

U.S. Department of Agriculture

Conservation Reserve Program CP40 FWP Aquaculture Wetland Restoration Documentation of Suitability and Feasibility Worksheet (Version 2.0 June 2018)

| Name of Client: | | Client Phone Number: () | | |
|--|--------------------------------|--|----------------------------|--|
| | | Client email: | | |
| Farm Number: | Field Number(s): | Location Description: | State: | |
| Tract Number: | | | County: | |
| *Refer to the Worksheet Instructi | ons for guidance on compl | eting a Suitability and Feasibility I | Determination. | |
| | | rpose: To restore habitat or the func aquaculture. Provide water cover for | | |
| Element #1 Site Conditions/Prog | | | | |
| Identify if offer area meets CP40 si | ite condition criteria by chec | cking the following: | | |
| ☐ Per site observation, offer☐ Water cover will not exce | | commercial pond-raised aquaculture. rolled acreage. | | |
| Current Cover Type in Offer Area: | | | | |
| Current Land Use in Offer Area: _ | | | | |
| YES – All Site Conditions | Referenced Above are Met | NO – Site Conditions | Not Met | |
| Element #2 Practice Needs | | | | |
| | source concern(s) in the prac | by CP40 per the practice purpose? tice purpose, then the determination P contract re-enrollment. | must be that the CP is not | |
| Indicate which NRCS resource concern causes are present within the offer area: Water Quality Degradation: Excess nutrients in surface and ground waters Water Quality Degradation: Pesticides transported to surface and ground waters Water Quality Degradation: Excess pathogens and chemicals from manure, bio-solids or compost applications Water Quality Degradation: Excessive salts in surface and ground waters Water Quality Degradation: Petroleum, heavy metals and other pollutants transported to receiving waters Water Quality Degradation: Excessive sediment in surface waters Soil Erosion: Concentrated flow erosion Inadequate Habitat for Fish and Wildlife: Habitat degradation Excess Water: Flooding YES – Practice is Needed | | | | |
| | | | | |
| Element #3 Practice Feasibility Will the implementation of CP40 solve or significantly improve the resource concern(s) listed in the practice purpose? | | | | |
| | orve or significantly improv | | | |
| YES – Practice is Feasible | | NO – Practice is Not | Feasible | |

| Element #4 Practice Suitability | | | | | |
|--|--|---|----------------|--|--|
| *If the land is developed to pro- inches of water. The water area | or installation of the NRCS conservaride water cover for wildlife habitat, a must provide a source of water for uited to plant and establish appropria | | pth of 6 to 18 | | |
| YES – Practice is Suitable | | NO – Practice is Not Suitable | | | |
| Suitability and Feasibility Det | Suitability and Feasibility Determination Findings: | | | | |
| The location and size Suitability and Feasib | | CRP-2C map meet all four elements of the | | | |
| not met. Site Prac Prac | Conditions/Program Requirements etice Needs etice Feasibility etice Suitability | requirements. Check the element(s) that were e) would result in meeting all four S&F determin | | | |
| See documentation. | | | | | |
| | g the determination of each element in thed or provided to FSA (check all that | | | | |
| ☐ Notes on form NRCS ☐ Photo's ☐ Other: | | ☐ Map☐ Electronic File with GPS Points or | GIS Shapefile | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | : Date returned to FSA: | | | |
| Sunability and Feasibility Deter | rmination Completed by: | | | | |