

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528M - Grazing management that protects sensitive areas from gully erosion

**Scenario:** #1 - Gully Erosion Treatment

**Scenario Description:**

Grazing management employed will provide vegetative cover and density needed in the watershed in order to protect sensitive areas such as sinkholes, streams, highly erodible areas, or locations that cannot tolerate plant defoliation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,882.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.88

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E528N - Improved grazing management through monitoring activities

**Scenario:** #1 - Monitor Rangeland Health

**Scenario Description:**

Three predominant key grazing areas are evaluated utilizing the Rangeland Health Assessment (where reference material is developed) or Describing Indicators of Rangeland Health protocols (where reference material is not developed) to determine how well the ecological processes of the site(s) are functioning. Utilizing knowledge learned from this as a part of the ranch resource assessment, a qualifying professional, as detailed in the enhancement criteria, will provide recommendations or follow-up evaluations toward mitigating some of the degradation risks that are initially identified.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1,000.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,336.84

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.34

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528O - Clipping mature forages to set back vegetative growth for improved forage quality

**Scenario:** #9 - Clipping, Mature Forages

**Scenario Description:**

Timely clipping of mature forages through mowing, swathing or some other mechanical cutting will occur to increase forage palatability by setting plants back to a vegetative state for improved grazing management and forage quality.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 80.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,432.54 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$55.41

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528P - Implementing Bale or Swath Grazing to increase organic matter and reduce nutrients in surface water

**Scenario:** #9 - Bale or Swath Grazing

**Scenario Description:**

Bale or swath grazing to improve organic matter, aggregate stability or soil organism habitat or to reduce nutrient risks to surface water by leaving field harvested forages on site or supplementing with off-field forages. Grazing forages in this manner, will help reduce nutrient concentrations from confined animal lots while incorporating organic matter, feeding and diversifying the microbiome, building better soil aggregation and increasing soil health.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,102.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$205.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528Q - Use of body condition scoring for livestock on a monthly basis to keep track of herd health

**Scenario:** #9 - Body Condition Scoring

**Scenario Description:**

Body condition scoring (BCS) serves as a useful management tool to monitor livestock performance with respect to current and recent feeding or grazing programs. Body condition scoring is a numeric scoring system, producers can use to consistently evaluate animals' estimated body energy reserves through degree of fatness. This information can be used to adjust nutritional strategies to reach optimal BCS. Since body condition is closely associated with reproductive performance as well as feed efficiency, monitoring body condition can help producers reach production goals and increase the operation's bottom line. Knowledge and understanding of BCS will assist producers to adjust a supplemental feeding program to maintain animal health and nutrition on a-monthly-basis.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$272.56

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2.73

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528R - Management Intensive Rotational Grazing

**Scenario:** #9 - Management Intensive Rotational Grazing

**Scenario Description:**

Management intensive, multi-paddock grazing system where livestock are regularly and systematically moved to fresh forage to optimize quantity and quality of forage growth, improve manure distribution, improve wildlife cover, and improve soil health.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,428.98

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$44.29

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528S - Soil Health Improvements on Pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Improve Pasture Condition

**Scenario Description:**

Use of soil health assessment to evaluate impact of current grazing system in addressing soil organic matter depletion, soil aggregate instability and soil organism habitat loss or degradation (primary assessment made in Year 1). Modifications to the grazing system will be made after the laboratory analysis. Modifications can be improvements to the grazing plan or changes to the forage composition. During year 4, a follow-up assessment will be completed to allow time for the modifications to show improvements to the soil health resource concerns. The follow-up sample will be taken in the same soil type, closely matched to time of year and with similar amounts of regrowth since previous grazing.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (PCS) 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,261.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$12.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E528T - Grazing to Reduce Wildfire Risk on Forests

**Scenario:** #9 - Reduce Wildfire Risks, Western Forests

**Scenario Description:**

Managing the harvest of vegetation with grazing and/or browsing animals for the purpose of balancing forage with maintaining/improving ecological site condition and while reducing the risk of wildfire hazard on forested ecological sites.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level with the addition of CPS 528 - Prescribed Grazing

**Feature Measure:** acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$127.18 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E533A - Advanced Pumping Plant Automation

**Scenario:** #9 - Automation

**Scenario Description:**

This enhancement consists of installing a control device to a pump station that allows the user to remotely monitor and operate the pump station based on field measured data. Pumping stations may have either a combustible or electric power unit that are compatible with the control device or sensor. These devices/sensors collect field-measured data and provide this data in real time to the landowner to make irrigation decisions and adjustments to the pump operation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 533 - Pumping Plant.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 533 - Pumping Plant.

**Feature Measure:** Number

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,418.53

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,418.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E533B - Complete pumping plant evaluation for energy savings

**Scenario:** #1 - Pumping Plant Evaluation, Energy

**Scenario Description:**

The performance of pump tests and evaluations of all pumping plants to determine the potential to rehabilitate/replace/reconfigure pump performance to reduce energy use. Evaluate to determine if a Variable Frequency Drive motor controller(s) will reduce energy use and is feasible. Develop and provide a written report with list of adjustments and calculations of the reduction of energy use based on before and after conditions.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 533 - Pumping Plant

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 533 - Pumping Plant

**Feature Measure:** Each pump evaluated

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,723.18

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$4,723.18

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E533C - Install VFDs on pumping plants

**Scenario:** #8 - Variable Frequency Drive

**Scenario Description:**

Install Variable Frequency Drive(s) (VFD) on Pumping Plant with the correct sensors, on all pumps as indicated in the evaluation.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 533 – Pumping Plant.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard, (CPS) 533 – Pumping Plant.

**Feature Measure:** Each pump modified

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,786.15 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7,786.15

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E533D - Switch fuel source for pumps

**Scenario:** #8 - Replacement of Fuel Source

**Scenario Description:**

Switch the fuel source for pump motor(s) to an on-farm renewable source (wind, solar, geothermal, etc.)

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 533 – Pumping Plant.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in the Conservation Practice Standard, (CPS) 533 – Pumping Plant.

**Feature Measure:** Each pump modified

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,859.81 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17,859.81

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E550A - Range planting for increasing/maintaining organic matter

**Scenario:** #1 - Establish Vegetation to Improve Soil Organic Matter

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of adapted perennial or self-sustaining vegetation such as grasses, forbs, legumes, shrubs and trees for the purpose of increasing or maintaining organic matter levels in the soil.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 550 - Range Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 550 - Range Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,389.76

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$53.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E550B - Range planting for improving forage, browse, or cover for wildlife

**Scenario:** #1 - Plantings for Wildlife

**Scenario Description:**

Establishment of adapted perennial or self-sustaining vegetation such as grasses, forbs, legumes, shrubs and trees for the purpose of improving forage, browse, or cover for wildlife on areas that have been degraded beyond recovery via ecological principles, or old crop fields and pastures devoid of desirable, native rangeland species that fit within an ecological site description steady state.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 550 - Range Planting

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 550 - Range Planting

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,576.66

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$25.77

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E578A - Stream crossing elimination

**Scenario:** #1 - Decommission Stream Crossing

**Scenario Description:**

Existing stream crossings on an operation are consolidated into fewer crossings in order to reduce impacts to stream habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 578 - Stream Crossing

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 578 - Stream Crossing

**Feature Measure:** Typical feature is 0.09 acres

**Scenario Unit:** Each

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$11,302.50 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$11,302.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E580A - Stream corridor bank stability improvement

**Scenario:** #1 - Vegetation for Bank Stability

**Scenario Description:**

Stream corridor bank vegetation components are established to provide additional streambank stability.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 580 - Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 580 - Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,149.66 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,574.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E580B - Stream corridor bank vegetation improvement

**Scenario:** #1 - Vegetation for Wildlife

**Scenario Description:**

Stream corridor bank vegetation components are established to improve ecosystem functioning and stability.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 580 - Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 580 - Streambank and Shoreline Protection

**Feature Measure:** Area planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 2.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$5,149.66 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,574.83

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E590A - Improving nutrient uptake efficiency and reducing risk of nutrient losses

**Scenario:** #1 - Nutrient Uptake Strategies

**Scenario Description:**

Nutrient management encompasses managing the amount, source, placement, and timing of the application of plant nutrients and soil amendments. Nutrients are currently being applied on the farm based on the 4R nutrient stewardship principles. Enhanced nutrient use efficiency strategies or technologies are utilized to improve nutrient use efficiency and reduce risk of nutrient losses to surface and groundwater and reduce risks to air quality by reducing emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 590 - Nutrient Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 590 - Nutrient Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,392.37

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E590B - Reduce risks of nutrient loss to surface water by utilizing precision agriculture technologies

**Scenario:** #1 - Precision Nutrient Application

**Scenario Description:**

Precision application technology and techniques are utilized to plan and apply nutrients to improve nutrient use efficiency and reduce risk of nutrient losses.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 590 - Nutrient Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 590 - Nutrient Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,208.62 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$22.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E590C - Improving nutrient uptake efficiency and reducing risk of nutrient losses on pasture

**Scenario:** #9 - Improve Nutrient Efficiency

**Scenario Description:**

Nutrient management encompasses managing the amount, source, placement, and timing of the application of plant nutrients and soil amendments. Nutrients are currently being applied on the farm based on the 4R nutrient stewardship principles. Enhanced nutrient use efficiency strategies or technologies are utilized to improve nutrient use efficiency and reduce risk of nutrient losses on pasture.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 590 - Nutrient Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 590 - Nutrient Management

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,597.20

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$25.97

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E590D - Reduce nutrient loss by increasing setback awareness via precision technology for water quality

**Scenario:** #9 - Precision Nutrient Application, Setbacks

**Scenario Description:**

Precision technology and techniques are used to increase Soil/Groundwater Setbacks & Associated Application Rate Restrictions (SGS&AARR) implementation during nutrient application by providing precise, real-time location information (geo-located) in the field to the equipment operator. While operating nutrient application equipment, the operator's location is continually updated and displayed on an add-on GPS-enabled device visible to the operator at all times to reduce the risk of nutrient application in setback and/or sensitive areas. Resource concerns addressed are Water Quality, Field sediment, nutrient and pathogen loss: Nutrients transported to groundwater and surface water and Pathogens and chemicals from manure, biosolids or compost applications transported to groundwater and surface water.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 590 - Nutrient Management.

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 590 - Nutrient Management.

**Feature Measure:** Acres with setback for nutri

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 300.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,684.54 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$15.62

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E595A - Reduce risk of pesticides in surface water by utilizing precision pesticide application techniques

**Scenario:** #1 - Precision Pesticide Application

**Scenario Description:**

Utilize precision application techniques to reduce risk of pesticides in surface water by reducing total amount of chemical applied and reducing the potential for delivery of chemicals into water bodies.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 595 - Integrated Pest Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 595 - Integrated Pest Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,369.32

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.69

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E595B - Reduce risk of pesticides in water and air by utilizing IPM PAMS techniques

**Scenario:** #1 - IPM PAMS, Air and Water

**Scenario Description:**

Utilize integrated pest management (IPM) prevent, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) techniques to reduce risk of pesticides in water and air. Reduce the potential for delivery of chemicals into water or ozone precursor emissions .

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 595 - Integrated Pest Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 595 - Integrated Pest Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$792.67

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.93

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E595D - Increase the size requirement of refuges planted to slow pest resistance to Bt crops

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Refuge Size for Pest Resistance

**Scenario Description:**

Bacillus thuringiensis (Bt) plant incorporated protectants are plants that have been genetically altered to produce proteins that are harmful to certain insect pests. Widespread implementation of Bt crops has decreased insecticide use and increased crop yields, but it must be used as part of an integrated pest management (IPM) approach to protect the crop from pest species that are not susceptible to the Bt toxin and to manage pest resistance. Crop rotation, scouting and resistance management strategies, such as planting and creating refuges of non-Bt crops, are essential when farming Bt crops. Insects have developed resistance to Bt proteins. To mitigate the development of further resistance, growers are required to plant refuges of non-transgenic crops. These refuges produce numbers of susceptible insects that will help sustain populations of non-resistant insects. The size of Refuge requirement depends on the environment, pest and strain of the crop. Size of refuge is determined by resistance risk. Most Bt corn requires that 20% of the total Bt crop planted be non-Bt. Cotton can require 50% of the crop be planted to non-Bt. A recent study published in the Journal of Integrated Pest Management revealed, compliance has been a challenge. Nearly 40% of growers surveyed did not plant the required refuge (Reisig 2017). They credit non-compliance, in part, to lack of understanding by small-scale farmers about the need for refuges.

**Before Situation:**

Minimal or no refuges were planted as required for Bt crops.

**After Situation:**

Optimum sized and located refuges are planted for Bt crops.

**Feature Measure:** Ac

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$661.79 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$16.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E595E - Eliminate use of chemical treatments to control pests and to increase the presence of dung beetles

**Scenario:** #1 - Dung Beetles

**Scenario Description:**

Pests and parasites can have a significant impact on the economic viability of livestock operations, by affecting the performance and health of animals. The use of broad-spectrum insecticides, pour-ons and avermectins have been shown to have a detrimental effect on dung beetle populations. Having a healthy population of dung beetles facilitates the recycling of nutrients and promotes soil and grassland health. By eliminating the application of broad-spectrum insecticides, pour-ons, and avermectins, including injectable avermectins, for pest control in and on livestock along with rotational grazing and higher stock densities has shown to increase the dung beetle population. Use of natural or alternative methods of pest control over multiple years is encouraged.

**Before Situation:**

Pests and parasites can have a significant impact on the economic viability of livestock operations, by affecting the performance and health of animals. The use of broad-spectrum insecticides, pour-ons and avermectins have been shown to have a detrimental

**After Situation:**

Having a healthy population of dung beetles facilitates the recycling of nutrients and promotes soil and grassland health. By eliminating the application of broad-spectrum insecticides, pour-ons, and avermectins, including injectable avermectins, for pest

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 500.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,633.56 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$7.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E595F - Improving Soil Organism Habitat on Agricultural Land

**Scenario:** #9 - Reduce Use of Seed Treatments

**Scenario Description:**

To reduce or eliminate the use of seed treatments in corn and soybean cropping systems to promote beneficial organism populations and pest control. Beneficial organisms such as the Carabidae beetle are very important in the population control of common agricultural pests like the grey garden slug. Slugs are a common pest in no-till and heavily cover cropped fields. Slugs are mollusks and can ingest some treatments with no adverse effects. Beneficial organism populations can be negatively impacted when they consume slugs exposed to seed treatments. The reduction or elimination of routine seed treatments in these cash crop systems may increase beneficial insect populations.

**Before Situation:**

Seed treatments are used on crops.

**After Situation:**

Producers effectively reduce or eliminate seed treatment use in their cropping rotations either by eliminating seed treatments on corn-soybean rotations or eliminating seed treatments on corn.

**Feature Measure:** Acres Planted

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$654.39

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$13.09

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E595G - Reduced resistance risk by utilizing PAMS techniques

**Scenario:** #9 - PAMS Management for Resistance

**Scenario Description:**

Design and implementation of an integrated pest management plan that will Utilize integrated pest management (IPM) prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) techniques to reduce pesticide resistance and address plant pest pressure. Increased resistance leads to increased use of more toxic pesticides and increased risk of delivery of chemicals to water or ozone precursor emissions.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 595 – Pest Management Conservation Systems

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level described in Conservation practice Standard (CPS) 595 Pest Management Conservation System.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,724.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$17.24

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E595H - Improved crop management to control wheat stem sawfly

**Scenario:** #9 - Manage Wheat Stem Sawfly

**Scenario Description:**

Crop system management of rotations and other plantings with solid stem wheat varieties and oats reduce populations of wheat stem sawfly. Residue conservation and tall wheat cutting heights improve habitat for beneficial parasitoid wasps.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 328 - Conservation Crop Rotation. WSS pest pressure will decrease. Wheat yields will increase, and residue height will be taller across the landscape, reducing wind erosion.

**Feature Measure:** Acres managed for pest

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 100.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,432.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.32

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E612B - Planting for high carbon sequestration rate

**Scenario:** #10 - Increase Carbon Sequestration

**Scenario Description:**

Plant tree species and use stocking levels for higher growth to increase the rate of carbon sequestration (capture). Use species with a longer life span as well as relatively fast growth, and species suitable for durable manufactured products. Increase stocking levels in forests that are not fully stocked. Implement afforestation on appropriate open lands.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 5.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,254.46

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,850.89

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E612D - Adding food-producing trees and shrubs to existing plantings

**Scenario:** #1 - Food-Producing Trees and Shrubs

**Scenario Description:**

Plant food-producing trees and shrubs for wildlife within windbreaks, alley cropping, multi-story cropping, silvopasture systems, and/or riparian forest buffers.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,554.85

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$255.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E612E - Cultural plantings

**Scenario:** #1 - Cultural Significant, Woody Species

**Scenario Description:**

Plant trees and shrubs that are of cultural significance, such as those species utilized by Tribes in traditional practices, medicinal plants, species used in basket-making, etc. (e.g., paper birch, slippery elm, witch hazel).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,350.06

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,350.06

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E612G - Tree/shrub planting for wildlife food

**Scenario:** #1 - Wildlife Plantings

**Scenario Description:**

Tree or shrub planting to enhance habitat for native wildlife. A minimum of five tree or shrub species will be used; they will be species that provide food and/or cover for identified wildlife species.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 612 - Tree/Shrub Establishment

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,266.92

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$2,266.92

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E643B - Restoration and management of rare or declining habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Create Habitat Refugia

**Scenario Description:**

Provide protection from adverse environmental conditions to create refugia for documented occurrences of sensitive plant communities.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 643 - Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 643 - Restoration and Management of Rare and Declining Habitats

**Feature Measure:** Feet of Fence

**Scenario Unit:** Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 440.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,729.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$10.75

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E643D - Low-tech process-based restoration to enhance floodplain connectivity

**Scenario:** #3 - Low-Tech Process-Based Floodplain Restoration

**Scenario Description:**

This enhancement is intended to kick-start natural ecological, geomorphic and hydrologic processes required for improvement and maintenance of healthy and functioning streams and associated floodplains in situations where planning criteria has already been met but restoration or enhancement is desired to improve floodplain connectivity, riparian condition and move towards Stage 0 stream conditions. Beaver Dam Analogues (BDAs) and/or Post-Assisted Log Structures (PALS) are low-tech structures used to facilitate process-based restoration of rare and declining 'Stage 0' stream conditions by mimicking, promoting, and sustaining the natural processes of beaver dam activity and wood accumulation that lead to more fully connected floodplains. BDAs and PALS are hand-built with a mixture of woody debris and on-site soils and vegetation.

**Before Situation:**

State approved evaluation tool identifies that stream reaches meet planning criteria.

**After Situation:**

Wetted area associated with stream reach has expanded due to increase in floodplain connectivity, improvement of riparian condition and movement towards State 0 stream conditions

**Feature Measure:** Linear feet

**Scenario Unit:** Linear Foot

**Scenario Typical Size:** 400.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$19,213.05

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$48.03

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E644A - Managing Flood-Irrigated Landscapes for Wildlife

**Scenario:** #1 - Manage Flood-Irrigation Water Depth

**Scenario Description:**

Developing and implementing a conservation plan that supports maintenance of flood-irrigation in key landscapes to provide important foraging habitat for local breeding and migratory waterfowl and waterbirds.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 644 – Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 644 – Wetland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,583.62 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$31.67

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E645A - Reduction of attractants to human-subsidized predators in sensitive wildlife species habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Reduce Non-Target Wildlife Attractants

**Scenario Description:**

Reduction of artificial perching sites, nest sites, food, and water available to subsidized predators in areas where human-subsidized predators are a threat to sensitive wildlife species. Human-subsidized predators may include ravens, crows, magpies, coyotes, foxes, skunks, raccoons, and other species. Activities under this enhancement may include removal of non- native or invasive trees; removal of unused power poles, corrals, windmills, buildings, and other vertical structures; and/or removal or management of watering facilities, dead livestock, road kill, garbage, animal feed, dumps, and other non-natural food sources.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Number

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,528.79

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$63.22

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E645B - Manage existing shrub thickets to provide adequate shelter for wildlife

**Scenario:** #9 - Management of Shrub Thickets

**Scenario Description:**

Existing shrub thickets provide an instant and important cover for wildlife. Various wildlife species may use shrubs as winter/thermal cover, summer shade, roosting, or as escape cover from predators. Proper management ensures that these shrubs will continue to provide the desired benefits for the local wildlife. A combination of herbicide treatments, cutting and trimming branches, and removal of other competing vegetation will occur. An eligible existing shrub thicket needs to have a canopy cover of 750 square feet, with an end goal of expanding to 1500 square feet. Any existing shrub thicket (not hand planted within the last 5 years) are eligible for this enhancement. Shrub thickets found within fence rows may now be very wide, but still meet the 750 square feet, are eligible.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$476.52 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$476.52

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E645C - Edge feathering for wildlife cover

**Scenario:** #9 - Edge Feathering

**Scenario Description:**

Selected trees are cut and brush clipped along the border between a wooded area and a grassland, cropland, or idle land, creating a dense woody cover of interlocking branches at ground level. The feathered edge will be an average of 30 feet wide and a minimum of 50 feet long, resulting in an area of 1500 square feet. The width of the strip will vary to follow topographic features and to create a wavy border; the design will also consider aesthetics. Vegetative composition and cover will vary within the edge, ranging from areas with no trees and shrubs to areas with scattered trees and extensive shrub cover. The variation in vegetation structure along with variable width of the edge will create feathering. The edge may include shrub plantings for wildlife food and aesthetics.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard 645 - Upland Wildlife Habitat Management

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,101.72

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1,101.72

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E645D - Wildlife Habitat Management Plan for Upland Landscapes

**Scenario:** #13 - Upland Landscapes

**Scenario Description:**

Develop and implement a wildlife habitat management plan that removes or significantly reduces the impact of existing land management activities occurring within agricultural landscapes (on any land use) causing chronic disturbance to wildlife during breeding, rearing, migration and over- wintering periods. Site monitoring may be necessary to identify and document sources of disturbance to wildlife. Examples of adjustments to existing management activities that can reduce disturbance to a tolerable level include: use of integrated pest management; capping of open vertical pipes; provision of wildlife-friendly water access and egress; and reduction of noise or movement within key migratory, nesting, rearing, loafing or hiding locations.

**Before Situation:**

The inadequate terrestrial wildlife habitat concern has been addressed under Conservation Practice Standard 645 and minimum planning criteria for the terrestrial wildlife habitat resource concern has been met. However, disturbance related impacts tied to

**After Situation:**

Land management activities occurring within the agricultural landscape (on any land use) have been adjusted to avoid causing chronic disturbance to wildlife during breeding, rearing, migration and over- wintering periods has been addressed. Planning criteria for the terrestrial wildlife habitat resource concern exceeds minimum planning criteria.

**Feature Measure:** Acres of Improved Habitat

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 40.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$596.17

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$14.90

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E646A - Close structures to capture and retain rainfall for waterfowl and wading bird winter habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Rainfall Retention for Wildlife Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

When flooded to shallow depths during fall and winter, agricultural fields provide ideal foraging habitat for myriad species of waterfowl and wading birds . In addition, flooded conditions promote establishment of aquatic invertebrate populations, thus providing protein-rich food sources for shorebirds as well as waterfowl and wading birds.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,676.55

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$33.53

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E646B - Extend retention of captured rainfall for migratory waterfowl and wading bird late winter habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Rainfall Retention for Wildlife Habitat, Expansion

**Scenario Description:**

When flooded to shallow depths during fall and winter, agricultural fields provide ideal foraging habitat for myriad species of waterfowl and wading birds. Harvested and idled agricultural lands, notably those occurring within rice rotations, contain high densities of residual (i.e., waste) grain and natural seeds following harvest. In addition, flooded conditions promote establishment of aquatic invertebrate populations, thus providing protein-rich food sources for shorebirds as well as waterfowl and wading birds. Benefits may become greatest during late winter and early spring as birds are assimilating nutrient and fat reserves in preparation for northward migration. However, agricultural fields flooded during fall-winter are typically drained during late January or February in advance of spring planting. This often results in a rapid reduction in available habitat, and may constrain ability of migratory birds to adequately prepare for migration, with greatest impacts likely occurring during years of low winter precipitation. Retention of water on agricultural lands into early spring will produce maximum benefits to migratory waterfowl and shorebirds by providing high quality habitat during a time when habitat may otherwise be in low abundance.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1,989.07 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$39.78

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E646C - Manipulate vegetation and maintain closed structures for shorebirds mid-summer habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Shorebirds Habitat, Mid-Summer

**Scenario Description:**

Suitable shorebird habitat is limited during the summer and fall as birds migrate south post-breeding and providing shallow water and mud flat habitat will benefit a variety of shorebird species. Optimal conditions are created when water levels are slowly reduced through evaporation, which allows for propagation of invertebrates (typically insect larvae) used as food by shorebirds. Manipulation of vegetation, preferably through rolling, creates open conditions required by this suite of birds as a means to detect and avoid predators, and provides nutrient inputs for invertebrate production.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,673.60

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$73.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E646D - Manipulate vegetation and maintain closed structures for shorebird late summer habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Shorebirds Habitat, Late-Summer

**Scenario Description:**

Suitable shorebird habitat is limited during the summer and fall as birds migrate south post-breeding. Providing shallow water and mud flat habitat will benefit a variety of shorebird species. Optimal conditions are created when water levels are slowly reduced through evaporation, which allows for propagation of invertebrates (typically insect larvae) used as food by shorebirds. Manipulation of vegetation, preferably through rolling, creates open conditions required by this suite of birds as a means to detect and avoid predators, and provides nutrient inputs for invertebrate production.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 646 - Shallow Water Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,023.29

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$80.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E647A - Manipulate vegetation on fields with captured rainfall for waterfowl & wading bird winter habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Waterfowl and Wading Bird Habitat, Winter

**Scenario Description:**

Harvested and idled agricultural lands, notably those occurring within rice rotations, contain high densities of residual (i.e., waste) grain and natural seeds following harvest. Seed densities in harvested rice fields may rival those documented in intensively managed moist-soil units, especially in the Gulf Coast and Central Valley of California. When flooded to shallow depths during fall and winter, these agricultural fields provide ideal foraging habitat for myriad species of waterfowl and wading birds. In addition, flooded conditions promote establishment of aquatic invertebrate populations, thus providing protein-rich food sources for shorebirds as well as waterfowl and wading birds. In many cases, light manipulation of dense vegetation is needed to improve the accessibility of food resources to waterfowl, wading birds, and shorebirds.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,663.50 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$53.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E647B - Provide early successional shorebird habitat between first crop and ratoon crop

**Scenario:** #1 - Shorebirds Habitat, First and Ratoon Crop

**Scenario Description:**

Many declining suites of wildlife species rely on early successional habitats for at least part of their life cycle needs. Migratory shorebird species in particular rely on open, moist soil or shallowly flooded conditions for foraging and security. Rice farms support many migratory and resident water bird species. The first rice crop harvest often coincides with the arrival of early migrating shorebirds. This time of year is also the highest rainfall months. If standing rice stubble from the first crop is rolled to push above-ground stalks level with the soil surface, the first component of this type of habitat is met. When moisture is added to this situation, short-term habitat is available until the ratoon crop initiates growth to a height beyond that which would provide benefit to the early successional species.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,663.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$53.27

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E647C - Maintain most soil vegetation on cropland edges to enhance waterfowl and shorebird habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Cropland Edges

**Scenario Description:**

The wetter or more water saturated portions of cropland fields such as areas adjacent to field drains, have the potential to produce a significant amount of moist soil plants which are a tremendously valuable source of forage and cover for many waterfowl, shorebird and wading bird species, especially during a period of time when such plants may be limited. Under normal cropland production, the native vegetation is restricted on these sites through mechanical and/or chemical control. These maintained moist soil plants also will provide filtering and improve water quality.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$922.47

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E647D - Establish and maintain early successional habitat in ditches and bank borders

**Scenario:** #1 - Vegetation Establishment, Ditches and Banks

**Scenario Description:**

This enhancement is to encourage the establishment of early successional, naturally occurring vegetation in ditches, side slope and bank borders to provide cover, critical nesting and brood rearing habitat as well as filtering overland flow and improving water quality. Ditches perform the critical function of removing water from agricultural lands. Allowing naturally occurring vegetation to develop along ditches, including side slopes, banks and borders, will help provide food and cover for wildlife while enhancing aquatic habitat and improving water quality. Ditches and ditch borders provide a foundation that supports a diverse wildlife community including Northern Bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*) and other birds preferring early successional cover. Rabbits, furbearers, amphibians and many other species that inhabit agriculture areas will use this vegetative cover. These areas can also provide critical nesting habitat for the Mottled Duck (*Anas fulvigula*).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 647 - Early Successional Habitat Development and Management

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$922.47

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$18.45

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666A - Maintaining and improving forest soil quality

**Scenario:** #1 - Forest Management

**Scenario Description:**

Adopts guidelines for maintaining and improving soil quality on sites where forest management activities are practiced. These guidelines will increase soil organic matter content, improve nutrient cycling, and increase infiltration and retention of precipitation. Avoiding soil compaction will allow for greater root development and tree growth, limit windthrow, and reduce drought stress. Increasing carbon storage on site will maintain the soil microbial community and provide wildlife benefits.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 50.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,677.12

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$53.54

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666D - Forest management to enhance understory vegetation

**Scenario:** #1 - Understory Enhancement

**Scenario Description:**

This enhancement provides for management of the understory vegetation in a forested area by mechanical, chemical, and/or manual methods to improve the plant species mix and the health of the residual vegetation. Managing the understory vegetation increases available water to the plants, minimizes runoff and erosion, and improves water quality. An adequately stocked forest provides inputs of leaves, needles, and woody twigs and stems to the forest floor, adding to soil organic matter and contributing to forest soil health. Desirable tree species and understory vegetation, with spacing that allows ground cover to develop, will allow moisture to infiltrate and be stored in the soil, releasing moisture over longer periods of time.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,619.63 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$330.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E666E - Reduce height of the forest understory to limit wildfire risk

**Scenario:** #1 - Woody Understory Reduction

**Scenario Description:**

Forest stand improvement that manages forest structure to reduce the risk of wildfire, and creates conditions that facilitate prescribed burning. The fire risk reduction is accomplished by reducing the height of the woody understory and midstory, creating space between the ground cover and the tree canopy. This enhancement provides for management of the understory vegetation in a forested area, using mechanical, chemical or manual methods to improve the plant species mix and the health of the residual vegetation, and reduce the risk of wildfire. In appropriate stands, the treatment creates conditions that favor prescribed burning. Forest stand improvement (FSI) activities are used to remove trees of undesirable species, form, quality, condition, or growth rate. The quantity and quality of forest for wildlife and/or timber production will be increased by manipulating stand density and structure. These treatments can also reduce wildfire hazards, improve forest health, restore natural plant communities, and achieve or maintain a desired native understory plant community for soil health, wildlife, grazing, and/or browsing.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,619.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$330.98

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666F - Reduce forest stand density to create open stand structure

**Scenario:** #1 - Open Structures

**Scenario Description:**

Reducing forest stand density creates open forest conditions with a low basal area which promotes the health and vigor of the residual trees. The open stand structure allows a significant amount of sunlight to reach the forest floor and stimulates the growth of understory vegetation. Understory vegetation management, along with the wide spacing between trees or clumps of trees, provides visual appeal, lowers the risk of wildfire, and provides habitat for many at-risk and listed wildlife species. The enhancement creates conditions that facilitate a follow-up treatment with prescribed burning.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 20.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$7,622.51 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$381.13

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666G - Reduce forest density and manage understory along roads to limit wildfire risk and improve habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Management of Understory

**Scenario Description:**

Opening the tree canopy along roads ("daylighting"), and providing space between ground vegetation and tree crowns minimizes the spread of wildfires that often start along roads, and improves wildlife habitat and food sources for many species. Some trees near a forest road are removed through harvesting, cutting, mulching, or another option available at the site, with the objective of creating a partially open forest canopy bordering the road. A semi-open canopy allows more sunlight to reach the forest floor to promote herbaceous understory plants, and reduces maintenance needs by allowing moisture to evaporate from roads. The reduced canopy and herbaceous understory limit woodland fuel buildup and reduce fire intensity.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$3,771.95 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$377.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666H - Increase on-site carbon storage

**Scenario:** #1 - Carbon Storage, Onsite

**Scenario Description:**

Use forest management techniques to maintain and increase on-site carbon storage. These include, but are not limited to, applying uneven-aged management, using longer rotations, retaining cavity/den trees, snags, and down woody debris, and protecting or increasing soil organic material.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$9,756.63

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$975.66

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666I - Crop tree management for mast production

**Scenario:** #1 - Mast Production

**Scenario Description:**

Forest stand improvement using crop tree management techniques to increase mast production

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$4,621.89

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$462.19

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666J - Facilitating oak forest regeneration

**Scenario:** #1 - Oak Revitalization

**Scenario Description:**

Facilitate oak regeneration following a forest stand improvement treatment for natural oak regeneration (i.e., a regeneration cut). After a regeneration cut, oaks in the seedling and sapling stages are often out-competed by invasive brush and undesirable tree and shrub species. This enhancement will release seedling and sapling oaks from competing invasive plants and other undesirable species, and thin stump sprouts. A forester will monitor site conditions, treat competition, protect seedlings, and recommend additional follow-up treatments as needed. The enhancement protects investments in oak regeneration by providing for follow-up activities that require the expertise of a professional forester.

**Before Situation:**

Naturally regenerated oak seedlings and/or saplings are threatened by competition from undesirable vegetation.

**After Situation:**

Oaks in the forest stand are free from competition and have adequate space and light to allow them to grow into the forest canopy.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$17,337.14 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$693.49

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666K - Creating structural diversity with patch openings

**Scenario:** #1 - Patch Openings

**Scenario Description:**

Forest stand improvement that creates patch openings. Size, shape, and arrangement of patches will be based on natural features, and emulate patches that would result from natural disturbance regimes of wind or fire, varying geographically and by forest type, and by tree species desired from natural regeneration. The treatment will create diversity in stand composition and structure, increase pest resistance, and enhance wildlife food availability. Openings may provide regeneration sites and restore natural plant communities, and achieve or maintain a desired understory plant community for wildlife habitat.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 15.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$10,327.02

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$688.47

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666L - Forest Stand Improvement to rehabilitate degraded hardwood stands

**Scenario:** #1 - Rehabilitate Degraded Hardwood Stands

**Scenario Description:**

Hardwood forestland has been subject to poor logging practices (“high-grading”) for decades. Without professional forestry assistance the best species and individual trees are removed, often before maturity (“diameter-limit cutting”), leaving the poorest species and individual trees to regenerate the stand. Reversing this process requires cutting or killing poor quality trees while retaining any desirable species that might still be present. A combination of 3 silvicultural methods are applied: crop tree release, group selection (all trees removed from an area 0.25 to 1.0 acre in size) and small clear-cuts (all trees removed from an area 1-3 acres in size).

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acres treated

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,612.58 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$661.26

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.



**Practice:** E666O - Snags, den trees, and coarse woody debris for wildlife habitat

**Scenario:** #1 - Dead or Decaying Trees for Habitat

**Scenario Description:**

Improve wildlife habitat through creation and retention of snags, den trees, forest stand structural diversity, and coarse woody debris on the forest floor, to provide cover/shelter for native wildlife species.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$660.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$66.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666P - Summer roosting habitat for native forest-dwelling bat species

**Scenario:** #1 - Roosting Habitat for Bat Species

**Scenario Description:**

Create new potential roost trees within upland and riparian forests to achieve desired summer habitat for forest-dwelling bat species.

**Before Situation:**

Resources are protected at the minimum level of the Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**After Situation:**

The adoption of this enhancement will provide resource protection above the minimum level as described in Conservation Practice Standard (CPS) 666 - Forest Stand Improvement

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 10.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$2,645.99 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$264.60

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** E666R - Forest songbird habitat preservation

**Scenario:** #1 - Habitat Management, Songbird

**Scenario Description:**

Adopts guidelines and methods developed by the Forest Bird Initiative of the Vermont Audubon Society, to preserve habitat features following a forest stand improvement treatment designed to create habitat for a suite of forest-dwelling neotropical migratory songbirds. It includes developing or updating a forest management plan, inspecting and tending forest habitat, and monitoring bird populations. It protects investments in habitat creation by providing for follow-up activities that require the expertise of a professional forester or biologist. This enhancement is appropriate for states in the Atlantic Flyway and the Upper Midwest.

**Before Situation:**

The bird habitat of a forest stand is threatened by undesirable vegetation, including noxious and invasive plants, and tree regeneration of species not favorable to birds. Harmful insects and tree diseases may also be present, and storms may have damaged

**After Situation:**

The forest stand has retained its habitat features and is utilized by a diversity of neotropical migratory songbirds.

**Feature Measure:** Acres

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 25.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$6,134.14 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$245.37

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** RFRN - FA Rental Payment based on NRCS Defined Model

**Scenario:** #7 - Rental Payment, Irrigated Cropland

**Scenario Description:**

FA payment earned for rental activity to provide conservation benefit based on NRCS defined tasks or templates.

**Before Situation:**

Eligible Lands with Project Resource Concerns

**After Situation:**

Eligible Lands where Project Resource Concerns are managed via Rental Contract

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$164.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$164.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** RFRN - FA Rental Payment based on NRCS Defined Model

**Scenario:** #8 - Rental Payment, Non-irrigated Cropland

**Scenario Description:**

FA payment earned for rental activity to provide conservation benefit based on NRCS defined tasks or templates.

**Before Situation:**

Eligible Lands with Project Resource Concerns

**After Situation:**

Eligible Lands where Project Resourced Concerns are managed via Rental Contract

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$65.00

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$65.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** RFRN - FA Rental Payment based on NRCS Defined Model

**Scenario:** #9 - Rental Payment, Pastureland

**Scenario Description:**

FA payment earned for rental activity to provide conservation benefit based on NRCS defined tasks or templates.

**Before Situation:**

Eligible Lands with Project Resource Concerns

**After Situation:**

Eligible Lands where Project Resource Concerns are managed via Rental Contract

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$22.50

*Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$22.50

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.

**Practice:** RFRP - FA Rental Payment based on Negotiated Project Specific Model

**Scenario:** #3 - Rental Payment, Negotiated Project

**Scenario Description:**

FA payment earned for agreed to rental activity to provide conservation benefits based on project specific negotiated rental activities.

**Before Situation:**

Eligible Lands with Project Resource Concerns

**After Situation:**

Eligible Lands where Project Resource Concerns are managed via Rental Contract

**Feature Measure:** Acre

**Scenario Unit:** Acre

**Scenario Typical Size:** 1.0

**Scenario Total Cost:** \$1.00 *Based on Kansas average costs. Individual county costs may vary.*

**Total Cost per Unit:** \$1.00

**Disclaimer:** Do not use this information for practice implementation. Use the site-specific Design or Implementation Requirements.