

Pasture

Soil Erosion

Sheet and Rill Erosion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10%.
Assessment level: The water erosion rate is <= T.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Plant cover controls active erosion (shallow <1 foot deep rills/gullies) and runoff from normal rain events. No litter dams or terracettes are present.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.

Yes No

Wind Erosion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10%.
Assessment level: The wind erosion rate is <= T.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

All areas expected to have high erosion rates are stable.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Classic Gully Erosion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Classic gullies are not present. Assessment level: Classic gully management is adequate to stop the progression of head cutting and widening and are offsite impacts are minimized by vegetation and/or structures.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Plant cover controls active erosion (gullies <1 foot deep).

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Streambank, Shoreline, Water Conveyance Channels

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Streams, shoreline or channels are not adjacent to site. Assessment level: Bank erosion is beyond the client's control or commensurate with normal geomorphological processes, AND PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is ≥ 4 .

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

All stream and channel banks, pond and other shorelines are stable.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Excluding all fundamentally unstable, natural geomorphic streambanks/shorelines, all streambanks/shorelines on the operation show few signs of erosion or bank failure. Each is stable and protected with natural materials.

Yes No

Pasture

Soil Quality Degradation

Organic Matter Depletion

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 80%. Assessment level: The SCI is > 0, OR the PCS - plant cover element score is >= 4 AND the PCS - plant residue element score is >= 4.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Compaction

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Soil compaction is not a problem AND activities do not cause soil compaction problems. Assessment level: The PCS - compaction element score is >= 4.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Soils are not compacted past a point that limits plant root depth and growth.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Excess Water

Runoff and Flooding and Ponding

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Ponding or flooding not a problem AND activities do not cause ponding/flooding problems. Assessment level: Excess water is managed to meet client's objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Excess water is managed to meet client's objectives.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Insufficient Water

Inefficient Moisture Management

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Moisture management is not a problem AND activities do not cause inefficient moisture management problems.
Assessment level: The PCS - compaction element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - plant cover element score is ≥ 4 .

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Predominate plants are adapted to the site, usual rain fall, and are useful as intended.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Water Quality Degradation

Pesticides in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize surface water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pesticides in Ground Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Pest control chemicals are not applied. Assessment level: Pesticides are stored, handled, disposed and managed to prevent runoff, spills, leaks and leaching AND conservation practices and managements are in place to minimize ground water impacts.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

A site-specific mixture of prevention, avoidance, monitoring, and suppression (PAMS) strategies are applied. If pesticide application is required, an environmental risk screening tool is used (such as WIN-PST or similar LGU approval tool) and application rates and timing are compliant with the label and the conservation plan.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Nutrients in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND grazed PLU is not adjacent to streams, ponds, or lakes AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: The PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - livestock concentration areas element score is ≥ 4 , OR Nutrients are applied and based on a soil test, tissue test or nutrient budget.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

If nutrients are applied, they do not degrade surface/ground water quality. Water use is not limited.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes No

Nutrients in Ground Water

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Organic or inorganic nutrients are not applied AND grazed PLU is not adjacent to streams, ponds, or lakes AND there are no confined livestock areas. Assessment level: The PCS - streambank/shoreline erosion element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - livestock concentration areas element score is ≥ 4 , OR Nutrients are applied and based on a soil test, tissue test or nutrient budget.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

If nutrients are applied, they do not degrade surface/ground water quality. Water use is not limited.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Grazing management in close proximity to sinkholes does not degrade groundwater.

Yes No

Pasture

Excess Pathogens and Chemicals from Manure, Bio-solids or Compost Applications in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Potential sources of pathogens or pharmaceuticals are not applied on the land. Assessment level: Organic materials are applied, stored, and/or handled to mitigate negative impacts to surface water sources.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Manure, compost, or biosolids are applied per their test report. Grazing management optimizes applied products.

Yes No

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes No

Excessive Sediment in Surface Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Permanent ground cover > 90% and slope < 10% AND classic gullies are not present AND streams or shoreline are not on or adjacent to site. Assessment level: Upslope treatment and buffer practices address concentrated flows to water bodies AND the SVAP2 - bank condition ≥ 5 AND the livestock and vehicle water crossings are stable AND The water erosion rate is $\leq T$ AND wind erosion rate is $\leq T$.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Plant cover controls active erosion (shallow <1 foot deep rills/gullies) and runoff from normal rain events. No litter dams are present.

Yes No

Pasture

Air Quality Impacts

Emission of Greenhouse Gases (GHGs)

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Activities are not present that produce GHGs emissions. GHG producing activities are: Fertilization(manure/commercial), CAFO/manure management, Engines (combustion source), Tillage, AND GHGs are not regulated in this planning area. Assessment level: Greenhouse gas emmissions are managed to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Forage Supply and Demand Balance is achieved.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Degraded Plant Condition

Undesirable Plant Productivity and Health

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The PCS is 30 or above. Plants are adapted to the site, meet production goals and do not negatively impact other resources.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Plants are perennial, adapted to the site, productive and healthy.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Inadequate Structure and Composition

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant communities support the intended land use and desired ecological functions. Assessment level: Plant communities contain adequate diversity, composition and structure to support desired ecological functions.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

The current plants provide the desired habitat structure and composition.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Pasture

Excessive Plant Pest Pressure

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Plant productivity is not limited from pest pressure.
 Assessment level: The PCS - insect and disease pressure element score is ≥ 4 AND the PCS - site adaptation element score is ≥ 4 .

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Plant growth and cover is managed as to inhibit pest plant introduction.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Wildfire Hazard, Excessive Biomass Accumulation

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Wildfire hazards is not a concern. Assessment level: Fuel loads and fuel ladders are managed to provide defensible space and meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Trees/shrubs are pruned to reduce wildfire hazard and/or excessive biomass accumulation.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Sites needing wildfire protection or using prescribed burning have a permanent or temporary strip of bare or vegetated land that retards fire.

Yes No

Pasture

Fish and Wildlife - Inadequate Habitat

Inadequate Habitat - Food

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR food is available in quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

The plant cover provides food for the chosen wildlife species.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

The land adjacent to a waterbody on the side or sides you control does:
 - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area,
 - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or 2.5 times channel width (for streams/rivers), whichever is greater,
 AND - have few places where concentrated runoff flows through.

Yes No

Pasture

Inadequate Habitat - Cover/Shelter

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - fish habitat complexity element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR cover is of available quality and extent to support habitat requirements for the species of interest.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

The stream(s) have: - a natural, unaltered configuration, with minimal channel straightening, dredging, or bank alteration by armoring with rip-rap or other non-natural materials, - stable banks with limited erosion or bank failure, and - human uses and/or grazing levels that do not negatively impact bank condition.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Forage cutting and removal matches NRCS local guidelines for desired species.

Yes No

The pond/lake, which supports a natural or planted fish population, is managed: -to exclude livestock, -to control nuisance species and undesirable aquatic vegetation controlled, -to complies with state and local regulations when stocking the pond, AND -use of a buffer zone of diverse, natural plant cover at least 35 feet wide.

Yes No

Livestock access to stream is controlled OR limited to small watering or crossing areas

Yes No

A combination of trees or shrubs and compatible forages are present on the same acreage.

Yes No

The plant cover provides cover and shelter for the chosen wildlife species.

Yes No

Pasture

Inadequate Habitat - Habitat Continuity (Space)

Planning Criteria

Assessment level: The WHSI rating is ≥ 0.5 AND (when surface stream present) the SVAP2 - barriers to movement element score is ≥ 7 AND the SVAP2 - aquatic invertebrate habitat element score is ≥ 7 , OR conservation practices and managements are in place that meet or exceed species or guild-specific habitat model thresholds, OR The connectivity of habitat components are adequate to support stable populations of targeted species.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Forage cutting and removal matches NRCS local guidelines for desired species.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Connectivity between food resources and cover and shelter is provided for the chosen wildlife species. <see State Wildlife Action Plan>

Yes No

Plant cover provides space for wildlife species.

Yes No

The land adjacent to a stream, river, or other waterbody on the side or sides you control does: - have diverse, natural plant cover typical to that along streams in your area, AND - extend from the stream bank/shoreline for a distance of 35 feet or (if applicable) the minimum State buffer-width requirement, whichever is greater.

Yes No

Pasture

Livestock Production Limitation

Inadequate Feed and Forage

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifier, livestock forage, roughage and supplemental nutritional requirements addressed.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The existing feed/forage quantity/quality meet the livestock needs and goals.

Yes No

Inadequate Shelter

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifier, artificial or natural shelters meet animal health needs and client objectives.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Livestock have adequate shelter.

Yes No

Inadequate Water

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Assessment level: When the land use has a "grazed" modifier, water of acceptable quality and quantity adequately distributed to meet animal needs.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

The livestock have enough drinking water of good quality.

Yes No

Pasture

Inefficient Energy Use

Equipment and Facilities

Planning Criteria

Planning Criteria Met

Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

Evaluation Test Met

Renewable energy systems are applied. For example, solar, wind, geothermal, or hydro.

Yes No

Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.

Yes No

Pasture

Farming/Ranching Practices and Field Operations

Planning Criteria

Screening level: Client is not interested in improving equipment and facilities energy efficiency. Assessment level: Major components of a USDA approved energy audit have been implemented that address equipment and facilities to meet client objectives OR On-farm renewable energy and/or energy conserving practices have been implemented to meet client objectives.

Planning Criteria Met

Yes No

Evaluation Tests

An irrigation water management plan is followed that: -meets the crop's needs, while maximizing irrigation water efficiency, -schedules water application based on soil moisture monitoring and/or evapotranspiration monitoring, -measures and records the amount of water you use to irrigate as it comes onto the farm and goes to each field, AND -the system's distribution uniformity has been evaluated and necessary changes were made.

Evaluation Test Met

Yes No

Renewable energy systems are applied. For example, solar, wind, geothermal, or hydro.

Yes No

Recommendations/components of an energy audit have been applied. The audit addressed equipment and facilities on the farm. For example, energy loss from lighting, drying, refrigeration, heating, or building insulation have been improved.

Yes No