

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
Farm Service Agency**

DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT


Madison County Arkansas

**Prepared By
Adam Kaufman, USDA, Farm Service Agency
State Environmental Coordinator**

11/21/2019

COVER SHEET

Proposed Action:	The Farm Service Agency of the United States Department of Agriculture proposes to provide Farm Loan Program assistance to finance the construction of (4) 66' x 700' turkey houses, (1) compost stacking shed, (1) shop building, access road, load out pad, a generator shed, and related infrastructure. This proposal would result in the establishment of a large CAFO. This proposal would take place at Section 36, Township 18 North, Range 25 West in Madison County Arkansas.
Type of Document:	This is a site-specific Environmental Assessment
Lead Agency:	United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) Farm Service Agency (FSA)
Cooperating Agencies:	None
Further Information:	Adam Kaufman, USDA, Farm Service Agency, 419 West Gaines Street, Suite 2, Monticello, AR 71655.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Introduction	7
1.1 Background	7
1.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action	7
1.3 Decision To Be Made	8
1.4 Regulatory Compliance	8
1.5 Public Involvement and Consultation	8
1.5.1 Internal Scoping	8
1.5.2 External Scoping	9
1.5.3 Public Involvement	9
2. Description of Proposed Action and Alternatives	10
2.1 Alternative A - Proposed Action	10
2.2 Alternative B - No Action Alternative	12
2.3 Alternative C	12
2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated From Analysis.....	12
3. Affected Environment and Impacts	13
3.1 Resources Eliminated from Detailed Analysis	13
3.2 Resources Considered with Detailed Analysis	15
3.2.1 Wildlife and Habitat.....	15
3.2.2 Cultural Resources	16
4. Water Quality	17
5. Air Quality	19
6. Noise	21
7. Cumulative Impacts	23
7.1 Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions	24
7.2 Cumulative Analysis	24
7.2.1 Wildlife and Habitat.....	25
7.2.2 Cultural Resources	25
7.2.4 Water Quality	25
7.2.5 Air Quality.....	25
7.3 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES.....	26
9. References	28
10. EA Determination and Signatures	30

APPENDIX A PROJECT AREA MAPS

APPENDIX B Site Photos and FSA site Visit Report

B-1 FSA Site Visit Report and Proposed Site Photos

APPENDIX C Required Permits and Plans

C-1 Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP)

C-2 Notice of Coverage for NPDES Permit from ADEQ

APPENDIX D Threatened and Endangered Species Documentation

D-1 IPaC Endangered/Threatened Species List

D-2 FSA Programmatic Decision Key and Maps

D-3 USFWS Correspondence

APPENDIX E Agency Correspondence Cultural Resources Documentation

E-1 Tribe Contacts and THPO Consultations

E-2 Section 106 Consultation Responses

E-3 War Eagle Creek Bridge Proximity Map

APPENDIX F Wilderness Areas Supporting Documentation

F-1 Buffalo National River Wilderness Map

APPENDIX G Wild and Scenic Rivers/ Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) Supporting Documentation

G-1 Buffalo River, Wild and Scenic River

G-2 Kings River, Nationwide Rivers Inventory

G-3 Map of Streams

G-4 Lower Dry Fork Watershed Map

APPENDIX H National Natural Landmark (NNL) Supporting Documentation

H-1 Marvel cave

H-2 National Natural Landmarks of Arkansas Map

APPENDIX I Wetlands Supporting Documentation

I-1 AD-1026

I-2 FSA 858 "Determining if a Wetland May be Present"

APPENDIX J Floodplain Supporting Documentation

J-1 Floodplain Map

APPENDIX K National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), Demographic, and Census info

APPENDIX L Notice of Availability (NOA)

L-1 NOA

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

ADEQ	Arkansas Department of Environmental
ANRC	Arkansas Natural Resource Commission
AOG	Arkansas Oklahoma Gas Corp
AR	Arkansas
ATV	All-terrain vehicle
BMP's	Best Management Practices
CAFO	Concentrated Animal Feeding Operation
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CNMP	Comprehensive Nutrient Management Plan
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
EA	Environmental Assessment
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
EQIP	Environmental Quality Incentives Program
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FSA	Farm Service Agency
GHG	Green House Gases
GPM	Gallons per minute
HUC	Hydrologic unit code
IPaC	Information for Planning and Conservation
MA/NLAA	May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NMP	Nutrient Management Plan
NOA	Notice of Availability
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Officers
TSP	Technical Service Provider
TMDL	Total Maximum Daily Load
WMA	Wildlife Management Area
U.S.	United States
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

- The Farm Service Agency of the United States Department of Agriculture proposes to provide Farm Loan Program assistance to finance the purchase of a 409 acre tract of land and funds for the construction of (4) 66' x 700' turkey houses, (1) compost stacking shed, (1) shop building, access road, load out pad, a generator shed, and related infrastructure. This proposal would result in the establishment of a large CAFO. This proposal would take place at Section 36, Township 18 North, Range 25 West in Madison County Arkansas. This (4) house proposed facility would have 184,800 square feet of growing space which would be capable of housing 63,100 turkeys per flock at maximum capacity. This farm would be growing turkeys with a target weight of 14 pounds. The proposed facility would receive approximately 3.5 flocks annually. This proposed facility would meet FSA's definition of a large Confined Animal Feeding Operation (CAFO). Flock placement would be dependent on bird variety, needs of the integrator, supply and demand, and several other factors.
- The proposed farm is located in Madison County which is in the Nutrient Surplus Area. Appendices A and B contain maps and photos of the proposed project area. A detailed description of the components of the proposed project, the project site and related surrounding area of potential effect is further described in Section 2.1 of this document.

1.2 Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action

The purpose of the proposed project/action is to implement USDA, Farm Service Agency programs, to make available economic opportunity to help rural America thrive, and to promote agriculture production that better nourishes Americans and help feed others throughout the world. FSA is tasked with this mission as provided for by the Food and Security Act of 1985 as amended, the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act as amended, and related implementing regulations found in 7 CFR Parts 762 and 764.

The need for the proposed action is to fulfill FSA's responsibility to provide access to credit, and to help improve the stability and strength of the agricultural economy, including to start, improve, expand, transition, market, and strengthen family farming and ranching operations, and to provide viable farming opportunities for family and beginning farmers and meet the needs of small and beginning farmers, women and minorities. Specifically, in the case of this loan request, FSA's need is to respond to the applicant's request for funding to support the proposed action.

FSA Farm Loan Program Assistance is not available for commercial operations or facilities that are not family farms, or to those having the ability to qualify for commercial credit without the benefit of FSA assistance. The applicants have been determined to be a family farm as defined by 7 CFR 761.2. The proposed action would allow them the opportunity to establish their family farming operation and provide the economic stability to meet the needs of the family.

In addition, poultry integrators have a demand for new facilities such as these to provide an adequate supply for processing plants and keep them operating at an economically feasible capacity. Specialized livestock facilities such as those proposed, have a limited useful life as they become functionally

obsolete as technology advances. Accordingly, a pipeline of new facilities is necessary to insure an adequate and economical supply of low cost protein food for the nation.

1.3 Decision To Be Made

FSA's decision is whether to:

- Approve the applicant's loan request;
- Approve the request with additional mitigations; or
- Deny the loan request.

1.4 Regulatory Compliance

This Environmental Assessment is prepared to satisfy the requirements of NEPA (Public Law 91-190, 42 United States Code 4321 et seq.); its implementing regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508); and FSA implementing regulations, *Environmental Quality and Related Environmental Concerns – Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act* (7 CFR 799). The intent of NEPA is to protect, restore, and enhance the human environment through well informed Federal decisions. A variety of laws, regulations, and Executive Orders (EO) apply to actions undertaken by Federal agencies and form the basis of the analysis.

All fifty states have enacted right-to-farm laws that seek to protect qualifying farmers and ranchers from nuisance lawsuits filed by individuals who move into a rural area where normal farming operations exist, and who later use nuisance actions to attempt to stop those ongoing operations. The Right to Farm law for Arkansas (Ark. Code Ann. § 24101) protects farming operations from nuisance claims when farms were established prior to the use of the area surrounding the agricultural operation for nonagricultural activities and those farms employ methods or practices commonly or reasonably associated with agricultural production.

1.5 Public Involvement and Consultation

Scoping is an early and open process to involve agencies, organizations, and the public in determining the issues to be addressed in the environmental document. Among other tasks, scoping determines important issues and eliminates issues determined not to be important; identifies other permits, surveys and consultations required with other agencies; and creates a schedule that allows adequate time to prepare and distribute the environmental document for public review and comment before a final decision is made. Scoping is a process that seeks opinions and consultation from the interested public, affected parties, and any agency with interests or legal jurisdiction.

1.5.1 Internal Scoping

USDA staff of various specialties have been consulted regarding the purpose and need, issues and impact topics appropriate for consideration for the proposed activity. A site visit and pedestrian review was completed by Charlene Holt, Farm Loan Officer, USDA, Farm Service Agency on 09/11/2019. Site visit notes and photographs are included in APPENDIX B.

1.5.2 External Scoping

USDA FSA has completed research and the following tasks and efforts:

- Research of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) - Information, Planning, and Conservation System (IPaC) about the project's potential to affect federally listed species as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973. SEE APPENDIX D-1. FSA's Programmatic Decision Key was utilized to develop affect determinations for threatened and endangered species that are known to occur in this area of Madison County.
- Consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) to ensure that compliance with the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) are met and that significant impacts to historic properties would not result from the project SEE APPENDIX E.
- Consultation with the Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, The Caddo Nation, Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, The Cherokee Nation, Osage Nation, Quapaw Tribe of Indians, and Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma to comply with the requirements of Section 106 of the NHPA are met and that significant impacts to historic properties would not result from the project. SEE APPENDIX E.
- FSA staff completed Form FSA-858, "Determining if a Wetland May Be Present" to screen for wetland indicators where ground disturbance associated with project would take place SEE APPENDIX I-1

1.5.3 Public Involvement

A notice of the availability of the Draft EA for public review and comment will be published in the Madison County Record in Huntsville, AR on 11/21/2019 and 11/28/2019. SEE APPENDIX L-1. The Draft EA will also be made available for public viewing at the following USDA Service Centers: USDA, Farm Service Agency, 909A Freeman Switch Road, BERRYVILLE, AR 72616-4608, and at 479 North Parrot Drive, Room 2 HUNTSVILLE, AR 72740-9530. The draft EA document will also be posted online at <https://www.fsa.usda.gov/state-offices/Arkansas/index> from 11/21/2019 thru 12/23/2019. Written comments only regarding this Draft EA will be accepted thru 12/23/2019 and should be submitted to Adam Kaufman at USDA, Farm Service Agency, 419 West Gaines Street, Monticello, AR 71655.

2. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Alternative A - Proposed Action

The proposed action involves FSA making a guarantee to a commercial lender for a loan that would be used to establish a new integrated turkey operation in Madison County Arkansas. The proposal would take place in northeast Madison county, approximately 1,000' south of the Madison-Carroll County line and 3 miles north of the Marble community. The applicants would enter into a contract with a poultry integrator, who would place flocks of turkeys on the farm, where they would be grown to market size with a target weight of 14 lbs. As growers, the applicants would be responsible for providing the equipment, utilities, and labor required to house and manage the flock including feeding, watering, brooding, waste disposal, maintaining the houses, and providing for animal welfare, sanitation, and biosecurity as they are currently doing with their existing operation. The integrator would supply the bids, feed, labor to deliver and remove the birds from the farm, veterinary services, and technical support to the grower.

This proposed action would take place within the Ozark Mountains ecoregion of Arkansas on a 409 acre tract of land which the applicants are under contract to purchase. The proposed turkey houses would go on a relatively flat area on top of a hill. Slopes where the majority of the proposed ground disturbance would take place range from 3 to 8 percent. SEE APPENDIX I-2. Historical aerial imagery suggests this area has been established in grasslands which has been utilized as cattle pasture for decades. The proposed site is currently vegetated with mixed native grasses and Fescue. There is a small area overgrown in Pine, Oak, and Cherry saplings that would also need to be removed. SEE APPENDIX B-1.

The proposed site would be accessed from the east via county road 548, which runs north and south and borders the 409 acre tract to the east. A proposed access road would be placed running east and west from county road 548 to the proposed turkey houses. The proposed access road would be approximately 2/10 of a mile long. The 409 acre tract of land has perimeter fencing around the open areas that are established in pasture, and some cross fencing but no other improvements. The proposed site where the turkey houses would go is completely vegetated.

The nearest neighboring dwellings in relation to the proposal would be approximately ¼ mile to the northeast, ½ mile to the west, and 4/10 of a mile to the southeast. SEE APPENDIX A-8. The nearest church, White Oak Church, is located 2.24 miles northwest of the proposed site. SEE APPENDIX A-6. The nearest school, Pension Mountain School, is located 7.66 miles northwest of the proposal. SEE APPENDIX A-5. The proposal would take place in a rural north Arkansas, where agriculture has a strong presence in this area. There are several cattle and hay operations in this area. According to the Madison County Conservation District, 153 poultry farms registered with the Arkansas Natural Resources Commission in 2019 for the 2018 production year and 181 poultry farms registered in neighboring Carroll County. SEE APPENDIX The USDA NASS Cattle Inventory Report indicates there are 69,000 head of cattle, including calves in Madison County in 2019 and 82,000 head of cattle, including calves in Carroll County. SEE APPENDIX K-1.

Proposed improvements would consist of (4) 66' x 700' turkey houses, (1) compost stacking shed, (1) shop building, access road, load out pad, a generator shed, and related infrastructure. These structures

would be built on top of earthen pads, which would be slightly larger than the dimensions of the houses themselves. The proposed turkey houses would be stacked north to south and would run northeast and southwest. SEE APPENDIX A-4. A load out pad would be placed on the east side of the (4) proposed turkey houses. The load out pad would need to be wide enough for feed and live haul trucks to turn in and out of the proposed facility. A compost shed would be utilized for mortality disposal for the proposed turkey operation. The composter would sit on top of a concrete pad, and would have a metal roof which would protect the contents from the elements. The compost shed would be located on the west side of the proposed turkey houses. A 30' x 50' shop building would be placed in the very center of this proposed facility in between the proposed turkey houses. This generator shed would have a wood frame, and a metal roof, and sides and sides and would house (1) 250 kW diesel generator which would be controlled by a (2) 500 Amp transfer switches. Underground wiring would be ran from the generator and plumbed into each house. The generator would serve as a backup power supply for this proposed broiler facility and utilize low sulfur diesel as a fuel source, stored in a 550 gallon above ground tank.

Related infrastructure will include an extension of the existing access road all the way to the proposed site, access roads in between the (4) turkey houses themselves, utility lines for water and electricity and above ground storage tanks for propane to heat these facilities. The proposed layout of this facility would be located as specified on the attached site plan found in APPENDIX C-2.

Electricity to proposed poultry house facilities would run overhead east and west from the existing Carroll electric service connection currently in place along Carroll County road 548, which borders this proposal on the west. A pole would be placed on the northeastern corner of the proposed load out pad, then wires would be placed underground all the way to the generator shed in the center of the operation. Propane heaters would be utilized as a heat source for the proposed turkey facility. The fuel would be stored in 1000 gallon above ground storage tanks placed in between the turkey houses.

Water to the proposed turkey operation would be supplied by (2) new water wells. The proposed location of these proposed water wells is as follows: Well (1) would be located in the center of the turkey houses, Well (2) would be drilled on the east side of the load out pad. Underground plumbing would run from the wells to the proposed broiler facilities. The proposal would also include (4) 5,000 gallon water tanks, which would be stored in the 30' x 50' storage building. The water tank would be utilized as an emergency water supply for the proposed turkey operation.

According to the SWPPP developed by Frank Walker, this proposal would involve 10.6 acres of ground disturbance. The proposed site is currently established in native grasses, Fescue, as well as Pine, Oak, and Cherry saplings. There are no other improvements on the 409 acre tract, with exceptions of a perimeter barbed wire fence.

There are no connected actions associated with this proposal at this time, however it would be possible to expand this operation in the future if the applicants were presented the opportunity to do so. Any future expansion financed with FSA funds would require a subsequent environmental review that meets the requirements of 1-EQ (revision3).

2.2 Alternative B - No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative means the loan would not be made and the farm described in Section 2.1 above (Proposed Action) would not be built. The applicants would continue with their existing cattle operation with no impacts as the proposed action would not go forward.

2.3 Alternative C

An alternative location would not be feasible, as the proposed project would take place on property the applicants are currently under contract to purchase. Integrators typically require a farm manager to live on or near their poultry farms.

Alternative arrangements and locations to implement the proposal on this farm would not be feasible. The proposed location is a relatively flat area that is predominantly established in grasslands. Slopes to the north, south, or west of the proposed site are much greater than that of the proposed location and would require tree removal. Ground disturbance on a greater slope would potentially accelerate erosion, increasing runoff and would present a greater threat to water quality. Either option would require more ground disturbance than that of the proposed action. Electing to move the proposal farther to the west would also require a longer access road, thus more ground disturbance than that of the Proposed Action. In addition, if the proposal were to be moved farther to the west, it would be closer to an unnamed tributary to Dry Fork, which would potentially present a greater threat to water quality in the surrounding areas. SEE APPENDIX G-3.

The proposed site configuration was designed to create the least amount of ground disturbance and vegetation removal, while trying to maximize the amount of open pasture that would be available to graze cattle, therefore having the smallest impact on the environment and its surroundings during the construction phase of the proposal. Alternative configurations were not considered due to the possibility of having a greater impact on the affected environment. Integrated poultry producers must comply with very specific logistical and design requirements provided by the integrators.

2.4 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated From Analysis

Other locations for the farm or other uses for the land in question are not considered here because such options do not meet the purpose and need for the proposed action. The applicant has applied for FSA-guaranteed loans to fund the construction of a new large CAFO. FSA's decision to be made is to approve the loan for the proposed farm as designed, to deny the loan, or to approve the loan with additional mitigations, practices or methods that would be needed to minimize or eliminate impacts to protected resources.

Similarly, alternative designs of farm components are not considered as the producer's agreement with a poultry integrator requires adherence to the integrator's construction and equipment specifications, which are in place to ensure consistency, maximize production, and reduce loss. Design alternatives that would involve modification of features and infrastructure put in place by an integrator would jeopardize the availability of bird placement, be grounds for a potential loss of the contract with the integrator, and therefore the viability of the farm. Accordingly, this alternative would not warrant further consideration.

3. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS

The impacts to a number of protected resources, as defined in FSA Handbook 1-EQ (Revision 3) Environmental Quality Programs for State and County Offices, are considered in this EA. Some resources are eliminated from detailed analysis following CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1501.7), which state that the lead agency shall identify and eliminate from detailed study the issues that are not significant or that have been covered by prior environmental review, narrowing the discussion of these issues in the document to a brief presentation of why they would not have a significant effect on the human or natural environment. Resources that are not eliminated are carried forward for detailed analysis. The table below shows the resources that are eliminated from detailed analysis and those carried forward. Section 3.1 contains discussions of those resources eliminated from detailed analysis. Section 3.2 describes the existing conditions for resources carried forward for detailed analysis and the anticipated impacts to those resources resulting from the Proposed Action.

Resource	Eliminated	Carried Forward
Wildlife and Habitat		X
Cultural Resources		X
Coastal Barriers	X	
Coastal Zones	X	
Wilderness Areas	X	
Wild and Scenic Rivers, NRI	X	
National Natural Landmarks	X	
Sole Source Aquifers	X	
Floodplains	X	
Wetlands	X	
Soils	X	
Water Quality		X
Air Quality		X
Noise		X
Important Land Resources	X	
Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice	X	

3.1 Resources Eliminated from Detailed Analysis

Coastal Barrier Resources System

Coastal barriers are eliminated from detailed analysis as there are no designated Coastal Barriers in Arkansas.

Coastal Zone Management Areas

Coastal Zone Management Areas are eliminated from detailed analysis because there are no Coastal Zone Management Areas in Arkansas.

Wilderness Areas

Wilderness areas were eliminated from detailed analysis in this EA. There are 12 designated Wilderness areas in Arkansas. The closest Wilderness Area would be Buffalo National River Wilderness, which is located 14.9 miles southeast of this proposed project. SEE APPENDIX F-1. This proposal should have no adverse impacts to the Buffalo National Wilderness Area.

Wild and Scenic Rivers and Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI)

Wild and Scenic Rivers and NRI have been eliminated from detailed analysis in this EA. The Buffalo River is the closest river in relation to the proposal with a Wild and Scenic designation. The nearest Wild and Scenic segment of the Buffalo is located 21.3 miles to the southeast of this proposal. SEE APPENDIX G-1. The Kings River is the closest river with a NRI listing in proximity to the proposal and is located 1.62 miles to the southwest of where the proposal would take place. SEE APPENDIX G-2. The proposal should have no effect on either of these rivers.

National Natural Landmarks

There are five National Natural Landmarks in Arkansas. SEE APPENDIX H-2. The site of the Proposed Action is not located in close proximity to any of these nor would the proposal threaten to alter or impair them. The closest in relation to this proposed site is Marvel Cave, which is located approximately 36.5 miles northeast of the proposed site, therefore National Natural Landmarks are eliminated from detailed analysis. SEE APPENDIX H-1.

Sole Source Aquifers

Sole source aquifers are eliminated from detailed analysis because there are no sole source aquifers in Arkansas.

Floodplains

Floodplains were eliminated from further detailed analysis. According to a Flood Hazard Boundary Map with an effective date of 06/14/1977 the proposed project would lie outside of a flood plain. SEE APPENDIX J-1.

Wetlands

Wetlands have been eliminated from further detailed analysis. According to FSA Form-858 "Determining if a Wetland May Be Present," wetland indicators were not present on the 10.6 acre area where ground associated with this proposal would be taking place, therefore no additional screening is necessary. SEE APPENDIX I-2.

Soils

Soils are eliminated from detailed analysis because no land on this farm would not be cropped and is therefore not subject to the Highly Erodible Land provisions of the Food Security Act. Furthermore, there would be no annual tillage of the soil associated with this proposed project. The applicants have both signed AD-1026 "Highly Erodible Land Conservation and Wetland Conservation Certification." SEE APPENDIX I-1.

Important Land Resources

Prime and unique farmland, forestland and rangeland resources are eliminated from detailed analysis because the proposed action would not result in prime and/or important farmland being converted to a nonagricultural use.

Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

No impact to population, housing, income, or employment in the region are anticipated to result from the Proposed Action, nor are disproportionate adverse impacts to minority or low income populations anticipated. Therefore, socioeconomics and environmental justice are not carried forward for detailed analysis. SEE APPENDIX K-3 for demographic information.

3.2 Resources Considered with Detailed Analysis

This section describes the environment that would be affected by implementation of the alternatives described in Chapter 2. Aspects of the affected environment described in this section focus on the relevant major resources or issues. Under the no action alternative, the proposed action would not be implemented. The no action alternative would result in the continuation of the current land and resource uses in the project area. This alternative will not be evaluated further in this EA.

3.2.1 Wildlife and Habitat

Existing Conditions

The proposed project site where the turkey houses would be built is currently established primarily in mixed grasslands, consisting primarily of fescue and other native grasses and utilized to graze beef cattle. SEE APPENDIX B-1. A portion of the proposed site is also established in pine, oak, and cherry saplings, ranging from 1-3 years old. It would be necessary to remove approximately 25-30 of these sapling sized trees. No other tree removal would be necessary to implement this proposal. The proposed project site would require 10.6 acre of ground disturbance. SEE APPENDIX B-1.

Wildlife typical of such areas include whitetail deer, squirrels, rabbits, raccoons, black bears, and various other mammals, birds, and reptile species. A site visit was conducted by FSA on 09/11/2019. SEE APPENDIX B-1.

An official list of threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat for this area of Madison County was obtained from the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) system. SEE APPENDIX D-1. The following threatened and endangered species are known to occur in this area of Johnson County: Gray Bat *Myotis grisescens* (endangered), Indiana Bat *myotis sodalist* (endangered), Northern Long Eared Bat *myotis septentrionalis*(threatened), Ozark Big-eared Bat *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus)* (endangered), and the Missouri Bladderpod *Physaria filiformis* (threatened). Farm Service Agency has entered a programmatic consultation agreement with USFWS on 05/02/2019. The Farm Service Agency Programmatic Decision Key was utilized to conduct a streamlined Section 7 Consultation with USFWS. SEE APPENDIX D-2. In addition, an informal email was sent to USFWS for clarification on the accuracy of the IPaC list. SEE APPENDIX D-3. According to the site

visit conducted by FSA personnel on 09/11/2019, there were no caves or karst features located on or near the proposed project site. SEE APPENDIX B-1. Based on the decision key, this proposal may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Gray Bat, or Ozark Big Eared Bat. SEE APPENDIX D-2. The 1 to 3 year old sapling sized trees that would need to be removed would not be considered suitable habitat for the Northern Long Eared Bat, or the Indiana Bat. No other tree removal would be necessary to implement this proposal. According to the decision key, this proposal may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the Northern Long Eared Bat and the Indiana Bat. SEE APPENDIX D-2. There were no sightings of the Missouri Bladderpod during the site visit and there would be no suitable habitat for this threatened plant, therefore the proposal should have no affect on the Missouri Bladderpod. Based on email correspondence from USFWS dated 11/06/2019, USFWS has reviewed the proposed project and has no concerns related to listed species. SEE APPENDIX D-3.

The Bald Eagle has been known to occur in this area, however the Bald Eagle is not covered by the Endangered Species Act. No Bald Eagles, or Bald Eagle nests were observed on this proposed site during the site visit. SEE APPENDIX B-1.

Impacts of Proposed Action

According to the SWPPP that was developed to obtain a construction permit for this proposed facility, an estimated 10.6 acres of ground disturbance would occur, resulting in a long term loss of 10.6 acres of mixed grasslands and sapling thickets. SEE APPENDIX C-1. The proposal would result in a long term loss of wildlife habitat that this 10.6 acres of vegetation provided. No significant impacts to Wildlife and Habitat would be expected to result from the Proposed Action. The SWPPP would implement BMP's during the construction phase of this proposal, which would help protect water quality in Horsehead Creek Watershed and the surrounding areas as well. Should any changes be made in the proposed layout or design of this proposed project, any potential impacts to threatened and endangered species would be re-evaluated.

3.2.2 Cultural Resources

Existing Conditions

The Proposed Action involves some ground disturbing activities in areas not previously evaluated or previously disturbed to the depth required for the Proposed Action, therefore cultural resources require detailed analysis. A site visit was conducted by USDA, Farm Service Agency on 09/11/2019. There are no existing structures located on this proposed 10.6 acre site.

The nearest structures in relation to the proposal listed on the National Register of Historic Places is the War Eagle Creek Bridge, which is located 7.43 to the southwest. SEE APPENDIX E-3. This proposal would not be visible from either of these historic places therefore FSA anticipates the proposal should have no effect on this historic structure.

FSA consulted with the Arkansas State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on 09/27/2019 providing the location and details of the Proposed Action. SEE APPENDIX E-1. Arkansas SHPO provided a response on 10/30/2019. SHPO's response indicates that no known historic properties would be affected by this undertaking although SHPO's affect determination could change should more information be brought to light.

In addition to Arkansas SHPO, FSA consulted with the following federally recognized Tribes: Apache Tribe of Oklahoma, The Caddo Nation, Cherokee Nation, Osage Nation, Quapaw Tribe of Indians, and Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma. Letters describing the location and details of the Proposed Action were sent to these Tribes on 09/27/2019. SEE APPENDIX E-1. A response from the Cherokee Nation was received on 10/21/2019, which indicates that they found no instances where this project would intersect or adjoin cultural, historic, and pre-historic resources, and that the Nation does not foresee this project imparting impacts to Cherokee cultural resources at this time. The Cherokee Nation, however wished to be contacted immediately should items of cultural significance be discovered during the course of this project. SEE APPENDIX E-2. No other responses from the Tribes listed above were received.

Impacts of Proposed Action

Based on the proximity to the War Eagle Creek Bridge in relation to the proposed action, SHPO's concurrence response, the response from the Cherokee Nation, and lack of responses from the other Tribes with an interest in this area of Madison county, FSA anticipates there would be no adverse impacts to known cultural resources would be anticipated to result from the Proposed Action. SEE APPENDIX E. Impacts to previously unidentified historic properties, including archaeological and historic resources, could occur during land clearing and construction activities. If such resources were encountered during construction, all activities would cease, FSA state and national office personnel would be notified, along with Arkansas SHPO and Tribes with an interest in this area, and the resources would be professionally evaluated for eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

4. Water Quality

Existing Conditions

In Arkansas, the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ) has the authority to enforce provisions of the Clean Water Act that are protective of water quality and to issue permits that are protective of water quality standards. This authority is delegated to ADEQ by the Environmental Protection Agency. The ADEQ Water Division issues Stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permits to protect surface waters from contamination from runoff associated with construction. Coverage under General Permit AR1500000 is required for construction that causes ground disturbance in excess of 1 acre. Permit AR1500000 for small sites is for disturbance between 1 and 5 acres and requires operators to post required forms and documents, including a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP), on the site rather than coordinate directly with ADEQ. Permit AR 1500000 for large sites including disturbance in excess of 5 acres, required documents are submitted to ADEQ. SPPPs are documents that describe construction activities to prevent stormwater contamination, control sedimentation and erosion, in order to prevent significant harm to surface waters and comply with the requirements of the Clean Water Act. ADEQ is also responsible for issuing Non-stormwater NPDES Permits issued to facilities that discharge water. Animal Feeding Operations and Confined Animal Feeding Operations that do not discharge into waters of the state do not require NPDES permits for ongoing operations. SEE ADEQ REFERENCE

The Arkansas Natural Resource Commission (ANRC) Water Division is responsible for developing and implementing the Arkansas Water Plan, the state's policy for long-term water management, and for the State's Non-point Source Pollution Management Program. The Arkansas Water Plan describes each of the state's river basins. The ANRC Conservation Division supports development, management and conservation of the state's land and water resources, in part through nutrient management planning. A nutrient management plan (NMP) is a document approved by a conservation district board that assists landowners and operators in the proper management and utilization of nutrient sources for maximum soil fertility and protection of state waters. ANRC requires NMPs for farms that plan to land apply litter, sewage sludge, or commercial fertilizer within an area designated as the Nutrient Surplus Area (which includes parts of Baxter, Benton, Boone, Carroll, Crawford, Madison, Marion, Polk, Scott, Sebastian, and Washington Counties. For land application outside this area, usage of a nutrient management plan is voluntary. REFERENCE ANRC REGS. Madison County lies inside of the designated nutrient surplus area. SEE APPENDIX A-7. The applicants would be required to have a Nutrient Management Plan (NMP) developed by the Madison County Conservation District for their proposed turkey operation if they choose to do so, which they are in the process of having developed. SEE APPENDIX C-3.

This proposal is located within the Lower Dry Fork Watershed (HUC 12 ID: 110100010907) SEE APPENDIX G-4, which lies within the Upper White River Basin. The Upper White River Basin encompasses approximately 11,684 square miles, or 7.5 million acres across 17 counties in northern Arkansas. According to the Arkansas water plan, the largest land use in the Upper White River Basin is 58.5 % forest land, followed by 28.5% grassland, 9.3% cropland, 1.7% urban build up, then other land uses. Madison county covers 837 square miles or 535,680 acres. Streams within the basin have an average yield of approximately 18.3 million acre feet per year. Hydroelectric power generation within the Upper White River Basin accounts for the majority of water use in the area, followed by irrigation, public supply, then rural/livestock, and then self-supplied industry. Surface Water quality within the Upper White River basin is generally good according to the Arkansas Water Plan. Reference Arkansas Water Plan.

The nearest impaired stream in relation to this proposal would be the Kings River, which is located 1.8 miles to the southwest of this proposal. SEE APPENDIX G-2. Although the King's river is impaired it still supports fish consumption, fisheries, primary and secondary contact, domestic water supply, and agricultural and industrial uses. According to ADEQ's Integrated Water Quality Monitoring Assessment Report, the Kings River is in non-attainment for sulfate and total dissolved solids, which is from unknown source REFERENCE ADEQ.

Impacts of Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would disturb 10.6 acres of land according to the SWPPP that was prepared by Frank Walker, who has decades of experience in stormwater plans. SEE APPENDIX C-1. The applicants submitted required paperwork to ADEQ and has been granted coverage under Storm water NPDES General Permit AR1500000 SEE APPENDIX C-1 and C-2. With adherence to the best management practices described in the SWPPP, minimal impacts to surface water from the proposed construction are anticipated. The farm does not discharge into waters of the state and therefore no impacts to state surface waters are anticipated. Any land application of litter produced on the farm would be in compliance with ANRC requirements and accordance with a nutrient management plan which in the

process of being developed by the Madison County Conservation District in order to be protective of surface water quality.

The applicant's SWPPP would implement several BMP's into the design of this proposed project. This proposed site would have a stabilized entrance and exit, which would be covered with gravel. The existing vegetation surrounding the 10.6 acre site would remain and would act as a natural buffer. Straw wattles and sandbags would be strategically placed along the drains to dissipate stormwater. A concrete washout area would be placed on the north side of the proposed entrance to the turkey facility. Any un-vegetated areas would be mulched and seeded to help stabilize these areas. SEE APPENDIX C-1. This proposal would disturb more than 10 acres which would require a sediment basin per ADEQ standards. Areas between the poultry houses would slope downward to the west. A 40,000 cubic foot sediment basin would be placed on the west side of the proposed poultry house pads, which would catch all of the runoff leaving this proposed site. SEE APPENDIX C-1.

The applicants would utilize a composter as a means of mortality disposal on this farm, which is an approved method per ANRC. The composter would be located on the west side of the proposed turkey houses. Integrators typically require their growers to "cake out" in between flocks, which consist removing the top few inches of litter. Depending on integrator requirements and management practices utilized by the grower, a full house clean out is typically conducted annually, where all the litter is removed from the houses. The applicants would have the option to spread litter on pastures as fertilizer in accordance with the NMP, which is currently being developed for this proposed operation, or sell this litter, and have it transported off site to another location for land application. SEE APPENDIX C-3.

The applicants would be responsible for record keeping and adherence to the NPDES permit and for implementation and maintenance of BMP's outlined in the SWPPP to help protect water quality during the construction phase of this proposal.

In summary, the applicants have obtained a NPDES permit thru ADEQ for proposed construction activities to take place and would have an acceptable means of mortality disposal for this proposed operation. This proposal would take place within a designated nutrient surplus area. SEE APPENDIX A-7 The applicants are in the process of having a NMP developed for their proposed turkey operation. These proposed measures should be adequate to help prevent contamination of stormwater off site during the construction phase and any potential future litter applications. No significant impacts to water quality are anticipated to result from the Proposed Action.

5. Air Quality

Existing Conditions

As of February 1, 2018, all of Arkansas is in attainment for all criteria pollutants established by the Environmental Protection Agency in compliance with the Clean Air Act. The proposed farm would not be required to obtain an air permit in accordance with Arkansas Air Pollution Control Regulation 18.301 since air emissions for defined criteria pollutants at the facility do not exceed the permitting thresholds considered protective of air quality. Potential air quality effects considered here include odor and dust

production, which may be associated with construction activities and the ongoing operations of the farm. SEE REFERENCES

The site of the Proposed Action lies in rural Madison County where agriculture, including livestock feeding operations, are common. There are numerous cattle and hay operations in close proximity to this existing cattle farm, as well as integrated poultry farms in this vicinity. According to the Madison County Conservation District, 153 poultry farms registered with ANRC for the 2018 production year. SEE APPENDIX K-4. The nearest neighboring dwellings in relation to the proposal would be approximately ¼ mile to the northeast, ½ mile to the west, and 4/10 of a mile to the southeast. SEE APPENDIX A-8. The nearest church, White Oak Church, is located 2.24 miles northwest of the proposed site. SEE APPENDIX A-6. The nearest school, Pension Mountain School, is located 7.66 miles northwest of the proposal. SEE APPENDIX A-5. The discharge fans on these proposed facilities would face to the west. This proposal would be virtually be surrounded by mixed timber in all directions. These trees would act as a natural buffer that would filter help filter out odors, dust, and other particulate matter emitted by the proposed turkey houses.

Arkansas Water and Air Pollution Control Act, Subchapter 3 Air Pollution exempts "Agricultural operations in the growing or harvesting of crops and the raising of fowls or animals" and the "use of equipment in agricultural operations in the growth of crops or the raising of fowls or animals." There are no local ordinances regulating odor in this area.

Impacts of Proposed Action

Construction activities that disturb the soil surface could generate dust. Such impacts would be minor, temporary and localized, generally confined to the farm property and ongoing only during construction activities. A driveway would be extended, covered with gravel and utilized as the entrance and exit to the proposed construction site. Exposed soils could be wet down to control fugitive dust. Similarly, during construction, minor and localized emissions associated with heavy machinery could be expected. None of these construction related impacts would have a significant or long-term adverse impact to surrounding air quality.

During operation of the farm, roads used by delivery trucks in between the proposed turkey houses would also be covered with gravel to minimize dust associated with travel. Dust generated while the poultry facility is in operation would occur mostly during feeding. Humidity and misting systems inside poultry houses would keep down dust, within the turkey houses.

Odor would be controlled through management of the poultry houses ventilation systems, as is required by integrators for flock health. The applicants would utilize the composter described in earlier sections of the EA for mortality disposal for their proposed broiler operation, which is an approved method of disposal by the Arkansas Poultry and Livestock Commission. Poultry litter that might be produced on this proposed turkey operation would be stored in the (4) turkey houses, or tarped on an elevated area on the 409 acre tract in accordance with ANRC regulations until the litter could either land applied on pastures on this tract or transported off site, which would keep it dry and reduce the impacts of odor emitted by the litter.

Dilution of odors is caused through the mixing of odors with ambient air and is a function of distance, topography, and meteorological conditions. Prevailing winds are from the west and would serve to

facilitate the dispersion of odors. Based on the climate of the southeastern United States, there would be a few days in the year when weather conditions and humidity may cause odor to linger in the vicinity.

According to the EPA, total GHG emissions in the US in 2014 were 6,870 million metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e), a metric measure used compare the emissions from various greenhouses gases based upon their global warming potential. Agriculture accounted for approximately 9 percent of the total or 625.4 million metric tons. The contribution of agriculture to GHG emissions is comprised of livestock (242.96 million metric tons CO₂e), crops (330.68 million metric tons CO₂e), and fuel combustion (51.79 million metric tons CO₂e).

Agricultural activities contribute to GHG in several ways:

Management of agricultural soils accounts for over half of agriculture emissions. Activities including fertilizer application, irrigation and tillage, can lead to production and emission of nitrous oxide. Livestock, particularly cattle, produce methane as part of their digestion accounting for almost one third of the agricultural emissions. Manure storage and management also contribute methane and nitrous oxide, accounting for about 14 percent of the agricultural GHG emissions. Smaller agricultural sources include methane produced by rice cultivation and the burning of crop residue, which produces methane and nitrous oxide. Odor impacts would not be expected to be significant.

6. Noise

Existing Conditions

Existing noise conditions at the site of the proposed action are generally quiet, since nobody currently lives on this 409 acre tract of land. There are nearby cattle, hay, and integrated operations located in the general vicinity of the proposed action. Tractors and equipment, vehicle traffic on County Roads in this area, and other farming and human activity contribute to noise levels in this area, however noise is temporary in nature and not ongoing. This is not a very densely populated area. The nearest neighboring dwellings in relation to the proposal would be approximately ¼ mile to the northeast, ½ mile to the west, and 4/10 of a mile to the southeast. SEE APPENDIX A-8. The nearest church, White Oak Church, is located 2.24 miles northwest of the proposed site. SEE APPENDIX A-6. The nearest school, Pension Mountain School, is located 7.66 miles northwest of the proposal. SEE APPENDIX A-5. There are no non-farm businesses in close proximity to this proposed facility.

Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would establish a new, four house, integrated turkey operation. Noise levels would increase during normal, daylight working hours during the construction phase of this project, which typically lasts about 6 months. Upon completion, noise from the Proposed Action would permanently increase noise levels in this area; however, noise from birds would be insignificant as they are contained within the poultry houses which are set back from property lines and further muffled by insulation in between the roofs, and walls within these structures and vegetative buffers to the east, northeast, and west. These measures would also aid in mitigating periodic equipment usage and truck noise associated with the movement of birds, feed, supplies and materials. Such activities would rarely take place other than during daylight hours, be infrequent in nature, of brief duration and low intensity. Similarly, noise from generators would be limited to a few minutes of periodic testing and they would only operate on a

temporary basis in the event of emergencies should power be lost. As such noise would be of irregular and infrequent duration it would not be significant. Additionally, Arkansas's Right to Farm Law protects operation of farms that were established prior to the use of the area surrounding the agricultural operation for nonagricultural activities and those farms which employ methods or practices commonly or reasonably associated with agricultural production. As integrated poultry production is a mainstay of the state's economy the related production methods have long been the accepted prevailing practice for widespread production both in Arkansas and throughout the country. SEE ARKANSAS RIGHT TO FARM REFERENCE

The proposed action is not expected to significantly affect ambient noise levels in the area or the nearest dwelling.

7. CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

The cumulative impacts analysis is important to understanding how multiple actions in a particular time and space (e.g., geographic area) impact the environment. The CEQ regulations define cumulative effects as “the impact on the environment, which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such actions” (40 CFR § 1508.7). Whereas the individual impact of one project in a particular area or region may not be considered significant, numerous projects in the same area or region may cumulatively result in significant impacts.

Cumulative impacts most likely arise when a relationship exists between a proposed action and other actions occurring in a similar location or time period. Actions overlapping with or in proximity to the proposed action would be expected to have more potential for a relationship than those more geographically separated. Similarly, actions that coincide in time, may have the potential for cumulative impacts.

Establishing an appropriate scope for cumulative impacts analysis is important for producing meaningful analysis that appropriately informs agency decision making. This involves identifying geographic or temporal boundaries within which to identify other activities that could contribute to cumulative impacts to resources. Boundaries should consider ecologically and geographically relevant boundaries which sustain resources of concern. Temporal boundaries will be dependent on the length of time the effects of the proposed action are estimated to last and analysis commensurate with the project’s impact on relevant past, present, and reasonably foreseeable activities within those boundaries. For example, small scale projects with minimal impacts of short duration would not likely contribute significantly to cumulative impacts. CEQ guidance (2005) reinforces this, stating:

“The scope of the cumulative impact analysis is related to the magnitude of the environmental impacts of the proposed action. Proposed actions of limited scope typically do not require as comprehensive an assessment of cumulative impacts as proposed actions that have significant environmental impacts over a large area. Proposed actions that are typically finalized with a Finding of No Significant Impact usually involve only a limited cumulative impact assessment to confirm that the effects of the proposed action do not reach a point of significant environmental impacts”

This cumulative impacts analysis focuses on the potentially affected resource (identified in section 3.2 of this document) and uses natural local boundaries to establish the geographic scope within which cumulative impacts could occur. Relevant past, present and reasonably foreseeable activities identified in Section 5.1 are based on potential geographic and temporal relationships with the proposed action within those identified boundaries. Cumulative effects on those resources are described in Section 4.2.

7.1 Past, Present and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions

Analysis of cumulative analysis is forward looking and focuses on Madison County where the proposed action would be implemented and the related area which includes the resources of concern. The purpose is to assess if the reasonably foreseeable effects of the proposed action would have an additive relationship to other past effects that would be significant, and to examine its relationship other actions (e.g. Federal, State, local, and private activities) that are currently taking place or are expected to take place in the reasonably foreseeable future.

Federal, State, local, and private activities that are currently taking place, have occurred in the past, or may reasonably be assumed to take place in the future in the cumulative effects area include the following: Madison County encompasses approximately 837 square miles and has a population of roughly 16,500. Pastureland accounts for 42% of the land use, Cropland accounts for 22%, Woodland makes up 30% of the land use, and 5% makes up the rest of the land uses in Madison county, according to the 2017 Census of Agriculture. SEE APPENDIX K-1. There were 1,229 farms in Madison county in 2017 and 277,701 acres devoted to farm land. SEE APPENDIX K-1.

Poultry integrators have a finite processing capacity and have a need for new facilities, such as the proposed project, as older facilities are routinely retired due to functional obsolescence or otherwise phased out of production. As there is no foreseeable expectation that integrators would be having a significant expansion in processing capacity in the area, the quantity of bird produced in the area would remain relatively stable, even if the number of farms fluctuates.

7.2 Cumulative Analysis

Some resources considered for detailed analysis above (in Section 3.2) could be directly or indirectly affected by the Proposed Action and therefore the Proposed Action could contribute to additive or interactive cumulative effects to these resources. For other resources, no such contributions to cumulative effects are anticipated because no direct or indirect impacts would occur based on program requirements.

The significance of cumulative effects is dependent on how impacts compare with relevant thresholds, such as regulatory standards. Regulatory standards can restrict development by establishing thresholds of cumulative resource degradation (CEQ 1997):

“Government regulations and administrative standards...often influence developmental activity and the resultant cumulative stress on resources, ecosystems, and human communities. They also shape the manner in which a project may be operated, the amount of air or water emissions that can be released, and the limits on resource harvesting or extraction.”

Cumulative effects in this analysis are described relative to regulatory standards and thresholds in accordance with CEQ guidance. FSA relies on the authority and expertise of regulatory agencies, which have broad knowledge of regional activities that could affect the sensitive resources they are responsible for protecting, and to ensure through their permitting and consultation processes that its activities are not likely to contribute to significant negative cumulative resource impacts.

7.2.1 Wildlife and Habitat

Contributions of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts include removal of existing vegetation and the loss and fragmentation of wildlife habitat. No impacts to Threatened and Endangered Species are anticipated based on program requirements. The proposed site is currently established in mixed cedar, pine and oak thickets, and could provide some value as wildlife habitat. Such impacts would add to vegetation and habitat lost as a result of past, present and reasonably foreseeable activities in the region of the Proposed Action including loss of native vegetation communities to agriculture, residential and commercial development and road building, recreation and other human activities. The Proposed Action would not be anticipated to result in long term or adverse impacts or to endangered species or their habitat. No cumulative impacts are anticipated based on coordination and consultation with USFWS and program requirements

7.2.2 Cultural Resources

Based on program requirements, which call for coordination and consultation with State and Tribal Historic Preservation Offices, no impacts to known cultural resources are expected to result from the Proposed Action. There is the potential for encountering unknown cultural resources during construction. Though unlikely, potential loss and damage to unknown cultural resources could occur, adding to similar potential impacts from other past, ongoing, and future developments that have the potential to degrade and destroy cultural resources.

7.2.4 Water Quality

During construction of the Proposed Action there is the potential for mobilization of exposed soil; however those impacts would be temporary and minor, and minimized by adherence to terms of the SWPPP. Such impacts would add to impacts to water quality resulting from residential, municipal, industrial, and commercial development, particularly the use of septic systems, as well as runoff from roads and development, and agricultural production. Once the disturbed areas are revegetated or otherwise stabilized, no impacts to water quality would be expected. Since there are no long-terms effected to water quality, the proposed action would not be expected to contribute significantly to cumulative effects to water quality.

7.2.5 Air Quality

The Council on Environmental Quality Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change In National Environmental Policy Act Reviews states:

This proposed operation Arkansas Water and Air Pollution Control Act, Subchapter 3 Air Pollution exempts "Agricultural operations in the growing or harvesting of crops and the raising of fowls or animals" and the "use of equipment in agricultural operations in the growth of crops or the raising of fowls or animals." There are no local ordinances regulating odor in existence in this area.

Arkansas's Right to Farm Law protects operation of farms that were established prior to the use of the area surrounding the agricultural operation for nonagricultural activities and those farms employ methods or practices commonly or reasonably associated with agricultural production. Management of agricultural soils accounts for over half of agriculture emissions. Activities including fertilizer application, irrigation and tillage, can lead to production and emission of nitrous oxide.

- Livestock, particularly cattle, produce methane as part of their digestion accounting for almost one third of the agricultural emissions.
- Manure storage and management also contribute methane and nitrous oxide, accounting for about 14 percent of the agriculture GHG emissions.
- Smaller agricultural sources include methane produced by rice cultivation and the burning of crop residue, which produces methane and nitrous oxide.

Dust would be generated from soil disturbance and equipment usage during construction and during operation as a result of equipment use, delivery trucks, and feeding systems. Such impacts would be minor, intermittent, and localized. Though such impacts are not expected to be significant, they would add to dust generated by other activities in the immediate vicinity of the farm.

Odor impacts from the proposed action including from the barns, litter storage facility, land application of litter on the farm, though not significant, would add to other sources of odor in the area including existing cattle and poultry farms nearby.

7.2.6 Noise

Increases in noise levels would be minimal compared to existing conditions. There are no local or state noise ordinances, based on Program Requirements.

7.3 IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES

NEPA requires that environmental analysis include identification of any irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources which would be involved should an action be implemented. The term irreversible refers to the loss of future options and commitments of resources that cannot be renewed or recovered, or can only be recovered over a long period. Irreversible commitments apply primarily to the use of nonrenewable resources, such as minerals or cultural resources, or to factors such as soil productivity, that are renewable only over a long period. Irretrievable refers to the loss of production or use of natural resources. For example, when a road is built through a forest, some, or all of the timber production from an area is lost irretrievably while an area is serving as a road. The production lost is irretrievable, but the action is not irreversible. If the use changes, it is possible to resume timber production. No irreversible resource commitments would occur as a result of the Proposed Action. Irretrievable resources include those raw materials and fuels used during construction.

8. List of Preparers	
Name and Title	Education and Experience
Adam Kaufman, State Environmental Coordinator, FSA, Arkansas	BS, Crop, Soil, and Environmental Sciences Years of Experience: 11

Persons and Agencies Contacted	
Name W	Affiliation
[REDACTED]	Applicant
[REDACTED]	Applicant
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
Charlene Holt	Farm Service Agency
Stacy Hurst	Arkansas SHPO
Bob Komardley	Apache Tribe of Oklahoma
Everett Bandy	Quapaw Tribe of Indians
Dr. Andrea Hunter	Osage Nation
Derek Hill	Caddo Nation
Elizabeth Toombs	Cherokee Nation
Tonya Tipton	Shawnee Tribe
Denton Fancher	Madison County Conservation District
Frank Walker	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
Melissa Lombardi	USFWS

9. REFERENCES

CEQ 1997. Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). 1997. Guidance under the National Environmental Policy Act. December.

TCEQ 2016. Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). 2016. Economic Values and Impacts of Poultry Production Activities in East Texas. <http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/> Accessed on 19 September 19, 2016.

Arkansas Water Plan:

https://arwaterplan.arkansas.gov/basin%20reports/awp_arkansas_river_basin.pdf

National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS):

https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Online_Resources/County_Profiles/Arkansas/cp05083.pdf:

Web Soil Survey (WSS): <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm>

IPAC (Information: <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>

FEMA: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal>

NEPASSIST: <https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist>

National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS):

https://www.agcensus.usda.gov/Publications/2012/Full_Report/Volume_1,_Chapter_2_County_Level/Arkansas/st05_2_001_001.pdf

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), Impaired Streams/TMDL Lists:

<https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/water/>

Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality (ADEQ), Rules and Regulations:

<https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/regs/>

ADEQ 303 (d): <https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/water/planning/integrated/303d/pdfs/2016/final-2016-303d-list.pdf>

Arkansas Natural Resource Commission (ANRC) Regs: <http://www.anrc.arkansas.gov/rules/current-rules/>

Arkansas Air Pollution Control Regulations:

https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/regs/files/reg18_final_160314.pdf

Burns, R.T., H. Li, H. Xin, R.S. Gates, D.G. Overhults, J. Earnest, and L. Moody. 2008. Greenhouse Gas (GHG) Emissions from Broiler Houses in the Southeastern United States. Published in Proceedings of the American Society of Agricultural and Biological Engineers Agricultural and Biosystems Engineering Conference.

EPA 2016a. US Environmental Protection Agency Sources of Greenhouse Gas Emissions. Available at:
<https://www.epa.gov/ghgemissions/sources-greenhouse-gas-emissions#agriculture>. Accessed
March 1, 2017.

EPA 2016b. US Environmental Protection Agency Greenhouse Gas Data Explorer. Available at:
<https://www3.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/inventoryexplorer/>. Accessed March 1,
2017.

University of Arkansas Research and Extension: Madison County:

<https://www.uaex.edu/counties/johson/>

Arkansas Air Pollution Control Regulations:

https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/regs/files/reg18_final_160314.pdf

Arkansas Right to Farm:

http://www.farmlandinfo.org/sites/default/files/Arkansas_RTF_law_1.htm

10. EA DETERMINATION AND SIGNATURES

ENVIRONMENTAL DETERMINATION – The FSA preparer of the EA determines:

1. Based on an examination and review of the foregoing information and supplemental documentation attached hereto, I find that this proposed action
 - would have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) must be prepared;
 - would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment and, therefore, an EIS will not be prepared.

2. I recommend that the Project Approval Official for this action make the following compliance determinations for the below-listed environmental requirements.

Not in compliance	In compliance	Not applicable	
			National Environmental Policy Act
			Clean Air Act
			Clean Water Act
			Safe Drinking Water Act
			Endangered Species Act
			Coastal Barrier Resources Act
			Coastal Zone Management Act
			Wild and Scenic Rivers Act/National Rivers Inventory
			National Historic Preservation Act
			Subtitle B, Highly Erodible Land Conservation, and Subtitle C, Wetland Conservation, of the Food Security Act
			Executive Order 11988 and 13690, Floodplain Management
			Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands
			Farmland Protection Policy Act
			Department Regulation 9500-3, Land Use Policy
			E.O. 12898, Environmental Justice

3. I have reviewed and considered the types and degrees (context and intensity) of adverse environmental impacts identified by this assessment. I have also analyzed the proposal for its consistency with FSA environmental policies, particularly those related to important farmland protection, and have considered the potential benefits of the proposed action. Based upon a consideration of these factors, from an environmental standpoint, this project may:
 - Be approved without further environmental analysis and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) prepared.
 - Not be approved because of the reasons identified under item b.

Signature of Preparer	Date
Adam Kaufman, State Environmental Coordinator	
Name and Title of Preparer (print)	

Environmental Determination – FSA State Environmental Coordinator determines:

Based on my review of the foregoing Environmental Assessment and related supporting documentation, I have determined:

- The appropriate level of environmental review and assessment has been completed and substantiates a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI); therefore, an EIS will not be prepared and processing of the requested action may continue without further environmental analysis. A FONSI will be prepared.

- The Environmental Assessment is not adequate and further analysis or action is necessary for the following reason(s):

- The Environmental Assessment has established the proposed action cannot be approved for the following reason(s):

Additional SEC Comments:

Signature of SEC	Date
Printed Name Adam Kaufman	

