CREP Contract Expiration Status Review

Ecological Function Evaluation

Complete this form one to two	o years prior to co	ontract expiration.				
Participant Name:			FS.	FSA Contract Number:		
County:						
Reviewer(s) Name & Affiliatio	n:				Date	:
Section 1: CONTRACT	ΓSUMMARY	,				
Year initially planted:		Curre	ent Contract	Expirat	ion Date:	:
Stream Name:		; Tribu	itary to:			
CREP practice(s) installed:						
CRP Primary Practices: (ac	res)					
CP22 – RFB	CP22 -	- Hedgerow			CP30	Wet. Buffer
CP23 Wet. Resflood	CP23A	Wet. Resnon-floo	od		CP21	Filter Strip
Support practices:						
382 Fence	ft.	Functioning as de	esigned:	Yes	No	Not Installed
614 Watering facility	no.	Functioning as de	esigned:	Yes	No	Not Installed
516 Livestock Pipeline	ft.	Functioning as de	esigned:	Yes	No	Not Installed
533 Pumping Plant	no.	Functioning as de	esigned:	Yes	No	Not Installed
578 Stream Crossing	no.	Functioning as de	esigned:	Yes	No	Not Installed
If No, explain:						
Section 2: PHYSICAL	CHARACTER	ISTICS				
СР						
Average Width:	Installed:	ft.	Current		ft.	
Length of stream protected:	Right bank	ft.	Left bank	(ft.	

Participant Name:		Review Date:					
СР							
Average Width:	Installed:	ft.	Current	ft.			
Length of stream protected:	Right bank	ft.	Left bank	ft.			
СР							
Average Width:	Installed:	ft.	Current	ft.			
Length of stream protected:	Right bank	ft.	Left bank	ft.			
Estimated Height Ran	ge of Planted H	ardwood Trees:	ft.	Conifers:	ft.		
Estimated Height Ran	ge of Shrubs (p	lanted or natural rege	nerated):	ft.			
Plant Distribution (select one, if applicable):							
Monoculture or limited pla	ant species dive	ersity. Common name	of species: _				
Tarp (all woody species planted on tarps originally with open space or grass in-between)							
Conifer understory (Contra	act provided co	nifer component only	in pre-existin	g vegetation)			
Patchiness: Mortality resul	ting in patchy p	plant community					
Explain cause and extent of plant distribution (restoration of natural hydrology, beaver, re-wetting hydric soils, early succession mortality, plants not suited for microsite):							

Participant Name:			Review Date:				_
Section 3: PLANTING SURV	IVAL						
WOODY VEGETATION Currer	DY VEGETATION Current density of all planted and natural plants:			stems/acre			
Evaluation method: (check all that app	ly) Transect	Plot	Other	Manual (total) Count		ınt	
If other, explain methodology:							
HERBACEOUS VEGETATION							
Established to permanent herk	paceous vegetation	Yes	No				
For Filter Strip:							
Stem density is equivalent to t	he seeding rate for a hi	gh quality gr	ass hay crop ii	n this area	Yes	No	N/A

Section 4: BUFFER FUNCTION

Rate the Ecological Functions being provided by the enrollment area:

Stream canopy and shade on streams <50' bank full	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
width					
Bank erosion prevented	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Soil surface stabilized	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Sediment from adjacent field retained by buffer	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Nutrients from adjacent field retained by buffer	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Pesticides from adjacent field retained by buffer	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Bacteria/pathogens from adj. field retained by buffer	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Surface water runoff from adj. field is slowed/infiltrated	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Habitat and travel corridor for small upland wildlife	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
provided					
Habitat and travel corridor for large upland wildlife	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
provided					
Stream meandering enabled	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Large woody debris source	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Litter (leaves, small branches) input to stream provided	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Overhanging vegetation provided	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Bank stability from root systems provided	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Pollinator habitat provided	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Beneficial insect habitat provided	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Spray drift reduced	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
Flood water attenuated (where stream is hydrologically	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A
connected to its historic floodplain and CREP planting)					
Off-channel habitat created	None	Low	Medium	High	N/A

Participant Name:	Review Date:
If none or low, provide explanation of why this function is not provided:	

)	Yes No
				ain:
			TION	tion 5: THREATS TO FUTURE BUFFER FUNC
				F
	Medium			
	Medium			
	Medium			
	Medium	Low	None	Hydrology Changes due to beaver
m High	Medium	Low	None	Hydrology changes due to natural evens such as flood or fire
_				Wildlife Damage (elk/deer/etc.)
m High	Medium	Low	None	Wildlife Damage (elk/deer/efc)
u u	Medi	Low Low Low Low	None None None None None None	Livestock Access Cropping encroachment Herbaceous Weed Pressure Woody Weed Pressure Hydrology Changes due to lack of ditch maintenance

Participant Name:	Revie	w Date:					
Section 6: DETERMINATION and	d recommendation						
Select one:							
Buffer functioning as originally design	ned						
Buffer functioning – alternative habit	Buffer functioning – alternative habitat than designed						
Buffer not functioning but trending increase in habitat function.							
Buffer not functioning – needs additional practice installation/maintenance							
Buffer not functioning – site no longe	er suitable for original CP practice bu	ffer installation					
If Buffer not functioning, summarize issues no	oted in sections 2-5 above:						
RECOMMENDATION:							
Recommend re-enrolling the following	ng CPs:						
CP22 RFB ac	CP 23	ac					
CP22 Hedgerow ac	CP21	ac					
CP 30 ac							
Recommend excluding	acres that no longer support any of	the available CPs.					
Attach a map showing are	ea of each CP. Attach ground pho	tos of issues					
-	luation to a completed CPA-LTP						
Form with landowner sign approval. NRCS will provid	nature. Provide to NRCS local offi de to FSA CED	ce for review and					